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BACKGROUND

LEGISLATIVE DIRECTIVES (LB1012):

1. Estimate the costs of completion of a canal and adjoining reservoirs as outlined in the South Platte River Compact.

2. Develop a timeline for completion of a canal and adjoining reservoirs as outlined in the South Platte River Compact.

3. Examine the cost-effectiveness of alternatives, including alternatives that may reduce environmental or financial impacts.

4. Evaluate the impacts of the canal on Nebraska water users throughout the Platte River Basin, including the drinking water supplies for the cities of Lincoln and Omaha.
SOURCE MATERIAL

Examined available and new materials in the context of Legislature’s four directives

STUDIES AND INFORMATION AVAILABLE FOR THE EVALUATION:

1. Department of Natural Resources studies funded through 2019 – 2021 appropriations ($1,050,000)

2. Colorado water use and supply data, planning documents, and project feasibility documents

3. 1982 United States Bureau of Reclamation Study of Perkins County Canal design features and costs

4. State of Nebraska data, studies, and reports

5. USGS, CDSS, and other state and federal information
OUR APPROACH

HOW WE ADDRESSED DIRECTIVES:

• Read South Platte River Compact
• Evaluated Information
• Completed Site Visit
• Estimated Water Supply
• Developed Project Alternatives
• Created Costs and Benefits for Alternatives
RISK FACTORS

COLORADO PLANS AND POLICIES REGARDING NEBRASKA WATER SUPPLIES:

• Colorado’s population is projected to grow up to 10 million by 2050
• Colorado needs between 600,000 – 1,000,000 AF of additional water supplies
• 90% of Colorado’s population lives in Front Range
• Colorado House Bill 16-1256 Declares intent to use South Platte River Supply
• Other sources in Colorado, like Colorado River, are running low
• Colorado plans to take Nebraska’s South Platte River water to meet demands
ANSWER TO DIRECTIVE 1

Estimation of the costs of completion of a canal and adjoining reservoirs as outlined in the South Platte River Compact.
COST ANALYSIS

ACTIVITIES INCLUDED:

1. Researched and reviewed historical documents
2. Refined Canal layout and elements
3. Created conceptual design of diversion, canals, and reservoirs
4. Optimized operational flexibility
5. Updated existing information on project costs based on updated design

ALT 1 COST = $567 Million

ALT 2 COST = $628 Million
ANSWER TO DIRECTIVE 2

Development of a timeline for completion of a canal and adjoining reservoirs as outlined in the South Platte River Compact.
# TIME SCHEDULE

Perkins County Canal Project Development Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task / Process</th>
<th>2023</th>
<th>2024</th>
<th>2025</th>
<th>2026</th>
<th>2027</th>
<th>2028</th>
<th>2029</th>
<th>2030</th>
<th>2031</th>
<th>2032</th>
<th>2033</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Public Outreach</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q3</td>
<td>Q4</td>
<td>Q1</td>
<td>Q2</td>
<td>Q3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft NEPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final NEPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Clearance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Draft NEPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final NEPA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regulatory Agency Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land Acquisitions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Bid Approval</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Construction Mobilization</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perkins County Canal Construction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ANSWER TO DIRECTIVE 3

Examination of the cost-effectiveness of alternatives, including alternatives that may reduce environmental or financial impacts.
COST EFFECTIVENESS

ACTIVITIES INCLUDED:

1. Analyzed water supply availability
2. Assessed future no project
3. Developed costs
4. Identified and quantified benefits of project
5. Defined timeframe for analysis (50-year Benefits)

Researched and reviewed historical documents

Refined Canal layout and elements
## COST EFFECTIVENESS OF PROJECT OPTIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>Cost</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Benefit–Cost Ratio</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>500 cfs Canal</td>
<td>$567 Million</td>
<td>$698 to $754 Million</td>
<td>1.23 to 1.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1,000 cfs Canal</td>
<td>$628 Million</td>
<td>$802 to $986 Million</td>
<td>1.28 to 1.57</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENVIRONMENTAL & FINANCIAL IMPACTS

Alternatives reduce environmental and financial impacts

- ✔ Reduction in the number of reservoirs
- ✔ Reduction in total canal length and footprint
- ✔ Enhance water quality
- ✔ Increase waterfowl habitat
- ✔ Provide consistent Platte River base flow
- ✔ Protect, preserve, and enhance groundwater recharge and returns to river
ANSWER TO DIRECTIVE 4

Evaluation of the impacts of the canal on Nebraska water users throughout the Platte River Basin, including the drinking water supplies for the cities of Lincoln and Omaha.
BENEFITS

Alternatives protect environmental, economic and community needs across Nebraska

- Municipal
- Agriculture
- Environmental
- Industrial
- Recreational
- Hydroelectric
- Water Quality
ADDITIONAL BENEFITS

✓ Regional Economic Effects
✓ Benefits realized in perpetuity
✓ Reliability (managed supplies)
✓ Drought resiliency
✓ Capturing surplus supplies
✓ Potential for small hydroelectric
✓ Increased wildlife habitat
✓ Increased hydroelectric on current system
✓ Value of water
CONCLUSIONS

1. Colorado plans to take Nebraska’s water (without Canal)
2. Water is available for Nebraska’s use
3. With construction of Canal, Nebraska will secure water
4. Benefits are greater than costs