

A STOCHASTIC MANAGEMENT MODEL FOR THE
OPERATION OF A STREAM-AQUIFER SYSTEM

Adán E. Z. Flores W.

Lynn W. Gelhar

New Mexico Water Resources Research Institute
in cooperation with
Department of Geoscience
New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology

May, 1976

ABSTRACT

The objective of this study is to develop and evaluate a simple management technique through which the cost of conjunctive operation of surface water and groundwater resources can be minimized under the effect of uncertainty.

A lumped parameter model represents the physics of the system and a linear outflow equation simulates the stream-aquifer flow. A subsurface outflow constant related to the response time of the aquifer proves to be an important concept in the simulation process. Furthermore, a drawdown correction is developed to compute the drawdown at wells.

In the developing of the management model, dynamics in the operation of the system is obtained by using linear decision rules. The nonlinear optimization problem (pumping cost dependent on the drawdown and the pumping volume) is solved by an iterative procedure which uses a standard linear programming package.

To study the effect of randomness in the system, uncertainties in the water demand, natural inputs and the physical properties of the system are considered. A stochastic differential equation governs the system and some of the statistics are obtained via spectral analysis. In addition, a conditional probability approach is followed to account for a random subsurface outflow constant. Chance constraints are introduced to include probabilities of satisfaction of constraints.

To test the reliability of the proposed model a comparative test with a previous study using a distributed parameter model is carried out; good agreement is obtained. An application to a basin in northwestern Mexico shows the capability of the proposed model in regional management problems involving hundreds of wells and large surface water facilities. A sensitivity analysis in the latter application shows a larger increase in the operational cost due to uncertainty in the water demand than to uncertainty in the aquifer parameters.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This study was conducted in the Department of Geoscience at New Mexico Institute of Mining and Technology as unsponsored research. During the course of the study, the first author was employed as a part-time Graduate Assistant on projects supported by the New Mexico Water Resources Research Institute (3109-55(A-055-NMEX) and 3109-313-03) and by the Department of Geoscience. The New Mexico Tech Computing Center provided the computer time required for this study.

The advise and assistance of Dr. Allen L. Gutjahr, Assistant Professor of Mathematics, and Dr. Gerardo W. Gross, Professor of Geophysics, is gratefully acknowledged. Dr. Thomas Maddock III, with the U. S. Geological Survey, Reston, Virginia, provided unpublished data used in the comparative testing of the model.

This report is essentially a reproduction of a dissertation submitted by the first author in February 1976, in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of Doctor of Philosophy in Geoscience. Dr. Lynn W. Gelhar, Associate Professor of Hydrology, served as dissertation advisor.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
TITLE PAGE	i
ABSTRACT	ii
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	iv
TABLE OF CONTENTS	v
LIST OF FIGURES	viii
LIST OF TABLES	xi
LIST OF SYMBOLS	xii
1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Background	1
1.2 Previous Work	2
1.3 Purpose and Scope of this Study	3
2. DEVELOPMENT OF THE PHYSICAL MODEL	11
2.1 Introduction	11
2.2 Mathematical Representation of the Lumped Model	12
2.3 Subsurface Outflow Constant	16
2.4 Techniques Used to Solve the Lumped Model	40
2.5 Response Time	43
2.6 Well Drawdown Correction	46
3. MANAGEMENT MODEL DEVELOPMENT	52
3.1 Introduction	52
3.2 Systems Analysis Approach	53
3.3 Mathematical Programming	54

	<u>Page</u>
4. STOCHASTIC REPRESENTATION OF THE PHYSICAL MODEL	65
4.1 Introduction	65
4.2 Stochastic Differential Equation	66
4.3 Statistics of the Processes	68
4.4 Randomness in the Subsurface Outflow Constant	76
5. STOCHASTIC REPRESENTATION OF THE MANAGEMENT MODEL	81
5.1 Introduction	81
5.2 Decision Variables	82
5.3 Objective Function	84
5.4 Chance Constraints	86
5.5 Iterative Procedure	91
6. RESULTS AND APPLICATIONS	94
6.1 Introduction	94
6.2 Comparative Study	94
6.3 Application	106
7. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS	142
APPENDIX A Computation of the Subsurface Outflow Constant for the Unsteady Case	149
APPENDIX B Computation of the Subsurface Outflow Constant for a Clogged Stream	153
APPENDIX C Details on the Computation of the Subsurface Outflow Constant for Converging Flow	156

	<u>Page</u>	
APPENDIX D	Effect of Different Aquifer Properties in Individual Segments of a Stream-Aquifer System	158
APPENDIX E	Proof that the Use of Average Heads in the Outflow Equation is Valid	160
APPENDIX F	Analytical Solution of the Lumped Model	165
APPENDIX G	Discussion on the Probability Level of Constraints Involving Random Quantities and Constraints Related to the Expected values	172
APPENDIX H	Input Data Used in the Comparative Study	175
APPENDIX I	Listing of the Computer Program	177
APPENDIX J	Basic Information on Rio Sinaloa Study Area	199
REFERENCES		201

LIST OF FIGURES

<u>Figure</u>		<u>Page</u>
2.1	Schematic representation of a natural stream-aquifer system.	13
2.2	Stream-aquifer interaction in an unconfined aquifer under stream effluent conditions.	23
2.3	Stream-aquifer interaction in an unconfined aquifer under stream influent conditions.	23
2.4	Stream-aquifer flow as a function of the stream-aquifer head difference.	26
2.5	Stream-aquifer flow with the stream clogged by a semipermeable layer of thickness \underline{d} and hydraulic conductivity K_s .	26
2.6	Converging aquifer-stream type of flow.	29
2.7	Diverging aquifer-stream type of flow.	31
2.8	Stream-aquifer interaction with recharge applied on a portion of the basin.	34
2.9	Time response t_h , as a function of the stream-aquifer unit response .	44
2.10	Graph of the dimensional pressure difference $p_D - \bar{p}_D$ against the dimensionless time t_{DA} .	50
3.1	Flow chart depicting the iterative procedure.	63
5.1	(a) Cumulative probability distribution of the demand for a given level of probability λ , and (b) Probability density function	

<u>Figure</u>		<u>Page</u>
	of the demand for a given level of probability λ .	88
5.2	Iterative procedure of a stochastic management problem.	92
6.1	Graph of $P(\sigma_D^2, 0)$ versus C_V , as a function of probability level λ .	102
6.2	Flow chart of the iterative procedure used to solve Maddock's problem.	105
6.3	Map of the Rio Sinaloa study area.	108
6.4	Rio Sinaloa water cycle.	110
6.5	Iterative procedure used to solve the Rio Sinaloa management problem.	131
6.6	Operational scheduling and aquifer behavior for probability level $\lambda = 0.75$	132
6.7	Variability of aquifer water level; $\sigma_h(\bar{a})$ represents uncertainty when the subsurface outflow constant is considered a constant, the expected value ($\bar{a}=4.29 \times 10^{-3} \text{ yr}^{-1}$); $\sigma_h(a)$ represents uncertainty when the subsurface outflow constant is considered a random variable with $\sigma_a = 0.25\bar{a}$.	135
6.8	Operational scheduling and aquifer behavior of the deterministic case.	137
6.9	Variation of the objective function value and operational cost of the system as a	

Figure

Page

	function of uncertainty in the subsurface outflow constant \underline{a} for a level of probability $\lambda = 0.75$.	138
6.10	Representation of the convergence problem when cost of surface water diversion and pumping are nearly the same.	140
6.11	Effect of averaging on convergence.	141
E.1	Boundaries of the aquifer.	161
F.1	Dirac delta function representation of natural recharge $\underline{\epsilon}$.	169
F.1	Representation of the natural recharge $\underline{\epsilon}$.	169

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Table</u>		<u>Page</u>
1.1	Review of Literature Relating to Management of Conjunctive Use of Groundwater and Surface Water.	3
2.1	Type of Effects on the Subsurface Outflow Constant \underline{a} , and the Respective Values of \underline{a} , and $\underline{\beta}$.	36
5.1	Significant Differences Between the Compared Models.	98
6.2	Comparison of Operating Rules of Maddock's and Proposed Models.	100
6.3	Parameter Values for the Rio Sinaloa Problem.	128
6.4	Summary of the Results Obtained from Several Alternatives for the Rio Sinaloa.	134

LIST OF SYMBOLS

a	subsurface outflow constant (1/T)
d	thickness of a restrictive layer (L)
d(0.75)	75 percentile of the water demand (L^3)
n	mean water table in the aquifer (L)
h'	mean water level at the wells (L)
h _o	initial water level
n	design period (T)
p _D	dimensionless pressure
q	stream-aquifer discharge per unit aquifer area (L/T)
r	nominal interest rate
r _w	average well radius (L)
r(0.75)	75 percentile of the streamflow (L^3)
\bar{s}	average drawdown (L)
s _w	drawdown at the wells (L)
t _{DA}	dimensionless time
t _h	response time of the system (L)
w	frequency (radians/T)
w _m	minimum dam storage fraction
w _o	initial dam storage fraction
y	fictitious net input to the system (L/T)
y _R	net inflow to the system (L/T)
A	aquifer area (L^2)
A _m	sine Fourier coefficient
A _w	average influence area of a well (L^2)

E	leakage factor (L)
C_p	unit cost of pumping ($\$/L^4$)
C_R	unit cost of spreading ($\$/L^3$)
C_S	unit cost of surface water ($\$/L^3$)
C_u	unit cost of water returned to the stream ($\$/L^3$)
CU	consumptive use (L^3)
C_v	coefficient of variation
D	demand of water (L^3)
DC	drawdown correction (L)
ET	evapotranspiration (L^3)
$F(x)$	gamma cumulative distribution
F1	dam freeboard (L^3)
n	mean stream stage (L)
\bar{L}	average initial lift (L)
K	hydraulic conductivity (L/T)
K^*	downstream flow (L^3/T)
K_e	hydraulic conductivity of a restrictive layer (L/T)
k_Y	autocovariance of \underline{y}
L	characteristic length (L)
N	design period (T)
R	recharge from precipitation (L^3)
S_f	seasons per year
OF	objective function ($\$$)
P	precipitation (L^3)
P^1	percent error in the discounted expected cost in relation to the deterministic case
Q	average instantaneous pumping (L^3/T)

Q'	capacity of water facilities (L^3)
Q_C	conveyance loss (L^3)
Q_i	subsurface inflow (L^3)
Q_{ou}	water release from the dam (L^3)
Q_P	quantity of water pumped from the aquifer (L^3)
Q_R	amount of water recharged to the aquifer (L^3)
Q_{ret}	irrigation return flow (L^3)
Q_{RS}	surface drainage (L^3)
Q_S	stream-aquifer discharge (L^3/T)
Q_{SD}	quantity of water diverted from the stream (L^3)
Q_{ST}	streamflow (L^3/T)
Q_u	amount of water returned to the stream (L^3)
R_0, R_2	radial dimension (L)
S	storage coefficient
S'	dam storage (L^3)
S_{ff}	spectral density function of f
T	transmissivity (L^2/T)
V	volume (L^3)
WN	number of wells
Z	ground surface level (L)
$Z(w)$	random process with orthogonal increments
$Z^*(w)$	complex conjugate of $Z(w)$
α^2	hydraulic diffusivity (L^2/T)
α_1	fraction of precipitation that actually recharges the aquifer
α_1	fraction of developed water for return to the stream
α_2	fraction of water applied that infiltrates

α_2	fraction of developed water for spreading
α_4	fraction of water infiltrated that actually recharges the aquifer
β	dimensionless constant, shape of the gamma distribution
β_1	fraction of precipitation that helps to satisfy the demand
γ_B	dam operation decision variable (L^3)
γ_P	pumping decision variable
γ_R	artificial recharge decision variable
γ_{R_1}	size of the dam (L^3)
γ_S	surface water decision variable
δ	R_0 / R_2
$\delta(u)$	Dirac delta function
ϵ	natural recharge (L/T)
θ	angle (radians)
λ	probability level
μ	expected value
ρ	autocorrelation function
ρ_{hQ_p}	cross correlation function of head and pumping
σ	standard deviation
σ^2	variance
τ	lag time (T)
χ	chi-square distribution
Δh	aquifer head difference (L)
Δt	time increment (T)

CHAPTER 1 INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

There is urgent need in many areas of the world to develop or allocate water resources in an optimal manner. Aquifers, important reservoirs provided by nature and able to store and convey water and to improve its quality, often are not used properly by planners; instead, emphasis is given to the development of surface water resources by constructing large reservoirs, thus ignoring the dynamic connection between stream and aquifer. Management of the conjunctive use of groundwater and surface water is an amenable solution to the problem.

In recent years, the use of distributed models in groundwater hydrology has been widespread. The trend has been favored by the development of numerical techniques and electronic computers. Regardless of field information available, the trend has been biased toward more elegant and detailed techniques.

With the previous ideas in mind the present study was oriented toward developing simple models capable of simulating the behavior of an interconnected stream-aquifer system and managing it in an economically optimal way. There was also interest in the study of the effects of uncertainties induced by nature and man on the operation of the system.

1.2 Previous Work

Optimal management of the conjunctive use of surface water and groundwater is a complex problem widely discussed in the literature but not yet exhausted.

Table 1.1 presents a review of the literature on optimal management of the conjunctive use of surface water (SW) and groundwater (GW); it also lists papers related to the research subject in terms of concepts and techniques.

Dynamic Programming is a widely used optimization technique (see Table 1.1). It is favored mainly because of the dynamic characteristics of the management problem. Therefore, it is extensively used for scheduling purposes. Probabilities of events can easily be included in its recursive equation (Buras, 1963; Saleem and Jacob, 1971) which is based on the optimality principle (Bellman, 1957, p.83). In general, a computer program has to be written for solving a specific problem. See Aron (1969) for advantages and disadvantages of the technique.

Linear Programming has fewer advantages than dynamic programming mainly because of nonlinear pumping costs and the dynamics of the system; see Table 1.1.

A significant contributor to a better understanding of the economics of groundwater resources has been O. Burt. A sequence of his papers (Table 1.1) discusses intensively the problem of optimal water allocation where random streamflows and conditional probabilities for storages have been included. Simple decision rules were developed and Burt (1970) worked

TABLE 1.1 Review of Literature Relating to Management of Conjunctive Use of Groundwater and Surface Water

<u>Reference</u>	<u>Objective</u>	<u>Optimization Technique</u>	<u>Type of System</u>	<u>Physical Model</u>	<u>Randomness</u>	<u>Remark</u>
Burt (1963)	optimal planning, design and operation of the system	dynamic programming	SW-GW	continuity equation	random streamflow	variable pumping costs
Burt (1964a)	optimal allocation of a single resource	dynamic programming	GW	continuity equation	deterministic	a functional equation is obtained to derive approximate decision rules
Burt (1964b)	optimal management of groundwater and surface water	dynamic programming	SW-GW	continuity equation	random streamflow and conditional probability for storages	variable pumping cost; detailed field data computations
Burt (1966)	develop a sequential decision model	dynamic programming	GW	continuity equation	random recharge	the variance of the net output is considered
Dracup (1966)	optimum use of ground-water and surface water	parametric linear programming	SW-GW	continuity equation	deterministic	an application is given; constant pumping cost
Burt (1967a)	a simple dynamic model for allocation of ground-water	marginal analysis	GW	continuity equation	random recharge	a linear decision rule is obtained
Burt (1967b)	temporal allocation of groundwater under quadratic criterion functions	marginal analysis	GW	continuity equation	random recharge	a linear decision rule is given
Yeat and Levin (1967)	optimal operation of a groundwater system	dynamic programming	GW	lumped linear outflow model	random recharge	the aquifer outflow is linear; variable pumping cost
Domenico et.al. (1968)	optimal ground-water mining	marginal analysis	GW	continuity equation	deterministic	an optimal mining yield volume is found; variable pumping cost

TABLE 1.1 (Continued)

<u>Reference</u>	<u>Objective</u>	<u>Optimization Technique</u>	<u>Type of System</u>	<u>Physical Model</u>	<u>Randomness</u>	<u>Remark</u>
Aron (1969) and Aron and Scott (1971)	optimization of a complex system with subsystem preoptimization	dynamic programming	SW-GW	continuity equation	random streamflow	discussion of other optimization techniques; variable pumping cost
Revelle et.al. (1969)	optimal design and opera- tion of a dam	linear programming	SW	continuity equation	random streamflow	use of a linear decision rule; use of chance constraints
Longenbaugh (1970)	optimal operation for conjunctive use of ground- water and surface water	linear programming	SW-GW	distributed model	deterministic	constant pumping cost; the physical model is tied to the management model, through the constraints
Taylor (1970)	optimal conjunctive use of water	linear programming	SW-GW	distributed model	deterministic	the stream depletion is optimized; only 3 calls were used
Milligan (1970)	optimal conjunctive use of water	linear programming	SW-GW	continuity equation	random streamflow and natural recharge	constant pumping cost for a head range
Bredenoef and Young (1970)	optimization of temporal allocation of groundwater	simulation	GW	distributed model	deterministic	part of the problem is solved by linear programming
Cummings and Winkelman (1970)	water resource management in arid regions	marginal analysis and lagrangian multiplier	SW-GW	continuity equation	random streamflow	the decision rules are in- terpreted but application is not given; the aquifer is considered to be closed to outside recharge
Salteem and Jacob (1971)	optimal utilization of several leaky aquifers and surface water	dynamic programming	SW-GW	continuity equation	random streamflow and natural recharge	optimiz. in time and space is performed

TABLE 1.1 (Continued)

<u>Reference</u>	<u>Objective</u>	<u>Optimization Technique</u>	<u>Type of System</u>	<u>Physical Model</u>	<u>Randomness</u>	<u>Remark</u>
Kierstead and Grantston (1971)	optimal planning of conjunctive use of surface water and groundwater	linear programming	SW-GW	continuity equation	random streamflow	used linear regression models of streamflow were used. Use of surface constraints and a zero order decision rule
Young and Brédéncoff (1972)	optimal conjunctive use of groundwater and surface water	simulation	SW-GW	distributed model	deterministic	no natural recharge; a conceptual model procedure was used. The approach is outlined to solve the problem; constant pumping cost
Brown and Deacon (1972)	optimal economic use of an aquifer under several conditions	Lagrange multiplier and marginal analysis	GW	continuity equation	deterministic	emphasis on economic aspects
Kaddock III (1972a)	coupling of a distributed physical model to a management model	quadratic programming	GW	distributed model	deterministic	the effect of each well is considered in the pumping cost; variable pumping cost
Moody and Kaddock III (1972)	developing of a water resources planning model to design a data collection network	mixed-integer programming	-	-	deterministic	separable programming techniques are used in nonlinear functions
Kaddock III (1972b)	planning and operation of a groundwater system	mixed-integer programming	GW	distributed model	deterministic	a separable programming procedure was used to handle a quadratic function; a sensitivity analysis was performed to study the system performance to changes in economic and hydrological factors

TABLE 1.1 (Continued)

<u>Reference</u>	<u>Objective</u>	<u>Optimization Technique</u>	<u>Type of System</u>	<u>Physical Model</u>	<u>Randomness</u>	<u>Remark</u>
Kiddock III (1973)	planning and operation of a ground-water system	quadratic programming	GW	distributed model	deterministic	there is not natural recharge; the effect of economics, hydrologic, and physical factors on the management is studied
Maddock III (1974)	optimal operation of a stream-aquifer system under random demands	quadratic programming	SW-GW	distributed model	random streamflow and demand	the demand persistence is included in the problem
Yu and Halmes (1974)	multilevel optimization for conjunctive use of groundwater and surface water	conjugate gradient method	SW-GW	distributed model	deterministic	the overall regional problem is decomposed to two levels; variable pumping cost; an example is given; a penalty function method is used to solve the first level
Korey-Seytoux (1975)	conjunctive surface ground-water management	linear programming	SW-GW	distributed model	deterministic	three examples are given; an analytical procedure to compute well drawdown for a regular boundary geometry is given

out a situation in which institutional constraints were important.

Few cases with variable pumping cost, dependent on the well drawdown, are found in the literature (Buras, 1968; Aron, 1969; Haddock, 1972a; Tu and Haines, 1974).

A linear decision rule in connection with chance constraints was used by Revelle et.al. (1969) in the optimal design and operation of a surface reservoir. Much controversy arose concerning the use of the linear decision rule (see e.g., Lockus, 1970; Biesel, 1970; Kirby et.a., 1970; Hagal and Arora, 1970). A zero decision rule was used by Nieswand and Granston (1971) to find the deterministic equivalent of the chance constraint in the management of the conjunctive use of surface water and groundwater.

Haddock (1974) emphasizes the stochastic nature of the problem and deals with a stochastic process represented by its mean, variance and autocovariance (persistence). Bear and Levin (1967) deal explicitly with a lumped model which includes a linear outflow, though the system consists of only a groundwater reservoir.

The optimal management of the conjunctive use of groundwater and surface water is a problem to which much attention has been given in the literature. However, there are only a few cases which have dealt with stochastic models, and none of these have included uncertainty in the properties of the stream-aquifer system.

The representation of physical systems by distributed

models in the management model is a recent advance. Three different couplings between the physical and management model have been noted. One includes the distributed aquifer model in the objective function and/or in the constraints of the management model (Taylor, 1970; Longenbaugh, 1970). Another considers only the distributed effect at the wells, with part of the drawdown computation done outside of the management model (Maddock, 1972; Morel Seytoux, 1975). Thirdly, the drawdown may be computed entirely outside of the management model. Young and Bredehoeft (1972) followed the latter approach; however, instead of a mathematical programming technique a simulation technique was used to approach an optimum.

Despite the common use of linear reservoirs or lumped parameter models to describe surface runoff phenomena (Chow 1964, Section 14), little importance has been given to this type of model in groundwater hydrology. Kraijenhoff Van de Leur (1953), Dooge (1960), Eriksson (1970), Eliasson (1971), Downing, Oakes, Wilkinson & Wright (1974) and Gelhar and Wilson (1974) deal with lumped model applications to groundwater hydrology.

1.3 Purpose and Scope of this Study

The main purpose of this research is to develop simple and reliable models which can be used to manage a regional system. The physical prototype under consideration is composed of a stream which is hydraulically connected to an aquifer; uncertainties exist in its properties and inputs.

The principal objectives of the study are:

1. Development of a simple model capable of representing the physics of a stream-aquifer system, simulating the head in the aquifer and at the wells, and being naturally connected to a management model.
2. Inclusion of uncertainties into the operation of the system.
3. Testing of the developed models against suitable work obtained from the literature and application to a real example.

Scope of the Study

A lumped model formed by an aquifer water balance and a linear outflow term represents the stream-aquifer system. The subsurface outflow constant and the response time are important concepts in the understanding and modeling of the system. The mean water levels of the aquifer are computed by a convolution integral. To obtain an average head at pumping wells, a drawdown correction is included in the physical model. A link between the physical and the management models was obtained through the mean head of the aquifer. Because of the nature of this connection it is possible to solve a nonlinear optimization problem with an iterative procedure that uses a linear programming package.

When randomness is included in the system, a stochastic differential equation represents the physical model, and the principal statistics of the head are obtained. The uncer-

tainty in the head is described by its standard deviation. By analysis of conditional probability, the uncertainty in the outflow constant is included in the problem. The cross correlation function between head and pumping, was found via spectral analysis. In the stochastic representation of the management model, the expected value of the objective function was used as an economic indicator; uncertainties in the demand of water and future availability of water facilities were included through chance constraints.

To examine the reliability of the proposed models, the results are compared with results obtained from a management model connected to a distributed type of model (Maddock, 1974). The sensitivity of the system to uncertainties is illustrated by an application of the models to a real basin in northwestern Mexico.

CHAPTER 2 DEVELOPMENT OF THE PHYSICAL MODEL

2.1 Introduction

In recent years many authors have used distributed models with the purpose of reproducing natural systems. Some of this work can be misleading; in that very detailed models are not consistent with the field information available. In groundwater hydrology limited attention has been given to lumped parameter models (Kraijenhoff Van de Leur, 1958; Dooge, 1960; Van Schilfhaarde, 1965; Eriksson, 1970; Eliasson, 1971; Gennar and Wilson, 1974) but none used this type of model in stochastic management of groundwater systems.

A lumped parameter model consisting of an aquifer water balance and a linear stream-aquifer flow will be developed in this work. This model is defined as the physical model, since it will deal with the physics of the groundwater flow system. The stream-aquifer interaction and the near head in the aquifer are governed by this model. The output of the physical model will serve as a link to a management model.

In general, a system can be defined as a set of inter-related objects which can respond to one or several inputs producing one or a series of outputs. Many definitions of a system exist in several disciplines. Two interesting discussions in the hydrological literature can be found in Dooge (1973, p.3) and Chow (1973, p.17). A simplified representation of nature which tries to clarify its behavior by simulation is called a model. Chorafa (1965) defines

simulation simply as a working analogy. A common practice is to use a mathematical model to simulate a complex system. A mathematical model is a set of mathematical equations used to describe a model. A proposed classification of hydrological models with reference to applications is given by Clarke (1973a, p.10; 1973b).

Two main types of models can be used to represent a hydrological system. The distributed model describes the spatial structure of a system and considers the inputs of the system as distributed in time and space. In general, a partial differential equation governs its behavior. The lumped parameter model groups inputs, and deals with a system in which temporal variation of the parameters is treated by an ordinary differential equation while spatial variation of the parameters is not considered. Black box is another name for a lumped model, because inputs and outputs can be measured, although the process which governs the system is masked, distorted or averaged. In other words no detailed description of interrelated processes is observed (Domenico, 1972, p.8).

2.2 Mathematical Representation of the Lumped Model

Description of the System

The system studied in this work is formed by two interconnected subsystems, an aquifer and a stream (Figure 2.1). An aquifer is defined as a saturated and permeable bed, formation or group of formations able to yield a




Fig. 2.1 Schematic representation of a natural stream-aquifer system.

substantial amount of water. The aquifer is unconfined or tends to be so at a regional scale. The stream can have one or several branches, is connected to the aquifer, and can be uncontrolled or controlled by a reservoir.

The system may or may not be connected to other systems. The inputs to the system are natural and artificial recharge, irrigation return flow, subsurface inflow and streamflow; the outputs from the system are pumping, subsurface outflow evapotranspiration and any downstream streamflow losses or water rights.

Development of the Lumped Model

The process that describes the behavior of the system is mass transport, governed by the law of conservation of water. The mathematical model which defines the system is an ordinary differential equation developed from the above principle and represents a water balance of the aquifer.

Amount of water that goes into the system in the interval Δt	-	Amount of water that comes out of the system in the interval Δt
--	---	---

Change of amount of
= water stored in the
aquifer in the interval Δt

or in symbols

$$(V_{\text{in}} - V_{\text{out}}) / \Delta t = S \Delta V / \Delta t \quad (2.1)$$

where, S is the storage coefficient (or specific yield).

A continuous representation can be found taking limits of both sides of equation 2.1

$$Q_{\text{in}} - Q_{\text{out}} = S \, dV/dt \quad (2.2)$$

Now let

$$dV = A dh$$

and

$$y_R = (Q_{\text{in}} - Q_{\text{out}}) / A$$

where y_R is the net inflow to the system, A is the area of the aquifer, and h is the mean water level in the aquifer. Substituting into equation 2.2 we obtain

$$S \, dh/dt = y_R \quad (2.3)$$

The stream-aquifer flow may be approximated by a linear term

$$q = a (H - h)$$

where, \underline{H} is the mean water level of the stream and \underline{a} is called the subsurface outflow constant.

Introducing the above equation into (2.3) produces

$$S \, dh/dt + ah = y \quad (2.4)$$

where, \underline{y} is a fictitious net input of the system with units of L/T and based on the aquifer area \underline{A} , defined by

$$y = y_R + aH$$

Equation 2.4 is an ordinary differential equation which describes the aquifer and its connection to a stream in a lumped manner.

The physical model exactly represents the natural system except for the assumption of linearity in the stream-aquifer flow.

2.3 Subsurface Outflow Constant

Stream-Aquifer Interaction

The use of linear models to represent outflows is a common practice in surface hydrology (Chow, 1964, p.14.27). However, few investigators have tried to apply these simple

models to depict subsurface flows.

In this section we make use of several elementary solutions for groundwater flow to determine the structure and magnitude of the subsurface outflow constant. Background information on the development of these elementary solutions can be found in texts on subsurface hydrology (see e.g., Bear, 1972). Though an actual system is nonlinear, the simplest most practical flow relationship between a stream and an aquifer, within the degree of accuracy required, is the linear one,

$$q = a(H - h) \quad (2.5)$$

where

- q stream-aquifer flow, L/T;
- a subsurface outflow constant, 1/T;
- H mean stream stage, L;
- h mean water table in the aquifer, L.

Development of the Subsurface Outflow Constant

The subsurface outflow constant a is a very useful system parameter. It accounts for stream channel characteristics such as, stream bed properties, and aquifer shape, it

includes the aquifer geometry, transmissivity of the aquifer, and recharge and withdrawal distribution. This constant is related to the time that the aquifer takes to respond to an input and allows the computation of the stream-aquifer flow in a simple way.

The subsurface outflow constant, \underline{a} , is defined as the stream-aquifer flow per unit aquifer area under a unit difference of mean head between the aquifer and a stream, which may be either influent or effluent.

Multiplying (2.5) by the horizontal area of the aquifer, \underline{A} gives

$$Q_s = qA = aA(H - h) \quad (2.6)$$

which may be rewritten to give

$$a = (Q_s/A) / (H - h) \quad (2.7)$$

where the variables are

Q_s stream-aquifer discharge, L^3/T ;

A aquifer area, L^2 .

The following mathematical procedure to find the

subsurface outflow constant shows its relationship to the properties of the aquifer and the validity of the linear assumption in the stream-aquifer flow.

Effect of Linearity Assumption on the

Stream-Aquifer Flow Computation

Let us consider a stream connected to an aquifer with natural recharge ϵ , and under steady flow conditions, as shown in Figure 2.2

Using the Dupuit approximation, the one dimensional flow equation is (Bear, 1972, p.376).

$$d/dx (Kh \, dh/dx) + \epsilon = 0 \quad (2.8)$$

where K is the hydraulic conductivity of the aquifer (L/T). Integrating equation 2.8 and using the boundary condition

$$x = L, \quad dh/dx = 0$$

we obtain

$$Kh \quad (dh/ dx) = \epsilon (L -x) \quad (2.9)$$

Integrating (2.9) with

$$x = 0, \quad h = H$$

we obtain

$$h^2 - H^2 = \epsilon x(2L - x)/K \quad (2.10)$$

Solving for \underline{h}

$$h = H(1 + \epsilon x(2L - x)/KH^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}$$

A second order approximation of the term in parentheses is given by expanding the radical

$$h - H = \epsilon x(2L-x)/2KH - \epsilon^2 x^2 (2L-x)^2 /8K^2 H^3 \quad (2.11)$$

In addition,

$$\bar{h} - H = 1/L \int_0^L (h - H)dx \quad (2.12)$$

where \bar{h} is the mean water table in the aquifer.

Substitute (2.11) into (2.12)

$$\bar{h} - H = \epsilon L^2 (1 - \epsilon L^2 / 5TH) / 3T \quad (2.13)$$

where the transmissivity of the aquifer is $T = KH$.

From equation 2.11, we note that the difference between the maximum water level and the stream level, Δh , is

$$\Delta h = \epsilon L^2 / 2T - \epsilon^2 L^4 / 8T^2 H$$

or

$$\Delta h / H = (1 - \epsilon L^2 / 4TH) \epsilon L^2 / 2TH \quad (2.14)$$

When the change in saturated thickness is small relative to the aquifer depth, H , ($\Delta h / H \ll 1$) the term $\epsilon L^2 / 2TH$ is also small relative to unity; under these conditions it is reasonable to neglect $\epsilon L^2 / 5TH$ in (2.13).

Then since the flow is steady ($q = \epsilon$),

$$q = 3T (\bar{h} - H) / L^2$$

where

$$a = 3T / L^2 = \beta T / L^2 \quad (2.15)$$

Therefore, the subsurface outflow constant a , depends on the transmissivity of the aquifer, T , a characteristic length L , and a dimensionless constant β which will be discussed subsequently.

The linear assumption in the stream-aquifer flow implies that (2.14) must be satisfied. Under steady conditions if the stream is influent or if the aquifer is subject to withdrawals as in Figure 2.3, the same analysis applies with $\epsilon < 0$ and the same subsurface outflow constant results.

Effect of Unsteady Flow on the Subsurface

Outflow Constant

To examine the effect of unsteady flow on \underline{a} , the Dupuit approximation given in linearized form ($T = \text{constant}$)

$$\partial (T \partial h / \partial x) / \partial x + \epsilon = S \partial h / \partial t \quad (2.16)$$

is used with the initial condition

$$h - H = \epsilon_0 x(2L - x) / 2T \quad \text{if } t < 0$$

$$\epsilon = 0 \quad \text{if } t \geq 0$$

and boundary conditions similar to the steady state case.

The solution to (2.16) is

$$h - H = \sum_{m=1,3,5,\dots}^{\infty} \Lambda_m \exp(-m \pi \alpha / 2L)^2 t \quad \text{Sin } (m \pi x / 2L) \quad (2.17)$$

where Λ_m is the sine Fourier coefficient of $h - H$,




Fig. 2.2 Stream-aquifer interaction in an unconfined aquifer under stream effluent conditions




Fig. 2.3 Stream-aquifer interaction in an unconfined aquifer under stream influent conditions.

$$A_m = 8 \epsilon_0 L (1 - \cos m\pi) / T m^3 \pi^3$$

using (2.17) and following a procedure similar to the steady case, an average head of the aquifer, \bar{h} , and the unit stream-aquifer discharge, \bar{q} , can be computed. Appendix A details the development of the solution of equation 2.16 and the computation of \bar{a} . Using (2.5) a value of the subsurface outflow constant was found for unsteady flow conditions.

$$a = T\pi^2/4L^2 = \beta T/L^2$$

where

$$\beta = \pi^2/4$$

The above examples of unsteady and steady flow conditions have shown us that the structure of the subsurface outflow constant remains the same except for the numerical value of the dimensionless constant, β . Kraijennoff Van de Leur (1958, p. 192) states that a constant ratio between the storage in the aquifer and outflow rate can be approximated in a period of depletion. His conclusion is similar to our introduction of the subsurface outflow constant.

If the water table decline is large the linearity of equation 2.5, may produce excessively large flows from stream to aquifer. In actuality, the flow approaches an asymptotic

limit (see, Figure 2.4) due to two restrictions: (1) the rate of infiltration into the stream bed is limited as the water table is lowered below the stream bed and unsaturated flow conditions develop and (2) the outflow relation (equation 2.13) becomes nonlinear when the change in water level across the aquifer is of the same order as the aquifer thickness.

