Inter-Basin Water Governance by Transfer Rules Based on System Dynamics

Mehri Abdi-Dehkordi

Univ. of Tehran

Omid Bozorg-Haddad (✉ OBHaddad@ut.ac.ir)

Univ. of Tehran

Abdolrahim Salavitar

Mahab Ghodss Consulting Engineering Company

Hugo A. Loáiciga

University of California, Santa Barbara

Research Article

Keywords: Governance, Inter-basin water transfer, Hedging rules, Firm energy, Water quality, Big Karun Basin.

Posted Date: August 12th, 2021

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-798469/v1>

License: © ⓘ This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

Inter-basin water governance by transfer rules based on system dynamics

Mehri Abdi-Dehkordi¹; Omid Bozorg-Haddad^{2*}; Abdolrahim Salavitarab³; and Hugo A.

Loáiciga⁴

Corresponding author: Omd Bozorg-Haddad

* Corresponding Author

Ph.D. Candidate, Faculty of Agricultural Engineering and Technology, Dept. of Irrigation and Reclamation, College of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Univ. of Tehran, Karaj, Tehran, Iran. E-mail: Abdi.Dehkordi@ut.ac.ir

² Distinguished Professor, Faculty of Agricultural Engineering and Technology, Dept. of Irrigation and Reclamation, College of Agriculture and Natural Resources, Univ. of Tehran, Karaj, Tehran, Iran (corresponding author). E-mail: OBHaddad@ut.ac.ir (Corresponding Author)

³ Managing Director Consultant on Water Resources of Mahab Ghodss Consulting Engineering Company. E-mail: A.Salavitarab@gmail.com

⁴ Professor, Department of Geography, University of California, Santa Barbara, CA 93016-4060. E-mail: Hugo.Loaiciga@ucsb.edu

Abstract

Inter-basin water transfers are widely implemented to counter the uneven geographical distribution of natural water sources. The Big Karun Basin, Iran, has long been of interest to water managers due to its discharge potential, and where several water transfer projects are operated or are under study. This study implements system dynamics modeling (SDM) to the Big

Karun Basin consisting of 6 dams, 12 drinking and industrial consumers, 7 fish farmers, 31 agricultural consumers, 5 operational inter-basin water transfer projects, and 7 under-study inter-basin water transfer projects. SDM was applied considering existing inter-basin water transfers. The results show an average annual 8 to 10 billion cubic meters of water is transferred from the Karun River to the Persian Gulf. Part of this flow can be used to meet some of the water demands in the central and eastern basins of Iran subject to accurate social and environmental assessment of impacts. SDM modeling was also implemented accounting for all existing water transfers plus under-study water transfers. The results indicate the firm energy from hydropower produced by the Big Karun Basin system would decrease by 28% relative to existing water transfer conditions. This issue raises concerns given the Big Karun Basin contribution to electricity production Iran. The water supply to several sectors would be marginally impacted by future water transfers, yet water quality would be compromised in some instances. Therefore, the Big Karun Basin water system was simulated considering inter-basin water governance based on hedging rules for the under-study water transfers. Results indicate the minimum demands of destination basins and source basin (drinking and industrial consumers) could be met, the hydropower energy could be generated with a high reliability when implementing inter-basin water governance. The results also indicate the firm energy from hydropower produced by the Big Karun Basin system would decrease by 12% relative to existing water transfer conditions and the vulnerability of the water system would decrease in terms of required quality for downstream demands and water users relative to the full-transfer water condition.

Keywords: Governance; Inter-basin water transfer; Hedging rules; Firm energy; Water quality; Big Karun Basin.

1- Introduction

Many regions of the world face serious water shortages. Water transfers have been built to provide water-scarce regions with needed water. Inter-basin water transfers have supported socio-economic development in destination basins, although adverse impacts in the source and destination regions of transferred water have been documented. There are many water transfer projects nowadays worldwide, a practice dating back to the Roman Empire. Inter-basin water transfer is implemented to reduce shortage to support municipal and agricultural consumption, hydropower generation, navigation, water quality improvement, and other functions (Lund and Israel (1995), Yevjevich (2001)). Feng et al. (2007) assessed the impact of water transfer from the south to the north of China as an effective means of economic development. Several authors, such as Zhou et al. (2017), Sadegh et al. (2010), Kucukmehmetoglu (2009), and others, applied evolutionary and fuzzy algorithms, Shapley fuzzy and fuzzy methods, game theory, and other optimization methods for the planning and design of inter-basin water allocations. A review of the pertinent literature shows the positive and negative impacts of inter-basin water transfers can be observed in various political, social, cultural, economic and environmental aspects. The positive impacts of inter-basin water transfer include flood control in source basins, restoration of natural landscapes and ecosystems, and improvement of biodiversity in destination basins, improvement of groundwater resources, wetlands, and various aquatic habitats receiving water imports. On the other hand, the negative impacts of inter-basin water transfer disrupt river ecosystems in the source basins, dry springs and streams, reduce groundwater storage in source basins, cause desertification, exacerbate pollution and the spread of infectious diseases (Davies et al. (1992), Gijbers and Loucks (1999), Larson et al. (2001), Knapp et al. (2003), Chen (2004), Gupta and Van Der Zaag (2008), Ma and Wang (2011), Rivera Monroy et al. (2013), Karakaya et al. (2014), Sible et al. (2015)). Some authors (e.g., Gibbins et al. (2000), Das (2006) and

Changming and Zheng (2002)) have shown inter-basin water transfers increase greenhouse gases emissions, water degradation, proliferation of metals disposals, erosion and sediment transport, and heighten temperature change, anaerobic aquatic conditions, and seawater intrusion.

