

# DERIVED OPERATING RULES FOR RESERVOIRS IN SERIES OR IN PARALLEL

By Jay R. Lund<sup>1</sup> and Joel Guzman<sup>2</sup>

**ABSTRACT:** This paper reviews a variety of derived single-purpose operating policies for reservoirs in series and in parallel for water supply, flood control, hydropower, water quality, and recreation. Such rules are useful for real-time operations, conducting reservoir simulation studies for real-time, seasonal, and long-term operations, and for understanding the workings of multireservoir systems. For reservoirs in series, several additional new policies are derived for special cases of optimal short-term operation for hydropower production and energy storage. For reservoirs in parallel, additional new special-case rules are derived for water quality, water supply, and hydropower production. New operating policies also are derived for reservoir recreation.

## INTRODUCTION

Despite the development and growing use of optimization models (Labadie 1997), the vast majority of reservoir planning and operation studies is based predominantly or exclusively on simulation modeling and thus requires intelligent specification of operating rules. Practical real-time operations also usually require the specification of reservoir operating rules. These rules determine the release and storage decisions for each reservoir at each time-step during the simulation and help guide reservoir operators (Bower et al. 1966; Hufschmidt and Fiering 1966). This paper reviews a variety of common and newly derived operating rules for single-purpose reservoirs in series and in parallel. These derived rules can all be supported by conceptual or mathematical deduction from principles of engineering optimization for special cases. These rules can be contrasted with the many and often highly effective empirically based rules common in practice, such as various pool-based rules and balancing rules ("Reservoirs" 1977; Wurbs 1996; Nalbantis and Koutsoyiannia 1997). The rules examined here are intended mostly for seasonal and long-term studies. Real-time studies, with an hourly or daily time-step, often have more detailed safety, habitat, and facility limitations not usually important for studies using coarser time-steps or longer operating horizons. The rules presented here offer some guidance for real-time operation but generally are more applicable to seasonal and long-term operations planning and modeling studies. Desirable operating rules for reservoir systems with mixed purposes might have very different forms from those presented here. Previous reviews of reservoir operating rules include Sheer's fine concise review (1986) and Loucks and Sigvaldason (1982). Several U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) reports (cited below) also developed reservoir operating rules for specific purposes. The work presented here is drawn from work done for the USACE (Lund and Guzman 1996).

For those developing operating policies for real reservoir systems, the rules presented are part of a bag of tricks with some theoretical or practical basis to recommend them. The rules discussed here are organized by reservoir configuration, in series or in parallel, and by various operating purposes. Operation for multiple purposes (i.e., most real systems) re-

quires some combination of these rules or use of other operating rule forms (Lund and Guzman 1996). The presumption in many of these rules is that a system of reservoirs can be operated to produce greater benefits than operating the individual reservoirs independently. While this is often the case (Palmer et al. 1982), it is not always the case (Needham 1998).

This paper begins with examination of rules for reservoirs in series for specific single purposes. Various single-purpose rules for reservoirs in parallel are then reviewed. A general storage-effectiveness-based rule for recreation storage is then presented, followed by a short general discussion of specification of operating rules by stochastic dynamic programming (SDP). The conceptual rules are summarized in Tables 1 and 2. A commentary and conclusions end the paper. Derivations of selected rules appear in appendices. Pseudocode for implementing many of these rules appear in Lund and Guzman (1996).

## RULES FOR RESERVOIRS IN SERIES

This paper begins with examination of operating rules for reservoirs in series, illustrated in Fig. 1, for water supply storage, flood control, energy storage, and hydropower production. Most rules presented are assembled from earlier cited work. This work is extended in some cases. The conceptual rules for reservoirs in series are summarized in Table 1.

### Water Storage Rules

For reservoirs in series providing water supply, a reasonable objective is to maximize the amount of water available, which is the same as minimizing spilled water. The resulting rule for single-purpose water supply reservoirs in series is simply to fill the highest reservoirs first and the lowest ones last (Sheer 1986).

The likelihood and severity of shortages is reduced by preventing any water from leaving the system as uncontrolled and unproductive spills. For reservoirs in series, with intermediate inflows, the probability of spill from the system is minimized by first filling the uppermost reservoirs and retaining storage capacity in the lower reservoirs to capture potentially large flows and reduce the likelihood of spills from the system. Spillage from any but the lowest reservoir can then be captured by a lower reservoir. During the drawdown season, where system inflows are less than demands, the system should be drawn down in order of the downstream reservoirs first, to provide storage to accommodate potentially excess intermediate inflows or an early onset of the refill season.

For reservoirs in series serving water supply as a sole purpose, the above rule seems universal. An exception might be where higher reservoirs suffer higher rates of water loss from evaporation and seepage (Kelley 1986). In this case, any increased evaporation or seepage from higher reservoirs would

<sup>1</sup>Prof., Dept. of Civ. and Envir. Engrg., Univ. of California, Davis, CA 95616. E-mail: jrlund@ucdavis.edu

<sup>2</sup>Formerly, Undergrad. Student, Dept. of Civ. and Envir. Engrg., Univ. of California, Davis, CA.

Note. Discussion open until November 1, 1999. To extend the closing date one month, a written request must be filed with the ASCE Manager of Journals. The manuscript for this paper was submitted for review and possible publication on August 5, 1998. This paper is part of the *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management*, Vol. 125, No. 3, May/June, 1999. ©ASCE, ISSN 0733-9496/99/0003-0143-0153/\$8.00 + \$.50 per page. Paper No. 18938.

**TABLE 1. Conceptual Rules for Reservoirs in Series<sup>a</sup>**

Purpose (1)	Season/Period	
	Refill (2)	Drawdown (3)
Water supply	Fill upper reservoirs first	Empty lower reservoirs first
Flood control	Fill upper reservoirs first	Empty lower reservoirs first
Energy storage	Fill upper reservoirs first	Empty lower reservoirs first
Hydropower production	Maximize storage in reservoirs with greatest energy production	Maximize storage in reservoirs with greatest energy production
Recreation		Equalize marginal recreation improvement of additional storage among reservoirs

<sup>a</sup>Exceptions and refinements are discussed in text.


**TABLE 2. Conceptual Rules for Reservoirs in Parallel<sup>a</sup>**

Purpose (1)	Season/Period	
	Refill (2)	Drawdown (3)
Water supply	Equalize probability of seasonal spill among reservoirs	Equalize probability of emptying among reservoirs
Flood control	Leave more storage space in reservoirs subject to flooding	— <sup>b</sup>
Energy storage	Equalize EV of seasonal energy spill among reservoirs	For last time-step, equalize EV of refill season energy spill among reservoirs
Water quality	Equalize EV of marginal seasonal water quality spill among reservoirs	For last time-step, equalize EV of refill season water quality spill among reservoirs
Hydropower production	Maximize storage in reservoirs with greatest energy production	Maximize storage in reservoirs with greatest energy production
Recreation	Equalize marginal recreation improvement of additional storage among reservoirs	Equalize marginal recreation improvement of additional storage among reservoirs

Note: EV = expected value.

<sup>a</sup>Exceptions and refinements are discussed in text.

<sup>b</sup>Not applicable.



**FIG. 1. Reservoirs in Series**

An exception to this rule can be where the outflow capacity of the lower reservoir is restricted. Here, it can be better to fill the lower reservoir first to increase head on the outlet, thereby increasing release capacity from the entire system to the downstream channel capacity (“Flood” 1976). This allows higher prereleases to increase total storage available for a coming flood event.