Therefore, the stream-aquifer flow is not only controlled by differences in head and aquifer properties but also by the streamflow and the physical characteristics of the stream bed.

Effect of Stream Clogging on the Subsurface

Outflow Constant

Several situations affecting the stream-aquifer flow will be presented to give an idea of the range and type of variables that affect the dimensionless constant.

The effect of stream bed clogging on the stream-aquifer flow is shown first.

Applying Darcy's law to the aquifer flow (Figure 2.5), the head difference across the semipermeable layer, Δh , is approximated by

$$\Delta h = h_0 - h \approx \epsilon Ld/HK_s \quad (2.18)$$

where, \underline{d} is the thickness of the restrictive layer and K_s its hydraulic conductivity (see Figure 2.5).




Fig. 2.4 Stream-aquifer flow as a function of the stream-aquifer head difference.




Fig. 2.5 Stream-aquifer flow, with the stream clogged by a semipermeable layer of thickness d and hydraulic conductivity K_s .

If steady state is considered or $q = \epsilon$, we have

$$q = a_c (h - H) \quad (2.19)$$

where a_c is the subsurface outflow constant corrected for the clogging layer. Also

$$q = a(h - h_0) \quad (2.20)$$

In Appendix B we show that

$$a_c = a / (1 + 3B^2/HL) \quad (2.21)$$

where \underline{a} , is the subsurface outflow constant for steady state conditions, and \underline{B} is defined as the leakage factor (Davis and De Wiest, 1967, p.225).

$$B = (T/(K_s/d))^{1/2}$$

As expected, a_c is smaller than \underline{a} by a factor which depends on the square of the leakage factor. A larger \underline{B} means smaller leakage, therefore a smaller a_c , and vice versa. Thus the stream channel characteristics can have a significant effect on the subsurface outflow constant.

Effect of Converging Aquifer Flow on
the Subsurface Outflow Constant

Two extreme cases will be considered: converging and

diverging flow under steady state. The flow is radial and converges toward the system outlet, the stream, as shown in Figure 2.6.

Equation 2.16 for steady state in cylindrical coordinates is

$$1/r \left(d (T r \, dh/dr) / dr \right) = - \epsilon \quad (2.22)$$

where T is again taken as a constant.

The boundary conditions are

$$r = R_2 \quad , \quad dh/dr = 0$$

and

$$r = R_0 \quad , \quad h = H$$

The solution of (2.22) is


$$T (h - H) = (R_0^2 - r^2) \epsilon / 4 + (\ln(r/R_0)) \epsilon R_2^2 / 2 \quad (2.23)$$

The mean water level in the aquifer is


$$\bar{h} - H = 1/(R_2^2 - R_0^2) \pi \int_{R_0}^{R_2} (h - H) 2 \pi r \, dr \quad (2.24)$$

Substituting (2.23) into (2.24), integrating and assuming

$\delta = R_0/R_2 \ll 1$, we obtain



PLAN VIEW



CROSS SECTION A-A'

Fig. 2.6 Converging aquifer-stream type of flow.

$$\bar{h} - h = ((1 + 2\delta)\ln \delta^{-1/2} - 3(1 + 2\delta)/8) \epsilon L^2 / T \quad (2.25)$$

Using (2.5) and (2.25), we have

$$a = (1/(1 + 2\delta)) \cdot (\ln \delta^{-1/2} - 3/8) T / L^2 \quad (2.26)$$

Additional information concerning the development of the above equations is available in Appendix C.

To give an idea of the magnitude of β for this type of flow, assume that

$$\delta = R_0 / R_2 = 0.1$$

and substitute into equation 2.26 to obtain

$$a = 1.07 T / L^2$$

and hence

$$\beta = 1.07$$

Effect of Diverging Aquifer Flow on the Subsurface Outflow Constant

To simulate the other extreme flow case, diverging flow in an unconfined aquifer is considered. Due to the aquifer shape, the flow is forced radially to a constant head boundary as shown in Figure 2.7.





Fig. 2.7 Diverging aquifer-stream type of flow.

Using equation 2.22 plus the two boundary conditions

$$r = 0 \quad , \quad dh/dr = 0$$

$$r = R_2 \quad , \quad h = H$$

we obtain the solution

$$T (h - H) = \epsilon (R_2^2 - r^2)/4 \quad (2.27)$$

Computing the average water level as

$$\bar{h} - H = \int_0^{R_2} 2\pi h r \, dr / \pi R_2^2 \quad (2.28)$$

and substituting equation 2.27 into (2.28), we have

$$\bar{h} - H = \epsilon R_2^2 / 8T$$

Taking use of equation 2.5

$$a = 8T/L^2 \quad (2.29)$$

The constant \underline{a} is identical for a semicircular or a wedge shaped aquifer with the same natural recharge $\underline{\epsilon}$.

Therefore, a reasonable range for $\underline{\beta}$ as a function of aquifer geometry (converging and diverging flow) is 1 to 8. This range of variation on $\underline{\beta}$ demonstrates the impor-

tance of a three dimensional flow on the computation of a.

Effect of Recharge Distribution on the
Subsurface Outflow Constant

Consider steady flow in a homogeneous aquifer in which the recharge occurs at the upper reaches of a basin (see Figure 2.8). For the computation, the aquifer is divided into two regions. Mathematically, this problem can be posed as

$$\epsilon_1 \alpha_L = \epsilon L$$

where ϵ_1 is the actual rate of recharge and $\underline{\epsilon}$ is the rate of recharge applied over the entire aquifer.

The differential equation applicable to region 1 is

$$d/dx (T dh_1/dx) = -\epsilon_1 \quad (2.30)$$

where \underline{T} is a constant. The boundary conditions are

$$dh_1/dx = 0, \quad x = 0$$

$$h = h_1, \quad x = \alpha_L$$

For region 2, the differential equation is

$$d/dx (T dh_2/dx) = 0 \quad (2.31)$$




Fig. 2.8 Stream-aquifer interaction with recharge applied on a portion of the basin.

and the boundary conditions are

$$T \frac{dh_2}{dx} = T \frac{dh_1}{dx} \quad , \quad x = \alpha L$$

$$h = H \quad , \quad x = L$$

The solutions of (2.30) and (2.31) are

$$h_1 = h + (2\alpha L^2 (1 - \alpha) + \alpha^2 L^2 - x^2) \epsilon_1 / 2T \quad (2.32)$$

and

$$h_2 = H + \alpha \epsilon_1 L(L - x) / T \quad (2.33)$$

The mean water level is computed by

$$\bar{h} = 1/L \left(\int_0^{\alpha L} h_1 dx + \int_{\alpha L}^L h_2 dx \right) \quad (2.34)$$

Therefore,

$$\bar{h} - H = (3\alpha/2 - \alpha^3/2) \epsilon_1 L^2 / 3T \quad (2.35)$$

and, since $\epsilon_1 = \epsilon / \alpha = q / \alpha$,

(2.35) becomes

$$\bar{h} - H = (3/2 - \alpha^2/2) qL^2 / 3T \quad (2.36)$$

Using (2.5), we find the subsurface outflow constant

$$a = 6T/(3 - \alpha^2)L^2 \quad (2.37)$$

With equation 2.37, we compute values for the two possible extremes which might occur in nature, and hence the range of the recharge distribution effect on the subsurface outflow constant.

If $\alpha = 1$, recharge occurs over the entire aquifer and

$$a = 3T/L^2 \quad (2.38)$$

If $\alpha = 0$, recharge is concentrated on the impermeable boundary, and

$$a = 2T/L^2 \quad (2.39)$$

Equation 2.38 represents, of course, the value of \underline{a} already computed for the steady-state case, and equation 2.39 can easily be verified by using Darcy's law, as follows:

$$\epsilon L = T(h_0 - H)/L \quad ; \quad h_0 - H = \epsilon L^2/T$$

Since the head distribution is linear, we may write

$$\bar{h} - h = \epsilon L^2/2T$$

and with equation 2.5, we obtain

$$a = 2T/L^2$$

which verifies (2.39).

The obvious conclusion from the above analysis is that the effect of the distribution of recharge or withdrawal is not very significant, since β ranges only from 2 to 3.

The effects of different aquifer properties in individual segments of a stream-aquifer are discussed in Appendix D. It is shown there that the system can be represented by a single linear reservoir only when \underline{a} and \underline{S} are the same in each segment.

A summary of the range of \underline{a} , for all studied possibilities is shown in Table 2.1. The β ranges from 1.07 to 3.

Gelhar et.al. (1974, p.94) applied spectral analysis to a Dupuit aquifer with recharge over the entire basin, and obtained values of β within the above range. Appendix E gives a mathematical justification for the use of average aquifer and stream water levels in equation 2.5.

In regions with limited field information Table 2.1 can be a helpful tool. If piezometric data exist, a more reliable selection of \underline{a} can be made by the following procedure:

- a) From a piezometric map, compute the mean water level.

TABLE 2.1 Type of Effects on the Subsurface Outflow Constant \underline{a} , and the Respective Values of \underline{a} , and β .

Type of Flow	Effect on \underline{a}	Schematic Flow Picture	\underline{a}	Parameters Used to Compute \underline{a}	β
Steady	Clogging		$\frac{3T/L^2}{(1+3B^2/HL)}$	$B = 1.4 \times 10 \text{ m}^2$ $H = 350 \text{ m}$ $L = 1.6 \times 10^3 \text{ m}$ $K_S = 10^{-3} \text{ K}$	1.71
	Recharge Distribution		$\frac{3T/L^2}{(3/2 - \alpha^2/2)}$	$\alpha = 0$ $\alpha = 1$	2.0 3.0
	Aquifer Geometry		$\frac{3T/L^2}{\lambda(1-2\delta)\ln\delta/2-3/8}$	$\delta = R_0/R = 0.1$	1.07
Unsteady	Diverging		$8T/L^2$		8.0
	Falling Sinusoidal Water Table		$\pi^2 T/4L^2$		2.47

- b) Apply Darcy's law to the flow passing through the stream tubes close to the stream and calculate a mean stream-aquifer flow or estimate the stream-aquifer flow from an aquifer water balance.
- c) Calculate a mean stream bed elevation from a topographic map and use it to compute a mean stream elevation.
- d) Apply equation 2.6 and obtain the subsurface outflow constant. Note that if the wells close to the stream are shallow an error in the stream-aquifer discharge can be introduced in the flow computation (b), due to the fact that the hydraulic gradients at the water table are greater than the gradients deeper in the aquifer.

The previous analysis investigates the validity of the linear outflow assumption in representing the stream-aquifer interaction. It gives a rather narrow range of variation of the subsurface outflow constant and presents a simple field procedure to obtain the latter. The subsurface outflow constant groups most of the system properties and helps to define the stream-aquifer flow in a simple way. Therefore the subsurface outflow constant is a very important parameter for defining or condensing important properties of the system. Its limitations include the effect of a deep water table in the stream-aquifer flow.

2.4 Techniques Used to Solve the Lumped Model

Analytical Solution

The first technique presented for solving the lumped model is an analytical one. The solution of equation 2.4 is

$$h(t) = n_0 \exp(-at/S) + 1/S \int_0^t y(\tau) \exp(-a(t-\tau)/S) d\tau \quad (2.40)$$

where n_0 is the initial condition at $t = 0$.

The first term on the right hand side represents the initial condition effect and the second term includes the effect of all past inputs $y(\tau)$, on the system. The integral is usually called the superposition or convolution integral (Miller, 1963, p.273). The mathematical development of equation 2.40 is given in Appendix F .

Finite Difference Approach

A finite difference representation of equation 2.40 can be written as

$$(h_{i+1} - h_i) S/\Delta t + (h_{i+1} + h_i) a/2 = y_i \quad (2.41)$$

Solving equation 2.41 for h_{i+1} will give

$$h_{i+1} = (y_i \Delta t/S + (1 - a \Delta t/2S) h_i)/(1 + a \Delta t/2S) \quad (2.42)$$

Equation 2.42 is easily programmed for an electronic computer; however, significant errors may be introduced by an improper choice of the time interval Δt , as illustrated by the following analysis.

Define the response time $t_h = S/a$ and assume, for simplicity, that y_i is zero. The exact solution of the lumped model (see, App. F) is

$$h_{i+1} = h_i (\exp(-\Delta t/t_h))$$

Using a Taylor series expansion, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} h_{i+1} \cong h_i (1 - (\Delta t/t_h) + (\Delta t/t_h)^2/2 - (\Delta t/t_h)^3/6 \\ + \dots) \end{aligned} \quad (2.43)$$

Expanding the denominator of equation 2.42 and assuming that y_i is zero, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} h_{i+1} \cong h_i (1 - \Delta t/2t_h) (1 - (\Delta t/2t_h) + (\Delta t/2t_h)^2 \\ - (\Delta t/2t_h)^3 + \dots) \end{aligned}$$

or

$$\begin{aligned} h_{i+1} \cong h_i (1 - (\Delta t/t_h) + (\Delta t/t_h)^2/2 - (\Delta t/t_h)^3/4 \\ + \dots) \end{aligned} \quad (2.44)$$

The difference between equations 2.43 and 2.44 is on the order of

$$h_{\text{exact}} - h_{\text{finite differences}} = (\Delta t/t_h)^3/12 \quad (2.45)$$

considering the first four terms of the expansions.

Therefore, a finite difference representation of the head h , can introduce a significant error that depends on the $\Delta t/(S/a)$ ratio. Thus it is seen that the increment time of a specific problem must be selected carefully.

For instance, a ratio $\Delta t/t_h$ of approximately 0.5 produces an error of about 1%. Since the error depends on the third power (equation 2.45), $\Delta t/t_h$ ratios greater than 1 are not recommended.

Discrete Representation

A discrete representation of the exact solution of the lumped model was preferred over the finite difference approach. Equation 2.4 is rewritten

$$S \, dh/dt + a (h - y_i/a) = 0$$

If y_i is constant during the time interval $(i, i+1)$ this can be written

$$S (d/dt) (h - y_i/a) + a (h - y_i/a) = 0$$

It has the solution

$$h - y_i/a = C \exp(-at/S)$$

where C is a constant of integration.

The initial conditions are

$$\text{at } t = 0, \quad h = h_i$$

$$\text{at } t = \Delta t, \quad h = h_{i+1}$$

Therefore ,

$$C = h_i - y_i/a$$

which yields

$$h_{i+1} = h_i \exp(-a \Delta t/S) + (1 - \exp(-a \Delta t/S))y_i/a \quad (2.46)$$

This is equivalent to (2.40) with the input y_i a constant in a time interval Δt_i .

2.5 Response Time

The response time, t_h , of the stream-aquifer system is the time required for the water level excess over that in the stream to drop to $1/e$ times the original level when there is no net inflow to the aquifer (see Figure 2.9).




Fig. 2.9 Response time t_h , as a function of the stream-aquifer unit response.

The unit response of the system (Appendix F) is

$$h = \exp(- at/S)/S$$

and

$$n_{t_h} = 1/S e$$

Therefore,

$$t_h = S/a \tag{2.47}$$

where \underline{S} is the storage coefficient and \underline{a} is the subsurface outflow constant.

The ratio of an active volume above the aquifer storage with zero outflow, Δv , to the stream-aquifer discharge, Q_s , is another definition of response time.

$$t_h = \Delta v/Q_s$$

or

$$t_h = AS(H - h)/Q_s$$

where $Q_s = Aa(H - h)$ is the stream-aquifer discharge.

Therefore,

$$t_h = S/a$$

Note that this same definition would apply when the river is influent, but in this case the volume increment is the active aquifer deficit.

Chapman (1964) mentioned the importance of the ratio of storage to flow. He gives a table of typical values and also mentions that in arid regions a value of at least fifty years, safely let us use a steady state formula to compute the flow. In an actual situation the steady state approximation is adequate if the long-term average of groundwater flow is more important than oscillations caused by non-steady fluctuations, as noted by Kraijenhoff (1954). Hence, as the response time increases it will be more appropriate to use the steady state value of the dimensionless constant β .

2.6 Well Drawdown Correction

As noted earlier the output of the lumped model is a mean water level in the aquifer; its use is limited to specific types of problems. Costs of pumping determined by a model of this sort would be underestimated. Therefore, in order to make our physical model capable of accounting not only for average drawdowns but for local drawdowns at the wells, a correction was developed and added to the model.

Several papers exist in the field of petroleum engineering concerning the relationship of average pressures and specific pressures in a bounded reservoir. Matthews et. al.

(1954), presented a procedure using the superposition principle for finding the difference between a so-called extrapolated pressure and an average pressure for different shapes of reservoirs. Earlougher et.al. (1968) developed a simplified procedure to find the pressure distribution in a bounded square, which was used as a building block to generate flow behavior in any rectangular region. Ramey et.al. (1973) checked the results obtained by earlier authors and presented programs to solve rectangular shapes with different types of boundaries.

To develop an average drawdown correction the following assumptions are made: the flow in the aquifer is unsteady; the aquifer area influenced by a given pumping well is a square of impermeable boundaries; the aquifer is confined. Inasmuch as our model is lumped, a mean area of influence for a well was obtained by dividing the entire area of study by the number of wells. The work by Earlougher et.al. (1968) is followed closely.

First some of the variables entering in the problem are presented. A water balance of a closed square is used as the basic tool. Let

$$\bar{s} = Qt/AS$$

where \bar{s} is an average drawdown, and A is the area of the square. Rearranging and multiplying the above equation by $2\pi T$, we find

$$2 \pi T \bar{s} / Q = 2 \pi T t / AS$$

Noting that the left hand side of this equation is an average dimensionless pressure, \bar{p}_D , and the right hand side of the equation can represent a dimensionless time based on \underline{A} , t_{DA} ; we have

$$\bar{p}_D = 2 \pi t_{DA}$$

where

$$\bar{p}_D = 2 \pi T \bar{s} / Q$$

and

$$t_{DA} = Tt / AS$$

A table showing the dimensionless pressure, p_D , against t_{DA} for $\sqrt{A}/r_w = 2000$ is given by Earlougher et.al. (1968). If different ratios of \sqrt{A}/r_w are found a correction must be added to the p_D values given in the table; it is

$$\ln ((\sqrt{A}/r)/2000) \quad (2.48)$$

For $t_{DA} \geq 0.2$ was found that the difference in pressure $p_D - \bar{p}_D$ was almost constant and equal to 6.29, as

shown in Figure 2.10. Therefore, a simple formula is developed to represent the average drawdown at the wells and it is

$$s_w - \bar{s} = (6.29 + \ln ((\sqrt{A}/r_w)/2000))Q/2\pi T \quad (2.49)$$

where Q is an average instantaneous pumping.

The average drawdown of the aquifer \bar{s} is obtained from the lumped model.

Conclusion

The use of the physical model presented in this chapter is straightforward. It was prepared with the purpose of linking it to a management model. It takes into account the stream-aquifer connection and models the aquifer under any type of input. It represents a water balance of the aquifer and the only assumption made throughout its development is a linear outflow which in most cases is satisfactory. Two useful concepts were developed: the subsurface outflow constant and the aquifer response time. The subsurface outflow constant a , condenses several properties of the system and allows for a simple stream-aquifer interaction. The aquifer response time is a ratio of an active volume above or below a basic aquifer storage with zero outflow, to the stream-aquifer flow. The analysis shows that the range of a is not large and a simple field procedure can be used to determine this parameter. Since our model is




Fig. 2.10 Graph of the dimensional pressure difference $P_D - \bar{P}_D$ against the dimensionless time t_{DA} .

lumped, all the variables are worked out in terms of space averages. A drawdown correction is successfully added to the average aquifer water level, to represent the drawdown in the wells.

CHAPTER 3 MANAGEMENT MODEL DEVELOPMENT

3.1 Introduction

One objective of this study is to present a simple and logical procedure for operating a system formed by a stream connected to an aquifer under optimal economic conditions. The interaction between the economics and the physics of the system is represented by the management model, which yields the optimal policy of operation. The model may also be used for design of surface and groundwater facilities (e.g. size of a dam, well fields and main canals).

The pumping cost will be considered as variable, and dependent on the pumping volume and the total lift. Linear decision rules will be used to define the decision variables. These linear decision rules allow for more dynamics in the system operation and for a deterministic analogy of chance constraints. A suitable link will be developed between the physical and management models. This link simplifies the objective function by computing the physical model outside of the management model. As a consequence of this link, it is possible to use an iterative procedure and a standard linear programming technique to solve a nonlinear optimization problem.

3.2 Systems Analysis Approach

Terminology

Systems Analysis or Operations Research is defined as a scientific approach to problem solving for executive management (Wagner 1969, p.4). However one of the main problems encountered in the use of water resources is the difference that exists in space, time and quality between the natural water supply and the water demand. Therefore, a more specific definition of operations research is; the art or science of choosing from a number of feasible alternatives whether it be in relation to planning, design, construction or operating a water resources system. An interesting discussion on the subject is found in Hall and Dracup (1970, p.39). The analysis of the set of alternatives is carried out in an organized common-sense strategy of techniques; ranking them according to a desired criterion e.g. an optimality criterion. The set of techniques available to solve the problem of development, allocation and use of limited resources to the best advantage is called Mathematical Programming. Optimization should be understood as the problem of finding the best type of action from a set of alternatives. An optimization procedure selects an optimal policy. A set of decision variables that maximizes or minimizes a performance function subject to the system constraints is called an optimal policy. An objective function, return function, value function or criterion

function is a function that establishes the criterion by which the best solution is selected.

Objectives and Limitations

The main objective of the management model is to reproduce the economics and physics of the problem and generate an optimal policy for the operation of the stream-aquifer system.

Different types of objectives of a water resource system can be thought of; social, economic and political or a combination of them. To simplify and to obtain a better understanding of the stream-aquifer management problem, the optimality criterion used in this study is based only on economic terms. This study is based on the following assumptions: (i) the management model is independent of changes in economic activities generated by decisions taken during the operation of the system, (ii) a central agency is responsible for the management of the system under non-competitive conditions, (iii) the water is used for agriculture only and (iv) no penalties are applied if the demand is not satisfied.

3.3 Mathematical Programming

Before going to the technique used to obtain the optimal policy, the main components of the optimization procedure will be discussed.

Objective Function

The main guiding principle used to select the objective function was the allocation of scarce water resources at the minimum possible cost. Inasmuch as operational costs need to be computed, a comparison of costs occurring at different points of time in the future was necessary. The present worth was, therefore, the economic concept used to bring out all costs to the same reference level and in order to perform this operation a nominal interest rate was used; to review these concepts in more detail an engineering economics book such as De Garmo (1960) is recommended.

The objective function, selected considering conjunctive use of surface and groundwater, was the discounted cost, that is

$$W = \sum_{i=1}^n (C_{S_i} Q_{SD_i} / (1 + r/N_S)^i + C_{P_i} Q_{P_i} (Z - h'_i) / (1 + r/N_S)^i) \quad (3.1)$$

where the parameters are

- C_S unit cost of surface water, $\$/L^3$;
- C_P unit cost of pumpage, $\$/L^4$;
- Q_{SD} quantity of water diverted from the stream, L^3 ;
- Q_P quantity of water pumped from the aquifer, L^3 ;
- Z ground surface level, L ;
- h' mean water level at the wells, L ;
- r nominal interest rate;
- n design period, T ;

N_S number of seasons per year.

The first term of the right hand side of equation 3.1 represents the discounted cost of diverting water from the stream and is linear with respect to the amount of flow Q_{SD} . The second term is the discounted cost of pumping water out of the aquifer and is quadratic with respect to Q_p , since h' depends on all past inflows of the system including pumping. In other words the groundwater pumping cost is a function of the total lift and the volume pumped. Hence our problem can be classified as a nonlinear programming type, for which standard solution packages exist (Kuester, 1973, p. 105). They have certain limitations in terms of initial assumptions, preparation of data and computer storage. Dynamic Programming Techniques could also be used but they require special computer programs for each specific problem. Aron (1969, p.40) gives advantages and disadvantages of the technique.

The purpose of this study was not to test different mathematical programming procedures but to develop a simple technique able to solve nonlinear optimization problems of the type described. This is done by taking advantage of the coupling between the physical and management model.

Constraints

Three types of constraints were used for an uncontrolled stream connected to an aquifer. The first deals with the demand of water to be satisfied; the second with the surface

water diversion and pumping facilities; and the last with the water requirements to be met by the stream.

The demand of water constraint is represented by

$$Q_{SD_i} + Q_{P_i} \geq D_i \quad (3.2)$$

and says that the sum of surface water diverted from the stream Q_{SD_i} , plus the amount of water pumped out of the aquifer Q_{P_i} , should satisfy the water demand for a given period of time.

The pumping facilities constraint is

$$Q_{P_i} \leq Q_{P_i}' \quad (3.3)$$

where Q_{P_i}' is the maximum pumped volume allowable, at time \underline{i} . This constraint establishes a limit, equal to the maximum capacity of pumping, for the amount of water pumped out of the aquifer at time \underline{i} .

The surface water diversion constraint is defined as

$$Q_{SD_i} \leq Q_{SD_i}' \quad (3.4)$$

where Q_{SD_i}' is the maximum allowable diverted volume from the stream at time \underline{i} . The constraint says that the amount of water diverted from the stream must be less or equal to the surface facilities available at time \underline{i} .

The last constraint, called the stream requirements

constraint, consists of the conservation of matter principle applied to the stream. Recall that this principle was already considered in the aquifer, and the mean water level h_i , is a result of its application. Stream and aquifer are coupled through this constraint which is very dynamic and restrictive with respect to the system operation.

Applying the conservation of matter principle to the stream under steady state conditions.

$$Q_{ST_i} - Q_{SD_i} - Q_{S_i} \geq K1_i \quad (3.5)$$

the parameters are defined as:

- Q_{ST_i} streamflow at time \underline{i} ;
- Q_{SD_i} water diverted from the stream at time \underline{i} ;
- Q_{S_i} stream-aquifer flow at time \underline{i} ;
- $K1_i$ downstream flow required at time \underline{i} .

Substituting equation 2.10 into 3.5, we obtain

$$Q_{ST_i} - Q_{SD_i} - Aa (H_i - h_i) \geq K1_i \quad (3.6)$$

which requires that the net sum of flows through the stream must be greater than or equal to any senior right existing downstream of the study area, at the time \underline{i} .

Decision Variables

The linear decision rule used to define the decision variables was introduced by Charnes et.al. (1958) for an

optimization problem and then applied by Revelle et.al. (1969) to a surface water management problem. Two important features of the linear decision rule are: (1) In a stochastic management problem, chance constraints can be changed to their deterministic equivalent; (2) It is highly desirable to base present decisions on a previous state of the process. A linear decision rule can be defined as $R_2 = \beta_{21} S_1 + \gamma_2$ (Charnes et.al. 1958) where β_{21} , γ_2 are the decision variables, R_2 is the unknown variable at time 2, and S_1 defines the state of the process at time 1. Several variants of this decision rule can be obtained (Charnes and Cooper 1963). Two types of decision rules are used in this study to define three decision variables. The first two decision variables use a linear decision rule such as

$$R_2 = \beta_{21} S_1$$

in which Charnes's notation is followed. The last decision variable makes use of a linear decision rule equal to that applied by Revelle et.al. (1969).

$$R_2 = S_1 + \gamma_2$$

The decision variables used in this study are:

(1) The diversion of surface water decision variable

$$\gamma_{S_i} = Q_{SD_i} / D_{i-1} \quad (3.7)$$

(2) The groundwater decision variable

$$\gamma_{P_i} = Q_{P_i} / AS_{h_{i-1}} \quad (3.8)$$

(3) If a dam controls the stream, a decision variable related to the dam operation is given by

$$\gamma_{B_i} = S'_{i-1} - Q_{ou_i} \quad (3.9)$$

The decision variables are defined as follows:

γ_{S_i} ratio of the water diverted from the stream at time \underline{i} to the demand at time $i-1$;

γ_{P_i} ratio of the water pumped from the aquifer at time \underline{i} to the amount of water stored in the aquifer at time $i-1$;

γ_{B_i} difference between the storage of the surface reservoir \underline{S}' at time $i-1$ and the volume of water released from the dam Q_{ou} at time \underline{i} .

Coupling of the Physical and Management Models

An important part in the development of the management model is its coupling to the physical model of the stream-aquifer system. The physical model output is, in our case, the mean head at the wells, \underline{h}' . A pumping lift can easily be found by subtracting \underline{h}' from the ground surface level \underline{Z} .

Three alternative links can be established between the two models: (1) The physical model is located within the management model (Longenbaugh, 1970), (2) Part of the drawdown is computed outside of the management model (Eaddock, 1972), and (3) The physical model is computed outside of the management model and the head is used as a link between the models. The later method was followed in the present study. Two connections are obtained: One is performed through the objective function by means of the drawdown $(Z - h_i')$, which brings to the management model all the properties and past information recorded in the aquifer by the physical model output, h_i' . The other connection is through the stream requirements constraint (equation 3.6) by means of the stream-aquifer interaction $Aa(H_i - h_i)$, where \underline{h} is the mean water table in the aquifer.

Two main advantages were gained because of the use of this coupling. First, an iterative procedure using a standard linear programming package was used to solve an optimization problem having a quadratic objective function. Second, the objective function was simplified by computing the head outside of the management model since the head computation implicitly considers all past inputs of the system.

Iterative Procedure

There are procedures to linearize equations, such as

(3.1), by approximating the objective function by straight lines (separable function) and then solving the optimization problem using a linear programming package (Maass, 1966, p.501). The problem then becomes extremely cumbersome and depending on the case, sometimes it is almost impossible to solve it with the available generation of computers.

Due to the coupling between the physical and management model an iterative procedure, using a standard linear programming program, was developed to solve a nonlinear programming problem.

As noted above, equation 3.1 is quadratic in Q_p when h' is unknown and includes all past stimuli of the system. However, the same equation should be linear in Q_p if h' somehow was known. Therefore, the substitution of assumed values of h' in equation 3.1 makes the iterative procedure logical. In an initial step, the physical model computes the mean heads with assumed inputs to the system. The computed heads are then substituted into the management model; the answers are fed back into the physical model and the procedure is repeated as many times as necessary to satisfy a convergence criterion. The number of iterations required to reach an optimal solution depends on the initial estimates. Figure 3.1 shows a flow chart depicting the technique.

The iterative procedure behaved satisfactorily when the cost of water diverted from the stream and the cost of water pumped out of the aquifer were not equal. If both




Fig. 3.1 Flow chart depicting the iterative procedure.

costs were similar, convergence problems appeared and no convergence was reached. However, this result appears reasonable since close to an optimum the model was indifferent to pumping or to use of surface water when both costs were almost the same. Furthermore, the values of the objective function for two different policies were practically same.

CHAPTER 4 STOCHASTIC REPRESENTATION OF THE PHYSICAL MODEL

4.1 Introduction

Large controversies have been raised in hydrology about the conceptual advantage of randomness over determinism (Hisiel 1969, p.23 and Yevjevich 1974). The use of stochastic approaches in groundwater hydrology has been slow in coming. In this work, a deterministic process will be presented as a special case of a stochastic or random process. The former is only concerned with the central tendency of a phenomenon and the latter also includes any unexplained variability of the studied variable. Therefore, both processes may be considered from a combined deterministic-stochastic point of view or as complements (Yevjevich, 1974, p.233).

Uncertainties or randomness in the inputs and properties of the physical model will be considered and studied. The statistics needed to represent a random stream-aquifer system are developed in this chapter. A stochastic differential equation governs the stream-aquifer system when the lumped model becomes subject to random inputs. Its solution is given in terms of ensemble averages of the aquifer head. The autocovariance function of the head as a measure of persistence, the cross correlation function as a measure of correlation between head and pumping, and the head variance as a measure of uncertainty are obtained. The subsurface outflow constant is considered to be a random variable and

through a conditional probability approach an expression for the variance of the head as a function of the variance of the subsurface outflow constant is obtained.

4.2 Stochastic Differential Equation

Three different types of randomness can be related to a system; randomness in the forcing function or inputs, randomness in the coefficients or properties of the system, and a random initial condition.

The deterministic representation of the physical model was given by equation 2.4. In this section, the initial condition h_0 , the storage coefficient S , and the subsurface outflow constant a will be assumed to be deterministic quantities represented by their mean values. However, the total input to the system $y(t)$ will be a random variable. Equation 2.4 under these circumstances becomes a so called stochastic differential equation with a random forcing function (Syski, 1967, p.378).

$$S \, dh/dt + ah = y(t) \quad (4.1)$$

Due to the random behavior of the input $y(t)$ the filter or equation 4.1 produces a random $h(t)$. The solutions of (4.1) are of the form of equation 2.47, that is

$$h(t) = h_0 \exp(-at/S) + 1/S \int_0^t y(\tau) \exp(-a(t-\tau)/S) d\tau$$

A simple way to represent the output process of the system is to take an ensemble average of all possible solutions of (4.1). Since integration and expectation commute, the solution of the stochastic differential equation 4.1 is represented by

$$E(h(t)) = h_0 \exp(-at/S) + 1/S \int_0^t E(y(\mathcal{T})) \exp(-a(t-\mathcal{T})/S) d\mathcal{T} \quad (4.2)$$

An ensemble average is defined as an average over all possible realizations at a given time. A realization is the deterministic representation obtained from measuring a stochastic process.

Equation 4.2 is valid for a stationary or non-stationary input $y(t)$. Although the system filter is time invariant, the output of the system $E(h(t))$ is a non-stationary process in the mean (see e.g., Kisiel, 1969, p.20 for definitions of stationarity).

Inputs of the System

In general, the input of the physical model $y(t)$ can be formed by the contributions of two kinds of inputs: natural inputs and man-controlled inputs. Natural inputs such as subsurface inflow, precipitation, evapotranspiration, etc. are random processes to a greater or lesser degree and with a natural persistence which can be computed from past

measurements. Some random processes depend on natural phenomena, but can be controlled by man. Such processes are pumpage, water diverted from the stream, etc. Their persistence depends on the persistence of the natural inputs and of the filter characteristics.

4.3 Statistics of the Processes

Three of the most important characteristics that define a stochastic process are: its expected value or ensemble average, the autocovariance and the variance.

