Fast Pump Scheduling Method for Optimum Energy Cost and Water Quality in Water Distribution Networks with Fixed and Variable Speed Pumps

Abdallah, Mohammed; Kapelan, Zoran

DOI

[10.1061/\(ASCE\)WR.1943-5452.0001123](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)WR.1943-5452.0001123)

Publication date

2019

Document Version

Accepted author manuscript

Published in

Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management

Citation (APA)

Abdallah, M., & Kapelan, Z. (2019). Fast Pump Scheduling Method for Optimum Energy Cost and Water Quality in Water Distribution Networks with Fixed and Variable Speed Pumps. *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management*, 145(12), [04019055]. [https://doi.org/10.1061/\(ASCE\)WR.1943-5452.0001123](https://doi.org/10.1061/(ASCE)WR.1943-5452.0001123)

Important note

To cite this publication, please use the final published version (if applicable).
Please check the document version above.

Copyright

Other than for strictly personal use, it is not permitted to download, forward or distribute the text or part of it, without the consent of the author(s) and/or copyright holder(s), unless the work is under an open content license such as Creative Commons.

Takedown policy

Please contact us and provide details if you believe this document breaches copyrights.
We will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Fast Pump Scheduling Method for Optimum Energy Cost and Water Quality in Water Distribution Networks with Fixed and Variable Speed Pumps

Mohammed Abdallah^{1,2} and Zoran Kapelan^{3,4}

1 PhD candidate, College of Engineering, Mathematics and Physical Sciences, Univ. of Exeter,
Harrison Building, North Park Rd., Exeter EX4 4QF, U.K. (corresponding author). E-mail:
maya202@exeter.ac.uk

2 Water Network Studies Engineer, Water Network Operations Division, Abu Dhabi
Transmission and Despatch Company (TRANSCO), Abu Dhabi, U.A.E., E-mail:
mohammed.abdulla@transco.ae

3 Professor, College of Engineering, Mathematics and Physical Sciences, Univ. of Exeter,
Harrison Building, North Park Rd., Exeter EX4 4QF, U.K. E-mail: z.kapelan@exeter.ac.uk

4 Professor, Delft university of Technology, Faculty of Civil Engineering and Geosciences,
Stevinweg 1, 2628 CN Delft, The Netherlands, E-mail: z.kapelan@tudelft.nl

Abstract

Supplying high quality water at competitive cost is a major challenge for water utilities worldwide, especially with ever increasing water quality standards and energy prices. A number of pump scheduling methods for optimising simultaneously water quality and energy cost have been developed already. However, none of these methods is ideal due to the complexity of water networks and the nonlinear behaviour of water flow. In this research, a new optimisation method named iterative Extended Lexicographic Goal Programming (iELGP) is developed to optimize energy cost and water quality (residual chlorine) in water networks with a mixture of fixed speed pumps (FSPs) and variable speed pumps (VSPs). Two different approaches were used to indirectly improve chlorine. The new method was tested on the C-Town water network and compared with the graph theory method of Price and Ostfeld (2016). The results obtained show the ability of the iELGP method to optimize energy cost and water quality in water networks and in a computationally very efficient manner. They

also show that the iELGP method can identify lower energy cost pump schedules and do this faster than the above comparison method. Using VSPs instead of FSPs improves the water quality and decreases the related energy and maintenance cost in water networks.

Keywords

Pump scheduling, Goal Programming, Energy Cost, Water Quality, Variable Speed Pumps.

Introduction

A recent comprehensive literature review of more than 200 publications on pump scheduling (Mala-Jetmarova et al 2017) has concluded that “water distribution operational optimisation problems are far from being solved, despite the large body of literature on this subject published over the last 20-30 years.” This is because the truly holistic pump scheduling problem formulation that addresses all relevant issues related to water flow, quality, operational risks and costs of energy and power used is currently missing. Additionally, there is still no agreement on the unique best optimisation method that gives global optimum solution in a short computational time for a general water distribution network.

Simultaneous optimisation of energy cost and water quality in water networks is important to ensure that energy cost is minimized without worsening the water quality. Several attempts to achieve this have been made in the past. Mehrez et al. (1992), Ostfeld and Shamir (1993a), Ostfeld and Shamir (1993b) and Percia et al. (1997) all used Non-Linear Programming (NLP) to minimize energy cost with water quality substances at demand nodes being constrained (or penalized in the objective function). However, all these approaches were made for conservative water quality substances that do not decay, hence these approaches cannot be used for optimization of chlorine concentration in water networks.

Goldman and Mays (1999) and Sakarya and Mays (1999) linked the hydraulic and water quality simulator EPANET with Simulated Annealing (SA) and NLP optimisation methods; respectively, to minimize pumping energy cost whilst constraining chlorine concentrations at demand nodes. Both

methods were applied on the same case studies and their results were compared. Both methods needed to be run multiple times with different values for optimisation parameters to ensure optimality of the solution.

Biscos et al. (2002) and Biscos et al. (2003) used Mixed Integer Non-Linear Programming (MINLP) to minimize energy cost and to maintain the required chlorine concentration at demand nodes.

However, the method required the network model to be simplified and could result in practically infeasible solutions.

Genetic Algorithms (GA) was used in multiple approaches to optimize energy cost and chlorine in water networks (Ostfeld and Salomons 2006; Gibbs et al. 2010a). Murphy et al. (2007) used GA to minimize energy cost and water age, which is inversely proportional to chlorine in water network.

However, GA, used in all these approaches, is a computationally expensive optimisation method.

Artificial Neural Networks (ANN) were used to address this issue (see e.g. Broad et al. 2010) but the downside of this is that ANN needs to be trained prior to optimisation which requires substantial computational time as well. Also, the ANN based approach may still give inaccurate or suboptimal solutions due to ANN's inability to act as a perfect surrogate model.

Kurek and Ostfeld (2014) used the Strength Pareto Evolutionary Algorithm II (SPEA2) multi-objective optimisation method to optimize chlorine, water age, tank sizing cost, and pumping energy cost in water distribution networks that have VSPs. Authors claim that generating a Pareto set with pump relevant schedules for 24 hours took approximately 4 hours for EPANET Example 3 network (USEPA, 2013). Thus, the method cannot be used for real-time control.

The use of VSPs instead of FSPs reduces the energy consumption, reduces the leakage, reduces the number of pump switches, and provides a better control in water distribution networks (Wood and Reddy 1995; Lamaddalena and Khila 2012). Despite of these potential benefits of VSPs, many existing pump scheduling methods including some recent ones (Giacomello et al. 2013; Odan et al. 2015) did not consider the VSPs, most likely because this increases the complexity of the pump

scheduling problem. Having said this, a number of papers did consider scheduling the operation of VSPs.

Several attempts to schedule the operation of VSPs relies on problem decomposition which could result in suboptimal solution. Coulbeck et al. (1988a) and Coulbeck et al. (1988b) solved the problem by decomposing it into three levels. The upper level finds optimum tanks' trajectories, then the intermediate level finds optimum flow from each pumping station, and finally the lower level finds the optimum operation of pumps in each pumping station. Ulanicki et al. (2007) solved the problem in two levels. The first level treats the number of pumps switched on during a time step as continuous decision variable (i.e. allowing fraction of pump to start during a time step), then in the second level, Branch and Bound method is used to find optimum integer number of running pumps and their speeds during each time step. Pump scheduling method should directly solve for the speed of each pump during each time step to ensure optimality of the solution.

Some of the previous attempts to optimise VSPs depended on discretisation of the VSP speed (Chen and Coulbeck 1991, Ulanicki et al. 1993; Pezeshk and Helweg 1996, Moreira and Ramos 2013). However, discretisation increases number of decision variables, computation time, and leads to suboptimal solution.

Several existing pump scheduling methods used metaheuristic methods like GA (Lingireddy and Wood 1998; Kelner and Leonard 2003; Wu 2007; Wu and Zhu 2009; Selek et al. 2012), Particle Swarm (Wegley et al. 2000), Ant Colony (Hashemi et al. 2013) to optimize the operation of VSPs. In Rao and Salomons (2007), ANN are used in conjunction with GA to reduce the computational time for hydraulic calculations. As mentioned previously, metaheuristics and ANN are time expensive and might give suboptimal solutions.

Verleye and Aghezzaf (2015) used Generalized Bender Decomposition Algorithm to schedule the operation of VSPs. The method gives optimal solution for large water networks, however the authors claim that the method needs to be carefully constructed and it includes parameters that need to be

102 tunned, otherwise the method will be computationally intensive and give suboptimal solutions. Thus,
103 the method is not fully automated and requires preparatory work prior optimisation.

104 Several existing pump scheduling methods assumed constant efficeincy of VSPs, regardless of the
105 speed, for the sake of simplicity (Chen and Coulbeck 1991; Kurek and Ostfeld 2013). However,
106 efficiency of VSP changes with speed and flow (Morton 1975; Sárbu and Borza 1998). If true
107 efficiency is not used, then the calculated power for a VSP running at low speed will be lower than
108 the actual power used resulting in inaccurate energy cost estimate and hence suboptimal solution
109 identified.

