

**INSTITUTIONAL ADJUSTMENTS FOR COPING WITH PROLONGED AND SEVERE
DROUGHT IN THE RIO GRANDE BASIN**

By

**Frank A. Ward¹
Robert Young²
Ronald Lacewell³
J. Philip King¹
Marshall Frasier²
J. Thomas McGuckin¹
Charles DuMars⁴
James Booker⁵
John Ellis³
Raghavan Srinivasan³**

TECHNICAL COMPLETION REPORT

Account Number 01423937

February 2001

**New Mexico Water Resources Research Institute
in cooperation with the**

**Colorado Water Resources Research Institute
Texas Water Resources Research Institute**

**Colorado Agricultural Experiment Station
New Mexico Agricultural Experiment Station
Texas Agricultural Experiment Station**

The research on which this report is based was financed in part by the U.S. Department of the Interior Geological Survey, through the New Mexico Water Resource Research Institute

¹New Mexico State University

²Colorado State University

³Texas A&M University

⁴University of New Mexico

⁵University of Colorado

DISCLAIMER

The purpose of the Water Resources Research Institute technical reports is to provide a timely outlet for research results obtained on projects supported in whole or in part by the institute. Through these reports, we are promoting the free exchange of information and ideas, and hope to stimulate thoughtful discussions and actions that may lead to resolution of water problems. The WRRI, through peer review of draft reports, attempts to substantiate the accuracy of information contained in its reports, but the views expressed are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the WRRI or its reviewers. Contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the views and policies of the Department of the Interior, nor does the mention of trade names or commercial products constitute their endorsement by the United States government.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The model described here has undergone a long evolution. It had the good fortune of receiving cooperation among model developers and the Water Resources Research Institutes and Agricultural Experiment Stations of Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas. We are grateful for receiving financial support from these six institutions in addition to a generous grant from the US Geological Survey.

Finally, this study could not have been completed without the unselfish assistance of the following people who agreed in May 1996, or more recently, to serve on our advisory council.

Colorado

Dr. Robert Ward, Director
Colorado Water Resources Research Institute
Ft. Collins, CO

Mr. Ralph Curtis, General Manager
Rio Grande Water Conservancy District
Alamosa, CO

Mr. Allen Davey
Davis Engineering Services
Alamosa, CO

Mr. Leroy Salazar
Agro Engineering Inc.
Alamosa, CO

Mr. Steve Vandiver
Colorado State Engineer's Office
Alamosa, CO

Mr. Hal Simpson
Colorado State Engineer
Denver, CO

Texas

Dr. Wayne R. Jordan, Director
Texas Water Resources Institute
College Station, TX

Mr. Darron Powell, Engineer Advisor to
Texas Rio Grande Compact Commissioner
El Paso, TX

Mr. Herman Settemeyer
Texas Natural Resource
Conservation Commission
Austin, TX

Mr. Ed Archuleta, General Manager
El Paso Water Utilities
El Paso, TX

Mr. Mike Fahy, Director
El Paso Water Utilities
El Paso, TX

Dr. Ari Michelsen, Director
El Paso Agricultural Research
and Extension Center
El Paso, TX

Mr. John M. Bernal, Commissioner
International Boundary & Water Commission
El Paso, TX

Mr. Edd Fifer, General Manager
El Paso Water Improvement District No. 1
El Paso, TX

Mr. Wayne Halbert, General Manager
Harlingen Irrigation District
Harlingen, TX

Mr. Mike Personett, Director
Texas Water Development Board
Austin, TX

Ms. Cindy Martinez
Rio Grande Watermaster
McAllen, TX

Mr. John Keiser
South Texas Development Council
Laredo, TX

Mr. Amando Garza Jr., Executive Director
South Texas Development Council
Laredo, TX

