

**Diagnostic assessment of reservoir release policies using
LSTM across the continental U.S.**

Matthew Chen¹, Jonathan D. Herman¹

¹Department of Civil & Environmental Engineering, University of California, Davis

Key Points:

- LSTMs can model reservoir releases with physically justifiable storage dynamics in internal cell states without using observed storage input.
- Model accuracy is only weakly related to the accuracy of the learned storage representation, but is strongly related to the degree of regulation.
- Large sampled pooled training does not generalize well to out-of-sample reservoirs, but finetuning improves accuracy for reservoirs with scarce data.

Corresponding author: Matthew Chen, mtwchen@ucdavis.edu

12 **Abstract**

13 The influence of reservoirs on the water cycle introduces significant uncertainty for hy-
 14 drologic prediction. The representation of reservoirs in hydrologic models ideally must
 15 be accurate, interpretable, and transferable across sites. Recent studies have highlighted
 16 the potential for data-driven methods, including long short-term memory (LSTM) net-
 17 works, to accurately capture reservoir releases. However, the performance of LSTM mod-
 18 els of reservoir releases has not yet been diagnosed on a large-sample dataset to under-
 19 stand whether their accuracy is physically justified. This study evaluates the ability of
 20 LSTMs to represent reservoir release policies across the continental U.S., leveraging the
 21 recently developed ResOpsUS dataset. In particular, we focus on four key challenges to
 22 the development and application of LSTMs for this purpose: architecture selection, mass
 23 conservation, nonstationarity in time, and large-sample pooled training. We find that
 24 in many cases the LSTM succeeds in encoding physically interpretable storage dynam-
 25 ics in its internal states. However, the model accuracy is only weakly related to the strength
 26 of the learned storage representation; instead, it is log-linearly related to the degree of
 27 regulation. In addition, LSTMs struggle to generalize in time, where distributional shifts
 28 in operating conditions may cause unstable accuracy, and in space, where large sample
 29 pooled training fails to improve performance. This study contributes to the growing lit-
 30 erature on interpreting deep learning models of human-hydrologic systems.

31 **1 Introduction**

32 Reservoirs are critical infrastructure that balance human and environmental needs
 33 such as flood control (Boulange et al., 2021), water supply (Biemans et al., 2011), hy-
 34 droelectricity, and environmental flows (Adams et al., 2017; Yin et al., 2014). However,
 35 because reservoir releases are managed to consider complex tradeoffs between multiple
 36 competing operating objectives, they are fundamentally dependent on human decisions
 37 and cannot be modeled as a physical hydrologic process (Longyang & Zeng, 2023; Yang
 38 et al., 2016). The role of reservoirs in altering surface flows is widely recognized (Nilsson
 39 et al., 2005; Zhou et al., 2016; Galelli et al., 2025), and human intervention in the wa-
 40 ter cycle introduces significant uncertainty for hydrologic prediction (Thompson et al.,
 41 2013). Further, reservoirs are often represented simplistically in hydrologic models, which
 42 may not be able to capture realistic operating rules (Pokhrel et al., 2016). For example,
 43 Dang et al. (2020) found that the misrepresentation of dams results in erroneous par-
 44 ameterizations of hydrologic models. Further, Hodgkins et al. (2024) found that when reser-
 45 voir storage was neglected in continental-scale hydrologic models, their errors increase
 46 nonlinearly with reservoir storage.

47 The ideal approach to represent reservoir releases in hydrologic models would be
 48 to incorporate the control policies directly as they are defined by operating agencies. How-
 49 ever, these rule curves are not always well-documented, and do not generalize across basins.
 50 It is also widely recognized that true release decisions, which require undocumented op-
 51 erator judgment to adapt to current conditions, constraints, and competing objectives,
 52 often deviate from these rules (Oliveira & Loucks, 1997). Given these challenges, alter-
 53 native models of reservoir release policies have been developed in main categories: generic
 54 control policies, optimization methods, and data-driven policies. Generic control poli-
 55 cies have low data requirements and are highly transferable, but may not accurately re-
 56 produce observed flows at fine temporal resolutions (Haddeland et al., 2006; Hanasaki
 57 et al., 2006). On the other hand, optimization methods seek to find optimal releases based
 58 on one or more operating objectives (Turner & Galelli, 2016). These methods can pro-
 59 vide valuable decision support, although in simulation the predefined objectives and sim-
 60 plifying assumptions often fail to capture the complexity of real-world operating condi-
 61 tions (Giuliani et al., 2021). Finally, data driven methods infer operating policies directly
 62 from historical inflow, storage, and release records, such as calibrating the parameters
 63 of a generic policy or other functional form against observed data (Tefs et al., 2021; Turner

