



Peer review status:

This is a non-peer-reviewed preprint submitted to EarthArXiv.

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12

Data-driven control reveals distributed flood adaptation priorities across large river networks

Jeil Oh¹ and Matthew Bartos¹

¹Fariborz Maseeh Department of Civil, Architectural and Environmental Engineering, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX, USA

Key Points:

- New method for basin-scale flood adaptation planning uses optimal control to determine best reach-scale attenuation targets
- Network-level analysis identifies spatial priorities that local reach attributes alone cannot capture
- Effort, residual-risk, and ensemble-agreement maps together inform where effort concentrates, risk accumulates, and uncertainty remains

Corresponding author: Jeil Oh, jeoh@utexas.edu

Abstract

In the face of growing flood risks, decentralized adaptation measures like detention storage, enhanced infiltration, and floodplain reconnection have the potential to mitigate flood impacts at the river basin scale. However, optimal spatial allocation of flood control measures is complicated by the high dimensionality of hydrologic systems and the sensitivity of proposed strategies to climate uncertainty. To overcome these challenges, we propose a diagnostic framework that combines reduced-order data-driven modeling with optimal control to directly estimate reach-level attenuation targets without the need for iterative simulation and optimization. First, Proper Orthogonal Decomposition (POD) and Dynamic Mode Decomposition with control (DMDc) are used to create a low-rank linear surrogate model of basin rainfall-runoff dynamics. A Linear Quadratic Regulator (LQR) is then applied to compute optimal reach-scale attenuation targets that mitigate flood impacts. Applied to a large river basin under a multi-model climate ensemble, the framework successfully determines distributed attenuation strategies that reduce bankfull discharge exceedances under varying adaptation budgets. Across scenarios, marginal increases to flow attenuation are found to yield diminishing returns to flood mitigation, while higher-emission scenarios retain substantially greater residual flood volume for the same effort level. Although attenuation allocation generally scales with mean flow, we identify tributary and transitional reaches where attenuation demand is disproportionate to local hydrologic size, showing that network-level flood dynamics produce spatial priorities that cannot be recovered from reach attributes alone. Taken together, the proposed framework provides a scalable approach for flood adaptation planning that is effective for basin- to continental-scale applications under climate uncertainty.

Plain Language Summary

As climate change intensifies flooding, communities face a core planning problem: where to deploy flood defenses across river networks, and how to size them. Because rivers are connected systems, reducing floodwaters in one place changes flood peaks downstream. Determining the best placement of flood interventions across thousands of river branches and many climate futures is thus computationally demanding. To overcome this challenge, we develop a flood control planning framework that compresses the complex behavior of a river network into a compact model that can be solved directly, bypassing trial-and-error simulations and producing requirement maps detailing the level of flood reduction needed at every stream segment across the basin. When applied to a large river basin, the framework identifies critical flood bottlenecks caused by interactions of tributary flows across the network that simple size-based rankings miss. The framework also shows how flood reduction benefits diminish as more attenuation is added, and identifies priority locations that remain robust across different climate projections. Together, these outputs diagnose basin-scale adaptation needs, helping planners decide where to act, how much capacity is realistic, and where to remain flexible as conditions evolve.

1 Introduction

Climate change is reshaping flood regimes worldwide, altering the magnitude, timing, and seasonality of extreme flows in regionally distinct ways (Blöschl et al., 2019; Tabari, 2020; Thober et al., 2018). In response, flood adaptation strategies are expanding beyond centralized defenses toward distributed, landscape-scale interventions such as detention basins, floodplain reconnection, wetland restoration, and enhanced infiltration (Dadson et al., 2017; Opperman et al., 2009). These measures attenuate flood peaks across the drainage network rather than concentrating protection at a few major dams. Catchment-scale evidence shows that such measures can substantially reduce flood peaks when deployed strategically (Black et al., 2021; Nicholson et al., 2020), and that combined port-

62 folios of nature-based measures outperform individual interventions in isolation (Cheng
63 et al., 2017).

64 However, the effectiveness of distributed flood control depends on the coordination
65 and spatial placement of interventions at the watershed scale. Flooding at any given point
66 in the river network reflects accumulated and time-shifted flow contributions from many
67 upstream tributaries; similarly, attenuation at any given location alters peak flows far-
68 ther downstream. Thus, tributary timing, upstream–downstream coupling, and climate-
69 driven shifts in flow generation jointly determine the locations where attenuation has the
70 greatest leverage and the level of flow reduction that should be achieved in each part of
71 the network (Ayalew et al., 2015; Thomas et al., 2016). This coupling raises a planning
72 question that precedes detailed design and siting decisions: *where* in a river network should
73 flood adaptation efforts concentrate, *how much* attenuation is needed at each location,
74 and how do these spatial patterns *shift* under varying climate futures? Without spatially
75 resolved guidelines, adaptation planning cannot distinguish reaches that require substan-
76 tial intervention from reaches where additional investment yields diminishing returns.

77 Optimal planning of flood control measures at the scale of major river basins con-
78 fronts three interlocking challenges. First, *hydrologic complexity*: the flood response at
79 any river reach depends on a complex array of nonlinear runoff generation and routing
80 processes that integrate precipitation forcing, antecedent soil conditions, and the tim-
81 ing and magnitude of inflows from all upstream tributaries. Second, *dimensionality*: river
82 networks routinely comprise tens of thousands of interconnected reaches (David et al.,
83 2011; Mizukami et al., 2016), each with distinct hydrologic characteristics, making ex-
84 haustive reach-by-reach optimization computationally intractable even for a single cli-
85 mate scenario. Third, *scenario dependence*: climate change rearranges precipitation pat-
86 terns and flood-generating mechanisms in projection-dependent ways, and robust adap-
87 tation planning requires characterization of reach-level attenuation requirements not un-
88 der a single design condition but across ensembles of general circulation models (GCMs)
89 and emission pathways, multiplying the computational burden by orders of magnitude.
90 Together, these challenges have severely limited the development of large watershed-scale
91 flood adaptation plans.

92 On the sensitivity of flood adaptation planning to climate uncertainty, recent work
93 has made substantial progress toward characterizing the effects of climate change on the
94 magnitude and distribution of flood hazards. Global and regional projections have cou-
95 pled GCMs with hydrologic and hydrodynamic models to quantify changes in flood mag-
96 nitude and frequency (Hirabayashi et al., 2013; Alfieri et al., 2017), while high-resolution
97 flood mapping efforts have identified locations where inundation risk concentrates at the
98 landscape scale (Bates et al., 2010; Bentivoglio et al., 2022). Scenario-neutral and bottom-
99 up frameworks complement these projections by stress-testing system performance across
100 broad ranges of climatic perturbations and identifying thresholds at which current in-
101 frastructure becomes inadequate (Broderick et al., 2019; Prudhomme et al., 2010). Col-
102 lectively, these tools equip planners with increasingly detailed pictures of *what may hap-*
103 *pen and where*. They do not, however, provide the complementary information that adap-
104 tation planning requires: the spatial distribution of attenuation measures needed to re-
105 duce flood exceedance across river networks.

106 On the response side, two bodies of work address the problem of optimal alloca-
107 tion of flood control measures, focusing on either the placement or operation of prede-
108 termined control assets like reservoirs or detention basins. The first body of work esti-
109 mates cost-effective adaptation strategies at regional to continental scales. Cost–benefit
110 analyses have compared portfolios of structural and nature-based measures under mul-
111 tiple warming levels (Dottori et al., 2023; Alfieri et al., 2016), and global frameworks have
112 quantified economically optimal protection standards for urban river reaches (Ward et
113 al., 2017). These studies show that distributed strategies such as detention areas can be
114 highly cost-effective. However, the principal focus of these studies is to quantify the cost–

115 benefit trade-off of predefined portfolios of mitigation measures—typically at the level
116 of administrative regions or coarse grid cells—and not to understand general spatial pat-
117 terns of how interventions should be organized at the watershed scale. The second body
118 of work applies control and optimization theory to management of water infrastructure,
119 primarily for operations. Stochastic and multi-objective optimization have been used to
120 derive reservoir operating policies (Giuliani et al., 2016; Bertoni et al., 2020; Giuliani et
121 al., 2021); Model Predictive Control and reinforcement learning have been used for adap-
122 tive real-time management (Bowes et al., 2022; Ning et al., 2022; Castelletti et al., 2023;
123 Oh & Bartos, 2023); linear quadratic feedback has been applied to real-time stormwa-
124 ter control (Wong & Kerkez, 2018; Lin et al., 2024); and data-driven surrogates have been
125 shown to accelerate the simulation–optimization loop that these methods require (Razavi
126 et al., 2012; Castelletti et al., 2012). Simulation–optimization methods have also been
127 used to select cost-effective detention-basin layouts, but computational tractability typ-
128 ically limits these applications to $O(10^1)$ – $O(10^2)$ subcatchments (Travis & Mays, 2008;
129 Perez-Pedini et al., 2005). As a result, these approaches do not directly resolve the reach-
130 level attenuation requirements of large river networks with $O(10^4)$ reaches.

131 These limitations in spatial extent and resolution not only reflect a computational
132 barrier to overcome, but also reflect a more fundamental knowledge gap regarding the
133 coordination of flood defenses in large, interconnected river systems: namely, how should
134 decentralized flood attenuation measures generally be distributed within a river basin,
135 and what flood mitigation benefits can be expected under this optimized placement? While
136 approaches based on process-based models of flood defenses provide practical guidelines
137 for siting a limited number of interventions, the general question of how interventions
138 should be spatially organized at the watershed scale is obscured by the computational
139 challenge of repeated simulation–optimization over thousands of potential control sites.
140 Thus, rather than starting with a fixed portfolio of interventions, an alternative approach
141 is to instead first determine the level of attenuation at each reach that minimizes flood
142 impacts, and then work backwards to find the specific interventions that satisfy this tar-
143 get attenuation. In addition to revealing general patterns for the spatial organization of
144 interventions within drainage networks, this approach ensures a system-scale adaptation
145 strategy that minimizes flood impacts over the entire drainage network, accounting for
146 the impacts of upstream interventions on peak flows farther downstream.

147 Using a similar line of reasoning, recent work has highlighted connections between
148 control theory and climate uncertainty in adaptation planning (Herman et al., 2020). We
149 build on this perspective by treating flood adaptation planning as an optimal control prob-
150 lem. However, rather than prescribing operations or investment timing, we use control
151 theory *diagnostically*. In this context, our proposed control strategy specifies the reach-
152 scale reductions in flow required to minimize exceedance of flood thresholds throughout
153 the drainage network. We interpret the magnitude of this attenuation as a scenario-conditioned
154 indicator of adaptation need, rather than as an operating rule for a specific structure.
155 The resulting attenuation target informs detention storage, infiltration capacity, or flood-
156 plain reconnection goals depending on local conditions. The challenge is making this di-
157 agnostic tractable for networks of $O(10^4)$ reaches under an ensemble of climate futures.