110 The initial development of the new iELGP pump scheduling methodology presented in this paper is
111 available in Abdallah and Kapelan (2017). The main objective of the initial development was to
112 minimize the energy cost of FSPs in a computationally efficient manner, for water distribution
113 networks with multiple tanks and pumping stations. In this research, the iELGP pump scheduling
114 method is further extended to optimize the operation of VSPs, to improve the water quality (chlorine)
115 in water networks and to overcome multiple deficiencies of exiting scheduling approaches (mentioned
116 in above paragraphs). Indeed, unlike in most existing pump scheduling approaches, the new iELGP
117 pump scheduling methodology proposed here can schedule simulateneously both fixed and variable
118 speed pumps (with both being modelled using true pump efficiency) whilst addressing energy cost
119 and water quality issues in a general water distirbution system. The methodology is based on a
120 computationally fast iELGP optimisation method which makes use of linearised energy cost and other
121 equations and continuous decision variables to present pump schedules and speeds. This method also
122 does not have parameters to calibrate hence overcoming the related difficulties with GA and many
123 other heuristic optimisation methods developed over the years. Despite this, as it will be illustrated in
124 the case study, the new methodology is capable of identifying near optimal solutions.

125 This paper is organized as follows. First, the problem and the assumptions used to solve the problem
126 are mentioned. Then, the paper presents in detail iELGP method and the solution steps for the
127 problem. Then, the method is applied on a water network that was used to test another pump
128 scheduling method, and the results obtained from iELGP method and the other method are compared

and discussed intensively. Finally, the key findings are summerized and the future recommendations are mentioned.

Methodology

Pump Scheduling Problem and Assumptions

The pump scheduling problem is formulated and solved here as an optimisation problem driven by the minimization of pumping energy cost whilst indirectly improving the residual chlorine in the network (details below). This problem is subjected to a number of constraints shown below.

Pump scheduling problem is an NP-hard problem due to its non-linearity and non-convexity (D'Ambrosio et al. 2015, Verleye and Aghezzaf 2015). The non-linearity is due to the non-linear relationship of pump's head with respect to flow, the non-linear relation between head loss and flow in pipes and the non-linear water quality changes in the system, due to nonlinearity of reactions and water mixing inside pipes and tanks. The non-convexity in pump scheduling problem comes from the changing flow paths in pipes and tanks, different discrete choices of pumps to run at a given time of the day and the nonlinearity of the scheduling problem which is present in both optimisation objectives and constraints. In addition to above, water quality simulation typically requires a short time step (e.g. 5 minutes) and long time horizons, to reach periodic behaviour.

All of the above makes the pump scheduling problem addressed here computationally expensive, especially for larger real life networks. Given this, the pump scheduling problem is relaxed here using the following assumptions:

1. The optimisation period is divided into time steps of fixed length. During each time step, demand is assumed to be known and fixed. Pumps' operating points during each time step are also fixed and will be determined by the optimisation method. These assumptions were used in the initial development of iELGP method in Abdallah and Kapelan (2017) and in most pump scheduling methods available in literature.
2. VSPs are allowed to run at specific relative speeds (defined as fractions of the maximum speed) ranging between 0.7 and 1.0. This is done for the following reasons: (a) VSP relative

efficiency (efficiency at actual speed over efficiency at maximum speed) is high i.e. almost equal to 1 in this range (Marchi et al. 2012; Coelho and Andrade-Campos 2016); (b) the efficiency of Variable Frequency Drive (VFD), the most common technology used to vary the speed of pump's motor, is usually between 95% and 98% in the aforementioned range of relative speeds and it drops significantly at lower speed (Ulanicki, et al. 2008). Additionally, motor's efficiency increases with the increase in its load and most motors reach their maximum efficiency when their load is above 75% of their rated load (Kaya et al. 2008; Marchi and Simpson 2013; Kalaiselvan et al. 2016). Please note that there are other energy losses that varies with speed such as pump-motor vibrations (Luo et al., 2012), efficiency of pump-motor coupling (e.g. magnetic coupling, oil coupling), efficiency of electric cables (Moreno et al., 2007). However, these energy losses have not been included in the work presented here.

Note that constraining the relative speed of VSPs between 0.7 and 1.0 requires VSPs not to be oversized, otherwise running oversized VSPs at high speeds will increase discharge pressure, leakage and energy consumption.

3. The minimum required chlorine at demand nodes can be achieved implicitly by decreasing tanks' maximum water level (Kennedy, et al. 1993; Oslon and Deboer 2011; Price and Ostfeld 2016). This prevents storing big amounts of water for long time and keeps water fresh. However, doing so might decrease the pressure at demand nodes. Additionally, it is not a good choice for emergency or maintenance cases when tanks are needed to recover water shortage in the network. Given this, alternative approach is used here (to have the minimum required chlorine at demand nodes) which is to keep tank's storage capacity as it is and to minimize the inlet/outlet flow. This, in turn, enables providing sufficient water in tanks for emergency cases and, at the same time, chlorine concentration in the network is improved. Note that tank's inlet/outlet flow is minimized to a rate that doesn't worsen the chlorine level in the tanks themselves. Note also that both approaches do not take chlorine at demand nodes into account during the optimisation. Instead, chlorine at demand nodes is evaluated using the water quality simulator in the post processing phase of the optimisation.

The above two approaches are used here to shed the light on pump scheduling as an important tool not only to reduce energy cost but also to improve water quality without the need to add chlorine boosters or increase chlorine dosing set-points. These approaches might be of interest for water utilities, and could draw their attention to the decay in water quality caused by excessive use of tanks. Additionally, our approach allows to improve water quality in a fast manner without dealing with the nonlinear water quality equations.

The aforementioned two-objective pump scheduling is solved here by using iELGP method, a variant of goal programming (GP) method that was introduced by Romero (2001). The iELGP is a promising new method that has already shown great potential for solving a more conventional pump scheduling focused on energy minimisation only (Abdallah and Kapelan 2017).

In iELGP, each goal (i.e. objective) must be a linear function of decision variables. In addition, each objective is given a target and the deviation between the value of the objective and its target is then minimized. Therefore, the aforementioned two objectives are combined into the following single objective function:

$$\text{Minimize } PEC_i + w \cdot \sum_{z=1}^Z \sum_{t=1}^T (PVC_{z,t,i} + NVC_{z,t,i}) \quad \forall i \in I \quad \text{Eq. (1)}$$

where PEC_i = positive deviation variable for energy cost at iteration i (£); $PVC_{z,t,i}$ = positive deviation variable for water volume change in tank z (m³); $NVC_{z,t,i}$ = negative deviation variable for water volume change in tank z (m³); w = weighting factor; i = iELGP iteration index; I = total number of iterations; z = tank index; Z = total number of tanks; t = time step index; and T = total number of time steps. Note that in each time step one of the deviation variables $PVC_{z,t,i}$ and $NVC_{z,t,i}$ is equal to or greater than zero and the other one is equal to zero due to the nature of GP.

The positive deviation variable for energy cost is defined as follows:

$$PEC_i = EC_i - ECT \quad \forall i \in I \quad \text{Eq. (2)}$$

where EC_i = energy cost at iteration i (£); and ECT = energy cost target (£). The energy cost target ECT is an ideal, optimistic value that cannot be reached in real life. Thus, the achieved energy cost EC_i will always positively deviate from the energy cost target ECT by an amount equal to PEC_i . ECT is estimated initially as described in the next section.

Further, energy cost for pumps (VSPs and FSPs) is calculated as follows:

$$EC_i = \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\left(\sum_{v=1}^V P_{v,t,i}^{Actual} + \sum_{f=1}^F P_{f,t,i} \cdot x_{f,t,i} \right) \cdot E_t \cdot S_t \right) \quad \forall i \in I \quad \text{Eq. (3)}$$

Where $P_{v,t,i}^{Actual}$ = VSP power at actual speed; v = VSP index; V = total number of VSPs; $P_{f,t,i}$ = FSP power; $x_{f,t,i}$ = decision variable denoting pump f status; f = FSP index; F = total number of FSPs; E_t = cost of electricity for given time step t (£/KWh); and S_t = time step length (hr).

Affinity Laws provide a good approximation for VSPs power when they are run at high speeds (Simpson and Marchi 2013). The relative power curve is almost linear for relative speeds between 0.7 and 1.0 (Coelho and Andrade-Campos 2016) hence it is possible to fit the following regression line:

$$P_{v,t,i}^{Actual} = (s \cdot x_{v,t,i} - y \cdot b_{v,t,i}) \cdot P_{v,t,i}^{Maximum} \quad \forall v \in V, \forall t \in T, \forall i \in I \quad \text{Eq. (4)}$$

where $P_{v,t,i}^{Maximum}$ = VSP power at maximum speed; s = the slope of the regression line which is equal to 2.1850; $x_{v,t,i}$ = decision variable denoting relative speed of VSP v at time t and iteration i ; y = the y-intercept of the regression line which is equal to 1.2176; and $b_{v,t,i}$ = binary variable that is equal to zero when pump is not running and equal to one when pump is running. The fitted regression line in Eq. (4) has coefficient of determination equals to 0.9899. Note that whilst the values of s and y are virtually constant for a VSP running at relative speed between 0.7 and 1.0, the same cannot be claimed for the relative speeds below 0.7.