et al., 2020; Yassin et al., 2019; Zhao et al., 2016). For example, Turner et al. (2020) found that such data driven policies are more accurate than generic policies where key parameters are set uniformly across reservoirs.

Within this category of data-driven control policies, several recent studies have highlighted the potential for fully empirical machine learning methods to accurately capture reservoir releases and outperform other data-driven methods (Coerver et al., 2018; Dong et al., 2023; Ehsani et al., 2016; Gangrade et al., 2022; Longyang & Zeng, 2023; Yang et al., 2016). Data-driven methods are supported by recent unprecedented high resolution reservoir datasets on a national scale (Hou et al., 2022; Steyaert et al., 2022), providing an opportunity to develop and analyze data driven reservoir models on large samples, much like the CAMELS dataset has done for rainfall-runoff modeling (Addor et al., 2017). In particular, the widespread success of LSTMs in rainfall-runoff modeling (Kratzert et al., 2018) holds promise for modeling reservoir releases: a model with explicit accumulation of one observable state should be able to capture release decisions, provided that the inputs align with relevant decision-making processes.

While LSTMs have been applied to models of reservoir releases, these studies have not investigated the key benefit of LSTMs for this purpose — the accumulation of storage. Because the LSTM maintains memory cell states through time (Hochreiter & Schmidhuber, 1997), it can in principle integrate past inflows and outflows to infer a latent storage state, analogous to how rule-based models enforce mass balance. This makes reservoir modeling distinctly different than hydrologic modeling, because the accumulated state is easily measured. However, many studies using LSTMs (e.g., (Longyang & Zeng, 2023; Tran et al., 2025; Fan et al., 2023; Gangrade et al., 2022)) use observed storage directly as an input variable, rather than testing whether the network can infer it through accumulation. When observed inflow and storage are both provided, the model is implicitly provided with recently observed outflow via mass balance. This potentially allows the model to exploit the high persistence and autocorrelation with previous observations rather than learning the true data generating process (i.e. rules of human decision making). Data leakage in this way may artificially inflate the accuracy of LSTMs and reduce generalization ability especially in cases where observed storage is not available but is simulated or estimated (e.g. when coupling with hydrologic models).

Here we develop a diagnostic framework for LSTMs to understand their ability to internally accumulate storage states and respect mass conservation, and to generalize over time and space. This includes several steps with direct parallels in rainfall-runoff modeling: architecture selection (Fuente et al., 2024), analysis of cell states (Lees et al., 2022; Kratzert, Herrnegger, et al., 2019), conservation of mass (Hoedt et al., 2021), and large-sample pooled training (Kratzert et al., 2024). Training a data driven model on a standardized large sample of reservoirs captures a diverse range of operating conditions and strategies, and potentially enables the extrapolation of policies to data-scarce regions (Turner et al., 2021). However, it is not clear whether reservoir release policies, once trained, can generalize across basins in the same way as physical hydrologic processes. Finally, modeling reservoir releases raises the additional challenge of nonstationarity, as the operator preferences and the structure of the policy itself may change during the period of record (Mason et al., 2018).

This study contributes a large sample diagnostic framework for LSTM-driven reservoir releases that addresses the key challenges of physical interpretability and generalization in time and space. For the former, we ask if the LSTM learns to capture latent representations of mass balance and storage dynamics for the reservoir operations problem. Our approach is to correlate unseen observed storage data with LSTM cell states, first individually and then as a linear model fitted to the cell states. For generalization in time, we provide a method to monitor performance in time through moving windows so that unstable performance due to nonstationary policies can be quickly detected. Finally, for generalization in space, we test if performance can be improved through large

sample pooling, as well as extrapolation to data scarce regions through finetuning and transfer learning.