Dr. Paul Dyke, Director
Blackland Research Center
Temple, TX

Mr. Gordon L. Thorn
Texas Water Development Board
Austin, TX

New Mexico

Dr. Tom Bahr, Director
NM Water Resources Research Institute
Las Cruces, NM

Dr. Bobby Creel, Associate Director
NM Water Resources Research Institute
Las Cruces, NM

Mr. Tom Turney
New Mexico State Engineer
Santa Fe, NM

Mr. Gary Daves
City of Albuquerque Public Works
Albuquerque, NM

Mr. Gary Esslinger
Elephant Butte Irrigation District
Las Cruces, NM

Mr. Subhas K. Shah
Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District
Albuquerque, NM

Mr. Steve Hansen
US Bureau of Reclamation
Albuquerque, NM

Mr. Dick Kreiner
US Army Corps of Engineers
Albuquerque, NM

Mr. Russ Livingston, District Chief
US Geological Survey
Albuquerque, NM

Mr. Jeff Whitney
US Fish & Wildlife Service
Albuquerque, NM

Dr. Mike Kernodle
US Geological Survey
Albuquerque, NM

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Rio Grande originates in the southern Colorado Rocky Mountains, flows through New Mexico, and forms the border between the U.S. and Mexico on its way to the Gulf of Mexico. Serving over one-million acres of irrigated land and the municipal and industrial needs of cities like Albuquerque and El Paso, the Rio Grande represents a significant resource in the arid southwest.

In 1938, Congress approved the Rio Grande Compact which divided the annual water flow among the three states of Colorado, New Mexico, and Texas. The U.S.-Mexico Treaty of 1906 divides the river flows between the U.S. and Mexico. The Compact acknowledges the Treaty in Articles IV and VI by stating that the Compact shall not diminish the allocation of water to Mexico and shall not degrade its quality.

Since that time, significant growth in the Rio Grande Basin's demand for water due to increasing populations, growing economies, and emerging policies toward fish and wildlife habitat emphasizing endangered species, has stressed the region's already scarce water supply. Although the inevitable severe drought would cause significant economic damage to the regional economy, present institutional arrangements have not had to confront such an event since the 1950s. The objective of this research is to test the hypothesis that new institutions for interstate coordination of surface water withdrawal and reservoir operations could reduce economic losses resulting from water shortfalls in periods of severe and sustained drought.

A three-state research team of economists, hydrologists and a lawyer was formed to perform the analysis to test this hypothesis. A fully-integrated hydrologic-economic model was developed which extends the basin optimization procedures developed by Vaux and Howitt for California and by Booker and Young for the Colorado River Basin. The geographic scope included the Rio Grande Basin, from

Colorado through New Mexico to Fort Quitman, Texas, downstream of El Paso. The objective was to identify hydrological and economic impacts of possible changes in institutional structure for coping with drought.

This study was an effort to examine options facing river basin managers when confronted with the extenuating circumstance of a major drought. It did not attempt a precise description of the current system as it is managed. The research team realizes that many considered institutional changes for managing water considered in this report would be difficult to do, costly, and in some cases fought bitterly. Nevertheless, like other analyses of proposed changes in water policy, there are several reasons for conducting these policy experiments. Estimating impacts of a proposed water policy change can be a cheap substitute for carrying it out, especially if carrying it out has potentially high but unknown political or economic costs or benefits. If a proposed policy change produces a low economic benefit and high cost for many water users, information on the size and distribution of those benefits and costs is important. This information is a valuable resource for formulating or executing this action should it be considered is a real possibility. If, however, there is a high benefit and low cost to most water users, this is also important information to get out, for it may influence the shape of future policies pursued.

The general approach used in this study reflected the random supplies and uncertain demands for water. They also reflect river and reservoir management rules resulting from economic growth and competing demands for water to meet future needs such as endangered species habitats. Water supplies, which included all major tributaries, interbasin transfers, and hydrologically connected groundwater, were represented in a yearly time-step over a forty-four year planning horizon.