The relative VSP speed is constrained as follows:

$$x_{v,t,i} = \begin{cases} 0, & \text{If pump is not running} \\ 0.7 \leq x_{v,t,i} \leq 1.0, & \text{If pump is running} \end{cases} \quad \forall v \in V, \forall t \in T, \forall i \in I \quad \text{Eq. (5)}$$

The minimum speed can be increased to more than 0.7 in case the pump is under-sized, to avoid getting zero flow.

Branch and bound method (Land and Doig 1960) is used to find the optimum value of $x_{v,t,i}$ during optimisation.

Pump power $P_{v,t,i}^{Actual\ Speed}$ in Eq. (4) should be equal to 0 when pump speed $x_{v,t,i}$ is equal to 0. Thus, the second term in Eq. (4) is multiplied by binary variable $b_{v,t,i}$. The following two constraints are applied with the aim to enforce $b_{v,t,i}$ to be equal to 1 when $x_{v,t,i}$ is between 0.7 and 1.0 and to enforce $b_{v,t,i}$ to be equal to 0 when $x_{v,t,i}$ is equal to 0:

$$b_{v,t,i} \geq x_{v,t,i} \quad \forall v \in V, \quad \forall t \in T, \quad \forall i \in I \quad \text{Eq. (6)}$$

$$s \cdot x_{v,t,i} - y \cdot b_{v,t,i} \geq 0 \quad \forall v \in V, \quad \forall t \in T, \quad \forall i \in I \quad \text{Eq. (7)}$$

The VSP power at maximum speed can be calculated using the following equation:

$$P_{v,t,i}^{Maximum\ Speed} = \frac{\gamma Q_{v,t,i}^{Maximum\ Speed} h_{v,t,i}^{Maximum\ Speed}}{\eta_{v,t,i}^{Maximum\ Speed}} \quad \forall v \in V, \forall t \in T, \forall i \in I \quad \text{Eq. (8)}$$

where γ = specific weight of water (kN/m³); $Q_{v,t,i}^{Maximum\ Speed}$ = flow rate (m³/h) of pump v running at

maximum speed; $h_{v,t,i}^{Maximum\ Speed}$ = head (m) of pump v running at maximum speed; and

$\eta_{v,t,i}^{Maximum\ Speed}$ = efficiency of pump v running at maximum speed. The values of $Q_{v,t,i}^{Maximum\ Speed}$

, $h_{v,t,i}^{Maximum\ Speed}$ and $\eta_{v,t,i}^{Maximum\ Speed}$ will be adjusted after each iteration upon the feedback from

the hydraulic simulator as will be shown in the next section.

For FSPs, the decision variable $x_{f,t,i}$ in Eq. (3) is the fraction of time step during which the pump is running and it is constrained:

$$0 \leq x_{f,t,i} \leq 1 \quad \forall f \in F, \quad \forall t \in T, \quad \forall i \in I \quad \text{Eq. (9)}$$

If $x_{f,t,i}$ is equal to zero, then the pump is off and if $x_{f,t,i}$ is equal to one, then the pump is on for the full duration of time step t . However, if $x_{f,t,i}$ has a value between zero and one then pump is on from the beginning of time step t for duration equal to $x_{f,t,i}S_t$ and then it is off until the end of that time step. Other options like FSP is off in the first part of the time step and then turns on within the same time step are not considered in our methodology. This is because having the other options would increase the computational time (due to increase in trials and iterations) without having significant beneficial effect on the optimality of the solution, especially if the time step length is not long (e.g. 1 hour) which is usually the case.

The following equation is used to calculate the FSP power:

$$P_{f,t,i} = \frac{\gamma Q_{f,t,i} h_{f,t,i}}{\eta_{f,t,i}} \quad \forall f \in F, \quad \forall t \in T, \quad \forall i \in I \quad \text{Eq. (10)}$$

where $Q_{f,t,i}$ = flow rate (m³/h) of pump f ; $h_{f,t,i}$ = head (m) of pump f ; and $\eta_{f,t,i}$ = efficiency of pump f . The values of $Q_{f,t,i}$, $h_{f,t,i}$, and $\eta_{f,t,i}$ will be adjusted after each iteration upon the feedback from the hydraulic simulator as will be shown in the next section.

If a group of parallel FSPs exists in a water network and they are all identical then what matters only is the number of pumps running in each time step (Gleixner, et al. 2012; Menke, et al. 2016; Bonvin, et al. 2017). Thus, the following constraint is used for each group of identical parallel FSPs:

$$x_{g,t,i} \geq x_{g+1,t,i} \geq \dots \geq x_{G,t,i} \quad \forall t \in T, \quad \forall i \in I \quad \text{Eq. (11)}$$

where g = is pump index in a group of parallel FSPs; and G = total number of pumps in a group of parallel FSPs. If all parallel FSPs in a group are identical then the number of possible solutions reduces from 2^G to $G + 1$ in each time step; thus reducing computational time.

Further, parallel identical VSPs should run at the same relative speed to have the same outlet flow rate from each pump. This concept is known as load sharing (Jones, et al. 2008) and it reduces the energy consumption, number of possible solutions and computational time. To enable load sharing concept in

the iELGP method, parallel identical VSPs are remodelled into combined pumps. Each combined pump has head, efficiency, and power curves of certain number of pumps in parallel. For example, if there is a group of two identical parallel VSPs, then these pumps should be remodelled into the following two combined pumps: (1) the first combined pump has head, efficiency, and power curves of one pump and (2) the second combined pump has head, efficiency, and power curves of two pumps in parallel. Only one combined pump is allowed to start during each time step. Thus, the following constraint is used for each group of parallel identical VSPs:

$$\sum_{cv=1}^{CV} b_{cv,t,i} \leq 1 \quad \forall t \in T, \quad \forall i \in I \quad \text{Eq. (12)}$$

where cv = index of combined VSP; and CV = total number of possible VSPs combinations in a group of parallel identical VSPs.

The negative and positive deviation variables for water change in each tank during each time step can be calculated as follows:

$$NVC_{z,t,i} - PVC_{z,t,i} = VCT_z - VC_{z,t,i} \quad \forall z \in Z, \quad \forall t \in T, \quad \forall i \in I \quad \text{Eq. (13)}$$

where VCT_z = water volume change target (m^3) in tank z ; and $VC_{z,t,i}$ = water volume change (m^3) in tank z .

The weighting factor w in Eq. (1) is needed to scale the two objectives (energy cost and water volume change in tanks) onto the same unit of measurement so they can be added up. The weighting factor is usually equal to the target value of the objective that is multiplied by the weight factor (Romero 1991), in this case the weight factor is equal to the target value of tanks water volume change VCT_z . Since VCT_z is required to be an optimistic value, it could be set to zero. However, here, the value of VCT_z is set to a small amount of 1 m^3 , to avoid multiplication by zero. The weighting factor w can be set by a pump scheduler (e.g. control room operator) to reflect his/her attitude toward balancing the two objectives.

To reduce the number of variables and to increase the computational efficiency, we related the change of water volume in tanks to pumps flow and demands. The following equation calculates the water volume change in each tank during each time step:

$$VC_{z,t,i} = \left(\left(\sum_{v=1}^V Q_{v,t,i}^{Max.Speed} \cdot x_{v,t,i} \right) + \left(\sum_{f=1}^F Q_{f,t,i} \cdot x_{f,t,i} \right) - D_{z,t} \right) \cdot S_t \quad \forall z \in Z, \forall t \in T, \forall i \in I \quad \text{Eq. (14)}$$

where $D_{z,t}$ = total demand from tank z during time step t (m^3/hr). The first term

$Q_{v,t,i}^{Maximum Speed} \cdot x_{v,t,i}$ gives the flow of the VSP at the actual speed according to the Affinity Laws. If a pump draws water from tank z , then its flow value is negative.

The water volume in each tank is constrained during each time step as shown in the following equation:

$$V_{z,min} \leq \left(\sum_{t=1}^t VC_{z,t,i} \right) + V_{z,initial} \leq V_{z,max} \quad \forall i \in I, \forall z \in Z, \forall t \in T \quad \text{Eq. (15)}$$

where $V_{z,min}$ = minimum water volume in tank z (m^3); $V_{z,initial}$ = initial water volume in tank z (m^3); $V_{z,max}$ = maximum water volume in tank z (m^3).

