

Probabilistic runoff volume forecasting in risk-based optimization for RTC of urban drainage systems

Löwe, Roland; Vezzaro, Luca; Mikkelsen, Peter Steen; Grum, Morten; Madsen, Henrik

Published in: Environmental Modelling & Software

Link to article, DOI: 10.1016/j.envsoft.2016.02.027

Publication date: 2016

Document Version Peer reviewed version

Link back to DTU Orbit

Citation (APA):

Löwe, R., Veźzaro, L., Mikkelsen, P. S., Grum, M., & Madsen, H. (2016). Probabilistic runoff volume forecasting in risk-based optimization for RTC of urban drainage systems. *Environmental Modelling & Software*, *80*, 143-158. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.envsoft.2016.02.027

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

• Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.

- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

3

6

Probabilistic runoff volume forecasting in risk-based optimization for RTC of urban drainage systems

Roland Löwe^{a, c,*,**}, Luca Vezzaro^{b, c}, Peter Steen Mikkelsen^b, Morten Grum^c, Henrik 4 5 Madsen^a

*present address: Department of Environmental Engineering, Technical University of Denmark (DTU

7 8 9 Environment), Miljøvej B115, Kgs. Lyngby, 2800, Denmark

*correspondence to: rolo@env.dtu.dk, +45-27600355 10

^aDepartment of Applied Mathematics and Computer Science, Technical University of Denmark (DTU

11 12 Compute), Matematiktorvet B303, Kgs. Lyngby, 2800, Denmark, hmad@dtu.dk

13 ^bDepartment of Environmental Engineering, Technical University of Denmark (DTU Environment), Miljøvej

- 14 B115, Kgs. Lyngby, 2800, Denmark, luve@env.dtu.dk, psmi@env.dtu.dk
- 15 ^cKrüger A/S, Veolia Water Solutions and Technologies, Gladsaxevej 363, Søborg, 2860, Denmark,
- 16 mg@kruger.dk 17

18 ABSTRACT

- 19 This article demonstrates the incorporation of stochastic grey-box models for urban runoff
- 20 forecasting into a full-scale, system-wide control setup where setpoints are dynamically
- 21 optimized considering forecast uncertainty and sensitivity of overflow locations in order to 22 reduce combined sewer overflow risk.
- 23 The stochastic control framework and the performance of the runoff forecasting models are
- 24 tested in a case study in Copenhagen (76 km2 with 6 sub-catchments and 7 control points)
- 25 using 2-hour radar rainfall forecasts and inlet flows to control points computed from a variety
- 26 of noisy/oscillating in-sewer measurements.
- 27 Radar rainfall forecasts as model inputs yield considerably lower runoff forecast skills than
- 28 "perfect" gauge-based rainfall observations (ex-post hindcasting). Nevertheless, the stochastic
- 29 grey-box models clearly outperform benchmark forecast models based on exponential 30 smoothing.
- 31 Simulations demonstrate notable improvements of the control efficiency when considering
- 32 forecast information and additionally when considering forecast uncertainty, compared with
- optimization based on current basin fillings only. 33 34

KEYWORDS 35

36 stochastic grey-box model, probabilistic forecasting, real-time control, urban hydrology, radar rainfall, storm water management 37

- 38
- 39 Revised
- 40 2016/02/14
- 41

42 1 **INTRODUCTION**

43 This article investigates the application of probabilistic multistep runoff forecasts generated

- 44 by simple, conceptual stochastic models (in the form of so-called stochastic grey-box models)
- 45 in system-wide, forecast-based optimization for real-time control (RTC) of urban drainage
- 46 networks. A drainage network is considered to be controlled in real time if process variables
- are monitored in the system and used to operate actuators affecting the flow process (Schütze 47
- 48 et al., 2004). RTC is an efficient tool for responding to changing demands that are defined for

49 urban drainage systems (Rauch et al., 2005, Vanrolleghem et al., 2005) and is increasingly

- 50 applied to operate these infrastructures in an efficient manner (for example, Mollerup et al.,
- 51 2013, Nielsen et al., 2010; Pabst et al., 2011; Pleau et al., 2005; Puig et al., 2009 and Seggelke
- 52 et al., 2013). In particular, RTC can support the operation of combined sewer systems, which
- 53 are used in most of the larger European cities and are constantly challenged by increased
- impervious area and changing rainfall patterns (Arnbjerg-Nielsen et al., 2013; Willems et al.,
 2012).
- 55 56

57 Most RTC implementations aim to minimize the volume of combined sewer overflows

58 (CSO). This is achieved by dynamically controlling flows in the system to achieve an optimal

- exploitation of the available storage volume, especially in cases with an uneven spatial
 rainfall distribution over the catchment. RTC is classically performed using static if-then-else
- rainfall distribution over the catchment. RTC is classically performed using static if-then-else rules (Seggelke et al., 2013, for example) that are optimized off-line based on heuristics and
- 61 rules (Seggelke et al., 2013, for example) that are optimized off-line based on heuristics and 62 model simulations, but mathematical optimization routines are also applied (Pleau et al., 2005,
- Buig et al.,2009).
- 64

65 Clearly, information on the future evolution of the urban drainage system (i.e., the runoff

- 66 expected in the near future) should contribute to a more efficient optimization of the
- 67 controlled system. Significant developments have been made in the last decade in terms of
- radar-based rainfall forecasting (Krämer et al., 2005, 2007; Thorndahl et al., 2014; Vieux and

69 Vieux, 2005) and radar-based urban runoff forecasting (Achleitner et al., 2009; Löwe et al.,

- 70 2014a; Schellart et al., 2014; Thorndahl and Rasmussen, 2013), paving the way for the
- 71 application of radar-based online runoff forecasts in RTC.
- 72

73 However, multiple sources of uncertainty affect the runoff forecasts generated by models (see 74 the discussions in Deletic et al. (2012), Schilling and Fuchs (1986) and Sun and Bertrand-75 Krajewski (2013)): input uncertainty, model structure uncertainty, parameter uncertainty and 76 measurement uncertainty (e.g., level and flow). The examples in Schilling and Fuchs (1986), 77 Schilling (1991) and Schellart et al. (2011) demonstrate that uncertainty of the measured and 78 forecasted rainfall input is often the major factor affecting the online performance of runoff 79 forecast models. Previous studies have evaluated the accuracy of online runoff forecasts based 80 on radar rainfall input in an urban setting and found the forecast performance diminished for 81 lead-times greater than 90 minutes (Achleitner et al., 2009) and between 60 and 120 minutes 82 (Thorndahl and Rasmussen, 2013).

83

84 Considering the large uncertainties of urban runoff forecasts, it has been hypothesized that the 85 uncertainties may adversely impact the efficiency of forecast-based RTC schemes (Breinholt et al., 2008; Schütze et al., 2004). As a result, RTC algorithms that account for these 86 87 uncertainties in mathematical optimization have recently emerged. Examples include the tree-88 based control algorithm, which was proposed for control of (non-urban) drainage water 89 systems by Maestre et al. (2013), and the dynamic overflow risk assessment (DORA; Vezzaro 90 and Grum, 2014) for urban drainage systems that performs a system-wide optimization based 91 on the computed risk of overflow.

92

93 Accounting for the uncertainty of runoff forecasts in RTC requires that an estimate of this

- 94 uncertainty is provided as an input to the control algorithm. The literature on uncertainty
- 95 quantification in rainfall runoff modelling is abundant. Informal approaches (GLUE) are
- 96 popular in urban hydrology (e.g., Dotto et al., 2012; Freni et al., 2009; Vezzaro and

- 97 Mikkelsen, 2012), while more formal Bayesian approaches without (Del Giudice et al.,
- 98 2015a; Kavetski et al., 2006) and with data assimilation routines (Moradkhani et al., 2012;
- 99 Vrugt et al., 2013) were developed mostly for natural catchment hydrology. Model estimation
- 100 and updating in these approaches are commonly based on Monte Carlo simulations, and they
- 101 can therefore be difficult to apply in an online context (Del Giudice et al., 2015b).
- 102
- 103 Recent research in the Storm- and Wastewater Informatics Project (SWI, 2015) has therefore
- 104 focused on the application of so-called stochastic grey-box models for probabilistic online 105 runoff forecasting over multiple prediction horizons. This type of model combines a simple
- and fast stochastic model structure with a data assimilation routine in the form of an extended
- 107 Kalman filter, allowing the user to generate probabilistic forecasts with time-dynamic
- 108 uncertainty quantification. The application of such models in urban hydrology was first tested
- by Carstensen et al. (1998) and Bechmann et al. (1999). Breinholt et al. (2011, 2012)
- 110 developed rainfall-runoff model structures, and the performance of these for probabilistic
- 111 flow predictions was assessed by Thordarson et al. (2012). Finally, Löwe et al. (2014a)
- analysed the influence of different rainfall inputs on runoff forecast performance, while
- 113 different options for parameter estimation were compared in Löwe et al. (2014b).
- 114

The work presented here combines these recent developments: probabilistic, radar-rainfall based runoff forecasts from stochastic grey-box models have been combined with a risk-based optimization algorithm that accounts for time-dynamic forecast uncertainty (DORA, Vezzaro and Grum, 2014) and integrated into a full-scale, system-wide RTC setup, providing a proof of concept for the case of applying stochastic forecasts in RTC. The setup is tested in a case study with noisy real-world measurements and six sub-catchments with distinctly different characteristics. The purpose of this article is to

- demonstrate this new, stochastic, system-wide real-time control setup for urban drainage systems,
- evaluate how the consideration of runoff forecast uncertainty influences the efficiency of the RTC scheme, and
- evaluate what runoff forecast performance and what control efficiency can be obtained with stochastic grey-box models and radar rainfall input under realistic conditions in a variety of catchments.
- 128 129

122

123

124

125

126

127

- 130 The new control setup applies stochastic grey-box models for runoff forecasting. However,
- 131 other probabilistic forecasting methods (such as the ones presented by Todini (2008), Van
- 132 Steenbergen et al. (2012), Vrugt et al. (2005) or Weerts et al. (2011)) could easily be
- 133 implemented. Thus, the proposed framework is generic in this respect.
- 134

135 **2 Methods**

136 2.1 STOCHASTIC REAL-TIME CONTROL SETUP

137 **2.1.1 General Setup**

- 138 A system-wide control setup was applied. Control points need to be defined by the users and
- are typically located at major actuators, such as the outlet of storage basins or pumping
- 140 stations. Runoff forecasts were generated by a separate stochastic model (Section 2.1.2) for
- 141 the inflow to each control point. Based on the inflow forecasts and online observations of the
- 142 current basin fillings, the DORA algorithm was then used to optimize the outflow from all of
- 143 the control points, aiming to minimize the overall overflow risk in the catchment (Section