Agricultural water uses, the major source of water demands, were split into major crops for four major demand areas. Municipal and Industrial (M&I) and recreational demands were also identified. Separate economic values were identified for each water use at each major location. Information on the

economic value of each water use at each location provides important facts to decision makers who wish to know impacts of complex proposals whose implementation affects several uses at many locations.

A mathematical model was developed that kept track of economic benefits subject to hydrologic and institutional constraints, and was solved with GAMS optimization software (Appendix CD ROM). Each institutional innovation considered was tested against the baseline Law of the River, the current set of rules for storing, allocating, and using water in the basin. Each proposal was tested for its impact on reducing total economic damages under a future, long-run drought scenario defined by inflows produced by the drought of the 1950s. Results are presented as economic and hydrologic impacts of measures for coping with drought by state, economic sector, and institutional alternative.

One baseline and three alternative institutional innovations were selected for evaluation. The baseline Law of the River focused primarily on the Rio Grande Compact and related rules for allocating the total quantity of water entering the Rio Grande Basin and available for use. Total economic benefits were calculated for: (1) long run normal inflows, (2) a sequence of drought inflows, defined by historical inflows for the period 1942-1985. This period was chosen to represent the severe drought of the 1950s bound by the years leading up to and following that drought. The period was extended to 1942 and 1985 because spills occurred in these two years, wiping out accrued debits and credits under the Compact. For that period, average inflows summed over six headwater stream gages used for this study were 1.40 million acre-feet per year, about 11 percent below the long-run average of 1.57 million.

Total drought damages were computed as the reduction in future economic benefits if future inflows to the basin averaged 1.40 million acre-feet per year compared to economic benefits if inflows averaged 1.57 million. Future economic activity is based on best available estimates for growth in M&I uses based on projected growth of the Albuquerque and El Paso areas.

Long-run annual average future drought damages, defined as the direct economic value of damages caused by the reduced streamflows to water users, were estimated at \$5.8 million for the San

Luis Valley (Colorado), \$3.37 million for New Mexico, and \$8.0 million for west Texas, or about \$101 per acre-foot of water supply reduction. Indirect economic impacts, resulting from interactions among drought-damaged water-users and the rest of the economy, were not measured.

The first institutional adjustment analyzed was increased carryover storage at Elephant Butte Reservoir. This carryover storage was based on reducing Rio Grande project deliveries downstream of Elephant Butte by 25,000 acre-feet per year in normal years, to be stored for use in drought years. The long-run average annual economic value of drought damages mitigated by this institutional change was zero for Colorado, minus \$200,000 for New Mexico, and minus \$433,000 for west Texas. This means that the current Law of the River produces less drought damage than the proposed institution of storing the added water at Elephant Butte.

The second institutional adjustment analyzed was a proposal to invest in technical measures to increase irrigation efficiency for the Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District, in which net stream depletions required for application to crops would be reduced by 18 percent. This institutional change produced virtually zero drought damage mitigation to each of the three states. Reduced water diverted from the Rio Grande brought about by greater irrigation efficiency would also considerably reduce irrigation return flows to the river. The result would be virtually zero water saved and essentially zero economic benefit. Zero drought damage mitigation benefits accrued to Colorado, \$7,000 per year to New Mexico, and \$15,000 to West Texas. This means that the cost of technologies needed to implement these increased irrigation efficiencies would have to be virtually zero to justify such investments economically.

The final institutional adjustment analyzed was to build 100,000 acre feet of new reservoir storage in northern New Mexico above Cochiti Lake. This action produced zero long-run average annual benefit to Colorado, \$134,000 to New Mexico water users, and \$685,000 to West Texas water users. The bulk of these benefits would result from reduced reservoir evaporation and reduced Rio Grande Compact over-deliveries by New Mexico to Texas.

Although the model developed for this study was comprehensive and detailed, it has several limitations in its current state. Overall, it does not precisely represent the behavior of the Rio Grande Basin system. One special area where further improvement is needed is to develop a better understanding and modeling of connections among economics, surface water movement, groundwater hydrology, and behavior of water users.