2 Methods

2.1 Long Short-Term Memory Networks

Here we give a brief introduction to the Long Short-Term Memory (LSTM) architecture (Hochreiter & Schmidhuber, 1997). The LSTM model addresses the problem of unstable gradients in training recurrent neural networks by conserving long term information using memory cells managed by several gating mechanisms, which control the flow of information through element-wise matrix multiplication with gate values ranging between 0 and 1. These allow the model to learn temporal relationships and long-term dependencies. Further, the ability of the LSTM to dynamically accumulate information makes it a well-suited candidate to model dynamical systems (Jordan et al., 2021; Kratzert, Klotz, et al., 2019; Wang, 2017) such as reservoir control. In a LSTM, every timestep t has a hidden state $h^{(t)}$ and a memory cell state $c^{(t)}$. The cell states store and maintain long term information, where the information from the cell state can be released into the hidden state where it can be used for prediction. This flow of information is managed by the output gate. As new inputs arrive, the model can also save and remove information from the cell state, which are managed by the input gate and forget gate, respectively. For example, in the reservoir control problem, storage states can be modeled by memory cells, where mass accumulation is managed by the input and forget gates, and release decisions can then be modeled based on the accumulated storage and day of the year, as managed by the output gate. Note that a LSTM architecture does not conserve mass unless explicitly tailored to do so (Hoedt et al., 2021).

The gate values at each timestep depend on the previous hidden state $h^{(t-1)}$ and the new input $x^{(t)}$ while the logistic function $\sigma : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow [0, 1]$ enforces that the gates values fall between 0 and 1. The forget gate, $f^{(t)}$, parameterized by the weight matrices W_f , U_f , and b_f , controls what information is retained versus forgotten from the previous cell state (Eq. 1).

$$f^{(t)} = \sigma \left(W_f h^{(t-1)} + U_f x^{(t)} + b_f \right) \quad (1)$$

The input gate, $i^{(t)}$, controls the information flow from the new input into the cell state. This gate is parameterized by the weight matrices W_i , U_i , and b_i (Eq. 2).

$$i^{(t)} = \sigma \left(W_i h^{(t-1)} + U_i x^{(t)} + b_i \right) \quad (2)$$

Finally, the output gate, $o^{(t)}$, controls information flow from the cell state to the hidden state to make a prediction at the current timestep. This gate is parameterized by the weight matrices W_o , U_o , and b_o (Eq. 3).

$$o^{(t)} = \sigma \left(W_o h^{(t-1)} + U_o x^{(t)} + b_o \right) \quad (3)$$

After the gate values are computed, a candidate cell state update $\tilde{c}^{(t)}$ is computed from the previous hidden state and data input from the current timestep using a hyperbolic tangent activation function (Eq. 4).

$$\tilde{c}^{(t)} = \tanh \left(W_c h^{(t-1)} + U_c x^{(t)} + b_c \right) \quad (4)$$

153 The cell state is then updated based on the values of the forget and input gates (Eq.
 154 5).
 155

$$c^{(t)} = f^{(t)} \odot c^{(t-1)} + i^{(t)} \odot \tilde{c}^{(t)} \quad (5)$$

155 Finally, the hidden state is computed based on the value of the output gate, which
 156 is used to derive the final prediction (Eq. 6).