Water scarcity can be eliminated due to inter-basin water transfers in the destination basin, yet, a lack of water governance in inter-basin water transfers results in or exacerbates adverse impacts in source and destination basins. Scholars in the water sector highlight the fact that enhancing water governance is the solution to many water crises (Araral and Yu (2013), Akhmouch (2012) and Biswas and Tortajada (2010)). Inter-basin water governance regulates which basins share water, when and how much water is transferred, and who receives water allocations. Equity and efficiency in water resource and services allocations may be achieved with proper governance.

Water resources in Iran are scarce. Population growth, urbanization, industrial development, and agricultural expansion have exacerbated the consumption of water resources, and, consequently, have raised the production of urban sewage, industrial waste, and agricultural drainage discharge. These pollutants impair the provision of high-quality water, especially in central Iran. Inter-basin water transfer from the Big Karun Basin to central and eastern regions of Iran has been implemented to cope with water shortage in central Iran.

Several new water transfer projects are also under consideration in the Big Karun Basin. It is timely to assess the possible impacts of these projects on the regional water resources of the Big Karun Basin. This study assesses the water transfer from Big Karun Basin to Iran's central basin relying on a comprehensive system dynamics modeling approach. Furthermore, inter-basin water governance based on hedging approach is applied to meet water uses and hydropower demand. This paper's assessment of water transfer takes into account the fulfillment of equity

among water users in the source and destination basins. In other words, this paper focuses on the need for a review on the inter-basin water transfer which are under study based on the water governance concept.

2. Material and Methods

This section is divided into 2 sub-section including development of the quantitative simulation model and development of the qualitative simulation model.

2-1- Development of the Quantitative Simulation Model

The Big Karun Basin system consists of 7 dams, 12 drinking and industrial consumers, 7 fish farmers, 31 agricultural consumers, 5 present inter-basin water transfer projects, and 7 under operation or under study inter-basin water transfer projects. This system is simulated with the system dynamics modeling (SDM) (Forrester, 1985). Water quality is assessed in Section 4. The dams on the Karun and Dez rivers supply hydropower, and supply water to meet drinking, industrial, fish farming and agricultural water uses in the Khuzestan plain. This paper's application of SDM simulates (i) water quantity for hydropower generation and for meeting water demands, and (ii) water quality in the Big Karun Basin. The SDM simulates the operation of the Big Karun Basin components: (1) hydropower dams, (2) inter-basin water transfer, (3) drinking, industry, fish farming and agricultural water uses, and (4) downstream environmental requirements for each dam calculated with the Montana method (Orth and Maughan, 1981). Figure 1 shows the SDM for Gotvand dam simulation. Similar simulations were performed for the other dams in the Big Karun Basin in this work. Modeling of the Big Karun Basin system was coded with Vensim DSS (5.9b).

Simulation of each reservoir was first based on the Standard Operation Policy (SOP) (Cancelliere et al., 1998; Bozorg-Haddad, 2014). This operation rule seeks to meet all the water demands. The available water for release from a reservoir is calculated with Equation (1).

$$A_t = S_t + I_t - L_t \quad (1)$$

in which A_t = available water for release in period t ; S_t = reservoir storage at the beginning of period t , I_t = Total inflows into the reservoir during period t , L_t = total losses from the reservoir (evaporation and seepage) during period t .

The volume of regulated water releases from a reservoir during period t ($Re\ g_t$) is calculated based on water demand (D_t). If the available water is less than water demand ($A_t < D_t$) all the available water is released from the reservoir. In this case, $Re\ g_t = A_t$. The release equals the water demand ($Re\ g_t = D_t$) when there is no waer shortage ($A_t > D_t$), and surplus flow is stored in the reservoir. There is overflow when the storage capacity of the reservoir exceeds the maximum storage volume. Figure 2(a) displays a schematic of the SOP rule.