If improved models are to be used to support development, execution, and evaluation of proposed decisions, considerable resources need to be put into model development and use. The kind of integrated, basin-wide modeling described in this report is a new area of research. The integrations required between modeling the behavior of water users and underlying natural processes are quite complex, poorly understood, and will require much work and patience to bring to full fruition.

Nevertheless, this study succeeded in organizing a highly integrated interdisciplinary study dealing with water management in an important western river basin. Most western river basins are under stress, from natural factors like drought, institutional factors such as endangered species requirements, and external factors like economic growth. The use of interdisciplinary teams to build and apply models such as described in this report, helps prepare society for dealing with unexpected circumstances, such as drought, to cope with future stresses on river basins.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

DISCLAIMER ii

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS iii

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY v

TABLE OF CONTENTS x

LIST OF TABLES xv

LIST OF FIGURES xviii

CHAPTER 1 - INTRODUCTION, SCOPE, AND OBJECTIVES 1

 The Water-Related Problem 1

 Objectives 4

 Scope 5

 Approach 5

CHAPTER 2 -- RELATED RESEARCH 6

 Causes and Effects of Drought 6

 Systems Operations 7

 Drought Response Planning 7

 Political and Institutional Analysis 8

CHAPTER 3 -- METHODS OF ANALYSIS 9

 Task 1: Formulate Drought Scenarios 9

 Task 2: Formulate a Hydrology-Institutions Model of the Rio Grande Basin 10

 Hydrologic Model 10

 Modeling Consultant 11

 Algorithm for Defining Water Use Patterns in Drought 12

 Task 3: Develop an Economics Drought Damage Component 13

 Economic Impacts and Responses 13

 Drought Damage Assessment by Category of Use 14

 Agriculture 14

 Municipal and Industrial (M&I) 15

 Hydroelectric Power 17

 Recreation 17

 Task 4: Identify Institutional Adjustments to Drought 18

 Task 5: Hydrologic-Economic-Legal Policy Analysis 19

 River Management 20

 Changes to Legal Environment 20

 Market Based Operations 21

 Drought Scenarios for the Rio Grande Basin 21

 Selection of Unimpaired Gaging Points in Rio Grande Basin 22

 Statistical Analysis of Drought Duration and Severity at Unimpaired Gaging Points 24

Frequency Distributions for Streamflow at Unimpaired Gaging Points	24
Calculation of Distribution Parameters	26
Gamma Distribution	27
Lognormal Distribution	29
Weibull Distribution	31
Kolmogorov-Smirnov Goodness of Fit Test	31
Synthetic Streamflow for 10,000 Years	36
Gamma Distribution	36
Lognormal Distribution	38
Weibull Distribution	40
Comparison of Headwater Flows	40
Determination of Frequency Distributions for Drought Duration	40
Identification of Drought Events	40
Estimation of Parameters for Drought Severity and Duration	43
Goodness of Fit Test to Identify Best Distribution	50
Analysis of Drought Severity vs. Drought Duration	50
Estimation of 50-year and 100-year Droughts at Unimpaired Gages	51
Economic Analysis of Farm Response to Drought in the San Luis Valley, Colorado	60
Summary	60
Introduction	60
Background	62
Analysis	63
Hydrology Model Development	69
Crop Growth Simulation Model	72
Results and Discussion	74
Conclusions	79
Documentation of Colorado Farm Drought Response Model	80
Water Rights and Supplies	80
Selection of Water Source to Simulate	83
Irrigation Ditch/Canal Data Analysis	84
Water Rights	91
Defining Representative Agricultural Areas	92
Defining Crop Acres	92
Defining Aquifers	93
Defining Areas with Similar Soil Characteristics	94
Allocation of Surface Water to Representative Agricultural Areas	95
Allocation of Groundwater to Representative Agricultural Areas	96
Costs and Returns	97
Description of Crop Growth Simulation Model	97
Agronomic Data Used for Economic Analysis of Drought, Agriculture, San Luis Valley, Colorado	100
Economic Analysis of Farm Response to Drought in New Mexico and West Texas	106
Summary	106
Analysis	107
A Prototype Example	107
New Mexico and West Texas Agriculture	111
Acreage Limits	112