158 We meet this challenge by proposing a new method for basin-scale planning of flood
159 defenses that combines data-driven dimensionality reduction with closed-form optimal
160 control. First, Proper Orthogonal Decomposition (POD) extracts the dominant spatial
161 modes of streamflow variability across the river network, compressing $O(10^4)$ reaches into
162 a low-rank basis that captures the main patterns of flood dynamics. Dynamic Mode De-
163 composition with control (DMDC) (Proctor et al., 2016; Kutz et al., 2016) then identi-
164 fies a linear surrogate in this reduced space, describing how reach-level discharge evolves
165 under precipitation forcing. The surrogate is trained directly on process-based hydro-
166 logic simulations rather than on simplified analytical representations of basin hydrology.
167 Finally, because the surrogate operates in reduced coordinates, a Linear Quadratic Reg-

168 ulator (LQR) (Anderson & Moore, 2007) solves in closed form for the reach- and time-
 169 specific attenuation for any prescribed balance between flood reduction and total effort.

170 Applied across a range of effort-penalty weights, the POD–DMDc–LQR formula-
 171 tion produces three diagnostic outputs for basin-scale flood adaptation. First, effort–residual
 172 trade-off curves link total attenuation effort to residual flood risk and identify points of
 173 diminishing returns where additional adaptation becomes less effective. Second, reach-
 174 level maps show where attenuation effort is allocated spatially and where residual risk
 175 remains after optimized attenuation. Third, scenario-ensemble diagnostics distinguish
 176 spatial patterns of proposed adaptation measures that are robust across climate futures
 177 versus those that remain sensitive to climate forcing. Together, these outputs identify
 178 priority locations for flood adaptation and provide reach-level attenuation targets that
 179 inform subsequent design and feasibility analysis.

180 We demonstrate the framework on the Brazos River basin (Texas, USA) and ad-
 181 dress three questions:

- 182 1. How does the basin-wide trade-off between attenuation effort and residual flood
 183 risk vary across climate scenarios?
- 184 2. How does the framework distribute adaptation effort across the drainage network,
 185 where does residual risk concentrate, and how do these spatial patterns relate to
 186 network structure and climate forcing?
- 187 3. Which attenuation and residual-risk priorities are robust across the climate en-
 188 semble, and which remain sensitive to individual climate scenarios?

189 2 Methodology

190 We formulate distributed flood adaptation as a control problem in which projected
 191 streamflow and precipitation are used to determine the reach-level attenuation targets
 192 needed to avoid flood impacts. The flood control planning framework proceeds in three
 193 stages (Figure 1): (i) a reduced-order system identification scheme based on POD and
 194 DMDc is applied to yield a compact linear surrogate model of basin rainfall-runoff dy-
 195 namics; (ii) an optimal control scheme based on LQR is derived to compute optimal reach-
 196 level flow attenuation targets for a range of effort-penalty weights; and (iii) using this
 197 LQR control scheme, a threshold-triggered closed-loop simulation is executed under a
 198 range of future climate scenarios to determine flood attenuation targets needed to mit-
 199 igate exceedance of bankfull flows.

200 2.1 Study Area and Data

201 We demonstrate the framework on the Brazos River basin in Texas, USA (approx-
 202 imately 118,000 km²), a large rainfall-dominated basin that drains from the semiarid South-
 203 ern High Plains to the Gulf of Mexico. The basin contains 14,421 NHDPlusV2 flowlines
 204 and exhibits spatially heterogeneous flood generation driven by diverse storm types, mak-
 205 ing it a challenging test case for reach-level adaptation planning.

206 Streamflow simulations are drawn from the CMIP6-based daily streamflow projec-
 207 tion dataset developed at Oak Ridge National Laboratory (Kao et al., 2022; Ghimire et
 208 al., 2023). The dataset provides routed daily discharge at NHDPlusV2 reaches across
 209 the conterminous United States using the RAPID routing model (David et al., 2011),
 210 without representing reservoir operations. We use two hydrologic models (VIC and PRMS),
 211 seven GCMs, and four SSPs, yielding 56 ensemble members spanning 1980–2099 (Kao
 212 et al., 2024).




Figure 1. Overview of the diagnostic framework. (1) Spatiotemporal streamflow and precipitation fields from process-based hydrologic simulations are assembled in moving windows. (2) Proper Orthogonal Decomposition (POD) compresses the high-dimensional discharge field into a low-rank basis. (3) Dynamic Mode Decomposition with control (DMDc) identifies a linear surrogate that captures streamflow routing and rainfall–runoff dynamics in reduced coordinates. (4) A Linear Quadratic Regulator (LQR) solves for the spatially distributed attenuation that balances flood reduction against total effort, producing reach-level adaptation requirements across the river network.

213

2.2 Problem Formulation

214

215

216

217

Let $\mathbf{x}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ denote daily streamflow across n river reaches at time t , $\mathbf{u}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ represent a spatially distributed control signal associated with flood attenuation, and $\mathbf{d}(t) \in \mathbb{R}^n$ represent the precipitation input forcing mapped to each reach. The uncontrolled basin dynamics can be written generally as

218

$$\mathbf{x}(t+1) = \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{d}(t)), \quad (1)$$

219

220

221

where \mathcal{F} is a function representing relevant hydrologic processes, including rainfall–runoff generation at each subcatchment and flow routing across the river network. The controlled system augments Eq. (1) with a control input $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}(t)$

222

$$\mathbf{x}(t+1) = \mathcal{F}(\mathbf{x}(t), \mathbf{d}(t)) + \mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}(t), \quad (2)$$

223

224

225

226

where $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{I}_n$, reflecting the assumption that every reach is in principle controllable. The control input $\mathbf{B}\mathbf{u}(t)$ represents the reach-scale flow adjustment associated with distributed flood attenuation. The more realistic case of intervention at selected sub-basin units is addressed in Section 4.2.

227

2.3 Reduced-Order System Identification

228

2.3.1 State-Space Reduction via POD

229

230

231

232

233

To make the control problem tractable, we project the high-dimensional streamflow state onto a low-dimensional subspace using Proper Orthogonal Decomposition (POD) (Berkooz et al., 1993). Let $\mathbf{X} = [\mathbf{x}(1), \dots, \mathbf{x}(T)] \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times T}$ be the discharge snapshot matrix and $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ its temporal mean. We retain the leading r left singular vectors of the mean-centered snapshots to form $\mathbf{U}_r \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times r}$, so that the reduced state is

234

$$\mathbf{z}(t) = \mathbf{U}_r^\top (\mathbf{x}(t) - \bar{\mathbf{x}}) \in \mathbb{R}^r. \quad (3)$$

235

236

237

For this case study, we fix the dimension of the reduced system as $r = 30$, which captures the dominant spatial modes of streamflow variability within the Brazos River basin while ensuring subsequent computations remain tractable. For each ensemble member

(GCM \times hydrologic model \times SSP), \mathbf{U}_r and $\bar{\mathbf{x}}$ are computed once from its full 2020–2099 discharge matrix and held fixed across all subsequent DMDc windows and LQR designs within that member, ensuring the same coordinate system for system identification, control, and reconstruction.

2.3.2 DMDc System Identification

Within the POD basis, we identify the basin response to precipitation forcing using Dynamic Mode Decomposition with control (DMDc) (Proctor et al., 2016; Kutz et al., 2016). DMDc provides a reduced-order linear dynamical model that maps the current reduced state and precipitation forcing to the next reduced state, with separate terms for routing dynamics and rainfall-driven inputs. The precipitation forcing is first centered and normalized: $\tilde{\mathbf{d}}(t) = (\mathbf{d}(t) - \boldsymbol{\mu}_d) / \sigma_d$, where $\boldsymbol{\mu}_d$ is the reach-wise temporal mean and σ_d is the global standard deviation across all reaches and time steps. A single global scale preserves relative spatial differences in precipitation magnitude across the basin. In reduced coordinates, the uncontrolled surrogate takes the form

$$\mathbf{z}(t+1) = \mathbf{A}\mathbf{z}(t) + \mathbf{E}\tilde{\mathbf{d}}(t), \quad (4)$$

where $\mathbf{A} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times r}$ is the reduced transition matrix encoding flow-routing dynamics across the network, and $\mathbf{E} \in \mathbb{R}^{r \times n}$ maps precipitation forcing to reduced-state responses, implicitly capturing rainfall–runoff generation. We estimate $\mathbf{G} = [\mathbf{A}, \mathbf{E}]$ jointly via Tikhonov-regularized regression:

$$\mathbf{G}^* = \arg \min_{\mathbf{G}} \left\{ \|\mathbf{Z}' - \mathbf{G}\boldsymbol{\Omega}\|_F^2 + \alpha \|\mathbf{G}\|_F^2 \right\}, \quad (5)$$

where $\boldsymbol{\Omega} = [\mathbf{Z}^\top, \tilde{\mathbf{D}}^\top]^\top$ concatenates state and disturbance snapshots (Proctor et al., 2016). The regularization parameter α is selected via grid search as the smallest value yielding spectral radius $\rho(\mathbf{A}) < 0.995$, promoting stable long-horizon simulations.

To accommodate nonstationarity in climate-driven streamflow dynamics, we estimate $(\mathbf{A}^{(w)}, \mathbf{E}^{(w)})$ in overlapping temporal windows of 10 years, advanced by 5 years. Each time step uses the dynamics from its containing window:

$$\mathbf{z}(t+1) = \mathbf{A}^{(w(t))}\mathbf{z}(t) + \mathbf{E}^{(w(t))}\tilde{\mathbf{d}}(t). \quad (6)$$

Because the POD basis is fixed, only the system matrices $\mathbf{A}^{(w)}$ and $\mathbf{E}^{(w)}$ vary across windows, capturing evolving climate-driven dynamics within a stationary coordinate frame.

2.3.3 Adding Control to the Identified System

Having identified a reduced-order surrogate model describing rainfall–runoff response within the river network, we augment this surrogate model with a control term representing the adaptation effort from Eq. (2), so that attenuation targets can be computed in reduced coordinates. In physical space, flow can be attenuated at each individual reach (i.e., $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{I}_n$). However, to operate in reduced coordinates, we constrain the attenuation to lie in the column space of the POD basis, $\mathbf{u}(t) = \mathbf{U}_r \mathbf{u}_z(t)$. Projecting the control term into reduced space gives

$$\mathbf{U}_r^\top \mathbf{B} \mathbf{U}_r \mathbf{u}_z(t) = \mathbf{U}_r^\top \mathbf{I}_n \mathbf{U}_r \mathbf{u}_z(t) = \mathbf{I}_r \mathbf{u}_z(t), \quad (7)$$

so the reduced input matrix is $\mathbf{B}_r = \mathbf{I}_r$ and the controlled reduced system becomes

$$\mathbf{z}(t+1) = \mathbf{A}^{(w)}\mathbf{z}(t) + \mathbf{B}_r \mathbf{u}_z(t) + \mathbf{E}^{(w)}\tilde{\mathbf{d}}(t). \quad (8)$$

Equation (8) can be read as a reduced-order water budget: the homogeneous term $\mathbf{A}^{(w)}\mathbf{z}$ propagates internal basin dynamics (routing and storage release), while the disturbance

280 term $\mathbf{E}^{(w)}\tilde{\mathbf{d}}$ introduces the precipitation-driven inflow, and the control term $\mathbf{B}_r\mathbf{u}_z$ rep-
 281 represents the flood adaptation effort, i.e., the spatially distributed attenuation that inter-
 282 ventions must provide. Separating the disturbance component (learned from data) from
 283 the control component (imposed by design) allows the framework to quantify the degree
 284 of adaptation required at each reach under a given climate scenario without prescrib-
 285 ing specific interventions.