The standard operation policy rule is adjusted based on the hedging concept to better account for system complexities that are not well captured by the SOP rule. Hedging commands that reservoir operation be based on rules that consider present conditions (as done by the SOP) and future conditions. With hedging part of the reservoir storage volume and inflow to the reservoir meet water demands in future periods. There are different types of hedging rules. The discrete hedging rule is employed in this study (Neelakantan and Pundarikanthan, 1999). Discrete hedging is well suited for real-time reservoir operation during dry periods. The discrete hedging rule calculates reservoir release according to a series of conditional formulas given by Equations (2) through (11). A schematic of the discrete hedging rule is depicted in Figure 2(b).

$$136 \quad T_t = D_t \quad \text{if} \quad S_{t-1} \geq L_{1t} \quad (2)$$

$$137 \quad T_t = \alpha_1 \times D_t \quad \text{if} \quad L_{2t} \leq S_{t-1} \prec L_{1t} \quad (3)$$

$$138 \quad T_t = \alpha_2 \times D_t \quad \text{if} \quad L_{3t} \leq S_{t-1} \prec L_{2t} \quad (4)$$

$$139 \quad T_t = \alpha_3 \times D_t \quad \text{if} \quad L_{4t} \leq S_{t-1} \prec L_{3t} \quad (5)$$

$$140 \quad T_t = \alpha_4 \times D_t \quad \text{if} \quad S_{t-1} \prec L_{4t} \quad (6)$$

$$141 \quad \text{Re } g_t = S_{t-1} + I_t - L_t - S_{\max} \quad \text{if} \quad S_{t-1} + I_t - L_t - T_t \geq S_{\max} \quad (7)$$

$$142 \quad \text{Re } g_t = T_t \quad \text{if} \quad 0 \leq S_{t-1} + I_t - L_t - T_t \prec S_{\max} \quad (8)$$

$$143 \quad \text{Re } g_t = S_{t-1} + I_t - L_t \quad \text{if} \quad S_{t-1} + I_t - L_t - T_t \leq 0 \quad (9)$$

$$144 \quad 0 \leq L_{4t} \leq L_{3t} \leq L_{2t} \leq L_{1t} \leq S_{\max} \quad (10)$$

$$145 \quad 0 \leq \alpha_4 \leq \alpha_3 \leq \alpha_2 \leq \alpha_1 \leq 1 \quad (11)$$

146 where T_t = target water release during period t , $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4$ = hedging coefficients,
 147 $L_{1t}, L_{2t}, L_{3t}, L_{4t}$ = threshold's levels of reservoir storage volume in period t and $S_{\max}$ = maximum
 148 reservoir storage. The discrete hedging rule equals the SOP rule whenever $\alpha_4 = 1$ or $L_{1t} = 0$.

149 Hydropower dams' operation is herein based on system reliability (Sharifi, 2008): the water
 150 release from the reservoir is such that the amount of generated energy in a monthly time period
 151 exceeds the firm energy. Firm energy is the minimum amount of monthly generated energy with
 152 a specified reliability. The generated hydropower and energy are calculated with Equations (12)
 153 and (13):

$$154 \quad P_t = \frac{9.81 \times e_p \times (\text{Re } g_t / pf) \times \Delta H_t}{1000} \quad (12)$$

$$155 \quad E_t = \frac{P_t \times pf \times nh_t}{1000} \quad (13)$$

where P_t = power generated in time t (MW), e_p = total efficiency of turbine and generator, g_t = release from powerhouse (m^3 / s), pf = the powerhouse coefficient which indicates the operating hours of the powerhouse during 24 hours, ΔH_t = the water level difference between the reservoir and the power houses's downstream (m), nh_t = number of hours per month t and E_t = generated energy (GWh/month). Reservoir water elevation is calculated from elevation-volume formulas for reservoirs.

In each time period (one month long each) the reservoir storage capacity must be within the minimum and maximum storage limits. In addition, the reservoir storage at the end and beginning of the operation period are equal. In each operation period hydropower generation increases whenever the reservoir storage exceeds the maximum storage because of surplus flow for hydropower generation. Accordingly, firm energy is calculated based on Equations (12), (13). The average energy is determined based on the total regulated release from the powerhouse that generates hydropower. The power generated by a powerhouse can not exceed its installed capacity.

In this work all the system dams were simulated based on the discrete hedging rule with the main goal of hydropower generation (which is their main function). Subsequently, operational or under study inter-basin water transfer projects were added to the water-resources system to assess the performance of the Karun River Basin system based on system reliability and vulnerability to meet hydropower and water quantity and quality requirements (Bozorg-Haddad, 2014).

2-2- Development of the Qualitative Simulation Model

Water quality simulation was carried out with SDM based on mass balance equations [Equations (14) through (18)] and the TDS (total dissolved solids) parameter:

$$S.V._{ext(t)} = Sup_t \times TDS_{up(t)} \quad (14)$$

$$S.V._{ret(t)} = Sup_t \times Co_{Sup} \times TDS_{up(t)} \times Co_{TDS} \quad (15)$$

$$S.V._{d(t)} = S.V._{up(t)} - S.V._{ext(t)} + S.V._{ret(t)} \quad (16)$$

$$Inf_{d(t)} = Inf_{up(t)} + Sup_t (1 - Co_{Sup}) \quad (17)$$

$$TDS_{d(t)} = \frac{S.V._{d(t)}}{Inf_{d(t)}} \quad (18)$$

in which $S.V._{ext(t)}$ and $S.V._{ret(t)}$ = the amounts of output and return TDS in output and return flow in period t , respectively, Sup_t = the flow delivered to demands in period t , $TDS_{up(t)}$ and $TDS_{d(t)}$ = TDS of flow upstream and downstream specific location, respectively, in period t , Co_{Sup} = the percentage of return flow which varies based on the type of water users, Co_{TDS} = the coefficient of variation of TDS which varies based on the type of user, $S.V._{up(t)}$ and $S.V._{d(t)}$ = The TDS volume upstream and downstream of specific location, respectively, $Inf_{up(t)}$, and $Inf_{d(t)}$ = respectively, flow upstream and downstream of specific location, respectively, in period t .