$$h^{(t)} = o^{(t)} \odot \tanh(c^{(t)}) \quad (6)$$

157 In the supplement (Figure S1), the operations from Equations 1-6 are presented
 158 as a computational graph.

159 2.2 Data Processing

160 Reservoir inflow, storage, and release data are drawn from two sources: ResOpsUS
 161 (Steyaert et al., 2022), which covers the majority of large reservoirs in the continental
 162 U.S. over the period 1980-2020 on a daily timestep; and longer records from the U.S. Bu-
 163 reau of Reclamation RISE system (1940s-present) to support more detailed modeling of
 164 specific reservoirs in the Western U.S. We filter the ResOpsUS data to only the reser-
 165 voirs with records that are at least 90% complete over the period 1980-2020, which leaves
 166 116 reservoirs. We analyze 4 additional reservoirs from the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation
 167 to support longer records (see Figure S2 map in the supplement for all sites considered
 168 in the study). The reservoir data records including inflow and release timeseries are split
 169 into training, validation, and testing portions. The training portion, representing the first
 170 60% of the available timeseries, is used directly for model training. The validation por-
 171 tion, representing the next 20% of the available record, is used for hyperparameter tun-
 172 ing, model selection, and early stopping. Early stopping prevents overfitting by inter-
 173 rupting the training process based on the validation data as a proxy for out-of-sample
 174 performance (Li et al., 2019). The validation set provides some measure of out-of-sample
 175 performance, especially if the validation set is not overutilized in the modeling process
 176 (i.e. overfitting to validation or “data leaking”). Finally, the testing portion, represent-
 177 ing the last 20% of the available data record, is used solely for the estimation of out-of-
 178 sample performance. The testing data is untouched throughout the model building pro-
 179 cess; however, it is also the furthest away from the training set in time. This may be a
 180 challenge if the reservoir operating policy has changed, a challenge we investigate later
 181 in the study.

182 Prior to modeling, the data is linearly transformed to be zero mean and unit stan-
 183 dard deviation, based on statistics from the training set. In early experiments, data nor-
 184 malization (scaling between 0 and 1) was also tested but provided little benefit over stan-
 185 dardization. Additionally, while the majority of records are verified to be complete, miss-
 186 ing values are imputed using the training mean. We also split the data into batches of
 187 3 years (the batch sequence length was chosen between 0.5 and 5 years in preliminary
 188 testing). Using longer sequences allow the model to capture longer term dependencies
 189 but may incur difficulty due to vanishing or exploding gradients in the training process
 190 where gradient magnitudes may become exponentially large or small over many steps
 191 of backpropagation through time.

192 2.3 Model Selection, Hyperparameter Tuning, and Benchmarks

193 While model selection experiments are conducted on the ResOPS dataset to com-
 194 pare model architectures and evaluate LSTM performance against benchmark models
 195 over many reservoirs (see Section 3.1), we conduct hyperparameter tuning on an indi-
 196 vidual reservoir (Shasta Reservoir, California) to select optimal hyperparameters using
 197 exhaustive grid search. Specifically, we select the model with the optimal validation loss

over a predefined grid of hyperparameters, averaging over 5 different random seeds to account for stochasticity in the optimization algorithm. We tune the number of LSTM layers (1 or 2), the size of the LSTM hidden layer (between 5 and 50), the hidden size of the feed-forward network (between 5 and 50), and the dropout regularization probability (0.3, 0.5, or 0.7). Shasta reservoir was chosen for its long data record and its representative degree of regulation (discussed in Section 3.3). It is computationally infeasible to tune hyperparameters using grid search for all 116 reservoirs in the large sample dataset individually, so the LSTM hyperparameters selected here are applied throughout the study. While we recognize that optimal hyperparameters for Shasta Reservoir may not be optimal for a different reservoir, tuning to a specific reservoir will provide a general idea of the architecture necessary to capture reservoir operations. That is, we assume that reservoir operating policies across the continental US are somewhat similar in terms of their complexity, even if their operating purposes and typical release patterns differ.

For model selection we consider four main LSTM architectures along with several other machine learning benchmarks (Figure 1). Since we are interested in the ability of the LSTM to learn to conserve mass and learn reservoir storages implicitly in its cell states, the modeling task is to predict reservoir releases based only on two inputs, the inflow and the day of the year. By doing so, we assume that storage is primarily driven by inflow and outflow, and that this dominates other external effects such as evaporation and seepage. Model 1 is a standard "vanilla" LSTM model where data is first processed by an LSTM cell and then headed by a single layer feed-forward neural network to provide additional non-linear flexibility in learning the operating policy. Model 2 is similar to Model 1, but adopts an autoregressive structure in which the previous output is concatenated as an additional input for the current prediction.




Figure 1. LSTM model architectures. "FF": feed-forward neural network; "DOY": day of the year.