The operation of reservoirs in series for flood control is fairly complementary with water supply operations, at least in regard to the preferred location of storage. The maintenance of water supply storage still preys on the absolute flood control capability of a system, and vice versa.

The USACE (“Flood” 1976) presented methods for allocating flood control space in reservoirs in series with flood control locations both downstream of the system and between reservoirs. In such cases, except for small flood events, there are likely to be inherent trade-offs in protection of these sites from different storage allocation and operations decisions.

**Hydropower Rules**

Hydropower rules for reservoirs in series vary between refill and drawdown seasons or periods. During a refill period, the problem usually is to maximize the storage of energy at the end of the period. During a drawdown period, the objective is to maximize hydropower production for a given total storage amount. Different rules are employed for each period. A difficult problem is the transition between seasons or periods.

**Energy Storage Rules**

The objective of the energy storage rule for reservoirs in series is to maximize the total energy stored at the end of a refill season or period. Here, the refill season is defined as the season when system inflows exceed those needed to meet water supply or hydropower production demands. The energy storage rule for reservoirs in series is to always fill the upper reservoirs first.

To maximize the energy stored for a future time, water storage is preferred in upstream reservoirs. Water stored at higher elevations has a higher energy content (kilowatt-hours/unit volume of water stored) than water stored at lower elevations. This is particularly true for water stored in reservoirs in series, where water eventually released from upper reservoirs generates hydropower at the lower reservoirs as well. Any spills from upper reservoirs are available for capture in space available in lower reservoirs. Kelman et al. (1989) mathematically examined the allocation of energy storage and flood control storage capacity in complex multireservoir systems. Their results will often indicate the compatibility of the desirable distribution of energy and flood control storages in such two-purpose systems.

Fortunately, energy storage and water supply storage rules for reservoirs in series are quite compatible for the refill sea-

have to be weighed against the increased potential for loss due to spill from concentrating storage at lower elevations.

**Flood Control Rules**

For reservoirs in series with intermediate inflows and storage serving solely for flood control downstream, it is optimal to regulate floods by filling the upper reservoirs first and emptying the lower reservoirs first. The objective is to maintain as much control over flows entering the system above a critical flood-prone reach as possible. Flood storage at the reservoir closest upstream from a critical flood control reach always provides greater flood controllability than for any other reservoir (Mariën et al. 1994). These are typically the lowest reservoirs in the series. Thus, for single-purpose flood control storage in a series of reservoirs, it is best to fill the higher reservoirs first and empty the lower reservoirs first. An illustration of this rule can be found in a large Brazilian multireservoir system (Kelman et al. 1989).

son, at least in terms of where storage is preferred in the system and their general intent to accumulate the maximum amount of water. However, with the coming of the drawdown season, hydropower production rules are required.

### Hydropower Production Rule

When it comes time to produce energy, rules to maximize hydropower production may be employed. Upper reservoirs generate hydropower by releases that consequently also increase downstream power generation by increasing heads, if stored downstream, or by subsequent turbine releases downstream.

The steady-state hydropower production rule attempts to maximize hydropower generation during a single time-step, given a total storage target for the system, primarily during the drawdown season. This problem involves allocating a given total storage to maximize hydropower production. In general, the rule favors allocation of storage to those reservoirs that create a higher head per unit volume of storage, have higher generation efficiencies, and have higher releases, as hydropower production is the product of head, efficiency, and release. A variant of this rule is the USACE's "storage effectiveness index" presented in Appendix I (*Engineering* 1985; Lund and Guzman 1996). This rule typically applies to a drawdown period or season.

The maximum amount of power that can be generated in a reservoir system occurs when head levels in all reservoirs are at their highest. Where the total amount of water stored in the system is limited, perhaps due to other operating purposes or variations in hydrology and demands, the problem then becomes one of allocating a limited amount of storage among the individual reservoirs to maximize hydropower production. This hydropower maximizing water storage allocation depends on reservoir capacities, inflows, efficiencies of energy production, and the total amount of water (or energy) to be stored.

Water often is stored first in smaller reservoirs, where head usually increases more per unit volume of additional storage than in most large reservoirs. This is illustrated in Fig. 2, where the volume of water needed to increase head by an amount  $x$  in the lower reservoir, V2, is much less than that needed to achieve an equivalent increase in head for the upper reservoir, V1.

Another consideration is release flow rate. All else being equal, hydropower production is maximized by allocating available stored water to reservoirs with the greatest release rates. Thus, for reservoirs in series with intermediate inflows, it is often desirable to maximize storage in the lower reservoirs first. Typically, downstream reservoirs receive more direct and indirect inflows than upstream reservoirs. Storage in downstream reservoirs is therefore often kept at high levels to take advantage of increased flows (with some increased chance of energy spills).

Finally, reservoirs with higher generation efficiencies should be maintained at higher levels of storage at the expense of reservoirs with lower efficiencies. The combination of reservoir capacity, amount of total inflows, and power generation efficiencies determines the overall potential of the reservoir to produce power, assuming all reservoirs have adequate turbine capacity. When reductions in storage are necessary, they are




FIG. 2. Change in Head with Varying Capacities

made from reservoirs with the least ability to produce power. Conversely, if an increase in storage can be made, it should be in reservoirs with the greatest ability to produce power.

The interaction of these factors is examined mathematically in Appendix II. The result is to calculate the following ratio for each reservoir  $i$  at each simulation time-step:

$$V_i = a_i e_i \left( \sum_{j=1}^i I_j \right) \quad (1)$$

where  $V_i$  = increased power production per unit increase in storage;  $a_i$  = unit change in hydropower head per unit change in storage (the slope of the head-storage curve);  $e_i$  = power generation efficiency of reservoir  $i$ ; and  $I_j$  = direct inflows and releases into reservoir  $j$ , for all reservoirs upstream of reservoir  $i$ . Here reservoir 1 is the uppermost reservoir in the series of reservoirs. For this steady-state hydropower production rule, reservoirs are ordered in terms of their values of  $V_i$  and are filled from highest to lowest values of  $V_i$  until the total water storage target is met.

For drawdown periods, these rules can be employed for hydropower production systems of reservoirs in parallel, in series, as well as mixed systems. Where the total storage constraint is desired to be in terms of energy storage, rather than water storage, the more elaborate linear programming (LP) approach presented in Appendix II is then required.

Many systems of reservoirs in series maintain their lower, smaller reservoirs full for hydropower production. This is the case for the Missouri River System and the Columbia River System. Often, maintaining high storage levels in the lower reservoirs also aids navigation through the lower reaches of the reservoir system, as in the lower Columbia River System.

The hydropower production rule for reservoirs in series can be implemented directly using the values of  $V_i$  presented above, or by using the more elaborate LP formulations of the problem presented in Appendix II. This rule should work best for individual time-steps under nearly steady-state conditions, where small changes in storage are anticipated.

A more dynamic and general version of this simple rule is discussed by Lund (unpublished paper, n.d.), based on a concept by Sheer (1986).

### RULES FOR RESERVOIRS IN PARALLEL

The operation of reservoirs in parallel (Fig. 3) differs from reservoirs in series in that downstream reservoirs cannot be used to capture additional water from underestimated flows or benefit from the transfer of water stored upstream if flows are overestimated. The following sections present balancing rules for water supply, energy storage, water quality, and flood control. These rules typically apply to the reservoir system's refill season. Computational studies suggest that these rules tend to work rather well over a wide range of conditions, perhaps because the performance response surface is flat for such stor-




FIG. 3. Reservoirs in Parallel

age allocation decisions (Sand 1984). Several hydropower production rules also are presented. Conceptual rules for operating parallel reservoirs are summarized in Table 2.