286 2.4 Optimal Control Design

287 To determine the optimal allocation of flood control interventions at the river basin
 288 scale, we apply a Linear Quadratic Regulator (LQR) approach (Anderson & Moore, 2007).
 289 The LQR computes a feedback policy that penalizes high-flow states while limiting to-
 290 tal attenuation effort. For a given window with dynamics $\mathbf{A}^{(w)}$ and $\mathbf{B}_r = \mathbf{I}_r$, we min-
 291 imize the quadratic cost function

$$292 \quad J = \sum_{t=0}^{T-1} [\mathbf{z}(t)^\top \mathbf{Q} \mathbf{z}(t) + \mathbf{u}_z(t)^\top \mathbf{R} \mathbf{u}_z(t)], \quad (9)$$

293 where $\mathbf{Q} = \mathbf{I}_r$ penalizes reduced-state magnitude and $\mathbf{R} = R_w \mathbf{I}_r$ penalizes control ef-
 294 fort. The scalar weight R_w governs the trade-off between flood reduction and attenua-
 295 tion effort. Small R_w allows stronger attenuation when control is active, whereas large
 296 R_w penalizes attenuation more heavily and leaves greater residual exceedance. The op-
 297 timal policy is given by the feedback law $\mathbf{u}_z(t) = -\mathbf{K}\mathbf{z}(t)$ with

$$298 \quad \mathbf{K} = (\mathbf{R} + \mathbf{B}_r^\top \mathbf{P} \mathbf{B}_r)^{-1} \mathbf{B}_r^\top \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}, \quad (10)$$

299 where \mathbf{P} solves the discrete algebraic Riccati equation (DARE),

$$300 \quad \mathbf{P} = \mathbf{Q} + \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A} - \mathbf{A}^\top \mathbf{P} \mathbf{B}_r (\mathbf{R} + \mathbf{B}_r^\top \mathbf{P} \mathbf{B}_r)^{-1} \mathbf{B}_r^\top \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}. \quad (11)$$

301 Since $\mathbf{B}_r = \mathbf{I}_r$, the optimal control gain reduces to $\mathbf{K} = (\mathbf{R} + \mathbf{P})^{-1} \mathbf{P} \mathbf{A}$, with \mathbf{P} given
 302 by the standard DARE. Gains $\mathbf{K}^{(w)}$ are computed separately for each window using the
 303 corresponding $\mathbf{A}^{(w)}$.

304 Given that the optimal control policy depends on the weighting R_w that determines
 305 the emphasis applied to flood reduction versus attenuation effort, we sweep R_w over a
 306 logarithmic grid spanning 10^{-4} to 10^5 to trace the trade-off between these two objec-
 307 tives. For cross-scenario comparison at a fixed effort budget, we linearly interpolate reach-
 308 level metrics between the two bracketing R_w values whose basin-total efforts straddle the
 309 target. This strategy ensures that all scenarios and ensemble members are evaluated at
 310 identical total effort, isolating the effect of climate forcing from differences in effort al-
 311 location.

312 2.5 Flood Threshold Definition

313 Because the controller is intended to attenuate flood exceedance rather than mod-
 314 ify ordinary within-bank flows, we require a reach-specific flood threshold $\tau \in \mathbb{R}^n$ that
 315 determines when flood control activates. We derive thresholds from pooled annual max-
 316 imum discharge series (AMS) over the period from 1980 to 2019. For each reach, we ex-
 317 tract the maximum daily discharge in each year and pool these annual maxima across
 318 all four SSP-specific historical segments. Because the bias correction applies SSP-dependent
 319 adjustments, these segments are not identical even during the shared historical period;
 320 pooling therefore incorporates downscaling uncertainty into the threshold estimate. The
 321 return level for return period T is the empirical $(1-1/T)$ quantile of the pooled AMS:

$$322 \quad \tau_i^{(T)} = \hat{F}_{\mathcal{A}_i}^{-1} \left(1 - \frac{1}{T} \right). \quad (12)$$

323 We use the $T=2$ -year return level as the default threshold, approximating bankfull discharge
 324 (Wolman & Miller, 1960; Wilkerson, 2008) and targeting the onset of overbank
 325 flooding rather than rare extremes.

326 2.6 Threshold-Triggered Simulation

327 The LQR gain $\mathbf{K}^{(w)}$ is derived from the standard (ungated) linear system but ap-
 328 plied in a threshold-modulated manner so that feedback acts only on flood exceedance.
 329 At each time step, we reconstruct discharge as $\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t) = \max(\mathbf{U}_r \mathbf{z}(t) + \bar{\mathbf{x}}, \mathbf{0})$ and define
 330 the exceedance vector

$$331 \quad \mathbf{x}^+(t) = \max(\hat{\mathbf{x}}(t) - \boldsymbol{\tau}, \mathbf{0}). \quad (13)$$

332 We project exceedance back to reduced space, $\mathbf{z}^+(t) = \mathbf{U}_r^\top \mathbf{x}^+(t)$, and compute flood-
 333 only feedback

$$334 \quad \mathbf{u}_z(t) = -\mathbf{K}^{(w(t))} \mathbf{z}^+(t). \quad (14)$$

335 When all reaches are below the threshold, $\mathbf{z}^+(t) = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{u}_z(t) = \mathbf{0}$. Conversely, dur-
 336 ing floods, effort scales with exceedance magnitude. This gating mechanism ensures that
 337 control effort is zero during normal flows and activates proportionally only when discharge
 338 exceeds the flood threshold, producing attenuation signals that correspond to the effort
 339 required to bring flows back toward the flood threshold $\boldsymbol{\tau}$.

340 The closed-loop surrogate evolves according to Eq. (8) with $\mathbf{u}_z(t)$ given by Eq. (14),
 341 initialized at $\mathbf{z}(0) = \mathbf{U}_r^\top (\mathbf{x}(0) - \bar{\mathbf{x}})$. The implied physical-space attenuation is $\mathbf{u}(t) =$
 342 $\mathbf{U}_r \mathbf{u}_z(t)$. Because this attenuation is solved in reduced coordinates and lifted through
 343 the POD basis rather than applied independently at each reach, the recovered $u_i(t)$ is
 344 not sign-constrained; we therefore quantify effort by its magnitude $|u_i(t)|$ (Table 1); we
 345 verify the attenuation interpretation of this signal in Section 4.2.

346 2.7 Performance Metrics

347 We evaluate flood attenuation performance for the future period 2020–2099 using
 348 metrics computed from surrogate-reconstructed discharge trajectories. Baseline metrics
 349 are computed from open-loop surrogate simulations (no control), and controlled metrics
 350 are computed from closed-loop simulations under Eq. (8). This setup ensures consistent
 351 comparisons within the surrogate framework. Table 1 defines the core performance met-
 352 rics. Volumetric metrics include excess volume, excess-volume reduction, total effort, and
 353 efficiency; together, these metrics quantify mean annual flood exposure above the thresh-
 354 old, the fraction of that exposure removed by control, the annual attenuation volume re-
 355 quired at each reach, and the reduction achieved per unit effort. Peak discharge reduc-
 356 tion measures the relative change in maximum daily flow. Return-level residuals com-
 357 pare controlled and uncontrolled annual-maximum quantiles for $T \in \{2, 5, 10, 20, 50, 100\}$
 358 years. For basin-scale summaries, volumetric quantities are summed across reaches. Be-
 359 cause the same water can pass through multiple downstream reaches, these sums rep-
 360 resent network-integrated exceedance and attenuation burdens rather than unique basin
 361 water volumes at the outlet. Non-additive metrics are summarized using medians and
 362 interquartile ranges.

363 2.8 Surrogate Validation

364 We validate the reduced-order surrogate by iterating it forward from initial con-
 365 ditions over 2020–2099 without re-initialization and comparing simulated streamflows
 366 with those from the original process-based model. Performance is measured at each reach
 367 using Nash–Sutcliffe Efficiency (NSE), Kling–Gupta Efficiency (KGE), squared Pearson
 368 correlation (R^2), and absolute percent bias ($|\text{PBIAS}|$). To evaluate the benefit of time-
 369 varying system identification, we compare the windowed surrogate (10-year windows, 5-
 370 year step) against a single full-period fit.

Table 1. Core performance metrics. Baseline (bl) and controlled (cl) refer to open-loop and closed-loop surrogate simulations. Δt denotes the daily time step, N_y is the number of evaluation years, Q_i^{\max} is the maximum daily discharge at reach i , and ϵ is a small constant that avoids division by zero.

Metric	Definition
Excess volume	$V_i = \frac{1}{N_y} \sum_t \max(x_i(t) - \tau_i, 0) \Delta t$
Excess-volume reduction	$\phi_i = \frac{V_i^{(bl)} - V_i^{(cl)}}{V_i^{(bl)} + \epsilon}$
Total effort	$E_i = \frac{1}{N_y} \sum_t u_i(t) \Delta t$, $u_i(t) = [\mathbf{U}_T \mathbf{u}_z(t)]_i$
Efficiency	$\eta_i = \frac{E_i + \epsilon}{V_i^{(bl)} - V_i^{(cl)}}$
Peak discharge reduction	$\delta_i = \frac{Q_i^{\max, (bl)} - Q_i^{\max, (cl)}}{Q_i^{\max, (bl)} + \epsilon}$, where $Q_i^{\max} = \max_t x_i(t)$
Return-level residual	$\text{RL}_{T,i}^{(cl)} / \text{RL}_{T,i}^{(bl)}$, where $\text{RL}_{T,i}$ is the empirical $(1 - 1/T)$ quantile of annual maxima

3 Results

We first assess surrogate fidelity (Section 3.1) and then examine the basin-wide effort–residual trade-off (Section 3.2). We then analyze the spatial structure of optimized attenuation in three steps: where effort is allocated across the network (Section 3.3), where residual risk remains and how it amplifies across climate scenarios (Section 3.4), and how fixed-budget controlled outcomes vary across the climate ensemble (Section 3.5).

3.1 Surrogate Fidelity

The windowed DMDc surrogate reproduces flood dynamics across the Brazos River basin, with the strongest performance along the mainstem and major tributaries that dominate basin-integrated flood volume (Figure 2a). Weaker performance is concentrated in low-order headwater reaches in the western basin, where intermittent flow regimes are more difficult to approximate linearly. These reaches contribute minimally to basin-integrated flood volume. Compared with a single full-period fit, the windowed approach (10-year windows, 5-year step) improves all validation metrics: ensemble-median NSE increases from 0.54 to 0.69, KGE increases from 0.52 to 0.71, and |PBIAS| decreases from 0.15 to 0.08. This improvement is consistent across all 14 GCM–hydrologic model combinations (Figure 2b–d). A single operator must represent 80 years of evolving dynamics with one set of matrices, which can conflate distinct hydrologic regimes. The windowed formulation reduces this limitation by estimating separate linear operators over successive temporal windows. Within each window, rainfall–runoff dynamics are treated as approximately stationary; re-identification across windows then updates the surrogate as projected hydroclimatic conditions evolve. Because the controller acts only during exceedance events, we also evaluate surrogate fidelity at high flows in the Supporting Information (Figure S1). Basin-total return-level bias remains within $\pm 5\%$ across all return periods (Figure S1b), and bias converges toward zero with increasing stream order (Figure S1c). These results indicate that the high-order reaches that dominate basin-total flood volume are modeled most accurately when the controller is active. Basin-aggregate mass conservation is further verified in Figure S2.