Accounting for Risk	113
Accounting for Drought	114
Crop-Water Production Technologies	116
Findings	118
Economic Analysis of Recreation Response to Drought in the Rio Grande Basin	125
Summary	125
Background	125
Methods of Analysis	128
Visitation	129
Benefits	129
Conclusions	130
Economic Analysis of Hydropower Response to Drought in the Rio Grande Basin	132
Overview	132
Analysis	133
Mathematical Documentation	134
Equations	137
Application to Drought Study	138
Economic Analysis of M&I Response to Drought in the Rio Grande Basin	139
Summary	139
Analysis	139
Significance of Municipal Uses	139
Special Problems of Municipal Water Valuation	140
Findings	142
Drought Damages	144
System Operation under Law of the River	149
Overview	149
Rio Grande Compact	149
Water Allocation Below Elephant Butte Reservoir	150
Water Delivery to Mexico	151
Summary of Mechanics	151
Below Elephant Butte Reservoir	152
Storage-Release Rules for Elephant Butte	152
Water Use Patterns from Elephant Butte Releases	152
New Mexico above Elephant Butte Reservoir	153
Inflows into Elephant Butte	153
Albuquerque Area M&I	153
Rio Grande Bosque	154
Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District (MRGCD)	154
Colorado	154
Deliveries to New Mexico	154
Use for Colorado Agriculture	154
San Luis Valley Closed Basin Project	154
Relation Between Aquifer and Surface Water Use	154
Integrated Model for Institutional Response to Drought in the Rio Grande Basin	155
Summary	155
Background	155
Hydrology	156

Approach	156
Detailed Implementation	157
Surface Diversions for Consumptive Use	157
Groundwater Pumping for Consumptive Use	157
Pumping Limits	158
Water Use by Albuquerque	158
Groundwater Pumping by the City of El Paso	158
Surface Water Use by El Paso	158
Mexican Surface Water Deliveries	158
Surface-Groundwater Interactions	159
Reservoirs	159
Consumption by the Bosque	159
Inflows	160
Consumptive Use of Water	160
Mass Balance	160
Compact Constraints	160
Water Distribution within New Mexico	161
Institutions	161
Maximizing Beneficial Use	161
Benefits from Consumption	162
Benefits from Recreation	162
Total benefits	162
The Rio Grande Compact	162
Water Rights	164
Compact Delivery Requirements	165
Institutions Selected	167
Reporting	167
Discussion	167
CHAPTER 4 -- RESULTS	168
Analysis of Institutional Adequacy for Drought Response in the Rio Grande Basin	168
Summary	168
Background	168
Need for New Water Management Approaches in the Rio Grande Basin	169
Historic vs. New Water Uses – Value in Tradition vs. Economic Value	170
Material Standards of Living vs. Sustainable Quality of Life	170
Needs of Human Species vs. Needs of Other Species	170
Streams as Aquatic Systems vs. Utilitarian Plumbing and Power Systems	171
Types of Disputes in New Mexico	171
Interstate	171
Interagency	172
Federal/Tribal-State	172
Federal/State-Tribal	172
Groundwater-Surface Water Conflicts	172
The Use of Multi-Disciplinary Technical Teams	175
Construction of a Common Data Set	176
Build, Test, and Calibrate a Hydrologic Model of the Water System	177