The following constraint is used to ensure that the final water volume in each tank is at least equal to the initial one:

$$\sum_{t=1}^T VC_{z,t,i} \geq 0 \quad \forall i \in I, \quad \forall z \in Z \quad \text{Eq. (16)}$$

The following mass balance constraint is used in case where there is no tank in a pressure zone (or water system):

$$VC_{z,t,i} = 0 \quad \forall z \in Z, \quad \forall t \in T, \quad \forall i \in I \quad \text{Eq. (17)}$$

Energy balance constraint is solved implicitly by the hydraulic simulator as will be shown in the next section.

Weighted average chlorine is used to quantify the spatial distribution of chlorine in the demand nodes as follows (motivated by a similar metric used for network water age in Marchi et al. (2014)):

$$WAC = \frac{\sum_j^J \sum_t^T k \cdot Q_{j,t} \cdot C_{j,t}}{\sum_j^J \sum_t^T Q_{j,t}} \quad \text{Eq. (18)}$$

Where WAC = weighted average chlorine in the network; $Q_{j,t}$ = demand in node j ; $C_{j,t}$ = chlorine in node j ; j = node index; J = total number of nodes; and k = constant that equals to 1 if $C_{j,t}$ is above predefined chlorine threshold or 0 otherwise. Nodes with high demand have more impact on the weighted average chlorine. Nodes with chlorine below the predefined threshold reduces the weighted average chlorine.

Scheduling Problem Solution

The pump scheduling problem defined in the previous section is solved here by using the iterative Extended Lexicographic Goal Programming (iELGP) method, as shown in Fig. 1. The solution process starts by setting the value for energy cost target ECT which needs to be carefully specified. If ECT is set too pessimistically then the resulting solution will be Pareto inefficient. If, on the other hand, ECT is set too optimistically (e.g. set equal to zero) then the method will focus on the energy cost target and will not take into consideration the other target (water volume change in tanks). The way that energy cost target is estimated is shown in the following solution steps:

- 1- Set iteration index $i = 1$.
- 2- For each VSP, find its flow and head values at its best efficiency point (BEP) when speed is maximum, then substitute these values in Eq. (8) to calculate $P_{v,t,i}^{Maximum\ Speed}$ and use it in Eq. (4). Each VSP has the same $P_{v,t,i}^{Maximum\ Speed}$ for all time steps in the first iteration.
- 3- For each FSP, find its flow and head values at its BEP, then substitute these values in Eq. (10) to calculate $P_{f,t,i}$. Each FSP has the same $P_{f,t,i}$ for all time steps in the first iteration.
- 4- Find the optimum statuses for VSPs and FSPs (i.e. $x_{v,t,1}$ and $x_{f,t,1}$) and the minimum energy cost EC_1 using Mixed Integer Linear Programming (MILP), where Eq. (3) is the objective function to be minimized and Eqs. (4), (5), (6), (7), (9), (11), (12), (15), (16), and (17)

are the constraints.

- 5- Set energy cost target ECT equals to energy cost EC_1 which is found in solution step 4. As can be seen, energy cost target equals to the optimum energy cost when all pumps have flow values at their BEP. This is an ideal optimistic value that is not realistic.

The optimum pumps' statuses ($x_{v,t,1}$ and $x_{f,t,1}$) which are found in step 4 are based on unreliable flow values. The flow values and the optimum pumps' statuses are corrected in an iterative way as shown in the following steps:

- 6- Set time step index $t = 1$.

- 7- Apply the optimum pumps' statuses ($x_{v,t,i}$ and $x_{f,t,i}$) during time step t on a hydraulic simulator for the water network which needs to be optimized.

- 8- Retrieve flow of VSPs $Q_{v,t,i}^{Actual Speed, Simulator}$ and FSPs $Q_{f,t,i}^{Simulator}$ from the hydraulic simulator. Find $Q_{v,t,i}^{Maximum Speed, Simulator}$ using affinity laws.

- 9- For all VSPs at time step t , if percentage differences between $Q_{v,t,i}^{Maximum Speed, Simulator}$ and $Q_{v,t,i}^{Maximum Speed}$ (which were used in Eq. (8) to calculate $P_{v,t,i}^{Maximum Speed}$ in the current iteration i) are all less than 1%, then move to step 12. The 1% tolerance was selected after limited sensitivity analysis on 3 case studies (2 in Abdallah and Kapelan (2017) and 1 in this paper). These case studies have different topologies, demand patterns, pipes and pumps characteristics. The threshold value proposed results in convergence in the three case studies. Having said this, if a smaller tolerance value is used, then the number of iterations will increase (without significant improvement in the final optimal solution) and, in the worst, case scenario, the iELGP method may not converge to an optimal solution. This tolerance may have to be adjusted for other case studies.

- 10- If percentage difference between $Q_{v,t,i}^{Maximum Speed, Simulator}$ and $Q_{v,t,i}^{Maximum Speed}$ for at least one of the VSPs v^* is more than 1%, then substitute $Q_{v,t,i}^{Maximum Speed}$ with

$Q_{v,t,i}^{Maximum\ Speed, Simulator}$ in Eq. (8), and Eq. (14) for pump v^* and for all other pumps that are running in parallel and in series with pump v^* in time step t .

11- Find heads and efficiencies for all VSPs that change their $Q_{v,t,i}^{Maximum\ Speed}$ values in solution step 10 using their head and efficiency curves, then recalculate their $P_{v,t,i}^{Maximum\ Speed}$ using Eq. (8). Move to step 13.

12- For all FSPs at time step t , if percentage differences between $Q_{f,t,i}^{Simulator}$ and $Q_{f,t,i}$ (which were used in Eq. (10) to calculate pump power $P_{f,t,i}$ in current iteration i) are all less than 1%, and if t is not the last time step, then move to the next time step $t = t + 1$ and go back to step 7. If t is the last time step, then move to step 17.

13- If percentage difference between $Q_{f,t,i}^{Simulator}$ and $Q_{f,t,i}$ for at least one of the FSPs f^* is more than 1%, then substitute $Q_{f,t,i}$ with $Q_{f,t,i}^{Simulator}$ in Eqs. (10), and (14) for pump f^* and for all other pumps that are running in parallel and in series with pump f^* in time step t .

14- Find heads and efficiencies for all FSPs that change their $Q_{f,t,i}$ values in solution step 13 using their head and efficiency curves, then recalculate their $P_{f,t,i}$ using Eq. (10).

15- Find the optimum statuses ($x_{v,t,i}$ and $x_{f,t,i}$) for all pumps during all time steps and find the minimum deviation variables (PEC_i , $PVC_{z,t,i}$, and $NVC_{z,t,i}$) using GP, where Eq. (1) is the objective function and Eqs. (2), (3), (4), (5), (6), (7), (9), (11), (12), (13), (14), (15), (16), (17) are the constraints.

16- Start new iteration $i = i + 1$ and go back to step 6.

17- If t is the last time step, then iteration will terminate.

18- Find chlorine concentration at each demand node by running the water quality simulator.

The solution in the last iteration has the minimum energy cost and water volume change in tanks. The flow chart for the previous steps is shown in Fig. 1.

A pump scheduling program is developed in *MATLAB R2011b* computer software. The iELGP-based optimiser calls the hydraulic simulator *EPANET 2.0* to do the hydraulic and water quality calculations, and the MILP solver *lp_solve 5.5.2.0* (Berkelaar et al. 2016) to do the optimisation.

Case Study

Description

The iELGP method is applied here on the same, real-life C-Town network that was used in Price and Ostfeld (2016). The EPANET input file for this network is available online (WDSA 2014). All of the following descriptions and assumptions for C-Town network were used in Price and Ostfeld (2016). This enables a fair comparison of solutions to be made. The C-Town network is shown in Fig. 2 and it consists of 1 water source, 11 FSPs, 7 tanks, 388 junctions, and 1 valve that is always opened. All pumps are assumed a fixed efficiency of 70%.

The residual chlorine is fixed to 0.50 mg/l upstream of all pumps and at tanks T2 and T6 at all times. Other tanks have initial chlorine value of 0 mg/l. Water mixing in tanks is assumed to be instantaneous and complete. The first order bulk decay rate is set to -0.55 mg/l/day and the first order wall decay rate is set to 0 m/day. The minimum required residual chlorine in all demand nodes is 0.28 mg/l.

The network is optimized for 1 week which is divided into 168 equal time steps of 1 hour length. Time step length in the hydraulic simulation is 1 hour and in the water quality simulation is 5 minutes. The hourly electrical tariff is shown in Fig. 3.

Three cases of C-Town network are optimized. In case I, the minimum required residual chlorine of 0.28 mg/l at demand nodes is reached by reducing tanks' maximum levels (the second term in Eq. (1) is set equal to zero in Case I), as in Case 1e of Price and Ostfeld (2016). This was done to compare the performance of the iELGP method to the graph theory method of Price and Ostfeld (2016).