3.2 Effort–Residual Trade-off

Figure 3 shows the temporal evolution of basin-integrated flood exceedance when each ensemble member is evaluated under a common fixed attenuation budget of $10 \text{ Gm}^3 \text{ yr}^{-1}$.




Figure 2. Surrogate validation comparing windowed (10-year windows, 5-year step) and full-period DMDc fitting. (a) Spatial distribution of ensemble-median NSE under the windowed approach. (b,c) Cumulative distributions of NSE and KGE; solid blue lines show the windowed approach and dashed red lines show the full-period fit; light shading shows individual ensemble members (7 GCMs \times 2 hydrologic models). (d) Multi-metric comparison showing median (dots) and interquartile range (bars) across all reaches.

402 Under all four SSPs, controlled exceedance trajectories remain below the baseline through-
 403 out the 80-year projection period (Figure 3a–d), indicating sustained flood attenuation
 404 under closed-loop control. The flow duration curves show that attenuation is concentrated
 405 in the upper tail of the discharge distribution, with the largest absolute reductions at
 406 the lowest exceedance probabilities (Figure 3e). This pattern follows from the threshold-
 407 triggered controller design: attenuation activates only when discharge exceeds the 2-year
 408 return level, so ordinary flows pass unmodified while flood peaks are preferentially sup-
 409 pressed.

410 Because the same R_w can produce different total attenuation volumes across sce-
 411 narios, direct cross-scenario comparison at a single penalty value is ambiguous. We there-
 412 fore sweep R_w across the full penalty range and compare scenarios using the trade-off
 413 between total attenuation and residual flood volume (Figure 4a). All four SSPs exhibit
 414 a common diminishing-return structure: marginal reductions in residual flood volume
 415 decline smoothly as total attenuation increases. Higher-emission scenarios show system-
 416 atically higher flood exceedances above SSP1-2.6 across the full effort range. At the refer-
 417 ence level of $10 \text{ Gm}^3 \text{ yr}^{-1}$, residual flood volume under SSP5-8.5 is roughly 60% higher
 418 ($\sim 1.6\times$) than under SSP1-2.6 (Figure 4a,b). This separation is consistent with stronger
 419 high-flow forcing under higher-emission pathways and implies that closing the gap would
 420 require substantially more annualized attenuation than the reference level.

421 Fixing total attenuation at $10 \text{ Gm}^3 \text{ yr}^{-1}$ enables a consistent multi-metric compar-
 422 ison across scenarios (Figure 4b,c). The residual-risk ratios show that climate-driven
 423 amplification of flood impacts depends on the flood metric considered. Excess flood volume
 424 exhibits the strongest scenario dependence, with the upper end of the inter-model range
 425 exceeding $2\times$ the SSP1-2.6 reference under SSP5-8.5. Annual peak discharge and return-




Figure 3. Temporal evolution of basin-integrated flood exceedance. (a–d) Annual exceedance volume above the 2-year return level for SSP1-2.6 through SSP5-8.5; dashed lines show baseline (open-loop surrogate), solid lines show controlled (closed-loop). Shading spans the inter-model range (7 GCMs \times 2 hydrologic models). (e) Flow duration curves of basin total flow under baseline (dashed) and controlled (solid) conditions, with shading indicating inter-model spread.

level metrics increase more modestly (Figure 4b). Controlled flood-frequency curves show that scenario separation increases with return period and becomes more pronounced beyond ~ 10 years (Figure 4c). Thus, even after optimized attenuation, the upper tail of the flood-frequency distribution remains the most sensitive to forcing pathway and the most uncertain across climate models.

The trade-off curve can be interpreted as the progressive exhaustion of readily attenuated flood exceedance. The steep initial decline reflects the removal of moderate, frequently recurring floods that can be reduced with relatively small amounts of distributed attenuation. As effort increases, the remaining exceedance is increasingly dominated by larger events, so additional attenuation produces diminishing marginal gains. The vertical separation among SSP curves indicates that stronger forcing leaves a larger residual exceedance burden at the same total effort level. Additional effort reduces this burden, but scenario separation persists over the range of budgets evaluated. In the following sections, we use the $10 \text{ Gm}^3 \text{ yr}^{-1}$ reference budget to examine how attenuation effort is distributed across the network and where residual risk remains.

3.3 Effort Allocation Structure

Given a fixed basin-wide adaptation budget, a natural question is whether the effort allocation simply tracks a hydrologic size metric, reproducing what a scaling argument would yield without the control framework. In other words, are flood attenuation measures simply applied to the largest river reaches, where the largest potential for discharge attenuation exists? Figure 5 investigates this question by benchmarking the effort allocation against mean annual discharge (\bar{Q}) and drainage area, then characterizing the spatial structure of the departures under SSP2-4.5 at the reference budget of $10 \text{ Gm}^3 \text{ yr}^{-1}$.

Raw effort (Figure 5a), measured in terms of the volume of water attenuated, spans more than two orders of magnitude across reaches, with the largest volumes concentrated along the mainstem and major tributaries. A log–log regression against mean annual dis-




Figure 4. Basin-scale effort–residual trade-off. (a) Trade-off curve between total attenuation and residual flood volume for four SSPs; the dashed line marks a reference level of $10 \text{ Gm}^3 \text{ yr}^{-1}$. Shading indicates inter-model spread (7 GCMs \times 2 hydrologic models). (b) Residual risk ratios (relative to SSP1-2.6) for multiple flood metrics at the reference level; dots show ensemble-median values and bars span the inter-model range. (c) Controlled flood frequency curves (flood magnitude vs. return period) with inter-model uncertainty.

452 charge yields $R^2 = 0.90$ with a sub-linear slope of 0.81 (Figure S3a), indicating that
 453 mean flow magnitude is the dominant predictor of applied control effort. By contrast,
 454 drainage area alone explains only 33% of the variance (Figure S3b), reflecting the strong
 455 east–west precipitation gradient across the Brazos River basin. Here, arid western head-
 456 waters drain large areas but generate modest discharge, while more humid eastern trib-
 457 utaries carry disproportionately large flows relative to their contributing area. Because
 458 flow magnitude, not contributing area, governs the allocation of adaptation measures,
 459 the proposed flood control planning framework encodes the basin’s hydroclimatic struc-
 460 ture rather than simply its network topology.

461 Normalizing effort by mean annual discharge (Figure 5b) removes the dominant
 462 flow-magnitude dependence and reveals the effort intensity, i.e., how much attenuation
 463 the optimal adaptation strategy demands per unit mean discharge. The resulting map
 464 shows a qualitatively different spatial pattern from the raw effort. Specific mid-basin trib-
 465 utaries and transitional reaches between headwaters and the mainstem display the high-
 466 est intensities, indicating that the optimized adaptation scheme prioritizes these loca-
 467 tions well beyond what their flow alone would warrant. Mainstem reaches, despite re-
 468 ceiving the largest absolute effort, have relatively low intensity of effort when normal-
 469 ized by mean discharge. This low relative intensity can be explained by the fact that adap-
 470 tation efforts applied to mainstem reaches have limited downstream impact. While flow
 471 attenuation achieved at headwater streams will accrue ‘bonus’ flood mitigation effects
 472 in receiving reaches, this bonus effect is limited for flow attenuation measures applied
 473 at mainstem reaches that are located near the terminus of the drainage network.

474 To isolate these departures formally, we regress log-transformed effort against log
 475 mean discharge and map the residuals (Figure 5c). Positive residuals (red) identify reaches
 476 receiving more effort than the mean-flow power law predicts; negative residuals (blue)
 477 mark those receiving less. The residual map reveals a coherent, physically interpretable
 478 spatial structure rather than random scatter. This pattern indicates that the LQR con-
 479 trol scheme does not merely scale effort with flow magnitude but redistributes it within

480 the network, allocating disproportionate effort to specific mid-basin reaches where at-
 481 tenuation demand exceeds what local flow magnitude alone would suggest. Conversely,
 482 reaches that benefit from cumulative upstream attenuation receive less effort per unit
 483 discharge than the basin-wide power law would predict.

484 The priority-mismatch map (Figure 5d) tests whether the high-attenuation reaches
 485 identified in panel c could have been flagged using local reach attributes alone. We rank
 486 all reaches independently by three criteria—LQR effort, mean annual discharge (\bar{Q}), and
 487 drainage area (DA)—and compare the top 10% under each ranking. Red, blue, and green
 488 segments mark reaches that appear in only one ranking (LQR-unique, \bar{Q} -unique, and DA-
 489 unique, respectively), while gray indicates reaches flagged by two or more. The 232 LQR-
 490 unique reaches are predominantly mid-order tributaries (median stream order 3, median
 491 drainage area 256 km²), too small to enter the top decile of either flow or area rankings
 492 but identified by the framework as requiring disproportionate attenuation relative to their
 493 hydrologic size. That these reaches cannot be recovered from local attributes confirms
 494 that the spatial allocation encodes network-level interactions—upstream–downstream
 495 coupling and confluence timing—that system-level analysis resolves but reach-attribute-
 496 based reasoning cannot.




Figure 5. Spatial structure of effort allocation under SSP2-4.5 at the reference attenuation level of 10 Gm³ yr⁻¹. (a) Raw effort at each reach. (b) Effort normalized by mean annual discharge (\bar{Q}). (c) Residual from regressing log effort against log \bar{Q} ; red indicates more effort than \bar{Q} scaling predicts, blue indicates less. (d) Priority-mismatch map: reaches are ranked independently by LQR effort, \bar{Q} , and DA, and the top 10% under each ranking are compared. Colored segments appear in only one ranking; gray appears in two or more.

497 3.4 Spatial Structure of Residual Risk

498 The preceding section showed that optimized effort allocation largely tracks mean-
 499 flow scaling, with systematic departures at selected tributary and transitional reaches.
 500 We now examine where residual exceedance remains after attenuation is implemented
 501 and how this residual varies with climate forcing. Figure 6a–c maps reach-level resid-
 502 ual exceedance volume relative to SSP1-2.6 (the lowest-emission scenario) for the three
 503 higher-emission pathways. The amplification of residual flood risk due to climate change
 504 is not spatially uniform: mainstem and high-order tributary reaches show ratios of 2–
 505 4×, indicating that major rivers show significantly greater residual flood risk under higher-

506 emission scenarios, while most headwater reaches remain near 1:1. Thus, higher-emission
 507 scenarios produce the largest residual increases along the largest streams in the network.