### Water Supply, Energy Storage, and Water Quality Rules

Several types of rules have been developed for water supply, energy storage, and water quality operations for parallel reservoirs during refill periods. For reservoir systems providing either water supply or energy production, a reasonable objective is to minimize expected shortages. The severity of shortages is reduced by avoiding any water leaving the system as uncontrolled and unproductive spills (Sand 1984). These rules prescribe ideal release or storage levels for reservoirs in parallel to avoid the inefficient condition of having some reservoirs full and spilling, whereas other reservoirs have unused storage capacity (Bower et al. 1966). These rules are derived in Appendix III.

#### New York City (NYC) Rules

The NYC rules use the probability of spills rather than the direct amounts of physical spill in the minimization of expected shortages. When the probabilities of spilling at the end of the refill season are the same for each reservoir, it follows that physical spill also is minimized (Appendix III). Water supply shortfall is consequently minimized as well.

The NYC rule was first stated by Clark (1950) for the NYC water supply system, "In operating this system an attempt is made to have the storage in each of the watersheds, at all times, fall on the same percentage year." The draw from each reservoir is adjusted to equalize the probability of refill by the end of the refill season, about June 1 (Clark 1956).

There are three requirements for rigorous application of the NYC rule as follows (Sand 1984):

1. The system contains reservoirs operating in parallel.
2. The system provides for a single demand downstream of all reservoirs.
3. Expected shortages are to be avoided or minimized.

Modified forms of the NYC rule also can handle situations where the unit value of water varies between reservoirs but is constant in any individual reservoir. In terms of water supply, the quality of water might affect its unit value. For example, higher total suspended solids concentrations correspond to greater treatment costs and lower desirability as a water supply source. For energy production the value of water is based on the maximum head of each reservoir, so that water contained in reservoirs with greater head has proportionally greater value.

Application of the NYC rule depends on predicted inflows. Thus greater accuracy in these predictions should yield better results (fewer spills). Because releases are recalculated at each period, a high degree of accuracy in predicted inflows is not critical in the early periods of the refill season. Toward the end of the refill season, reliable flow forecasts become more important as the chances of spill increase (Bower et al. 1966). Therefore, it is important to have enough historical and watershed data for probabilistic streamflow forecasts.

Optimality also depends on the coefficient of variation of mean monthly flows and the correlation between flows on adjacent streams (Bower et al. 1966; Sand 1984). The NYC rule has been found to behave optimally or near-optimally for a wide variety of operating conditions and system configurations (Sand 1984).

The general form of the NYC rule equates the probabilities of spill at the end of the refill season adjusted by the unit value of water for each reservoir

$$h_i \Pr[CQ_i \geq K_i - S_{fi}] = \lambda, \quad \forall i \quad (2)$$

where  $h_i$  = unit value of water in reservoir  $i$ ;  $CQ_i$  = cumulative inflow to reservoir  $i$  from the end of the current period to the end of the refill season;  $K_i$  = storage capacity of reservoir  $i$ , assumed to be the same in every period;  $S_{fi}$  = end-of-period storage for the current period for reservoir  $i$ ; and  $\lambda$  = constant across all reservoirs in parallel.

The values of  $h_i$  depend on water quality and energy storage issues as described later. Historical data are typically used to establish the cumulative inflows  $CQ_i$ . Individual reservoir releases for the current period  $R_i$  are found by taking the initial storage  $S_{oi}$  plus expected inflow for the current period  $E[Q_i]$  and subtracting the end-of-period storage  $S_{fi}$  that satisfies (2):

$$R_i = S_{oi} + E[Q_i] - S_{fi} \quad (3)$$

such that the sum of releases equals a current-period total downstream release target  $R_{OT}$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n R_i = R_{OT} \quad (4)$$

This often requires a search over  $\lambda$  to find the proper total release.

#### Water Supply

When the unit value of water  $h_i$  is the same among reservoirs providing water supply,  $h_i$  is incorporated into the constant  $\lambda$  and thus drops from the equation

$$\Pr[CQ_i \geq K_i - S_{fi}] = \lambda, \quad \forall i \quad (5)$$

#### Water Quality

When the quality of water varies between reservoirs, such as varying total dissolved or suspended solids concentrations the probabilities of spill are adjusted by  $h_i$ , the marginal value of water use minus its treatment cost for each reservoir. Thus, if the marginal value of treated water use downstream is \$500/acre-ft and the cost of treatment for water from reservoir 1 is \$50/acre-ft,  $h_1 = \$450$ . Such a formulation might also be applied to provide a balancing rule that preferentially stores water for downstream fish flows.

#### Energy Storage

For energy storage applications, the probabilities of the potential energy of spill are equated. Therefore the probabilities of spill are adjusted by  $h_i$  in (2), the full head level of each reservoir, representing the marginal value of energy lost from spill.

The NYC space rules apply to the refill season of systems of parallel reservoirs and attempt to minimize the expected value of spilled water. The primary difficulties are specification of inflow probabilities, computational implementation of the rule (now a minor problem), and potentially the absence of considering future refill season demands on the inflows into the system.

#### Space Rule

The space rule seeks to leave more space in reservoirs where greater inflows are expected, or where greater potential energy of inflows are expected in the case of energy storage (Bower et al. 1966). It is a special case of the NYC rule, seeking to minimize the total volume of spills. The same conditions for applicability and optimality apply. The NYC rule becomes the space rule when the distributional forms of inflows into each parallel reservoir are the same, with distributions scaled by their expected value [i.e., the distribution  $f_i(CQ_i/EV(CQ_i))$ ,

where  $EV(\ )$  is the expected value operator, is identical for all reservoirs] (Sand 1984). This derivation appears in Appendix III. The advantage of the space rule over the NYC rule is its direct computation. Like the NYC rule, the spill minimizing objective implies that this rule is applicable to the system's refill season. Like the NYC rule, the space rule has been found to behave optimally or near-optimally for a wide variety of operating conditions and system configurations (Sand 1984; Wu 1988).

Johnson et al. (1991) examined the application of space rules for operating the Central Valley Project in Northern California. In this system, power output is maximized while maintaining high levels of water supply reliability. This application appeared to offer improvements over the simulated operation of the system.

The particular form of the equal ratio space rule depends on the reservoir purpose being examined for the system. Space rules have been developed for water supply storage and energy storage purposes.