Water quality was simulated from the Gotvond dam from the Karun River and the Dez dam on the Dez River to the Persian Gulf. TDS is a key water quality parameter within the simulation region.

2.3. Methodology

This work's methodology is depicted in Figure 3.

3- The Case Study

The Big Karun Basin encompasses the Dez and Karun rivers, and it is the basin with the most water resources in Iran. This basin is located in the middle Zagros Mountains between longitudes

48.00 and 30.52 degrees and latitudes 30.00 and 34.05 degrees. This basin plays an important role in hydropower generation and meeting drinking, industrial and agricultural water demands in the provinces of Khuzestan, Chahar Mahal and Bakhtiari, Kohgiluyeh and Boyer Ahmad, and Lorestan. Figure 4 shows the location of the basin in and the distribution of different consumers.

The Big Karun Basin houses various water projects. Those projects include the Dez Dam on the Dez river, and the Karun-4, Karun-3, Karun-1 (ShahidAbbaspur), Godarland (MasjedSoleyman), and Gotvand dams on the Karun river. Other projects are the Lorestan's Roudbar and Bakhtiari Dam in the Dez river basin, and the Bazoft, Khersan-1, Khersan-2 and Khersan-3 dams in the Karun River Basin, which are in the planning stages or under construction. The functions of these dams are hydropower generation and water supply for agricultural, drinking, and industrial sectors in the Khuzestan plain. A schematic of Big Karun Basin and its water resources system, including 6 dams under operation, 5 existing inter-basin water transfer projects, 12 drinking and industrial consumers, 7 fish farmers, 31 agricultural consumers and 7 under study/construction inter-basin water transfer projects is depicted in Figure 5. The technical characteristics of operating hydropower dams on the Karun and Dez rivers are listed in Table 1. The hydropower dams supply electricity during peak hours of electricity consumption in the national Iranian network. New dams and power plants are intended to enhance the electric supply to the national network. Table 2 lists the monthly water requirements for drinking, industry, agriculture, and fish farming in the Big Karun Basin. Inter-basin water transfer projects are a key component of the Big Karun Basin, which transfers part of the Karun and Dez rivers' inflows to meet water demands in the central plain of Iran, in spite of conflicting goals of the water transfer project pitting hydropower generation against downstream

water supply. These projects are key components of the regional water and electric supplies. Currently, the Kuhrang-1 and 2 tunnels in the Karun basin, and the Cheshmehlangan, Dez to Qomroud, and Khadangestan tunnels in the Dez Basin are also operational. Similar projects include the Kuhrang-3, Beheshtabad, Solakan, Shahid, and Bideh dams in the Karun River basin and the Gukan and Kamal Saleh dams in the Dez basin are under study. Tables 3 and 4 list the monthly water requirements for existing water transfer projects and for projects under study in the Karun and Dez rivers. Numerous water projects on the Karun and Dez rivers with conflicting goals create complex operational and benefits/cost issues. This study develops a simulation model of the Big Karun Basin water resources system based on system dynamics. The model includes all the operating dams located on the Karun and Dez rivers, all the drinking, industry, fish farming, and agricultural water uses, water withdrawals from the Karun and Dez rivers, return flows from each user sector to rivers, existing inter-basin water transfer projects, and under-study inter-basin water transfers.

4- Results

The SDM of the Big Karun Basin was applied from 1956 through 2013. This period includes wet, dry, and normal years. Figure 6 displays the river inflow to the Karun-4 reservoir. The flow pattern is typical and similar for inflows to other reservoirs in the study area. It is seen in Figure 6 that inflow to the Karun-4 reservoir is lower than the long-term average inflow from 2006 through 2013, equivalent to a drought. This dry period continues until 2018, and it affirms the need for careful water resources management in the Big Karun Basin. The water governance for inter-basin water transfers which is applied in this paper transcends water management. Figures 7 and 8 display the water demands met by inter-basin water transfers under present and under full transfer conditions, respectively. It is evident that only the demand of present inter-basin transfer

projects can be met. Under full transfer conditions projects under study are added to existing projects and their combined water demand must be fully met. Figures 7 and 8 indicate larger water-transfer flows would be required in the Karun River Basin than in the Dez River Basin.