Model Water Quantity - Water Quality Conditions to Achieve or Avoid	177
Negotiate Tough Issues	178
Use of Multi-disciplinary Teams and Modeling – the Georgia Experience	179
The Rio Grande Compact	183
History	183
Pre-1938 Compact History	183
The Rio Grande Compact of 1938	186
Rio Grande Compact Commission Rules and Regulations	188
The Goals of the 1938 Compact	189
How the 1938 Compact Achieves Those Goals	191
Delivery Obligations in Drought	199
Less than 600,000 Acre-Feet of Usable Water in Project Storage ..	199
Less than 400,000 Acre-Feet of Usable Water in Project Storage ..	202
General Provisions	205
Role of Models in Drought Policy Analysis	205
Law of the River, Normal Inflows	207
Water Use Patterns	207
Economic Benefits	210
Law of the River, 1942-1985 Drought Inflows	212
Water Use Patterns	212
Economic Benefits	215
Carryover Storage at Elephant Butte for Use in Drought	217
Water Use Patterns	218
Economic Benefits	221
Increase Irrigation Efficiency in Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District	225
Water Use Patterns	226
Economic Benefits	229
Build Reservoir Storage in Northern New Mexico	231
Water Use Patterns	231
Economic Benefits	233
 CHAPTER 5 -- CONCLUSIONS	 236
 REFERENCES	 239
 APPENDIX	
GAMS Code for Supporting Models	
<i>(Contained on CD-ROM attached to inside of back cover)</i>	

LIST OF TABLES

<u>TABLES</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
3-1. Gamma Function Values for a River's Annual Streamflow in cfs-years	28
3-1a. Gamma Parameter Calculation, Rio Chama	29
3-2. Estimated Parameters for Distribution of Rio Conejos Streamflows at Mogote Gage, Measured in Cfs-Years, Longnormal Distribution	30
3-3. Estimation of Weibull Distribution Parameters for Annual Rio Grande Headwater Streamflows, Del Norte Gage (cfs-yrs)	31
3-4. Goodness-of-Fit Test to Identify Distribution that Best Characterizes Annual Streamflow (Cfs-years), Rio Puerco	35
3-5. Generated Annual Streamflows (cfs-yrs), first 40 of 10,000 years, Rio Salado Near San Acacia, NM, Gamma Distribution	37
3-6. Rio Puerco Generated Annual Streamflow, in cfs-yrs, first 40 of 10,000 years, lognormal distribution, in which $\mu_{\ln(x)} = 9.44$ and $\sigma_{\ln(x)} = 0.7284$	39
3-7. Analysis of Drought Deficits, based on first 40 years of 10,000 years synthetic streamflow, Rio Grande at Del Norte gage, (cfs-years)	42
3-8. Drought Duration and Deficits, Rio Grande at Del Norte, CO	43
3-8a. Rio Grande at Del Norte, CO Drought Duration Distribution Parameters	44
3-9. Distribution of Drought Durations, 10,000 years of synthetic streamflow, Rio Grande Del Norte, CO headwater flows with 50 and 100-year drought events indicated in bold font . . .	46
3-10. Estimated Drought Duration Parameters, Four Probability Distributions, Six Headwater Gages, Rio Grande Basin	49
3-11. Sample of Rio Grande Drought Durations vs. Water Deficits	51
3-12. 50-Year Drought Scenarios, Six Headwater Gages, Rio Grande Basin, Total Annual Streamflows, in cfs-years	52
3-13. 50-Year Drought Scenarios, Six Headwater Gages, Rio Grande Basin, Cumulative Storage Deficits, cfs-Years, Since Drought Onset	54
3-14. 100-Year Drought Scenarios, Six Headwater Gages, Rio Grande Basin, Total Annual Streamflows, cfs-Years	56
3-15. 100-Year Drought Scenarios, Six Headwater Gages, Rio Grande Basin, Cumulative Storage Deficits, cfs-Years, Since Drought Onset	58
3-16. Canals / Ditches Modeled in the Analysis, Acres Serviced by Canal/Ditch, Number of Shares Held by the Canal/Ditch, and Annual Assessment for Each Share, San Luis Valley Colorado	65
3-17. Crop Growth Coefficients for Crop Production Functions (Eq. 3.23)	73
3-18. Price and Variable Costs for Alfalfa, Barley and Potatoes	74
3-19. Water Diversions for Each Irrigation Ditch/Canal with 100% and 50% of River Flow Available	75
3-20. Representative Farm, Irrigation Ditch/Canal from which Water is Diverted, Acres Available for Crop Production, Acres Cropped, and Amount of Water Applied when River Flow and Aquifer Volume are Full and Reduced by 50%	76
3-21. Acres of Alfalfa Produced with Different Quantities of Water Available	77
3-22. Acres of Barley Produced with Different Quantities of Water Available	78
3-23. Acres of Potatoes Produced with Different Quantities of Water Available	78
3-24. Total Net Returns from Crop Production with River Flow and Aquifer Volume Declining from 100% to 0%	79