After careful study of the C-Town network, it was found that demand nodes which can be supplied from tank T3 have very low residual chlorine. Thus, in cases II and III, the minimum required residual

chlorine at all demand nodes is reached by minimizing tank T3 inlet and outlet flow rate. In other words, tank T3 is allowed to loose and gain water at minimum rates, to increase chlorine in its related demand nodes and, at the same time, to keep its water fresh. This was done to test the effect of minimizing tanks flow on demand nodes chlorine and compare it to the effect of minimizing tanks maximum water level (Case I).

In addition, in Cases I and II only FSPs are used (as it was done in Case 1e of Price and Ostfeld (2016)) whilst in Case III pumps P1, P2, and P3 are assumed to have variable speeds (with respective maximum speeds set equal to their fixed speeds in Case 1e of Avi and Ostfeld (2016), Case I and Case II). This enables to analyse the potential benefits of using variable speed pumps in Case III.

In all cases, initial water level in each tank is set equal to half of that tank's maximum water level in Case 1e of Price and Ostfeld (2016). Minimum water level in all tanks in all cases is 0 m.

The computer used in Price and Ostfeld (2016) is based on the Intel® Core™ i7-3770 CPU running at 3.40 GHz and the RAM available is 8 GB. The computer used in this research is based on the Intel® Core™ i7-3612 QM CPU running at 2.10 GHz and the RAM available is 8 GB.

Results and Discussion

The results obtained for each of the three cases analysed are summarised in Table 1.

As it can be seen from Table 1, in Case I, the optimal pump schedule identified by using the iELGP method has lower energy cost of 381.10 \$/day than the corresponding solution identified by Price and Ostfeld (2016) which has the energy cost of 395.40 \$/day. However, the latter solution has lower total number of pump switches (230) than the former solution (342). This means that there is a trade-off between energy cost and total number of pump switches. The iELGP method identifies solution with a lower energy cost but also with a higher number of pump switches. This is because the iELGP method allows pumps to run for a fraction of each time step, unlike the approach proposed by Price and Ostfeld (2016). Note that both methods have not constrained the number of pump switches. This is because reducing the number of pump switches increases water age and hence reduces residual

chlorine in the network (Price and Ostfeld 2016). Having said this, it is possible to reduce the number of pump switches in iELGP by increasing the length of time steps (instead of one hour) and allowing pumps to start only once during a time step. This was already proved in Abdallah and Kapelan (2017).

The optimum tanks' levels obtained by the iELGP method for Case I are shown in Fig. 3. As it can be seen from this figure, as expected, tanks' levels increase (i.e. tanks refill) during low electrical tariff periods and decrease (i.e. empty) during high electrical tariff periods. Tanks' final levels are also equal to or above their initial levels meaning that all tanks in the analysed network are balancing well. Tanks T2 and T6 have high water levels most of the time because they have lower elevation than respective parallel tanks T1 and T7. Having high water levels in tanks T2 and T6 most of the time increases their water age and decreases their chlorine. To avoid that, chlorine is set to 0.5 mg/l at tanks T2 and T6 at all times, as mentioned previously.

Fig. 4 shows the hourly tank T3 levels for Cases I, II and III and tank T3 chlorine concentration in Cases II and III. As it can be seen from this figure, water level in tank T3 in Case I has many hikes (tank drains and refills frequently). This is because tank T3 maximum level is reduced by 85% to have minimum chlorine of 0.28 mg/l at nearby demand nodes. In contrast, tank T3 level in Case II is almost steady and it is smooth in Case III when compared to Case I. This is because in Cases II and III, the 0.28 mg/l minimum residual chlorine in the network was reached by minimizing tank T3's inlet/outlet flow. In Cases II and III, pump P4 (which supplies tank T3) starts at the beginning of every time step and stops before the end of each time step. This is to provide sufficient water supply to demand nodes and to, at the same time, avoid storing excess water in T3. Table 1 shows that pump P4 in Cases II and III has the highest number of pump switches. This causes tank T3 to have good chlorine range in Cases II and III as shown in Fig. 4.

As shown in Table 1. VSPs benefits Case III when compared to Case II. The number of switches for pumps P1, P2, and P3 are reduced from 34 to 6 and the total energy cost is reduced from 394.60 to 385.04 \$/day.

Fig. 5 shows tank T1 water level and pumps P1, P2, P3 status/speed in Cases II and III. As it can be seen from this figure, FSPs P1, P2, and P3 in Case II start with the maximum constant speed during low electrical tariff and stop during high electrical tariff. However, in Case III, VSPs P1, P2, and P3 are running all the time (except during time steps 163, 164, and 167) and at the minimum relative speed of 0.70 (except for few time steps where relative speed is 0.80). Additionally, when parallel VSPs P1, P2, and P3 are running in Case III, they are running at the same speed, to equally share the load and reduce energy cost, as mentioned previously.

The above mentioned difference in pumps P1, P2, and P3 running between Cases II and III makes the water level of tank T1 (which is supplied by pumps P1, P2, P3) different in Cases II and III. Tank T1 water level in Case II increases steeply during low electrical tariff and decreases steeply during high electrical tariff. This is because pumps P1, P2, and P3 in this case start (with the maximum constant speed) during low electrical tariff and stops during high electrical tariff. Tank 1 level in Case III increases during the peak tariff hours because in this case VSPs 1, 2, and 3, which supply water to this tank, are running during the peak tariff hours. However, FSPs 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10 and 11, which are drawing water from the same tank, are not running during the peak tariff hours.

The above mentioned running behaviour of pumps in Case III increases the number of water level cycles in tank T1 and allows water to reside in tank T1 for less time than in Case II. Thus, tank T1 have lower water age and higher residual chlorine in Case III than in Case II. Additionally, having the source pumps P1, P2, and P3 running almost all the time in Case III at minimum speed of 0.70 provides more fresh water for the whole network all the time than in Case II where pumps P1, P2, and P3 are running at maximum speeds during low electrical tariff (and not running during the high electrical tariff). As a consequence, the weighted average network chlorine in Case III (0.429 mg/l) is slightly higher than that in Case II (0.419 mg/l). The improved water quality represents an additional advantage of using VSPs, i.e. in addition to previously mentioned lower energy cost and lower number of pump switches.

Table 1 also shows that the iELGP method is highly computationally efficient, as evidenced by short optimisation times required in all three cases to generate hourly pump schedules for a whole week.

Out of the three cases analysed, Case III requires the largest computational time to identify optimal pump schedule. This is because of the time consuming Branch and Bound method that is used in this case to optimise the operation of VSPs P1, P2, and P3. Note also that in all three cases (I, II, and III), *Epanet 2.0* reinitializes hydraulic simulations to the first time step in each iteration. This consumes a lot of computational time (Price and Ostfeld 2015) and avoiding this could further reduce the total computational time required.

Further Remarks

All pumps in the C-Town network case study were assumed a fixed efficiency of 70%, for the sake of simplicity. However, iELGP optimisation method can deal with variable efficiencies (Abdallah and Kapelan 2017) and unlike several existing pump scheduling methods (Chen and Coulbeck 1991; Price and Ostfeld 2015) which assume fixed efficiency for pumps.

It is required to know in advance which tanks deteriorates chlorine and water age in the demand nodes by running a water quality simulation. The deterioration depends on many things such as tanks' sizes, how far tanks are from their supply pumps and demand pattern downstream the tanks'.

As it can be further seen from Table 1, the energy cost in Case I is lower than the corresponding energy costs in Cases II and III. This is because in Cases II and III, there is no energy saving made in pump P4 which supplies tank T3, because it starts and stops during all time steps including high electrical tariff time steps. Additionally, the weighted average network chlorine in Case I is 0.435 mg/l, while it is 0.419 mg/l in Case II and 0.429 mg/l. This is because in Case I tanks' maximum levels are reduced to have minimum chlorine of 0.28 mg/l everywhere in the network, while in Cases II and III only tank T3 flow was minimized to have minimum chlorine of 0.28 mg/l everywhere in the network. If tanks flow other than tank T3 flow are also reduced in Cases II and III, and if weight factors w for tanks' flow are reduced, then Cases II and III might have better energy cost and weighted average chlorine than Case I. Thus, although Case I gives lower energy cost and higher weighted average chlorine than Cases II and III, one cannot conclude that reducing tanks' maximum level is better than minimizing tanks' flow in terms of energy cost and chlorine.