#### Water Supply

For water supply purposes, implementing the space rule consists of setting target storages in each reservoir so that the ratio of space remaining at the end of the current period to the expected value of remaining refill season inflow for each reservoir is identical (Johnson et al. 1991). This is expressed mathematically as follows:

$$\frac{K_i - S_{fi}}{EV(CQ_i)} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n K_i - V}{\sum_{i=1}^n EV(CQ_i)}, \quad \forall i \quad (6)$$

with

$$V = \sum_{i=1}^n (S_{0i} + EV(Q_i)) - R_{OT} \quad (7)$$

where  $V$  = total water storage of the system at the end of the current time-step and all other terms are as defined in the NYC rule. Using the above equation, releases in a parallel system of reservoirs containing equally valued units of water are determined similarly to implementing the NYC rule as follows:

$$S_{fi} = K_i - \left( \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n K_i - V}{\sum_{i=1}^n EV(CQ_i)} \right) EV(CQ_i) \quad (8)$$

#### Energy Storage

When preventing energy spills, the space rule equation used for water supply is modified by replacing reservoir capacities, available storage, and expected inflows with their potential energy counterparts. These consist of maximum potential energy that can be stored or the capacity of the turbines, available potential energy storage, and potential energy of expected inflows, respectively (Johnson et al. 1991). The substitution of these elements yields the following equation:

$$\frac{KE_i - E_{fi}}{EV(CE_i)} = \frac{\sum_{i=1}^n KE_i - E}{\sum_{i=1}^n EV(CE_i)}, \quad \forall i \quad (9)$$

where  $KE_i$  = maximum energy content of reservoir  $i$ ;  $E_{fi}$  = target energy content of reservoir  $i$  at the end of the current

time-step;  $CE_i$  = cumulative energy inflow to reservoir  $i$ ;  $E$  = total target energy content of the reservoir system at the end of the current time-step; and  $EV(\ )$  = expected value operator. If releases or storages fall outside their permitted upper or lower bounds, the decision variables can be set to those bounds while the remaining variables are balanced according to the space rule (Stedinger et al. 1983). Johnson et al. (1991) used a quadratic program to implement their energy space rule for each time-step for their California Central Valley Project simulation model.

Space rules are simpler to implement than NYC rules. However, they rest upon distributional assumptions that might not always hold. The importance of these distributional assumptions can be tested for particular situations using long-term simulation modeling.

#### LP-NYC Rule

Similar to the two previous balancing rule forms, the LP-NYC rule also relies on historical data to determine expected inflows. However, rather than producing cumulative inflow distributions for  $CI_i$ , the inflow data are entered directly into an LP. Spill, or the value of spill, is minimized by considering all individual cumulative inflows from each period to the end of the refill cycle in past years. Compared to the NYC rules, the primary advantage of LP-NYC rules is its ability to incorporate other (linear) short-term reservoir operation constraints into the rule. Such additional constraints might include minimum or maximum flows downstream of each reservoir or required diversions below a subset of reservoirs.

The same conditions required for the NYC rule apply to the LP-NYC rule. LP-NYC rules are slightly more general than NYC rules in that they can also incorporate other linear operating constraints in the setting of short-term storage targets for each reservoir and could also incorporate other operating purposes in the objective function (Johnson et al. 1991). However, implementation of LP-NYC rules requires greater computational effort. For each time-step, the linear program described in Appendix III would be solved. The values of  $h_i$  in the formulation depend on whether water supply, water quality, or energy storage issues are being considered. Thus, water supply, water quality, and energy storage versions of the LP-NYC rule can be developed.

#### Flood Control Balancing Rule

The approach taken for flood control in parallel reservoirs is to maintain balance between reservoirs in terms of occupied capacities and flood runoff from drainage areas. If a reduction in outflows is required, it is made from the reservoir with the least percentage occupancy or smallest flood runoff. When an increase in releases is possible, it is made from the reservoir with the greatest capacity occupied or where relatively higher flood runoff is occurring. Higher releases from reservoirs receiving greater flood runoff may thus be counterbalanced by reducing releases from reservoirs receiving lesser runoff (Ghosh 1986).

The intent of the flood control balancing rule is to operate the parallel reservoirs to balance the amount of flood control storage available, while maximizing undamaging releases from the system. Although the principle of balancing flood control storage on parallel reservoirs should be clear, the operation used to meet this objective is not an exact one. If the objective were to minimize the expected value of damaging spills above the downstream channel capacity, then flood control rules could be developed analogous to the NYC rules. Unfortunately, the objective of flood control is more likely to be minimization of peak downstream flood flows during the refill season, where peak inflows to the system can arrive during a

very short time. This situation is less rigorously represented by the NYC rule approach.

The USACE ("Flood" 1976) suggested the following method for allocating flood control space between two parallel reservoirs (A and B) with a single downstream flood damage location:

1. Route the project design flood and other observed floods with a maximum amount of runoff occurring above reservoir A and with maximum nondamaging releases from reservoir A. Allow reservoir B to make the remaining releases, up to the maximum nondamaging level. Plot the space required at reservoir A versus total space required.
2. Perform the same exercise for reservoir B, with the maximum design and observed flood flows entering above reservoir B. Plot the space required at reservoir B versus total space required.
3. The ratio for balancing flood storage between the two reservoirs should lie between these two curves.

While the concept of a flood control balancing rule appears conceptually sound, exact formulations remain unclear.

### Water Supply Drawdown

For drawdown of water supply reservoirs in parallel, Wu (1988) suggested a rule that equalizes the probability of each reservoir being empty at the end of the drawdown season. For systems of reservoirs in parallel with side demands, depending on releases from a specific individual reservoir, such an operation is meant to avoid the possibility of having to reduce a side demand when water is available to meet other demands. Wu fashioned a drawdown rule along these lines similar to the space rule. In simulation tests, he found a combination of space rule and this drawdown rule to be simple to implement and provide near-optimal performance relative to other rule forms.

### Hydropower Production Rules for Reservoirs in Parallel

#### Steady-State Hydropower Production Rule

For steady-state hydropower production at reservoirs in parallel, the hydropower production rule for small time-steps derived in Appendix II reduces to

$$\max P = \gamma \sum_{j=1}^m e_j a_j S_j I_j \quad (10)$$

where the subscript  $j$  refers to an individual parallel reservoir; and variables are defined as for (1). Taking the first derivative  $\partial P / \partial S_j = e_j a_j I_j = V_j$ , or the hydropower storage effectiveness of parallel reservoir  $j$ . The resulting rule is as follows: Empty parallel reservoirs sequentially, beginning with those with the smallest  $V_j$ . Fill in the reverse order.

#### Power Production and Energy Drawdown Rules for Parallel Reservoirs

Sheer (1986) provided a rule for drawing down reservoirs with the minimum impact on long-term hydropower production (e.g., lost potential energy) for reservoirs that will fill before they empty. Reservoirs in which withdrawal results in the smallest reduction in potential energy should be drawn down first. This rule is derived and elaborated by Lund (unpublished paper, n.d.). Some of these results for parallel reservoirs appear below.

Assuming the reservoirs do not empty before they refill, the most efficient drawdown of water volume from the system

would minimize total reduction in annual hydropower production. The marginal economic value of hydropower release is calculated for each reservoir as follows:

$$\frac{\partial z}{\partial T_i} = e_i \left( P_0 H_i(S_{i0}) + P_r R_i \frac{\partial \bar{H}_i(S_{i0})}{\partial T_i} - P_f H_i(K_i) \alpha_i \right) \quad (11)$$

where  $e_i$  = efficiency of power generation at reservoir  $i$ ;  $T_i$  = volume of storage to be released from reservoir  $i$  in the present time-step;  $\bar{H}_i(S_{i0})$  = expected flow-weighted hydropower head for reservoir  $i$  until refill with present reservoir storage  $S_{i0}$ ;  $H_i(K_i)$  = hydropower head with storage at refill capacity  $K_i$ ;  $P_0$  = present price of energy;  $P_r$  = flow-weighted average price of energy expected until the reservoir refills;  $P_f$  = expected price of energy when the reservoir is filled; and  $\alpha_i$  = marginal proportion of additional storage in the present time-step that would not be spilled during the refill season for reservoir  $i$  (if =0.9, 10% of any additional storage now is expected to be spilled).