3-25.	Total Decreases from WD 20, Rio Grande and Six Ditches with Largest Decreases	85
3-26.	Irrigation Canals and Ditches with Largest Decreases in Water District 20	85
3-27.	Water District 20 Reservoir Decreases with No Priority and Late Appropriation/Adjudication Dates Not Included in the River Flow Model	86
3-28.	Total Decreases from WD 20, Rio Grande and Six Ditches with Largest Decreases after Decreases Listed in Table A.2 Deleted	86
3-29.	Irrigation Ditches and Canals Diverting Water from the Rio Grande in Water District 20 with No Priority Number	87
3-30.	Total Decreases from Water District 20, Rio Grande and Six Ditches with Largest Decreases after Decreases with no Priority Number Deleted	87
3-31.	Six Irrigation Canals and Ditches with Largest Decreases in Water District 20 After Deleting Decreases in Acre-feet and No Priority	88
3-32.	Comparing Priority and Decree of the Six Ditches with the Most Decreases and all Other Ditches with the Percent of Total Flow Required to Satisfy all Decreases	89
3-33.	Rio Grande Daily Average, Minimum and Maximum Flow for 1986-1995 at Del Norte During Critical Months for Agricultural Irrigation	90
3-34.	Actual Rio Grande Diversions for the Six Ditches and Canals with the Most Deceased Water, all Other Ditches and Rio Grande Flow for 1987-1995 Del Norte Gauging Station	91
3-35.	Water and Land Use in a Hypothetical Western Irrigated Farm	108
3-36.	Solution to Hypothetical Farm Management Problem	109
3-37.	Sample methods and data, illustrated for onions, Elephant Butte Irrigation District, New Mexico	115
3-38.	Crop Water use Technologies, Elephant Butte Irrigation District, New Mexico	118
3-39.	Economic Damages from Selected Water Shortages, Elephant Butte Irrigation District, New Mexico	119
3-40.	Economic Damages from Selected Water Shortages, Middle Rio Grande Conservancy District, New Mexico	123
3-41.	Economic Damages from Selected Water Shortages, El Paso Area Irrigation, Texas	124
3-42.	Recreational Use and Benefit, Rio Grande Basin Reservoirs	130
3-43.	Hydropower Capacity, Rio Grande Basin	134
3-44.	Indices for Hydropower Model	135
3-45.	Parameters for Hydropower Model	135
3-46.	Area Capacity Relations	136
3-47.	Variables for Hydropower Model	137
3-48.	Economic losses for selected water use curtailments due to drought: Albuquerque	145
3-49.	Economic losses for selected water use curtailments due to drought: El Paso	146
3-50.	Water use apportioned by state under Rio Grande Compact, in 1,000 acre-feet per year, exclusive of tributary flows produced in New Mexico and Texas	166
4-1.	Elements of the ACT/ACF Comprehensive Study	182
4-2a.	Debit Cancellation and Credit Reduction by Spill	199
4-2b.	Debit Reduction When There Is No Spill	200
4-2c.	Required Release When There Is less than 600,000 Acre-feet of Usable Water in Storage	203
4-2d.	Limitation on Increasing Storage When There Is less than 400,000 Acre-feet of Usable Water in Storage	206
4-3.	Long Run Average Annual Water Use Patterns in Drought, by State, Location, and User (1000s acre-feet)	212