For Model 3 and Model 4, we propose two alternative architectures that accumulate implied storage states internally. Specifically, Model 3 explicitly models the mass balance for implied storages as an additional internal state and concatenates them as input so that mass conservation is learned without relying on the LSTM gating mechanisms. Model 4 is similar to Model 3, except without the LSTM gating mechanisms, which results in a model resembling a mass-accumulating recurrent neural network (RNN). However, Model 4 is unable to capture longer-range dependencies through learned cell states beyond storage, unlike in Model 3. All four models are trained using the squared error loss function. These LSTM experiments were conducted in the Pytorch deep learning library (Paszke et al., 2019). In training, model parameters were optimized using the Adam algorithm, a first-order stochastic gradient descent algorithm with momentum and strong empirical performance (Kingma & Ba, 2015).

We consider autoregressive linear and random forest models with 5 lags as benchmarks for other machine learning architectures against the LSTM. Specifically, we model reservoir releases as a function of the current day of the year and inflow, as well as the previous 5 inflow values. We also consider benchmarks where the current observed storage is another data input, since the linear and random forest models cannot learn to preserve information over time unlike the LSTM architecture (these are denoted linear-S and random forest-S, respectively). This modeling problem is represented by Equation 7, where $\hat{y}^{(t)}$ is the predicted target release at time t , and x_{in} , x_{sto} , x_{DOY} are the inflow, storage, and day of year features, respectively. These benchmark models, trained with squared-error loss, are implemented in the open-source scikit-learn library (Pedregosa et al., 2011).

$$\hat{y}^{(t)} = f \left(x_{in}^{(t)}, x_{in}^{(t-1)}, x_{in}^{(t-2)}, x_{in}^{(t-3)}, x_{in}^{(t-4)}, x_{in}^{(t-5)}, x_{sto}^{(t)}, x_{DOY}^{(t)} \right) \quad (7)$$

Since we are interested in the LSTM learning storage information implicitly, it is useful to also add a benchmark where observed storage is explicitly provided to the LSTM model. As such we also compare a version of Model 1 (denoted as Model 1-S) that is provided inflow, storage and the day of the year rather than only inflow and day of the year.

Finally, as a benchmark against a rule-based model, we adapt a simplified reservoir release policy which includes an exponential hedging release rule (Eq. 8) and a flood control rule (Eq. 9) as used in the larger context of climate adaptation planning in Steinschneider et al. (2023); Chen and Herman (2024). $R(t)$, $S(t)$ are releases and implied storages for time t , respectively, and $R_m(t)$, $S_m(t)$ denote the median observed release and storage (in the training data) for that day of the year. The flood control rule applies if the day of the year is in between $[x_1, x_2]$, and storage exceeds a threshold $S(t) > x_4 S_m(t)$. x_0, x_1, x_2, x_3, x_4 are fitted parameters resulting in 5 parameters per reservoir. We match the LSTM training methodology by fitting the policy parameters using the training dataset, using early stopping on the validation dataset to prevent overfitting, and providing a final estimate for out-of-sample performance on the test dataset. This ensures that the results are directly comparable with the LSTM and other machine learning benchmarks. Additional details about the model formulation can be found in Steinschneider et al. (2023).

$$\frac{R(t)}{R_m(t)} = \left(\frac{S(t)}{S_m(t)} \right)^{x_0} \quad (8)$$

$$R(t)' = R(t) + x_3(S(t) - x_4 S_m(t)) \quad (9)$$

Table 1 summarizes R^2 scores for Models 1-4 on Shasta Reservoir after hyperparameter tuning, as well as the linear, random forest, and rule-based benchmarks, and variants of models where observed storage is a provided input.

We are interested in comparing validation scores so that the test data is completely withheld from the model building process; the test data can later be used for further analysis of model behavior (such as the behavior of cell states) and provide a final estimate for out-of-sample performance. Between Models 1-4, Model 1 (validation $R^2 = 0.69$) and Model 2 (validation $R^2 = 0.70$) both perform reasonably well in validation, however, Model 1 is more parsimonious and efficient to train. After running the hyperparameter tuning process with exhaustive grid search on Shasta Reservoir, we find the following optimal configuration for Model 1: 1 LSTM layer, 30 LSTM hidden units, 15 feed-forward hidden units, and a dropout probability of 0.3. Figure 2 provides a visualization of the hyperparameter tuning results. Note that smaller architectures, particularly with 5 LSTM or feed-forward hidden units, and higher dropout (0.7) are associated with higher validation error; tuning results are more uniform beyond these cases.