508 The stream-order decomposition (Figure 6d) clarifies the outside impact of climate
 509 change on larger streams. High-order reaches (order 5+) integrate runoff from many up-
 510 stream branches, so scenario-driven increases in runoff appear as larger and more spa-
 511 tially coherent residual exceedance along major channels. Low-order reaches (order 1–
 512 2) have smaller absolute residual volumes but greater ensemble-to-ensemble variability,
 513 reflecting their stronger dependence on localized storm placement and intensity. From
 514 a flood management perspective, the major-channel residual pattern is therefore more
 515 stable across climate futures, whereas headwater residual risk remains more uncertain
 516 relative to its magnitude.




Figure 6. Spatial distribution of residual risk amplification at the reference attenuation level of $10 \text{ Gm}^3 \text{ yr}^{-1}$. (a–c) Reach-level ratio of controlled residual exceedance volume relative to SSP1-2.6 for SSP2-4.5, SSP3-7.0, and SSP5-8.5. Color scale is logarithmic (base 2); line widths are scaled by log drainage area. (d) Distribution of residual ratio by Strahler stream order; dots show flow-weighted medians, bars span flow-weighted interquartile ranges.

517 Tracing residual risk along the mainstem as a function of drainage area reveals how
 518 these reach-level patterns accumulate downstream (Figure 7). Both residual exceedance
 519 volume and 10-year return-level residual increase on average with drainage area, with
 520 some of the largest gains coinciding with major tributary junctions near 50,000, 75,000,
 521 and 100,000 km^2 where contributing area grows abruptly. The profiles are not strictly
 522 monotonic, because residual exceedance volume is a reach-specific metric dependent on
 523 local thresholds, control allocation, and event timing, rather than a conserved downstream
 524 flux.

525 The clearest longitudinal signal is the progressive widening of inter-scenario sep-
 526 aration with drainage area: from roughly $1.5\times$ for SSP5-8.5 relative to SSP1-2.6 in the
 527 upper basin to approximately $3\times$ near the outlet. This widening is consistent with down-
 528 stream area integration, as each additional tributary contributes scenario-sensitive resid-
 529 ual exceedance from its own drainage area. Downstream reaches therefore face both larger
 530 absolute residual volumes and greater scenario separation.

531 This reach-to-reach variability is a direct consequence of treating the river network
 532 as a single coupled dynamical system. Because the DMDc surrogate is trained on network-
 533 wide discharge time series, the transition matrix \mathbf{A} encodes how flow perturbations prop-

534 agate between reaches—including connectivity, travel times, and confluence interactions—
 535 and the LQR allocation inherits this system-level structure.




Figure 7. Mainstem profiles of residual risk at the reference attenuation level of $10 \text{ Gm}^3 \text{ yr}^{-1}$. (a) Residual exceedance volume and (b) 10-year return level residual under controlled conditions. Filled circles show ensemble-median values ($7 \text{ GCMs} \times 2 \text{ hydrologic models}$); shading spans the inter-model range. Notable increases near $50,000$, $75,000$, and $100,000 \text{ km}^2$ coincide with major tributary confluences.

536 3.5 Scenario Sensitivity and Ensemble Agreement

537 The previous sections showed where attenuation effort is allocated and where resid-
 538 ual exceedance remains after control. We next evaluate whether adaptation benefits re-
 539 main stable under stronger forcing. To do so, we compare peak-discharge reduction under
 540 SSP2-4.5 with the corresponding reduction under SSP5-8.5 at the same $10 \text{ Gm}^3 \text{ yr}^{-1}$
 541 attenuation budget.

542 Under SSP2-4.5, optimized attenuation produces spatially uneven peak-discharge
 543 reductions across the river network (Figure 8a). The comparison with SSP5-8.5 shows
 544 how these benefits change under stronger forcing. In some reaches, the same total at-
 545 tenuation budget produces a smaller peak-reduction benefit under SSP5-8.5; in others,
 546 the change is weak or the benefit increases. This heterogeneous response reflects the com-
 547 bined influence of scenario-dependent runoff changes, ensemble-specific hydroclimate pro-
 548 jections, and routed network effects, including the way upstream attenuation alters down-
 549 stream peak flows. The map is therefore best interpreted as a scenario-sensitivity diag-
 550 nostic of the optimized control solution, rather than as reach-by-reach attribution to a
 551 single physical mechanism.

552 The ensemble agreement map adds a robustness layer to this sensitivity analysis
 553 (Figure 8b). For each reach, it counts how many ensemble members agree that peak-reduction
 554 benefit decreases from SSP2-4.5 to SSP5-8.5. High agreement identifies reaches where
 555 the direction of change is consistent across the ensemble, whereas mixed agreement iden-
 556 tifies reaches where the result depends more strongly on climate or hydrologic model choice.
 557 In this application, roughly half of reaches show majority agreement on decreased con-

558 trol benefit under SSP5-8.5, about 30% show majority agreement on increased benefit,
 559 and the remaining reaches show mixed ensemble signals.

560 The stream-order summary shows that these changes are not confined to one part
 561 of the drainage hierarchy (Figure 8c). Sensitivity appears across multiple stream orders,
 562 indicating that changes in modeled control effectiveness are a network-wide property of
 563 the optimized solution rather than a feature of only headwater channels or mainstem reaches.

564 Together, these results add an uncertainty and confidence layer to the previous maps.
 565 The effort-allocation maps identify where control effort is placed (Section 3.3), the residual-
 566 risk maps identify where flood exceedance remains after control (Section 3.4), and the
 567 sensitivity and agreement maps show whether the modeled control benefits remain con-
 568 sistent across climate futures (Section 3.5). This latter sensitivity assessment makes the
 569 framework useful not only for locating priority reaches, but also for distinguishing reaches
 570 with robust ensemble support from reaches where adaptive or staged planning may be
 571 more appropriate.




Figure 8. Control effectiveness and robustness across the ensemble at the reference attenuation level of $10 \text{ Gm}^3 \text{ yr}^{-1}$. (a) Change in ensemble-median peak reduction from SSP2-4.5 to SSP5-8.5 (percentage points; red = degradation, blue = improvement). (b) Map of ensemble agreement on degradation (0–14 scale); each ensemble member is a unique GCM–hydrologic model pair. (c) Distribution of peak reduction change by stream order; dots show medians and bars span the interquartile range.

572 4 Discussion

573 4.1 Planning Implications

574 The results suggest that basin-scale flood adaptation planning can be organized
 575 around the combined assessment of flood control capacity, placement, residual risk, and
 576 robustness. At a basic level, flood planners need to know the level of investment required
 577 to satisfactorily mitigate flood impacts, the spatial locations where flood defenses should
 578 be allocated, the level of flooding risk that remains after implementation, and the ro-
 579 bustness of the given adaptation strategy in the face of climate uncertainty. The pro-
 580 posed planning framework addresses each of these four criteria in turn.

581 The effort–residual trade-off analysis (Section 3.2) first defines the level of flood miti-
 582 gation benefit that is expected for a given level of adaptation effort, and provides wa-
 583 ter managers with a means to decide an appropriate level of investment. Our analysis
 584 shows that increasing attenuation effort reduces flood exceedance monotonically across
 585 all climate scenarios considered; however, marginal flood control benefits decline as the
 586 remaining risk becomes increasingly associated with large events (Figure 4). The trade-

587 off curve therefore provides a screening basis for evaluating the scale of adaptation re-
588 quired to meet flood mitigation goals.

589 The effort-allocation analysis (Section 3.3) reveals the optimal spatial distribution
590 of attenuation needed to reduce flood exceedance, and thus provides water managers with
591 spatially explicit guidance for coordination of flood defenses. In general, raw attenua-
592 tion effort concentrates along the mainstem and major tributaries, consistent with their
593 larger flood volumes (Figure 5a). These results confirm that major dams located on large
594 rivers are effective targets for basin-scale flood control. However, optimized allocation
595 of attenuation does not merely reflect hydrologic size; in particular, selected mid-order
596 tributaries and transitional reaches receive disproportionate priority even when they are
597 not the largest reaches by discharge or drainage area (Figure 5b–d). These prioritized
598 regions arise because network position—how far a reach sits above the outlet, and how
599 the timing of its hydrograph aligns with those of converging tributaries—governs how
600 much downstream benefit a given attenuation produces. While additional research is needed
601 to contextualize these findings with respect to real-world implementation constraints,
602 these results suggest that decentralized interventions (e.g. small-scale detention storage)
603 may offer greater flood mitigation benefits per unit volume of water attenuated when
604 they are located at these critical locations in the drainage network. Consistent with this
605 distributed-adaptation framing, a stream-order constrained experiment confirms that the
606 bulk of the achievable flood-volume reduction can be realized through distributed con-
607 trol across lower-order portions of the drainage hierarchy, rather than concentrated at
608 the largest channels alone (Figure S4).

609 The residual-risk analysis (Section 3.4) indicates the level of remaining flood risk
610 that is expected after flood defenses are implemented, and the degree to which this risk
611 varies by spatial location and climate scenario. Generally, we find that higher-emissions
612 scenarios and major rivers exhibit greater flooding risks. Even after optimized attenua-
613 tion, residual exceedance accumulates along high-order channels and near major con-
614 fluences, and inter-scenario separation widens downstream as scenario-sensitive tribu-
615 tary inflows are routed through the mainstem (Figures 6 and 7). This distinction is im-
616 portant because the reaches prioritized for attenuation and the reaches where residual
617 flood burden remains concentrated are related but not identical. Mid-basin tributaries
618 with high attenuation priority may be candidate locations for distributed retention, in-
619 filtration enhancement, or floodplain reconnection, whereas downstream mainstem reaches
620 may require complementary measures to manage risk, such as improved emergency re-
621 sponse or removal of structures from floodplains (Tanoue et al., 2021). These spatial pri-
622 orities are also broadly stable across the projection period and across imposed total ef-
623 fort levels (Figure S5). Although absolute residual volumes increase in the later period
624 under higher-emission pathways, reach-level effort rankings remain similar, suggesting
625 that rank-based priority maps provide robust starting points even as the required mag-
626 nitude of attenuation capacity grows.

627 The scenario-robustness analysis (Section 3.5) qualifies the consistency of the pre-
628 dicted spatial adaptation plan with respect to climate uncertainty, thereby providing wa-
629 ter managers with guidance for planning confidence and sequencing. Reaches where peak-
630 reduction benefits degrade consistently across the ensemble indicate locations where main-
631 taining control benefits under stronger forcing may require additional capacity or com-
632plementary measures (Figure 8). Reaches with mixed ensemble signals are not necessar-
633 ily lower-priority; rather, they identify places where flexible, low-regret measures (Hallegatte,
634 2009) and staged implementation are appropriate.

635 Together, these diagnostics translate the reach-level optimization results into a prac-
636 tical planning sequence: evaluate the appropriate scale of basin-wide flood control ca-
637 pacity, locate reaches where attenuation provides the greatest network-level flood mit-
638 igation potential, identify corridors where residual risk accumulates after adaptation, and

639 apply ensemble agreement and temporal stability analyses to distinguish robust near-
640 term priorities from less certain interventions that should be implemented adaptively.