The rule then is to draw down reservoirs with the greatest values of  $\partial z / \partial T_i$  first and to refill them in the reverse order. (Note that the last two terms are negative and a positive  $\partial z / \partial T_i$  indicates increased hydropower value with increased release.) This rule is particularly applicable where the withdrawals are being made to supply some downstream water supply volume requirement.

If the current drawdown is intended to supply an energy demand or contract, the above rule is then modified somewhat. The most efficient drawdown of potential energy from the system would minimize total reduction in annual hydropower production. The marginal economic value of energy release from each reservoir is estimated,  $\partial z / \partial E_i$ , where  $E_i = H_i(S_{i0}) e_i T_i$ . This leads to the following:

$$\frac{\partial z}{\partial E_i} = P_0 + \frac{P_r R_i}{H_i(S_{i0})} \frac{\partial \bar{H}_i(S_{i0})}{\partial T_i} - \frac{P_f H_i(K_i)}{H_i(S_{i0})} \alpha_i \quad (12)$$

The rule then is to draw down reservoirs with the greatest values of  $\partial z / \partial E_i$  first and to refill them in the reverse order.

Both hydropower production rules should apply well where the reservoirs refill in most years and do not empty. Under these circumstances, energy spills might be common unless sufficient turbine flow capacity exists to pass common high refill-season flows. Thus, the coefficient  $\alpha_i$  can be important. Alternative rules are developed for systems where reservoirs are expected to empty before they refill (Lund, unpublished paper, n.d.). Because the value of hydropower production often varies seasonally, these formulations also allow consideration of relative energy prices in different periods.

### STORAGE ALLOCATION FOR RESERVOIR RECREATION

Where reservoir recreation is the predominant purpose for operations during a time-step, how should a given total storage be allocated among reservoirs? For individual reservoirs, recreation potential usually varies discontinuously around storage levels corresponding to the elevations of docks, boat ramps, and beaches. However, within these ranges reservoir recreation potential is likely to be roughly proportional to reservoir surface area  $A_i$ , perhaps weighted by some constant representing accessibility or recreational facilities  $r_i$  at each reservoir. Thus, the systemwide reservoir recreation objective is to maximize total weighted surface area over all  $n$  reservoirs

$$\max A_T = \sum_{i=1}^n r_i A_i(S_i) \quad (13)$$

subject to

$$\sum_{i=1}^n S_i = S \quad (14)$$

Solving this problem using Lagrange multipliers gives the condition that for any two reservoirs  $i$  and  $j$

$$r_i \frac{\partial A_i(S_i)}{\partial S_i} = r_j \frac{\partial A_j(S_j)}{\partial S_j} \quad (15)$$

or, each reservoir's marginal storage contribution to recreation should be equal. This becomes a storage allocation rule for an arbitrary system of reservoirs predominantly used for reservoir recreation. Because reservoir surface area is usually a concave function of storage, the rule usually should roughly balance storage among all reservoirs, skewed by the weighting factor  $r_i$ . This type of storage effectiveness rule is likely to be of greatest use during the drawdown season, when storage is decreasing and the distribution of remaining storage becomes an important recreational issue.

During the drawdown season, operations for hydropower and recreation might be made more compatible by varying the development of reservoir recreation facilities and access. This would vary  $r_i$  to make the outcomes of hydropower and recreation rules more closely agree.

### SDP-BASED RULES

Rules for operation of multireservoir systems can also be developed by SDP. Here, an explicit characterization of streamflow probabilities is used together with an explicit loss function and definition of system configuration and constraints to numerically derive optimal reservoir operating policies. This approach has long been explored and developed (Little 1955; Tejada-Guibert et al. 1995; Kim and Palmer 1997). Various formulations have been developed to include probabilistic streamflow forecasts and improvements and approximations to improve computational speed.

SDP approaches to deriving operating rules are rigorous and conceptually flexible. However, they suffer from extreme computational demands for large problems and require explicit probabilistic characterization of unimpaired streamflows. Attempts to reduce computational requirements by increasing the coarseness of storage and flow discretizations lead to results being more approximate (Klemes 1977). In most cases, it is also difficult to have confidence in a specific explicit probabilistic characterization of a region's inflows, and there seems to be a limited variety of approaches available for representing streamflow relationships within an SDP format. SDP-based rules continue to show increasing promise but remain somewhat prohibitively difficult to apply in practice.

A few tests of SDP versus other operating rules have been performed (Karamouz and Houck 1987; Wu 1988; Johnson et al. 1991). These tests show that well-crafted conventional operating rules typically perform nearly as well, and sometimes better, than SDP-based rules.

### COMMENTARY

#### Refill versus Drawdown Periods

The rules presented here apply mostly to either periods of refill or drawdown. NYC and space rules for reservoirs in parallel and water supply, energy storage, and flood control rules for reservoirs in series typically apply to refill seasons. Hydropower production rules apply mostly to drawdown periods. Within each type of period, it is relatively easy to determine desirable single-purpose operating policies for the system. It is far more difficult to determine operationally when these periods begin and end, and thus how operations should make the transition between these periods. Rules for determining which season applies can be based on time of year or streamflow

forecasts and evaluated using historical probabilities, explicit optimization, implicit optimization, and/or historically-based simulation studies. Forecasting is likely to be important here.

### Multipurpose and Generic Multireservoir Rules

Most reservoir systems are multipurpose. Fortunately, many of the operating rules presented here show compatibility between different reservoir purposes, such as flood control, water supply, and energy storage for refill periods on reservoirs in series. In complex cases, optimization approaches and traditional simulation may be used to calibrate the rule forms identified above or parameterized simplifications of such multireservoir rules. A wide variety of parameterized forms of these and other multireservoir operating rules are available, including the USACE's highly flexible "index-level method" for allocation of total storage among multiple reservoirs ("Reservoir" 1977; Nalbantis and Koutsoyiannis 1997).

Traditionally, iterative simulation methods are used to calibrate operating rules to perform well for multiple purposes, and they are the final analysis methods used to refine and test operating rules ("Reservoir" 1977). Performance-based optimization models can also sort through the operations of complex multipurpose systems. Where implicit stochastic optimization is used for computational convenience (Lund and Ferreira 1996), some of the rule forms suggested here might be useful for disentangling the results. Some of these rule forms may also be useful for other simulation-based reservoir optimization studies, such as genetic algorithms (Oliveira and Loucks 1997).

### Reservoir Aggregation in Multireservoir Systems

For systems consisting of many reservoirs, it is common to aggregate some of the reservoirs to reduce the computational or data storage demands of large simulation and optimization models (Saad et al. 1994). A final use of the rules presented here is to help aggregate reservoirs and understand how to disaggregate operations of aggregated reservoirs. In this regard, reservoirs in series are typically easier to aggregate and disaggregate than reservoirs in parallel. A related use of these rules is to derive improved starting-point solutions for application of large-scale optimization methods or more refined simulation studies.

### Simulation and Optimization

In almost every case, simulation modeling is the standard by which operating rules are refined and tested. Simulation models can provide more realistic and detailed representation of reservoir system operations and much lower computational demands than optimization models for all but the most straightforward cases. Simulation models are also more common in practice and, therefore, are more likely to be trusted as a standard of comparison.