Minimizing tank T3 flow in Cases II and III did not decrease the residual chlorine in tank T3 as shown in Fig. 4. However, there is possibility in other cases studies that minimizing tanks flow will reduce residual chlorine in the tanks because water age in tanks will increase. This problem can be solved by reducing the weight factor w in the objective function Eq. (1). This will decrease the weight of water volume change in the objective function and make the optimisation method focus more on minimizing the energy cost; thus giving more freedom to tanks to increase and decrease their water levels based on electrical tariff. In general, the value of the weight factor w needs to be carefully chosen due to the sensitivity of the objective function Eq. (1) to this factor and to ensure identifying efficient Pareto optimal solutions (Cohon 1978; Walski, et al. 2003, Jones and Tamiz 2010). The two objectives (energy cost and water volume change in tanks) are inversely proportional to each other, i.e. reducing energy cost by running pumps during low tariffs and stopping pumps during high tariffs causes high water volume changes in tanks and reduces chlorine in the network. In contrast, running pumps based on demand only regardless of electrical tariff increases energy cost and reduces water volume changes in tanks (improves chlorine in the network). So, once the value of the weighting factor w is selected, then the minimum chlorine concentration should be fulfilled by the optimal solution every time the optimisation method is run. This, of course, does not hold if there is a major change in demand patterns or if the network configuration changes. In this case, the value of the weighting factor should be changed to reflect these changes.

Several research works proved that decreasing VSP speed (and thus the VSP flow rate) causes decrease in chlorine decay in the water network (Ramos, et al. 2010; Mohammed and Khudiar 2012; Jamwal and Kumar 2016). This is due to the decrease in pipe wall reaction and biofilm removal. However, the above effect of VSPs on chlorine decay does not appear in *EPANET 2.0* water quality simulator because it does not account for mass flux between the water and the pipe wall which depends on the flow rate.

The ability of the iELGP method to find optimal solutions in three different cases (I, II, and III) represents a good sensitivity test that proves the robustness of this method under different conditions in the network. Additionally, note that, unlike many other stochastic pump scheduling methods

(especially the ones based on Evolutionary Algorithms, e.g. Wu and Zhu (2009) and Hashemi et al. (2013)), the iELGP method does not have parameters that require tuning before running the optimisation and it is a deterministic optimisation method that gives the same solution for the same initial conditions every time the optimisation is run.

As stated in Abdallah and Kapelan (2017), the iELGP pump scheduling method does not guarantee obtaining the minimum required pressures at demand nodes because these are not constrained. The iELGP method assumes that the water distribution network is designed in such a way that minimum required pressures are always provided under normal operating conditions, i.e., regardless of tanks' levels or pumps running. This potential drawback can be overcome by increasing the minimum water volume in Eq. (15) only for tanks that supply demand nodes which are expected to have pressure below the minimum required pressure during the optimization period.

Water demand changes from day to day and hence can affect the identification of optimal pump schedules. This can be overcome by linking a demand forecaster to the pump scheduling methodology. However, it was not preferred to do so in this paper as it would shift the focus and also make the paper too long.

Conclusions

A new pump scheduling method based on the iELGP optimisation method is developed and presented here. The method aims to optimize energy cost and water quality (residual chlorine) in large scale multi-tank water networks that have mixture of variable and fixed speed pumps. The method is tested and validated on the real-life C-Town network. The results obtained by using the iELGP method are compared with the results obtained by the pump scheduling introduced and tested on the same network by Price and Ostfeld (2016). The key findings obtained are as follows:

1. The iELGP based methodology is capable of determining optimal, low cost pump schedules whilst trading-off energy costs and water quality. The optimal schedules for both fixed and variable speed pumps can be generated in a computationally very efficient manner. Given this, the iELGP method has potential to be applied to real-time scheduling of pumps in larger,

water distribution networks and without the need to simplify the respective hydraulic models or replace these with surrogate models in the form of ANN or otherwise.

2. The comparison of the iELGP and Price and Ostfeld (2016) graph theory based method shows that the iELGP method can identify pump schedules with lower energy cost and in a computationally more efficient manner (albeit at the cost of increased number of pump switches, even though neither of the two methods constrained this).
3. Two different approaches were used to improve water quality (i.e. increase residual chlorine) in the analysed C-Town network whilst scheduling pumps, by reducing tanks' maximum water levels and by minimizing tanks' in/out flows. Both approaches proved their ability to improve water quality through pump scheduling without the need to change chlorine dosing set-point or add chlorine boosters.
4. When comparing the pump schedules obtained by using fixed and variable speed pumps at the source of the C-Town network, it was found that using variable speed pumps reduces the total cost of energy used for pumping, it reduces the total number of pump switches, and it also improves the water quality by increasing the weighted average residual chlorine in the network.

Future work should include scheduling of network valves (in addition to pumps) and finding better approach to determine the weight factor used to combine the two objectives into a single-objective pump scheduling problem.

Notation

The following symbols are used in this paper:

$b_{v,t,i}$ = binary variable that is equal to zero when pump is not running and equal to one when pump is running;

$C_{j,t}$ = chlorine in node j ;

CV = total number of possible VSPs combinations in a group of parallel identical VSPs;

cv = index of combined VSP;

593 $D_{z,t}$ = total demand from tank z during time step t (m^3/hr);

594 E_t = cost of electricity for given time step t (£/KWh);

595 EC_i = energy cost at iteration i (£);

596 ECT = energy cost target (£);

597 F = total number of FSPs;

598 f = FSP index;

599 G = total number of pumps in a group of parallel pumps;

600 g = pump index in a group of parallel pumps;

601 $h_{v,t,i}^{Maximum\ Speed}$ = head (m) of pump v running at maximum speed;

602 $h_{f,t,i}$ = head (m) of pump f ;

603 I = total number of iterations;

604 i = iELGP iteration index;

605 J = total number of nodes;

606 j = node index;

607 k = constant that equals to 1 if $C_{j,t}$ is above predefine chlorine threshold or 0 otherwise.

608 $NVC_{z,t,i}$ = negative deviation variable for water volume change in tank z (m^3);

609 PEC_i = positive deviation variable for energy cost at iteration i (£);

610 $PVC_{z,t,i}$ = positive deviation variable for water volume change in tank z (m^3);

611 $P_{v,t,i}^{Actual\ Speed}$ = VSP power at actual speed;

612 $P_{f,t,i}$ = FSP power;

613 $P_{v,t,i}^{Maximum\ Speed}$ = VSP power at maximum speed;

614 $Q_{v,t,i}^{Maximum\ Speed}$ = flow rate (m^3/h) of pump v running at maximum speed;

615 $Q_{f,t,i}$ = flow rate (m^3/h) of pump f ;

616 $Q_{j,t}$ = demand in node j ;

617 S_t = time step length (hr);

618 s = the slope of the regression line which is equal to 2.1850;

619 T = total number of time steps;

620 t = time step index;

621 $VCT_{z,t}$ = water volume change target (m^3) in tank z ;

622 $VC_{z,t,i}$ = water volume change (m^3) in tank z ;

623 $V_{z,min}$ = minimum water volume in tank z (m^3);

624 $V_{z,initial}$ = initial water volume in tank z (m^3);

625 $V_{z,max}$ = maximum water volume in tank z (m^3);

626 V = total number of VSPs;

627 v = VSP index;

628 WAC = weighted average chlorine in the network;

629 w = weighting factor;

630 $x_{f,t,i}$ = decision variable denoting pump f status;

631 $x_{v,t,i}$ = decision variable denoting relative speed of VSP v at time t and iteration i ;

632 y = the y-intercept of the regression line which is equal to 1.2176;

633 Z = total number of tanks;

634 z = tank index;

635 γ = specific weight of water (kN/m^3);

636 $\eta_{v,t,i}^{Maximum\ Speed}$ = efficiency of pump v running at maximum speed;

637 $\eta_{f,t,i}$ = efficiency of pump f ;

638

639 **References**

640 Abdallah, M., Kapelan, Z. (2017) "Iterative Extended Lexicographic Goal Programming Method for

641 Fast and Optimal Pump Scheduling in Water Distribution Networks." *J. Water Resour. Plan. Manag.* 10.1061/(ASCE)WR.1943-5452.0000843.

642

643 Berkelaar, M., Dirks, J., Eikland, K., Notebaert, P., and Ebert, J. (2016). "lp_solve reference guide."
644 <http://lpsolve.sourceforge.net/5.5> (Mar. 22, 2016).

645 Biscos, C., Mulholland, M., Le Lann, M., Brouckaert, C., Bailey, R., Roustan, M. (2002). "Optimal
646 operation of a potable water distribution network." *Water Sci. Technol*, 46(9), 155-162.

647 Biscos, C., Mulholland, M., Le Lann, M.-V., Buckley, C.A., Brouckaert, C.J. (2003). "Optimal
648 operation of water distribution networks by predictive control using MINLP." *Water SA*,
649 29(4), 393-404.

650 Bonvin, G., Demasse, S., Le Pape, C., Maïzi, N., Mazauric, V., and Samperio, A. (2017). "A convex
651 mathematical program for pump scheduling in a class of branched water networks." *Applied*
652 *Energy*, 1702–1711.

653 Broad, D.R., Maier, H.R., Dandy, G.C. (2010). "Optimal operation of complex water distribution
654 systems using metamodels." *J. Water Resour. Plan. Manag*, 10.1061/(ASCE)WR.1943-
655 5452.0000052.

656 Chen, Y. C., and Coulbeck, B. (1991). "Optimized operation of water supply systems containing a
657 mixture of fixed and variable speed pumps." *Int. Conf. on Control*, The Institution, London,
658 1200–1205.