- 144 2.1.3). A control time step of 2 minutes was applied and a maximum forecast horizon of 2
- hours was considered. Correspondingly, new runoff forecasts were generated every 2 minutes
- 146 for 2 hours into the future with a resolution of 60 time steps (intervals of 2 minutes).
- 147
- 148 The online operation of the framework is illustrated in Figure 1. It can be split into 5 steps
- 149 that are executed every 2 minutes:
- Data collection the runoff forecast models apply rainfall forecasts as an input and flow observations for updating the model states. In addition, the current basin filling is required as an input to the control algorithm. Depending on the source, these data are either downloaded as text files through FTP connections or directly imported from the SCADA system through the standard OPC UA (Unified Architecture) protocol (Mahnke et al., 2009).
- 156 2. Pre-processing – flow observations are required to update the states of the runoff forecast models (Section 2.1.2). However, for many control points, no direct inflow 157 158 measurements are available. Instead, these need to be constructed by "software 159 sensors" from a combination of indirect measurements (such as level in and outflow from a storage basin). Catchment specific pre-processing routines (see appendix A) 160 161 are therefore implemented in this module. The software WaterAspects (Grum et al., 162 2004) was applied for this step in our work, while future implementations will apply 163 JEP and R scripts.
- Runoff forecasting a separate stochastic grey-box model (Section 2.1.2) is applied for forecasting the inflow volume to each control point. The model output is a distribution of forecasted runoff volume for each considered horizon, discretized in 50 quantiles from 1 to 99 %. Each model in our work was implemented as an executable (FORTRAN-based) that communicates with the control server via text files. An Rbased setup that directly communicates with the database is currently being implemented.
- Identifying set points for the actuators using the DORA algorithm (Section 2.1.3) –
 this module is implemented in JAVA. The overflow risk for each control point is
 computed based on the current basin filling and the forecasted distribution of runoff
 volumes in the form of quantiles.
 - 5. The new outflow set points for the actuators are sent to the SCADA system through the standard OPC UA protocol.
- A control software is required to manage the execution of the tasks mentioned above, the
 communication with external data sources and actuators, data storage in a database and
- 180 quality control of measurements and simulation results. In our case, the STAR[®] Utility
- 181 SolutionsTM framework (Nielsen and Önnerth, 1995) was used. The framework is
- 182 implemented in JAVA but allows for the execution of external programs written in, for
- 183 example, R. The framework can be installed either on a dedicated control server, on a cloud
- 184 server or within the end-user's own virtual server environment.
- 185



Figure 1. Technical integration of stochastic grey-box models and DORA in a STAR Utility SolutionsTM control setup.

190 2.1.2 Runoff Forecasting Using Stochastic Grey-Box Models

191 Model Structure

192 A simple cascade of three linear reservoirs was applied for forecasting runoff volume in the inflow to a single control point. We did not consider more elaborated model structures as the 193 purpose of this article is to provide a proof of concept. The model was set up as a stochastic 194 grey-box model in a state-space layout as described by Breinholt et al. (2011) and shown in 195 196 state equations (1), which are implemented using stochastic differential equations (SDEs) and observation equation (2). The setup includes an extended Kalman filter, which updates the 197 198 model states whenever new flow observations become available (Kristensen et al., 2004). The 199 model was implemented in the open source software CTSM-R (Juhl et al., 2013). 200

$$d\begin{bmatrix} S_{1,t} \\ S_{2,t} \\ S_{3,t} \\ a_0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} A \cdot P + a_0 - \frac{1}{K} S_{1,t} \\ \frac{1}{K} S_{1,t} - \frac{1}{K} S_{2,t} \\ \frac{1}{K} S_{2,t} - \frac{1}{K} S_{3,t} \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} dt + \begin{bmatrix} \sigma_1 S_{1,t} \\ \sigma_2 S_{2,t} \\ \sigma_3 S_{3,t} \\ \sigma_4 \cdot I \end{bmatrix} d\omega_t$$
(1)

$$Y_{k} = \frac{1}{K}S_{3,k} + D_{k} + e_{k}$$
(2)

202 S_1 , S_2 and S_3 correspond to the storage states, A to the effective catchment area, P to the rain intensity, a_0 to the mean dry weather flow and K to the travel time constant. The uncertainty 203 204 of model predictions is described in the so-called diffusion term, which is driven by a vector 205 Wiener process $d\omega_t$ (Iacus, 2008). Considering a time step Δt , an increment $\Delta \omega_t$ of this process is Gaussian with mean 0 and covariance $diag(\Delta t, \Delta t, \Delta t, \Delta t)$. The parameters σ_i scale 206 207 the standard deviation of the diffusion process, which here increases linearly with the state value S_i . We have included the mean dry weather flow a_0 as a state to allow the model to 208 adapt to varying dry weather flows, which we have observed in some of the catchments 209 210 considered in our case study. The index I was 1 during the updating step of the extended 211 Kalman filter and 0 when generating runoff forecasts. The last-known estimate of a_0 was thus 212 applied during the generation of multistep runoff forecasts.

213

The observation equation (2) relates time-continuous model predictions and flow observations Y_k at discrete time steps k. This equation additionally includes a trigonometric function D to describe the variation of dry-weather flows (Breinholt et al., 2011) and the observation error e_k with standard deviation σ_e .

218

A Lamperti transformation (Iacus, 2008) was applied to the state equations (1) to remove the
dependency of the noise description on the state (Breinholt et al., 2011), as state-dependent
SDEs are difficult to simulate numerically (Iacus, 2008).

222

223 The diffusion term in Equation 1 accounts for the combined effects of input and model 224 structure uncertainty. The observation error e_k in Equation (2) can account for deficiencies in 225 the sensor measurements as well as for oscillations resulting, for example, from varying 226 pumping discharges. The latter were treated as noise if they occurred on short time scales of 227 only few minutes, as such variations have only little effect on the basin volumes at the control 228 points. The parameters A and K, the uncertainty scalings σ_i of the diffusion term and the 229 standard deviation of the observation error σ_e were estimated as part of the automated 230 calibration routine.

231

232 Parameter estimation

The model parameters were determined in an automated calibration routine. As an objective function, we minimized the multistep probabilistic flow forecast error as described by Löwe et al. (2014b). Using the state prediction equations of the extended Kalman filter (Eq. 17 and

18 in Kristensen et al. (2004)) and subsequently inserting the state predictions into the output

- 237 prediction equations (Eq. 11 and 12 in Kristensen et al. (2004)), a multistep flow forecast was
- 238 generated at each time step k for forecast horizons $i = 1 \dots 60$ with a resolution of $\Delta t =$
- 239 2 min. The forecasts were assumed Gaussian with mean $\hat{Y}_{k+i|k}$ and forecast covariance
- 240 $\hat{R}_{k+i|k}$. As an estimate for the probabilistic forecast error, we computed the continuous ranked
- 241 probability score $CRPS_{i,k}$ (Gneiting and Raftery, 2007) for each forecast horizon *i* as
- 242

$$CRPS_{i,k} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \left(\hat{F}_{k+i|k}(s) - \mathcal{H}(s > Y_{k+i}) \right)^2 ds , \qquad (3)$$

- 243 where $\hat{F}_{k+i|k}(s)$ is the cumulative normal distribution function of the flow forecast, Y_{k+i} is the
- 244 observed flow for the corresponding time step and \mathcal{H} is the Heaviside function that takes the
- value 0 if $s < Y_{k+i}$ and 1 otherwise. A closed-form solution of the *CRPS* is available for
- 246 Gaussian $\hat{F}_{k+i|k}(s)$. However, we chose to evaluate the integral in Eq. 3 numerically for

quantiles from 1 to 99 % in steps of 2 % to make the approach flexible for other distributional
assumptions. A measure of average performance over all forecast horizons was defined as

$$CRPS_k = \frac{1}{\sum_{i=1}^{60} (60 - i + 1)} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{60} ((60 - i + 1) \cdot CRPS_{i,k}) \right).$$
(4)

250

251 The RTC scheme requires forecasts of runoff volume as an input (see Section 2.1.3).

Therefore, more weight is put on flow forecasts for shorter forecast horizons in Eq. 4. These have a stronger influence on forecasts of runoff volume, which are generated as an integral over flow forecasts for several horizons. Finally, averaging the $CRPS_k$ over all time steps k provided the objective function for parameter estimation, which we aimed to minimize.

255 256

We applied the heuristic optimization algorithm described by Tolson and Shoemaker (2007) with 2500 objective function evaluations for automated parameter estimation. The dry weather flow variation *D* was fixed during the parameter estimation process. The

260 corresponding parameters were estimated separately during a dry weather period.

- 261
- 262 On-line forecast generation

To generate probabilistic runoff forecasts online, we performed scenario simulations of the model equations (1), starting with the updated states provided by the extended Kalman filter at time step *t* and ending at the maximum considered forecast horizon t + j. We considered N = 1000 scenarios. The forecasted flow for each scenario was integrated into a runoff volume. The resulting empirical distribution of forecasted runoff volumes served as input to the control algorithm in the form of quantiles with a resolution of 2 %. The approach was described in more detail by Löwe (2014) and Löwe et al. (2014a).

270

The generation of on-line runoff forecasts was based on scenario simulations of the stochastic

process without distributional assumption, while assumed-Gaussian forecasts were generated

using the extended Kalman filter during parameter estimation. This inconsistency is ashortcoming of the current setup, which was caused by the need to generate forecasts with

shortcoming of the current setup, which was caused by the need to generlimited computational effort during parameter estimation.

276

277 2.1.3 Real-time Control under Uncertainty

We applied the dynamic overflow risk assessment (DORA, see Vezzaro and Grum (2014) and
Vezzaro et al. (2014)) in this study. This approach, in the terminology of

280 Mollerup et al. (2015), acts on the optimization layer of the real-time control setup, aiming for

a system-wide (across the entire catchment) reduction of the risk of CSO using a forecast-

based mathematical optimization routine that accounts for both forecast uncertainty andimpact cost.