641 4.2 Methodological Considerations and Outlook

642 Several methodological assumptions define the scope of the diagnostic framework
643 and point to natural extensions. The most immediate extension concerns the surrogate
644 itself. The DMDc operator approximates nonlinear basin dynamics with a linear state-
645 space model in reduced coordinates, a trade-off that enables closed-form LQR solutions
646 across the full network but may reduce fidelity during strongly nonlinear rainfall–runoff
647 episodes. Nonlinear alternatives such as Koopman-based lifting (Kutz et al., 2016) or
648 kernel-based extended DMD (Williams et al., 2015) could improve fidelity for extreme
649 events while preserving compatibility with structured control design. Separately, para-
650 metric data-driven representations of nonautonomous systems (Lu & Tartakovsky, 2024)
651 could replace the sequential windowing adopted here with a more systematic treatment
652 of nonstationarity in the external forcing.

653 A second extension involves the control structure. The assumption $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{I}_n$ treats
654 every reach as independently controllable, but flood adaptation planning typically op-
655 erates at the scale of sub-basins or administrative units. The framework accommodates
656 this naturally through the control input matrix \mathbf{B} : replacing $\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{I}_n$ with configura-
657 tions where control acts only at sub-basin outlets reduces the number of independent de-
658 cision points while preserving the same surrogate dynamics and POD basis. The reduced
659 input matrix $\mathbf{B}_r = \mathbf{U}_r^\top \mathbf{B}$ enters the DARE directly, so the LQR is re-solved in closed
660 form at any planning resolution without re-running process-based simulations. To demon-
661 strate this capability, we tested outlet-only configurations at HUC12, HUC10, and HUC8
662 resolution (Figure S6), showing that the framework can operate across a range of insti-
663 tutional planning scales. The same mechanism extends to excluding infeasible reaches,
664 weighting columns by local intervention capacity, or matching control units to admin-
665 istrative boundaries—each requiring only a re-solve of the closed-form LQR rather than
666 new simulations. Requirement maps produced at alternative resolutions could also in-
667 form related placement problems, such as siting hydraulic control structures within the
668 network (Bartos & Kerkez, 2019) or prioritizing hydrological monitoring (Oh & Bartos,
669 2025).

670 A related consideration is the physical interpretation of the lifted control signal.
671 Because the LQR is solved in reduced coordinates and lifted back to physical space through
672 the POD basis, the reach-level signal is not constrained to act in the attenuation direc-
673 tion at every reach and time step. We therefore evaluated the lifted signal a posteriori
674 to test whether this unconstrained representation compromises its interpretation as flood
675 attenuation. At the $10 \text{ Gm}^3 \text{ yr}^{-1}$ reference budget, the recovered physical-space signal
676 acts in the intended attenuation direction for the overwhelming majority of exceedance
677 events, with an ensemble-median attenuation fraction of 99%; at the basin scale, atten-
678 uation accounts for 95–97% of the absolute control effect across SSPs (Figure S7a,b). The
679 magnitude of the lifted signal is also small relative to local flow: the median per-reach
680 attenuation during exceedance events is 12% of channel flow and never exceeds local dis-
681 charge in any ensemble member (Figure S7c). These checks support interpreting $|u_i(t)|$
682 as a diagnostic attenuation-effort metric rather than as a sign-constrained operating rule.

683 Because the process-based simulations used to train the surrogate omit reservoir
684 operations, existing reservoir capacity is not credited in the control analysis. The result-
685 ing targets therefore provide a conservative estimate of the distributed attenuation re-
686 quired across the basin. Although annualized attenuation volume is not directly equiv-
687 alent to static storage capacity, the reference target of $10 \text{ Gm}^3 \text{ yr}^{-1}$ (Figure 4a) is broadly
688 comparable in order of magnitude to the approximately 4.9 Gm^3 of designated flood-pool
689 storage across the nine USACE reservoirs in the Brazos basin (Brazos River Authority

690 & Halff Associates, 2019). Incorporating reservoir dynamics explicitly, by augmenting
 691 the state vector with storage volumes and treating release schedules as constrained control
 692 inputs, would yield a coupled channel–reservoir system that partitions projected flood
 693 risk into the portion manageable by existing capacity and the residual requiring distributed
 694 interventions. Pairing such an augmented formulation with active control strategies such
 695 as model predictive control would allow existing reservoir capacity to be adaptively co-
 696 ordinated with distributed measures as climate conditions evolve.

697 The framework currently uses precipitation as the sole exogenous forcing, appropriate
 698 for a rainfall-dominated basin such as the Brazos but insufficient where snowmelt,
 699 glacier retreat, or rain-on-snow events (Musselman et al., 2018) drive flood generation.
 700 The modeling pipeline can accommodate additional forcing channels: expanding $\tilde{\mathbf{d}}(t)$ to
 701 include temperature or snow water equivalent requires re-estimating the disturbance matrix
 702 \mathbf{E} without altering the control design. Applying this to snowmelt-driven or mixed-
 703 regime basins would test whether the capacity, placement, and robustness diagnostics
 704 generalize beyond the rainfall-dominated setting demonstrated here. Similarly, including
 705 hydrologic model structures beyond VIC and PRMS would broaden the ensemble’s
 706 coverage of land-surface process uncertainty. Such an expanded ensemble would enable
 707 a formal decomposition of the relative contributions of climate model choice, emission
 708 pathway, hydrologic model structure, and surrogate model error to reach-level uncertainty
 709 (Steinschneider et al., 2023).

710 A further advantage follows from how the operators are obtained: because they are
 711 identified from input–output data rather than specified a priori, the framework can be
 712 re-estimated as new simulation outputs or observational records become available. The
 713 windowed identification strategy already demonstrates this property within a single pro-
 714 jection: surrogate dynamics are updated every five years to track evolving hydroclimatic
 715 conditions (Section 2.3). The same mechanism extends to incorporating updated climate
 716 projections, additional GCM ensembles, or monitoring records by re-running the iden-
 717 tification and control steps without modifying the framework itself, making the pipeline
 718 compatible with adaptive replanning in which requirement maps are periodically revised
 719 as new information becomes available (Cohen & Herman, 2021; Fletcher et al., 2019).
 720 This re-estimability positions the framework not as a one-time diagnostic but as a re-
 721 curring component of long-term adaptation planning. Future work should integrate these
 722 spatial diagnostic targets into deeply uncertain pathway simulation frameworks (Trindade
 723 et al., 2019) to evaluate the robust sequencing of distributed flood interventions over multi-
 724 decadal planning horizons.

725 5 Conclusions

726 We present a flood-control planning framework for coordinating the placement of
 727 decentralized interventions, such as detention storage, floodplain reconnection, wetland
 728 restoration, and infiltration enhancement, at the river-basin scale. The framework com-
 729 bines multi-model hydrologic simulations with reduced-order dynamics learning and op-
 730 timal control to estimate reach-level flow-attenuation requirements under future climate
 731 scenarios. By combining POD, DMDc, and LQR, the framework transforms a high-dimensional
 732 network-scale problem into a tractable sequence of reduced-order identification and con-
 733 trol steps, producing reach-level attenuation targets, effort–residual trade-off curves, and
 734 robustness diagnostics. We demonstrate the framework on the Brazos River basin and
 735 address three research questions.

736 *How does the effort–residual trade-off vary across scenarios?* The trade-off curves
 737 share a common diminishing-return shape across all emission pathways. Higher-emission
 738 scenarios retain substantially greater residual flood volume at comparable effort levels,
 739 implying that closing the gap would require substantially greater attenuation capacity
 740 or complementary adaptation measures.

741 *How does the framework distribute effort, where does residual risk concentrate, and*
 742 *how do these patterns relate to network structure?* The bulk of the effort allocation tracks
 743 mean-flow scaling, but the framework identifies mid-order tributary reaches where at-
 744 tenuation demand substantially exceeds what local hydrologic size would suggest. This
 745 result indicates that system-level analysis identifies spatial patterns in attenuation de-
 746 mand that reach-attribute-based screening alone cannot capture. Residual risk follows
 747 the drainage-network hierarchy, with inter-scenario separation widening progressively down-
 748 stream as each tributary compounds climate-sensitive runoff.

749 *How robust are fixed-budget controlled outcomes to inter-model uncertainty?* The
 750 ensemble agreement map identifies where controlled performance consistently degrades
 751 under stronger forcing and where the direction of change remains mixed across GCM–
 752 hydrologic model members. This diagnostic provides a confidence layer on the effort-allocation
 753 and residual-risk results: high-priority reaches with strong agreement provide stronger
 754 support for near-term capacity planning, whereas high-priority reaches with mixed agree-
 755 ment motivate flexible or staged adaptation measures.

756 More broadly, the proposed framework provides a computationally tractable tool
 757 for translating climate projection ensembles into spatially explicit flood adaptation strate-
 758 gies. By identifying where attenuation demand is robust, where residual risk remains con-
 759 centrated, and where flexibility should be preserved as new information becomes avail-
 760 able, the proposed framework supports adaptive flood-planning decisions across large river
 761 networks.

762 Acknowledgments

763 This study was supported in part by the United States National Science Foundation un-
 764 der Grant No. 2340176.

765 Conflict of Interest

766 The authors declare no conflicts of interest relevant to this study.

767 Open Research

768 All replication code and intermediate pipeline outputs supporting this study are
 769 archived on Zenodo (Oh & Bartos, 2026). The source repository is at [https://github](https://github.com/future-water/flood-adaptation-control)
 770 [.com/future-water/flood-adaptation-control](https://github.com/future-water/flood-adaptation-control). Climate-forced streamflow and pre-
 771 cipitation projections used as forcing inputs are publicly available from the ORNL Hy-
 772 droSource record (Kao et al., 2024).