Comparison of proposed operating rules by simulation modeling provides many benefits. In many cases, simulation results will show that several sets of operating procedures will provide approximately equivalent performance (Wu 1988). In other cases, simulation results will demonstrate the trade-offs of multiple performance objectives with different operating policies. In a few cases, the ability to demonstrate trade-offs will aid in negotiations over how the system should best be operated. For all of these purposes, it is useful to have a wide variety of potential operating rule forms available for examination.

### CONCLUSIONS

Derived operating rules available for reservoirs in series and in parallel have been reviewed. These rules are summarized in

Tables 1 and 2. A wide variety of operating rules are available for simulation modeling of reservoirs in series and in parallel. These provide a great deal of flexibility in the specification of system operations under various flow, storage, and demand conditions. Fortunately, for many single-purpose cases, a derived basis exists to help engineers narrow the search for appropriate operating rules.

A particular set of operating rules can be supported technically in a number of ways. Some rules are based on simple engineering principles for reservoir operations, such as keeping reservoirs full for water supply or empty for flood control. Several rules are derived from more formal optimization principles, such as the NYC space rules and hydropower production and energy storage rules. However, many rules in practice are based largely on empirical or experimental successes, either from actual operational performance, performance in simulation studies, or optimization results. These experimentally supported rules are common for large multipurpose projects.

Many opportunities exist for the use of formal optimization methods within reservoir simulation models. Examples include implementing storage allocation rules for reservoirs in series and in parallel, as well as general penalty-minimizing operations, and allocating water among uses within a given time-step. Effective means of employing and hybridizing these rules are likely to be required for multipurpose systems. Similarly, rules for shifting operating rule sets according to drawdown or refill conditions are an important area for further work.

## APPENDIX I. STORAGE EFFECTIVENESS INDEX RULES FOR HYDROPOWER PRODUCTION

The storage effectiveness index has been developed by the USACE for maximizing firm hydropower production during the drawdown season (*Engineering* 1985). For each reservoir, a storage effectiveness index is calculated for each time-step, using forecast inflows and power demands for the current time-step and remaining time-steps in the drawdown season. Reservoirs with a low index value are drawn down first.

**Step 1.** Find the firm energy requirement for the current time-step  $E_f$ .

**Step 2.** Estimate the shortfall of firm hydropower production due to insufficient inflows to the system

$$S_f = E_f - \frac{720}{11.81} \sum_{i=1}^n I_{ui} H_i(S_i) e_i$$

where  $S_f$  = energy shortage for the current time-step;  $I_{ui}$  = inflow upstream of reservoir  $i$  during the current time-step;  $H_i(S_i)$  = hydropower head as a function of reservoir storage for reservoir  $i$ ;  $S_i$  = current reservoir storage for reservoir  $i$ ;  $e_i$  = hydropower production efficiency of reservoir  $i$ ; and the constant is a conversion factor for  $I_{ui}$  (cfs),  $H_i$  (ft), and  $S_f$  (Kw·h). This assumes that all flows can be utilized through the turbines.

**Step 3.** For each reservoir, estimate the drawdown required for that reservoir to individually eliminate the shortfall

$$S_i = \frac{720}{11.81(59.5)} \Delta S_i H_i e_i$$

where  $1/59.5$  = conversion of cubic feet per second to acre-foot draft per month;  $\Delta S_i$  = drawdown (acre-ft); and  $H_i$  = average head corresponding to the drawdown (often found iteratively). Solving for  $\Delta S_i$

$$\Delta S_i = \frac{11.81(59.5)}{720} S_f / (H_i e_i)$$

**Step 4.** For each reservoir, estimate the energy loss in the remainder of the drawdown season due to a drawdown of  $\Delta S_i$  during this time-step (month)

$$E_{Li} = \frac{720}{11.81} (CI_{Ui} + V_{pi}) H_i (S_i - \Delta S_i) e_i / 59.5$$

where  $E_{Li}$  = drawdown season power loss due to drawdown of reservoir  $i$  by  $\Delta S_i$ ;  $CI_{Ui}$  = cumulative natural inflow upstream of reservoir  $i$  for the remainder of the refill season; and  $V_{pi}$  = volume (acre-ft) of upstream storage to be emptied during the remainder of the drawdown season.

**Step 5.** Calculate the storage effectiveness ratio (SER) for each reservoir  $i$

$$SER_i = E_{Li} / S_f$$

Reservoirs with the lowest ratios are to be drawn down first.

## APPENDIX II. DERIVATION OF HYDROPOWER PRODUCTION RULES FOR RESERVOIRS IN SERIES

### LP Short-Term Storage Allocation

The objective is to find the allocation of a total storage volume that maximizes hydropower production for one period, subject to inflow forecasts for each reservoir, reservoir storage capacities, and a total storage target. As an equilibrium analysis, changes in reservoir storage are neglected. This is expressed mathematically as follows:

$$\max P = \gamma \sum_{i=1}^n H_i(S_i) Q_i e_i \quad (16)$$

subject to

$$Q_i = I_i \quad (17)$$

$$Q_i = Q_{i-1} + I_i, \quad \forall i > 1 \quad (18)$$

$$S_i \leq K_i, \quad \forall i \quad (19)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n S_i = S \quad (20)$$

where  $P$  = sum total of energy produced by all reservoirs;  $n$  = number of reservoirs in system;  $H_i$  = level of head in reservoir  $i$ ;  $S_i$  = storage target for reservoir  $i$ ;  $S$  = total system storage target;  $Q_i$  = total inflow and release for reservoir  $i$ ;  $I_i$  = direct inflows into reservoir  $i$ ;  $K_i$  = storage capacity of reservoir  $i$ ;  $e_i$  = efficiency of turbines in reservoir  $i$ ;  $V_i$  = change in overall power production  $P$  with change in storage in reservoir  $i$ ; and  $\gamma$  = unit weight of water. It should be noted that reservoir  $i = 1$  is the most upstream reservoir in series. For short-term allocation, the head-storage relationship can often be linearized, or  $H_i(S_i) = a_i S_i$ . The following LP results:

$$\max P = \gamma \sum_{i=1}^n a_i e_i S_i Q_i \quad (21)$$

subject to constraint equations (17)–(20), where  $a_i$  is a constant relating change in head with change of storage in reservoir  $i$  (for small changes in head).  $H_i(S_i)$  is commonly nonlinear but may be piecewise linearized and solved with an LP, because head-storage relationships for most reservoirs are concave.

### Derivation of Hydropower Production Rule

The above LP formulation can typically be simplified, where the head-storage relationship can be linearized. Using the objective function of (21) and substituting it in (17) and (18) results in the simpler LP

$$\max P = \gamma \sum_{i=1}^n a_i e_i \left( \sum_{j=1}^i I_j \right) S_i \quad (22)$$



subject to constraint equations (19) and (20). This problem is solved by finding the slope of the objective function with respect to storage for each reservoir

$$\frac{\partial P}{\partial S_i} \alpha a_i e_i \left( \sum_{j=1}^i I_j \right) = V_i \quad (23)$$

**Rule.** Fill reservoirs in order of highest to lowest  $V_i$  until total storage  $S$  is filled. Empty in the reverse order.