- 284 The overflow risk for each controlled point is calculated by
- subtracting the basin outflow volume over the forecast horizon and the currently free
 basin volume from the forecasted probability distribution of runoff volume, and
- 287
 2. multiplying the resulting probability distribution of overflow by a constant CSO unit cost that is user-defined for each overflow location (which reflects the sensitivity of the different receiving waters). More sensitive control points (e.g., discharging to bathing areas) are given higher CSO unit costs than less sensitive control points (e.g., discharging to bathing areas) are given higher CSO unit costs than less sensitive control points (e.g., discharging to bathing areas) are given higher CSO unit costs than less sensitive control points (e.g., discharging to bathing areas) are given higher CSO unit costs than less sensitive control points (e.g., discharging to bathing areas) are given higher CSO unit costs than less sensitive control points (e.g., discharging to bathing areas) are given higher CSO unit costs than less sensitive control points (e.g., discharging to bathing areas) are given higher CSO unit costs than less sensitive control points (e.g., discharging to bathing areas) are given higher CSO unit costs than less sensitive control points (e.g., discharging to bathing areas) are given higher CSO unit costs than less sensitive control points (e.g., discharging to bathing areas) are given higher CSO unit costs than less sensitive control points (e.g., discharging to bathing areas) are given higher CSO unit costs than less sensitive control points (e.g., discharging to bathing areas) are given higher CSO unit costs than less sensitive control points (e.g., discharging to bathing areas) are given higher costs than less sensitive control points (e.g., discharging to bathing areas) are given higher costs than less sensitive control points (e.g., discharging to bathing areas) are given higher costs than less sensitive control points (e.g., discharging to bathing areas) are given higher costs than less sensitive control points (e.g., discharging to bathing to bathi
- 291 discharging close to the wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) inlet).

292 The motivation for DORA is that stochastic forecasts are needed because a deterministic

- 293 forecast only leads to optimal control decisions if the loss function applied in optimization
- 294 does not depend on the uncertainty range associated with the forecasted variable. Even for the
- 295 simple CSO unit cost applied here, this is clearly not the case because the overflow risk is a
- 296 discontinuous function that is zero for small forecasted runoff volumes and increases linearly
- 297 for larger forecasted runoff volumes that would lead to an overflow of the basin.
- 298 At each control time step (in this study set to 2 minutes, i.e., each time a new set of
- 299 measurements from the catchment becomes available), DORA executes the following loop 300 (Figure 2):
- 301 Step 1: The available storage volume for each basin is calculated using online • 302 measurements.
- 303 Step 2: Runoff forecasts (and the associated uncertainty) are used to estimate the • 304 overflow risk for each controlled point. The probability density for the forecasted runoff volume is here described empirically by a set of quantiles provided by the 305 stochastic grey-box model. This is different from the approach in Vezzaro and Grum 306 307 (2014), who described forecast uncertainty analytically by a Gamma distribution with roughly fixed parameters. 308
- Step 3: A genetic algorithm (Meffert et al.) is used to identify the optimal set of flows 309 • 310 between all of the basins in the catchment, minimizing the total CSO risk. The settings 311 of the algorithm were defined for the study area after off-line tests, which focused on convergence (especially in dry weather conditions, when CSO risk is low and several 312 313 solutions form a Pareto front). By initializing the algorithm from the solution obtained at the previous time step, a population size of 100 and a maximum of 50 evolutions 314 315 were sufficient to obtain the desired convergence and reliability.
- When the CSO risk is low (e.g., after the end of a rain event with no new rainfall 316 within the forecast horizon), DORA empties the controlled system as quickly as 317 possible, with the highest priority on the control points with the largest CSO cost. 318
 - Step 4: Optimal set points for each basin outflow are sent to the actuators in the system.
- 322 DORA does not currently account for transport times in the optimization step 3 (see Vezzaro 323 and Grum (2014)). Instead, an immediate transfer of outflow volumes is assumed between the 324 control points.
- 325

319 320

321



storage volume

based on runoff forecast

risk across the catchment

sent to actuators

- 326 327 Figure 2. Schematic representation of the principal steps in DORA. The runoff volume V is forecasted with a 328 probability density function pdf. The part of the pdf used for computing the probability of overflow is marked 329 in red.
- 330
- 331

332 **2.2 PERFORMANCE EVALUATION**

333 We validated the stochastic forecasting and control setup in a two-step procedure. First, we

evaluated runoff forecasting performance by comparing forecasts and observations. Second,
 we determined the efficiency of the control setup with and without forecast uncertainty and

336 considering different rainfall inputs.

337 2.2.1 Evaluation of Forecast Quality

In the evaluation of forecast performance, we focused solely on lead times of 120 minutes (60 time steps) into the future because this is the longest horizon considered in the system-wide control scheme and may be considered as the worst case.

- 341
- 342 Point Forecast Skill
- 343 To assess point forecast quality, we applied a skill score defined as:
- 344

$$SPI = 1 - \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{N} \left(\widehat{V}_{k+60|k,50\%} - \sum_{k=1}^{60} Y_{k+i} \cdot \Delta t \right)^{2}}{\sum_{k=1}^{N} \left(\sum_{i=1}^{60} \left((1 - \lambda) \cdot Y_{SM,k-1} + \lambda \cdot Y_{k} \right) \cdot \Delta t - \sum_{i=1}^{60} Y_{k+i} \cdot \Delta t \right)^{2}}.$$
(5)

345 In equation 5, the numerator of the fraction is the mean squared error of the runoff volume

forecasts generated by the stochastic grey-box models. $\hat{V}_{k+60|k,50\%}$ is the median of the

probabilistic forecast of runoff volume generated by the stochastic grey-box models at time step k for a forecast horizon of 60 time steps. Y_k are the flow observations for the same

step k for a forecast horizon of 60 time steps. Y_k are the flow observations for the same period. These are available in intervals of $\Delta t = 2 \min$ and for a total of N time steps during an event for which the forecast skill is computed.

351

The denominator of the fraction in equation (5) is the mean squared error of a reference (or benchmark) forecast. As a reference, we considered locally constant runoff volume forecasts derived using exponential smoothing (Brown and Meyer, 1961). $Y_{SM,t-1}$ is the smoothed flow observation obtained for the previous time step and λ is the smoothing parameter, which was tuned to minimize the 60 step forecast error shown in the denominator in equation (5) during the calibration events described in section 3 and which can vary between 0 and 1.

358

We denote the resulting skill score as the smoothed persistence index (SPI) because it resembles the persistence index described in Bennett et al. (2013). However, a smoothed value is applied as the reference forecast instead of the last observation to make the score more robust towards the noisy flow measurements we encountered in our study. Ideally, the SPI would take a value of 1 for a perfect runoff forecast. Values smaller than 0 indicate that the forecasts generated by the stochastic grey-box models have a bigger mean squared error than the locally constant forecast based on exponential smoothing.

- 366
- 367 Forecast Reliability

368 In a probabilistic sense, it is desirable for the runoff forecasts to be reliable. An α %

369 prediction interval should empirically include α % of the observations, i.e., have an observed

370 coverage rate of α %. This property of the probabilistic forecasts can be assessed by plotting

371 predicted (or nominal) and observed coverage rates against each other in reliability diagrams

372 (Murphy and Winkler, 1977). Such diagrams are easier to understand and simplify

- 373 communication with practitioners and were therefore preferred over the probability integral
- transform used by, for example, Hemri et al. (2013) and Renard et al. (2010). Ideally,
- 375 predicted and observed coverage rates should be equal. Predicted coverage rates smaller than
- the observed coverage rates indicate an overestimation of forecast uncertainty by the model,
- 377 while the reverse indicates an underestimation of forecast uncertainty.
- 378

379 Sharpness of Forecasts

Finally, given a reliable probabilistic forecast, it is desirable for it to be as sharp (or "narrow") 380 381 as possible. A common measure is the sharpness or average width of an α % prediction interval. Jin et al. (2010) normalized this measure with the observation to obtain the average 382 383 interval width ARIL. The observation, however, is not related to the forecast and ARIL will be 384 difficult to evaluate if the observations approach zero, for example. We therefore applied a modified version of ARIL in which we normalized by the absolute value of the forecast 385 median. We applied this version for the 90 % prediction interval as a measure of forecast 386 387 uncertainty:

388

$$ARIL^{*} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{t=1}^{N} \frac{\hat{V}_{95\%,k+60|k} - \hat{V}_{5\%,k+60|k}}{\left| \hat{V}_{50\%,k+60|k} \right|}$$
(6)

In (6), $\hat{V}_{95\%,k+60|k}$, $\hat{V}_{50\%,k+60|k}$ and $\hat{V}_{5\%,k+60|k}$ correspond to the 95 %, 50 % and 5 % quantiles of the probabilistic runoff volume forecasts generated at time step t for a lead time of 120 minutes (60 time steps). Smaller values of *ARIL*^{*} indicate narrower prediction intervals.

392 2.2.2 Evaluation of Control Efficiency

To evaluate the effect of different forecast inputs on the efficiency of the system-wide control algorithm, simulations need to be performed in a model that describes flows in all relevant parts of the catchment, includes all actuators and allows for the evaluation of CSO in different scenarios (as demonstrated by Seggelke et al., 2013, for example). In the evaluation, this model (Section 3.2) replaces the actuators in Figure 1 and provides current basin fillings as input to the DORA algorithm.

399

400 To compare the performance of the setup in different scenarios, we focused on the evaluation

- 401 of overflow volumes and cost accumulated over a number of rain events. Reduced overflow
- 402 volumes in a scenario indicate an improved performance of the control system. The best
- 403 performing setup minimizes the total overflow cost, which corresponds to the overflow
- 404 volume weighted according to the expected environmental impact at the location of the
- 405 overflow structures. The weighting factors correspond to the CSO unit cost defined in DORA
- 406 for the different overflow structures (see Section 2.1.3 and Table 1 in Section 3)

407 2.2.3 Considered Scenarios

- Five scenarios were simulated to (i) evaluate the influence of runoff forecast uncertainty on
 the efficiency of system-wide control and (ii) estimate what forecast performance and what
 control efficiency can be achieved under realistic conditions:
- 411
- 412 1. AU Rain gauge based runoff forecast with uncertainty: The inputs for the
- stochastic grey-box models were the rain gauge measurements averaged for each sub-catchment (see Section 3.3.1).
- 415 Rainfall forecasts are required as model input for the generation of runoff forecasts. In