Five levels of water-supply thresholds set equal to 80%, 60%, 40%, 30% and 20% were considered based on hedging transfer rules. In other words, the values of the hedging coefficients $\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4, \alpha_5$ equal 0.2, 0.3, 0.4, 0.6 and 0.8, respectively. These coefficient values were determined based on experts' opinions. When the threshold level is 20% drinking and industrial demands are fully met and no shortage would occur. The threshold values $L_{1t}, L_{2t}, L_{3t}, L_{4t}$, and L_{5t} were calculated based on long-term inflow data for the Karun-4 dam on the Karun River and the Dez dam on the Dez River (Table 5).

Figure 9 shows the average annual hedging coefficients of the under-study inter-basin water transfer projects in the Big Karun basin. It is seen in Figure 9 that only in a few years are all the water demand of the under-study inter-basin water transfer projects met in the Karun and Dez basins. During the years 2006-2013 the average hedging coefficients equals 0.4.

The results for hydropower powerhouse's coefficient, average annual firm energy, average annual average energy corresponding to each dam are listed in Table 6, which encompasses present conditions, full transfer conditions, and inter-basin water governance for under-study and operational (i.e., under operation) inter-basin water transfer projects.

It is seen in Table 6 that full transfer to meet all inter-basin water transfer demands in the Karun River Basin has a dramatic impact on hydropower generation at the Karun-4, Karun-3, Karun-1, Godarland and Gotvand dams. The coefficient of each dam's hydropower powerhouse decreases to achieve 90% reliability in hydropower generation under the full transfer condition and hedging transfer. Firm energy and average energy decrease at Dez dam under full transfer

and inter-basin water governance of water demand with transfe projects; , yet, this reduction is negligible compared to the Karun River basin. The difference of powerhouse coefficient at the Dez dam is also low under present, full transfer, and hedging transfer conditions. This is due to the Dez reservoir high volume of spills. It follows from Figure 8 that the volume of inter-basin water transfers from the Dez river are lower than transfers from the Karun River Basin.

Figures 10 and 11 display the changes in firm energy and average energy generated from each reservoir in the Karun and Dez River Basins. The highest and lowest values of generated energy correspond to the Karun-1 dam and Karun-4 dam, respectively. This is justified by the powerhouse coefficient and installed capacity of the powerhouses. During the years 2013-2016 the firm energy generation for all dams except Gotvand dams was reduced because of the its installed capacity. Furthermore, overflow (spills) at Gotvand Dam during average and wet periods is larger than in other dams.

Table 7 lists the results for system efficiency in meeting water demands for drinking, industrial, fish farming, and hydropower generation sectors under present condition, full transfer conditions, and inter-basin water governance of inter-basin water transfer projects. Hydropower dams under present, full transfer, and inter-basin water governance conditions correspond to 90% reliability. The results indicate that under the three conditions the reliability of meeting water demand exceeds 90%, specially in the drinking and industrial sectors. No shortage for supplying drinking and industrial occurred under the three conditions (present condition, full transfer conditions, and inter-basin water governance of inter-basin water transfer projects). The results also indicate the vulnerability of the water system with respect to the supply of quality water for various users. The complexity of water-quality characteristics rises under the full transfer condition.

5. Conclusion and Discussion

This study applied system dynamics modeling (SDM) to assess the impact of inter-basin water transfer on hydropower and water supply in the Big Karun Basin's water system, Iran. This work's results indicate that under full-transfer conditions the water demands can be met reliably, yet the vulnerability of the water system increases with respect to water quality. The results demonstrate that under full-transfer conditions the water system capacity declines dramatically with respect to firm hydropower generation. This issue requires consideration because of the central contribution of the Big Karun Basin to Iran's hydropower generation. Water demands associated with inter-basin water transfer projects were revised based on the concept of water governance. Also, this work's results indicate the minimum water demands of destination basins for drinking and industrial consumers would be met. The firm energy from hydropower produced by the Big Karun Basin system would decrease by 12% relative to existing water transfer conditions, and the vulnerability of the water system would increase in terms of required quality for downstream demands and water users.

Implementing inter-basin water governance, aided by the determination of suitable water transfers may decrease the firm energy, yet this reduction can be compensated by the Big Karun currently under construction. Moreover, implementing water demand management in destination basin would meet most water demands thus avoiding social crises. This paper's results indicate that considering equity among multiple water users requires even distribution of water benefits from inter-basin water transfers among both source and target basins.

Acknowledgment

The authors thank Iran's National Science Foundation (INSF) for its support of this research and Mahab Ghodss consulting engineering company for its assistance.