The Autocovariance Function of The Head

The autocovariance function of the head represents the interdependence of the stochastic process $h(t)$, at different times \underline{r} , \underline{t} and it is the second moment about the mean values of the function $h(t)$.

$$\text{Cov}(h(\underline{r}), h(\underline{t})) = K_h(\underline{r}, \underline{t}) = E((h(\underline{r}) - \mu_h(\underline{r}))(h(\underline{t}) - \mu_h(\underline{t})))$$

or

$$K_h(\underline{r}, \underline{t}) = E(h(\underline{r})h(\underline{t})) - \mu_h(\underline{r})\mu_h(\underline{t}) \quad (4.3)$$

Combining equation 2.47 with (4.3), we obtain

$$K_h(r, t) = 1/S^2 \int_0^r \int_0^t K_y(u, v) \exp(-a(r-u)/S) \exp(-a(t-v)/S) du dv \quad (4.4)$$

where $K_y(u, v)$, the autocovariance of the input $y(t)$, is defined by

$$K_y(u, v) = E(y(u) y(v)) - \mu_y(u) \mu_y(v)$$

If the process $y(t)$ is a stationary process in the autocovariance, i.e., K_y is dependent on $u-v$ only; then

$$K_h(\mathcal{T}) = 1/S^2 \int_0^r \int_0^t K_y(u - v) \exp(-a(r+t-u-v)/S) du dv \quad (4.5)$$

where $\mathcal{T} = r - t$

The Variance of the Head

If $r = t$ in equation 4.4, we obtain the variance of, \underline{h}

$$\sigma_h^2(t) = K_h(t, t)$$

or

$$\sigma_h^2(t) = 1/S^2 \int_0^t \int_0^t K_y(u, v) \exp(-a(t-u)/S) \exp(-a(t-v)/S) du dv \quad (4.6)$$

In a real case the autocovariance of the input, $K_y(u, v)$ should be computed from raw data. However, if white

noise is assumed feeding a system like ours, the output h is called a first order autoregressive process and has a standard autocorrelation function (Jenkins and Watts, 1968, p.162). White noise is a process which consists of uncorrelated contiguous impulses, with an autocovariance function $K_z(u) = \sigma_z^2 \delta(u)$, where $\delta(u)$ is the Dirac delta function (Jenkins and Watts, 1968, p.157).

In this study the random component $y'(t)$ of the input $y(t)$ was removed from its mean $\mu_y(t)$. The random component was assumed stationary and belonging to a first-order autoregressive process. Therefore, its autocovariance function is

$$K_y(\tau) = \exp(-|\tau|/J) \sigma_y^2 \quad (4.7)$$

where, $J = -1/\ln \rho_1$ and ρ_1 is the autocorrelation function of the input for $t = 1$.

Stationary head Variance Computed

Via Spectral Analysis

Next, a procedure making use of spectral analysis (see Celhar, 1974) will be used to obtain an asymptotic or stationary expression of the variance of the head $h(t)$.

Substituting $t_h = S/a$ into equation 4.1, we obtain

$$t_h \frac{dh}{dt} + h = y(t)/a \quad (4.8)$$

If

$$h(t) = \mu_h(t) + \underline{f} \quad \text{and} \quad y(t) = \mu_y(t) + \underline{r}$$

where, \underline{f} and \underline{r} are stationary random components about the means, then equation 4.8 can be transformed into

$$t_h \frac{d\mu_h}{dt} + \mu_h + t_h \frac{df}{dt} + f = (\mu_y + r)/a \quad (4.9)$$

taking ensemble averages

$$\begin{aligned} t_h E\left(\frac{d\mu_h}{dt}\right) + E(\mu_h) + t_h E\left(\frac{df}{dt}\right) + E(f) \\ = (E(\mu_y) + E(r))/a \end{aligned}$$

and since $E(df/dt)$, $E(f)$ and $E(r)$ are zero.

$$t_h \frac{d\mu_h}{dt} + \mu_h = \mu_y/a \quad (4.10)$$

by linearity, we can subtract equation 4.10 from 4.9 and get

$$t_h \frac{df}{dt} + f = r/a \quad (4.11)$$

which is a stochastic differential equation for the random fluctuations about the mean.

Since \underline{f} and \underline{r} are stationary random processes,

they can be represented by a Fourier-Stieljes integral in the form (Lumley and Panofsky, 1964, p.16)

$$f(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(i\omega t) dZ_f(\omega) \quad (4.12)$$

and

$$r(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(i\omega t) dZ_r(\omega) \quad (4.13)$$

where ω is the frequency (radians/unit time). Substituting, we have

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} i\omega t_h \exp(i\omega t) dZ_f(\omega) + \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(i\omega t) dZ_f(\omega) = 1/a \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(i\omega t) dZ_r(\omega)$$

and then

$$dZ_f(\omega) = dZ_r(\omega)/(a + i\omega t_h)$$

Since the random process $Z(\omega)$ has orthogonal increments (Lumley and Panofsky, 1964, p.16)

$$\begin{aligned} E(dZ_f(\omega_1)dZ_f^*(\omega_2)) &= 0 \quad \text{for } \omega_1 \neq \omega_2 \\ &= S_{ff}(\omega)d\omega \quad \text{for } \omega_1 = \omega_2 = \omega \end{aligned}$$

and

$$E(dZ_{\underline{r}}(w_1) dZ_{\underline{r}}^*(w_2)) = 0 \quad \text{for } w_1 \neq w_2$$

$$= S_{\underline{rr}}(w)dw \quad \text{for } w_1 = w_2 = w$$

where $S_{\underline{ff}}$, $S_{\underline{rr}}$ are the spectral density functions or spectra of \underline{f} and \underline{r} respectively and $dZ^*(w)$ is the complex conjugate of $dZ(w)$.

Since

$$E(dZ_{\underline{f}}(w)dZ_{\underline{f}}^*(w)) = E(dZ_{\underline{r}}(w)dZ_{\underline{r}}^*(w)/((a+iaS)(a-iaS))) \quad (4.14)$$

using the previous orthogonal properties, we find

$$S_{\underline{ff}}(w) = S_{\underline{rr}}(w)/(a^2 + w^2 S^2) \quad (4.15)$$

Equation 4.15 gives the relationship between the spectrum of the input and the output of the system.

The spectrum is the Fourier transform of the auto-covariance function and shows how the variance of a stochastic process is distributed with frequency. Therefore, the expression for the variance of the \underline{f} process is

$$\sigma_{\underline{f}}^2 = K_{\underline{f}}(0) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} S_{\underline{ff}}(w) dw \quad (4.16)$$

using equation 4.7, the input spectrum is

$$S_{rr}(w) = 1/2 \pi \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(-iw \xi) K_{rr}(w) d\xi = T \sigma_r^2 / (1 + J^2 w^2) \pi \quad (4.17)$$

Using (4.17), (4.15) and (4.16),

$$\sigma_f^2 = T \sigma_r^2 / \pi \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dw / (1 + J^2 w^2) (a^2 + Sw^2)$$

and performing the integration, we obtain

$$\sigma_f^2 = \sigma_r^2 J/a(S + Ja) \quad (4.18)$$

Equation 4.18 gives the stationary expression for the variance of the head, and was used to check values obtained from equation 4.6.

The Cross Correlation Coefficient of the Head and Pumping

An analysis similar to the previous one was carried out to find the cross correlation coefficient of the water level in the aquifer, \underline{h} , and the pumping discharge Q_p .

An expression relating the head \underline{h} and specific pumping discharge q_p is

$$t_h dh/dt + h = - q_p/a \quad (4.19)$$

Representing \underline{h} and q_p in complex form, we obtain

$$h(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(i\omega t) dZ_h(\omega) \quad (4.20)$$

$$q_p(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \exp(i\omega t) dZ_{q_p}(\omega) \quad (4.21)$$

After substituting (4.20) and (4.21) into (4.19), we get

$$dZ_h(\omega) = -dZ_{q_p}(\omega)/(a + i\omega S)$$

The cross-spectral density function of q_p and h , $S_{q_p h}(\omega)$ can be expressed (Lumley and Panofsky, 1964, p.21) as

$$E(dZ_{q_p}(\omega) dZ_h^*(\omega)) = S_{q_p h}(\omega) d\omega$$

Therefore

$$S_{q_p h}(\omega) = -S_{q_p q_p}(\omega)(a + i\omega S)/(a^2 + \omega^2 S^2) \quad (4.22)$$

If the random fluctuation of q_p about its mean is assumed stationary and is a first-order autoregressive process,

then

$$K_{q_p}(\tau) = \exp(-|\tau|/J) \sigma_{q_p}^2 \quad (4.23)$$

and

$$S_{q_p h}(\omega) = - (a+i\omega)T \sigma_{q_p}^2 / (a^2 + \omega^2 S^2) (1 + J^2 \omega^2) \pi \quad (4.24)$$

Since

$$K_{q_p} h(o) = 1/2 \pi \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} S_{q_p} h(w) dw$$

then

$$K_{q_p} h(o) = -J \sigma_{q_p}^2 / (Ja + S) \quad (4.25)$$

Let

$$\rho_{q_p} h(o) = K_{q_p} h(o) / \sigma_{q_p} \sigma_h \quad (4.26)$$

and by analogy with (4.18) we have

$$\sigma_h = (J/a(S + Ja))^{\frac{1}{2}} \sigma_{q_p} \quad (4.27)$$

Now, substituting (4.27) and (4.25) into (4.26) produces

$$\rho_{Q_P} h(o) = - (aJ/(aJ + S))^{\frac{1}{2}} \quad (4.28)$$

where $\rho_{Q_P} h(o)$ is the cross correlation coefficient of the pumping and the head in the aquifer.

4.4 Randomness in the Subsurface Outflow Constant

Our system represents a natural phenomenon governed by chance. We do not know what the demand for water will be next year or how much rain will fall. Furthermore, we do

not know how much water will be pumped nor what the water level in the aquifer will be next year. The output uncertainty will depend on the uncertainty present in the system and on the randomness and persistence of the inputs.

Much work remains to be done in the theory of stochastic differential equations. Equations (of the mixed type) with both a random forcing function and random coefficients, are difficult to solve. A conditional probability approach will be followed to obtain an expression of the uncertainty of the head as a function of a random input and of the subsurface outflow constant \underline{a} in equation 4.1.

We will start our analysis by presenting an expression for the variance of a random variable \underline{Y} which depends on another random variable \underline{X} (Parzen, 1962, p.55).

$$\text{Var} (Y) = E (\text{Var} (Y | X)) + \text{Var} (E (Y | X)) \quad (4.29)$$

The subsurface outflow constant \underline{a} , will be considered a random variable, leaving the storage coefficient \underline{S} , as a deterministic quantity. Equation 4.1 can be transformed to

$$S \, dh/dt + ah = Y_A(t) + aH(t) \quad (4.30)$$

where $y(t) = Y_A(t) + aH(t)$

From the linearity of equation 4.30 and from (2.40), we obtain

$$h(t) = h_0 \exp(-at/S) + 1/S \int_0^t (Y_A(\mathcal{T}) + aH(\mathcal{T})) \exp(-a(t-\mathcal{T})/S) d\mathcal{T}$$

Taking the expected value of $h(t)$ given \underline{a} we get

$$\begin{aligned} E(h(t)|a) &= h_0 \exp(-at/S) + 1/S \int_0^t a \mu_H(\mathcal{T}) \exp(-a(t-\mathcal{T})/S) d\mathcal{T} \\ &+ 1/S \int_0^t \mu_{Y_A}(\mathcal{T}) \exp(-a(t-\mathcal{T})/S) d\mathcal{T} \end{aligned} \quad (4.31)$$

Now, making an analogy with equation 4.29, in which $h(t)$ is a random variable that depends on another random variable, the subsurface outflow constant \underline{a} , we have

$$\text{Var}(h(t)) = E(\text{Var}(h(t) | a)) + \text{Var}(E(h(t) | a)) \quad (4.32)$$

In order to obtain the second part of the right hand side of equation 4.32 we use

$$\text{Var}(g(a)) = E((g(a) - E(g(a)))^2)$$

for any function $g(a)$.

Expanding $g(a)$ in a Taylor series about $E(a)$ and assuming a first order analysis (Cornell, 1972, p.1245), (i.e. neglecting terms beyond the first order)

$$g(a) \cong g(a) \Big|_{E(a)} + g'(a) \Big|_{E(a)} (a - E(a)) \quad (4.33)$$

Squaring equation 4.33 and taking the expected value

(Papoulis, 1965, p.152)

$$E((g(a) - g(E(a)))^2) \cong (g'(a) \Big|_{E(a)})^2 \sigma_a^2 \quad (4.34)$$

with $g(a) = E(h(t) | a)$

$$\text{Var}(E(h(t) | a)) \cong (\partial E(h(t) | a) / \partial a \Big|_{E(a)})^2 \sigma_a^2 \quad (4.35)$$

The first term of the right hand side of (4.32) can be obtained by taking the expected value of (4.6). Hence

$$E(\text{Var}(h(t) | a)) = 1/S^2 \int_0^t \int_0^t E(K_Y(u, v, a) \exp(-a(t-u)/S) \cdot \exp(-a(t-v)/S)) dudv \quad (4.36)$$

Expanding $K_Y(u, v, a)$ about $E(a)$ and assuming a first order analysis and then taking the expected value, we obtain

$$E(K_Y(u, v, a)) \cong K_Y(u, v, E(a))$$

Therefore

$$\text{Var}(h(t)) \cong 1/S^2 \int_0^t \int_0^t K_Y(u, v, E(a)) \exp(-E(a)(t-u)/S) \cdot \exp(-E(a)(t-v)/S) dudv + (\partial(E(h(t) | a) \Big|_{E(a)}) / \partial a)^2 \sigma_a^2 \quad (4.37)$$

The above expression shows the variance of the water levels

due to the uncertainty in the input \underline{y} and in the subsurface outflow constant \underline{a} .

CHAPTER 5 STOCHASTIC REPRESENTATION
OF THE MANAGEMENT MODEL

5.1 Introduction

No general procedure has yet been developed to solve the general stochastic programming problem in which some of the parameters are random. There are two bounds to the solution of a stochastic programming problem (Hadley, 1964, p.180); the lower bound can be obtained by determining the optimal value of the objective function for every possible set of parameters assuming that the random variables are known a priori, and then taking the expected value over all values of the random variables. The upper bound is obtained by replacing all the random parameters by their expected values and therefore, the variables found form a feasible but not necessarily optimal solution.

A solution of a stochastic programming problem could be obtained assuming that each model parameter can take on any one of a finite number of known values and all constraints hold for all possible combinations. However, the number of constraints becomes prohibitive if the number of possibilities is reasonably large. Also, the joint density function of the parameters must be known in this procedure.

The approach which will be followed in this work is a trade-off with respect to the solution that occurs between the two bounds. Expected values of the variables will be used in the objective function and the constraints will be

of the chance constraints type or constraints that hold for most of the possible combinations but not for all. General operations research books discuss this type of constraint (e.g., Hillier, and Lieberman, 1972, p.536).

A stochastic management model will be developed to represent the management of a stream-aquifer system where economic and physical variables are governed by chance. Uncertainties for the demand of water and future availability of groundwater and surface water facilities will be considered. A stochastic management model aids in obtaining optimal operational policies and in designing water facilities.

The objective function is a function of the uncertainty in the aquifer water levels and of the cross correlation between pumping and head. It represents the discounted expected value of cost. Chance constraints (Charnes, et.al., 1958) are used to include probabilities of satisfaction of constraints. A nonstationary demand is easily reproduced by these constraints. The linear decision rule is used to define the decision variables and helps to transform the chance constraints into deterministic constraints. Finally, the computational part of the iterative procedure, used to solve the nonlinear programming problem, is discussed.

5.2 Decision Variables

The policy, control or decision variables, those deterministic variables calculated out of the optimization process, are defined as in the deterministic case (see,

Section 3.3) and they are:

The surface water decision variable

$$\gamma_{S_i} = Q_{SD_i} / D_{i-1}$$

The groundwater decision variable

$$\gamma_{P_i} = Q_{F_i} / AS h_{i-1}$$

The dam operation decision variable

$$\gamma_{B_i} = S'_{i-1} - Q_{ou_i}$$

The variables appearing in the decision variables definitions are random.

One advantage of the linear decision rule in defining the decision variables is that when the random events materialize in the form of preceding events (D_{i-1} , h_{i-1} and S'_{i-1}) they become known and are used in connection with the decision variables to make decisions (Q_{SD_i} , Q_{P_i} , and Q_{ou_i}) at the present. Therefore a random problem is transformed into one which deals with deterministic quantities. This feature is useful in scheduling problems; the decision policy is dynamic in the sense that current decisions depend on the previous condition of the system.

5.3 Objective Function

Due to the random nature of the variables, the objective function becomes a random variable; however, since it is meaningless to minimize a random variable, a deterministic quantity is needed. The expected value was selected because of its simplicity.

If we take the expected value of equation 3.1 (ensemble average), the objective function will represent the discounted expected value of cost.

Minimize

$$\begin{aligned}
 E(W) = & \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_{C_S} \mu_{Q_{SD_i}} / (1 + r/N_S)^i \\
 & + \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_{C_P} (Z \mu_{Q_{P_i}} - E(Q_{P_i} h_i)) / (1 + r/N_S)^i \\
 & + \sum_{i=1}^n \mu_{C_P} \psi E(Q_{P_i}^2) / (1 + r/N_S)^i \quad (5.1)
 \end{aligned}$$

where the well water level, \underline{h}' , is represented by $h + DC$ and the drawdown correction, DC , is given by (2.49)

$$DC = s_w - \bar{s} = \psi Q_P$$

Considering Q_P and \underline{h} to be correlated, we have

$$E(Q_{P_i} h_i) = \mu_{Q_{P_i}} \mu_{h_i} + \rho_{Q_P h} \sigma_{Q_{P_i}} \sigma_{h_i} \quad (5.2)$$

also

$$E(Q_{P_i}^2) = \mu_{Q_{P_i}}^2 + \sigma_{Q_{P_i}}^2 \quad (5.3)$$

where $\rho_{Q_P h}$ is the cross correlation coefficient of pumping and aquifer head, σ_{Q_P} is the standard deviation of pumping and σ_h is the standard deviation of aquifer head. Substituting (5.2), (5.3) and the first two decision variables into (5.1), we get

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Minimize} \\ E(W) = & \sum_{i=1}^n (1/(1 + r/N_S)^i) (\mu_{C_S} \mu_{D_{i-1}} \gamma_{S_i} + \mu_{C_P} AS(z \mu_{h_{i-1}} \\ & - \mu_{h_{i-1}} \mu_{h_i} + \mu_{DC_i} \mu_{h_{i-1}}) \gamma_{P_i} + \mu_{C_P} (-\rho_{Q_P h} \sigma_{Q_P} \sigma_{h_i} + \psi \sigma_{Q_P}^2)) \end{aligned} \quad (5.4)$$

From equation 4.27, for a stationary process,

$$\sigma_h = c \sigma_{q_p}$$

where c is a constant which depends on aquifer properties.

Above equation can be transformed into

$$\sigma_{Q_P} = c_1 \sigma_h \quad (5.5)$$

where the constant $c_1 = C/A$, since $q_p = Q_P/A$ and

$\sigma_{q_p} = \sigma_{Q_P}/A$. Substituting (5.5) into (5.4) we obtain

Minimize

$$E(W) = \sum_{i=1}^n (1/(1 + r/N_S)^i) (\mu_{C_S} \mu_{D_{i-1}} \gamma_{S_i} + \mu_{C_P} AS(Z \mu_{h_{i-1}} - \mu_{h_{i-1}} \mu_{h_i} + \mu_{DC_i} \mu_{h_{i-1}}) \gamma_{P_i} + \mu_{C_P} (-c_1 / Q_{Ph} + c_1^2 \psi) \sigma_{h_i}^2)$$

(5.6)

where, the first term represents the cost of surface water diversion, the second term is that portion of the pumping cost which does not depend on the head variance, and the last term is that part of the pumping cost that depends on the head variance.

5.4 Chance Constraints

Chance constraints are not absolute but are satisfied up to specified probability levels. They were introduced by Charnes and Cooper (1959) as an approach to linear programming under uncertainty. As used in this work they include: (1) probabilities that imply degree of constraint satisfaction; (2) uncertainties of water facilities; and (3) nonstationary of the demand.

The constraint on the demand of water will be taken as an example of the procedure for representing a system restriction, by a chance constraint.

We are interested in the satisfaction of the demand constraint (see equation 3.2) under the probabilistic condition

$$P(D_i - (Q_{SD_i} + Q_{P_i}) \leq 0) \geq \lambda_1^* \quad (5.7)$$

where λ_1^* is a level of probability chosen to satisfy the probabilistic statement. Since the demand of water D , the amount of water diverted from the stream Q_{SD} , and the aquifer pumping Q_P are random variables, (5.7) is a difficult statement to convert to certainty inequalities that can be used in the linear programming. In place of (5.7) we state

$$P(D_i \leq \mu_{Q_{SD_i}} + \mu_{Q_{P_i}}) \geq \lambda_1 \quad (5.8)$$

For various values of λ_1 we give lower bounds on $P(D_i - (Q_{SD_i} + Q_{P_i}) \geq 0)$ in Appendix G; these calculations indicate that the probability level λ_1^* in (5.7) is slightly smaller than the value λ_1 . It is shown how λ_1^* can be estimated from a given value of λ_1 .

Therefore, the cumulative distribution of the demand $F_{D_i}(d)$ at a time i (see, Figure 5.1) is defined as

$$F_{D_i}(d) = P(D_i \leq d) \quad (5.9)$$

where d is a variable. To insure that (5.9) is satisfied

$$d \geq d_i(\lambda_1) \quad (5.10)$$

where $d_i(\lambda_1)$ is the solution for x_1 of the equation $F_{D_i}(x_1) = \lambda_1$. Hence, from (5.8) and introducing the decision variables (see Section 5.2), we obtain




Fig. 5.1 (a) Cumulative probability distribution of the demand for a given level of probability λ , and (b) Probability density function of the demand for a given level of probability .

$$F_{D_i}(\mu_{D_{i-1}} \gamma_{S_i} + AS \mu_{h_{i-1}} \gamma_{P_i}) \geq \lambda_1 \quad (5.11)$$

This inequality may be called a chance representation of the demand. Equation (5.11) is equivalent to

$$\mu_{D_{i-1}} \gamma_{S_i} + AS \mu_{h_{i-1}} \gamma_{P_i} \geq d_i(\lambda_1) \quad (5.12)$$

where $d_i(\lambda_1)$ can be connected with μ_D and σ_D , to produce

$$\mu_{D_{i-1}} \gamma_{S_i} + AS \mu_{h_{i-1}} \gamma_{P_i} \geq \mu_{D_i} + x \sigma_{D_i} \quad (5.13)$$

where x depends on λ_1 and the type of probability density function of the demand which can be skewed.

Equation 5.13 is a deterministic representation of the chance constraint and can be used with a mathematical programming technique. A nonstationary demand can easily be represented by this constraint and if (5.12) is used instead of (5.13) a skew probability density function of the demand can easily be considered.

According to equation 5.13, the probability that the water demand in a given time period i be smaller than or equal to the average sum of flows Q_{SD} and Q_P must be greater than or equal to a probability level λ_1 .

Another type of constraint states that the available pumping capacity at a time period i must be greater than or equal to the average amount of water pumped from the

aquifer with a given probability level λ_2 . In other words, there is always an uncertainty present in the available pumping capacity at a given time, due to maintenance and operational problems which shut down several of the available wells. Therefore, there is no way to know precisely how much water we shall be able to pump at a future time. The chance constraint for pumping facilities is

$$AS \mu_{h_{i-1}} \gamma_{P_i} \leq \mu_{Q_{P_i}} + x \sigma_{Q_{P_i}} \quad (5.14)$$

where $\sigma_{Q_{P_i}}$ represents the standard deviation of the pumping capacity and $\mu_{Q_{P_i}}$ the expected amount of water that can be extracted from the aquifer at time period i .

Equation 5.14, as well as the other constraints, can be obtained following a procedure similar to that used for the demand-of-water constraint.

The surface water diversion constraint states that the available surface water capacity at time period i must be greater than or equal to the average amount of water diverted from the stream at the same time with a probability level λ_3 . The constraint can be written as

$$\mu_{D_{i-1}} \gamma_{S_i} \leq \mu_{Q_{SD}} + x \sigma_{Q_{SD}} \quad (5.15)$$

where $\sigma_{Q_{SD}}$ is the standard deviation of the surface water capacity and $\mu_{Q_{SD}}$, the expected amount of water that

the surface water facilities can convey at a given time i .

Finally, the stream requirements constraint states that the average flow left in the stream, after all uses and interactions between the stream and the aquifer, at time period i , must be greater than or equal to the downstream flow required at the same time.

$$P(Q_{ST_i} \geq \mu_{Q_{SD_i}} + \mu_{Q_{S_i}} + \mu_{K1_i}) \geq \lambda_4$$

or

$$1 - F_{Q_{ST_i}}(\mu_{Q_{SD_i}} + \mu_{Q_{S_i}} + \mu_{K1_i}) \geq \lambda_4 \quad (5.16)$$

where the variables were defined in Section 3.3 in a deterministic form. The certainty equivalent of equation 5.16 is

$$\mu_{D_{i-1}} \gamma_{S_i} + Aa(\mu_{H_i} - \mu_{h_i}) + \mu_{K1_i} \leq d_i (1 - \lambda_4)$$

where $d_i(1 - \lambda_4)$ represents the $100 \cdot (1 - \lambda_4)$ percentile of the streamflow Q_{ST} .

5.5 Iterative Procedure

An iterative procedure similar to that described in Chapter 3 is used to solve the stochastic management problem.

Figure 5.2 shows a flow chart depicting the iterative procedure. The variable names are given in previous sections




Fig. 5.2 Iterative procedure of a stochastic management problem.

or in the list of symbols. Shaded blocks show the inputs to the system and the area delimited by dashed lines represents the generation of the random input Y_i . This can be omitted if not enough field information is available. In this case, the variance of the input σ_y^2 should be assumed. Assumptions implied throughout the computation of the variance of the input are: (1) the components of the general input, Y_i , are statistically independent; (2) first order autoregressive processes are used to simulate demand of water, D_i , precipitation, P_i and the aquifer head, h_i ; (3) a normal cumulative distribution function is used to generate random numbers; (4) the variance of y is assumed constant and is estimated by $\sigma_y^2 = \sum_{i=1}^n (y_i - \bar{y})^2 / (n - 1)$; (5) precipitation is the only natural input with important randomness. Certainly most of the above assumptions could easily be relaxed; they were chosen to keep the simulation of data simpler and closer to the real case.

In summary, we have presented the stochastic management model in its simplest form. Depending on a specific problem, more terms may be added to the objective function, as well as constraints. The iterative procedure and basic concepts and equations will remain the same giving generality to the work presented.

CHAPTER 6 RESULTS AND APPLICATIONS

6.1 Introduction

To examine the reliability of the models developed herein, a comparative test was done based on a suitable case study obtained from the literature related to the subject. Furthermore, to demonstrate the viability and the versatility of these models they were applied to an actual stream-aquifer system, located in northwestern Mexico.

6.2 Comparative Study

Two features of the models were examined through comparative study: the presence of uncertainties or randomness in the stream-aquifer system and the distribution of variables in space and time. Based on a survey of related literature, a study by Maddock (1974) was chosen for the comparative work because it uniquely met the above requirements.

Maddock developed operating rules for the conjunctive use of surface water and groundwater when the demand and the natural supply (streamflow) are stochastic. He used a set of "technological functions" to condense information supplied by a distributed aquifer model and to get a link between the physical model and the stochastic management model. Also, when his water demand was represented by a Markov process (first-order autoregressive process) a demand

persistence was introduced into the management model through the product of pumping and drawdown.

It was our purpose to simulate the reference problem as closely as possible. Nevertheless, a few discrepancies remain. For instance, the main source of randomness in Maddock's case was the demand, while for the model proposed here it is the mean water level in the aquifer which involves the randomness. Also in the present model, decision variables are defined differently. In Maddock's work the decision variables are defined as ratios of flow to demand at a specific time i , while here the decision variables are defined as ratios of flow occurring at time i to the demand of water occurring at time $i-1$, or to the volume of water stored in the aquifer at time $i-1$. This definition is the result of the use of a linear decision rule which allows more dynamic decision variables.

The proposed management model is given by the following equations which should be compared to the development in Chapter 5 (Sections 5.2, 5.3 and 5.4). Objective function;

$$\begin{aligned}
 E(W) = & \sum_{i=1}^n 1/(1 + r/N_S)^i (\mu_{C_S} \mu_{D_{i-1}} \gamma_{S_i} + \alpha_1 \mu_{C_u} \mu_{D_{i-1}} \gamma_{u_i} \\
 & + \mu_{C_P} \Delta S (Z \mu_{h_{i-1}} - \mu_{h_{i-1}} \mu_{h_i} + HL \mu_{h_{i-1}} + \mu_{D_{C_i}} \mu_{h_{i-1}}) \gamma_{P_i} \\
 & + \mu_{C_P} (-C_1 \rho_{Q_P h} + C_1^2 \psi) \sigma_{h_i}^2 + \alpha_2 \mu_{C_R} \mu_{D_{i-1}} \gamma_{R_i})
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{6.1}$$

Constraints;

(1) Demand of water,

$$\mu_{D_{i-1}} \gamma_{S_i} + AS \mu_{h_{i-1}} \gamma_{P_i} \geq \mu_D + x \sigma_D \quad (6.2)$$

(2) Stream Requirements,

$$\mu_{D_{i-1}} \gamma_{S_i} - \alpha_1 \mu_{D_{i-1}} \gamma_{u_i} \leq \mu_{Q_{ST_i}} - aA \mu_H + aA \mu_{h_{i-1}} \quad (6.3)$$

(3) Water left after the demand is satisfied,

$$\gamma_{u_i} + \gamma_{R_i} = 1 \quad (6.4)$$

Decision variables;

(1) Surface water diversion,

$$\gamma_{S_i} = Q_{SD_i} / D_{i-1} \quad (6.5)$$

(2) Water returned to the stream,

$$\gamma_{u_i} = Q_{u_i} / D_{i-1} \alpha_1 \quad (6.6)$$

(3) Pumping,

$$\gamma_{P_i} = Q_{P_i} / AS h_{i-1} \quad (6.7)$$

(4) Artificial recharge,

$$\gamma_{R_i} = Q_{R_i} / D_{i-1} \alpha_2 \quad (6.8)$$

where the parameters are

- Q_{SD_i} amount of water diverted from the stream at time \underline{i} ;
- Q_{u_i} amount of water returned to the stream at time \underline{i} ;
- Q_{p_i} amount of water pumped out of the aquifer at time \underline{i} ;
- Q_{R_i} amount of water recharged to the aquifer at time \underline{i} .

The rest of the variables are defined in the List of Symbols. All the decision variables, except that for pumping, are in a form equivalent to that used by Maddock. Since the pumping decision variable is defined differently, the structure of the objective function is such that the variance of the head appears rather than that of the demand.

Table 6.1 summarizes the important conceptual differences between the two models. An idea of the simplicity of our physical model is demonstrated by the number of aquifer parameters needed.

$$T = 0.031 \text{ ft}^2/\text{s}$$

$$S = 0.01$$

$$L = 4900 \text{ ft}$$

$$A = 8173 \text{ acres}$$

$$\beta = 3$$

TABLE 6.1 Significant Differences Between the Compared Models.

	Distributed Parameter Model (Maddock, 1974)	Lumped Parameter Model (Present Investigation)
Physical Model	The location of wells must be specified and the aquifer properties defined in detail. The pumping scheduling is obtained for every well.	The location of wells is not specified and the aquifer properties are average values. The pumping scheduling is obtained for the entire region.
	This model computes the drawdown at nodal points representing wells.	Since this model does not compute the drawdowns at the well locations, a drawdown correction is added in order to achieve correct pumping costs.
Management Model	A standard quadratic programming package requiring 190 k bytes of core was used.	An iterative procedure was developed to take advantage of the structure of the physical model and a simple linear programming package is used.
	An average demand constraint is applied to the problem.	A phase overlay computer software technique helps to reduce program storage to 144 k bytes of core. A solution requiring two iterations is solved in about 12 minutes on an IBM 360 model 44 system.
	"Static" decision variables.	A chance demand constraint is applied to the problem. Dynamic decision variables which use the linear decision rule.

The properties of the homogeneous aquifer, transmissivity and storage coefficient, and a map of the study area were provided by Maddock (personal communication, 1975). The characteristic length \underline{L} of the system (Section 2.3) was estimated from the aquifer area and the length of the main stream channel. The location of the wells was unknown. Appendix H gives the information required by the models and the variable names. A response time t_h of one month was obtained for this system by using (2.47).

The operating rules formulated by Maddock for a coefficient of variation of 0.457 and a mean demand of water of 131 acre-ft per season are shown in Table 6.2 along with our results for the same situation. A remarkable likeness is to be noted in these results, which substantiates the competence of our stochastic management model in general and the iterative procedure in particular.

By referring to the deterministic case, we obtain the sensitivity of the discounted expected cost to changes in the demand variance. This sensitivity is expressed by Maddock as a percent error in the discounted expected cost in relation to the deterministic world assumption $P'(\sigma_D^2, 0)$, versus σ_D^2 . An expression that defines $P'(\sigma_D^2, 0)$ is

$$P'(\sigma_D^2, 0) = (E(W(\sigma_D^2, 0)) - E(W(0,0))) \cdot 100 / E(W(0,0)) \quad (6.9)$$

where $E(W(0, 0))$ is the discounted expected cost when the true value of the demand is known (deterministic case).

TABLE 6.2 Comparison of Operating Rules of Maddock's and Proposed Models.

Sea- son	Decision Variables									Expected Interaction Withdrawal from Stream (acre-ft)	
	Pumping			Stream Diversion		Return to the Stream		Spreading			
	$\gamma_{(1,n)}^*$	$\gamma_{(2,n)}^*$	γ_P^1	$\lambda_{(n)}^*$	γ_s^1	$\xi_{(n)}^*$	γ_u^1	$\gamma_{(3,n)}^*$	γ_R^1	$f(n)$	Q_s^1
1	0.511	0.489	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	84	57
2	0.519	0.481	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	89	62
3	0.466	0.534	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	89	62
4	0.514	0.486	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	93	62
5	0.516	0.484	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	93	62
6	0.519	0.481	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	94	62
1	0.523	0.477	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	95	62
2	0.527	0.473	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	95	62
3	0.447	0.553	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.036	0.0	0.964	1.0	93	62
4	0.516	0.484	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	96	62
5	0.517	0.483	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	96	62
6	0.520	0.480	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	96	62
1	0.525	0.475	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	97	62
2	0.529	0.471	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	97	62
3	0.449	0.551	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.054	0.0	0.946	1.0	95	62
4	0.489	0.511	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	96	62
5	0.515	0.485	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	98	62
6	0.517	0.483	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	98	62
1	0.522	0.478	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	98	62
2	0.526	0.474	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	98	62
3	0.446	0.554	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.063	0.0	0.937	1.0	96	62
4	0.466	0.534	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	96	62
5	0.504	0.496	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	98	62
6	0.499	0.501	1.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	0.0	1.0	1.0	98	62

* Maddock's Solution
 1 Present Investigation
 $\gamma_P = \gamma_{(1,n)} + \gamma_{(2,n)}$
 $\gamma(k) =$ Fraction of the demand supplied by the Kth well
 during the nth time period

This expression for sensitivity was also utilized in the present investigation as a basis for comparison. The results of this analysis are expressed in graphical form in Figure 6.1. Maddock's result represents the point given in the text of Maddock (1974, p.9); Maddock (personal communication, 1975) has stated that his Figure 2 is incorrect. His results are only a special case of a more general stochastic representation used in the present management model. In Maddock's problem, the expected value of the demand of water is satisfied according to any given level of probability λ , as shown in Figure 6.1 by using a chance constraint representation (Section 5.4). In addition, a non-stationary demand could easily be represented by this type of constraint (see equation 6.2).