- this scenario, perfect rainfall forecasts derived from the rain gauge measurements for
 the forecast period where applied, both when calibrating the parameters of the runoff
 forecast models and when evaluating runoff forecasting performance and control
 efficiency.
- 420
 421
 421
 421
 421
 422
 422
 423
 423
 424
 424
 424
 425
 426
 427
 428
 429
 429
 429
 420
 420
 420
 420
 420
 420
 421
 421
 421
 422
 423
 424
 424
 424
 425
 425
 424
 426
 427
 428
 429
 429
 429
 420
 420
 420
 420
 420
 420
 420
 420
 421
 421
 421
 421
 422
 423
 424
 424
 424
 424
 424
 425
 424
 424
 425
 424
 425
 424
 425
 425
 425
 426
 427
 427
 428
 428
 429
 429
 429
 429
 420
 420
 420
 420
 420
 421
 421
 421
 421
 422
 423
 424
 424
 424
 424
 424
 424
 425
 425
 424
 425
 425
 425
 426
 427
 428
 428
 429
 429
 429
 429
 420
 420
 420
 420
 420
 420
 420
 420
 420
 420
 420
 420
 420
 421
 421
 421
 421
 422
 422
 423
 424
 423
 424
 424
 424
 424
 424
 424
 425
 424
 425
 424
 425
 424
 425
 424
 425
 425
 425
 425
 425
 426
 427
 428
 428
 428
- BU Radar based runoff forecast with uncertainty: Radar rainfall measurements and forecasts (see Section 3.3.1) were used as model input for calibrating the runoff forecast models, for evaluating runoff forecasting performance and for evaluating control efficiency.
- 4. BNU Radar based runoff forecast without uncertainty: Runoff forecasts were
 generated in the exact same way as in scenario BU. However, runoff forecast
 uncertainty was neglected when evaluating control performance by defining a forecast
 distribution with negligible standard deviation (the forecast median divided by 2500)
 around the forecast median.
- 434
 435
 435
 436
 437
 438
 438
 5. **REF No forecast**: This is a reference scenario for the evaluation of control efficiency only. In this scenario, DORA was used with a zero forecast as described by Vezzaro and Grum (2014). The control algorithm in this case simply attempts to equalize the basin fillings in the different sub-catchments, weighted according to the CSO unit cost at the overflow points (Table 1).
- 439

Scenario AU provides a base case with near-perfect rainfall forecast. Scenario BU, on the other hand, illustrates the runoff forecast quality and control efficiency that can be achieved with more realistic rainfall forecasts. As the skill of radar rainfall forecasts strongly decreases with the forecast horizon (Achleitner et al.,2009; Thorndahl and Rasmussen, 2013), scenario BU would be expected to yield lower runoff forecasting skill and reduced control efficiency as a result of the larger uncertainty of the rainfall input applied in this case.

447 If the consideration of forecast uncertainty has a (positive) impact on the performance of
448 system-wide control (as hypothesized by Vezzaro and Grum (2014) and Löwe et al. (2014b)),
449 then scenarios AU and BU should yield better control results than their counter parts ANU
450 and BNU.

- 451 un
- 452 Finally, the reference scenario REF provides a reasonable benchmark for the control
- 453 performance obtained when applying DORA with and without runoff forecasts as input.
- 454

455 **3** CASE STUDY

456 **3.1 CATCHMENT**



457 458

460

Figure 3. Catchment of the Lynetten wastewater treatment plant (WWTP) with control points in the combined sewer system and their respective sub-catchments.

461 The case study was designed to test the setup in a situation where the runoff forecast models need to cope with a variety of sub-catchments with different characteristics (Table 1), where 462 463 realistic rainfall forecasts are applied (Section 3.3.1) and where outflow measurements are far from perfect (Section 3.3.1 and Appendix C). We considered the catchment of the Lynetten 464 wastewater treatment plant (WWTP), which covers the central area of Copenhagen 465 (Denmark) and has a total area of approximately 76 km². The system-wide control strategy for 466 the Lynetten catchment considers seven sub-catchments and nine overflow structures (see 467 468 Figure 3), discharging to recipients with different sensitivities to CSO. Large storage basins 469 were implemented in the catchment over the past three decades as a result of efforts to 470 minimize CSO and secure bathing water quality in the harbour. The total storage capacity is 471 approximately 153,000 m³.

472

473 Separate stochastic grey-box models were implemented to forecast runoff volumes for the
474 inflow to each control point. No runoff forecasts were generated for the sub-catchments
475 discharging to the St. Annæ basin (SKT) and to the WWTP inlet (LYN) due to the very poor
476 quality of the available flow and water level observations. Only the current filling rate at these

- 477 control points was included in the optimization strategy to calculate the system-wide CSO
- 478 risk and no control decisions were determined for the corresponding actuators. The

479 Strandvænget sub-catchment comprises two control points at the basin outlet (STB) and the
480 pumping station (STP) to the WWTP. Runoff forecasts were only generated for the basin
481 inflow because the pumping station only receives inflows from STB. The characteristics of
482 the sub-catchments are summarized in Table 1.

483

| Sub-catchment | Imper- vious area [ha] | Storage available for RTC [m ³] | Max outflow [m ³ /s] | CSO unit cost [€m ³] | Controll ed by DORA | Typology |
|-----------------------|---------------------------------|--|---------------------------------------|---|---------------------------|--|
| Colosseum (COL) | 211 | 30,914 | 0.9 | 5 | Х | basin, pumped outflow |
| East Amager (EAM) | 228 | 44,425 | 2.1 | 25 | Х | storage pipes, pumped outflow |
| Kloevermarken (KLO) | 777 | 27,500 | 7.5 | 5 | X | pumping station with storage in upstream pipe network |
| Lersoeledning (LER) | 733 | 27,000 | 1.1 | 25 | Х | storage pipe with gate |
| Lynetten WWTP (LYN) | 564 | 76 | 5 (6.4 ^a) | 1 | | CSO at WWTP inlet |
| St. Annæ (SKT) | 77 | 7,987 | 1.3 | 5 | | basin, pumped outflow |
| Strandvaenget | | | | | | |
| Basin (STB) | 92 | 1,020 | 3.9 | 25 | Х | CSO structure, pumped outflow |
| Pumping station (STP) | - | 900 | 2.4 | 1 | Х | pumping station |
| West Amager (WAM) | 97 | 13,490 | 1.0 | 5 | Х | basin, pumped outflow |
| Total | 2.279 | 153.312 | | | | |

484Table 1. Main characteristics of the control points considered. Points not controlled by DORA are used to485calculate the CSO risk, but they are not considered as actuators in the optimization algorithm

3.2 CATCHMENT SIMULATION MODEL FOR THE EVALUATION OF CONTROL EFFICIENCY

488 EFFICIENCY
489 We used a conceptual model of the Lynetten catchment (implemented in WaterAspects 490 Grum et al., 2004) to evaluate the control efficiency. Following the procedure presented by
491 Borsanyi et al. (2008), this model was calibrated against a detailed MIKE URBAN model of
492 the catchment. A sketch of the model together with a comparison of simulated and observed
493 inflows to the control points EAM, COL, KLO, LER, SKT and WAM is provided in
494 Appendix C for all rain events.

496 The generation of runoff was described using the time area method, and a simple time delay 497 was applied for routing in pipes. Local controls existing in the catchment (e.g., pumping

498 based on filling degree in basins) were implemented in the model. They were overridden by

499 the DORA set points when system-wide control strategies were simulated.

⁴⁸⁶ 487

Rain gauge measurements averaged over each sub-catchment (see Section 3.3.1) were used as input for the catchment simulation model.

502 503

504 **3.3 DATA AND SIMULATION PERIODS**

505 **3.3.1 Rain Data and In-Sewer Observations**

A time step of 2 minutes was adopted for all of the datasets in this work, corresponding to the control time step of the existing control setup. Data available at higher temporal resolution were averaged, while data with lower temporal resolution were assumed constant in between observations ("zero order hold"). Online measurements were available for the period from November 2011 until September 2014.

511

Rain measurements from 29 gauges in the area (Figure 3) with a temporal resolution of 1

- 513 minute were available from the network of the Danish Water Pollution Committee (SVK), 514 which is operated by the Danish Meteorological Institute (Jørgensen et al., 1998). A time
- 514 which is operated by the Danish Meteorological Institute (Jørgensen et al., 1998). A time 515 series of mean areal rainfall was determined for each of the sub-catchments shown in Figure 3
- 516 using Thiessen polygons.
 - 517

518 Radar rainfall measurements and forecasts were available from the C-band radar of the

519 Danish Meteorological Institute in Stevns. The data had a resolution of 10 minutes in time and

520 2x2 km in space. The radar data were time-dynamically adjusted to rain-gauge data at every 521 time step as described in Löwe et al. (2014a), Thorndahl et al. (2013) and Thorndahl and

521 time step as described in Lowe et al. (2014a), Thorndani et al. (2013) and Thorndani and 522 Rasmussen (2013). A mean areal rainfall series was calculated for each sub-catchment from

523 the radar data by computing a weighted average of the rainfall measured in different pixels.

524 The weighting factors for this process were determined from the intersecting area between a 525 pixel and the corresponding sub-catchment.

526

527 Historical radar rainfall forecasts were made available for forecast horizons of 10, 20, 30, 60 528 and 90 minutes. We interpolated the forecasts for horizons of 40, 50, 70 and 80 minutes and 529 assumed that the rainfall forecasts for the 100 to 120 minute horizons were equal to the 530 forecast for the 90 minute horizon. This is a limitation in our work caused by the data that 531 were made available to us. In reality, a radar-based flow forecasting setup would be expected 532 to perform slightly better than presented here.

533

534 Various level and flow measurements from the sewer network were available for the 535 considered period (see Appendix A). In most sub-catchments, no direct measurements of the 536 inflow to the control point were provided. However, inflow measurements are required to 537 update the stochastic runoff forecasting models (see Equation 2) and to evaluate forecast 538 performance. They were computed from the available data using the water balance for each 539 control point and (in some cases) rating curves (see Appendix A). This approach led to noisy 540 flow measurements (see Appendix C) and proved problematic in the LER and STB 541 catchments, where negative measurements were obtained after rain events because the water 542 balance was not closed in some situations. Such systematically negative data were excluded 543 from the updating of the forecast models and from the evaluation of forecast performance. 544

545 **3.3.2** Selection of Rain Events

Rain events were identified from the mean areal radar rainfall measurements for the six sub-catchments where stochastic runoff forecasting models were implemented. An event was

- 548 considered to start when any of the mean areal rainfall series exceeded a threshold intensity of 549 0.2 mm/10 min. The event was considered to end when the mean areal rainfall series for all 550 sub-catchments were below this threshold for a period of at least 10 hours.
- 551

552 Based on these criteria, a total of 422 rain events were identified between Nov 2011 and Sep 2014. Many of these events were unlikely to cause CSO due to the small rainfall volumes 553 554 involved. In addition, significant data gaps were observed for many events. The number of 555 events under consideration was reduced in the three-stage procedure shown in Table 2.

556

557 Appendix B lists all 130 rain events identified after the first two stages of data inspection, while Appendix C depicts the observed inflow to the control points for these events. Rain 558 559 events that were identified as problematic during visual inspection were excluded from the evaluation of forecast performance in the corresponding catchment as well as from the 560 evaluation of control efficiency. These events are marked in the table in Appendix B and with 561 562 a grey background in Appendix C.

