


DECOMPOSITION OF A WATER DISTRIBUTION PIPELINE PROBLEM




This Hypercard stack was prepared by:
Dennis L. Bricker,
Dept. of Industrial Engineering,
University of Iowa,
Iowa City, Iowa 52242
e-mail: dbricker@icaen.uiowa.edu

Given a set of customers and a water source,



- Select lengths & diameters of pipes
- Satisfy minimal pressure ("head") requirements
- Provide specified rates of usage to customers
- Minimize cost of the network

Assumption: pipe network is a tree, i.e., between any two nodes is a single path which doesn't repeat arcs!



This Hypercard stack is to illustrate:

- parametric analysis of the RHS of an LP
- separable (piecewise-linear) programming
- "resource"-directed decomposition

©D.Bricker, U. of Iowa, 1998

Minimize $\sum_{(r,p) \in N} \sum_k C_k L_{k,(r,p)}$

LP Problem

subject to $H_r - H_p = \sum_k S_{k,(r,p)} L_{k,(r,p)} \quad \forall (r,p) \in N$

$$\sum_k L_{k,(r,p)} = \Lambda_{(r,p)} \quad \forall (r,p) \in N$$

decision variables

pressure at node p

$$H_p \geq \hat{H}_p \quad \forall p \in C = \text{customer set}$$

$$H_r \leq \bar{H}_r \quad \forall r \in P = \text{set of pumps}$$

length of pipe of diameter k in link (r,p)

$$H_p \geq 0 \quad \forall p,$$

$$L_{k,(r,p)} \geq 0 \quad \forall k \ \& \ (r,p)$$

©D.Bricker, U. of Iowa, 1998

Why a need to decompose the problem?

- model may be too large for LP software
- after getting initial solution, modification of the pipeline configuration can be considered more easily
- debugging the model data is easier

etc.

©D.Bricker, U. of Iowa, 1998

How to decompose the problem

demand (customer) nodes are aggregated into subnetworks L_1, L_2, \dots with the properties

- $L_i \cap L_j = \emptyset$ i.e., the subnetworks are disjoint
- flow into L_i is via a single node $r \notin L_i$

called the *root* node, i.e.,

$$\{r : (r,p) \in N, p \in L_i \text{ \& } r \notin L_i\}$$

contains a single node.



©D.Bricker, U. of Iowa, 1998

Head loss coefficients

Discharge cu ft/sec	Diameter (in.)			
	3	6	9	12
1	0.7585	0.0259	0.0036	0.00089
2	2.7390	0.0950	0.0130	0.003
3	5.8040	0.2000	0.0270	0.007
5	14.9480	0.5100	0.7100	0.017
Cost (\$/ft)	0.50	1.00	2.00	3.00

©D.Bricker, U. of Iowa, 1998


First we will solve the subproblem with root node #7, performing parametric analysis on $H_7 = \mu$.



This gives us a piecewise-linear cost function of the subnetwork as a function of μ .

©D.Bricker, U. of Iowa, 1998

Then we solve the original problem with the subnetwork replaced by a single "fictitious" customer requiring minimum head $H_7 = \mu$ with cost $C_7(\mu)$



We somewhat arbitrarily set an upper limit of 40 on H_7

©D.Bricker, U. of Iowa, 1998

MIN 0.5 L1A74 + L2A74 + 2 L3A74 + 3 L4A74
 + 0.5 L1A75 + L2A75 + 2 L3A75 + 3 L4A75
 + 0.5 L1A76 + L2A76 + 2 L3A76 + 3 L4A76