4-4.	Long-Run Average Annual Economic Benefit from Water Use Patterns, by State, Location, and User (\$1000s)	214
4-5.	Long-Run Average Annual Water Use Patterns in Drought, by State, Location, and User (1000s acre-feet)	217
4-6.	Long-Run Average Annual Drought Damages by State, Location, and User (\$1000s)	219
4-7.	Long-Run Average Annual Water Use Patterns under Drought Mitigation by State, Location, and User (1000s of acre-feet)	223
4-8.	Long-Run Average Annual Drought Damage Mitigation from Alternative Institution, by State, Location, and User (\$1000s)	225
4-9.	Long-Run Average Annual Water Use Patterns under Drought Mitigation by State, Location, and User (1000s of acre-feet)	231
4-10.	Long-Run Average Annual Drought Damage Mitigation from Alternative Institution, by State, Location, and User (\$1000s)	233
4-11.	Long-Run Average Annual Water Use Patterns under Drought Mitigation by State, Location, and User (1000s of acre-feet)	235
4-12.	Long-Run Average Annual Drought Damage Mitigation from Alternative Institution, by State, Location, and User (\$1000s)	238

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>FIGURES</u>	<u>PAGE</u>
1-1 Map of Rio Grande Basin	2
1-2 Schematic of Rio Grande Basin	3
3-1 Rio Chama Annual Streamflow Probability Distributions	25
3-2 Rio Salado Annual Streamflow	26
3-3 Rio Puerco Annual Flow Histogram	34
3-4 Drought Duration Histogram, Rio Grande at Del Norte, CO	45
3-5 Schematic of Irrigation Ditches/Canals and Ditch Number Identifier used in Simulation Model, San Luis Valley, CO	66
3-6 Relative Yield from Crop Growth Simulation Model with Each Possible Irrigation Combination for Alfalfa on Sandy Soil	100
3-7 Relative Yield from Crop Growth Simulation Model with Each Possible Irrigation Combination for Alfalfa on Sandy Loam Soil	100
3-8 Relative Yield from Crop Growth Simulation Model with Each Possible Irrigation Combination for Barley on Sandy Soil	101
3-9 Relative Yield from Crop Growth Simulation Model with Each Possible Irrigation Combination for Barley on Sandy Loam Soil	101
3-10 Relative Yield from Crop Growth Simulation Model with Each Possible Irrigation Combination for Potatoes on Sandy Soil	102
3-11 Relative Yield from Crop Growth Simulation Model with Each Possible Irrigation Combination for Potatoes on Sandy Loam Soil	102
3-12 Regression Results to Derive Crop Growth Coefficients for Alfalfa on Sandy Soil	103
3-13 Regression Results to Derive Crop Growth Coefficients for Alfalfa on Sandy Loam Soil ..	103
3-14 Regression Results to Derive Crop Growth Coefficients for Barley on Sandy Soil	104
3-15 Regression Results to Derive Crop Growth Coefficients for Barley on Sandy Loam Soil ...	104
3-16 Regression Results to Derive Crop Growth Coefficients for Potatoes on Sandy Soil	105
3-17 Regression Results to Derive Crop Growth Coefficients for Potatoes on Sandy Loam Soil .	105
3-18a Residential Demand for Water Per Household, Albuquerque	147
3-18b Economic Value of a Range of Water Uses-Per Household, Albuquerque	147
3-18c Residential Demand for Water Per Household, El Paso	148
3-18d Economic Value of a Range of Water Uses Per Household, El Paso	148