659 Coelho, B., and Andrade-Campos, A. G. (2016) "A new approach for the prediction of speed-adjusted
660 pump efficiency curves." *J. of Hydraul. Res.*, 586-593.

661 Cohon, J. L. (1978). *Multiobjective Programming and Planning*, Academic Press, New York.

662 Coulbeck, B., Brdys, M., Orr, C.H., Rance, J.P. (1988a). "A hierarchical approach to optimized
663 control of water distribution systems: Part I. Decomposition." *Optim. Control Appl. Methods*,
664 9 (1), 51-61.

665 Coulbeck, B., Brdys, M., Orr, C.H., Rance, J.P., 1988b. A hierarchical approach to optimized control
666 of water distribution systems: Part II. Lower-level algorithm." *Optim. Control Appl. Methods*,
667 9 (2), 109-126.

668 D'Ambrosio, C., Lodi, A., Wiese, S., and Bragalli, C. (2015). "Mathematical programming techniques
669 in water network optimisation." *Eur. J. Oper. Res.*, 243 (3), 774–788.

670 EPANET version 2.0 [Computer software]. EPA, Washington, DC.

671 Giacomello, C., Kapelan, Z., and Nicolini, M. (2013). "Fast hybrid optimisation method for effective
672 pump scheduling." *J. Water Resour. Plann. Manage.*, 10.1061/(ASCE)WR.1943-
673 5452.0000239, 175–183.

674 Gibbs, M.S., Dandy, G.C., Maier, H.R. (2010a). "Calibration and optimization of the pumping and
675 disinfection of a real water supply system." *J. Water Resour. Plan. Manag.*,
676 10.1061/(ASCE)WR.1943-5452.0000060.

677 Gleixner, A., Held, H., Huang, W., and Vigerske, S. (2012). "Towards globally optimal operation of
678 water supply networks." *Numer. Algebra, Control Optim.*, 2 (4), 695-711.

679 Goldman, F.E., Mays, L.W. (1999). "The Application of Simulated Annealing to the Optimal
680 Operation of Water Systems." *Proc., 29th Annual Water Resources Planning and Management*
681 *Conf.*, ASCE, Tempe, USA, 10.1061/40430(1999)56.

682 Hashemi, S.S., Tabesh, M., Ataekia, B. (2013). "Ant-colony optimization of pumping schedule to
683 minimize the energy cost using variable-speed pumps in water distribution networks." *Urban*
684 *Water J.*, 11 (5), 335-347.

685 Jamwal, P., and Kumar, M. (2016). "Effect of flow velocity on chlorine decay in water distribution
686 network: A pilot loop study." *Current science*, 114(8), 1349-1354.

687 Jones, D., and Tamiz, M. (2010). *Practical goal programming*, Springer, New York.

688 Jones, G. M., Sanks, R. L., Tchobanoglous, G., and Bosserman II, B. E. (2008). *Pumping station*
689 *design*, 3rd Ed., Elsevier, Amsterdam, Netherlands.

690 Kalaiselvan, A. S. V., Subramaniam, U., Shanmugam, P., and Hanigovszki, N. (2016). "A
691 comprehensive review on energy efficiency enhancement initiatives in centrifugal pumping
692 system." *Applied Energy*, 495-513.

693 Kaya, D., Yagmur, E. A., Yigit, K. S., Kilic, F. C., Eren, A. S., and Celik, C. (2008). "Energy
694 efficiency in pumps." *Energy Conversion and Management*, 49(6), 1662–1673.

695 Kennedy, M. S., Moegling, S., Sarikelle, S., and Suravallop, K. (1993). "Assessing the Effects of
696 Storage Tank Design on Water Quality ." American Water Works Association, 85(7), 78-88.

697 Kurek, W., and Ostfeld, A. (2013). "Multi-objective optimization of water quality, pumps operation,
698 and storage sizing of water distribution systems." *J. Environ. Manage.*, 115, 189–197.

699 Kurek, W., Ostfeld, A. (2014). "Multiobjective water distribution systems control of pumping cost,
700 water quality, and storage-reliability constraints." *J. Water Resour. Plan. Manag.*,
701 10.1061/(ASCE)WR.1943-5452.0000309.

702 Lamaddalena, N., and Khila, S., (2012) "Energy saving with variable speed pumps in on-demand
703 irrigation systems." *Irrigation Science*, 30(2), 157–166.

704 Land, A. H., and Doig, A. G. (1960). "An Automatic Method of Solving Discrete Programming
705 Problems." *Econometrica*, 28(3), 497-520.

706 Lingireddy, S., and Wood, D. J. (1998). "Improved Operation of Water Distribution Systems Using
707 Variable-Speed Pumps." *J. Water Resour. Plann. Manage.*, 10.1061/(ASCE)0733-
708 9402(1998)124:3(90).

709 Luo, Y., Yuan, S., Tang, Y., Yuan, J., & Zhang, J. (2012). Modeling Optimal Scheduling for Pumping
710 System to Minimize Operation Cost and Enhance Operation Reliability. *Journal of Applied*
711 *Mathematics*, 2012, 1-19. doi:10.1155/2012/370502

712 Mala-Jetmarova, H., Sultanova, N., and Savic, D. (2017). "Lost in optimisation of water distribution
713 systems? A literature review of system operation." *Environmental Modelling & Software*, 93,
714 209-254.

715 Marchi, A., Salomons, E., Ostfeld, A., Kapelan, Z., Simpson, A., Zecchin, A., Maier, H., Wu, Z.,
 716 Elsayed, S., Song, Y., Walski, T., Stokes, C., Wu, W., Dandy, G., Alvisi, S., Creaco, E.,
 717 Franchini, M., Saldarriaga, J., Páez, D., Hernández, D., Bohórquez, J., Bent, R., Coffrin, C.,
 718 Judi, D., McPherson, T., van Hentenryck, P., Matos, J., Monteiro, A., Matias, N., Yoo, D.,
 719 Lee, H., Kim, J., Iglesias-Rey, P., Martínez-Solano, F., Mora-Meliá, D., Ribelles-Aguilar, J.,
 720 Guidolin, M., Fu, G., Reed, P., Wang, Q., Liu, H., McClymont, K., Johns, M., Keedwell, E.,
 721 Kandiah, V., Jasper, M., Drake, K., Shafiee, E., Barandouzi, M., Berglund, A., Brill, D.,
 722 Mahinthakumar, G., Ranjithan, R., Zechman, E., Morley, M., Tricarico, C., de Marinis, G.,
 723 Tolson, B., Khedr, A. & Asadzadeh, M. (2014). "Battle of the water networks II." *J. Water*
 724 *Resour. Plann. Manage.*, 10.1061/(ASCE)WR.1943-5452.0000378, 04014009.

725 Marchi, A., and Simpson, A. R. (2013). "Correction of the EPANET Inaccuracy in Computing the
 726 Efficiency of Variable Speed Pumps." *J. Water Resour. Plann. Manage.*,
 727 10.1061/(ASCE)WR.1943-5452.0000273.

728 Marchi, A., Simpson, A. R., and Ertugrul, N. (2012). "Assessing variable speed pump efficiency in
 729 water distribution systems." *Drink. Water Eng. Sci.*, 5, 15-21.

730 MATLAB [Computer software]. MathWorks, Natick, MA.

731 Mehrez, A., Percia, C., Oron, G., (1992). "Optimal operation of a multi-source and multiquality
 732 regional water systems." *Water Resour. Res.*, 28 (5), 1199-1206.

733 Menke, R., Abraham, E., Pappas, P., and Stoianov, I. (2016). "Exploring Optimal Pump Scheduling in
 734 Water Distribution Networks with Branch and Bound Methods." *Water Resour. Manage.*,
 735 30(14), 5333-5349.

736 Mohammed, R. A., and Khudiar, K. M. (2012). "Effects of flow rate and pipe diameter on wall
 737 chlorine decay rates." *Al-Taqani*, 25(1), 134-144.

738 Moreira, D. F., and Ramos, H. M. (2013). "Energy Cost Optimisation in a Water Supply System Case
 739 Study." *Journal of Energy*, 2013.

740 Moreno, M. A., Carrión, P. A., Planells, P., Ortega, J. F., & Tarjuelo, J. M. (2007). Measurement and
 741 improvement of the energy efficiency at pumping stations. *Biosystems Engineering*, 98(4), 479-
 742 486. doi:10.1016/j.biosystemseng.2007.09.005

743 Morton, W. R. (1975). "Economics of AC Adjustable Speed Drives on Pumps." *IEEE Transactions*
 744 *on Industry Applications*, IA-11(3), 282 - 286.

745 Murphy, L., McIver, D., Dandy, G.C., Hewitson, C., Frey, J.P., Jacobsen, L., Fang, M. (2007). "GA
 746 Optimization for Las Vegas Valley Water Distribution System Operations and Water
 747 Quality." *Proc., World Environmental and Water Resources Congress 2007*, ASCE, Tampa,
 748 USA, 10.1061/40927(243)494.