- 563 564 In total, between 114 and 127 rain events were considered for the evaluation of forecast 565 performance in the different sub-catchments, and 98 events were considered for the evaluation 566 of control efficiency. Four rain events were selected for estimating parameters of the forecast models. These were chosen to cover different rainfall characteristics (short, intense and 567 568 localized storms as well as widespread, long lasting rainfall) in different seasons and are 569 marked in Appendix B.
- 570

571 Table 2. Procedure for selecting rain events for simulation. The table shows the criteria applied in different 572 stages together with the number of rain events removed from the dataset according to the different criteria. 573

| Events removed | Criterion | | | | |
|--|--|--|--|--|--|
| according to | | | | | |
| Stage 1 (automated) – Remove insignificant events | | | | | |
| ¥ | observed maximum inflow at any of the considered control points (after | | | | |
| | smoothing) did not exceed the peak dry weather flow by at least a factor of | | | | |
| | 1.5, | | | | |
| 251 | or | | | | |
| | a simulation with a conceptual model of the whole catchment without system- | | | | |
| | wide RTC (Section 3.2) did not yield CSO and the maximum rain intensity | | | | |
| | averaged over the whole catchment was below 1 mm/30 min | | | | |
| Stage 2 (automated) – Remove events with bad data quality | | | | | |
| | at least 10 % of the in-sewer measurements were missing in at least one of the | | | | |
| 32 | considered sub-catchments, | | | | |
| | or | | | | |
| | the maximum radar rain intensity, averaged over a 30 min interval and the | | | | |
| 7 | whole Lynetten catchment, was higher than 30 mm/30 min while no | | | | |
| 1 | corresponding increased runoff was observed, | | | | |
| | or | | | | |
| 2 | both of the above issues | | | | |
| Stage 3 (manual) – Visual inspection of the remaining events | | | | | |
| 3 to 16 | inflow measurements had no relation to the rainfall measured by radar and | | | | |
| (depending on sub- | gauges | | | | |
| catchment under | | | | | |

consideration)

574

575

576 **4 Results**

577 **4.1 FORECAST PERFORMANCE**

578 This section focuses on the evaluation of runoff forecast performance obtained for the

- 579 stochastic grey-box models. As explained in Section 2.2.1, all of the results shown in the
- 580 following were derived for forecasts of runoff volume for a forecast horizon of 120 minutes,
- 581 corresponding to 60 control time steps.



582

Figure 4. Boxplot of point forecast skill (SPI) for all considered events in the different catchments using rain
 gauge observations (scenario AU, left) and radar rainfall observations and forecasts (scenario BU, right) as input
 for runoff forecasting.

586

Figure 4 shows the point forecast skill SPI obtained in all of the catchments. Skill values
larger than zero indicate that the stochastic grey-box models outperformed the benchmark
forecast derived from exponential smoothing. This was mostly the case; however, there is a
large spread of the results obtained for different rain events.

591 Very high forecast skill was obtained if rain gauge observations were used as input for runoff

592 forecasting and future rainfall was assumed known (scenario AU). In the more realistic

593 scenario based on radar rainfall forecasts (BU), the runoff forecasting skill was clearly

reduced and the spread of the SPI values obtained for different rain events increased. The

595 impact of this reduction on the efficiency of the control scheme is shown in the next section.

596

597 Lower forecast skills were generally obtained in the LER and STB sub-catchments for the AU

598 scenario due to the complexity of this part of the catchment with multiple gates and overflow 599 points. Such features are hard to capture with the very simple, data-driven forecast models

applied here (Equation 1). In addition, the derivation of flow measurements based on multiple

applied here (Equation 1). In addition, the derivation of now measurements based on multip

for rating curves and with part of the basin outflows not captured by the sensors lead to

602 significant uncertainty of the observed basin inflow.

604 Unexpectedly, in the STB catchment, the SPI tended to be higher in scenario BU than in

605 scenario AU. This difference was caused by an improved forecast skill of the stochastic grey-

box model during dry weather. The estimated uncertainty scaling of the model states (see 606

607 Equation 1) was larger in scenario BU due to the larger forecast errors caused by the radar

608 rainfall forecasts. As a result, the extended Kalman filter could more easily adapt the dry

609 weather state a_0 of the model (see Equation 1) to the rather strong variations of observed dry





611 612

Figure 5. Reliability diagrams (expected vs. observed coverage of the observations) for scenario AU (true 613 (observed) rainfall input from gauges in runoff forecasting) for the different catchments. The results for the 614 single events are marked in grey, while the median coverage rates over all events are marked as black, solid 615 lines.

616

617 Figure 5 shows reliability diagrams (expected against observed coverage rates) for scenario 618 AU for the different sub-catchments. The grey lines (showing results for the single events)

illustrate that, similar to the point forecasting skill SPI, the reliability of forecasts strongly 619

varied from event to event. Generally, the actual uncertainty of the forecasts was 620

621 underestimated. The worst results in terms of forecast reliability were obtained in the LER

622 and the STB catchment, where the point forecast skill was also lowest.

624 Similar results were obtained for scenario BU (Figure 6). However, the reliability of forecasts625 generally improved as a result of the larger forecast uncertainty.



626 627

Figure 6. Reliability diagrams (expected vs. observed coverage of the observations) for scenario BU (radar
rainfall forecasts as input in runoff forecasting) for the different catchments. The results for the single events are
marked in grey, while the median coverage rates over all events are marked as black, solid lines.

630

Figure 7 shows the ARIL^{*} values obtained for scenarios AU and BU in the different subcatchments. ARIL^{*} is an expression of the uncertainty of runoff forecasts (see Section 2.2.1).
As expected, the ARIL^{*} values strongly increased when radar rainfall forecasts were used as
model input in scenario BU instead of rain gauge observations (with assumed perfect rainfall

- 635 forecast) in scenario AU (Figure 7).
- 636
- An exception was again the STB catchment, where only a very minor increase in forecast
 uncertainty was observed for scenario BU. This result fits well with the improved point
- 639 forecasting skill obtained in this catchment.
- 640



641
642 Figure 7. Boxplot of prediction interval width (ARIL^{*}) for all considered events in the different catchments
643 using rain gauge observations (scenario AU, left) and radar rainfall forecasts (scenario BU, right) as input for
644 runoff forecasting.

646 **4.2 Efficiency of System-wide Real-Time Control**

647 The total overflow volumes and cost obtained for the considered scenarios are shown in 648 Figure 8. In the reference scenario REF, overflow occurred for 87 of the considered rain 649 events, leading to a total overflow volume of $0.95 \cdot 10^6 m^3$ (Figure 8, left) and $12.0 \cdot 10^6$ 650 units of overflow cost (Figure 8, right).

651

645

652 Including forecast information in the control scheme in all cases lead to a strong reduction of overflow volumes and cost. As expected, overflow volumes and cost were smallest for 653 654 scenarios AU and ANU because the future rainfall was considered known during the generation of runoff forecasts. Control efficiency was reduced if radar rainfall measurements 655 and forecasts were used as input to the stochastic runoff forecasting models (for example, 656 657 scenario ANU vielded 15 % lower overflow volume and 20 % lower overflow cost than scenario BNU). Nevertheless, in scenarios BU and BNU, the amount of overflow was also 658 659 greatly reduced compared to the reference scenario REF.

660

661 The results obtained by the system-wide control scheme improved further if the uncertainty of the runoff forecasts was accounted for. The total overflow cost (i.e., the objective function of 662 the control scheme) and volume in scenario AU were reduced by 33 % compared to scenario 663 ANU (Figure 8). In scenario BU, the total overflow volume was reduced only minimally 664 compared to scenario BNU (Figure 8). This result was caused by a strong increase in forecast 665 uncertainty at control point KLO. As a result, the optimization routine frequently assigned 666 667 high outflows to this control point (reducing overflow volumes almost to zero), while outflows from STP were frequently minimized (leading to a strong increase of overflow 668 volumes at this point). However, the total overflow cost in this scenario was reduced by 20 % 669

670 compared to scenario BNU, meaning that CSO were diverted from more to less sensitive 671 recipients.

672



673 674

675

Figure 8. Total overflow volume (left) and cost (right) over all events and catchments in the different scenarios.

676 **5 DISCUSSION**

677 5.1 DEPENDENCY OF RUNOFF FORECAST SKILL ON CATCHMENT AND RAINFALL INPUT

On average, the stochastic grey-box models outperformed the exponential smoothing
benchmark in all of the considered sub-catchments. However, the forecast skill varied
strongly between catchments and rain events.

681

682 If future rainfall was assumed to be known (scenario AU), the highest forecast skill was obtained for the smaller catchments (EAM, COL, WAM - see Figure 4), where a reservoir 683 cascade could suitably describe the runoff processes. For the more complex catchments, 684 forecasts could be improved if somewhat more complex model structures were considered 685 (Del Giudice et al. 2015a, Löwe et al. 2014a). However, simple models are desirable for 686 687 online purposes (see the discussion in Harremoës and Madsen (1999)) and the work of Del Giudice et al. (2015a) demonstrated only limited improvement of the predictions beyond a 688 689 certain level of model complexity.

- 690
- The skill of the runoff forecasts (SPI, Figure 4) was strongly reduced and varied more
- between events if radar rainfall forecasts were used as model input (scenario BU) instead of a
- 693 perfect rainfall forecast derived from gauge measurements (scenario AU). The decrease in
- 694 forecast skill was most pronounced for the smallest considered sub-catchment (WAM) and
- less pronounced for the larger sub-catchments such as KLO. This behaviour was caused by
- 696 the shorter concentration time in smaller catchments, where a runoff forecast for two hours
- 697 into the future is strongly affected by the uncertainty of the rainfall forecast.

699 5.2 RELIABILITY OF RUNOFF FORECASTS

Figure 5 and Figure 6 compare expected and observed coverage rates for forecasts of runoff
volume on a 120 minute horizon. We identified a general tendency for the runoff forecasts to
be unreliable. For example, a 90 % prediction interval covered less than 70 % of the
observations in all of the sub-catchments in scenario AU.

704

The main reason for this result was that the stochastic grey-box approach aims to model

runoff forecast uncertainty for a multitude of forecast horizons in a single model structure.
 This approach has the advantage of providing us with an intrinsic quantification of the

707 This approach has the advantage of providing us with an intrinsic quantification of the 708 correlation between forecasts for different horizons, but the model structure is currently not

adapted to account for the different effects occurring at different forecast horizons.