773 References

- 774 Alfieri, L., Bisselink, B., Dottori, F., Naumann, G., de Roo, A., Salamon, P., . . .
 775 Feyen, L. (2017). Global projections of river flood risk in a warmer world.
 776 *Earth's Future*, 5(2), 171–182. doi: 10.1002/2016EF000485
- 777 Alfieri, L., Feyen, L., & Di Baldassarre, G. (2016). Increasing flood risk under
 778 climate change: a pan-European assessment of the benefits of four adaptation
 779 strategies. *Climatic Change*, 136(3), 507–521. doi: 10.1007/s10584-016-1641-1
- 780 Anderson, B. D., & Moore, J. B. (2007). *Optimal control: linear quadratic methods*.
 781 Courier Corporation.
- 782 Ayalew, T. B., Krajewski, W. F., & Mantilla, R. (2015). Insights into expected
 783 changes in regulated flood frequencies due to the spatial configuration of flood
 784 retention ponds. *Journal of Hydrologic Engineering*, 20(10), 04015010. doi:
 785 10.1061/(ASCE)HE.1943-5584.0001173

- 786 Bartos, M., & Kerkez, B. (2019). Hydrograph peak-shaving using a graph-theoretic
787 algorithm for placement of hydraulic control structures. *Advances in Water Re-*
788 *sources*, *127*, 167–179. doi: 10.1016/j.advwatres.2019.03.016
- 789 Bates, P. D., Horritt, M. S., & Fewtrell, T. J. (2010). A simple inertial for-
790 mulation of the shallow water equations for efficient two-dimensional
791 flood inundation modelling. *Journal of Hydrology*, *387*(1-2), 33–45. doi:
792 10.1016/j.jhydrol.2010.03.027
- 793 Bentivoglio, R., Isufi, E., Jonkman, S. N., & Taormina, R. (2022). Deep learning
794 methods for flood mapping: a review of existing applications and future re-
795 search directions. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, *26*(16), 4345–4378.
796 doi: 10.5194/hess-26-4345-2022
- 797 Berkooz, G., Holmes, P., & Lumley, J. L. (1993). The proper orthogonal decom-
798 position in the analysis of turbulent flows. *Annual Review of Fluid Mechanics*,
799 *25*(1), 539–575. doi: 10.1146/annurev.fl.25.010193.002543
- 800 Bertoni, F., Giuliani, M., & Castelletti, A. (2020). Integrated design of dam size
801 and operations via reinforcement learning. *Journal of Water Resources Plan-*
802 *ning and Management*, *146*(4), 04020010. doi: 10.1061/(ASCE)WR.1943-5452
803 .0001182
- 804 Black, A., Peskett, L., MacDonald, A., Young, A., Spray, C., Ball, T., . . . Werritty,
805 A. (2021). Natural flood management, lag time and catchment scale: Results
806 from an empirical nested catchment study. *Journal of Flood Risk Management*,
807 *14*(3), e12717. doi: 10.1111/jfr3.12717
- 808 Blöschl, G., Hall, J., Viglione, A., Perdigão, R. A., Parajka, J., Merz, B., . . . others
809 (2019). Changing climate both increases and decreases European river floods.
810 *Nature*, *573*(7772), 108–111. doi: 10.1038/s41586-019-1495-6
- 811 Bowes, B. D., Wang, C., Ercan, M. B., Culver, T. B., Beling, P. A., & Goodall,
812 J. L. (2022). Reinforcement learning-based real-time control of coastal urban
813 stormwater systems to mitigate flooding and improve water quality. *Envi-*
814 *ronmental Science: Water Research & Technology*, *8*(10), 2065–2086. doi:
815 10.1039/d1ew00582k
- 816 Brazos River Authority, & Halff Associates. (2019, March). *Lower Brazos*
817 *floodplain protection planning study* (Tech. Rep.). Brazos River Author-
818 ity. Retrieved from <https://brazos.org/Portals/0/Documents/LowerBrazosFloodplainStudy/Appendix-A-Previous-Studies-and-Data-Collection.pdf>
- 819
820
- 821 Broderick, C., Murphy, C., Wilby, R. L., Matthews, T., Prudhomme, C., & Adam-
822 son, M. (2019). Using a scenario-neutral framework to avoid potential mal-
823 adaptation to future flood risk. *Water Resources Research*, *55*(2), 1079–1104.
824 doi: 10.1029/2018WR023623
- 825 Castelletti, A., Ficchi, A., Cominola, A., Segovia, P., Giuliani, M., Wu, W., . . .
826 Maestre, J. M. (2023). Model predictive control of water resources systems:
827 A review and research agenda. *Annual Reviews in Control*, *55*, 442–465. doi:
828 10.1016/j.arcontrol.2023.03.013
- 829 Castelletti, A., Galelli, S., Ratto, M., Soncini-Sessa, R., & Young, P. C. (2012).
830 A general framework for dynamic emulation modelling in environmen-
831 tal problems. *Environmental Modelling & Software*, *34*, 5–18. doi:
832 10.1016/j.envsoft.2012.01.002
- 833 Cheng, C., Yang, Y. E., Ryan, R., Yu, Q., & Brabec, E. (2017). Assessing cli-
834 mate change-induced flooding mitigation for adaptation in Boston’s Charles
835 River watershed, USA. *Landscape and Urban Planning*, *167*, 25–36. doi:
836 10.1016/j.landurbplan.2017.05.019
- 837 Cohen, J. S., & Herman, J. D. (2021). Dynamic adaptation of water resources sys-
838 tems under uncertainty by learning policy structure and indicators. *Water Re-*
839 *sources Research*, *57*(11), e2021WR030433. doi: 10.1029/2021WR030433
- 840 Dadson, S. J., Hall, J. W., Murgatroyd, A., Acreman, M., Bates, P., Beven, K.,

- 841 ... others (2017). A restatement of the natural science evidence concerning
 842 catchment-based ‘natural’ flood management in the UK. *Proceedings of the*
 843 *Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, 473(2199),
 844 20160706. doi: 10.1098/rspa.2016.0706
- 845 David, C. H., Maidment, D. R., Niu, G.-Y., Yang, Z.-L., Habets, F., & Eijkhout, V.
 846 (2011). River network routing on the NHDPlus dataset. *Journal of Hydrome-*
 847 *teorology*, 12(5), 913–934. doi: 10.1175/2011JHM1345.1
- 848 Dottori, F., Mentaschi, L., Bianchi, A., Alfieri, L., & Feyen, L. (2023). Cost-effective
 849 adaptation strategies to rising river flood risk in Europe. *Nature Climate*
 850 *Change*, 13(2), 196–202. doi: 10.1038/s41558-022-01540-0
- 851 Fletcher, S., Lickley, M., & Strzepek, K. (2019). Learning about climate change
 852 uncertainty enables flexible water infrastructure planning. *Nature Communica-*
 853 *tions*, 10(1), 1782. doi: 10.1038/s41467-019-09677-x
- 854 Ghimire, G. R., Kao, S.-C., & Gangrade, S. (2023). *ORNL hydroclimate projections:*
 855 *Technical documentation* (Tech. Rep. No. ORNL/TM-2023/2912). Oak Ridge
 856 National Laboratory. doi: 10.2172/1887712
- 857 Giuliani, M., Castelletti, A., Pianosi, F., Mason, E., & Reed, P. M. (2016). Curses,
 858 tradeoffs, and scalable management: Advancing evolutionary multiobjec-
 859 tive direct policy search to improve water reservoir operations. *Journal*
 860 *of Water Resources Planning and Management*, 142(2), 04015050. doi:
 861 10.1061/(ASCE)WR.1943-5452.0000570
- 862 Giuliani, M., Lamontagne, J. R., Reed, P. M., & Castelletti, A. (2021). A state-of-
 863 the-art review of optimal reservoir control for managing conflicting demands in
 864 a changing world. *Water Resources Research*, 57(12), e2021WR029927. doi:
 865 10.1029/2021WR029927
- 866 Hallegatte, S. (2009). Strategies to adapt to an uncertain climate change. *Global En-*
 867 *vironmental Change*, 19(2), 240–247. doi: 10.1016/j.gloenvcha.2008.12.003
- 868 Herman, J. D., Quinn, J. D., Steinschneider, S., Giuliani, M., & Fletcher, S. (2020).
 869 Climate adaptation as a control problem: Review and perspectives on dynamic
 870 water resources planning under uncertainty. *Water Resources Research*, 56(2),
 871 e24389. doi: 10.1029/2019WR025502
- 872 Hirabayashi, Y., Mahendran, R., Koirala, S., Konoshima, L., Yamazaki, D., Watan-
 873 abe, S., ... Kanae, S. (2013). Global flood risk under climate change. *Nature*
 874 *Climate Change*, 3(9), 816–821. doi: 10.1038/nclimate1911
- 875 Kao, S.-C., Ghimire, G. R., DeNeale, S. T., Gangrade, S., Rastogi, D., Ashfaq, M.,
 876 & Uria Martinez, R. (2022). CMIP6 downscaling and hydrologic projection for
 877 the conterminous United States. *Earth’s Future*, 10(12), e2022EF002734. doi:
 878 10.1029/2022EF002734
- 879 Kao, S.-C., Ghimire, G. R., & Gangrade, S. (2024). *CMIP6-based multi-model*
 880 *streamflow projections over the conterminous US, version 1.1*. Oak Ridge
 881 National Laboratory. doi: 10.13139/OLCF/2318650
- 882 Kutz, J. N., Brunton, S. L., Brunton, B. W., & Proctor, J. L. (2016). *Dynamic mode*
 883 *decomposition: data-driven modeling of complex systems*. SIAM. doi: 10.1137/
 884 1.9781611974508
- 885 Lin, C.-Y., Yang, Y.-C. E., & Moazeni, F. (2024). Flood risks of cyber-physical
 886 attacks in a smart storm water system. *Water Resources Research*, 60(1),
 887 e2023WR034827. doi: 10.1029/2023WR034827
- 888 Lu, H., & Tartakovsky, D. M. (2024). Data-driven models of nonautonomous sys-
 889 tems. *Journal of Computational Physics*, 507, 112976. doi: 10.1016/j.jcp.2024
 890 .112976
- 891 Mizukami, N., Clark, M. P., Sampson, K., Nijssen, B., Mao, Y., McMillan, H., ...
 892 others (2016). mizuRoute version 1: a river network routing tool for a conti-
 893 nental domain water resources applications. *Geoscientific Model Development*,
 894 9(6), 2223–2238. doi: 10.5194/gmd-9-2223-2016
- 895 Musselman, K. N., Lehner, F., Ikeda, K., Clark, M. P., Prein, A. F., Liu, C., ...