Table 1. Train, validation, and test R^2 scores for Models 1-4 and benchmark models. Models with observed storage as input are denoted with -S.

Model	Storage Inputted	Train (1944-1991)	Validation (1992-2007)	Test (2008-2022)
LSTM Model 1	No	0.73	0.69	0.43
LSTM Model 2	No	0.74	0.70	0.44
LSTM Model 3	No	0.59	0.60	0.52
LSTM Model 4	No	0.60	0.67	0.41
LSTM Model 1-S	Yes	0.82	0.75	0.64
Linear	No	0.4	0.4	0.14
Random Forest	No	0.64	0.57	0.37
Linear-S	Yes	0.42	0.43	0.21
Random Forest-S	Yes	0.69	0.64	0.56
Rule Based Model	No	0.69	0.68	0.66




Figure 2. Hyperparameter tuning of LSTM Model 1 on Shasta Reservoir.

278 **2.4 Model Diagnostics**

279 Beyond model selection, our goal is to diagnose the behavior and performance of
 280 LSTM reservoir models, specifically, assessing their physical interpretability and perfor-
 281 mance over time, and testing if learned policies are generalizable in both space and time.
 282 For large sample experiments, we leverage reservoir inflow, storage, and release records
 283 from the ResOps dataset (Steyaert et al., 2022), and for additional experiments that ben-
 284 efit from longer history we utilize records from the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation. For each
 285 reservoir in the selected dataset, we conduct data processing as described above, select-
 286 ing 60% of the available record for training, 20% for validation, and the last 20% for test-
 287 ing.

288 ***2.4.1 Analysis of Cell States***

289 We investigate whether a LSTM model of reservoir releases can learn storage rep-
 290 resentations in its memory cell states without being given storage data explicitly, with
 291 the larger goal of determining if such models are physically interpretable. This is inspired
 292 by the success of LSTM in capturing hydrologic states such as snowpack in its memory
 293 cells (Kratzert, Herrnegger, et al., 2019). Similar to Kratzert, Herrnegger, et al. (2019),
 294 we study the correlation coefficients between individual memory cell states compared to
 295 observed storage with the purpose of uncovering if the LSTM learns to internally rep-
 296 resent storage in an interpretable way; the ideal would be a model that aligns with phys-
 297 ical understanding of reservoir storage and release decisions.

298 Further, the LSTM may learn a distributed representation of storage across mul-
 299 tiple of its cell states. To address this, we employ a linear probe (Liu et al., 2019; Alain
 300 & Bengio, 2018), i.e., a supervised ordinary least squares model fitted between frozen
 301 cell states and observed storage on training data to test if storage can be represented by
 302 a linear combination of cell states. While useful latent representations may be encoded
 303 nonlinearly, more complex probes (e.g. multi-layer perceptrons) are not only less inter-
 304 pretable, but also introduce uncertainty in which model, the probe itself or the original
 305 model, learns the useful relationship. If internal states are a sufficient statistic of the in-
 306 put features, i.e. providing a lossless encoding, a nonlinear probe with sufficient capac-
 307 ity could in principle learn any task as a function of the original features (Hewitt & Liang,
 308 2019). As such, we argue that linear probes are simple enough that if storage can be lin-
 309 early extracted from cell states on unseen data, we can conclude that the LSTM itself
 310 learns mass balance in a physically meaningful and accessible way. This interpretation
 311 of linear probes has also been accepted in the broader machine learning literature (Belinkov,
 312 2021), and similar methodology has previously been applied to analyze hydrological states
 313 (Lees et al., 2022), though not yet for reservoir operations. Here, similar to the analy-
 314 sis of individual states, we study the correlation coefficients between observed storage
 315 and the linear probe on unseen (test) data, as well as their relationship with accuracy
 316 and the degree of regulation.