710

711 Forecast variance increases nonlinearly from short forecast horizons (where the updating of

- the model to current observations has a strong influence on forecast quality) to longer forecast
- horizons (where uncertainty from rainfall input and model structure affects the runoff forecast
- 714 most). The stochastic differential equations in Equation 1, however, assume that forecast
- 715 variance increases linearly with lead time because the variance of an increment $\Delta \omega_t$ of the
- 716 Wiener process driving the noise term directly corresponds to the considered time increment 717 Δt . As a result, the stochastic forecast models tended to be reliable on short forecast horizons
- 717 Δt . As a result, the stochastic forecast models tended to be reliable on short forecast horizons 718 and unreliable on longer forecast horizons (not shown, but demonstrated in Löwe et al.,
- 719 2014b).
- 720

We identified the following options for addressing this problem in the grey-box modellingframework in the future:

- 723 Different forecast models could be applied for different forecast horizons. While this option would yield reliable forecasts, it would also lead to a strong increase in the 724 725 number of parameters that need to be identified, and it would not provide the description of correlation between forecast horizons. The identification of forecast 726 727 distributions of runoff volumes would then require the application of copulas 728 (Madadgar et al., 2014; Papaefthymiou and Kurowicka, 2009) or recursive estimates 729 of the correlation of forecast errors for different horizons (Löwe et al., 2014b, Pinson 730 et al., 2009) to link the stochastic flow forecasts for different horizons.
- A scaling factor depending on forecast lead time could be introduced in the diffusion term of the state equations (Equation 1) and identified as a parameter in the automatic calibration routine. This option seems preferable, as it could be easily integrated in the grey-box modelling approach.
- 735 736 Another interesting result was that higher coverage rates were observed for scenario BU, 737 where radar rainfall forecasts were used as input to the forecast models, than for scenario AU. 738 The parameter estimation procedure identifies the uncertainty scaling for the model states (σ_i) 739 based on how many observations are located how far from the centre of the forecasted 740 distribution (see Löwe et al. (2014b)). During rain periods, runoff forecast errors are much 741 larger if radar rainfall is used as an input to the models, leading to a strong increase in the 742 uncertainty parameters in the model and to increased forecast uncertainties. These, in turn, 743 lead to an increased reliability of the model during dry weather periods, explaining the more 744 reliable pattern observed in Figure 6.
- 745

- This issue can also be related to a deficiency in the structure of the stochastic grey-box model
- because only a single parameter σ_i is used in Equation 1 to scale the forecast uncertainty.
- Alternative formulations of the diffusion term should distinguish between dry weather andrain periods.
- 750

751 **5.3 FORECAST UNCERTAINTY AND SYSTEM-WIDE REAL-TIME CONTROL**

- 752 The results shown in Figure 8 indicate that there is a clear benefit in using forecast
- information in the system-wide control algorithm. All scenarios that apply forecast
- information (AU, ANU, BU and BNU) yield much lower overflow volumes and cost than thereference scenario REF.
- 755 756

In addition, accounting for the uncertainty of runoff forecasts in the system-wide control
algorithm has proven beneficial. The reduction in total overflow cost (comparing scenarios
AU and ANU as well as BU and BNU) was comparable in magnitude to the increase in total
overflow cost caused by the uncertainty of radar rainfall forecasts (comparing scenarios AU
and BU as well as ANU and BNU).

762

763 The results also showed some limitations of the setup. Replacing perfect rainfall forecasts 764 (scenarios AU and ANU) by radar rainfall forecasts (BU and BNU) decreased runoff forecast 765 skill and strongly increased runoff forecast uncertainty at KLO. This resulted in high 766 forecasted overflow cost at this point and a prioritization of outflows from KLO over those 767 from STP (see Figure 3), strongly increasing overflow volumes at STP. Although the total 768 overflow cost in the system could be reduced, such effects may be undesirable and can be

- 769 mitigated by an adjustment of the CSO unit cost.
- 770

Generally, DORA prioritizes outflow from overflow points where runoff forecast uncertaintyis high over overflow points where runoff forecast uncertainty is low. This is desirable

- because free storage volume is kept available at points where little is known about the future
- runoff, while storage volume is kept available at points where fitte is known about the future runoff, while storage volume at other control points is used to the fullest. It is, however,
- important that realistic estimates of forecast uncertainty are identified. In particular,
- 776 combinations of over- and underestimation of forecast uncertainty at different control points 777 are expected to negatively impact the performance of the control scheme.
- 777 778

779 5.4 GENERAL APPLICABILITY OF THE SETUP

The aim of the article was to provide a proof of concept for a forecast- and optimization-based
 RTC setup that takes forecast uncertainty into account. The setup was demonstrated in a case

- study involving six different sub-catchments in which the performance of the runoff formasting models uses totad by comparing with characterist. The second of the second states of the second states
- forecasting models was tested by comparing with observations. The process of generating
- stochastic runoff forecasts over a horizon of 2 hours and identifying set points using the
- DORA algorithm required approximately 1 minute on a standard PC (Intel i7-4930k) and is
 thus well feasible within a control time step of 2 minutes.
- 787
- The sub-catchments had different sizes and structures (Table 1), and they therefore behaved
 differently hydraulically. In addition, flow observations were far from perfect and, in most of
- the catchments, were affected by changes in pumping discharges (Section 3.3.1 and Appendix
- 790 the catchments, were affected by changes in pumping discharges (Section 3.3.1 and Append 791 C). These conditions correspond well to what we would expect in other urban catchments.
- 791 C). These conditions correspond wen to what we would expect in other urban catchments 792 The skilful forecasts that were obtained for most of the sub-catchments suggest that the
- 793 forecast setup can be transferred to other catchments.

- 794
- 795 Current limitations of the setup are that rather unreliable forecasts are obtained for long
- forecast horizons (Section 5.2) and that only a very simple model structure is considered,
- 797 while including effects from, e.g., overflow structures located upstream from the control point
- may well improve the forecast skill in some sub-catchments (Sections 2.1 and 4.1).
- 799 Conversely, the radar rainfall forecasts provided as model input in our case study were
- incomplete. In particular, no forecast information was available for horizons beyond 90
 minutes. We would therefore expect somewhat better rainfall forecasts and thus better
- performance of the runoff forecasts in other catchments with more complete rainfall forecasts.
- 803

804 The derivation of inflow measurements using the water balance of the control points proved 805 problematic in terms of operational reliability because each inflow measurement depended on the correct operation of multiple sensors. In fact, we were able to use only 98 out of 171 806 807 relevant rain events in our data period as a result of sensors failing at one or multiple control 808 points. This problem can be avoided by installing redundant level sensors or dedicated flow measurements. Männig and Lindenberg (2013) demonstrated that a reliable operation of a 809 control system can also be achieved with a large number of 13 control points and more than 810 811 100 in-sewer measurements.

812

813 The effect of forecast uncertainty on the optimization-based control scheme was tested for the 814 first time in an urban setting in this study. Raso et al. (2014) demonstrated the value of 815 considering forecast uncertainty in reservoir operation. As we applied a full-scale catchment 816 in our case study, our results provide a strong indication that optimization-based control 817 schemes should consider forecast uncertainty. Nevertheless, this result needs to be verified in 818 further studies and catchments. 819

820 6 CONCLUSIONS

A forecast-based, stochastic optimization setup was presented for system-wide real-time
control of combined sewer systems aimed at reducing combined sewer overflows. The setup
combined stochastic grey-box models for probabilistic forecasting of urban runoff online and
the risk-based optimization algorithm DORA that accounts for forecast uncertainty and
impact cost.

In a case study in Copenhagen, Denmark, involving 6 sub-catchments of varying sizes and 7
 control points we assessed forecast performance by comparing runoff forecasts to

measurements and by testing the efficiency of the control scheme in simulations. We conclude that:

- 831
 1. Accounting for forecast uncertainty in the system-wide control positively affected the results of the control scheme. In the simulation study performed in this work, the reduction of total overflow cost resulting from the consideration of forecast uncertainty was comparable to the increase of total overflow cost resulting from the uncertainty of radar rainfall forecasts (comparing simulation results for the case of a perfect, rain gauge based rainfall forecast to a real-world radar rainfall forecast).
- 837
 2. Higher uncertainty of the runoff forecast at a control point leads to a higher priority of 838
 837
 838
 839
 839
 840
 840
 840
 841
 841
 841

- Using radar rainfall forecasts as input to the stochastic runoff forecasting models
 instead of perfect rainfall forecasts based on rain gauge measurements lead to a
 significant decrease in runoff forecast skill. Nevertheless, an exponential smoothing
 model used as the benchmark forecast was outperformed in all of the considered subcatchments. In addition, the control scheme yielded much better results than in the
 reference case where optimization was performed without forecast information, i.e.,
 based on the current basin fillings only.
- 849
 4. Models that forecast the inflow to the control points could be set up, although direct 850
 851
 851
 852
 852
 853
 853
 854
 854
- 855
 5. Stochastic runoff forecasting models need to consider a nonlinear increase of forecast
 856
 uncertainty with forecast lead time when generating multistep forecasts.
- 6. Deriving flow measurements from a multitude of sensors implies that each
 measurement depends on the correct operation of multiple sensors. This can severely
 impact the reliability of the control setup, a problem that can easily be mitigated by
 installing redundant sensors in the most suitable locations during the implementation
 of the RTC system.
- The present study has provided a proof of concept for considering forecast uncertainty in a
 risk-based optimization scheme for RTC of urban drainage systems. Future work should focus
 on improving rainfall forecasts as well as the development of libraries of runoff forecasting
 models, where the model structure performing best for a given control point can be selected
 automatically.

868 7 ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

869 This research has been financially supported by the Danish Council for Strategic Research, 870 Programme Commission on Sustainable Energy and Environment through the Storm- and Wastewater Informatics (SWI) project. The catchment and flow data were kindly provided by 871 872 Copenhagen Utility Company (HOFOR). We thank the Danish Meteorological Institute 873 (DMI) and Michael Rasmussen and Søren Thorndahl from Aalborg University (Dept. of Civil 874 Engineering) for providing data from the C-Band radar at Stevns. Luca Vezzaro was an 875 industrial postdoc financed by the Innovation Fund Denmark under the project "MOPSUS -876 Model predictive control of urban drainage systems under uncertainty". 877

878 **8 References**

Achleitner, S, Stefan Fach, T Einfalt, and W Rauch. 2009. "Nowcasting of Rainfall and of
Combined Sewage Flow in Urban Drainage Systems." Water Science and Technology 59 (6):
1145–51. doi:10.2166/wst.2009.098.