Up to this point apparently no discrepancies exist between the management decision resulting from the two approaches. The aquifer in our case shows a decline of the mean water level which is responsible for the stream-aquifer flow. However, a water balance calculation from Maddock's Table 5 implies that the mean water level of the aquifer underwent a recovery of 8.6 ft at the end of the design period instead of declining. The explanation of this phenomenon was found in the distributed nature of Maddock's model, which was able to simulate the local cone of depression of a pumping well and to induce local stream to aquifer flow even though the mean water level in the aquifer was above the stream level.

EXPLANATION
 ○ Maddock (1974) expected value constraint
 (equivalent to $\lambda = 0.5$)
 × Present study




Fig. 6.1 Graph of $P'(\sigma_D^2, 0)$ versus C_V , as a function of probability level λ .

Since the cone of depression due to pumping of only two wells was the dominant effect on aquifer flow it was difficult for our lumped model to manage problems of the local flow type, even though a correction for the effect of drawdown at the wells themselves was included. As a consequence, the values of the objective function differ in magnitude. For a coefficient of variation of 0.458 and $\lambda = 0.5$, Maddock's objective function was \$3606, while in our case it was \$5976.

The advantage of our models in terms of computational effort and simple structure is illustrated by the fact that only 24 quantities, appear in the pumping term of the objective function compared to 600 of Maddock. For instance if we had 20 pumping wells, (instead of 2, as in the present case), Maddock's objective function would show 6000 different products of decision variables; while only 24 quantities would still appear in our case.

A management model such as Maddock's is very cumbersome and almost impossible to solve when the number of pumping wells is large. This is due to the large number of terms in the objective function, which is not only a consequence of the distributed representation of the problem but also of the structure of the physical model. To compute drawdown in Maddock's management model all past pumping must be included in the objective function.

A discrete representation of the convolution integral is part of our lumped parameter model solution and is used

to compute all past pumping outside of the management model condensing the past information into the current aquifer head. Hence, when the physical model and the management model are brought together in the objective function many complications are avoided and an iterative procedure arises as a natural procedure for solving the nonlinear optimization problem. The iterative procedure used to solve Maddock's problem is depicted in Figure 6.2 and a listing of the computer program is supplied in Appendix I. The inputs of the models are: initial assumptions of the decision variables and the mean aquifer water levels; and the model parameters. Normally distributed random numbers were used to simulate random demand needed in the artificial recharge Q_{AR} computation. As a computational simplification, mean water levels instead of random water levels were used in the pumping computation. To compute the variance of the system input, σ_y^2 , a time average was used and stationarity was assumed. The computation of the variance of the aquifer head was obtained from (4.6) and the mean water levels from (4.2). The drawdown correction was computed using (2.49).

Summary of Model Testing

The simple physical model was developed for regional studies where the effect of many wells produces a quasi-mean water level change. The resulting operating rules compare satisfactorily with Maddock's results. However under the local flow situation herein tested, in which the pumping




Fig. 6.2 Flow chart of the iterative procedure used to solve Maddock's problem.

effect of two wells produced cones of depression dominating the flow picture, the lumped model indicates a slightly higher value of the objective function.

The stochastic management model, with the use of a linear decision rule to define the decision variables, makes the problem more dynamic since every future decision for the system depends on a known present situation. Furthermore the use of a chance constraint representation of the demand shows that situations such as Maddock's dealing with average accomplishments (50% level of probability) are only special cases of a more general problem, in which any desired level of probability can be considered. Demands of water represented as nonstationary process, can easily be managed by a chance constraint, as used in the present work.

6.3 Application

Introduction

The objective of this part of the study was to illustrate the application of the present management scheme to a complex and realistic field problem. A system able to develop conjunctive use of surface water and groundwater and a central management agency were used to test the reliability and adaptability of the models to specific situations. A basin in northwestern Mexico was chosen as the study case. Inasmuch as not enough detailed field information was available to represent the area accurately, the results obtained from our models should not be thought

of as the ultimate policies applicable to that area. Realism was important but not the most important criterion. The practical objectives of the investigation were: to formulate an optimal operational schedule for the system; and to determine the size of a projected dam for control of the stream. We especially considered uncertainties present in the natural inputs, in future demands of water, in availability of surface and groundwater facilities, and in the stream-aquifer subsurface outflow constant.

Description of the Area

The study area is crossed by the Rio Sinaloa which flows into the Gulf of Baja California. Two well fields exist, one on each side of the river. They serve mainly agriculture. The boundaries of the system are shown in Figure 6.3. Additional information on the area can be found in Appendix J.

Water Balance

To obtain the subsurface outflow constant a water balance of the studied area was carried out for the period between September of 1969 to September of 1970, this portion of the problem can be defined as the calibration part. The following equation represents the water balance of the aquifer

$$S \frac{dV}{dt} = Q_i + N_r + Q_{ret} + Q_C + Q_S - Q_P - ET \quad (6.10)$$




Fig. 6.3 Map of the Rio Sinaloa study area.

where

$$N_r = \alpha_1 P'$$

$$Q_{ret} = \alpha_4 \alpha_2 (Q_P + \beta_1 P + Q_{SD})$$

$$Q_S = Aa(H - h)$$

$$Q_C = \alpha_3 Q_{SD}$$

The variables are defined in Figure 6.4.

To visualize better the magnitude of the variables equation 6.10 may be expressed in terms of water depths; this is done by dividing by the aquifer area \underline{A} .

$$S \, dh/dt = \epsilon - q_P + a(H - h) \quad (6.11)$$

in which

$$\epsilon = q_i + \alpha_1 P' + \alpha_4 \alpha_2 (q_P + \beta_1 P + q_{SD}) + \alpha_3 q_{SD} - q_{ET} \quad (6.12)$$

Information about the variables involved in (6.11) and (6.12) is presented next.

- a) Irrigated Land. Irrigated land of 460 Km² and an aquifer of 1744 Km² were included in the aquifer water balance.
- b) Water demand. An average consumptive use of one

EXPLANATION

- Q_{SD} : Surface water applied to the field
- Q_C : Conveyance loss
- Q_{RS} : Surface drainage
- CU : Consumptive use
- P : Precipitation
- ET : Evapotranspiration
- Q_i : Subsurface inflow
- N_r : Recharge from precipitation
- Q_{ret} : Irrigation return flow
- Q_P : Pumping
- Q_S : Stream-aquifer flow




Fig. 6.4 Rio Sinaloa water cycle.

meter was estimated. This estimate is based on the consumptive use of the main crops and the seasonal irrigation cycles. Hence 1.7 meters of applied water was assumed reasonable.

$$\text{Demand} = 460 \times 10^6 \times 1.7 = 782 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3/\text{yr}$$

$$q_D = 782/1744 = 0.448 \text{ m/yr} \quad (6.13)$$

where q_D is the water depth required by the demand and computed for the total area of the aquifer (as opposed to the irrigated area only).

- c) Subsurface Inflow. It is mainly due to the Arroyo Ocoroni (Figure 6.3) and was estimated from water table maps.

$$Q_i = 25 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3/\text{yr}$$

and

$$q_i = 25/1744 = 0.0143 \text{ m/yr} \quad (6.14)$$

where q_i is the depth of surface inflow, over the total aquifer area.

- d) Pumping. Figures for pumping can be seen in Appendix J.

$$Q_P = 200 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3/\text{yr}$$

and

$$q_P = 200/1744 = 0.115 \text{ m/yr} \quad (6.15)$$

where q_P is the depth of pumped water over the total aquifer area.

- e) Precipitation. An average annual precipitation of 0.45 meters was estimated for the basin; 67 percent of this precipitation falling over the irrigated land was assumed to contribute to the demand. Then

$$p = 0.45 \times 460/1744 = 0.118 \text{ m/yr}$$

and

$$\beta_1 p = 0.67 \times 0.118 = 0.0793 \text{ m/yr} \quad (6.16)$$

where p is the depth of precipitation, referred to the aquifer area.

- f) Diverted Surface Water. Since no precise information existed about surface water diverted from the stream, this quantity was obtained as follows

$$q_P + q_{SD} + \beta_1 p = q_D$$

where q_{SD} is the depth of diverted surface water, over the total aquifer area. Therefore,

$$q_{SD} = q_D - q_p - \beta_1 p$$

Substituting (6.13), (6.15) and (6.16) into above equation produces

$$q_{SD} = 0.2527 \text{ m/yr} \quad (6.17)$$

- g) Irrigation Return Flow. A coefficient of infiltration of water applied to the irrigated land was computed as:

$$\alpha_2 = \frac{\text{water applied} - \text{consumptive use}}{\text{water applied}}$$

or

$$\alpha_2 = (1.7 - 1.0)/1.7 = 0.411$$

Then the depth of water infiltrated due to irrigation is

$$\alpha_2 q_D = 0.185 \text{ m/yr}$$

Since some of the water infiltrated returns to any available surface drainage (such as the stream) it

was assumed that 55 percent of the amount of water infiltrated returned to the surface drainage system (α_4) and therefore,

$$\alpha_4 \alpha_2 q_D = 0.45 \times 0.185 = 0.0829 \text{ m/yr} \quad (6.18)$$

- h) Infiltration from Precipitation. Here, the flow of water infiltrated into the non-irrigated area is calculated assuming a coefficient of infiltration, α_1 , of 5 percent. The depth of precipitation falling on non irrigated land is

$$p' = (1744-460) \times 0.45/1744 = 0.332 \text{ m/yr}$$

and the depth of infiltrated water is

$$p' = 0.0166 \text{ m/yr} \quad (6.19)$$

- i) Conveyance Losses. A coefficient of infiltration α_3 , of 10 percent, due to the conveyance losses of canals was included in the losses as follows

$$\alpha_3 q_{SD} = 0.0253 \text{ m/yr} \quad (6.20)$$

- j) Evapotranspiration. This term includes losses from evapotranspiration due to phreatophytes (mainly cottonwoods along the Arroyo Ocoroni and Rio Sinaloa,

see Figure 6.3). An area 130 Km long and 250 m wide was assumed to be affected by the phreatophytes. Based on an approximation of the volume density and the water consumption of cottonwoods (Robinson, 1958, p.61), a consumptive use of 1.55 meters was estimated. Therefore,

$$q_{PT} = (130 \times 0.25 \times 1.55) / 1744 = 0.0289 \text{ m/yr} \quad (6.21)$$

where, q_{PT} is the depth of phreatophyte consumption referred to the aquifer area.

Making use of equation 6.12 and the previous terms, we obtain

$$\epsilon = 0.1102 \text{ m/yr} \quad (6.22)$$

The mean water level change between September 1969 and September 1970, Δh was

$$\Delta h = -0.511 \text{ m} \quad (6.23)$$

A mean water level for the entire aquifer of 19.969 meters above sea level was calculated from water table maps of the studied area.

Two points should be kept in mind when computing the mean stream stage; first, downstream of the town of Guasave

(Figure 6.3), the area to the west of the river is not considered in the analysis; second, some subsurface outflow discharges to the sea. Therefore, in the computation of the mean stream stage, the length of the stream above Guasave was included twice; the length of coast was considered and at datum level. The average stream stage elevation was then 20.6 meters.

With the values of the system variables and the water balance of (6.11) the subsurface outflow constant was computed as follows

$$- 0.311 \times 10^{-2} = 0.110 - 0.116 + 0.63a \quad (6.24)$$

and

$$a = 4.29 \times 10^{-3} \text{ 1/yr} \quad (6.25)$$

The response time (see equation 2.54) can be obtained as

$$t_h = 10^{-2} / (4.29 \times 10^{-3}) = 2.33 \text{ years} \quad (6.26)$$

A characteristic length of the aquifer can be computed once the subsurface outflow constant is known (see Section 2.3). In this case, the characteristic length is 21 km. This can easily be measured from a map of the area and is strikingly the same as that obtained using the aquifer

water balance equation. This example shows how simple it is to obtain the subsurface outflow constant and to represent the system by our physical model, provided we have a clear picture of the field situation. A water balance will always be recommended as a powerful and simple tool in checking the behavior or characteristics of the physical model.

Management of the System

Plans have been made for construction of a reservoir on the Rio Sinaloa in order to control and have better use of the river. However, for best use of available water resources in the area, the conjunctive use of groundwater and surface water appears to be an advantageous alternative, and should be considered.

An aquifer, an underground reservoir built by nature and able to store, transmit and supply water, is already available. It is naturally connected to the stream, and hydraulic head differences dominate the stream-aquifer interaction. About 600 wells, approximately 120 with depth greater than 50 meters, presently extract water from the aquifer. In drought periods, the aquifer can be a reliable source of water.

Both subsystems, stream and aquifer would be operated by a central agency, charged with satisfying an estimated water demand in the "best" economic way, and with absorbing the initial costs of the irrigation and pumping facilities. No changes in the unit operational cost of the facilities,

due to operation of the system, will be considered.

Optimal decisions concerning size of the dam and its operation, diversion, and operational policies for pumping will be determined. The inputs and characteristics of the system such as the subsurface outflow constant and the availability of pumping facilities are the uncertain quantities.

In a deterministic treatment, the minimization of the discounted operational cost of the system (see, e.g., equation 3.1), including the fixed cost of the dam, is represented by an objective function such as:

$$W = \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{(1 + r/N_S)^i} (C_{S_i} D_{i-1} \gamma_{S_i} + C_{R_1} \gamma_{R_1} + C_{P_i} Q_{P_i} (Z - h_i + DC_i)) \quad (6.27)$$

See section 3.3 and the List of Symbols for description of the variables. The decision variables are:

- γ_{S_i} ratio of water diverted from the stream at time \underline{i} , to water demand at time $\underline{i}-1$;
- γ_{R_1} size of the dam in 10^6 m^3 ;
- γ_{P_i} ratio of water pumped out of the aquifer at time \underline{i} to amount of water stored in the aquifer at time $\underline{i}-1$.

If the demand of water and inputs of the systems are random a stochastic representation of the objective function

is the discounted expected value of cost. Following an analysis similar to that presented in Section 5.3 we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \text{Minimize} \\
 E(W) = & \sum_{i=1}^n (1/(1 + r/N_S)^i) (\mu_{C_S} \mu_{D_{i-1}} \gamma_{S_i} + \mu_{C_R} \gamma_{R_i} \\
 & + \mu_{C_P} AS (\mu_{h_{i-1}} - \mu_{h_i} + \mu_{DC_i} \mu_{h_{i-1}}) \gamma_{P_i} \\
 & + \mu_{C_P} (-c_1 \rho_{Q_P h} + c_1^2 \psi) \sigma_{h_i}^2) \quad (6.28)
 \end{aligned}$$

The constraints of the problem are given next (see Section 5.4 for development of some of the constraints).

1) The demand constraint states that the water demand in a given period \underline{i} must be smaller than or equal to the sum of the expected amount of water diverted from the stream and that pumped out of the aquifer, with a level of probability λ_1 .

$$\mu_{D_{i-1}} \gamma_{S_i} + AS \mu_{h_{i-1}} \gamma_{P_i} \geq \mu_{D_i} + x_1 \sigma_{D_i} \quad (6.29)$$

2) The pumping capacity constraint says that the available pumping facilities at a time \underline{i} , must be greater than or equal to the expected amount of water pumped out of the aquifer, with a given probability λ_2 .

$$AS \mu_{h_{i-1}} \gamma_{P_i} \leq \mu_{Q'_P} + x_2 \sigma_{Q'_P} \quad (6.30)$$

3) The diversion facilities constraint establishes that the surface water capacity at a time i must be greater than or equal to the expected amount of water diverted from the stream, with a given level of probability λ_3 .

$$\mu_{D_{i-1}} \gamma_{S_i} \leq \mu_{Q'_{SD}} + x_3 \sigma_{Q'_{SD}} \quad (6.31)$$

4) The dam freeboard constraint says that the freeboard at time i must exceed f_i with probability λ_4 .

$$\gamma_{R_i} - \gamma_{B_i} \geq r_i(\lambda_4) + f_i \quad (6.32)$$

where $r_i(\lambda_4)$ is the 100. λ_4 percentile of the streamflow Q_{ST_i} and f_i is the considered freeboard volume.

To obtain equation 6.32, a new decision variable γ_{B_i} (see Section 3.3) is introduced through a linear decision rule (Revelle et.al., 1969) which is

$$Q_{ou_i} = S'_{i-1} - \gamma_{B_i} \quad (6.33)$$

is expressed in terms of the reservoir storage during the previous time period S'_{i-1} . The continuity equation for the reservoir is

$$S'_i = S'_{i-1} - Q_{ou_i} + Q_{ST_i} \quad (6.34)$$

Substituting (6.33) into (6.34) produces

$$s'_i = \gamma_{B_i} + Q_{ST_i} \quad (6.35)$$

and similarly

$$s'_{i-1} = \gamma_{B_{i-1}} + Q_{ST_{i-1}} \quad (6.36)$$

Introducing (6.36) into (6.33), we obtain

$$Q_{ou_i} = \gamma_{B_{i-1}} - \gamma_{B_i} + Q_{ST_{i-1}} \quad (6.37)$$

which gives us an expression of the release from the dam Q_{ou} at time i , based on the stream flow Q_{ST} at time $i-1$.

In a deterministic representation of the freeboard constraint

$$\gamma_{R_1} - s'_i \geq f_i \quad (6.38)$$

Substituting equation 6.35 into 6.38, we have

$$\gamma_{R_1} - \gamma_{B_i} - f_i \geq Q_{ST_i} \quad (6.39)$$

If the streamflow is random, then equation 6.39 can be written in terms of a probability statement, as follows:

$$P(Q_{ST_i} \leq \gamma_{R_1} - \gamma_{B_i} - f_i) \geq \lambda_4 \quad (6.40)$$

For mathematical programming it is better to represent it

as a certainty equivalent (equation 6.32).

5) The stream requirement constraint, states that the streamflow downstream of the studied region must be greater than or equal to a given senior right K_1 with a probability λ_5 .

$$w_0 \gamma_{R_1} - \gamma_{B_1} - \mu_{D_1} \gamma_{S_1} \geq aA(\mu_H - \mu_{h_1}) + K1_1 \quad (6.41)$$

is an equation for time $i = 1$, and

$$\gamma_{B_{i-1}} - \gamma_{B_i} - \mu_{D_{i-1}} \gamma_{S_i} \geq aA(\mu_H - \mu_{h_i}) - r_{i-1}(1-\lambda_5) + K1_i \quad (6.42)$$

is a constraint for time $i \geq 2$ where $w_0 \gamma_{R_1}$ is the initial storage of the reservoir.

6) The dam storage constraint is defined as the storage at the dam which must be greater than a minimum storage with a probability λ_6 .

$$w_m \gamma_{R_1} - \gamma_{B_i} \leq r_i(1-\lambda_6) \quad (6.43)$$

where $w_m \gamma_{R_1}$ is the minimum storage that the dam must have and $r_i(1-\lambda_6)$ is the 100.(1- λ_6) percentile of the stream-flow.

The deterministic constraint can be written as

$$S'_i \geq S'_{\min}$$

Then, making use of equation 6.35, we obtain

$$Q_{ST_i} \geq w_m \gamma_{R_1} - \gamma_{B_i} \quad (6.44)$$

where $S'_{\min} = w_m \gamma_{R_1}$. Now, if Q_{ST_i} is random, we have

$$P(Q_{ST_i} \geq w_m \gamma_{R_1} - \gamma_{B_i}) \geq \lambda_6$$

or

$$1 - F_{Q_{ST_i}}(w_m \gamma_{R_1} - \gamma_{B_i}) \geq \lambda_6 \quad (6.45)$$

in which $F_{Q_{ST_i}}$ is the cumulative distribution of the streamflow. Equation 6.45 in its certainty representation becomes equation 6.43.

At this point, it is convenient to mention that the levels of probability λ 's are selected by the designer according to available information and future estimations about the system operating policy.

A well drawdown correction DC was included in the objective function to simulate the difference between the average water level in the aquifer and the average water level at the pumping wells. Equation 2.49, previously developed, was applied to obtain the above correction. Well losses were not included in the analysis.

A mean influence area of the wells of 1.45 km^2 was obtained from a map showing the location of the wells in

the studied area. This value is based on an average distance between wells, the irrigated land area and the number of wells significantly deep (depth greater than 25 meters).

The well drawdown correction based on (2.49) is

$$s_w - \bar{s} = (Q / 2\pi T)(p_D - \bar{p}_D) \quad (6.46)$$

where Q is an average instantaneous pumping, obtained by assuming that two thirds of the number of pumping wells, WN , were pumping half of the year; it is related to the annual pumping of the area Q_P , as follows.

$$Q_P = 2/3 \times 1/2 \times WN \times Q_w \times 31.54 \quad (6.47)$$

Statistics

A gamma distribution was selected to represent the streamflow because of its non-symmetry (Fiering, 1971, p.35). The gamma cumulative distribution (Mood et.al., 1963, p.128) or incomplete gamma function is given by

$$F(x) = \int_0^x t^{\alpha} \exp(-t/\beta) dt / \alpha! \beta^{\alpha+1} \quad (6.48)$$

which can be transformed to

$$P(a, x') = F(x) = 1/\Gamma(a) \int_0^{\beta x} t_1^{a-1} \exp(-t_1) dt_1 \quad (6.49)$$

where, $\Gamma(a) = \alpha!$, $\alpha = a-1$ and $x = \beta x'$

Equation 6.49 can be related to the chi-square distribution if a is an integer (Abramowitz, et.al., 1964, p.941) as follows,

$$P(a, x') = \gamma(a, x') / \Gamma(a) = P(\chi^2/\nu) \quad (6.50)$$

in which, $\nu = 2a$ and $\chi^2 = 2x'$ (chi-square distribution), and

$$\Gamma(a, x') / \Gamma(a) = Q(\chi^2/\nu) \quad (6.51)$$

where

$$1 - P(\chi^2/\nu) = Q(\chi^2/\nu) \quad (6.52)$$

A table of $Q(\chi^2/\nu)$ can be found in Abramowitz (1964, p. 978). Two parameters a and β define the shape of the gamma distribution and are related to the statistics of the streamflow as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \mu &= \beta a \\ \sigma^2 &= \beta^2 a \end{aligned}$$

The assumed values of μ and σ were $1334 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3/\text{yr}$ and $544 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3/\text{yr}$, respectively. Therefore,

$$a = 6$$

$$\beta = 222.5$$

$$V = 12$$

For a value of probability of $F(x) = 0.75$ we obtain $\chi^2 = 14.85$ from the tables of χ^2 . Since

$$\chi^2 = 2x/\beta$$

then

$$x = r(0.75) = 1650 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3/\text{yr}$$

where $r(0.75)$ is the 75th percentile of the streamflow. Repeating the procedure for $F(x) = 0.25$, we have

$$x = r(0.25) = 940 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3/\text{yr}$$

where $r(0.25)$ is the 25th percentile of the streamflow.

The cross correlation function of pumping and the head of the aquifer for zero lag (computed by equation 4.28) was -0.74.

Parameters Needed by the Models

The amount of information required by the models under a stochastic formulation increases substantially compared to a deterministic formulation. The values of the parameters

required for the Rio Sinaloa problem are given in Table 6.3.

A flow chart depicting the iterative procedure for solving the Rio Sinaloa management problem under random conditions is shown in Figure 6.5. The listing of the program is given in Appendix I.

Results

Figure 6.6 summarizes certain final results obtained from the application of the proposed models to the study area. These results are: the optimal operation of the system, the optimal size of the dam γ_{R_1} and the expected value of the operational cost of the system (which includes the cost of the dam). Dam, surface water diversion facilities and pumping facilities are those items optimally operated. Also shown in Figure 6.6 are: the expected water level in the aquifer, the stream-aquifer flow and the 75th percentile of the demand.

Examination of the results shows that pumping was always at its maximum capacity throughout the entire horizon, since pumping was cheaper than diversion of water from the stream. Therefore, the amount of surface water was enough to satisfy the demand unfulfilled by pumping, and at the same time absorbed any trend or random fluctuation included in the demand.

An average well drawdown correction of about 7.29 m was found by using equation 2.49.

Because of the increasing water demand and the particular

TABLE 6.3 Parameter Values for the Rio
Sinaloa Problem.

N	Design horizon	20 years
N_S	Number of seasons per year	1
A	Aquifer area	1744 Km ²
T	Transmissivity	0.02 m ² /sec
S	Storage coefficient	0.01
β	Dimensionless constant, used to compute the subsurface outflow constant	3.0
L	Characteristic length	21 Km.
Z	Ground surface level	350 m.
H	Mean stream water level	338.63 m.
h_0	Initial water level	338 m.
WN	Number of wells	314
r_w	Average well radius	0.254 m.
A_w	Average influence area of a well	1.45 Km ²
$K1_i$	Downstream quota	0.0
$F1_i$	Dam freeboard	200 x 10 ⁶ m ³
w_m	Minimum dam storage fraction	0.4
w_0	Initial dam storage fraction	0.6
α_1	Fraction of precipitation that actually reaches the water table	0.1845
α_2	Fraction of water applied that infiltrates	0.411
α_4	Fraction of water infiltrated that actually recharges the aquifer	0.45

TABLE 6.3 (Continued)

β_1	Fraction of precipitation that helps to satisfy the demand	0.422
ET	Expected value of evapotranspiration	$50.4 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3/\text{yr}$
P	Expected value of precipitation	$785 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3/\text{yr}$
Q_i	Expected value of subsurface inflow	$25 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3/\text{yr}$
ρ_y	Autocorrelation function of the inputs for lag 1	0.7
$\rho_{Q_{ph}}$	Cross correlation function of pumping and head for lag 0	-0.74
λ_K	Probability level to satisfy the constraints, $K=1, \dots, 6$	0.75
$r(0.75)$	75 percentile of the streamflow	$1650 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3/\text{yr}$
$r(0.25)$	25 percentile of the streamflow	$940 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3/\text{yr}$
$\mu_{Q_{Fi}}$	Expected value of capacity of the pumping facilities	$470 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3/\text{yr}$
$\mu_{Q_{SDi}}$	Expected value of capacity of the surface water facilities	$1500 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3/\text{yr}$
σ_{D_i}	Standard deviation of the demand	$200 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3/\text{yr}$
$\sigma_{Q_{Fi}}$	Standard deviation of the pumping facilities	$70 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3/\text{yr}$
$\sigma_{Q_{SDi}}$	Standard deviation of the surface water facilities	$300 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3/\text{yr}$
σ_a	Standard deviation of the subsurface outflow constant	0.25 \bar{a}

TABLE 6.3 (Continued)

σ_y	Standard deviation of the input	8.07×10^{-3} m/yr
r	Nominal rate of interest	5%
μ_{C_S}	Expected stream diversion costs	$\$6000/10^6 \text{ m}^3$
μ_{C_R}	Expected dam unit cost	$\$24444/10^6 \text{ m}^3$
μ_{C_P}	Expected pumping costs	$\$63.8/10^6 \text{ m}^4$
μ_{D_i}	Expected water demand in 10^6 m^3	

i	μ_{D_i}	i	μ_{D_i}	i	μ_{D_i}	i	μ_{D_i}
1	800	6	1000	11	1050	16	1050
2	850	7	1000	12	1050	17	1050
3	900	8	1050	13	1050	18	1050
4	950	9	1050	14	1050	19	1050
5	950	10	1050	15	1050	20	1050




Fig. 6.5 Iterative procedure used to solve the Rio Sinaloa management problem.

Objective function	OF = \$113,224,000
Reservoir volume	$\gamma_{R1} = 1915 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3$
Std. dev. of subsurface outflow constant	$\sigma_a = 0.25 \bar{a}$
Probability level	$\lambda^a = 0.75$




Fig. 6.6 Operational scheduling and aquifer behavior for probability level $\lambda = 0.75$.

combination of physical aquifer properties, the aquifer behaved such that the expected water levels experience a fast drop in the first five years of operation of the system. After this large initial decline of the water table, an equilibrium is rapidly reached because irrigation return flow and stream-aquifer flow increase. The amount of increase depends on the demand and on the stream-aquifer head difference.

The results of several alternatives are summarized in Table 6.4. Note that alternative B shows a 19% increase of the objective function relative to the deterministic case (alternative A), when the coefficient of variation of the demand is approximately 0.2 (see Table 6.3). This increase is comparable to that found in the Maddock problem under similar conditions (see Figure 6.1).

A graph of the variability of the water level \underline{h} in the aquifer is presented in Figure 6.7. Shown is the result when the subsurface outflow constant \underline{a} is a deterministic quantity ($\sigma_a = 0$) and the randomness is due to the inputs to the system. Figure 6.7 also shows the variability of \underline{h} when \underline{a} is treated as a random variable with a standard deviation of $0.25\bar{a}$. A sum of both variance $\sigma_h^2(\bar{a})$ and $\sigma_h^2(a)$ produces the total variance of the system. From Figure 6.7 it is seen that both cases behave in a similar manner, increasing up to a steady state value. However, $\sigma_h(a)$ has higher values than $\sigma_h(\bar{a})$ and takes almost twice the time to show its total effect. This implies that an uncertainty in \underline{a} due to inadequate field information and

TABLE 6.4 Summary of the Results Obtained from Several Alternatives for the Rio Sinaloa.

ALTERNATIVES				
	A	B	C	D
λ	deterministic	0.75	0.75	0.75
σ_a		0.0	0.25a	a
μ_{c_s} ($\$/10^6 m^3$)	6000	6000	6000	6000
μ_{c_p} ($\$/10^6 m^3$)	63.8	63.8	63.8	63.8
OF(\$)	95,054,000	112,993,000	113,224,000	116,703,000
δ_{R_1} ($10^6 m^3$)	1534	1915	1915	1915
ALTERNATIVES				
	E	F	G	H
λ	0.75	0.9	0.9	0.75
σ_a	0.25a	0.25a	0.25a	0.25a
μ_{c_s} ($\$/10^6 m^3$)	3000	6000	3000	3000
μ_{c_p} ($\$/10^6 m^3$)	63.8	63.8	63.8	90.0
OF(\$)	87,090,000	1,325,252,000	1,292,978,000	118,942,000
δ_{R_1} ($10^6 m^3$)	1915	51,054	51,054	1915




Fig. 6.7 Variability of aquifer water levels; $\sigma_h(\bar{a})$ represents uncertainty when the subsurface outflow constant is deterministic, the mean ($\bar{a} = 4.29 \times 10^{-3} \text{ yr}^{-1}$); $\sigma_h(a)$ represents uncertainty when the subsurface outflow constant is considered a random variable with $\sigma_a = 0.25\bar{a}$.

the random behavior of the system properties such as the aquifer transmissivity, increases considerably the uncertainty associated with water levels.

Sensitivity Analysis

In order to see the effect of randomness on the operation of the system, the deterministic case was run and its solution is presented as Figure 6.8. We note that both cases, deterministic and random, behave in a very similar manner; but the system under fully known conditions is cheaper to operate and the size of the dam is almost 25% smaller than in the situation where uncertainties dominate the picture.

The effect on the objective function caused by uncertainty in the subsurface outflow constant is shown in Figure 6.9. However, it should be noted that this behavior depends on the parameters of the stream-aquifer system through the coefficient part of the variance term in (6.28). In this case the effect on the objective function which is caused by uncertainty in the subsurface outflow constant is small (Figure 6.9).

The nonlinear objective function (quadratic in pumping) was solved by the proposed iterative procedure (see, Section 3.3), in which a standard linear programming package using a simplex algorithm (Kuester and Mize, 1973, p.10) was used. If reasonable initial conjectures of the value of the variables were supplied to the models, only two or three

Objective function $OF = \$95,054,000$
 Reservoir volume $V_{R1} = 1534 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3$




Fig. 6.8 Operational scheduling and aquifer behavior of the deterministic case.




Fig. 6.9 Variation of the objective function value and operational cost of the system as a function of uncertainty in the subsurface outflow constant a for a level of probability $\lambda = 0.75$.

iterations in an IBM 360 model 44 were required to solve the Rio Sinaloa management problem. Less than 150 k bytes of main memory were utilized.

Convergence problems were found when the cost of diverting water from the stream Q_{SD} , and of pumping from the aquifer Q_P were approximately equal. The above problems are illustrated in Figure 6.10 and 6.11; Figure 6.10 shows the results of two iterations (subindices 1 and 2); Figure 6.11 presents the average of iterations 1 and 2 (subindex 3) as the initial assumption of the next iteration (subindex 4). Even though both objective functions are almost identical in Figure 6.11, the policies appear very different. No procedure was found to solve this convergence problem. The application of any of the two schedulings found by the models (Figure 6.11) would of course solve the management problem, since their cost is the same. The actual selection of a operational scheme would depend on factors other than those economic factors introduced in this management model.




Fig. 6.10 Representation of the convergence problem when cost of surface water diversion and pumping are nearly the same.




Fig. 6.11 Effect of averaging on convergence.

CHAPTER 7 SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

Summary

A development of simple models to represent a stream-aquifer system and its optimal operation under situations involving uncertainties was the main concern of the study. Only physical and economic variables were considered in this work.

A lumped parameter model composed of an aquifer water balance and a linear stream-aquifer flow relationship is proposed for modeling the system. This model is not offered as a substitute for distributed models but as a simple reliable and economical alternative suitable for initial evaluation of systems with only limited field data. The stream-aquifer flow is governed by the subsurface outflow constant and a head difference between stream and aquifer. The subsurface outflow constant was found to be dependent on the average transmissivity of the aquifer, a characteristic length of the aquifer and a dimensionless constant. The effect of system properties and input characteristics on the value of the dimensionless constant was studied.

The solution of the physical or lumped parameter model is given by a convolution integral which accounts for past inputs to the system. Since the lumped model provides an average water level \bar{h} , an improvement was made by introducing a correction which allows the physical model

to compute the head at the pumping wells. An important concept included in the analysis is the response time of the stream-aquifer system t_h ; it is a measure of the time required for the system to respond to inputs, and is related to the subsurface outflow constant and an average storage coefficient of the aquifer.