749 Odan, F. K., Reis, L. F. R., and Kapelan, Z. (2015). "Real-time multiobjective optimization of
 750 operation of water supply systems." *J. Water Resour. Plann. Manage.*,
 751 10.1061/(ASCE)WR.1943-5452.0000515.

752 Olson, C. T., and DeBoer, D. E. (2011). "Effects of tank operation and design characteristics on
 753 water quality in distribution system storage tanks." *Water and Environmental Engineering*
 754 *Research Center*, South Dakota State University, Brookings, SD 57007

755 Ostfeld, A., Salomons, E. (2006). "Conjunctive optimal scheduling of pumping and booster chlorine
 756 injections in water distribution systems." *Eng. Optim.*, 38 (3), 337-352

757 Ostfeld, A., Shamir, U. (1993a). "Optimal operation of multiquality networks. I: steady-state
 758 conditions." *J. Water Resour. Plan. Manag.*, 10.1061/(ASCE)0733-9496(1993)119:6(645).

759 Ostfeld, A., Shamir, U. (1993b). "Optimal operation of multiquality networks. II: unsteady
 760 conditions." *J. Water Resour. Plan. Manag.*, 10.1061/(ASCE)0733-9496(1993)119:6(663).

761 Percia, C., Oron, G., Mehrez, A. (1997). "Optimal operation of regional system with diverse water
 762 quality resources." *J. Water Resour. Plan. Manag.*, 10.1061/(ASCE)0733-
 763 9496(1997)123:2(105).

764 Pezeshk, S., and Helweg, O. J. (1996). "Adaptive Search Optimization in Reducing Pump Operating
765 Costs." *J. Water Resour. Plann. Manage.*, 10.1061/(ASCE)0733-9496(1996)122:1(57).

766 Price, E., and Ostfeld, A. (2015). "Graph theory modeling approach for optimal operation of water
767 distribution systems." *J. Hydraul. Eng.*, 10.1061/(ASCE)HY.1943-7900.0001099, 04015061.

768 Price, E., and Ostfeld, A. (2016). "Optimal Pump Scheduling in Water Distribution Systems Using
769 Graph Theory under Hydraulic and Chlorine Constraints." *J. Water Resour. Plann. Manage.*,
770 10.1061/(ASCE)WR.1943-5452.0000680.

771 Ramos, H. M., Loureiro, D., Lopes, A., Fernandes, C., Covas, D., Reis, L. F., and Cunha, M. C.
772 (2010). "Evaluation of Chlorine Decay in Drinking Water Systems for Different Flow
773 Conditions: From Theory to Practice." *Water Resour. Manage.*, 24(4), 815–834.

774 Rao, Z., and Salomons, E. (2007). "Development of a real-time, nearoptimal control process for
775 water-distribution networks." *J. Hydroinform.*, 9(1), 25–37.

776 Romero, C. (1991). *Handbook of Critical Issues in Goal Programming*, Elsevier, Amsterdam.

777 Romero, C. (2001). "Extended lexicographic goal programming: a unifying approach." *Omega*, 29(1),
778 63-71.

779 Sakarya, A.B., Mays, L.W. (1999). "Optimal Operation of Water Distribution Systems for Water
780 Quality Purposes." *Proc., 29th Annual Water Resources Planning and Management Conf.*,
781 ASCE, Tempe, USA, 10.1061/40430(1999)54.

782 Sárbu, I., and Borza, I. (1998). "Energetic optimisation of water pumping in distribution systems."
783 *Periodica Polytechnica Mechanical Engineering*, 42(2), 141-152.

784 Selek, I., Bene, J.G., Hos, C. (2012). "Optimal (Short-Term) pump schedule detection for water
785 distribution systems by neutral evolutionary search." *Appl. Soft Comput.*, 12 (8), 2336-2351.

786 Simpson, A. R., and Marchi, A. (2013). "Evaluating the Approximation of the Affinity Laws and
787 Improving the Efficiency Estimate for Variable Speed Pumps." *J. Hydraul. Eng.*,
788 10.1061/(ASCE)HY.1943-7900.0000776.

789 Ulanicki, B., Kahler, J., and Coulbeck, B. (2008). "Modeling the Efficiency and Power Characteristics
790 of a Pump Group." *J. Water Resour. Plann. Manage.*, 10.1061/(ASCE)0733-
791 9496(2008)134:1(88).

792 Ulanicki, B., Kahler, J., and See, H. (2007). "Dynamic optimization approach for solving an optimal
793 scheduling problem in water distribution systems." *J. Water Resour. Plann. Manage.*,
794 10.1061/(ASCE)0733-9496(2007)133:1(23), 23–32.

795 Ulanicki, B., Rance, J.P., Davis, D., and Chen, S. (1993). "Computer-aided optimal pump selection
796 for water distribution networks." *J. Water Resour. Plan. Manag.*, 10.1061/(ASCE)0733-
797 9496(1993)119:5(542).

798 USEPA (2013). "EPANET 2.0. United States Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA)."
799 (<http://www.epa.gov/nrmrl/wswrd/dw/epanet.html>) (Nov. 30, 2017).

800 Verleye, D., and Aghezzaf, E. H. (2015). "Generalized benders decomposition to reoptimize water
801 production and distribution operations in a real water supply network." *J. Water Resour.*
802 *Plann. Manage.*, 10.1061/(ASCE)WR.1943-5452.0000603, 04015059.

803 WDSA. (2014). "Battle of water networks" < [http://www.water-](http://www.water-system.org/wdsa2014/index155a.html?q=content/battle-water-networks)
804 [system.org/wdsa2014/index155a.html?q=content/battle-water-networks](http://www.water-system.org/wdsa2014/index155a.html?q=content/battle-water-networks)> (Mar. 28, 2018).

805 Wegley, C., Lansey, K., Eusuff, M. (2000). "Determining Pump Operations Using Particle Swarm
806 Optimization." *Proc., Joint Conf. on Water Resource Engineering and Water Resources*
807 *Planning and Management*, ASCE, Minneapolis, USA, 10.1061/40517(2000)206.

808 Wood D.J., Reddy L.S. (1995). "Using Variable Speed Pumps to Reduce Leakage and Improve
809 Performance." In: Cabrera E., Vela A.F. (eds) *Improving Efficiency and Reliability in Water*
810 *Distribution Systems. Water Science and Technology Library*, 14. Springer, Dordrecht

Wu, Z.Y. (2007). “A benchmark study for minimizing energy cost of constant and variable speed pump operation.” *Proc., World Environmental and Water Resources Congress 2007: Restoring Our Natural Habitat*, ASCE, Reston, USA, 10.1061/40927(243)470.

Wu, Z.Y., Zhu, Q. (2009). “Scalable Parallel Computing Framework for Pump Scheduling Optimization.” *Proc., World Environmental and Water Resources Congress 2009*, ASCE, Kansas, USA, 10.1061/41036(342)42.

List of tables

Table 1. Data and optimisation results for different cases of C-Town water network

Table 1. Data and optimisation results for different cases of C-Town water network

Optimisation Method	Graph theory Case 1e from Price and Ostfeld (2016)	iELGP Case I	iELGP Case II	iELGP Case III
Reaching the 0.28 mg/l minimum residual chlorine	By reducing tanks' maximum level: T1 by 65%, T2 by 30%, T3 by 85%, T4 by 15%. These percentages were found by Price and Ostfeld (2016) and fixed before optimisation.		By minimizing inlet and outlet flow of tank T3 only.	
Tank's Maximum Water Level (m)				
T1	2.28		6.50	
T2	4.13		5.90	
T3	1.01		6.75	
T4	4.00		4.70	
T5	4.50			
T6	5.50			
T7	5.00			
Pump speed	Fixed	Fixed	Fixed	Fixed except P1, P2, P3
Optimisation Results				
Optimum energy cost (\$/day)	395.40	381.10	394.60	385.04
Computation time (min)	17.2	12.3	11.9	22.7
Weighted average network chlorine (mg/l)	Information not available	0.435	0.419	0.429
Pump switches				
P1	8	12	13	2
P2	1	33	13	2
P3	17	10	8	2
P4	58	93	168	167
P5	3	0	0	0
P6	31	54	46	33
P7	18	27	17	23

P8	42	58	47	34
P9	16	0	1	0
P10	21	50	41	28
P11	15	5	3	10
Total	230	342	367	301

List of figures

Fig. 1. Flow chart for iELGP pump scheduling method

Fig. 2. C-Town Network (adapted from Price and Ostfeld (2016))

831 **Fig. 3.** Electrical tariff and optimum tanks' levels for Case I

832

Fig. 4. Optimum water level for tank T3 in Cases I, II, and III and residual chlorine in tank T3 in Cases II and III

Fig. 5. Tank T1 water level and pumps P1, P2, P3 status/relative speed in Cases II and III