882

Arnbjerg-Nielsen, K., Willems, P., Olsson, J., Beecham, S., Pathirana, A., Bülow Gregersen,
I., Madsen, H., Nguyen, V.T. V, 2013. Impacts of climate change on rainfall extremes and
urban drainage systems: A review. Water Sci. Technol. 68, 16–28. doi:10.2166/wst.2013.251

- Bechmann, H, M K Nielsen, H Madsen, and N K Poulsen. 1999. "Grey-Box Modelling of
 Pollutant Loads from a Sewer System." Urban Water 1 (1): 71–78.
- 889

890 Bennett, N D., B F W W Croke, G G, J H A Guillaume, S H Hamilton, A J Jakeman, S 891 Marsili-Libelli, L T H Newman, J P Norton, C Perrin, S A Pierce, B Robson, R Seppelt, A A 892 Voinov, B D Fath, and V Andreassian. 2013. "Characterising Performance of Environmental 893 Models." Environmental Modelling & Software 40: 1–20. doi:10.1016/j.envsoft.2012.09.011. 894 Borsányi, P., Benedetti, L., Dirckx, G., De Keyser, W., Muschalla, D., Solvi, A.-M., 895 Vandenberghe, V., Weyand, M., Vanrolleghem, P.A., 2008. Modelling real-time control 896 897 options on virtual sewer systems. J. Environ. Eng. Sci. 7, 395-410. doi:10.1139/S08-004 898 899 Breinholt, A., Santacoloma, P. A., Mikkelsen, P. S., Madsen, H., Grum, M., & Nielsen, M. K. 900 (2008). Evaluation framework for control of integrated urban drainage systems. In 901 Proceedings of the 11th International Conference on Urban Drainage, Edinburgh, Scotland, 902 UK. 903 904 Breinholt, A, F O Thordarson, J K Møller, M Grum, P S Mikkelsen, and H Madsen. 2011. 905 "Grey-Box Modelling of Flow in Sewer Systems with State-Dependent Diffusion." 906 Environmetrics 22 (8): 946-61. doi:10.1002/env.1135. 907 908 Breinholt, A., J.K. Møller, H. Madsen, P.S. Mikkelsen. 2012. "A formal statistical approach 909 to representing uncertainty in rainfall-runoff modelling with focus on residual analysis and 910 probabilistic output evaluation - distinguishing simulation and prediction". J. Hydrol., 472-911 473, 36-52. 912 913 Brown, R G, and R F Meyer. 1961. "The Fundamental Theorem of Exponential Smoothing." 914 Operations Research 9 (5): 673–85. 915 http://search.ebscohost.com/login.aspx?direct=true&db=buh&AN=7689664&site=ehost-live. 916 917 Carstensen, J, M K Nielsen, and H Strandbæk. 1998. "Prediction of Hydraulic Load for Urban 918 Storm Control of a Municipal WWT Plant." Water Science and Technology 37 (12): 363-70. 919 920 Del Giudice, D., Reichert, P., Bares, V., Albert, C., Rieckermann, J., 2015a. Model bias and 921 complexity - Understanding the effects of structural deficits and input errors on runoff 922 predictions. Environ. Model. Softw. 64, 205-214. doi:10.1016/j.envsoft.2014.11.006 923 924 Del Giudice, D., Löwe, R., Madsen, H., Mikkelsen, P.S., Rieckermann, J., 2015b. 925 Comparison of two stochastic techniques for reliable urban runoff prediction by modeling 926 systematic errors. Water Resour. Res. 51, 5004-5022. doi:10.1002/2014WR016678 927 928 Deletic, A., Dotto, C.B.S., McCarthy, D.T., Kleidorfer, M., Freni, G., Mannina, G., Uhl, M., 929 Henrichs, M., Fletcher, T.D., Rauch, W., Bertrand-Krajewski, J.L., Tait, S., 2012. Assessing 930 uncertainties in urban drainage models. Phys. Chem. Earth, Parts A/B/C 42-44, 3-10. 931 doi:10.1016/j.pce.2011.04.007 932 933 Dotto, C.B.S., G. Mannina, M Kleidorfer, L Vezzaro, M. Henrichs, D.T. McCarthy, G Freni, 934 W Rauch, and A Deletic. 2012. "Comparison of Different Uncertainty Techniques in Urban Stormwater Quantity and Quality Modelling." Water Research 46 (8): 2545–58. 935 936 doi:10.1016/j.watres.2012.02.009. 937

- Freni, G, G. Mannina, and Gaspare Viviani. 2009. "Assessment of Data Availability Influence
 on Integrated Urban Drainage Modelling Uncertainty." Environmental Modelling and
 Software 24 (10): 1171–81. doi:10.1016/j.envsoft.2009.03.007.
- 940 Software 24 (10): 11/1–81. doi:10.1016/j.envsoft.2009.03.007. 941
- 942 Gneiting, T, and Adrian E Raftery. 2007. "Strictly Proper Scoring Rules, Prediction, and
- 943 Estimation." Journal of the American Statistical Association 102 (477): 359–78.
- 944 doi:10.1198/016214506000001437. 945
- Grum, M, E Longin, and J J Linde. 2004. "A Flexible and Extensible Open Source Tool for
- 947 Urban Drainage Modelling: www.WaterAspects.org." In Proceedings of the 6th International
- 948 Conference on Urban Drainage Modelling. Dresden, Germany.
- 949 http://prswww.essex.ac.uk/mantissa/reports/essex/MANTISSAFinalReportJ.pdf.
- 950
- Harremoës, P., Madsen, H., 1999. Fiction and reality in the modelling world–Balance
 between simplicity and complexity, calibration and identifiability, verification and
- 953 falsification. Water Sci. Technol. 39, 1–8.954
- Hemri, S., F. Fundel, and M. Zappa. 2013. "Simultaneous Calibration of Ensemble River
 Flow Predictions over an Entire Range of Lead Times." Water Resources Research 49: 6744–
 doi:10.1002/wrcr.20542.
- 958
- Iacus, S M. 2008. Simulation and Inference for Stochastic Differential Equations : With R
 Examples. Springer Series in Statistics. Milan, Italy.
- Jin, X, C Y Xu, Q Zhang, and V P Singh. 2010. "Parameter and Modeling Uncertainty
 Simulated by GLUE and a Formal Bayesian Method for a Conceptual Hydrological Model."
 Journal of Hydrology 383 (3-4): 147–55. doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2009.12.028.
- 965
 966 Jørgensen, H K, S Rosenørn, H Madsen, and P S Mikkelsen. 1998. "Quality Control of Rain
 967 Data Used for Urban Runoff Systems." Water Science and Technology 37 (11): 113–20.
- Juhl, R, N R Kristensen, P Bacher, J K Møller, and H Madsen. 2013. "CTSM-R User Guide."
 Kgs. Lyngby, Denmark. Technical University of Denmark. http://CTSM.info.
- Kavetski, Dmitri, George Kuczera, and Stewart W. Franks. 2006. "Bayesian Analysis of Input
 Uncertainty in Hydrological Modeling: 1. Theory." Water Resources Research 42 (March):
 W03407. doi:10.1029/2005WR004368.
- 975

- Krämer, S, M Grum, H R Verworn, and A Redder. 2005. "Runoff Modelling Using Radar
 Data and Flow Measurements in a Stochastic State Space Approach." Water Science and
 Technology 52 (5): 1–8.
- 978 979
- Krämer, Stefan, Lothar Fuchs, and H R Verworn. 2007. "Aspects of Radar Rainfall Forecasts
 and Their Effectiveness for Real Time Control -The Example of the Sewer System of the City
 of Vienna." Water Practice & Technology 2 (2). doi:10.2166/WPT.2007042.
- Kristensen, N. R., Madsen, H., and Jørgensen, S. B. (2004) Parameter estimation in stochastic
 grey-box models. Automatica, 40(2), 225–237.

986 987 Löwe, R. 2014. "Probabilistic Forecasting for On-Line Operation of Urban Drainage 988 Systems." Ph.D. thesis, Department of Applied Mathematics and Computer Science, 989 Technical University of Denmark (DTU). Kgs. Lyngby, Denmark. 990 991 Löwe, R, S Thorndahl, P S Mikkelsen, M R Rasmussen, and H Madsen. 2014a. "Probabilistic 992 Online Runoff Forecasting for Urban Catchments Using Inputs from Rain Gauges as Well as 993 Statically and Dynamically Adjusted Weather Radar." Journal of Hydrology 512: 397–407. 994 doi:10.1016/j.hydrol.2014.03.027. 995 996 Löwe, R, P S Mikkelsen, and H. Madsen. 2014b. "Stochastic Rainfall-Runoff Forecasting: 997 Parameter Estimation, Multi-Step Prediction, and Evaluation of Overflow Risk." Stochastic 998 Environmental Research and Risk Assessment 28: 505-16. doi:10.1007/s00477-013-0768-0. 999 1000 Madadgar, S., Moradkhani, H., Garen, D., 2014. Towards improved post-processing of 1001 hydrologic forecast ensembles. Hydrol. Process. 28, 104–122. doi:10.1002/hyp.9562 1002 1003 Maestre, J. M., L Raso, P J van Overloop, and B. De Schutter. 2013. "Distributed Tree-Based 1004 Model Predictive Control on a Drainage Water System." Journal of Hydroinformatics 15 (2): 335-47. doi:10.2166/hydro.2012.125. 1005 1006 1007 Mahnke, W., S. H. Leitner, M. Damm. 2009. "OPC Unified Architecture". Springer. 1008 ISBN:978-3-540-68898-3 1009 1010 Männig, F., and M. Lindenberg, 2013. "Betriebserfahrungen mit der Abflusssteuerung des 1011 Dresdner Mischwassernetzes." KA Korrespondenz Abwasser, Abfall 2013 (12): 1036-43. 1012 doi:10.3242/kae2013.12.001. 1013 1014 Meffert, K. et al.: "JGAP - Java Genetic Algorithms and Genetic Programming Package". 1015 http://jgap.sf.net 1016 1017 Mollerup, A.L., D. Thornberg, P. S. Mikkelsen, N.B. Johansen, G. Sin. 2013. "16 Years of Experience with Rule Based Control of Copenhagen's Sewer System". 11th Int. IWA Conf. 1018 1019 on Instrumentation, Control and Automation (ICA), Narbonne/France, 18-20 September 1020 2013. Extended abstract, 4 pp 1021 1022 Mollerup, A.L., P.S. Mikkelsen, D. Thornberg, G. Sin. 2015. "Regulatory control analysis and 1023 design for sewer systems". Environmental Modelling & Software. Environ. Model. Softw. 66, 1024 153-166. doi:10.1016/j.envsoft.2014.12.001 1025 1026 Moradkhani, H, C M DeChant, and S Sorooshian. 2012. "Evolution of Ensemble Data 1027 Assimilation for Uncertainty Quantification Using the Particle Filter Markov Chain Monte 1028 Carlo Method." Water Resources Research 48 (12). doi:10.1029/2012WR012144. 1029 1030 Murphy, A H, and R L Winkler. 1977. "Reliability of Subjective Probability Forecasts of Precipitation and Temperature." Journal of the Royal Statistical Society.Series C (Applied 1031 1032 Statistics) 26 (1): 41–47. http://www.jstor.org.globalproxy.cvt.dk/stable/2346866. 1033