SUBJECT TO

2) - 0.7585 L1A74 - 0.0259 L2A74 - 0.0036 L3A74
 - 0.0004 L4A74 + H7 - H4 = 0

3) - 0.7585 L1A75 - 0.0259 L2A75 - 0.0036 L3A75
 - 0.0004 L4A75 + H7 - H5 = 0

4) - 0.7585 L1A76 - 0.0259 L2A76 - 0.0036 L3A76
 - 0.0004 L4A76 + H7 - H6 = 0

5) L1A74 + L2A74 + L3A74 + L4A74 = 200

6) L1A75 + L2A75 + L3A75 + L4A75 = 200

7) L1A76 + L2A76 + L3A76 + L4A76 = 200

8) H4 >= 25

9) H5 >= 15

10) H6 >= 20

11) H7 = 40 ← μ

END

Subproblem

©D.Bricker, U. of Iowa, 1998

Solution of subproblem with $\mu = 40$

OBJECTIVE FUNCTION VALUE

1) 569.6560

VARIABLE	VALUE	REDUCED COST
L1A74	13.404314	.000000
L2A74	186.595700	.000000
L1A75	27.054330	.000000
L2A75	172.945700	.000000
L1A76	20.229320	.000000
L2A76	179.770700	.000000
H7	40.000000	.000000
H4	25.000000	.000000
H5	15.000000	.000000
H6	20.000000	.000000


©D.Bricker, U. of Iowa, 1998

row# \rightarrow new value
 : PARARHS 11 0

VAR OUT	VAR IN	PIVOT ROW	RHS VAL	DUAL PRICE BEFORE PIVOT	OBJ VAL
			40.00	2.04750	569.656
L1A74	L3A74	5	30.18	2.04750	589.762
L2A74	L4A74	8	25.72	46.2080	795.850
L1A76	L3A76	10	25.18	313.865	965.337
L3A74	ART	5	25.08	358.026	1001.14
			.00	+INFINITY	INFEASIBLE

Results of Parametric Analysis of RHS #11

©D.Bricker, U. of Iowa, 1998




©D.Bricker, U. of Iowa, 1998

$$H_7 = 25.08 \lambda_0 + 25.18 \lambda_1 + 25.72 \lambda_2 + 30.18 \lambda_3 + 40 \lambda_4$$

$$C_7(H_7) = 1001.14 \lambda_0 + 965.34 \lambda_1 + 795.85 \lambda_2 + 589.756 \lambda_3 + 569.66 \lambda_4$$

"Lambda" formulation
of the piecewise-linear
cost function:



©D.Bricker, U. of Iowa, 1998

We now formulate the original problem, but with the subnetwork rooted at node #7 now replaced by a "fictitious" customer, the cost of serving which is $C_7(H_7)$

TOTAL COST

$$\begin{aligned} \text{MIN } & 0.5 L_{1A12} + L_{2A12} + 2 L_{3A12} + 3 L_{4A12} \\ & + 0.5 L_{1A23} + L_{2A23} + 2 L_{3A23} + 3 L_{4A23} \\ & + 0.5 L_{1A27} + L_{2A27} + 2 L_{3A27} + 3 L_{4A27} \end{aligned} \left. \begin{array}{l} \text{cost of links} \\ (1,2), (2,3), \\ \& (2,7) \end{array} \right\}$$

$$\begin{aligned} & + 1001.14 L_{AM0} + 965.34 L_{AM1} + 795.85 L_{AM2} \\ & \quad + 589.76 L_{AM3} + 569.66 L_{AM4} \end{aligned} \left. \begin{array}{l} C_7(H_7) \\ \text{cost of} \\ \text{sub-} \\ \text{network} \end{array} \right\}$$