A management model was developed which minimizes the discounted operational costs of a stream-aquifer system. It is linked to the physical model by the average head of the aquifer. A simplification of the objective function was obtained by computing the average head of the aquifer outside of the management model, not including any past input to the system in the objective function. Taking advantage of this link between the models, an iterative procedure was developed for solving the quadratic optimization problem with a standard linear programming package. Linear decision rules were used to define the decision variables. By making present decisions based on previous information the operation of the system was made more dynamic.

A further step in the analysis was made by considering random natural inputs and a random demand. A stochastic differential equation with a random forcing function represented the physical model. The ensemble average, the variance, and the autocovariance of the aquifer head were computed. Using a conditional probability approach, the variance of the random subsurface outflow constant was included in the problem; a variance of the head as a

function of the variance of the inputs and of the subsurface outflow constant is computed. It was found that the pumping cost depends on the interaction between the head and pumping. Hence, spectral analysis was used to find a cross correlation coefficient between these quantities. The minimization of the discounted expected value of cost is the representation of the objective function in a stochastic system. Chance constraints which allow for satisfaction of the constraints with a given probability level were used in the stochastic management model. Nonstationary demands of water are easily represented by these types of constraints.

To examine the reliability of the proposed models a comparative test was made with a study by Maddock (1974), which includes a distributed aquifer model coupled with a stochastic management model. From the comparison, similar operating rules were found and a sensitivity analysis showed that Maddock's results were a particular case of a more general problem treated by our stochastic management model. The increase in the objective function with increasing variance of the demand was in agreement with that found by Maddock. However, some differences in the objective functions were found because of the local effect on the water table of only two pumping wells. The iterative procedure as well as the link between the physical and management model proved to work satisfactorily. An advantage of our models is the small number of terms in the objective function produced by computing the mean water level of the aquifer outside of

the management model.

The proposed model was applied to a basin in northwestern Mexico. The adaptability to a different situation was tested and a sensitivity analysis performed. Optimal decisions about the size and operation of a projected dam were made. The operational scheduling of water diverted from the stream and water pumped out of the aquifer were obtained to satisfy a random demand. Since the groundwater costs less than surface water, all random fluctuations in the demand of water were absorbed by the surface water. The variance of the random levels in the aquifer including a random or a deterministic subsurface outflow constant, showed similar patterns; it increased up to a steady state value. The variance of the water levels was larger when affected by a random subsurface outflow constant. Comparison of a deterministic and a stochastic case showed that for a deterministic case operational costs are less and a smaller dam is required. The study of the sensitivity of the objective function to uncertainties in the subsurface outflow constant showed that they had little effect on the discounted expected value of cost. Convergence problems in the iterative procedure were found only when the surface water cost and pumping cost were similar. In this case two different policies produced almost identical discounted cost. Otherwise, with reasonable initial assumptions, only two or three iterations were required to converge to a reasonably accurate solution.

Conclusions

The following conclusions were obtained

1. In regional studies the physical model developed in this work is very simple and reliable in its usage; it is capable of accounting for local drawdown at the wells, stream-aquifer interaction, and can easily be coupled to a management model.
2. The subsurface outflow constant is a very useful concept in modeling a stream-aquifer system. It groups parameters such as the transmissivity of the aquifer, a characteristic length of the system, and a dimensionless constant which depends on several system properties and input characteristics.
3. A simple link was made between a physical and a management model allowing us to develop an iterative procedure for solving a nonlinear optimization problem with a standard linear programming package.
4. In the stochastic management model dynamics were introduced with the use of linear decision rules to define decision variables and more generality was obtained with the use of chance constraints. A nonstationary water demand was easily represented by using chance constraints.
5. Good agreement was obtained between the results of the proposed model and a previous study by Maddock

(1974) based on a distributed aquifer model and quadratic programming. The operating rules and the sensitivity to demand uncertainty were practically the same. The value of the objective function obtained from the lumped parameter model was slightly larger; the difference is thought to be related to the interaction between the stream and the local cones of depression of the two wells.

6. The versatility of the developed model was demonstrated by applying it in the Rio Sinaloa study area in northwestern Mexico. This was a regional study involving over 400 Km² of land irrigated by hundreds of wells and by diversion from a stream. The optimal operational scheduling of conjunctive use of surface water and groundwater and the optimal size of a surface reservoir were obtained under random conditions.
7. The effect of uncertainty on the management of a stream-aquifer system is an important factor to be considered; under random conditions the size of the surface reservoir is larger and the cost of operation is greater than under a deterministic situation. The choice of the level of probability in the chance constraints is an important managerial decision because the expected value of the discounted cost is significantly affected by the level of probability. Uncertainty of the water demand

produced a larger increase in the operational cost than uncertainty in aquifer parameters. However, the effect of uncertainty on the aquifer water levels was found to be dependent on the system properties and input randomness.

Recommendations

1. Work remains to be done on the determination of the subsurface outflow constant when the aquifer is asymmetric with respect to the stream.
2. Different types of boundaries and shapes of well influence areas need to be used and analysed.
3. In managerial studies of conjunctive use of groundwater and surface water more emphasis should be given to the statistics of the economic variables than the statistics of the properties of the stream-aquifer system.
4. More study related to the convergence problem of the iterative procedure is needed.
5. Another approach to include a random subsurface outflow constant in the physical model, can be used: it consists of solving a stochastic differential equation with a random coefficient and a random forcing function.

APPENDIX A Computation of the Subsurface
Outflow Constant for the Unsteady Case

The equation governing the flow is

$$\alpha^2 \frac{\partial^2 h}{\partial x^2} + \epsilon/S = \frac{\partial h}{\partial t} \quad (\text{A.1})$$

where $\alpha^2 = T/S$ is the hydraulic diffusivity of the aquifer,
and

$$\epsilon = \epsilon_0 \quad ; \quad t < 0$$

$$\epsilon = 0 \quad ; \quad t > 0$$

The initial and boundary conditions are

$$t < 0 \quad ; \quad h - H = (2L-x) \epsilon_0 x/2T \quad (\text{A.2})$$

$$x = 0 \quad ; \quad h - H = 0 \quad (\text{A.3})$$

$$x = L \quad ; \quad \frac{\partial (h - H)}{\partial x} = 0 \quad (\text{A.4})$$

The method of separation of variables is used to solve (A.1) satisfying the initial and boundary conditions. The variable $h - H$ is used throughout the analysis.

Let

$$h - H = X(x)T(t) \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Substituting the above expression into (A.1) produces

$$\alpha^2 X''/X = T'/T$$

Now, let

$$\alpha^2 X''/X = -p^2 \quad (\text{A.6})$$

and

$$T'/T = -p^2 \quad (\text{A.7})$$

Solving (A.6) and (A.7) and substituting into (A.5) we have

$$h - H = \exp(-p^2 t) (A \cos px/\alpha + B \sin px/\alpha) \quad (\text{A.8})$$

where A and B are constants of integration, which are obtained by using (A.5) and (A.4). Now (A.8) may be transformed into

$$h - H = B \exp((-m\pi\alpha/2L)^2 t) \sin(m\pi x/2L) \quad (\text{A.9})$$

In order to satisfy the initial condition (A.2)

$$h - H = \sum_{m=1,3,5,\dots}^{\infty} A_m \exp((-m\pi\alpha/2L)^2 t) \sin(m\pi x/2L) \quad (\text{A.10})$$

where

$$A_m = 1/L \int_0^{2L} f(x) \sin(m x/L) dx$$

If

$$f(x) = (2L - x) \epsilon_0 x/2$$

then

$$A_m = (1 - \cos m \pi) 8 \epsilon_0 L/T m^3 \pi^3 \quad (\text{A.11})$$

Equations A.10 and A.11 are the solutions of (A.1) satisfying the initial and boundary condition.

The average head in the aquifer can be obtained by

$$\bar{h} = 1/2L \int_0^{2L} h dx \quad (\text{A.12})$$

Substituting (A.10) into (A.12) we get

$$\bar{h} - H = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} A_m \exp((-m \pi/2L)^2 Tt/S) (1 - \cos m \pi)/m \quad (\text{A.13})$$

since

$$q = T/L \left(\frac{\partial \bar{h}}{\partial x} \right) \Big|_{x=0} \quad (\text{A.14})$$

we can find that

$$q = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} A_m \exp\left(-m \pi / 2L\right)^2 T t / S \quad (T m \pi / 2L^2) \quad (\text{A.15})$$

Both Venetis (1969) and Kraijenhof Van de Leur (1958) show that the terms in the series in (A.13) for $m > 1$ become very small relative to the first harmonic when time increases. Retaining only the $m = 1$ term

$$q = A_1 \exp(-\pi^2 T t / 4S) \quad (T \pi / 2L^2) \quad (\text{A.16})$$

and

$$\bar{h} - H = (A_1 2 / \pi) \exp(-\pi^2 T t / 4S) \quad (\text{A.17})$$

Since

$$q = a (\bar{h} - H) \quad (\text{A.18})$$

then

$$a = T \pi^2 / 4L^2 \quad (\text{A.19})$$

which is the subsurface outflow constant for the unsteady case, with an initial condition equal to the steady state head solution.

APPENDIX B Computation of the Subsurface
Outflow Constant for a Clogged Stream

The differential equation that governs the flow under steady flow conditions is

$$T \frac{d^2h}{dx^2} = 0 \quad (B.1)$$

with boundary conditions

$$x = 0 \quad ; \quad dh/dx = 0$$

$$x = L \quad ; \quad h = h_0$$

The solution of the boundary problem is

$$h = (L^2 - x^2) \epsilon / 2T + h_0 \quad (B.2)$$

Since the flow is steady and the average water level is located at $2/3$ of the maximum water level difference, because the shape of the water table is parabolic,

$$q = a (\bar{h} - h_0) \quad (B.3)$$

where $a = 3T/L^2$. Analogous to (B.3), we find an expression for the flow passing through the semipermeable layer (see Fig. 2.8)

$$q = a_c (\bar{h} - H) \quad (B.4)$$

where a_c is the subsurface outflow constant which includes the clogging effect. Therefore

$$a_c = q (\bar{h} - h_0 + \Delta h)^{-1} \quad (B.5)$$

where, $\Delta h = h_0 - H$. Applying Darcy's law at $x = L$

$$-T dh/dx = K_s (h_0 + H) \Delta h / 2d = \epsilon L \quad (B.6)$$

If

$$(h_0 + H)/2 \cong H$$

and if the flow is steady, we obtain

$$\Delta h \cong qLd / HK_s \quad (B.7)$$

Substituting (B.3) and (B.7) into (B.5), produces

$$a_c = 5T/L^2 (1 + 3Td/HK_s L) \quad (B.8)$$

or

$$a_c = a / (1 + 3Td/HK_s L) \quad (B.9)$$

A further simplification gives

$$a_c = a / (1 + 5B^2/HL) \quad (E.10)$$

where \underline{B} is the leakage factor (Davis and De Wiest, 1967, p.225).

APPENDIX C Details on the Computation of
the Subsurface Outflow Constant for
Converging Flow

The equation governing the flow under steady conditions and as shown in Figure 2.6 is

$$1/r (d(Tr dh/dr)/dr) = - \epsilon \quad (C.1)$$

where T is a constant. The boundary conditions are

$$r = R_2 \quad , \quad dh/dr = 0$$

and

$$r = R_0 \quad , \quad h = H$$

The solution of (C.1) is

$$T(h - H) = (R_0^2 - r^2)\epsilon/4 + (\ln (r/R_0)) \epsilon R_2^2 /2 \quad (C.2)$$

The mean water level in the aquifer is

$$\bar{h} - H = 1/(R_2^2 - R_0^2) \pi \int_{R_0}^{R_2} (h - H) 2\pi r dr \quad (C.3)$$

Let

$$dr^2 = 2rdr \quad (C.4)$$

and

$$r \ln(r/R_0) dr = 1/4 \ln(r/R_0)^2 dr^2 \quad (C.5)$$

Making use of (C.4) and (C.5) and substituting (C.2) into (C.3), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} T (\bar{h} - h) &= \epsilon (R_0^2/4 - (R_2^2 + R_0^2)/8 \\ &+ R_2^4 \ln(R_2^2/R_0^2) / 4 (R_2^2 - R_0^2) - R^2/4) \end{aligned} \quad (C.6)$$

If $\delta = R_0/R_2 \ll 1$, we obtain

$$(\bar{h} - h) = ((1 + 2\delta)(-\ln \delta)/2 - 3(1+2\delta)/8) \epsilon L^2/T \quad (C.7)$$

Since

$$q = \epsilon = a(\bar{h} - h) \quad (C.8)$$

substitute (C.7) into (C.8), to get

$$a = (1/(1 + 2\delta) ((-\ln \delta)/2 - 3/8)) T/L^2 \quad (C.9)$$

APPENDIX D Effect of Different Aquifer
Properties in Individual Segments of
a Stream-Aquifer System

Let us start by trying to compute a subsurface outflow constant of an aquifer divided into two parts by a stream.

The equations governing the flow at each aquifer cell (see Section 2.2) are:

$$S_1 dh_1/dt + a_1 h_1 = y_1 \quad (D.1)$$

and

$$S_2 dh_2/dt + a_2 h_2 = y_2 \quad (D.2)$$

Multiplying both sides of (D.1) and (D.2) by the aquifer cell areas A_1 and A_2 , respectively and rearranging the equations, we obtain

$$A_1 (dh_1/dt + h_1/t_{h_1}) = y_1 A_1 / S_1 \quad (D.3)$$

and

$$A_2 (dh_2/dt + h_2/t_{h_2}) = y_2 A_2 / S_2 \quad (D.4)$$

where the response time of cell 1 is $t_{h_1} = S_1/a_1$ and the response time of cell 2 is $t_{h_2} = S_2/a_2$. Adding (D.3) and

(D.4) and dividing by $A = A_1 + A_2$,

$$\begin{aligned} & d/dt (A_1 h_1 + A_2 h_2)/A + (A_1 h_1/t_{n_1} + A_2 h_2/t_{n_2})/A \\ & = (y_1 A_1/S_1 + y_2 A_2/S_2)/A \end{aligned} \quad (D.5)$$

An equation for the entire aquifer might be

$$d \bar{h}/dt + \bar{h}/t_n = \bar{y} \quad (D.6)$$

where the overbars mean weighted averages with respect to the areas. However, (D.6) is not be found unless $t_{n_1} = t_{n_2} = t_n$ and $S_1 = S_2$, i.e., $a_1 = a_2$. This last case might represent an aquifer symmetric to the stream or a combination of the transmissivity \underline{T} and characteristic length \underline{L} , such that the T/L^2 ratio were the same (see equation 2.15). Therefore in order to represent the stream-aquifer system by only one subsurface outflow constant \underline{a} , the response times of each cell must be equal as well the storage coefficient \underline{S} . The reason for this restriction is the nonlinear relationship between the aquifer head and the response time. If the parameter \underline{a} and \underline{S} are significantly different it may be necessary to use more than one cell to represent the physical model.

APPENDIX E Proof that the Use of Average
Heads in the Outflow Equation is Valid

To demonstrate that the use of average heads is correct in the outflow equation, we shall show that the average of any departure from the mean head in the aquifer and in the aquifer outlet is zero.

Let us consider an aquifer consisting of a sector of a circle bounded externally by a stream, as shown in Figure E.1 and with uniform recharge ϵ . For simplicity, steady flow is assumed. The equation of continuity in polar coordinates (Davis and De Wiest, 1966, p.245) is

$$(T/r) \partial (r \partial h / \partial r) / \partial r + (T/r^2) \partial^2 h / \partial \theta^2 = -\epsilon \quad (\text{E.1})$$

Since equation E.1 is a non homogeneous partial differential equation,

$$h = h_p + h_1 (r, \theta) \quad (\text{E.2})$$

where h_p is the particular integral and solution of

$$\nabla^2 h_p = -\epsilon \quad (\text{E.3})$$

and h_1 is the complementary function and solution of

$$\nabla^2 h_1 = 0 \quad (\text{E.4})$$




Fig. E.1 Boundaries of the aquifer.

Next the solution of (E.3) will be found. The boundary conditions are:

$$h = h_1 = f(\theta) \quad ; \quad r = R \quad (E.5)$$

$$h_p = 0 \quad ; \quad r = R \quad (E.6)$$

and

$$dh_p/dr = 0 \quad ; \quad r = 0 \quad (E.7)$$

Thus h_p refers to the average outlet head and $f(\theta)$ is the departure from the average outlet head.

Integrating (E.3) twice and using (E.6) and (E.7) we find the solution of (E.3) which is

$$h_p = (R^2 - r^2) \epsilon / 4T \quad (E.8)$$

The solution of (E.4) will be found by using the method of separation of variables. With the boundary conditions

$$r = 0 \quad ; \quad h_1 \text{ is finite}$$

$$\theta = 0 \quad ; \quad \partial h_1 / \partial \theta = 0$$

$$\theta = \beta \quad ; \quad \partial h_1 / \partial \theta = 0$$

we find that

$$h_1 = a_0/2 + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} a_m \cos (m\pi\theta/\beta) r^{m\pi/\beta} \quad (\text{E.9})$$

Equation E.9 satisfies (E.5) if

$$f(\theta) = a_0/2 + \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} a_m \cos (m\pi\theta/\beta) \quad (\text{E.10})$$

Since the above equation is a Fourier series,

$$a_0 = 2/\beta \int_0^\beta f(\theta) d\theta = 0 \quad (\text{E.11})$$

because $\bar{f}(\theta) = 0$, and

$$a_m = (2/\beta R^{m\pi/\beta}) \int_0^\beta f(\theta) \cos m\pi\theta/\beta d\theta \quad (\text{E.12})$$

Therefore

$$h_1 = \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} a_m \cos (m\pi\theta/\beta) r^{m\pi/\beta} \quad (\text{E.13})$$

is the solution of (E.4) with the proper boundary conditions.

The outflow equation is

$$\epsilon = a(\bar{h} - \bar{H})$$

Let

$$\bar{h} = 1/A \int_0^R \int_0^\beta n(r, \theta) r \, dr \, d\theta \quad (\text{E.14})$$

or

$$\bar{h} = 1/A \iint h_p \, r \, dr \, d\theta + 1/A \iint h_1 \, r \, dr \, d\theta \quad (\text{E.15})$$

where $A = \beta R^2/2$. Then

$$\bar{h}_p = \epsilon/4TR^2 \int_0^R (R^2 - r^2) \, dr^2 = \epsilon R^2/8T \quad (\text{E.16})$$

and

$$\bar{h}_1 = 1/A \iint_0^R \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} a_m r^m \pi/\beta \cos(m\pi\theta/\beta) \, r \, dr \, d\theta$$

but

$$\int_0^\beta \cos(m\pi\theta/\beta) \, d\theta = 0$$

Then

$$\bar{h}_1 = 0$$

This shows that the use of average heads in the outflow equation is correct for any head distribution at the outlet. Since the average of the aquifer head perturbation produced by the departure at the boundary head from its average is zero, it follows that the average boundary head can be used in the outflow expression for \bar{h} .

APPENDIX F Analytical Solution of the Lumped Model

Let us transform equation 2.4 which represents the lumped model to

$$dh/dt + ah/S = y/S \quad (\text{F.1})$$

Solving the homogeneous equation, we find

$$h = h(t_0) \exp(-a(t - t_0)/S) \quad (\text{F.2})$$

which represents a decay curve from an initial condition $h(t_0)$. From (F.2) we have

$$h(t_0) = h \exp(a(t - t_0)/S)$$

Differentiating with respect to time,

$$d/dt (h \exp(a(t-t_0)/S)) = 0 \quad (\text{F.3})$$

or

$$(dh/dt + ah/S) \exp(a(t - t_0)/S) = 0$$

where $\exp(at/S)$ is the integration factor. Multiplying both sides of (F.1) by the integration factor and making

use of (F.3), we obtain

$$d/dt (h \exp(at/S)) = y \exp(at/S)/S \quad (\text{F.4})$$

Integrating the above equation produces

$$h(t) = h(t_0) \exp(-a(t - t_0)/S) + 1/S \int_{t_0}^t y(\tau) \exp(-a(t-\tau)/S) d\tau \quad (\text{F.5})$$

Then if

$$t_0 = 0, \quad h = h_0$$

we get

$$h(t) = h_0 \exp(-at/S) + 1/S \int_0^t y(\tau) \exp(-a(t-\tau)/S) d\tau \quad (\text{F.6})$$

The above integral is called a convolution integral.

A somewhat different and perhaps more illustrative procedure for finding the solution of (2.4) or (F.1) is given next.

Let us represent the rate of recharge y , as a Dirac delta function or impulse function (see Figure F.1) defined as

$$\delta(t - t_0) = \begin{cases} \infty & \text{when } t = t_0 \\ 0 & \text{when } t \neq t_0 \end{cases}$$

and

$$\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \delta(t - t_0) dt = 1$$

Using the above definition, $y(t)$ is given by

$$y(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \delta(t - \tau) y(\tau) d\tau$$

Let us represent (F.1) by

$$S \, dh/dt + ah = y \tag{F.7}$$

For a unit input in (F.7),

$$S \, dh/dt + ah = \delta(t - t_0)$$

At $t \neq t_0$

$$S \, dh/dt + ah = 0$$

whose solution is

$$h = c \exp(-at/S) \tag{F.8}$$

When $t \cong t_0$

$$\int_{t_0 - \Delta/2}^{t_0 + \Delta/2} (S \frac{dh}{dt} + ah - \delta(t - t_0)) dt = 0$$

where Δ is a small time increment. Integrating gives

$$S (h(t_0^+) - h(t_0^-)) + a \int_{t_0 - \Delta/2}^{t_0 + \Delta/2} h(t) dt - 1 = 0$$

and if $\Delta \rightarrow 0$

$$h(t_0^+) = 1/S \quad (F.9)$$

Substituting (F.9) into (F.8), we get

$$h = (1/S) \exp(-a/S(t - t_0)) = \mu(t - t_0) \quad (F.10)$$

a function called unit response or weighting function;

$\mu(t - t_0)$ is the output of the system to a delta function input (Dodge, 1975, p.21).

If $y(t)$ changes arbitrarily as shown in Figure F.2, we can follow the next analysis,

$$\Delta \mathcal{T}_k = t_k - t_{k-1}$$

where \mathcal{T}_k is a point between t_k and t_{k-1} .




Fig. F.1 Dirac delta function representation of natural recharge y .




Fig. F.2 Representation of the natural recharge y .

$$(y(\mathcal{T}_k) \Delta \mathcal{T}_k) \delta(t - t_k)$$

represents the shaded area in Figure F.2. The natural response is represented by

$$y(t) \cong \sum_{k=1}^n y(\mathcal{T}_k) \delta(t - t_k) \Delta \mathcal{T}_k$$

Since the response of the system to $\delta(t - \mathcal{T}_k)$ is $\mu(t - \mathcal{T}_k)$, we have

$$h(t) = 1/S \sum_{k=1}^n y(\mathcal{T}_k) \mu(t - \mathcal{T}_k) \quad (\text{F.11})$$

Substituting (F.10) into (F.11) and taking the limit when $\Delta \mathcal{T}$ tends to zero, we obtain

$$h(t) = 1/S \int_0^t y(\mathcal{T}) \exp(-a(t - \mathcal{T})/S) d\mathcal{T} \quad (\text{F.12})$$

the convolution integral for a lumped model, which represents a time-invariant system.

Observe that the initial condition effect (see equation F.2) is

$$h_0(t) = h_0 \exp(-at/S) \quad (\text{F.13})$$

Inasmuch as the system is linear, the superposition principle can be applied and equations F.12 and F.13 can be added together to produce the total output of the

system,

$$h(t) = h_0 \exp(-at/S) + 1/S \int_0^t y(\mathcal{T}) \exp(-a(t-\mathcal{T})/S) d\mathcal{T} \quad (P.14)$$

APPENDIX G Discussion on the Probability Level of
Constraints Involving Random Quantities and
Constraints Related to the Expected Values

Consider the deterministic representation of the demand chance constraint to be

$$\mu_{D_i} + x \sigma_D \leq \mu_{Q_{SD_i}} + \mu_{Q_{P_i}} = \mu_{Q_{T_i}} \quad (G.1)$$

where x corresponds to a probability level of λ_1 .

To get a lower bound for

$$P(D_i - Q_{T_i} \leq 0) \geq \lambda_1^* \quad (G.2)$$

where λ_1^* is the actual probability associated with the constraint stated in terms of random quantities, assume that:

(1) $D_i - Q_{T_i}$ and D_i are normal random variables; (2) the correlation between Q_{T_i} and D_i is positive. Hence, $D_i - Q_{T_i}$ has mean $\mu_{D_i} - \mu_{Q_{T_i}}$ and variance

$$\sigma_D^2 + \sigma_{Q_{T_i}}^2 - 2\rho\sigma_D\sigma_{Q_{T_i}}, \text{ where}$$

$$\sigma_D^2 + \sigma_{Q_{T_i}}^2 - 2\rho\sigma_D\sigma_{Q_{T_i}} \leq \sigma_D^2 + \sigma_{Q_{T_i}}^2 \quad (G.3)$$

if $\rho > 0$.

Let

$$\begin{aligned}
P(D_i - Q_{T_i} \leq 0) &= P((D_i - Q_{T_i} - (\mu_{D_i} - \mu_{Q_{T_i}})) / \sigma_{D-Q_T}) \\
&\leq (\mu_{Q_{T_i}} - \mu_{D_i}) / \sigma_{D-Q_T} \quad (G.4)
\end{aligned}$$

Now, if we satisfy (G.1), then

$$\mu_{Q_{T_i}} - \mu_{D_i} \geq x \sigma_D \quad (G.5)$$

and

$$P(X \leq a) \geq P(X \leq b) \quad (G.6)$$

if $a > b$. Therefore, by using (G.4) and (G.5) in (G.6), we get

$$\begin{aligned}
P((D_i - Q_{T_i} - (\mu_{D_i} - \mu_{Q_{T_i}})) / \sigma_{D-Q_T} \leq (\mu_{D_i} - \mu_{Q_{T_i}}) / \sigma_{D-Q_T}) \\
\leq P((D_i - Q_{T_i} - (\mu_{D_i} - \mu_{Q_{T_i}})) / \sigma_{D-Q_T} \leq x \sigma_D / \sigma_{D-Q_T})
\end{aligned}$$

or

$$\begin{aligned}
P(D_i - Q_{T_i} \leq 0) &\geq P((D_i - Q_{T_i} - (\mu_{D_i} - \mu_{Q_{T_i}})) / \sigma_{D-Q_T}) \\
&\leq x \sigma_D / \sigma_{D-Q_T} \quad (G.7)
\end{aligned}$$

If $\sigma_D^2 = \sigma_{Q_T}^2$ and $\rho = 0$, we have

$$\sigma_D / \sigma_{D-Q_T} = 1/\sqrt{2} = 0.707$$

where (G.7) is transformed into

$$P(D_i - Q_{T_i} \leq 0) \geq P(N(0,1) \leq 0.707x) \quad (G.8)$$

where $N(0,1)$ is a normal random number with mean zero and variance one. Using (G.8) we can easily find the actual probability level, λ_1^* .

For $\lambda_1 = 0.95$, then $P(D_i - Q_{T_i} \leq 0) \geq 0.877 = \lambda_1^*$

and

$\lambda_1 = 0.7$, then $P(D_i - Q_{T_i} \leq 0) \geq 0.644 = \lambda_1^*$

As we can note the difference between the probability levels is not very large; the above procedure can be used to estimate the actual probability level λ_1^* which is implicit in an assumed value of λ_1 .

APPENDIX H Input Data Used in
the Comparative Study

N	Design horizon	4 years
N_S	Number of seasons per year	6
A	Aquifer area	8172.635 acres
T	Transmissivity	0.031 ft ² /s
S	Storage coefficient	0.01
β	Dimensionless constant	3.0
L	Characteristic length	4900 ft
Z	Ground surface level	20 ft
H	Mean stream water level	20 ft
h_0	Initial water level	20 ft
HL	Average initial lift	26.25 ft
r_w	Average well radius	1 ft
A_w	Average influence area of a well	1.78 x 10 ⁸ ft ²
α_1	Fraction of developed water for return to stream	0.8
α_2	Fraction of developed water for spreading	0.5
ρ_y	Autocorrelation coefficient of the inputs	0.7
$\rho_{Q_p h}$	Cross correlation coefficient of pumping and head (from eq. 4.28)	-0.92
μ_D	Expected water demands per season	131 ac ft
σ_D	Standard deviation of water demands per season	60 ac ft

r	Nominal rate of interest	5%
μ_{C_S}	Expected stream diversion costs	\$3.4/acft
μ_{C_P}	Expected operating cost of pumping	\$0.024/acft ²
μ_{C_u}	Expected return to stream costs	\$0.105/acft
μ_{C_R}	Expected recharging costs	\$0.085/acft
$\mu_{Q_{ST}}$	Expected available streamflow	
	Season	$\mu_{Q_{ST}}$ ac-ft/season
	1, 7, 13, 19	193
	2, 8, 14, 20	115
	3, 9, 15, 21	89
	4, 10, 16, 22	96
	5, 11, 17, 23	165
	6, 12, 18, 24	198

APPENDIX I Listing of the Computer
Program

The Fortran IV program used in this work is composed of: (1) a control program which controls the number of iterations either by a mean square error test of the aquifer heads or a maximum number of iterations; (2) a Main 1 program which prepares data for linear programming; (3) a linear programming program (see, Kuester and Mize, 1973, p.10).

A phase overlay computer software technique in which Main 1 and Linear Programming share main computer core is used. This listing is for the particular case of Maddock's problem consisting of inputs, program listing, and outputs of the first iteration.


```
//SYS001 ACCLSS SCRICH 190 SYSRES
IAD01 SYS001 SCRICH
// LALC COPY

SYSIPT 423
SYS003 423
//SYS012 ACCLSS SCRICH
//SYS003 ACCESS S0S0PT
// LABEL 00
IAD01 SYS002 SCRICH 191 SYSRES
IAD01 SYS003 S0S0PT 200
// EXEC COPY
MADDDCK PROBLEM
ROW-ID
MATRIX
FI 0.0
EU 0.0
```

```
00:00:00
00:00:01
00:00:12
00:00:13
00:00:13
00:00:13
```

- 0 PROFIT
- DD1
- DD2
- DD3
- DD4
- DD5
- DD6
- DD7
- DD8
- DD9
- DD10
- DD11
- DD12
- DD13
- DD14
- DD15
- DD16
- DD17
- DD18
- DD19
- DD20
- DD21
- DD22
- DD23
- DD24
- E DR1
- E DR2
- E DR3
- E DR4
- E DR5
- E DR6
- E DR7
- E DR8
- E DR9
- E DR10
- E DR11
- E DR12
- E DR13
- E DR14
- E DR15
- E DR16
- E DR17
- E DR18
- E DR19
- E DR20
- E DR21
- E DR22
- E DR23
- E DR24
- 0 CU1
- 0 CU2
- 0 CU3
- 0 CU4
- 0 CU5
- 0 CU6
- 0 CU7
- 0 CU8
- 0 CU9
- 0 CU10
- 0 CU11
- 0 CU12
- 0 CU13
- 0 CU14
- 0 CU15
- 0 CU16
- 0 CU17
- 0 CU18
- 0 CU19
- 0 CU20
- 0 CU21
- 0 CU22
- 0 CU23
- 0 CU24

- VS1 PROFIT
- VS1 DD1
- VS1 DR1
- VU1 PROFIT
- VU1 DR1
- VU1 CU1
- VP1 PROFIT
- VP1 DD1
- VR1 PROFIT
- VR1 CU1
- VS2 PROFIT
- VS2 DD2
- VS2 DR2
- VU2 PROFIT
- VU2 DR2
- VU2 CU2
- VP2 PROFIT
- VP2 DD2
- VR2 PROFIT
- VR2 CU2
- VS3 PROFIT
- VS3 DD3
- VS3 DR3
- VU3 PROFIT
- VU3 DR3
- VU3 CU3

VP3 PROFIT
 VP3 DD3
 VR3 PROFIT
 VR3 CU3
 VS4 PROFIT
 VS4 DD4
 VS4 DR4
 VU4 PROFIT
 VU4 DR4
 VU4 CU4
 VP4 PROFIT
 VP4 DD4
 VR4 PROFIT
 VR4 CU4
 VS5 PROFIT
 VS5 DD5
 VS5 DR5
 VU5 PROFIT
 VU5 DR5
 VU5 CU5
 VP5 PROFIT
 VP5 DD5
 VR5 PROFIT
 VR5 CU5
 VS6 PROFIT
 VS6 DD6
 VS6 DR6
 VU6 PROFIT
 VU6 DR6
 VU6 CU6
 VP6 PROFIT
 VP6 DD6
 VR6 PROFIT
 VR6 CU6
 VS7 PROFIT
 VS7 DD7
 VS7 DR7
 VU7 PROFIT
 VU7 DR7
 VU7 CU7
 VP7 PROFIT
 VP7 DD7
 VR7 PROFIT
 VR7 CU7
 VS8 PROFIT
 VS8 DD8
 VS8 DR8
 VU8 PROFIT
 VU8 DR8
 VU8 CU8
 VP9 PROFIT
 VP9 DD9
 VR9 PROFIT
 VR9 CU9
 VS9 PROFIT
 VS9 DD9
 VS9 DR9
 VU9 PROFIT
 VU9 DR9
 VU9 CU9
 VP9 PROFIT
 VP9 DD9
 VR9 PROFIT
 VR9 CU9
 VS10 PROFIT
 VS10 DD10
 VS10 DR10
 VU10 PROFIT
 VU10 DR10
 VU10 CU10
 VP10 PROFIT
 VP10 DD10
 VR10 PROFIT
 VR10 CU10
 VS11 PROFIT
 VS11 DD11
 VS11 DR11
 VU11 PROFIT
 VU11 DR11
 VU11 CU11
 VP11 PROFIT
 VP11 DD11
 VR11 PROFIT
 VR11 CU11
 VS12 PROFIT
 VS12 DD12
 VS12 DR12
 VU12 PROFIT
 VU12 DR12
 VU12 CU12
 VP12 PROFIT
 VP12 DD12
 VR12 PROFIT
 VR12 CU12
 VS13 PROFIT
 VS13 DD13
 VS13 DR13
 VU13 PROFIT
 VU13 DR13
 VU13 CU13
 VP13 PROFIT
 VP13 DD13
 VR13 PROFIT
 VR13 CU13
 VS14 PROFIT
 VS14 DD14
 VS14 DR14
 VU14 PROFIT
 VU14 DR14
 VU14 CU14
 VP14 PROFIT
 VP14 DD14
 VR14 PROFIT
 VR14 CU14
 VS15 PROFIT

VS15 UD15
 VS15 DR15
 VU15 PROFT
 VU15 DR15
 VU15 CU15
 VP15 PROFT
 VP15 DD15
 VR15 PROFT
 VR15 CU15
 VS16 PROFT
 VS16 DD16
 VS16 DR16
 VU16 PROFT
 VU16 DR16
 VU16 CU16
 VP16 PROFT
 VP16 DD16
 VR16 PROFT
 VR16 CU16
 VS17 PROFT
 VS17 DD17
 VS17 DR17
 VU17 PROFT
 VU17 DR17
 VU17 CU17
 VP17 PROFT
 VP17 DD17
 VR17 PROFT
 VR17 CU17
 VS18 PROFT
 VS18 UD18
 VS18 DR18
 VU18 PROFT
 VU18 DR18
 VU18 CU18
 VP18 PROFT
 VP18 UD18
 VP18 PROFT
 VR18 CU18
 VS19 PROFT
 VS19 DD19
 VS19 DR19
 VU19 PROFT
 VU19 DR19
 VU19 CU19
 VP19 PROFT
 VP19 DD19
 VR19 PROFT
 VR19 CU19
 VS20 PROFT
 VS20 UD20
 VS20 DR20
 VU20 PROFT
 VU20 DR20
 VU20 CU20
 VP20 PROFT
 VP20 DD20
 VR20 PROFT
 VR20 CU20
 VS21 PROFT
 VS21 DD21
 VS21 DR21
 VU21 PROFT
 VU21 DR21
 VU21 CU21
 VP21 PROFT
 VP21 DD21
 VR21 PROFT
 VR21 CU21
 VS22 PROFT
 VS22 DD22
 VS22 DR22
 VU22 PROFT
 VU22 DR22
 VU22 CU22
 VP22 PROFT
 VP22 DD22
 VR22 PROFT
 VR22 CU22
 VS23 PROFT
 VS23 DD23
 VS23 DR23
 VU23 PROFT
 VU23 DR23
 VU23 CU23
 VP23 PROFT
 VP23 DD23
 VR23 PROFT
 VR23 CU23
 VS24 PROFT
 VS24 DD24
 VS24 DR24
 VU24 PROFT
 VU24 DR24
 VU24 CU24
 VP24 PROFT
 VP24 DD24
 VR24 PROFT
 VR24 CU24
 UD1
 UD2
 UD3
 UD4
 UD5
 UD6
 UD7
 UD8
 UD9
 UD10
 UD11
 UD12
 UD13
 UD14
 UD15
 UD16
 UD17

DJ18
 DJ19
 DJ20
 DJ21
 DJ22
 DJ23
 DJ24
 DR1
 DR2
 DR3
 DR4
 DR5
 DR6
 DR7
 DR8
 DR9
 DR10
 DR11
 DR12
 DR13
 DR14
 DR15
 DR16
 DR17
 DR18
 DR19
 DR20
 DR21
 DR22
 DR23
 DR24
 CU1
 CU2
 CU3
 CU4
 CU5
 CU6
 CU7
 CU8
 CU9
 CU10
 CU11
 CU12
 CU13
 CU14
 CU15
 CU16
 CU17
 CU18
 CU19
 CU20
 CU21
 CU22
 CU23
 CU24

3.4	0.08	39.278	-4.25825	-1.9614	51.4864	1.9614	0.0425
-2.05	0.01	0.52	-0.50	0.20	1.05	1.05	
-1.08	-0.49	0.25	0.44	1.48	-0.77	-0.47	
-0.13	0.0	-0.33	0.64	-0.18	-0.67	1.03	
1.46	-1.55	0.92					
20.	20.	20.	20.	20.	20.	20.	
20.	20.	20.	20.	20.	20.	20.	
20.	20.	20.	20.	20.	20.	20.	
20.	20.	20.	20.	20.	20.	20.	
193.	115.	89.	90.	165.	195.	193.	
115.	89.	96.	165.	193.	195.	115.	
89.	96.	165.	193.	195.	115.	89.	
96.	165.	193.					