317 ***2.4.2 Model Performance vs. Degree of Regulation***

318 Previous studies have shown that LSTM rainfall-runoff models perform worse on
 319 managed basins, particularly those with higher degrees of regulation (Ouyang et al., 2021).
 320 Consequently, we hypothesize that this result extends to reservoir models directly, i.e.
 321 higher degrees of regulation in a reservoir adversely affects performance. Specifically, we
 322 compare performance from the large sample of individually trained reservoirs against the
 323 log ratio of mean inflow to maximum storage as a proxy for capacity. This ratio repre-
 324 sents the inverse of the degree of regulation. We then compute Pearson's correlation co-
 325 efficient between the LSTM R^2 performance and the log mean-inflow max-storage ra-
 326 tio. Statistical inference is done using randomization testing and Monte Carlo resam-
 327 pling, i.e. via permutation test, to determine the p-value against the null hypothesis of

328 no correlation. As a robustness check against outliers, we also include the 95% confidence
 329 interval of Thiel-Sen slopes (Sen, 1968).

330 ***2.4.3 Model Performance Over Time***

331 While overfitting can lead to a downward shift between training set and out-of-sample
 332 performance, reservoir policies themselves may also change over time. Any difference be-
 333 tween the out-of-sample and test distributions, i.e. distributional shift in operating con-
 334 ditions, may cause a declining trend in performance. To understand this problem, we
 335 first train a new “initial” LSTM model on the first 30 years and validate on the next 10
 336 years, and then analyze R^2 performance on rolling and sliding 20-year windows to cap-
 337 ture how performance changes over time. Notably, this experiment is challenged by lim-
 338 ited record lengths: the length of the initial training window is chosen so that the model
 339 can learn a reasonable representation of the operating policy while the moving window
 340 size is chosen to balance signal and noise. For this reason, we select two example reser-
 341 voirs for this experiment leveraging longer records available from the U.S. Bureau of Recla-
 342 mation (Shasta and Folsom, both in California) with records of 70-80 years.

343 ***2.4.4 Large Sample Pooled Training***

344 Finally, we test a top-down modeling approach, that is, learning a general model
 345 by training on all available data. To assess the ability of a simultaneously trained LSTM
 346 reservoir policy to generalize, we randomly select 70% of ResOps reservoirs (where at
 347 least 90% of the data record is available), pool and train on them simultaneously, and
 348 test out-of-sample performance using the remaining 30% of reservoirs. This is not to be
 349 confused with data splitting in time, where we train, validate, and test on the same reser-
 350 voir. Here, out-of-sample testing is done on held out reservoirs, not held out time. Rec-
 351 ognizing that reservoirs may be operated differently, we include the main use from the
 352 GRaND dataset (Lehner et al., 2011) and four categories of degree of regulation (low,
 353 medium, high, and very high) based on the 25, 50, and 75th percentiles of the log mean-
 354 inflow max-storage ratio as additional features.

355 We also compare the test performance after fine-tuning the pooled model on in-
 356 dividual reservoirs. Finetuning in this context refers to calibrating a pre-trained model
 357 to a specific reservoir by running additional training iterations from data unique to the
 358 reservoir of interest. This is related to the concept of transfer learning in the machine
 359 learning literature in which a pre-trained model trained on a large dataset can be adapted
 360 to improve performance for a potentially different task on a smaller dataset (Tan et al.,
 361 2018). The idea of “knowledge transfer” has shown to be successful in a variety of do-
 362 mains including image recognition (Iorga & Neagoe, 2019) and natural language process-
 363 ing (Ruder et al., 2019). In this case, we can train and validate (on a 75% training and
 364 25% validation split, respectively) using 5-30 year subsets of the complete data record
 365 for the held-out reservoirs as the finetuning data, and finally test using the last 20% of
 366 the complete record so that results between finetuning, individual training, and the pooled
 367 training model are comparable. Performance is also compared to an individual model
 368 trained only on the finetuning subset with the same train/validation split, which rep-
 369 resents individual training in a data-scarce scenario. Note that validation scores here are
 370 not directly comparable since they vary in length depending on the amount of fine-tuning
 371 data used while the test set is the same.