### LP Short-Term Energy Storage Allocation

This problem is slightly modified from that discussed above in that instead of seeking to maximize hydropower production subject to a given total water storage, it is desired to maximize hydropower production of reservoirs in series subject to a given total energy storage. For this problem, the objective and constraints in (19) and (22) are restated below, and (20) is modified to an energy storage constraint

$$\max P = \gamma \sum_{i=1}^n a_i e_i \left( \sum_{j=1}^i I_j \right) S_i \quad (24)$$

subject to

$$S_i \leq K_i, \quad \forall i \quad (25)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n E_i(S_i) = E \quad (26)$$

where  $E$  = total energy storage sought; and  $E_i(S_i)$  = energy content of each reservoir as a function of its water storage.

For small changes in reservoir storage, the function  $E_i(S_i)$  can probably be linearized into the form  $b_i S_i$  (where  $b_i$  is a constant), allowing (26) to be made linear and (24)–(26) to be employed as an LP to allocate storage among reservoirs in series to maximize hydropower production, subject to a total energy storage level. For large changes in storage, another solution method is likely to be required, as  $E_i(S_i)$  is convex.

### APPENDIX III. DERIVATIONS OF PARALLEL BALANCING RULES

These derivations of the NYC and space rules are adapted from derivations presented by Sand (1984) and Johnson et al. (1991). These derivations are further extended to examine energy storage and water quality applications.

#### Basic Derivation of NYC Rule

Definitions of variables used in this appendix are as follows:  $z$  = value of objective function;  $h_i$  = unit value of water in reservoir  $i$ ;  $n$  = number of reservoirs in the system;  $S_{fi}$  = end-of-period storage for the current period for reservoir  $i$ ;  $S_{0i}$  = beginning of current period storage for reservoir  $i$ ;  $CQ_i$  = cumulative inflow to reservoir  $i$  from the end of the current period to the end of the refill cycle;  $K_i$  = storage capacity of reservoir  $i$ , assumed to be the same in every period;  $V$  = total volume of water in storage at the end of the current period;  $I_i$  = inflow to reservoir  $i$  for the current period;  $D$  = demand for current period (release for current period); and  $f_i(CQ_i)$  = probability density of  $CQ_i$ .

The objective of the NYC balancing rule is to minimize the expected value  $EV(\cdot)$  of total cumulative spill from all of the parallel reservoirs at the end of the refill season. This is reflected in the objective function in (1). In (1), the term  $h_i$  represents the relative value of water stored in each reservoir. Variation in the value of water can reflect variation in pumping costs, treatment costs, or energy content between the various reservoirs, as discussed later in the derivation. To implement

this rule, this optimization problem is solved for each time-step during the refill season

$$\min z = EV \left( \sum_{i=1}^n h_i \min(0, S_{fi} + CQ_i - K_i) \right) \quad (27)$$

subject to the following constraints:

$$\sum_{i=1}^n S_{fi} = V \quad (28)$$

$$V = \sum_{i=1}^n (S_{0i} + I_i) - D \quad (29)$$

Constraint equation (29) indicates that the total water available should equal the sum of available water (current storage plus current period inflows) minus downstream water demands for the current period.

Expanding the expected value function in the objective function [(27)] yields

$$\min z = \sum_{i=1}^n h_i \left( \int_{K_i - S_{fi}}^{\infty} (S_{fi} + CQ_i - K_i) f_i(CQ_i) dCQ_i \right) \quad (30)$$

subject to constraint equations (28) and (29).

The Lagrangian for this problem is

$$\begin{aligned} L = & \sum_{i=1}^n h_i \left( \int_{K_i - S_{fi}}^{\infty} (S_{fi} + CQ_i - K_i) f_i(CQ_i) dCQ_i \right) \\ & + \lambda \left( \sum_{i=1}^n S_{fi} - V \right) = \sum_{i=1}^n h_i \left( (S_{fi} - K_i) \int_{K_i - S_{fi}}^{\infty} f_i(CQ_i) dCQ_i \right. \\ & \left. + \int_{K_i - S_{fi}}^{\infty} CQ_i f_i(CQ_i) dCQ_i \right) + \lambda \left( \sum_{i=1}^n S_{fi} - V \right) \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} L = & \sum_{i=1}^n h_i \left( (S_{fi} - K_i) \left( 1 - \int_0^{K_i - S_{fi}} f_i(CQ_i) dCQ_i \right) \right. \\ & \left. + \overline{CQ}_i - \int_0^{K_i - S_{fi}} CQ_i f_i(CQ_i) dCQ_i \right) + \lambda \left( \sum_{i=1}^n S_{fi} - V \right) \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where  $\overline{CQ}_i$  = expected value of cumulative inflows for reservoir  $i$  during the remainder of the refill season.

The first-order conditions for solving this problem are

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{\partial L}{\partial S_{fi}} = 0 = & h_i \left( \left( 1 - \int_0^{K_i - S_{fi}} f_i(CQ_i) dCQ_i \right) \right. \\ & \left. + (S_{fi} - K_i)(-f_i(CQ_i = K_i - S_{fi})) \right. \\ & \left. - (K_i - S_{fi}) f_i(CQ_i = K_i - S_{fi}) \right) + \lambda \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

or

$$h_i \left( 1 - \int_0^{K_i - S_{fi}} f_i(CQ_i) dCQ_i \right) = \lambda \quad (34)$$

or

$$h_i \Pr(CQ_i > K_i - S_{fi}) = \lambda, \quad \forall i \quad (35)$$

or

$$h_i \Pr(\text{any spill in reservoir } i) = \lambda \quad (36)$$

This general result indicates that the storage targets for all reservoirs should have the same probability of spill, weighted by the value of water for each reservoir  $h_i$ . The use of the NYC rule for water supply, water quality, and energy storage purposes all follow (35) and (36), with different interpretations of  $h_i$ .

### NYC Water Supply Rule

For simple water supply purposes,  $h_i$  has the same value for all  $i$ , and so (35) becomes

$$\Pr(CQ_i > K_i - S_{fi}) = \lambda, \quad \forall i \quad (37)$$

### NYC Rule for Water Quality

For simple water supply purposes with important water quality differences (e.g., total dissolved solids or perhaps water temperature, or total suspended solids) between reservoirs,  $h_i$  varies between reservoirs and can be interpreted as the marginal value of water use minus its water treatment cost for reservoir  $i$ . In this case (35) and (36) remain the same but with this net water value varying with spills of different water qualities.

### NYC Rule for Energy Storage

Here, the objective is to minimize the expected value of potential energy spilled rather than physical water spilled. Here,  $h_i$  has the interpretation of the energy content of water stored in reservoir  $i$ . Eqs. (35) and (36) remain the same and apply to this interpretation.

### Derivation of Space Rules

Returning to (35)—the central result of the NYC rule—the assumption is made that the distributions  $f_i(CQ_i)$  have the same distributional form, except that they are scaled by the average cumulative flow of the basin  $\overline{CQ}_i$ . Where this assumption holds, then the distributions

$$f_i(CQ_i/\overline{CQ}_i) = f_j(CQ_j/\overline{CQ}_j) \quad (38)$$

for any two reservoirs  $i$  and  $j$ .

Where this is the case, the ratio  $(K_i - S_{fi})/\overline{CQ}_i$  becomes a standard deviate for all distributions, having the same probability of exceedence for all reservoirs. If this ratio is set so that it equals the same ratio at the basin-wide scale

$$\frac{\sum_{i=1}^n K_i - V}{\sum_{i=1}^n \text{EV}(CQ_i)} \quad (39)$$

then the reservoirs are all balanced in terms of minimizing expected value of spill and maximizing capture of current inflows.