- 1034 Nielsen, M K, and T Önnerth. 1995. "Improvement of a Recirculating Plant by Introducing
- 1035 STAR Control." Water Science & Technology 31 (2): 171–80. 1036
- Nielsen, N H, C Ravn, and N Mølbye. 2010. "Implementation and Design of a RTC Strategy
 in the Sewage System in Kolding , Denmark." In Proceedings of NOVATECH 2010. Lyon,
 France.
- 1040
- 1041 Pabst, M, J Alex, M Beier, C Niclas, M Ogurek, D Peikert, and M Schütze. 2011. "ADESBA
- A New General Global Control System Applied to the Hildesheim Sewage System." In
 Proceedings of the 12th International Conference on Urban Drainage. Vol. 11–16 Sept. Porto
 Alegre, Brazil.
- 1045
- Papaefthymiou, G., Kurowicka, D., 2009. Using copulas for modeling stochastic dependence
 in power system uncertainty analysis. IEEE Trans. Power Syst. 24, 40–49.
 doi:10.1109/TPWRS.2008.2004728
- 1040
- Pinson, P., Madsen, H., Papaefthymiou, G., 2009. "From Probabilistic Forecasts to Wind
 Power Production. Production" 51–62. doi:10.1002/we
- 1052
 1053 Pleau, M, H Colas, P Lavalle, G Pelletier, and R Bonin. 2005. "Global Optimal Real-Time
 1054 Control of the Quebec Urban Drainage System." Environmental Modelling and Software 20
 1055 (4). Elsevier: 401–13. doi:10.1016/j.envsoft.2004.02.009.
- 1056
 1057 Puig, V, G Cembrano, J Romera, J Quevedo, B Aznar, G Ramón, and J Cabot. 2009.
 1058 "Predictive Optimal Control of Sewer Networks Using CORAL Tool: Application to Riera
 1059 Blanca Catchment in Barcelona." Water Science and Technology 60 (4). IWA Publishing:
 1060 869–78. doi:10.2166/wst.2009.424.
- 1061
- Raso, L., Schwanenberg, D., van de Giesen, N.C., van Overloop, P.J., 2014. Short-term
 optimal operation of water systems using ensemble forecasts. Adv. Water Resour. 71, 200–
 208. doi:10.1016/j.advwatres.2014.06.009
- Rauch, W, K Seggelke, Rebekah Brown, and Peter Krebs. 2005. "Integrated Approaches in
 Urban Storm Drainage: Where Do We Stand?" Environmental Management 35 (4): 396–409.
 doi:10.1007/s00267-003-0114-2.
- 1070 Renard, B, Dmitri Kavetski, George Kuczera, Mark Thyer, and S Franks. 2010.
- 1071 "Understanding Predictive Uncertainty in Hydrologic Modeling: The Challenge of Identifying
- 1072 Input and Structural Errors." Water Resources Research 46 (5): W05521.
- 1073 doi:10.1029/2009WR008328.
- 1074

- Schellart, A.N.A., Shepherd, W.J., Saul, A.J., 2011. Influence of rainfall estimation error and
 spatial variability on sewer flow prediction at a small urban scale. Adv. Water Resour. 45, 65–
 75. doi:10.1016/j.advwatres.2011.10.012
- 1078 1079 Schellart, A N A, Sara Liguori, Stefan Krämer, A J Saul, and M A Rico-Ramirez. 2014.
- 1080 "Comparing Quantitative Precipitation Forecast Methods for Prediction of Sewer Flows in a

- 1081 Small Urban Area." Hydrological Sciences Journal 59 (7): 1418–36.
- 1082 doi:10.1080/02626667.2014.920505.
- Schilling, W, and L Fuchs. 1986. "Errors in Stormwater Modeling-a Quantitative
 Assessment." Journal of Hydraulic Engineering 112 (2): 111–23.
- 1086
- Schilling, W. 1991. "Rainfall Data for Urban Hydrology: What Do We Need?" AtmosphericResearch 27 (1): 5–21.
- 1089

- Schütze, M., Campisano, A., Colas, H., Schilling, W., Vanrolleghem, P.A., 2004. Real time
 control of urban wastewater systems—where do we stand today? J. Hydrol. 299, 335–348.
 doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2004.08.010
- Seggelke, K, R Löwe, T Beeneken, and L Fuchs. 2013. "Implementation of an Integrated
 Real-Time Control System of Sewer System and Waste Water Treatment Plant in the City of
 Wilhelmshaven." Urban Water Journal 10 (5): 330–41. doi:10.1080/1573062X.2013.820331.
- Storm- and Wastewater Informatics, SWI. 2015: Project website, http://www.swi.env.dtu.dk/,
 visited 12th March 2015.
- 1100
 1101 Sun, S., Bertrand-Krajewski, J.L., 2013. Separately accounting for uncertainties in rainfall and
 1102 runoff: Calibration of event-based conceptual hydrological models in small urban catchments
 1103 using Bayesian method. Water Resour. Res. 49, 5381–5394. doi:10.1002/wrcr.20444
- 1104
 1105 Thordarson, F O, A Breinholt, J K Møller, P S Mikkelsen, M Grum, and H Madsen. 2012.
 1106 "Uncertainty Assessment of Flow Predictions in Sewer Systems Using Grey Box Models and
 1107 Skill Score Criterion." Stochastic Environmental Research and Risk Assessment 26 (8):
 1108 1151–62. doi:10.1007/s00477-012-0563-3.
- 1109

- Thorndahl, S, and M R Rasmussen. 2013. "Short-Term Forecasting of Urban Storm Water
 Runoff in Real-Time Using Extrapolated Radar Rainfall Data." Journal of Hydroinformatics
 15 (3): 897–912. doi:10.2166/hydro.2013.161.
- 1114 Thorndahl, S, T S Poulsen, T Bøvith, M Borup, M Ahm, J E Nielsen, M Grum, M R
- 1115 Rasmussen, R Gill, and P S Mikkelsen. 2013. "Comparison of Short Term Rainfall Forecasts
- 1116 for Model Based Flow Prediction in Urban Drainage Systems." Water Science and
- 1117 Technology 68 (2): 472–78. doi:10.2166/wst.2013.274. 1118
- Thorndahl, S, J E Nielsen, and M R Rasmussen. 2014. "Bias Adjustment and Advection
 Interpolation of Long-Term High Resolution Radar Rainfall Series." Journal of Hydrology
 508 (January): 214–26. doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2013.10.056.
- 1122
- 1123Todini, E., 2008. A model conditional processor to assess predictive uncertainty in flood1124forecasting. Int. J. River Basin Manag. 6, 123–137. doi:10.1080/15715124.2008.9635342
- 11251126 Vanrolleghem, P A, L Benedetti, and J Meirlaen. 2005. "Modelling and Real-Time Control of
- 1127 the Integrated Urban Wastewater System." Environmental Modelling and Software 20 (4):
- 1128 427–42. doi:10.1016/j.envsoft.2004.02.004.

- 1129 1130 Van Steenbergen, N., Ronsyn, J., Willems, P., 2012. A non-parametric data-based approach 1131 for probabilistic flood forecasting in support of uncertainty communication. Environ. Model. 1132 Softw. 33, 92-105. doi:10.1016/j.envsoft.2012.01.013 1133 1134 Vezzaro, L, and P S Mikkelsen. 2012. "Application of Global Sensitivity Analysis and 1135 Uncertainty Quantification in Dynamic Modelling of Micropollutants in Stormwater Runoff." 1136 Environmental Modelling and Software 27-28: 40–51. doi:10.1016/j.envsoft.2011.09.012. 1137 Vezzaro, L, and M Grum. 2014. "A Generalised Dynamic Overflow Risk Assessment 1138 1139 (DORA) for Real Time Control of Urban Drainage Systems." Journal of Hydrology 515: 1140 292–303. doi:10.1016/j.jhydrol.2014.05.019. 1141 1142 Vezzaro, L, M.L. Christensen, C Thirsing, M. Grum, and P S Mikkelsen. 2014. "Water 1143 Quality-Based Real Time Control of Integrated Urban Drainage Systems: A Preliminary 1144 Study from Copenhagen, Denmark." Procedia Engineering 70: 1707–16. 1145 doi:10.1016/j.proeng.2014.02.188. 1146 1147 Vieux, B E, and J E Vieux. 2005. "Statistical Evaluation of a Radar Rainfall System for 1148 Sewer System Management." Atmospheric Research 77 (1). Elsevier: 322–36. 1149 doi:10.1016/j.atmosres.2004.10.032. 1150 Vrugt, J A, C G H Diks, Hoshin V Gupta, W Bouten, and J M Verstraten. 2005. "Improved 1151 1152 Treatment of Uncertainty in Hydrologic Modeling: Combining the Strengths of Global 1153 Optimization and Data Assimilation." Water Resources Research 41 (1): W01017. 1154 doi:10.1029/2004WR003059. 1155 1156 Vrugt, J A, C J F Ter Braak, C G H Diks, and G Schoups. 2013. "Hydrologic Data Assimilation Using Particle Markov Chain Monte Carlo Simulation: Theory, Concepts and 1157 1158 Applications." Advances in Water Resources 51: 457–78. 1159 doi:10.1016/j.advwatres.2012.04.002. 1160 Weerts, A., Winsemius, H.C., Verkade, J.S., 2011. Estimation of predictive hydrological 1161 1162 uncertainty using quantile regression: examples from the National Flood Forecasting System (England and Wales). Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. 15, 255-265. doi:10.5194/hess-15-255-2011 1163 1164 Willems, P., Ollson, J., Arnbjerg-Nielsen, K., Beecham, S., Pathirana, A., Gregersen, I.B., Madsen, H., Nguyen, V.T. V, 2012. Impacts of Climate Change on Rainfall Extremes and 1165 Urban Drainage. IWA Publishing, London, United Kingdom. 1166 1167 1168 1169 1170 9 **APPENDIX A** 1171 see Supporting Material 1172 1173 **10** APPENDIX **B**
- 1174 see Supporting Material
- 1175

11 APPENDIX C see Supporting Material 1177 1178