0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08
0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08
0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08	0.08
1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0	1.0
20.0	19.5	19.5	19.5	19.5	19.5	19.5
19.5	19.5	19.5	19.5	19.5	19.5	19.5
19.5	19.5	19.5	19.5	19.5	19.5	19.5
19.5	19.5	19.5	19.5	19.5	19.5	19.5

SYS02 423
 SYS03 423
 //PROG EXEC FORTRAN

00:00:24

```

C *****
C C
C C
C C
C C
0001 COMMON/SAZ/ X(50),Y(50),Z(50),R(50),QB(50),QAR(50),
0002 COMMON/SES/ L5(100),RMI(100),PZ(100),CLM1(500),CLM2(500),
0003 COMMON/SMZ/ SMZ(500),RMI(100),PMZ(100),
0004 COMMON/SLV/ VS(50),V(50),VP(50),VK(50),CRP
C COMMON/SOS/ HI(50),H2(50)
C DATA
0005 J=0
0006 NA=3
0007 N=24
0008 N1=2
0009 N1=10
0010 N2=3
0011 K1=72
0012 K2=K1+1
  
```

```

0013      N3=NL*N
0014      Z7=J.U01
0015      12 CONTINUE
0016      CALL LOAD ('MAIN1 ')
0017      CALL MAIN1 (H1)
0018      J=J1
0019      CALL LOAD ('LP ')
0020      CALL LP (VS,VU,VP,VY)
0021      REWIND 3
0022      WRITE (MA,404) (AA(I),I=1,13)
0023      404 FORMAT (1X,13A4)
0024      WRITE (MA,405) (B0(I),I=1,2)
0025      405 FORMAT (2A4)
0026      WRITE (MA,406) (CC(I),I=1,2)
0027      WRITE (MA,409) (DD(I),I=1,2),DD1)
0028      409 FORMAT (2A4,11A,11L,4)
0029      WRITE (MA,408) (EE(I),I=1,1),EE1)
0030      408 FORMAT (A4,15X,11L,4)
0031      WRITE (MA,400) (GG(I),RN1(I),RN2(I),I=1,K2)
0032      400 FORMAT (11X,A1,1X,A4,A1)
0033      WRITE (MA,401) (CLNM1(I),CLNM2(I),RNM1(I),RNM2(I),I=1,K3)
0034      401 FORMAT (7X,A4,A1,1X,A4,A1)
0035      WRITE (MA,402) (EM1(I),RM2(I),I=1,K1)
0036      402 FORMAT (11X,A4,A1)
0037      500 FORMAT (6F10.5)
0038      WRITE (MA,501) (HH(I),I=1,N)
0039      WRITE (MA,501) (II(I),I=1,N)
0040      WRITE (MA,501) (JJ(I),I=1,N)
0041      WRITE (MA,501) (VV(I),I=1,N)
0042      WRITE (MA,501) (VV(I),I=1,N)
0043      WRITE (MA,501) (VV(I),I=1,N)
0044      WRITE (MA,501) (VV(I),I=1,N)
0045      WRITE (MA,501) (VV(I),I=1,N)
0046      WRITE (MA,501) (HH(I),I=1,N)
0047      501 FORMAT (7F10.6)
0048      C MEAN SQUARE ERROR HEAD TEST
0049      B=0.0
0050      G=N-1
0051      DO 5 K=2,N
0052      B=B+(H2(K)-H1(K))*(H2(K)-H1(K))
0053      5 CONTINUE
0054      E=SQRT(B/G)
0055      WRITE (6,10)
0056      10 FORMAT (1H,10X,73(1H-))
0057      WRITE (6,14) (J,E)
0058      14 FORMAT (1H,14X,'ITERATION *',13,9X,'*SQRT(H.M.S.E.) *',E13.6)
0059      WRITE (6,40)
0060      40 FORMAT (1H,10X,73(1H-))//////)
0061      WRITE (6,10)
0062      IF (E-ZZ) 20,20,11
0063      11 IF (J.GE.ND) GO TO 20
0064      REWIND 2
0065      REWIND 3
0066      GO TO 12
0067      20 STOP
0068      END

```

TOTAL MEMORY REQUIREMENTS 000A6C BYTES

COMPILER HIGHEST SEVERITY CODE WAS 0

//MAIN1 EXEC FORTRAN

00:00:32

```

0001      SUBROUTINE MAIN1
0002      MAIN1 PROGRAM
0003      *****
0004      COMPUTATION OF COEFF. OF OBJ FUN AND CONSTRAINTS
0005      *****
0006      COMPUTATION OF COEFF. OF OBJ FUN
0007      ALPHA=PROBABILITY LEVEL
0008      C1=C1 COEFFICIENTS OF DECISION VARIABLES
0009      CCH1=WATER LEVEL CORRELATION COEFF.
0010      CCH2=WATER LEVEL AUTOCORRELATION FUNCTION
0011      CCH=CORREL. CORRELATION FUNCTION OF HEAD AND PUMPAGE
0012      CLNM1=N1*N ARRAY
0013      CLNM2=N1*N ARRAY
0014      CRP=CONST. CONTRIBUTION OF RANDOM TERM
0015      CS=AVERAGE DRAWDOWN AT WELLS
0016      CI=CONSTANT DEPENDING OF P.D.F. KNOWLEDGE
0017      K1=NO. OF CONSTRAINTS
0018      M1=DEMAND MEAN
0019      N1=NO. OF PERIODS
0020      N2=NO. OF DEC. VAR. COEFF. BY TIME INCREMENT IN DEC. VAR. COEFF. MATRIX
0021      N3=NO. OF CONST. COEFFICIENTS
0022      R=RATE OF INTEREST
0023      RNM1=N1*N ARRAY
0024      RNM2=N1*N ARRAY
0025      S=STORAGE COEFFICIENT
0026      SDD=STANDARD DEV. OF DEMAND
0027      SN=NUMBER OF SEASONS
0028      SYMB=N1*N ARRAY
0029      VALU=N1*N ARRAY
0030      VALU1=DEC. VAR. COEFF. MATRIX BY COLUMN
0031      VALU11=RS. VECTOR
0032      VALU12=N ARRAY
0033      VALU2=VAL. VALUE OF VALUE
0034      VALU21=N1*N ARRAY
0035      CARDS THAT SHOULD BE CHANGED TO GET THE DETERMINISTIC CASE
0036      MAIN: SDD=0.0,CCH1=0.0,CCH2=0.0
0037      I=1: VALU1=0.0
0038      VARY: VAPY1=0.0
0039      C (MNM1/3)/V1(50),V2(50),V3(50),V4(50),V5(50),V6(50),V7(50),V8(50),V9(50),V10(50),
0040      1 VALU1(1,1),VALU1(1,2),VALU1(1,3),VALU1(1,4),VALU1(1,5),VALU1(1,6),VALU1(1,7),VALU1(1,8),VALU1(1,9),VALU1(1,10),
0041      1 VALU1(2,1),VALU1(2,2),VALU1(2,3),VALU1(2,4),VALU1(2,5),VALU1(2,6),VALU1(2,7),VALU1(2,8),VALU1(2,9),VALU1(2,10),
0042      2 VALU1(3,1),VALU1(3,2),VALU1(3,3),VALU1(3,4),VALU1(3,5),VALU1(3,6),VALU1(3,7),VALU1(3,8),VALU1(3,9),VALU1(3,10),
0043      C (MNM2/3)/V1(50),V2(50),V3(50),V4(50),V5(50),V6(50),V7(50),V8(50),V9(50),V10(50),
0044      C (MNM2/3)/V1(50),V2(50)
0045      DIMENSION H(20),S(50),VAR(50),SU(50)
0046      DIMENSION C1(2,1),C1(2,2),C1(2,3),C1(2,4),C1(2,5),C1(2,6),C1(2,7),C1(2,8),C1(2,9),C1(2,10)
0047      DIMENSION CCH1(50),CCH2(50),CCH(50),CP1(50)
0048      DIMENSION H1(50),H2(50),H3(50),H4(50),H5(50),H6(50)
0049      DIMENSION VALU(50)
0050      DIMENSION VALU1(50)

```

```

0012 DIMENSION VALU(2100)
0013 DIMENSION COEF(200),RM(50),CS(50)
0014 LOGICAL*1 SYM(100)
0015 LOGICAL*1 PLUS/'+',MINUS/'-'
0016 LOGICAL*1 SYM(100)
0017 LOGICAL*1 A*P/'*',M*P/'*',M*P/'*'
0018 LOGICAL*1 LGCHR(4,100)
0019 EQUIVALENCE (LG,LGCHR)
0020 LOGICAL EQ,NE,GT,GE,LT,LE
C
0021 DATA
0022 N=24
0023 N1=10
0024 N2=8
0025 K1=72
0026 K2=K1+1
0027 K3=N1*N
0028 LA=2
0029 FORMAT (1X,1J,A)
0030 F1A(1A,20) (B(1)),(=1,2)
0031 F2A(1A,20) (C(1)),(=1,2)
0032 F3A(1A,20) (D(1)),(=1,2)
0033 READ (1A,20) ((C(1)),(=1,2),001)
0034 F4A(1A,11A,F11.4)
0035 READ (1A,20) ((C(1)),(=1,1),E1)
0036 F5A(1A,15X,F11.4)
0037 READ (1A,20) ((C(1)),KN1(1),RN2(1),=1,K2)
0038 F6A(11X,=1,1X,A*,A1)
0039 READ (1A,20) ((CLM1(1)),CLM2(1),MM1(1),RM2(1),=1,K3)
0040 F7A(1X,=1,1X,A*,A1)
0041 READ (1A,20) (RM1(1),RM2(1),=1,K1)
0042 F8A(11X,=4,A1)
0043 READ (1A,100) (C(K),K=1,N2)
0044 F9A(10F10.5)
C
0045 AWT=1.7E3
0046 CQH=-0.92
0047 H=20.0
0048 HD=131.0
0049 R=0.05
0050 RN=1.0
0051 S=-0.1
0052 SDD=60.0
0053 SS=6.
0054 T=0.031
0055 X=0.0
0056 A=1.+R/SS
0057 UP=6.29*ALOG(SQRT(AWT)/(RN*2000.0))
0058 UP1=UP/(2.*5.1616*T)
0059 CALL INPUTY (N,AR,A1)
0060 CALL MEANM (H,SP,N,AR,A1)
0061 CALL VARH (VAR,SU,VAR,N,AR,A1)
C
0062 H(1)=H0
0063 D(1)=D0
0064 H(1)=H(1)
0065 800 CONTINUE
C
0066 PRESENT VALUE OF STREAM DIV. AND RETURNED WATER COEFFICIENTS
0067 CRP=0.0
0068 DU 5 I=1,N
0069 B=1
0070 LCH2(1)=0.7*0
0071 C1X(1)=C(1)*MD/A**B
0072 C2X(1)=C(2)*MD/A**B
C
0073 PRESENT VALUE OF PUMPING COEFFICIENTS
0074 CR(1)=CP(1)*5500./(2.*5.1616*E6)
0075 CS(1)=2*(1)*UP1
0076 CP1(1)=C(1)*SP(1)/A**B
0077 CP2(1)=C(2)*SP(1)/(CQH-0.177*177.427)/A**B
0078 CP3(1)=C(3)*SP(1)*H(1)/A**B
0079 CP4(1)=C(4)*SP(1)*H(1)/A**B
0080 CP5(1)=C(5)*SP(1)*H(1)/A**B
0081 CP(1)=CP1(1)+CP2(1)+CP3(1)+CP4(1)+CP5(1)
0082 CRP=CRP+CP*(1)
C
0083 PRESENT VALUE OF RECHARGE COEFFICIENTS
0084 C1X(1)=C(1)*MD/A**B
C
0085 CONSTRAINT COEFFICIENTS COMPUTATION
C
0086 DYNAMIC CONSTRAINTS
C
0087 IF R.N.S. IS NEGATIVE THE SIGN OF THE CONSTRAINT IS CHANGED
0088 H(1)=H0
0089 B2(1)=AR*S*H(1)
0090 B3(1)=MD*X*SD
C
0091 DOWNSTREAM CONSTRAINTS
0092 B4(1)=JST(1)-AR*A1*H(1)+AR*A1*H(1)
0093 B5(1)=H0
0094 B6(1)=J.S*MD
C
0095 WHITE DOWNSTREAM CONSTRAINT BEFORE THE LAST
0096 IF R.N.S. IS NEGATIVE THE TYPE OF CONSTRAINT IS CHANGED
0097 KA=K2-2*N
0098 DO 7 J=1,KA
0099 SYM(J)=LGCHR(1,J)
0100 7 CONTINUE
0101 KB=KA+N*1
0102 DO 8 J=NB,K2
0103 SYM(J)=LGCHR(1,J)
0104 8 CONTINUE
0105 IF (B5(1)) 101,4,4
0106 B4(1)=B4(1)
0107 B5(1)=B5(1)
0108 B6(1)=B5(1)
0109 IF (E) LGCHR(KA+1,'C') GO TO 3
0110 SYM(KA+1)=AMPER
0111 GO TO 5
0112 SYM(KA+1)=MUNOS
0113 GO TO 5
0114 SYM(KA+1)=LGCHR(1,KA+1)
0115 WRITE LIST AFTER CONSERVATIVE USE CONSTRAINTS
0116 5 CONTINUE
C
0117 *****
C
0118 BEGINNING VAR COEFF MATRIX
C
0119 *****
C
0120 FIRST 3 TERMS ARE V(1)
C
0121 SECOND 3 TERMS ARE V(2)
C
0122 THIRD 2 TERMS ARE V(3)
C
0123 FOURTH 2 TERMS ARE V(4)
C
0124 IF IT IS A MAX.CHANGE SIGN OF O.F. COEFFS.

```

```

0107      DO 199 I=1,N
0108          VALUE (I*(I-1)*I)=-C1X(I)
0109          VALUE (I*(I-1)*2)=B1(I)
0110          VALUE (I*(I-1)*3)=B2(I)
0111          VALUE (I*(I-1)*4)=-C2X(I)
0112          VALUE (I*(I-1)*5)=B3(I)
0113          VALUE (I*(I-1)*6)=L
0114          VALUE (I*(I-1)*7)=-CPT(I)
0115          VALUE (I*(I-1)*8)=R2(I)
0116          VALUE (I*(I-1)*9)=-C3X(I)
0117          VALUE (I*(I-1)*10)=1.
0118
0119      199 CONTINUE
0120      DO 207 I=1,K3
0121          SYMB(I)=PLUS
0122          IF (VALUE(I).LT.0.) SYMB(I)=MINUS
0123          VALUE2(I)=ABS(VALUE(I))
0207 CONTINUE
C *****
C      RIGHT HAND SIDE VECTOR
C *****
0124      DO 203 I=1,M
0125          VALUE(I)=B3(I)
0126          VALUE(I+1)=B4(I)
0127          VALUE(I+2*N+1)=1.
0128
0203 CONTINUE
C      STREAM-AQUIFER INTERACTION
0129      DO 2 K=1,N
0130          QSA(K)=A1*AR*(WHIK)-H(K)
0131      2 CONTINUE
0132          WRITE (6,10)
0133      10 FORMAT (1H,10X,73(1H-))
0134          WRITE (6,11) (A1,VARY)
0135      11 FORMAT (1H,12X,1',5X,'QSD(I)',4X,'QAU(I)',4X,'QP(I)',9X,'QAR(I)'
0136          1,6X,'Y(I)',3X,'A1=',E15.6,2X,'VARY=',E15.6,2X,'INITIAL GUESSES')
0137          WRITE (6,12) (J,QSD(J),QAU(J),QP(J),QAR(J),Y(J),J=1,N)
0138      12 FORMAT (1H,10X,13,1X,F10.3,1X,F10.3,1X,F10.3,1X,F10.3,1X,
0139          IF10.3)
0140          WRITE (6,40)
0141      40 FORMAT (1H,10X,73(1H-))
0142          WRITE (6,20) CRP
0143      20 FORMAT (1H,12X,1',9X,'HEAD MEAN',4X,'ORAW CORR.',6X,
0144          1,HEAD VARS',9X,'PUMPING RANDOM',3X,'CRP=',F10.3)
0145          WRITE (6,30) (I,H(I),C3(I),VAR(I),CP2(I),I=1,N)
0146      30 FORMAT (1H,10X,13,5X,F10.3,5X,F10.3,5X,E15.6,5X,E15.6)
0147          WRITE (6,50)
0148          WRITE (6,50)
0149      50 FORMAT (1H,12X,1',1X,'STREAM DIV COEFF=C1X',1X,
0150          1,RETR.C)F=C2X',1X,'PUMPING COEFF=CPT',2X,'A RECH COEFF=C3X')
0151          WRITE (6,10)
0152          WRITE (6,51) (I,C1X(I),C2X(I),CPT(I),C3X(I),I=1,N)
0153      51 FORMAT (1H,10X,13,1X,E10.5,1X,E10.5,1X,E10.5,1X,E10.5)
0154          WRITE (6,4J)
C *****
0155          WRITE (6,10)
0156          WRITE (6,9)
0157      9 FORMAT (1H,21X,'DEMAND CONSTRAINTS')
0158          WRITE (6,10)
0159          WRITE (6,11)
0160      11 FORMAT (1H,12X,1',7X,'1=B1',7X,'2=B2',11X,'3=B3')
0161          WRITE (6,10)
0162          WRITE (6,12) (I,B1(I),B2(I),B3(I),I=1,N)
0163      12 FORMAT (1H,10X,13,2X,F10.2,2X,F10.2,4X,F10.2)
0164          WRITE (6,13)
0165      13 FORMAT (1H,10X,73(1H-))
0166          WRITE (6,10)
0167          WRITE (6,19)
0168      19 FORMAT (1H,22X,'DOWNSTREAM CONSTRAINTS')
0169          WRITE (6,10)
0170          WRITE (6,21)
0171      21 FORMAT (1H,12X,1',7X,'1=B5',9X,'2=B6',9X,'3=B4')
0172          WRITE (6,10)
0173          WRITE (6,22) (I,B5(I),B6(I),B4(I),I=1,N)
0174      22 FORMAT (1H,10X,13,2X,F10.2,2X,F10.2,2X,F10.2)
0175          WRITE (6,10)
0176          WRITE (6,10)
0177          WRITE (6,29)
0178      29 FORMAT (1H,16X,'WATER LEFT AFTER C.U. CONSTRAINTS')
0179          WRITE (6,10)
0180          WRITE (6,31)
0181      31 FORMAT (1H,12X,1',7X,'1=L',11X,'2=L',13X,'3=L')
0182          WRITE (6,10)
0183          WRITE (6,10)
0184          WRITE (6,32)
0185      32 FORMAT (1H,13X,1',9X,'QSA(I)',12X,'CCH2(I)',13X,'RN(I)',
0186          115X,'D(I)')
0187          WRITE (6,10)
0188          WRITE (6,39) (I,QSA(I),CCH2(I),RN(I),D(I),I=1,N)
0189      39 FORMAT (1H,11X,13,6X,E13.6,6X,E13.6,6X,E13.6,6X,E13.6)
0190          WRITE (6,10)
0191          REWIND 2
0192          LB=3
0193          WRITE (1H,40) (AA(I),I=1,13)
0194      40 FORMAT (1X,13A4)
0195          WRITE (1H,61) (BB(I),I=1,2)
0196      61 FORMAT (2A4)
0197          WRITE (1H,62) (CMM1(I),RN1(I),KN2(I),I=1,K2)
0198      62 FORMAT (11X,A1,1X,A5,A1)
0199          WRITE (1H,63) (CC(I),I=1,2)
0200          WRITE (1H,63) (CCNM1(I),CCNM2(I),RNMI(I),RNHZ(I),SYMB(I),
0201          1VALM2(I),I=1,K3)
0202      63 FORMAT (7X,A4,A1,1X,A6,A1,A1,F11.4)
0203          WRITE (1H,64) (DD(I),I=1,2),DD1)
0204      64 FORMAT (13X,A4,A1,1X,A5,A1)
0205          WRITE (1H,65) (LL(I),I=1,1),EE1)
0206      65 FORMAT (13X,20H) (LL(I),I=1,1),EE1)
0207          KLTUR4
0208          END

```

//INPUT EXEC FORTRAN

00:00:53

```

0001      SUBROUTINE INPUT (N,AR,A1)
C
C *****
C INPUT TO THE PHYSICAL MODEL
C *****
C
C A1=OUTFLOW CONSTANT IN 1/SEASON
C AL=LEAKAGE
C AL1=CHAR LENGTH
C ALPHA1=RETURN FLUX COEFF
C ALPHA2=ART RECH COEFF
C AR=AREA
C AT=TRANSPIRATION
C D=DEMAND
C HB=PREVIOUS MEAN H(I)
C P=PRECIPITATION
C QAR=WATER THAT ACTUALLY RECHARGES THE AQUIFER
C QAR1=WATER THAT ACTUALLY REACHES THE STREAM
C QI=SUBSURFACE INFLOW
C QI1=STREAMFLOW
C R1(J)=4 NORMAL RANDOM NUMBERS (0,1)
C S5=NUMBER OF SEASONS PER YEAR
C T=TRANSMISSIVITY
C VS(J)=STREAM DISPERSION DEC VAR
C VU(J)=RETURNED WATER DEC VAR
C VP(J)=PUMPING DEC VAR
C VR(J)=ART RECHARGE DEC VAR
C WH=STREAM STAGE
C
C YI(J)=EXPECTED VALUE OF INPUT (1/T)
C
C
0002      COR=0.75/AS/DS/HS/MS/OS/PS/QR/QR1/QR2/QR3/
1      COM=PI/VS/VS(50)/VU(50)/VP(50)/VR(50)/CRP
C
0003      COM=PI/VS/VS(50)/VU(50)/VP(50)/VR(50)/CRP
0004      COM=PI/VS/VS(50)/VU(50)/VP(50)/VR(50)/CRP
0005      AL=4900.
0006      ALPHA1=0.8
0007      ALPHA2=0.5
0008      AR=3172.655
0009      LC=2
0010      HD=1.1
0011      S=0.01
0012      SD=00.0
0013      SS=6.
0014      T=0.031
0015      5 READ (LC,1) (RN(K),K=1,N)
0016      READ (LC,1) (WH(K),K=1,N)
0017      READ (LC,1) (QS(K),K=1,N)
0018      READ (LC,1) (VS(K),K=1,N)
0019      4 READ (LC,1) (VU(K),K=1,N)
0020      READ (LC,1) (VP(K),K=1,N)
0021      3 READ (LC,1) (VR(K),K=1,N)
0022      READ (LC,1) (HB(K),K=1,N)
0023      1 FORMAT (7F10.6)
0024      A1=(1.0/AL)*36500.0/SS
C
C DISCHARGE IN ACRES-FEET/SEASON
C DEMAND COMPUTATION
C
0025      DO 6 N=1,N
0026      VS=0.0
0027      VU=0.0
0028      VP=0.0
0029      VR=0.0
0030      6 CONTINUE
0031      DO 2 J=1,N
0032      QSI(J)=D(J)*VS(J)
0033      MSUM)*VS(J)
0034      QAU(J)=ALPHA1*D(J)*VU(J)
0035      QAR=ALPHA1*HD*VU(J)
0036      QR(J)=AR*S*HR(J)*VP(J)
0037      QR1=ALPHA2*QI(J)*VU(J)
0038      QR2=ALPHA2*QI*VR(J)
0039      YI(J)=(QAR(J)-QI(J)+AR*A1*WH(J))/AR
0040      YU(J)=(QAR-QI)*AR*A1*WH(J)/AR
C
C COMPUTATION OF A NEW HEAD ARRAY, H2(I)
C
0041      DO 4 I=1,N
0042      H2(I)=H(I)
0043      4 CONTINUE
0044      RETURN
0045      END

```

TOTAL MEMORY REQUIREMENTS 000708 BYTES

COMPILER HIGHEST SEVERITY CODE WAS 0

00:01:00

//MEANH EXEC FORTRAN

```

0001      SUBROUTINE MEANH (H,SH,N,AR,A1)
C
C *****
C AVERAGE HEAD OF THE PHYSICAL MODEL
C *****
C
C H(I)=EXPECTED VALUE OF HEAD (1)
C H0=INITIAL HEAD
C S=SEVERITY COEFFICIENT
C
0002      COM=PI/VS/VS(50)/VU(50)/VP(50)/VR(50)/CRP
C
0003      DIMENSION H(50),SH(50)
C
0004      DATA
0005      HD=20.0
0006      S=.01
0007      AR=AL/S
C
0008      9 X(1)=EXP(X)
C
0009      4 H(I)=H0*EXP(X)+X1*Y(I)/A1
0010      IF (H(I).GT.20.0) H(I)=20.0
C
0011      5 SH(I)=H(I)*H(I)
C
0012      SUCCESSIVE VALUES OF HEAD
C
0013      DO 1 I=2,N
0014      H(I)=H(I-1)*EXP(X)+X1*Y(I)/A1
0015      IF (H(I).LE.0.0) H(I)=0.0
0016      IF (H(I).LT.20.0) H(I)=20.0
0017      SH(I)=H(I)*H(I)
C
0018      1 CONTINUE
0019      RETURN

```



```

0018          END
TOTAL MEMORY REQUIREMENTS 00035C BYTES
COMPILER HIGHEST SEVERITY CODE WAS 0
//VARN EXEC FORTRAN                                00:01:04

```

```

0001      SUBROUTINE VARN (VAR,SO,VARY,N,AR,A1)
C
C *****
C HEAD VARIANCE OF THE PHYSICAL MODEL *****
C *****
C C = INPUT CORRELATION COEFF
C S = STORAGE COEFFICIENT
C SD = HEAD STANDARD DEVIATION
C VARK = HEAD VARIANCE
C VARY = INPUT VARIANCE
0002      COMMON /SAS/ U(SO),H(SO),ST(SO),OSD(SO),QAU(SO),UP(SO),QAR(SO),
1         /SA/ Y(SO),Y1(SO),Y11(SO),RH(SO),H1(SO)
0003      DIMENSION VARN(SO),SD(SO)
0004      CC = 0.7
0005      S = 0.01
C
C INPUT VARIANCE
0006      YA = 0.0
0007      DO 4 L=1,N
0008      YA = YA + Y1(L)
0009      4 CONTINUE
0010      C = N
0011      10 Y1LAN = YA / C
0012      YB = 0.0
0013      DO 5 M=1,N
0014      9 YB = YB + (Y11(M) - YMEAN) * (Y1(M) - YMEAN)
0015      5 CONTINUE
0016      VARY = YB / (C - 1.)
0017      8 VARY1 = VARY / S ** 2.
0018      VARI1 = VARY1
0019      7 SD(1) = SQRT(VARY1)
0020      DO 1 I = 2, N
0021      VARK = 0.0
0022      DO 2 K=1, I
0023      VARK = VARK + 1.
0024      DO 3 J=1, I
0025      A = K
0026      B = J
0027      E = 1
0028      H = AUS(A-B)
C CHECKING EXPONENT SIZE (EXP. LE. 100)
0029      Z = 2. * E - A - B
0030      7 I = 100. * S / A1
0031      IF (Z .GE. 7 I) 7 = Z1
0032      6 VARKJ = VARK + VARY1 * (CC ** W) * EXP(-A1 * Z / S)
0033      3 CONTINUE
0034      VARK = VARK + VARKJ
0035      2 CONTINUE
0036      VARK(1) = VARK
0037      SD(1) = SQRT(VARK(1))
0038      1 CONTINUE
0039      RETURN
0040      END

```

```

INITIAL MEMORY REQUIREMENTS 000540 BYTES
COMPILER HIGHEST SEVERITY CODE WAS 0
//LP EXEC FORTRAN                                00:01:10

```

```

0001      SUBROUTINE LP
0002      INTEGER RN#1,RN#2,CLN#1,CIN#2,BLNK,NFG,PUS,SYMB,CD10,RU,MA,FI,EU,
1         IAN(160),IAN2(160),NOM1(160),NOM2(160)
0003      REAL AS,AP,AN,AJ,JE,KA,VAL(160),RQ(160),B(160,160),PI(160),
1         INAP(160),A(160),PIV(160),PIV1(160)
0004      COMMON /S/ S,N(SO),V1(SO),V2(SO),V3(SO),CRP
0005      INTEGER VS(INDX),V1(INDX),V2(INDX),V3(INDX)
0006      INTEGER ILL
0007      LOGICAL *1 DUMCHR
0008      LOGICAL *1 TITLE(140)
C
C SET ALPHANUMERIC CODES IN RN, MA, FI, EU, PUS, NEG, BLNK FOR
C COMPARING WITH LP CARD CODES
0009      RU = -660270272
0010      AA = -77537600
0011      FI = -999981944
0012      FIU = -119419942
0013      PUS = 114638032
0014      NEG = 1614823448
0015      BLNK = 1077952576
C
C INPUT PROGRAM
0016      54323 CONTINUE
0017      M = 3
0018      N = 1
0019      ISM = 3
0020      NPDWS = 0
0021      NPL = 0
0022      NLE = 0
0023      NLU = 0
0024      NEL = 0
0025      NRHS = 0
0026      NCOLS = 0
C
C CLEAR MATRIX TO ZERO
0027      DO 12 I=1,160
0028      DO 12 J=1,160
0029      12 B(I,J) = 0.0
C READ PROBLEM TITLE
0030      READ (2,800) TITLE
0031      WRITE (6,8151) TITLE
0032      WRITE (6,800) TITLE
0033      WRITE (6,901) TITLE
0034      8151 FORMAT(1H1)

```

```

PL010005
PL010006
PL010007
PL010008
PL010012
PL010013
PL010014
PL010017
PL010018
PL010019
PL010020
PL010021
PL010022
PL010023
PL010024
PL010025
PL010026
PL010028
PL010032
PL010033