- 896 Rasmussen, R. (2018). Projected increases and shifts in rain-on-snow flood
897 risk over western North America. *Nature Climate Change*, 8(9), 808–812. doi:
898 10.1038/s41558-018-0236-4
- 899 Nicholson, A. R., O'Donnell, G. M., Wilkinson, M. E., & Quinn, P. F. (2020).
900 The potential of runoff attenuation features as a natural flood manage-
901 ment approach. *Journal of Flood Risk Management*, 13, e12565. doi:
902 10.1111/jfr3.12565
- 903 Ning, J., Bowes, B. D., Goodall, J. L., & Behl, M. (2022). Data-driven model predic-
904 tive control for real-time stormwater management. In *2022 American Control*
905 *Conference (ACC)* (pp. 1438–1443). doi: 10.23919/ACC53348.2022.9867410
- 906 Oh, J., & Bartos, M. (2023). Model predictive control of stormwater basins coupled
907 with real-time data assimilation enhances flood and pollution control under
908 uncertainty. *Water Research*, 235, 119825. doi: 10.1016/j.watres.2023.119825
- 909 Oh, J., & Bartos, M. (2025). Scalable, adaptive and risk-informed design of hydro-
910 logical sensor networks. *Nature Water*, 3(10), 1144–1154. doi: 10.1038/s44221
911 -025-00496-7
- 912 Oh, J., & Bartos, M. (2026). *Replication code and intermediate data for: Data-*
913 *driven control reveals distributed flood adaptation priorities across large*
914 *river networks*. Zenodo. Retrieved from [https://doi.org/10.5281/](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20576488)
915 [zenodo.20576488](https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.20576488) doi: 10.5281/zenodo.20576488
- 916 Opperman, J. J., Galloway, G. E., Fargione, J., Mount, J. F., Richter, B. D., & Sec-
917 chi, S. (2009). Sustainable floodplains through large-scale reconnection to
918 rivers. *Science*, 326(5959), 1487–1488. doi: 10.1126/science.1178256
- 919 Perez-Pedini, C., Limbrunner, J. F., & Vogel, R. M. (2005). Optimal location of
920 infiltration-based best management practices for storm water management.
921 *Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management*, 131(6), 441–448. doi:
922 10.1061/(ASCE)0733-9496(2005)131:6(441)
- 923 Proctor, J. L., Brunton, S. L., & Kutz, J. N. (2016). Dynamic mode decomposi-
924 tion with control. *SIAM Journal on Applied Dynamical Systems*, 15(1), 142–
925 161. doi: 10.1137/15M1013857
- 926 Prudhomme, C., Wilby, R. L., Crooks, S., Kay, A. L., & Reynard, N. S. (2010).
927 Scenario-neutral approach to climate change impact studies: application
928 to flood risk. *Journal of Hydrology*, 390(3-4), 198–209. doi: 10.1016/
929 j.jhydrol.2010.06.043
- 930 Razavi, S., Tolson, B. A., & Burn, D. H. (2012). Review of surrogate model-
931 ing in water resources. *Water Resources Research*, 48(7). doi: 10.1029/
932 2011WR011527
- 933 Steinschneider, S., Herman, J. D., Kucharski, J., Abellera, M., & Ruggiero, P.
934 (2023). Uncertainty decomposition to understand the influence of water
935 systems model error in climate vulnerability assessments. *Water Resources*
936 *Research*, 59(1), e2022WR032349. doi: 10.1029/2022WR032349
- 937 Tabari, H. (2020). Climate change impact on flood and extreme precipitation in-
938 creases with water availability. *Scientific Reports*, 10(1), 13768. doi: 10.1038/
939 s41598-020-70816-2
- 940 Tanoue, M., Taguchi, R., Alifu, H., & Hirabayashi, Y. (2021). Residual flood damage
941 under intensive adaptation. *Nature Climate Change*, 11(10), 823–826. doi: 10
942 .1038/s41558-021-01158-8
- 943 Thober, S., Kumar, R., Wanders, N., Marx, A., Pan, M., Rakovec, O., ... Zink, M.
944 (2018). Multi-model ensemble projections of European river floods and high
945 flows at 1.5, 2, and 3 degrees global warming. *Environmental Research Letters*,
946 13(1), 014003. doi: 10.1088/1748-9326/aa9e35
- 947 Thomas, N. W., Amado, A. A., Schilling, K. E., & Weber, L. J. (2016). Evaluating
948 the efficacy of distributed detention structures to reduce downstream flooding
949 under variable rainfall, antecedent soil, and structural storage conditions. *Ad-*
950 *vances in Water Resources*, 96, 74–87. doi: 10.1016/j.advwatres.2016.07.002

- 951 Travis, Q. B., & Mays, L. W. (2008). Optimizing retention basin networks. *Journal*
952 *of Water Resources Planning and Management*, *134*(5), 432–439. doi: 10.1061/
953 (ASCE)0733-9496(2008)134:5(432)
- 954 Trindade, B., Reed, P., & Characklis, G. (2019). Deeply uncertain pathways:
955 Integrated multi-city regional water supply infrastructure investment and
956 portfolio management. *Advances in Water Resources*, *134*, 103442. doi:
957 10.1016/j.advwatres.2019.103442
- 958 Ward, P. J., Jongman, B., Aerts, J. C., Bates, P. D., Botzen, W. J., Diaz Loaiza,
959 A., . . . others (2017). A global framework for future costs and benefits of
960 river-flood protection in urban areas. *Nature Climate Change*, *7*(9), 642–646.
961 doi: 10.1038/nclimate3350
- 962 Wilkerson, G. V. (2008). Improved bankfull discharge prediction using 2-year
963 recurrence-period discharge. *JAWRA Journal of the American Water Re-*
964 *sources Association*, *44*(1), 243–257. doi: 10.1111/j.1752-1688.2007.00151.x
- 965 Williams, M. O., Rowley, C. W., & Kevrekidis, I. G. (2015). A kernel-based method
966 for data-driven Koopman spectral analysis. *Journal of Computational Dynam-*
967 *ics*, *2*(2), 247–265. doi: 10.3934/jcd.2015005
- 968 Wolman, M. G., & Miller, J. P. (1960). Magnitude and frequency of forces in ge-
969 o-morphic processes. *The Journal of Geology*, *68*(1), 54–74. doi: 10.1086/
970 626637
- 971 Wong, B. P., & Kerkez, B. (2018). Real-time control of urban headwater catchments
972 through linear feedback: Performance, analysis, and site selection. *Water Re-*
973 *sources Research*, *54*(10), 7309–7330. doi: 10.1029/2018WR022657

Supporting Information for “Data-driven control reveals distributed flood adaptation priorities across large river networks”

Jeil Oh¹, and Matthew Bartos¹

¹Fariborz Maseeh Department of Civil, Architectural and Environmental Engineering,

The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, TX, USA

Contents of this file

1. Figures S1 to S7

Introduction

This supporting information provides supplementary analyses that document the fidelity of the reduced-order surrogate model and the physical interpretability of the optimized control signals reported in the main text. Figure S1 evaluates surrogate fidelity during extreme flows, and Figure S2 verifies basin-aggregate mass conservation. Figure S3 characterizes the scaling of optimal control effort with hydrologic size, and Figure S4 reports stream-order controllability. Figure S5 assesses the robustness of the spatial allocation priorities across climate scenarios and budget levels, and Figure S6 demonstrates the flexibility of the framework across institutional planning resolutions. Figure S7 documents the physical feasibility of the recovered control signals. All figures use the 56-member climate ensemble (7 GCMs \times 2 hydrological models \times 4 SSPs) described in the main text; figures based on a single representative ensemble member identify that member in the caption.




Figure S1. Surrogate-model fidelity during extreme flows, evaluated against reference-model annual maxima across all 56 ensemble members. (a) Distribution of per-reach 10-year return-level relative bias (NSE > 0.5 reaches only); ensemble-median bias is -0.145 . (b) Basin-total return-level bias by return period. Daily discharge is summed across all reaches before computing annual maxima and return levels. Each dot shows one ensemble member; the red line connects ensemble medians. Bias remains within $\pm 5\%$ across return periods from 2 to 100 years. (c) The same basin-total return-level bias at the 10-year level, disaggregated by stream-order class.




Figure S2. Surrogate mass fidelity and control-signal consistency across all 56 ensemble members (7 GCMs \times 2 hydrological models \times 4 SSPs). (a) Ratio of surrogate-predicted to reference-model basin-total annual discharge. The dashed line marks unity; ensemble median is 1.008. (b) Correlation r between the reduced-space prediction ($\mathbf{w}_r^\top \delta \mathbf{z}$) and the physical-space reconstruction ($\sum \max(x_{cl}, 0) - \sum \max(x_{ol}, 0)$) of the basin-total control effect $\delta(t)$. Ensemble-median correlation is 0.959; the corresponding ensemble-median R^2 is 0.872. (c) Per-reach correlation between the reduced-space and physical-space control effects, summarized as the median across reaches within each ensemble member. Ensemble-median value is 0.876. In all panels, small dots show individual ensemble members, large symbols mark the scenario median, and bars span the interquartile range.




Figure S3. Log-log scaling of optimal control effort with hydrologic size, for SSP2-4.5 at a basin-wide budget of $10 \text{ Gm}^3 \text{ yr}^{-1}$. (a) Annual effort versus mean annual flow \bar{Q} : slope = 0.81, $R^2 = 0.90$. (b) Annual effort versus drainage area: slope = 0.52, $R^2 = 0.33$. Each hexagon represents the ensemble-median effort for a reach; color intensity indicates point density. Dashed lines show ordinary least-squares fits in log-log space.




Figure S4. Stream-order controllability for a representative ensemble member (VIC5/MPI-ESM1-2-HR, SSP2-4.5). Restricting the control input matrix \mathbf{B} to reaches of selected stream orders and re-solving the LQR in closed form yields the best achievable flood-volume reduction under that constraint. (a) Brazos river network colored by Strahler stream order; reach counts and percentages in the legend. (b) Effort–reduction trade-off curves for cumulative order subsets. Each curve gives the flood-volume reduction as a function of basin-total effort when control is restricted to reaches of order $\leq N$; the unrestricted case (“All”, 100% of reaches) is shown in bold for reference. (c) Marginal contribution of each stream-order class to total flood-volume reduction at fixed effort levels (1, 3, 5, 10, 15 $\text{Gm}^3 \text{ yr}^{-1}$). Values inside bars indicate the order-1 contribution; values above bars indicate the cumulative reduction.




Figure S5. Robustness of spatial allocation priorities. (a) Share of basin-total effort ($\sum_i |u_i|$) by stream-order class, across SSPs. High-order reaches (5+) receive 43–49% of effort. This quantifies where attenuation capacity is installed in physical space. (b) Ratio of late-century (2060–2099) to early-century (2020–2059) controlled exceedance volumes at fixed effort. Values above 1.0 indicate higher residual flood volume in the late century. Medians: 0.84 (SSP1-2.6), 1.15 (SSP2-4.5), 1.34 (SSP3-7.0), 1.22 (SSP5-8.5). (c) Ranking stability across budget levels: Spearman ρ (blue circles) between full reach-level priority rankings at different budgets, and top-10% overlap (orange squares) for the highest-priority reaches. Both metrics exceed 0.9 across all scenarios. In (b) and (c), dots show the ensemble median, and bars span the interquartile range.




Figure S6. Change in peak discharge reduction when the control input matrix \mathbf{B} is restricted to sub-basin outlet reaches, relative to reach-level control ($\mathbf{B} = \mathbf{I}_n$), at a basin-wide budget of $10 \text{ Gm}^3 \text{ yr}^{-1}$ under SSP2-4.5 (VIC5/MPI-ESM1-2-HR). (a) HUC12 outlet control (208 control points). (b) HUC10 outlet control (42 points). (c) HUC8 outlet control (28 points). Red indicates reaches where coarser control reduces peak attenuation relative to the reach-level baseline. Gray lines show hydrologic unit boundaries at each resolution. Percentages beneath each map denote basin-total flood volume reduction as a fraction of the reach-level baseline.




Figure S7. Physical feasibility of the control signal, pooled across all 56 ensemble members at a basin-wide budget of $10 \text{ Gm}^3 \text{ yr}^{-1}$. (a) Distribution of the physical-space attenuation fraction $|\delta_i^-|/|\delta_i|$ during flood exceedance events, where $\delta_i(t) = \max(x_{cl,i}, 0) - \max(x_{ol,i}, 0)$ is the change in discharge at reach i between the controlled and uncontrolled simulations. The dashed line marks the ensemble median (99%). (b) Basin-scale attenuation fraction per SSP, computed as $\sum |\delta^-| / \sum |\delta|$ across all reaches and time steps. Ensemble medians: 95.5% (SSP1-2.6), 97.3% (SSP2-4.5), 94.6% (SSP3-7.0), 94.8% (SSP5-8.5). (c) Control-input-to-flow ratio $|u_i|/x_i$ during exceedance events; ensemble-median across scenarios is 12%. In (b) and (c), small dots show individual ensemble members, large circles mark the scenario median, and bars span the interquartile range.