315 **Conflict of interests: none**

316 There are no conflicts of interest.

317

318

References

- Akhmouch, A. (2012). "Water governance in Latin America and the Caribbean: a multi-level approach." OECD Publishing.
- Araral, E. and Yu, J.D. (2013). "Comparative water law, policies, and administration in Asia: evidence from 17 countries." *Water Resource researche*, 49, 5307-5316.
- Biswas, A.K. and Tortajada, C. (2010). "Future water governance: problems and perspectives." *Water Resources Development*, 26(2), 129-139.
- Bozorg-Haddad, O. (2014). "Optimization of water resources systems." Tehran university press, First edition, Tehran, Iran.
- Cancelliere, A., Ancarani, A., and Rossi, G. (1998). "Susceptibility of watersupply reservoirs to drought conditions." *Hydrologic Engineering*, 3(2), 140–148.
- Changming, L. and Zheng, H. (2002). "South-to-north Water Transfer Schemes for China." *Water Resources Development*, 18, 453–471.
- Chen, Y.H. (2004). "Analysis on advantages and disadvantages of large scale, long distance and transbasin diversion." *Water Resource and Protection*, 59(2):48–50.
- Das, D.K. (2006). "Environmental Impact of Inter-Basin Water Transfer Projects - Some Evidence from Canada." *Economic and Political Weekly*, 41(17), 1703–1707.
- Davies, B.R., Thoms. M., and Meador, M. (1992). "An assessment of the ecological impacts of inter-basin water transfers, and their threats to river basin integrity and conservation." *Aquatic Conservation*, 2(4), 325–349.
- Forrester, J.W. (1958). "Industtrial dynamics: a major breakthrough for decision makers." *Harvard Business Review*, 36(4), 37-66.

341 Feng, S., Li, L.X., Duan, Z.G., and Zhang, J.L. (2007). “Assessing the impacts of South-to-North
 342 Water Transfer Project with decision support systems.” *Decision Support System*, 42(4), 1989-
 343 2003.

344 Gibbins, C.N., Jeffries, M.J., and Soulsby, C. (2000). “Impacts of an inter-basin water transfer:
 345 Distribution and abundance of *Micronectapoweri* (Insecta: Corixidae) in the River Wear, north-
 346 east England.” *Aquatic Conservation Marine and Freshwater Ecosystems*, 10(2):103-115.

347 Gijssbers, P.J.A. and Loucks, D.P. (1999). “Libya’s choices: desalination or the Great Man-made
 348 River Project.” *Physics and Chemistry of the Earth, Part B: Hydrology, Oceans and*
 349 *Atmosphere*, 24(4), 385–389.

350 Gupta, J. and Van Der Zaag, P. (2008). “Interbasin water transfers and integrated water resources
 351 management: where engineering, science and politics interlock.” *Physics and Chemistry of the*
 352 *Eart*, Parts A/B/C, 33(1-2):28–40

353 Karakaya, N., Evrendilek, F., Gonenc, E. (2014). “Interbasin water transfer practices in Turkey.”
 354 *Ecosystem and Ecography*, 4(2), 1-5.

355 Knapp, K.C., Weinberg, M., Howitt, R. and Posnikoff, J.F. (2003). “Water transfers, agriculture,
 356 and groundwater management: a dynamic economic analysis.” *Environmental Management*,
 357 67(4), 291-301.

358 Kucukmehmetoglu, M. (2009) “A game theoretic approach to assess the impacts of major
 359 investments on transboundary water resources: the case of the Euphrates and Tigris. *Water*
 360 *Resource Management*, 23, 3069–3099.

361 Larsona, K.J., Başağaoğlu, H., and Mariño, M.A. (2001). “Prediction of optimal safe ground
 362 water yield and land subsidence in the Los Banos-Kettleman City area, California, using a
 363 calibrated numerical simulation model.” *Hydrology*, 242(1–2), 79–102.

364 Lund, J. and Israel, M. (1995). "Optimization of transfer in urban water supply planning." *Water*
 365 *Resources Planning and Management*, 12(1).
 366 Ma, F.B. and Wang, X. (2011). "Impacts of water transfer project on eco environment: a
 367 review." *Water Conservancy Science and Technology and Economy*, 17(10), 20–24.
 368 Neelakantan, T.R. and Pundarikanthan, N.V. (1999). "Hedging Rule Optimisation for Water
 369 Supply Reservoirs System." *Water Resources Management*, 13(6), 409-426.
 370 Orth, D.J., and Maughan, O.E. (1981). "Evaluation of the Montana Method for recommending
 371 instream flows in Oklahoma streams." *Proc. Oklahoma Acad. Sci.*, 61, 62–66.
 372 Rivera Monroy, V.H., Branoff, B., Meselhe, E.A., McCorquodale, A., Dortch, M., Steyer, G.D.,
 373 Visser, J., and Wang, H. (2013). "Landscape-level estimation of nitrogen loss in coastal
 374 Louisiana wetlands: potential sinks under different restoration scenarios." *Coastal Research*, 67,
 375 75–87.
 376 Sadegh, M., Mahjouri, N., and Kerachian, R. (2010). "Optimal Inter-Basin Water Allocation
 377 Using Crisp and Fuzzy Shapley Games." *Water Resource Management*, 24, 2291–2310.
 378 Sharifi, A. (2008). "A system dynamics model for predicting upstream development on
 379 hydropower generation." M.Sc. thesis, Sharif Univ. of Technology, Tehran, Iran.
 380 Sible, E., Cooper, A., Malkia, K., Bruder, K., Watkins, S.C., Fofanov, Y., and Putonti, C. (2015).
 381 "Survey of viral populations within Lake Michigan nearshore waters at four Chicago area
 382 beaches." *Data in Brief*, 5, 9–12.
 383 Yevjevich, V. (2001). "Water diversions and interbasin transfers." *Water International*, 26(3),
 384 342-348.
 385 Zhou, Y., Guo, S., Hong, X., and Chang, F.C. (2017). "Systematic impact assessment on inter-
 386 basin water transfer projects of the Hanjiang River Basin in China." *Hydrology*, 553. 584-595.
 387

Table 1. General and technical characteristics of the operating dams in the Big Karun Basin.