```

```

0035      300 FORMAT (1X,40A11)
0036      801 FORMAT(//)
C
C      READ FIRST CARD - SHOULD BE ROWID
C
0037      READ (2,2) C010
0038      2 FORMAT (A2)
0039      IF (C010=RO) 3,600,3
0040      3 WRITE(6,3333)
0041      3333 FORMAT (//) ROWID CARD MISSING '//'
0042      3334 STOP 1
C
C      READ AND STORE ROWID CARDS
C      INCLUDING DUMMY READ
C      FOR OBJECTIVE ROW NAME
C      GENERATE POS AND NEG SLACKS AS REQUIRED
C
0043      600 READ (2,601) DUMCHR
0044      601 FORMAT (A1)
0045      101 READ (2,102) C010,LGE,RNKL,RNMZ
0046      WRITE (6,102) C010,LGE,RNKL,RNMZ
0047      102 FORMAT(A2,19X,A1,1X,A4,A1)
0048      IF (C010=MA)103,504,103
0049      504 CONTINUE
0050      GO TO 104
0051      103 RNKL =
0052      ROWS = NROWS+1
0053      IF (LGE=POS)105,106,105
0054      105 IF (LGE=NEG)107,108,107
0055      106 R1(1)=RNM1
0056      R2(1)=RNM2
0057      NLE = NLE+1
0058      RPTM = J.0
0059      GO TO 101
0060      108 R1(N) = RNM1
0061      R2(N) = RNM2
0062      NGE = NGE+1
0063      RPT(N) = -1.0
0064      E1(N) = -1.0
0065      401 RNM1(N) = RNM1
0066      RNM2(N) = RNM2
0067      NNP(N) = 0.0
0068      N = N+1
0069      GO TO 101
0070      107 R1(N) = RNM1
0071      R2(N) = RNM2
0072      NLE = NLE+1
0073      RPT(N) = -2.0
0074      GO TO 101
C
C      READ AND STORE FIRST MATRIX ELEMENT
C
0075      104 READ (2,195) C010,CLNM1,CLNM2,RNM1,RNM2,SYMB,VALUE
0076      WRITE (6,195) C010,CLNM1,CLNM2,RNM1,RNM2,SYMB,VALUE
0077      195 FORMAT(A2,19X,A4,A1,1X,A4,A1,A1,11.4)
0078      GO TO 119
0079      109 IF (RNM1(N) = CLNM1)111,600,111
0080      600 IF (RNM2(N) = CLNM2)111,601,111
0081      601 CONTINUE
0082      112 DO 113 I=1,N
0083      113 R1(I) = RNM1
0084      402 IF (RNM2(I) = RNM2)113,603,113
0085      113 CONTINUE
0086      WRITE(6,8113)
0087      8113 FORMAT (//) INCORRECT INGREDIENT CARD '//'
0088      STOP 2
0089      603 CONTINUE
0090      114 IF (SYMB=NEG) 116,115,116
0091      115 R1(I) = -VALUE
0092      GO TO 117
0093      116 R1(I) = VALUE
C
C      READ AND STORE MATRIX ELEMENTS
C
0094      117 READ (2,195) C010,CLNM1,CLNM2,RNM1,RNM2,SYMB,VALUE
0095      WRITE (6,195) C010,CLNM1,CLNM2,RNM1,RNM2,SYMB,VALUE
0096      NLE = NLE+1
0097      GO TO 109
0098      111 N = N+1
0099      NCOLS = NCOLS+1
0100      IF (C010=I) 119,190,119
0101      119 NCOL1(N) = CLNM1
0102      NCOL2(N) = CLNM2
0103      201 IF (SYMB=NEG)202,203,202
0104      202 R1(N) = VALUE
0105      GO TO 117
0106      203 R1(N) = -VALUE
0107      GO TO 117
C
C      READ AND STORE RHS ELEMENTS
C
0108      190 DO 191 I=1,N
0109      191 R2(I) = J.0
0110      GO TO 120
0111      120 READ (2,121) C010,RNM1,RNM2,VALUE
0112      WRITE (6,121) C010,RNM1,RNM2,VALUE
0113      121 FORMAT(A2,1X,A4,A1,1X,A4,A1,11.4)
0114      IF (C010=RO) 122,193,122
0115      122 DO 123 I=1,N
0116      123 R1(I) = RNM1
0117      610 IF (RNM2(I) = RNM2)124,511,124
0118      124 CONTINUE
0119      WRITE(6,8124)RNM1,RNM2
0120      8124 FORMAT(//) NO ROW NAME FOR 'A4,A1//'
0121      STOP 3
0122      611 CONTINUE
0123      125 R1(I) = VALUE
0124      NRRHS = NRRHS+1
0125      GO TO 120
0126      193 N = N+1
0127      WRITE(6,551)NROWS,NCOLS,NLE,NGE,NFO,NRHS,NLE
0128      551 FORMAT('ROWS ',12,' COLS ',12,' LE ROWS ',12,' GE ROWS ',12,'
NONZERO MATRIX ELEMENTS ',15)
C
PLUT0037
PLUT0040
PLUT0042
PLUT0045
PLUT0047
PLUT0048
PLUT0049
PLUT0050
PLUT0051
PLUT0052
PLUT0053
PLUT0054
PLUT0055
PLUT0056
PLUT0057
PLUT0058
PLUT0059
PLUT0060
PLUT0061
PLUT0062
PLUT0063
PLUT0064
PLUT0065
PLUT0066
PLUT0067
PLUT0068
PLUT0069
PLUT0070
PLUT0071
PLUT0072
PLUT0073
PLUT0074
PLUT0075
PLUT0076
PLUT0077
PLUT0078
PLUT0079
PLUT0080
PLUT0081
PLUT0082
PLUT0083
PLUT0084
PLUT0085
PLUT0086
PLUT0087
PLUT0088
PLUT0093
PLUT0094
PLUT0095
PLUT0096
PLUT0097
PLUT0098
PLUT0099
PLUT0102
PLUT0103
PLUT0104
PLUT0105
PLUT0106
PLUT0107
PLUT0108
PLUT0109
PLUT0110
PLUT0111
PLUT0114
PLUT0115
PLUT0116
PLUT0117
PLUT0118
PLUT0119
PLUT0120
PLUT0121
PLUT0122
PLUT0123
PLUT0124
PLUT0125
PLUT0126
PLUT0127
PLUT0128
PLUT0129
PLUT0130
PLUT0131
PLUT0135
PLUT0136
PLUT0137
PLUT0138
PLUT0139
PLUT0141
PLUT0142
PLUT0143
PLUT0144
PLUT0145
PLUT0146
PLUT0147
PLUT0149
PLUT0150
PLUT0151
PLUT0152

```

```

C          BLANK OUT ARTIFICIAL NAMES
C
0129      DO 10 I=1,M
0130      IF (AP(I))=1,0)19,11,10
0131      11  IAN1(I) = BLNK
0132      IAN2(I) = BLNK
0133      GO TO 10
0134      19  RP(I) = -1.0
0135      IAN1(I) = BLNK
0136      IAN2(I) = BLNK
0137      10  CONTINUE

C          ACCUMULATE COUNT OF INFEASIBILITIES
C
0138      NINF = 0
0139      DO 6000 I=1,M
0140      IF (RP(I))6001,6000,6000
0141      6001 NINF = NINF+1
0142      6000 CONTINUE

C          GENERATE INDICATORS FOR MINIMIZATION OF INFEASIBILITY
C
0143      DO 6101 J=1,N
0144      AP(J) = 0.0
0145      DO 6101 I=1,M
0146      IF (RP(I))6102,6101,6101
0147      6102 AP(J) = XPI(J)-B(I,J)
0148      6101 CONTINUE
0149      DO 6002 I=1,M
0150      RP(I) = 0.0
0151      IPHASE = 1

C          MAIN ROUTINE
C
0152      9201 WRITE (0,9202)
0153      9202 FORMAT (10 ITERATION      VAR IN      VAR OUT      OBJ FN',/)
0154      IF = 0
0155      54325 CONTINUE

C          CALCULATE SHADOW PRICES
C
0156      DO 194 J=1,N
0157      PI(J) = -NAP(J)
0158      DO 194 I=1,M
0159      PII(J) = PI(J) + BP(I)*B(I,J)

C          SELECT BEST NONBASIS VECTOR
C
0160      9101 LST = -.0000001
0161      KCOL = 0
0162      GO TO (751,552),IPHASE
0163      751 IF (NINF)54321,54321,552
0164      552 CONTINUE
0165      DO 9102 J=1,N

C          IGNORE ARTIFICIAL VARIABLES
C
0166      IF (IAN1(J)-BLNK+IAN2(J)-BLNK)651,9102,651
0167      651 CONTINUE
0168      GO TO (6003,6004),IPHASE
0169      6003 IF (AP(J)-LST)6005,6006,6006
0170      6005 KCOL = J
0171      LST = AP(J)
0172      GO TO 9102
0173      6006 CONTINUE
0174      IF (PII(J)-LST)9103,9102,9102
0175      9103 KCOL = J
0176      LST = PII(J)
0177      6006 CONTINUE
0178      9102 CONTINUE
0179      IF (KCOL)54321,54321,9104

C          DETERMINE KEYROW
C
0180      9104 KROW = 0
0181      LSUM = 1.51
0182      LST = 1.0E20
0183      DO 9105 I=1,M
0184      IF (I)KCOL)9105,9105,9106
0185      9105 KAT(I) = B(I)/B(I,KCOL)
0186      IF (KAT(I)-LST)9107,9105,9105
0187      9107 LST = KAT(I)
0188      KROW = I
0189      9105 CONTINUE
0190      IF (KROW)9112,9112,9114
0191      9112 AP(I) = AP(I) + B(I,KCOL)*NINF
0192      9113 EDIT(1) VARIABLE ',A4,A1,' UNBOUNDED '
0193      GO TO 54325
0194      9114 CONTINUE

C          TRANSFORM
C
C          DIVIDE BY PIVOT
C          PIVOT = B(KROW,KCOL)
C          DO 9109 J=1,N
0195      B(KROW,J) = B(KROW,J)/PIVOT
0196      DO 9108 I=1,M
0197      B(I,KROW) = B(I,KROW)/PIVOT
0198      9108 CONTINUE
0199      DO 9109 I=1,M
0200      IF (I-KROW)9110,9109,9110
0201      9110 B(I) = B(I) - B(I,KROW)*B(I,KCOL)
0202      DO 9109 J=1,N
0203      IF (J-KCOL)9111,9109,9111
0204      9111 B(I,J) = B(I,J) - B(I,KROW)*B(I,KCOL)
0205      9109 CONTINUE
0206      DO 9300 I=1,M
0207      B(I,KCOL) = -B(I,KCOL)/PIVOT
0208      B(KROW,KCOL) = 1.0/PIVOT
0209      B(KROW,I) = 1.0/PIVOT

C          INTERCHANGE BASIS AND NONBASIS VARIABLES
C
0210      RAN1 = IAN1(KCOL)
0211      RAN2 = IAN2(KCOL)
0212      IAN1(KCOL) = IAN1(KROW)
0213      IAN2(KCOL) = IAN2(KROW)
0214      IAN1(KROW) = RAN1

```

PL01153
 PL01154
 PL01155
 PL01156
 PL01157
 PL01158
 PL01159
 PL01160
 PL01161
 PL01162
 PL01163
 PL01164
 PL01165
 PL01166
 PL01167
 PL01168
 PL01169
 PL01170
 PL01171
 PL01172
 PL01173
 PL01174
 PL01175
 PL01176
 PL01177
 PL01178
 PL01179
 PL01180
 PL01181
 PL01182
 PL01183
 PL01184
 PL01185
 PL01186
 PL01187
 PL01188
 PL01189
 PL01190
 PL01191
 PL01192
 PL01193
 PL01194
 PL01195
 PL01196
 PL01197
 PL01198
 PL01199
 PL01200
 PL01201
 PL01202
 PL01203
 PL01204
 PL01205
 PL01206
 PL01207
 PL01208
 PL01209
 PL01210
 PL01211
 PL01212
 PL01213
 PL01214
 PL01215
 PL01216
 PL01217
 PL01218
 PL01219
 PL01220
 PL01221
 PL01222
 PL01223
 PL01224
 PL01225
 PL01226
 PL01227
 PL01228
 PL01229
 PL01230
 PL01231
 PL01232
 PL01233
 PL01234
 PL01235
 PL01236
 PL01237
 PL01238
 PL01239
 PL01240
 PL01241
 PL01242
 PL01243
 PL01244
 PL01245
 PL01246
 PL01247
 PL01248
 PL01249
 PL01250
 PL01251
 PL01252
 PL01253
 PL01254
 PL01255
 PL01256
 PL01257
 PL01258
 PL01259
 PL01260
 PL01261
 PL01262
 PL01263
 PL01264
 PL01265
 PL01266
 PL01267
 PL01268

```

0215      IAN2(KROW) = RNM2
0216      LST = NBP(KCOL)
0217      NBP(KCOL) = DP(KROW)
0218      BP(KROW) = LST
0219      IT = IT + 1
0220      IF (NBN1(KCOL) - BENK + NBN2(KCOL) - BENK) 6201, 6200, 6201
0221      6200  LINE = MINF - 1
0222      6201  CONTINUE

C
      COMPUTE OBJECTIVE FUNCTION

0223      FN = 0.0
0224      DO 9301 I=1,M
0225      9301  FN = FN + BP(I)*RO(I)
0226      GO TO (700), 7001, I, PHASE
0227      7000  SAVE = PI(KCOL)
0228      DO 7003 J=1,N
0229      7003  PI(J) = PI(J) - SAVE*B(KROW,J)
0230      7003  XPI(J) = XPI(J) - CJBAR*B(KROW,J)
0231      PI(KCOL) = -SAVE/PIVOT
0232      XPI(KCOL) = -CJBAR/PIVOT
0233      GO TO 7004
0234      7001  CONTINUE
0235      DO 9302 J=1,N
0236      9302  PI(J) = PI(J) - CJBAR*B(KROW,J)
0237      9302  XPI(J) = XPI(J) - CJBAR/PIVOT
0238      7004  CONTINUE
C
      CHECK FOR ESSENTIAL ZERO
0240      DO 6111 I=1,M
0241      6111  DO 6112 J=1,N
0242      6112  X=B(I,J)
0243      6112  IF (ABS(X) - .0000001) 6112, 6112, 6111
0244      6111  CONTINUE

C
      LOG ITERATION

0246      WRITE(6,9120) IT, IAN1(KROW), IAN2(KROW), NBN1(KCOL), NBN2(KCOL), FN
0247      9120  FORMAT('I', 7X, A4, A1, 8X, A4, A1, 3X, F13.3)
0248      GO TO 9121

C
54321  CONTINUE
      IF (IPHASE - 118000, 8000, 54322)
0251      8000  IPHASE = 2
0252      IF (ININ) 8003, 8003, 8004
0253      8004  WRITE(6, 8005)
0254      8005  FORMAT('J SOLUTION INFLEASIBLE', /)
0255      GO TO 54322
0256      8003  CONTINUE
0257      WRITE(6, 8002)
0258      8002  FORMAT('O SOLUTION FEASIBLE', /)
0259      GO TO 54325
0260      54322  CONTINUE

C
      OUTPUT ROUTINE

0261      WRITE(6, 301) IT, FN
0262      301  FORMAT('I', 1, ' ITERATION', 15, ' OBJ FN ', F15.3 /)
0263      WRITE(6, 21) CUP
0264      21  FORMAT('3X, RANDOM PUMPING TERM', 3X, F10.3)
0265      ZZ = CUP * LR
0266      WRITE(6, 22) ZZ
0267      22  FORMAT('3X, TOTAL OBJ FN', 6X, F10.3)
0268      WRITE(6, 302)
0269      302  FORMAT('3X, BASIS VAR', 17X, 'AMOUNT', 6X, 'UNIT PROFIT', 6X, 'LU=
      1, 6X, 'HIGH', /)
0270      DO 303 J=1,M

C
      COST RANGING

0271      VALUE = 1.0E20
0272      LST = 1.0E20
0273      DO 12300 J=1,N
0274      12300  IF (B(NB1(J) - BENK + NBN2(J) - BENK) 12305, 12300, 12305)
0275      12305  CONTINUE
0276      IF (A(I, J)) 12301, 12300, 12302
0277      12302  X = PI(I) / A(I, J)
0278      IF (X - LST) 12303, 12300, 12300
0279      12303  LST = X
0280      GO TO 12300
0281      X = -PI(J) / A(I, J)
0282      IF (X - VALUE) 12304, 12300, 12300
0283      12304  VALUE = X
0284      12300  CONTINUE
0285      LST = BP(I) - LST
0286      VALUE = BP(I) + VALUE
0287      303  WRITE(6, 304) IAN1(I), IAN2(I), RO(I), BP(I), LST, VALUE
0288      304  FORMAT('7X, A4, A1, 7X, F16.6, 3X, F11.6, 3X, F11.6, 3X, F11.6)
0289      305  WRITE(6, 305)
0290      305  FORMAT('11 VARIABLE REDUCED COST', /)
0291      DO 309 J=1,N
0292      309  IF (NBN1(J) - BENK + NBN2(J) - BENK) 311, 309, 311
0293      311  WRITE(6, 310) NBN1(J), NBN2(J), PI(J)
0294      310  FORMAT('11, 4X, A4, A1, 10X, F12.5)
0295      309  CONTINUE

C
      SORT DECISION VARS AND FORM NEW ARRAYS

0296      12307  NP = NO. OF PERIODS
0297      DO 900 I=1, NP
0298      900  VS(I) = 0.0
0299      900  VP(I) = 0.0
0300      900  VPI(I) = 0.0
0301      900  VPI(I) = 0.0
0302      900  CONTINUE
0303      DO 902 I=1, M
0304      902  IF (LC(I) (I) (1), 'VS', 21) 903, 902, 903
0305      902  CONTINUE
0306      VS(I) = VS(I) + IAN1(I) * RO(I)
0307      VPI(I) = VPI(I) + RO(I)
0308      903  GO TO 901
0309      903  CONTINUE

```

```

0310      IF (CLC(1BN1(1),'VU',2)) 913,912,913
0311      CONTINUE
0312      VINDEX=INDEX(1BN1(1),1BN2(1))
0313      V(VINDEX)=RQ(1)
0314      GO TO 901
0315      CONTINUE
0316      IF (CLC(1BN1(1),'VR',2)) 905,904,905
0317      CONTINUE
0318      VRINDEX=INDEX(1BN1(1),1BN2(1))
0319      V(VRINDEX)=RQ(1)
0320      GO TO 901
0321      CONTINUE
0322      IF (CLC(1BN1(1),'VP',2)) 907,906,907
0323      CONTINUE
0324      VPINDEX=INDEX(1BN1(1),1BN2(1))
0325      V(VPINDEX)=RQ(1)
0326      GO TO 901
0327      CONTINUE
0328      CONTINUE
0329      WRITE (6,908)
0330      FORMAT (1H,4X,8J(1H-))
0331      WRITE (6,909)
0332      FORMAT (1H,5X,'I',11X,'VS(1)',13X,'VU(1)',13X,'VP(1)',
0333      113X,'VR(1)')
0333      WRITE (6,908)
0334      WRITE (6,910) (I,V5(I),VU(I),VP(I),VR(I),I=1,MP)
0335      FORMAT (1H,3X,13,2X,E16.5,2X,E16.5,2X,E16.5)
0336      WRITE (6,908)
0337      RETURN
0338      END
    
```

PLUTO302
PLUTO303
PLUTO304

TOTAL MEMORY REQUIREMENTS 01C7D4 BYTES

COMPILER HIGHEST SEVERITY CODE HAS 0

//INDX EXEC FORTRAN

0010133

```

0001      FUNCTION INDX (PART1,PART2)
0002      INTEGER PART1,PART2,NAME12,CVB
0003      LOGICAL *1 INDXAM(1),CJ
0004      EQUIVALENCE (NAME1(1),INDXAM(1))
0005      NAME1(1)=PART1
0006      NAME1(2)=PART2
0007      LEN=1
0008      C      UCCIDE NO.OF DECIMALS IN VAR NAME E.G. VS14 HAS 2
0009      C      I(CJ)INDXAM(5),I(1) LEN=2
0010      C      I(CJ)INDXAM(4),I(1) LEN=1
0011      CVB=CHANGE FROM HEX TO BINARY
0012      INDX=CVB(INDXAM(1),LEN)
0013      RETURN
0014      END
    
```

TOTAL MEMORY REQUIREMENTS 000254 BYTES

COMPILER HIGHEST SEVERITY CODE HAS 0

0010136

```

// EXLC LINKEDT
LIST PHASE CUMPH,ROOT
LIST INCLUDE PROG,L
LIST AUTOLINK LOAD FROM SYSREL
LIST AUTOLINK IBCOM# FROM SYSREL
LIST AUTOLINK SORT FROM SYSREL
LIST AUTOLINK USLRPT FROM SYSREL
LIST AUTOLINK FIDCS# FROM SYSREL
LIST AUTOLINK UNITAB#
LIST PHASE MAINI,*
LIST INCLUDE MAINI,L
LIST INCLUDE INPUT,L
LIST INCLUDE HEADI,L
LIST INCLUDE VARH,L
LIST AUTOLINK EO FROM SYSREL
LIST AUTOLINK ALOG FROM SYSREL
LIST AUTOLINK FRXPK# FROM SYSREL
LIST AUTOLINK EXP
LIST PHASE LP,MAINI
LIST INCLUDE LP,L
LIST INCLUDE INDX,L FROM SYSREL
LIST AUTOLINK CLC FROM SYSREL
LIST AUTOLINK LU FROM SYSREL
LIST AUTOLINK CVB FROM SYSREL
LIST ENTRY
    
```

T6/029	PHASE	TRANSFER ADDR.	LOCORE	HICORE	BLOCK NO.	ESD TYPE	LABEL	LIBA00U
COMMON						COMMON	SAS	000200
COMMON						COMMON	SES	000060
COMMON						COMMON	SIS	000080
COMMON						COMMON	SOS	000098
ROOT	CUMPH	00A830	00A838	00EAA7	5	CSECT * ENTRY	MAIN444 MAIN444	00A838 00A838
						CSECT ENTRY * ENTRY	BIAQVLY LOAD LINK	00B5A8 00B5C0 00B5D0
						CSECT ENTRY ENTRY * ENTRY * ENTRY * ENTRY * ENTRY	BQAIBCOM IBCOM# FIRSTIX FIRSCC# FIRPDIAT FIRGCC# ADLUNA	00B6A0 00B6A0 00C118 00C179 00C1E0 00C11F 00C15C
						CSECT ENTRY	BIAQSQRT SORT	00E100 00E10E
						CSECT	BIAQOPT	00E200

76/029	PHASE	TRANSFER ADDR.	LOCORE	MICORE	BLOCK NO.	ESU TYPE	ESU LABEL	ESU ADDRESS
						ENTRY	USIRUPT	00E260
						CSECT	EDAF10CS	00E290
						ENTRY	EDAF10CS	00E284
						ENTRY	ACRFRG#	00E288
						ENTRY	FDGCS#	00E290
						* ENTRY	FIDCOM#	00E2CA
						* ENTRY	FLAB	00E2FB
						* ENTRY	VAR#	00E406
						ENTRY	VAR#	00E400
						* ENTRY	VDIGCS#	00E48C
						CSECT	UUTFAD#	00E420
						ENTRY	UUTFAD#	00E420
	MAIN1	00EAAA	00EAAA	0139AF	28	CSECT	MAIN1C	00E4A8
						ENTRY	MAIN1	00E4A8
						CSECT	INPUTYL	012500
						ENTRY	INPUTYL	012500
						CSECT	MEANHL	012000
						ENTRY	MEANH	012000
						CSECT	VARHG	013000
						ENTRY	VARH	013000
						CSECT	EQ	013000
						* ENTRY	GE	013028
						* ENTRY	LE	013018
						* ENTRY	GT	013020
						* ENTRY	LT	013010
						* ENTRY	NE	013008
						CSECT	BIASLUG	013658
						ENTRY	ALUG	01367A
						* ENTRY	ALUG10	013600
						CSECT	BIJAFRPR	013768
						ENTRY	FRAPR#	013770
						CSECT	BUASLXP	013860
						ENTRY	EXP	013804
	LP	00EAAA	00EAAA	028650	57	CSECT	LPE	00E4A8
						ENTRY	LP	00E4A8
						CSECT	INDXG	028280
						ENTRY	INDX	028280
						CSECT	CLC	028408
						CSECT	EQ	028580
						* ENTRY	GE	0285A8
						* ENTRY	LE	028598
						* ENTRY	GT	0285A0
						* ENTRY	LT	028590
						* ENTRY	NE	028588
						CSECT	CVB	028508

3 PHASES USED 216 BLOCKS

LINXAGE (EDITOR HIGHEST) SEVERITY WAS 0

//SYS002 ACCESS SCRICH
//SYS003 ACCESS SCRICH
JABB1 SYS002 SCRICH 190 SYSRES
JABB1 SYS003 SCRICH 190 SYSRES
// EXIC CUMPT

00101157
00101157

00:01:57

I	QSD(I)	QAU(I)	QPI(I)	QAR(I)	Y(I)	AL*	Q.7007901-01	VARY*	Q.110111E-04
1	0.0	0.0	150.707	4.00J	0.39395				
2	0.0	0.0	127.493	81.10J	0.39395				
3	0.0	0.0	127.493	50.50J	0.39395				
4	0.0	0.0	127.493	71.50J	0.39395				
5	0.0	0.0	127.493	96.70J	0.39395				
6	0.0	0.0	127.493	97.90J	0.39395				
7	0.0	0.0	127.493	33.10J	0.39395				
8	0.0	0.0	127.493	52.30J	0.39395				
9	0.0	0.0	127.493	73.00J	0.39395				
10	0.0	0.0	127.493	78.70J	0.39395				
11	0.0	0.0	127.493	109.90J	0.39395				
12	0.0	0.0	127.493	42.40J	0.39395				
13	0.0	0.0	127.493	51.40J	0.39395				
14	0.0	0.0	127.493	61.60J	0.39395				
15	0.0	0.0	127.493	65.50J	0.39395				
16	0.0	0.0	127.493	55.60J	0.39395				
17	0.0	0.0	127.493	84.70J	0.39395				
18	0.0	0.0	127.493	60.10J	0.39395				
19	0.0	0.0	127.493	45.40J	0.39395				
20	0.0	0.0	127.493	121.90J	0.39395				
21	0.0	0.0	127.493	109.90J	0.39395				
22	0.0	0.0	127.493	19.00J	0.39395				
23	0.0	0.0	127.493	93.10J	0.39395				
24	0.0	0.0	127.493						

I	HEAD MEAN	ORAH. CORR.	HEAD VAR.	PUMPING	RANDOM	CRP*
1	19.619	22.516	0.1301611	00	0.177641E 02	-472.873
2	19.620	22.516	0.156973E 00	00	0.212511E 02	
3	19.619	22.516	0.159750E 00	00	0.211991E 02	
4	19.619	22.516	0.160022E 00	00	0.213073E 02	
5	19.619	22.516	0.160047E 00	00	0.211345E 02	
6	19.619	22.516	0.160050E 00	00	0.209603E 02	
7	19.619	22.516	0.160050E 00	00	0.207807E 02	
8	19.619	22.516	0.160050E 00	00	0.206151E 02	
9	19.619	22.516	0.160050E 00	00	0.204448E 02	
10	19.619	22.516	0.160050E 00	00	0.202758E 02	
11	19.619	22.516	0.160050E 00	00	0.201080E 02	
12	19.619	22.516	0.160050E 00	00	0.199421E 02	

13	19.619	22.516	0.160050E 00	0.177773E 02
14	19.619	22.516	0.160050E 00	0.170136E 02
15	19.619	22.516	0.160050E 00	0.174517E 02
16	19.619	22.516	0.160050E 00	0.172919E 02
17	19.619	22.516	0.160050E 00	0.171315E 02
18	19.619	22.516	0.160050E 00	0.170050E 02
19	19.619	22.516	0.160050E 00	0.168666E 02
20	19.619	22.516	0.160050E 00	0.167333E 02
21	19.619	22.516	0.160050E 00	0.166000E 02
22	19.619	22.516	0.160050E 00	0.164667E 02
23	19.619	22.516	0.160050E 00	0.163333E 02
24	19.619	22.516	0.160050E 00	0.162000E 02

I	STREAM DIV	COEFF=C1X	RET.W. COEFF=C2X	PUMPING COEFF=CPT	A.RECH COEFF=C3X
1	0.44172E 03	0.10913E 02	0.19332E 04	0.55215E 01	
2	0.43607E 03	0.10823E 02	0.13677E 04	0.54759E 01	
3	0.43445E 03	0.10733E 02	0.18448E 04	0.54300E 01	
4	0.43086E 03	0.10643E 02	0.18295E 04	0.53857E 01	
5	0.42733E 03	0.10557E 02	0.18144E 04	0.53412E 01	
6	0.42377E 03	0.10470E 02	0.17994E 04	0.52971E 01	
7	0.42020E 03	0.10383E 02	0.17845E 04	0.52533E 01	
8	0.41664E 03	0.10297E 02	0.17696E 04	0.52099E 01	
9	0.41309E 03	0.10212E 02	0.17547E 04	0.51668E 01	
10	0.40954E 03	0.10128E 02	0.17400E 04	0.51241E 01	
11	0.40600E 03	0.10044E 02	0.17257E 04	0.50818E 01	
12	0.40246E 03	0.99610E 01	0.17116E 04	0.50398E 01	
13	0.39892E 03	0.98786E 01	0.16976E 04	0.49981E 01	
14	0.39538E 03	0.97970E 01	0.16836E 04	0.49568E 01	
15	0.39184E 03	0.97160E 01	0.16699E 04	0.49159E 01	
16	0.38830E 03	0.96357E 01	0.16561E 04	0.48752E 01	
17	0.38476E 03	0.95561E 01	0.16424E 04	0.48349E 01	
18	0.38122E 03	0.94771E 01	0.16286E 04	0.47949E 01	
19	0.37768E 03	0.93986E 01	0.16150E 04	0.47552E 01	
20	0.37414E 03	0.93211E 01	0.16016E 04	0.47159E 01	
21	0.37060E 03	0.92441E 01	0.15883E 04	0.46771E 01	
22	0.36706E 03	0.91677E 01	0.15752E 04	0.46384E 01	
23	0.36352E 03	0.90919E 01	0.15622E 04	0.46001E 01	
24	0.36000E 03	0.90168E 01	0.15497E 04	0.45621E 01	

DEMAND CONSTRAINTS

I	1=B1	2=B2	3=B3
1	131.00	1634.52	131.00
2	131.00	1606.17	131.00
3	131.00	1603.44	131.00
4	131.00	1603.41	131.00
5	131.00	1603.40	131.00
6	131.00	1603.40	131.00
7	131.00	1603.40	131.00
8	131.00	1603.40	131.00
9	131.00	1603.40	131.00
10	131.00	1603.40	131.00
11	131.00	1603.40	131.00
12	131.00	1603.40	131.00
13	131.00	1601.40	131.00
14	131.00	1603.40	131.00
15	131.00	1603.40	131.00
16	131.00	1603.40	131.00
17	131.00	1603.40	131.00
18	131.00	1603.40	131.00
19	131.00	1603.40	131.00
20	131.00	1603.40	131.00
21	131.00	1603.40	131.00
22	131.00	1603.40	131.00
23	131.00	1603.40	131.00
24	131.00	1603.40	131.00

DOWNSTREAM CONSTRAINTS

I	1=B5	2=B6	3=B4
1	131.00	-104.80	136.06
2	131.00	-104.80	52.00
3	131.00	-104.80	26.50
4	131.00	-104.80	33.50
5	131.00	-104.80	102.50
6	131.00	-104.80	139.50
7	131.00	-104.80	130.50
8	131.00	-104.80	26.50
9	131.00	-104.80	26.50
10	131.00	-104.80	33.50
11	131.00	-104.80	102.50
12	131.00	-104.80	139.50
13	131.00	-104.80	130.50
14	131.00	-104.80	26.50
15	131.00	-104.80	26.50
16	131.00	-104.80	33.50
17	131.00	-104.80	102.50
18	131.00	-104.80	139.50
19	131.00	-104.80	130.50
20	131.00	-104.80	26.50
21	131.00	-104.80	26.50
22	131.00	-104.80	33.50
23	131.00	-104.80	102.50
24	131.00	-104.80	139.50

WATER LEFT AFTER C.U. CONSTRAINTS

I	1=L1	2=L1	3=L1
---	------	------	------

I	CSA(I)	CUZ(I)	PR(I)	U(I)
1	0.567368E 02	0.700000E 03	-0.255100E 01	0.800000E 01
2	0.623159E 02	0.490000E 00	0.610000E 00	0.167000E 03
3	0.624707E 02	0.343000E 00	0.520000E 00	0.162000E 03
4	0.624932E 02	0.243000E 00	-0.550000E 00	0.161000E 03
5	0.624957E 02	0.160000E 00	0.220000E 00	0.142000E 03
6	0.624957E 02	0.117000E 00	0.100000E 01	0.193000E 03
7	0.624957E 02	0.823000E -01	0.108000E 01	0.195000E 03
8	0.624957E 02	0.576000E -01	-0.103000E 01	0.662000E 02
9	0.624957E 02	0.405000E -01	-0.440000E 00	0.104000E 03
10	0.624957E 02	0.202000E -01	0.250000E 00	0.146000E 03
11	0.624957E 02	0.197000E -01	0.440000E 00	0.157000E 03
12	0.624957E 02	0.138000E -01	0.148000E 01	0.219000E 03
13	0.624957E 02	0.908000E -02	-0.770000E 00	0.041000E 02
14	0.624957E 02	0.678226E -02	-0.470000E 00	0.123000E 03
15	0.624957E 02	0.474757E -02	-0.130000E 00	0.131000E 03
16	0.624957E 02	0.332329E -02	0.0	0.111000E 03
17	0.624957E 02	0.232051E -02	-0.330000E 00	0.111000E 03
18	0.624957E 02	0.162902E -02	0.640000E 00	0.169000E 03
19	0.624957E 02	0.112909E -02	-0.180000E 00	0.126000E 03
20	0.624957E 02	0.797923E -03	-0.670000E 00	0.900000E 02
21	0.624957E 02	0.558047E -03	0.140000E 01	0.245000E 03
22	0.624957E 02	0.390982E -03	0.148000E 01	0.219000E 03
23	0.624957E 02	0.273664E -03	-0.150000E 01	0.360000E 02
24	0.624957E 02	0.191581E -03	0.920000E 00	0.186200E 03

MADDOCK PROBLEM

- DD1
 - DD2
 - DD3
 - DD4
 - DD5
 - DD6
 - DD7
 - DD8
 - DD9
 - DD10
 - DD11
 - DD12
 - DD13
 - DD14
 - DD15
 - DD16
 - DD17
 - DD18
 - DD19
 - DD20
 - DD21
 - DD22
 - DD23
 - DD24
 - 0 DR1
 - 0 DR2
 - 0 DR3
 - 0 DR4
 - 0 DR5
 - 0 DR6
 - 0 DR7
 - 0 DR8
 - 0 DR9
 - 0 DR10
 - 0 DR11
 - 0 DR12
 - 0 DR13
 - 0 DR14
 - 0 DR15
 - 0 DR16
 - 0 DR17
 - 0 DR18
 - 0 DR19
 - 0 DR20
 - 0 DR21
 - 0 DR22
 - 0 DR23
 - 0 DR24
 - 0 CU1
 - 0 CU2
 - 0 CU3
 - 0 CU4
 - 0 CU5
 - 0 CU6
 - 0 CU7
 - 0 CU8
 - 0 CU9
 - 0 CU10
 - 0 CU11
 - 0 CU12
 - 0 CU13
 - 0 CU14
 - 0 CU15
 - 0 CU16
 - 0 CU17
 - 0 CU18
 - 0 CU19
 - 0 CU20
 - 0 CU21
 - 0 CU22
 - 0 CU23
 - 0 CU24
- MA
- | | | |
|-----|---------|-----------|
| VS1 | PROFT- | 441.7168 |
| VS1 | DU1 | 131.0000 |
| VS1 | DR1 | 131.0000 |
| VU1 | PRJH F- | 104.1131 |
| VU1 | DR1 | 104.4000 |
| VU1 | CU1 | 1.0000 |
| VPI | PROFT- | 1933.1611 |
| VPI | DU1 | 1634.5259 |
| VRI | PROFT- | 5.5215 |