SUBJECT TO

©D.Bricker, U. of Iowa, 1998

SUBJECT TO

- 2) $14.948 L_{1A12} + 0.51 L_{2A12} + 0.071 L_{3A12} + 0.017 L_{4A12} + H_2 - H_1 = 0$
 - 3) $2.739 L_{1A23} + 0.095 L_{2A23} + 0.013 L_{3A23} + 0.003 L_{4A23} - H_2 + H_3 = 0$
 - 4) $5.804 L_{1A27} + 0.2 L_{2A27} + 0.027 L_{3A27} + 0.007 L_{4A27} - H_2 + H_7 = 0$
 - 5) $L_{1A12} + L_{2A12} + L_{3A12} + L_{4A12} = 4000$
 - 6) $L_{1A23} + L_{2A23} + L_{3A23} + L_{4A23} = 2000$
 - 7) $L_{1A27} + L_{2A27} + L_{3A27} + L_{4A27} = 1000$
 - 8) $25.08 L_{AM0} + 25.18 L_{AM1} + 25.72 L_{AM2} + 30.18 L_{AM3} + 40 L_{AM4} - H_7 = 0$
 - 9) $L_{AM0} + L_{AM1} + L_{AM2} + L_{AM3} + L_{AM4} = 1$
 - 10) $H_1 = 130$
 - 11) $H_3 \geq 30$
- END

Row (8) expresses H_7 in terms of the multipliers $\lambda_0, \dots, \lambda_4$

©D.Bricker, U. of Iowa, 1998

OBJECTIVE FUNCTION VALUE

1) 18486.11

OPTIMAL SOLUTION

VARIABLE	VALUE	REDUCED COST
L3A12	89.259170	.000000
L4A12	3910.741000	.000000
L2A23	14.390250	.000000
L3A23	1985.610000	.000000
L3A27	1000.000000	.000000
LAM0	.000000	379.130700
LAM1	.000000	343.963040
LAM2	.000000	177.887610
LAM3	1.000000	.000000
LAM4	.000000	41.995710
H2	57.180000	.000000
H1	130.000000	.000000
H3	30.000000	.000000
H7	30.180000	.000000

©D.Bricker, U. of Iowa, 1998

After we determine that the optimal value of H7 is 30.18, we may assign that value to H7 in the subproblem in order to determine the optimal lengths of the various diameters of the pipes in the subproblem.

```

MIN      0.5 L1A74 + L2A74 + 2 L3A74 + 3 L4A74
        + 0.5 L1A75 + L2A75 + 2 L3A75 + 3 L4A75
        + 0.5 L1A76 + L2A76 + 2 L3A76 + 3 L4A76
SUBJECT TO
2) -0.7585 L1A74 -0.0259 L2A74 -0.0036 L3A74
   -0.0004 L4A74 + H7 - H4 = 0
3) -0.7585 L1A75 -0.0259 L2A75 -0.0036 L3A75
   -0.0004 L4A75 + H7 - H5 = 0
4) -0.7585 L1A76 -0.0259 L2A76 -0.0036 L3A76
   -0.0004 L4A76 + H7 - H6 = 0
5)  L1A74 + L2A74 + L3A74 + L4A74 = 200
6)  L1A75 + L2A75 + L3A75 + L4A75 = 200
7)  L1A76 + L2A76 + L3A76 + L4A76 = 200
8)  H4 >= 25
9)  H5 >= 15
10) H6 >= 20
11) H7 = 30.18 ←
END

```

*Optimal value of H_7 ,
as determined by the
"master" problem*

©D.Bricker, U. of Iowa, 1998


OBJECTIVE FUNCTION VALUE

1) 589.7625

VARIABLE	VALUE	REDUCED COST
L2A74	200.000000	.000000
L1A75	13.650013	.000000
L2A75	186.350000	.000000
L1A76	6.825007	.000000
L2A76	193.175000	.000000
H7	30.180000	.000000
H4	25.000000	.000000
H5	15.000000	.000000

*Optimal solution of the subproblem,
given $H_7 = 30.18$*

©D.Bricker, U. of Iowa, 1998




©D.Bricker, U. of Iowa, 1998

EXERCISE

Modify the previous problem as shown below. Consider nodes {8,9} as a sub-network and determine its cost as a function of H_3 .

Then modify the master problem as required, and solve it to get a new design.



©D.Bricker, U. of Iowa, 1998