Parameters	Unit	Karun-4	Karun-3	Karun-1	Godarlandar	Gotvand	Dez
Area of upstream basin	Km ²	12,813	24,260	26,838	27,632	32,425	17,430
Average annual discharge	m ³ /s	190	332.8	392.5	412	466	256.6
Crest length	m	1,032	850	542	382	246	354
Type of dam	–	2 arch concrete	2arch concrete	2arch concrete	Clay core rockfill	Clay core rockfill	2arch concrete
Normal elevation	m	1,025	845	532	372	230	352
Minimum reservoir storage	10 ⁶ m ³ /s	1,266	1,141	1,095	181	117	1,126
Reservoir storage	10 ⁶ m ³ /s	748.7	1,689	1,318	46	3,050	2,048
Installation Capacity	MW	1,000	2,000	2,000	2,000	1,500	520
Powerhouse efficiency	%	92	92.4	90	92	93	89

391

Table 2. Monthly water requirement by users in the Big Karun Basin (m³/s).

Consumer Type	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May.	Jun.	Jul.	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Annual
Domestic and industry	64.4	64.4	63.4	70.4	70.5	70.7	57.4	57.4	57.4	72.3	64.9	64.5	64.8
Agricultural	42.4	154.9	657.8	648.6	414.6	346.1	427.9	744.9	505.9	315.2	161.7	29.1	370.8
Fish farming	23.9	42.3	61.1	61.1	61.1	39.8	39.8	39.8	39.8	39.8	39.3	31.6	43.4

392

393

Table 3. Monthly water requirement for operational water transfer projects in the Karun and Dez basins (m³/s).

Basin	Name	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May.	Jun.	Jul.	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Annual
Dez	Dez to Qomrud	4.9	6.1	8.6	13.1	11.6	5.5	3.1	2.6	2.0	2.4	3.9	5.1	5.7
	CheshmehLangan Tunnel	1.5	3.3	6.0	11.8	11.2	5.7	2.3	0.9	0.4	0.3	0.6	1.2	3.8
	Khadangestan Tunnel	0.7	0.9	2.6	8.2	9.0	4.5	2.0	0.9	0.5	0.5	0.7	1.1	2.6
Karun	Kuhrang-1	4.5	5.1	7.9	16.5	19.9	18.9	15.6	11.0	6.8	5.3	5.3	5.1	10.2
	Kuhrang-2	4.8	6.0	9.4	18.4	25.3	21.0	14.2	7.2	4.1	3.2	4.4	4.8	10.2

Table 4. Monthly water requirements for water transfer projects under study in the Karun and Dez basins (m³/s).

Basin	Name	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May.	Jun.	Jul.	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Annual
Dez	GukanTunnel and Dam	2.4	4.9	9.1	19.9	19.6	9.9	4.0	1.5	0.6	0.5	1.0	2.2	6.3
	Kamalsaleh Dam	2.0	2.0	2.2	1.9	2.0	2.0	2.1	2.3	2.1	2.0	2.2	2.0	2.1
Karun	Kuhrang-3	4.4	5.0	9.0	16.4	19.3	12.2	7.5	5.0	3.5	3.1	4.4	4.7	7.9
	Beheshtabad	24.3	31.3	56.3	87.7	84.0	39.9	20.9	14.6	10.8	10.4	17.0	23.5	35.1
	Sulakan	6.6	8.1	12.8	14.9	12.3	7.8	4.9	3.4	3.0	3.1	4.6	6.9	7.9
	Shahid Dam	0.7	0.9	1.7	2.9	3.9	4.6	2.9	1.7	1.2	0.7	0.8	0.7	1.9
	Bideh Dam	7.4	7.4	7.6	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.2	7.4	7.4	7.4	7.3

Table 5. Threshold levels L_{1t} , L_{2t} , L_{3t} , L_{4t} , and L_{5t} in each month of the year in the Karun and Dez rivers (m^3/s).