VP1	CUI	1.0000
VS2	PROFT-	438.0684
VS2	DU2	131.0000
VS2	DR2	131.0000
VU2	PROFT-	10.8229
VU2	DR2	104.8000
VU2	CU2	1.0000
VP2	PROFT-	1807.6575
VP2	DU2	1603.4021
VK2	PROFT-	5.4759
VK2	CU2	1.0000
VS3	PROFT-	434.4430
VS3	DU3	131.0000
VS3	DR3	131.0000
VU3	PROFT-	10.7334
VU3	DR3	104.8000
VU3	CU3	1.0000
VP3	PROFT-	1844.8367
VP3	DU3	1603.4019
VR3	PROFT-	5.4306
VR3	CU3	1.0000
VS4	PROFT-	430.0577
VS4	DU4	131.0000
VS4	DR4	131.0000
VU4	PROFT-	10.6447
VU4	DR4	104.8000
VU4	CU4	1.0000
VP4	PROFT-	1829.5056
VP4	DU4	1603.4148
VR4	PROFT-	5.3857
VR4	CU4	1.0000
VS5	PROFT-	427.2969
VS5	DU5	131.0000
VS5	DR5	131.0000
VU5	PROFT-	10.5508
VU5	DR5	104.8000
VU5	CU5	1.0000
VP5	PROFT-	1814.3735
VP5	DU5	1603.4036
VR5	PROFT-	5.3412
VR5	CU5	1.0000
VS6	PROFT-	423.7656
VS6	DU6	131.0000
VS6	DR6	131.0000
VU6	PROFT-	10.4695
VU6	DR6	104.8000
VU6	CU6	1.0000
VP6	PROFT-	1799.3732
VP6	DU6	1603.4021
VR6	PROFT-	5.2971
VR6	CU6	1.0000
VS7	PROFT-	420.2632
VS7	DU7	131.0000
VS7	DR7	131.0000
VU7	PROFT-	10.3830
VU7	DR7	104.8000
VU7	CU7	1.0000
VP7	PROFT-	1784.5056
VP7	DU7	1603.4021
VK7	PROFT-	5.2533
VK7	CU7	1.0000
VS8	PROFT-	416.7903
VS8	DU8	131.0000
VS8	DR8	131.0000
VU8	PROFT-	10.2772
VU8	DR8	104.8000
VU8	CU8	1.0000
VP8	PROFT-	1769.7590
VP8	DU8	1603.4021
VK8	PROFT-	5.2099
VK8	CU8	1.0000
VS9	PROFT-	413.3457
VS9	DU9	131.0000
VS9	DR9	131.0000
VU9	PROFT-	10.2121
VU9	DR9	104.8000
VU9	CU9	1.0000
VP9	PROFT-	1755.1331
VP9	DU9	1603.4021
VR9	PROFT-	5.1663
VR9	CU9	1.0000
VS10	PROFT-	409.9294
VS10	DU10	131.0000
VS10	DR10	131.0000
VU10	PROFT-	10.1277
VU10	DR10	104.8000
VU10	CU10	1.0000
VP10	PROFT-	1740.6274
VP10	DU10	1603.4021
VR10	PROFT-	5.1241
VR10	CU10	1.0000
VS11	PROFT-	406.5417
VS11	DU11	131.0000
VS11	DR11	131.0000
VU11	PROFT-	10.0440
VU11	DR11	104.8000
VU11	CU11	1.0000
VP11	PROFT-	1726.2422
VP11	DU11	1603.4021
VR11	PROFT-	5.0818
VR11	CU11	1.0000
VS12	PROFT-	403.1819
VS12	DU12	131.0000
VS12	DR12	131.0000
VU12	PROFT-	9.9610
VU12	DR12	104.8000
VU12	CU12	1.0000
VP12	PROFT-	1711.9763
VP12	DU12	1603.4021
VR12	PROFT-	5.0398
VR12	CU12	1.0000
VS13	PROFT-	399.8499
VS13	DU13	131.0000

VS13	DR13	111.0000
VU13	PROFT-	9.8706
VU13	DR13	104.8000
VU13	CU13	1.0000
VP13	PROFT-	1697.8279
VP13	DU13	1603.4021
VR13	PROFT-	4.9981
VR13	CU13	1.0000
VS14	PROFT-	396.5457
VS14	DU14	131.0000
VS14	DR14	131.0000
VU14	PROFT-	9.7779
VU14	DR14	104.8000
VU14	CU14	1.0000
VP14	PROFT-	1683.7971
VP14	DU14	1603.4021
VR14	PROFT-	4.9568
VR14	CU14	1.0000
VS15	PROFT-	395.2683
VS15	DU15	131.0000
VS15	DR15	131.0000
VU15	PROFT-	9.7160
VU15	DR15	104.8000
VU15	CU15	1.0000
VP15	PROFT-	1669.8811
VP15	DU15	1603.4021
VR15	PROFT-	4.9159
VR15	CU15	1.0000
VS16	PROFT-	390.0143
VS16	DU16	131.0000
VS16	DR16	131.0000
VU16	PROFT-	9.6357
VU16	DR16	104.8000
VU16	CU16	1.0000
VP16	PROFT-	1656.0808
VP16	DU16	1603.4021
VR16	PROFT-	4.8752
VR16	CU16	1.0000
VS17	PROFT-	386.7749
VS17	DU17	131.0000
VS17	DR17	131.0000
VU17	PROFT-	9.5561
VU17	DR17	104.8000
VU17	CU17	1.0000
VP17	PROFT-	1642.3943
VP17	DU17	1603.4021
VR17	PROFT-	4.8349
VR17	CU17	1.0000
VS18	PROFT-	383.5984
VS18	DU18	131.0000
VS18	DR18	131.0000
VU18	PROFT-	9.4771
VU18	DR18	104.8000
VU18	CU18	1.0000
VP18	PROFT-	1628.8206
VP18	DU18	1603.4021
VR18	PROFT-	4.7950
VR18	CU18	1.0000
VS19	PROFT-	380.4282
VS19	DU19	131.0000
VS19	DR19	131.0000
VU19	PROFT-	9.3988
VU19	DR19	104.8000
VU19	CU19	1.0000
VP19	PROFT-	1615.3638
VP19	DU19	1603.4021
VR19	PROFT-	4.7554
VR19	CU19	1.0000
VS20	PROFT-	377.2842
VS20	DU20	131.0000
VS20	DR20	131.0000
VU20	PROFT-	9.3211
VU20	DR20	104.8000
VU20	CU20	1.0000
VP20	PROFT-	1602.0100
VP20	DU20	1603.4021
VR20	PROFT-	4.7161
VR20	CU20	1.0000
VS21	PROFT-	374.1663
VS21	DU21	131.0000
VS21	DR21	131.0000
VU21	PROFT-	9.2441
VU21	DR21	104.8000
VU21	CU21	1.0000
VP21	PROFT-	1588.7710
VP21	DU21	1603.4021
VR21	PROFT-	4.6771
VR21	CU21	1.0000
VS22	PROFT-	371.0740
VS22	DU22	131.0000
VS22	DR22	131.0000
VU22	PROFT-	9.1677
VU22	DR22	104.8000
VU22	CU22	1.0000
VP22	PROFT-	1575.6404
VP22	DU22	1603.4021
VR22	PROFT-	4.6384
VR22	CU22	1.0000
VS23	PROFT-	368.0073
VS23	DU23	131.0000
VS23	DR23	131.0000
VU23	PROFT-	9.0919
VU23	DR23	104.8000
VU23	CU23	1.0000
VP23	PROFT-	1562.6189
VP23	DU23	1603.4021
VR23	PROFT-	4.6001
VR23	CU23	1.0000
VS24	PROFT-	364.9658
VS24	DU24	131.0000
VS24	DR24	131.0000
VU24	PROFT-	9.0168
VU24	DR24	104.8000
VU24	CU24	1.0000
VP24	PROFT-	1549.7046
VP24	DU24	1603.4021

```

VR24 PRUFT- 4.5621
VR24 CU24 1.0000
F1 0.0
    UU1 131.0000
    UU2 131.0000
    UU3 131.0000
    UU4 131.0000
    UU5 131.0000
    UU6 131.0000
    UU7 131.0000
    UU8 131.0000
    UU9 131.0000
    UU10 131.0000
    UU11 131.0000
    UU12 131.0000
    UU13 131.0000
    UU14 131.0000
    UU15 131.0000
    UU16 131.0000
    UU17 131.0000
    UU18 131.0000
    UU19 131.0000
    UU20 131.0000
    UU21 131.0000
    UU22 131.0000
    UU23 131.0000
    UU24 131.0000
    UR1 135.5042
    UR2 52.5042
    UR3 26.5042
    UR4 33.5042
    UR5 102.5042
    UR6 135.5042
    UR7 130.5042
    UR8 52.5042
    UR9 26.5042
    UR10 33.5042
    UR11 102.5042
    UR12 135.5042
    UR13 130.5042
    UR14 52.5042
    UR15 26.5042
    UR16 33.5042
    UR17 102.5042
    UR18 135.5042
    UR19 130.5042
    UR20 52.5042
    UR21 26.5042
    UR22 33.5042
    UR23 102.5042
    UR24 135.5042
    CU1 1.0000
    CU2 1.0000
    CU3 1.0000
    CU4 1.0000
    CU5 1.0000
    CU6 1.0000
    CU7 1.0000
    CU8 1.0000
    CU9 1.0000
    CU10 1.0000
    CU11 1.0000
    CU12 1.0000
    CU13 1.0000
    CU14 1.0000
    CU15 1.0000
    CU16 1.0000
    CU17 1.0000
    CU18 1.0000
    CU19 1.0000
    CU20 1.0000
    CU21 1.0000
    CU22 1.0000
    CU23 1.0000
    CU24 1.0000
    0.0

```

EU ROWS 72, COLS 96, LE ROWS 24, GE ROWS 24, E ROWS 24, NONZERO RHS'S 72, NONZERO MATRIX ELEMENTS

ITERATION	VAR IN	VAR OUT	OBJ FN
1	VP1		-154.934
2	VP2		-307.261
3	VP3		-457.978
4	VP4		-607.449
5	VP5		-755.686
6	VP6		-902.697
7	VP7		-1048.443
8	VP8		-1193.044
9	VP9		-1336.441
10	VP10		-1478.492
11	VP11		-1619.728
12	VP12		-1759.598
13	VP13		-1898.313
14	VP14		-2035.481
15	VP15		-2172.312
16	VP16		-2307.616
17	VP17		-2441.402
18	VP18		-2574.878
19	VP19		-2706.855
20	VP20		-2837.741
21	VP21		-2967.545
22	VP22		-3096.277
23	VP23		-3223.945
24	VP24		-3350.557
25	VU1		-3476.470
26	VU2		-3601.293
27	VU3		-3725.026
28	VU4		-3848.071
29	VU5		-3970.228
30	VU6		-4091.697
31	VU7		-4212.080
32	VU8		-4331.277
33	VU9		-4449.589
34	VU10		-4567.717
35	VU11		-4685.760
36	VU12		-4803.721

37	VU13	-3485.630
38	VU14	-3475.577
39	VU15	-3535.113
40	VU16	-3514.748
41	VU17	-3524.304
42	VU18	-3533.781
43	VU19	-3543.180
44	VU20	-3552.501
45	VU21	-3561.745
46	VU22	-3570.912
47	VU23	-3580.104
48	VU24	-3589.421

SOLUTION FEASIBLE

49	VR1	VU1	-3583.629
50	VR2	VU2	-3578.282
51	VR3	VU3	-3572.779
52	VR4	VU4	-3567.720
53	VR5	VU5	-3562.504
54	VR6	VU6	-3557.332
55	VR7	VU7	-3552.202
56	VR8	VU8	-3547.115
57	VR9	VU9	-3542.070
58	VR10	VU10	-3537.066
59	VR11	VU11	-3532.105
60	VR12	VU12	-3527.183
61	VR13	VU13	-3522.302
62	VR14	VU14	-3517.462
63	VR15	VU15	-3512.662
64	VR16	VU16	-3507.902
65	VR17	VU17	-3503.180
66	VR18	VU18	-3498.498
67	VR19	VU19	-3493.855
68	VR20	VU20	-3489.250
69	VR21	VU21	-3484.683
70	VR22	VU22	-3480.154
71	VR23	VU23	-3475.662
72	VR24	VU24	-3471.200

ITERATION 72 OBJ FN -3471.208

RANDOM PUMPING TERM -472.873

TOTAL OBJ FN -3444.340

BASIS VAR AMOUNT

BASIS VAR	AMOUNT	UNIT PROFIT	LOW	HIGH
VP1	0.000146	0.000000	-0.000000	-0.000000
VP2	0.001569	0.000000	-0.000000	-0.000000
VP3	0.001677	0.000000	-0.000000	-0.000000
VP4	0.001701	0.000000	-0.000000	-0.000000
VP5	0.001701	0.000000	-0.000000	-0.000000
VP6	0.001701	0.000000	-0.000000	-0.000000
VP7	0.001701	0.000000	-0.000000	-0.000000
VP8	0.001701	0.000000	-0.000000	-0.000000
VP9	0.001701	0.000000	-0.000000	-0.000000
VP10	0.001701	0.000000	-0.000000	-0.000000
VP11	0.001701	0.000000	-0.000000	-0.000000
VP12	0.001701	0.000000	-0.000000	-0.000000
VP13	0.001701	0.000000	-0.000000	-0.000000
VP14	0.001701	0.000000	-0.000000	-0.000000
VP15	0.001701	0.000000	-0.000000	-0.000000
VP16	0.001701	0.000000	-0.000000	-0.000000
VP17	0.001701	0.000000	-0.000000	-0.000000
VP18	0.001701	0.000000	-0.000000	-0.000000
VP19	0.001701	0.000000	-0.000000	-0.000000
VP20	0.001701	0.000000	-0.000000	-0.000000
VP21	0.001701	0.000000	-0.000000	-0.000000
VP22	0.001701	0.000000	-0.000000	-0.000000
VP23	0.001701	0.000000	-0.000000	-0.000000
VP24	0.001701	0.000000	-0.000000	-0.000000
DR1	136.504196	0.0	-2.189174	0.051497
DR2	52.534196	0.0	-2.181231	0.051021
DR3	26.534196	0.0	-2.165655	0.050599
DR4	33.534196	0.0	-2.147513	0.050181
DR5	102.534196	0.0	-2.130231	0.049767
DR6	135.534196	0.0	-2.112227	0.049355
DR7	130.504196	0.0	-2.095166	0.048948
DR8	52.534196	0.0	-2.077832	0.048543
DR9	26.534196	0.0	-2.060678	0.048142
DR10	33.534196	0.0	-2.043694	0.047744
DR11	102.534196	0.0	-2.026760	0.047349
DR12	135.534196	0.0	-2.010010	0.046956
DR13	130.504196	0.0	-1.993339	0.046570
DR14	52.534196	0.0	-1.976846	0.046185
DR15	26.534196	0.0	-1.960537	0.045802
DR16	33.534196	0.0	-1.944405	0.045425
DR17	102.534196	0.0	-1.928451	0.045050
DR18	135.534196	0.0	-1.912679	0.044677
DR19	130.504196	0.0	-1.897090	0.044307
DR20	52.534196	0.0	-1.881685	0.043941
DR21	26.534196	0.0	-1.866456	0.043578
DR22	33.534196	0.0	-1.851399	0.043219
DR23	102.534196	0.0	-1.836512	0.042861
DR24	135.534196	0.0	-1.821794	0.042507
VR1	1.000000	-5.521500	-10.913100	0.000000
VR2	1.000000	-5.475900	-10.822500	0.000000
VR3	1.000000	-5.430600	-10.733400	0.000000
VR4	1.000000	-5.385700	-10.644700	0.000000
VR5	1.000000	-5.341200	-10.556400	0.000000
VR6	1.000000	-5.297100	-10.468500	0.000000
VR7	1.000000	-5.253400	-10.381000	0.000000
VR8	1.000000	-5.210100	-10.294000	0.000000
VR9	1.000000	-5.167200	-10.207500	0.000000
VR10	1.000000	-5.124700	-10.121500	0.000000
VR11	1.000000	-5.082600	-10.036000	0.000000
VR12	1.000000	-5.040900	-9.951000	0.000000
VR13	1.000000	-5.000000	-9.866500	0.000000
VR14	1.000000	-4.959900	-9.782500	0.000000
VR15	1.000000	-4.920000	-9.700000	0.000000
VR16	1.000000	-4.880000	-9.618000	0.000000
VR17	1.000000	-4.840000	-9.536500	0.000000
VR18	1.000000	-4.800000	-9.455500	0.000000
VR19	1.000000	-4.760000	-9.375000	0.000000
VR20	1.000000	-4.720000	-9.295000	0.000000
VR21	1.000000	-4.680000	-9.215500	0.000000
VR22	1.000000	-4.640000	-9.136500	0.000000
VR23	1.000000	-4.600000	-9.058000	0.000000
VR24	1.000000	-4.562100	-8.980000	0.000000

VARIABLE PRODUCE COST

DD1	1.18273
DD2	1.16290
DD3	1.17051
DD4	1.14101
DD5	1.13158
DD6	1.12222
DD7	1.11295
DD8	1.10375
DD9	1.09463
DD10	1.08558
DD11	1.07661
DD12	1.06771
DD13	1.05889
DD14	1.05014
DD15	1.04146
DD16	1.03285
DD17	1.02432
DD18	1.01585
DD19	1.00746
DD20	0.99913
DD21	0.99087
DD22	0.98269
DD23	0.97456
DD24	0.96651
VS1	280.78442
VU1	5.37160
VS2	287.74121
VU2	5.34700
VS3	283.73076
VU3	5.30280
VS4	261.34574
VU4	5.25900
VS5	279.36030
VU5	5.21500
VS6	276.75415
VU6	5.17240
VS7	274.46680
VU7	5.12970
VS8	272.19873
VU8	5.08730
VS9	269.94877
VU9	5.04530
VS10	267.71872
VU10	5.00360
VS11	265.50562
VU11	4.96220
VS12	263.31128
VU12	4.92120
VS13	261.13525
VU13	4.88050
VS14	258.97729
VU14	4.84020
VS15	256.83691
VU15	4.80010
VS16	254.71449
VU16	4.76050
VS17	252.60931
VU17	4.72120
VS18	250.52177
VU18	4.68210
VS19	248.45128
VU19	4.64340
VS20	246.39831
VU20	4.60500
VS21	244.36174
VU21	4.56700
VS22	242.34224
VU22	4.52930
VS23	240.33916
VU23	4.49180
VS24	238.35337
VU24	4.45470

I	VS(I)	VU(I)	VP(I)	VR(I)
1	0.0	0.0	0.80146E-01	0.10000E 01
2	0.0	0.0	0.81566E-01	0.10000E 01
3	0.0	0.0	0.81697E-01	0.10000E 01
4	0.0	0.0	0.81701E-01	0.10000E 01
5	0.0	0.0	0.81701E-01	0.10000E 01
6	0.0	0.0	0.81701E-01	0.10000E 01
7	0.0	0.0	0.81701E-01	0.10000E 01
8	0.0	0.0	0.81701E-01	0.10000E 01
9	0.0	0.0	0.81701E-01	0.10000E 01
10	0.0	0.0	0.81701E-01	0.10000E 01
11	0.0	0.0	0.81701E-01	0.10000E 01
12	0.0	0.0	0.81701E-01	0.10000E 01
13	0.0	0.0	0.81701E-01	0.10000E 01
14	0.0	0.0	0.81701E-01	0.10000E 01
15	0.0	0.0	0.81701E-01	0.10000E 01
16	0.0	0.0	0.81701E-01	0.10000E 01
17	0.0	0.0	0.81701E-01	0.10000E 01
18	0.0	0.0	0.81701E-01	0.10000E 01
19	0.0	0.0	0.81701E-01	0.10000E 01
20	0.0	0.0	0.81701E-01	0.10000E 01
21	0.0	0.0	0.81701E-01	0.10000E 01
22	0.0	0.0	0.81701E-01	0.10000E 01
23	0.0	0.0	0.81701E-01	0.10000E 01
24	0.0	0.0	0.81701E-01	0.10000E 01

ITERATION = 1 SQRT(M.S.E.) = 0.11713E 00

APPENDIX J Basic Information on
Rio Sinaloa Study Area

Population of the valley in
which the study area is
located: 150,000 inhabitants

Area of the irrigated land: 460 Km²

Area of the aquifer: 1744 Km²

Main aquifer: Quaternary alluvium

Irrigation cycles and average
consumptive use: Spring (46.8 cm), summer
(77.7 cm) and winter (48 cm)

Main crops: Cotton, wheat, bastard saffron,
sorghum, corn, soybean and
cantaloupe.

Climate: Semiarid

Rainy season: July to October and sometimes
is extended to January

Average precipitation: 450 mm.

Monthly mean temperature: 29°C maximum and 17°C minimum

Annual mean evaporation: About 2300 mm

Topography of the study area: The area to the west of the
river slopes to the southwest
and descend from 45 m above
sea level to 20 m above sea
level. The area to the east of
the river slopes to the south-

west and descends from 65 m above sea level to sea level.

Pumping figures: East side of the river, 300 wells extracting $149 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3/\text{yr}$ (in 1971); west side of the river 240 wells extracting $50 \times 10^6 \text{ m}^3/\text{yr}$

Well depth distribution: About 68 wells with a depth greater than 50 m are located at the east side of the river; about 22 wells with a depth greater than 50 m are located at the west side of the river

Average aquifer transmissivity: $0.02 \text{ m}^2/\text{s}$

Average aquifer storage coefficient: 0.01

REFERENCES

- Aron, G., Optimization of conjunctively managed surface and ground water resources by dynamic programming, 158 pp., Water Resources Center Contribution No. 129, Univ. of California, Davis, California, 1969.
- Aron, G., and V. H. Scott, Dynamic programming for conjunctive water use, J. Hydraul. Div. Amer. Soc. Civil Eng., 97(HY5), 705-721, 1971.
- Abramowitz, M., and I. A. Stegun (Ed.), Handbook of Mathematical Functions with Formulas Graphs and Mathematical Tables, 1046 pp., Nat. Bureau of Standards, Applied Mathematics Series 55, Washington, D.C., 1972.
- Bear, J., Dynamics of Fluids in Porous Media, 764 pp., Elsevier, New York, 1972.
- Bear, J., and O. Levin, The optimal yield of an aquifer, Int. Assoc. Sci. Hydrol. Bull., Symp. Haifa, Publ. 72, 401-412, 1967.
- Bellman, R., Dynamic Programming, 340 pp., Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, New Jersey, 1957.
- Bredehoeft, J. D., and R. A. Young, The temporal allocation of ground water - a simulation approach, Water Resour. Res., 6(1), 3-21, 1970.
- Brown, G. B., and R. Deacon, Economic optimization of a single-cell aquifer, Water Resour. Res., 8(3), 557-564, 1972.
- Buras, N., Conjunctive operation of dams and aquifers, J. Hydraul. Div. Amer. Soc. Civil Eng., 89(HY6), 111-131, 1963.

- Burt, O. R., Optimal resource use over time with an application to ground water, *Management Sci.*, 11(1), 80-93, 1964a.
- Burt, O. R., The economics of conjunctive use of ground and surface water, *Hilgardia*, 36(2), 31-111, 1964b.
- Burt, O. R., Temporal allocation of groundwater, *Water Resour. Res.*, 3(1), 45-56, 1967a.
- Burt, O. R., Groundwater management under quadratic criterion functions, *Water Resour. Res.*, 3(3), 673-682, 1967b.
- Burt, O. R., Groundwater storage control under institutional restrictions, *Water Resour. Res.*, 6(6), 1540-1548, 1970.
- Chapman, T. G., Effects of ground-water storage and flow on the water balance, in *Water Resources Use and Management*, Melbourn Univ. Press, Australia, 290-301, 1964.
- Charnes, A., W. W. Cooper, and G. H. Symonds, Cost horizons and certainty equivalents: an approach to stochastic programming of heating oil, *Management Sci.*, 4(3), 235-263, 1958.
- Charnes, A., and W. W. Cooper, Chance-constrained programming, *Management Sci.*, 6(1), 73-80, 1959.
- Charnes, A., and W. W. Cooper, Deterministic equivalents for optimizing and satisficing under chance constraints, *Operations Res.*, 10(1), 18-39, 1963.
- Chorafas, D. N., *Systems and Simulation*, 503 pp., Academic Press, New York, 1965.
- Chow, V. T. (ed.), *Handbook of Applied Hydrology*, McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York, 1964.

- Chow, V. T., An introduction to systems analysis of hydrological problems, in Proc. of the Second Int. Seminar for Hydrology Professors, Utah State Univ., 15-41, 1970.
- Clarke, R. T., Mathematical Models in Hydrology, 282 pp., Food and Agriculture Organization, UN , Irrigation and Drainage Paper 19, Rome, 1973.
- Clarke, R. T., A review of some mathematical models used in hydrology, with observations on their calibration and use, J. Hydrol., 19, 1-20, 1973.
- Cornell, C. A., First-order analysis of model and parameter uncertainty, in International Symposium on Uncertainties in Hydrology and Water Resources, Tucson, Arizona, 1245-1274, 1972.
- Davis, S. N., and R. J. M. De Wiest, Hydrogeology, 463 pp., John Wiley, New York, 1967.
- De Garmo, E. P., Engineering Economy, 580 pp., The Macmillan Co., New York, 1960.
- Domenico, P. A., D. V. Anderson, and C. M. Case, Optimal ground-water mining, Water Resour. Res., 4(2), 247-255, 1968.
- Domenico, P. A., Concepts and Models in Groundwater Hydrology, 405 pp., McGraw-Hill, Inc., New York, 1972.
- Dooge, J. C. I., The routing of groundwater recharge through typical elements of linear storage, Int. Ass. Sci. Hydrol. Helsinki Publ. 52, 286-300, 1960.
- Dooge, J. C. I., Linear Theory of Hydrologic Systems, 327

- pp., U. S. Dept. of Agriculture, Tech. Bull., 1468, 1973.
- Downing, R. A., D. E. Oakes, W. B. Wilkinson, and C. E. Wright, Regional development of groundwater resources in combination with surface water, *J. Hydrol.*, 22, 155-177, 1974.
- Dracup, J., The optimum use of a groundwater and surface water system - a parametric linear programming approach, 134 pp., Water Resources Center Contribution No. 107, Univ. of California, Berkeley, California, 1966.
- Earlougher, R. C., Jr., H. J. Ramey Jr., F. G. Miller, and T. D. Mueller, Pressure distribution in rectangular reservoirs, *J. Petroleum Tech.*, 199-208, 1968.
- Eisel, L. M., Comments on the linear decision rule in reservoir management and design by Ch. Revelle, E. Joeres, and W. Kirby, *Water Resour. Res.*, 6(4), 1239-1241, 1970.
- Eliasson, J., Mechanism of ground-water reservoirs, *J. Nord. Hydrol.*, 2, 266-277, 1971.
- Eriksson, E., Groundwater time series: an exercise in stochastic hydrology, *J. Nord. Hydrol.*, 1(3), 181-205, 1970.
- Fiering, M. B., and B. B. Jackson, Synthetic Streamflows, 98 pp., Water Resour. Monogr. 1, AGU, Washington, D. C., 1971.
- Freeze, R. A., and P. A. Witherspoon, Theoretical analysis of regional groundwater flow, 2. Effect of water-table configuration and subsurface permeability variation, *Water Resour. Res.*, 3(2), 623-634, 1967.

- Gelhar, L. W., P. Y. Ko, H. H. Kwai, and J. L. Wilson,
Stochastic modeling of groundwater systems, 313 pp.,
Ralph M. Parsons Laboratory, Report No. 189, Massachusetts
Inst. of Technology, Cambridge, Mass., 1974.
- Gelhar, L. W., and J. L. Wilson, Ground-water quality modeling,
Groundwater 12(6), 399-408, 1974.
- Hadley, G., Nonlinear and Dynamic Programming, 484 pp.,
Addison-Wesley, Reading, Massachusetts, 1964.
- Hall, W. H., and J. A. Dracup, Water Resources Systems
Engineering, 372 pp., McGraw-Hill, New York, 1970.
- Hillier, F. S., and G. J. Lieberman, Introduction to Operations
Research, 639 pp., Holden-Day, San Francisco, Cal., 1972.
- Jenkins, G. M., and D. G. Watts, Spectral Analysis and its
Applications, 525 pp., Holden-Day, San Francisco, Cal.,
1968.
- Kirby W., C. Revelle, and E. Joeres, Reply, Water Resour.
Res., 6(4), 1242-1245, 1970.
- Kisiel, Ch. C., Time series analysis of hydrologic data, in
Advances in Hydroscience, Vol. 5, edited by V. T. Chow,
1-119 pp., Academic, New York, 1969.
- Kraijenhoff Van de Leur, D. A., A study of non-steady ground-
water flow with special reference to a reservoir-coefficient,
Ingenieur, No. 19, 87-94, 1958.
- Kuester, J. L., and J. H. Mize, Optimization Techniques with
Fortran, 500 pp., McGraw-Hill, New York, 1973.
- Longenbaugh, R. A., Determining optimum policies for conjunctive
use of ground and surface water using linear programming,

- paper presented at Hydraul. Div. Spec. Conf., Amer. Soc. of Civil Eng., Minneapolis, Minn., 14 pp., Aug. 1970.
- Loucks, D. P., Some comments on linear decision rules and chance constraints, *Water Resour. Res.*, 6(2), 668-671, 1970.
- Lumley, J. L., and H. A. Panofsky, *The Structure of Atmospheric Turbulence*, 239 pp., Interscience Publishers, New York, 1964.
- Maass, A., MM. Hufschmidt, R. Dorfman, H. A. Thomas, Jr., S. A. Marglin, and G. M. Fair, *Design of Water Resources Systems*, 620 pp., Harvard Univ. Press, Cambridge, Mass., 1966.
- Maddock, T., III, Algebraic technological function from a simulation model, *Water Resour. Res.* 8(1), 129-134, 1972a.
- Maddock, T., III, A ground-water planning model - a basis for a data collection network, in *International Symposium on Uncertainties in Hydrology and Water Resources*, Tucson, Arizona, 1105-1130, 1972b.
- Maddock, T., III, Management model as a tool for studying the worth of data, *Water Resour. Res.*, 9(2), 270-280, 1973.
- Maddock, T., III, The operation of a stream-aquifer system under stochastic demands, *Water Resour. Res.*, 10(1), 1-10, 1974.
- Matthews, C. S., F. Brons, and F. Hazebroek, A method for determination of average pressure in a bounded reservoir, *Petroleum Trans.*, AIME, 182-191, 1954.

- Miller, K. S., Engineering Mathematics, 417 pp., Dover Publications, New York, 1963.
- Milligan, J. H., Optimizing conjunctive use of groundwater and surface water, 160 pp., Utah Water Research Laboratory, PRWG 42-4T, Utah State Univ., Logan, Utah, 1970.
- Mood, A. M., and F. A. Graybill, Introduction to the Theory of Statistics, 443 pp., McGraw-Hill, New York, 1963.
- Moody D. W., and T. Maddock, III, A planning model for preliminary network design, in International Symposium on Uncertainties in Hydrology and Water Resources, Tucson, Arizona, 1059-1069, 1972.
- Morel-Seytoux, H. J., A simple case of conjunctive surface-ground-water management, Ground Water, 13(6), 506-515, 1975.
- Nayak, S. C., and S. R. Arora, A note on linear decision rules, Water Resour. Res., 6(6), 1789-1790, 1970.
- Nieswand, G. H., and M. L. Granstrom, A chance-constrained approach to the conjunctive use of surface waters and groundwaters, Water Resour. Res., 7(6), 1425-1436, 1971.
- Papoulis, A., Probability, Random Variables, and Stochastic Processes, 583 pp., McGraw-Hill, New York, 1965.
- Parzen, E., Stochastic Processes, 324 pp., Holden - Day Inc., San Francisco, California, 1962.
- Ramey, H. J., A. Kumar, and M. S. Gulati, Gas Well Test Analysis under Water-Drive Conditions, 312 pp., American Gas Association, Arlington, Virginia, 1973.
- Revelle C., E. Joeres, and W. Kirby, The linear decision

- rule in reservoir management and design. 1, Development of the stochastic model, *Water Resour. Res.*, 5(4), 767-777, 1969.
- Robinson, T. W., *Phreatophytes*, U. S. Geol. Surv. Water Supply Pap. 1423, 84 pp., 1958.
- Saleem, Z. A., and C. E. Jacob, *Dynamic programming model and quantitative analysis Roswell basin, New Mexico*, 180 pp., Water Resources Research Institute, Las Cruces, New Mexico, 1971.
- Syski, R., *Stochastic Differential Equations*, in *Modern Nonlinear Equations*, edited by T. L. Soaty, pp. 346-456, McGraw-Hill, New York, 1967.
- Taylor, O. J., *Optimization of conjunctive use of water in a stream-aquifer system, using linear programming*, U.S. Geol. Surv. Prof. Pap. 700c, c218-c221, 1970.
- Van Schilfgaarde, Jan, *Transient design of drainage systems*, *J. Irrig. and Drainage Div. Amer. Soc. Civil Eng.*, 91(IR3), Proc. Paper 4458, 9-22, 1965.
- Venetis, C., *A study on the recession of unconfined aquifer*, *Bull. Int. Ass. Sci. Hydrol.*, XIV, 4(12), 119-125, 1969.
- Wagner, H. M., *Principles of Operations Research*, 933 pp., Prentice-Hall, Englewood Cliffs, New Jersey, 1969.
- Yevjevich, V., *Stochastic Processes in Hydrology*, 276 pp., Water Resources Publications, Fort Collins, Colorado, 1972.
- Yevjevich, V., *Determinism and stochasticity in hydrology*, *J. Hydrol.*, 22, 225-238, 1974.
- Young, R. A., and J. D. Bredehoeft, *Digital computer simulation*

for solving management problems of conjunctive groundwater and surface water systems, *Water Resour. Res.*, 8(3), 533-556, 1972.

Yu, W., and Y. Y. Haines, Multilevel optimization for conjunctive use of groundwater and surface water, *Water Resour. Res.*, 10(4), 625-636, 1974.