By replacing water inflows, water storage capacities, and water storage levels with energy inflows, energy storage capacities, and energy storage levels, the space rule can be adapted to energy storage purposes as the NYC rule can be adapted to other operating purposes (Johnson et al. 1991).

### Derivation of LP-NYC Rules

Derivation of the LP space rules begins with (27)–(29) used in the derivation of the NYC rules. Additional constraints can also be added to the LP-NYC rule problem, as long as the additional constraints are linear.

In this case the expected value operator in (27) is replaced by use of the weighed summation of spill values that would

result from each year of the historical record or the probabilities of several representative year-types. Given historical streamflows of equal record length  $> m$  for each of  $n$  reservoirs,  $m$  representative refill seasons can be inferred. This yields the following LP:

$$\min z = \sum_{j=1}^m p_j \sum_{i=1}^n h_i L_{ij} \quad (40)$$

subject to

$$\sum_{i=1}^n S_{fi} = V \quad (41)$$

$$L_{ij} - E_{ij} = CQ_{ij} + K_i - S_{fi}, \quad \forall i \text{ and } j \quad (42)$$

$$V = \sum_{i=1}^n (S_{fi} + Q_i) - D \quad (43)$$

in addition to any other linear constraints on present-period operations, where  $m$  = number of equally probable refill seasons;  $p_j$  = probability of hydrologic year-type  $j$ ;  $CQ_{ij}$  = in hydrologic year  $j$ , the expected cumulative inflow to reservoir  $i$  from the end of the current period to the end of the refill cycle;  $L_{ij}$  = spill from reservoir  $i$  under hydrologic year  $j$ ; and  $E_{ij}$  = empty storage capacity in reservoir  $i$  under hydrologic year  $j$ .

### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported by the USACE Hydrologic Engineering Center and benefited considerably from discussions with Dan Barcellos, Richard Hayes, Morris Israel, Ken Kirby, Dan Sheer, Jerry Stedinger, and Mimi Jenkins. The writers wish to thank the two reviewers of the paper for their helpful comments.

### APPENDIX IV. REFERENCES

- Bower, B. T., Hufschmidt, M. M., and Reedy, W. W. (1966). "Operating procedures: Their role in the design of water-resource systems by simulation analyses." *Design of water-resource systems*, A. Maass et al., eds., Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass., 443–458.
- Clark, E. J. (1950). "New York control curves." *J. AWWA*, 42(9), 823–827.
- Clark, E. J. (1956). "Impounding reservoirs." *J. AWWA*, 48(4), 349–354.
- Engineering manual: Engineering and design, Hydropower*. (1985). EM 1110-2-1701, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Washington, D.C.
- "Flood control by reservoirs." (1976). *Hydrologic engineering methods for water resources development*, Vol. 7, Hydrologic Engineering Center, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Davis, Calif., February.
- Ghosh, S. N. (1986). *Flood control and drainage engineering*. Oxford and IBH, New Delhi, 158–159.
- Hufschmidt, M. M., and Fiering, M. B. (1966). *Simulation techniques for design of water-resource systems*. Harvard University Press, Cambridge, Mass.
- Johnson, S. A., Stedinger, J. R., and Staschus, K. (1991). "Heuristic operating policies for reservoir system simulation." *Water Resour. Res.*, 27(6), 673–685.
- Karamouz, M., and Houck, M. H. (1987). "Comparison of stochastic and deterministic dynamic programming for reservoir operating rule generation." *Water Resour. Bull.*, 23(1), 1–9.
- Kelley, K. F. (1986). "Reservoir operation during drought: Case studies." *Res. Document No. 25*, Hydrologic Engineering Center, Davis, Calif.
- Kelman, J., Damazio, J. M., Mariën, J. L., and daCosta, J. P. (1989). "The determination of flood control volumes in a multireservoir system." *Water Resour. Res.*, 25(3), 337–344.
- Kim, Y.-O., and Palmer, R. N. (1997). "Value of seasonal flow forecasts in Bayesian stochastic programming." *J. Water Resour. Plng. and Mgmt.*, ASCE, 123(6), 327–335.
- Klemes, V. (1977). "Discrete representation of storage for stochastic reservoir operation." *Water Resour. Res.*, 13(1), 149–158.
- Labadie, J. (1997). "Reservoir system optimization models." *Water Resources Update*, University Council on Water Resources, 108(Summer), 83–110.
- Little, J. D. C. (1955). "The use of storage in a hydroelectric system." *Operations Res.*, 3, 187–197.

- Loucks, D. P., and Sigvaldason, O. T. (1982). "Multiple-reservoir operation in North America." *The operation of multiple reservoir systems*, Z. Kaczmarek and J. Kindler, eds., International Institute for Applied Systems Analysis, Laxenburg, Austria.
- Lund, J. R., and Ferreira, I. (1996). "Operating rule optimization for the Missouri River reservoir system." *J. Water Resour. Plng. and Mgmt.*, ASCE, 122(4), 287–295.
- Lund, J. R., and Guzman, J. (1996). "Developing seasonal and long-term reservoir system operation plans using HEC-PRM." *Tech. Rep. No. RD-40*, Hydrologic Engineering Center, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Davis, Calif.
- Mariñ, J. L., Damázio, J. M., and Costa, F. S. (1994). "Building flood control rule curves for multipurpose multireservoir systems using controllability conditions." *Water Resour. Res.*, 30(4), 1135–1144.
- Nalbantis, I., and Koutsoyiannis, D. (1997). "A parametric rule for planning and management of multiple-reservoir systems." *Water Resour. Res.*, 33(9), 2165–2178.
- Needham, J. T. (1998). "Application of linear programming for flood control operations on the Iowa and Des Moines rivers," MS thesis, University of California, Davis, Calif.
- Oliveira, R., and Loucks, D. P. (1997). "Operating rules for multireservoir systems." *Water Resour. Res.*, 33(4), 839–852.
- Palmer, R. N., Smith, J., Cohon, J., and ReVelle, C. (1982). "Reservoir management in the Potomac River Basin." *J. Water Resour. Plng. and Mgmt.*, ASCE, 108(1), 47–66.
- "Reservoir system analysis for conservation." (1977). *Hydrologic engineering methods for water resources development*, Vol. 9, Hydrologic Engineering Center, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Davis, Calif., June.
- Saad, M., Turgeon, A., Bigras, P., and Duquette, R. (1994). "Learning disaggregation technique for the operation of long-term hydroelectric power systems." *Water Resour. Res.*, 30(11), 3195–3203.
- Sand, G. M. (1984). "An analytical investigation of operating policies for water-supply reservoirs in parallel," PhD dissertation, Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.
- Sheer, D. (1986). "Dan Sheer's reservoir operating guidelines." School of Civ. and Envir. Engrg., Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y., June/July, 1.
- Stedinger, J. R., Sule, B. F., and Pei, D. (1983). "Multiple reservoir system screening models." *Water Resour. Res.*, 19(6), 1383–1393.
- Tejada-Guibert, J. A., Johnson, S., and Stedinger, J. (1995). "The value of hydrologic information in stochastic dynamic programming models of multi-reservoir systems." *Water Resour. Res.*, 31(10), 2571–2579.
- Wu, R.-S. (1988). "Derivation of balancing curves for multiple reservoir operation," MS thesis, Dept. of Civ. and Envir. Engrg., Cornell University, Ithaca, N.Y.
- Wurbs, R. A. (1966). *Modeling and analysis of reservoir system operations*. Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, N.J.