Basin	Threshold	Oct.	Nov.	Dec.	Jan.	Feb.	Mar.	Apr.	May.	Jun.	Jul.	Aug.	Sep.
Dez	L_{5t}	9.4	9.4	10.5	13.3	16.1	24.5	37.5	36.1	26.2	17.5	12.8	10.3
	L_{4t}	10.2	10.5	12.4	15.7	21.0	31.7	45.3	44.7	30.4	20.7	14.6	11.5
	L_{3t}	11.0	11.1	14.6	17.8	26.8	40.0	56.8	52.1	33.8	23.6	16.4	12.4
	L_{2t}	12.9	14.9	23.9	23.6	35.1	49.7	82.8	74.7	43.2	29.1	19.8	14.8
	L_{1t}	14.3	18.3	33.7	32.4	52.6	67.6	100.1	91.5	59.0	37.8	25.6	17.9
Karun	L_{5t}	46.8	57.6	72.4	80.5	97.6	165.8	248.2	211.2	129.3	82.8	57.7	46.5
	L_{4t}	51.4	61.9	76.1	84.2	108.8	185.1	283.8	232.0	146.3	88.7	67.3	55.9
	L_{3t}	55.0	64.0	86.8	89.5	123.5	198.6	312.5	260.7	161.2	95.8	68.9	58.1
	L_{2t}	63.4	71.7	102.4	109.4	142.6	245.6	369.6	332.7	187.4	115.1	79.8	65.7
	L_{1t}	74.3	93.3	140.0	158.9	206.1	325.8	510.7	420.6	235.1	135.1	94.4	75.3

Table 6. The values of the efficiency coefficient, firm energy, and generated energy for each dam.

Dam	pf			Average Annual Firm Energy (GWh/year)			Average Annual Average Energy (GWh/year)		
	Present Condition	Full Transfer	Hedging Transfer	Present Condition	Full Transfer	Hedging Transfer	Present Condition	Full Transfer	Hedging Transfer
Karun-4	0.135	0.061	0.106	1'148.1	510.1	904.5	2'148.7	1'367.8	1'594.5
Karun-3	0.112	0.075	0.096	1'891.2	1'264.9	1'626.2	3'650.1	2'886.5	3'121.1
Karun-1	0.121	0.088	0.106	2'070.0	1'508.7	1'820.0	3'991.8	3'270.8	3'493.0
Godarladar	0.108	0.080	0.095	1'863.6	1'379.5	1'647.5	3'759.9	3'107.6	3'391.1
Gotvand	0.111	0.086	0.100	1'915.3	1'474.3	1'720.9	3'961.7	3'337.4	3'541.1
Dez	0.405	0.395	0.398	1'746.4	1'693.6	1'710.5	2'449.2	2'381.1	2'405.1
Total				10'634.6	7'831	9'429.6	19'961.4	16'351.2	17'473.9

410 **Table 7.** Reliability and vulnerability performance measures to meet water demands under
411 system conditions.

	Present Condition				Full Transfer				Hedging Transfer			
	Water Quantity	Water Quality	Water Quantity	Water Quality	Water Quantity	Water Quality	Water Quantity	Water Quality	Water Quantity	Water Quality	Water Quantity	Water Quality
	Vulnera bility	Reliabil ity	Vulnera bility	Reliabil ity	Vulnera bility	Reliabil ity	Vulnera bility	Reliabil ity	Vulnera bility	Reliabil ity	Vulnera bility	Reliabil ity
Hydropower	90.0	5.9	-	-	90.0	6.3	-	-	90.0	6.1	-	-
Domestic and Industry	100.0	0.0	91.5	33.0	100.0	0.0	86.5	44.9	100.0	0.0	89.2	38.4
Fish	99.0	1.1	81.3	41.6	99.0	1.2	75.0	52.2	99.0	1.0	78.4	46.5
Agriculture	98.7	12.0	57.4	74.8	97.8	16.4	54.9	79.4	98.3	14.2	56.2	77.0

(a)

(b)

Figure 2. (a) The SOP rule and (b) Discrete hedging rule.

Figure 3. Flowchart of of this work's methodology.

Figure 4. The location of the Big Karun Basin showing the distribution of users. (ArcGIS

10.8.1)

Figure 5. A schematic of the Big Karun Basin with its components.

Figure 6. Chart of inflows to the Karun-4 dam's lake and comparison to the long-term average inflow.

(a)

(b)

Figure 7. Charts of water demands met through present inter-basin water transfer projects in the (a) Karun and (b) Dez River Basins under present condition (IBWT: inter-basin water transfer).

Figure 8. Charts of water demand met through present and under study inter-basin water transfer in (a) Karun and (b) Dez River Basins under full transfer conditions (IBWT: inter-basin water transfer).

(a)

(b)

Figure 9. Average annual hedging coefficients of inter-basin water transfer in the (a) Karun and (b) Dez river basins under water governance based on hedging transfer conditions.

Figure 10. Firm energy generated by the Hydropower Plant of (a) Karun-4, (b) Karun-3, (c) Karun-1, (d) Godarland, (e) Gotvand, and (f) Dez dams.

(a)

(b)

(c)

(d)

(e)

(f)

Figure 11. Average energy generated by the HydroPower Plants of the (a) Karun-4, (b) Karun-3, (c) Karun-1, (d) Godarland, (e) Gotvand, and (f) Dez dams.