372 **3 Results**

373 ***3.1 Large Sample Model Performance***

374 Figure 3 summarizes performance over the ResOPS dataset for LSTM Models 1-
 375 4 as well as the benchmarks listed in Table 1. Comparing median scores in validation

376 for the purpose of LSTM model selection, Model 1 (median val $R^2=0.618$) outperforms
 377 Model 2 (median val $R^2=0.587$), Model 3 (median val $R^2=0.511$), Model 4 (median $R^2=0.368$),
 378 as well as the rule-based model (median val $R^2=0.504$). Additionally, Model 1 is the most
 379 accurate model in validation for 62 out of all 116 sites (53%). This solidifies our model
 380 selection choice of Model 1 for the large sample experiments moving forward. We also
 381 note that the deep learning architectures where implied storages were recursive inputs
 382 (Model 3 and 4) did not improve performance compared to a purely statistical version
 383 (Model 1).

384 In final testing, the ranking between Model 1-4 median scores remains the same
 385 as the training and validation set. Additionally, Model 1 (median test $R^2=0.567$) still
 386 outperforms the rule based model (median test $R^2=0.433$), as well as the other archi-
 387 tectures even with observed storage inputs: linear-S (median test $R^2=0.333$) and ran-
 388 dom forest-S (median test $R^2=0.555$). Model 1 is still the most accurate model for the
 389 majority of sites as well for 63 out of 116 reservoirs (54%). This highlights the advan-
 390 tage of LSTM to learn non-linear temporal relationships compared other model archi-
 391 tectures.

392 Unsurprisingly, Model 1 trained with observed storage (Model 1-S) has the high-
 393 est performance (median val $R^2=0.713$, median test $R^2=0.658$). However, as discussed
 394 in the introduction, previous observed storages implicitly encode previous observed out-
 395 flows which can artificially inflate accuracy. When Model 1-S is tested with simulated
 396 storage instead of observed storage (olive), the persistence from recent observed releases
 397 is no longer present and performance collapses (median train $R^2=0.07$, val $R^2=0.03$, test
 398 $R^2=0.04$). This is the situation expected when coupling reservoir policies with hydro-
 399 logic models, as the decision would depend on the modeled reservoir storage rather than
 400 the historical observation.

401 These aggregate performance results for the machine learning and rule based mod-
 402 els are generally consistent with the initial model selection finding for Shasta reservoir
 403 in Table 1, though the ranking may be different for individual reservoirs. For example,
 404 the rule-based model performed much better in testing compared to the LSTM in the
 405 individual case of Shasta reservoir. This requires foreknowledge that the fixed rule struc-
 406 ture of the model is a good fit for the reservoir in question. If it is not, performance will
 407 likely suffer, whereas the fully empirical LSTM has enough degrees of freedom to adapt
 408 to any operating policy leading to its stronger performance overall. The aggregate rank-
 409 ings are also consistent between the train, validation, and test periods. We also observe
 410 large spreads of R^2 scores for each model, with high and low extreme values across reser-
 411 voirs. For example, the interquartile range for Model 1 in validation is 0.357 with a max-
 412 imum score of 0.978 and a minimum score of -1.656.

413 Across all tested models, we observe severe declines in performance in the test pe-
 414 riod compared to the validation and training periods. Models 1, 2, 3, and 4 show declines
 415 of 0.08, 0.07, 0.08, and 0.05 in median R^2 between the training and test periods. The
 416 same is true for the rule based model, which had a decline of 0.12 in median R^2 . Declines
 417 for individual reservoirs can be far greater than the median decline over all reservoirs
 418 - for example, Model 1 trained for Shasta reservoir (Table 1) has a decline of 0.3 in R^2
 419 between the training and testing periods. This could be due to either poor generaliza-
 420 tion (i.e. overfitting), policy changes over time, or a combination. We explore the issue
 421 of performance over time further in Section 3.5.

422 Figure 4 shows R^2 with respect to geographic location, and we find no apparent
 423 spatial patterns. Climate and hydrologic factors alone do not appear to be a strong in-
 424 dicator of model performance.




Figure 3. Comparison of individual model performance over ResOPS reservoirs. LSTM policies and benchmarks are described in Section 2.3.




Figure 4. Map of train, validation, and test R^2 scores for individually trained LSTMs

425 3.2 Analysis of Cell States and Observed Storage

426 We compare the memory cell states of Model 1 trained on ResOPS reservoirs with
 427 observed storage to see if the model learns physically interpretable states internally. Fig-
 428 ure 5a provides the distribution of the maximum absolute correlation coefficient between
 429 the cell states and observed storage on test data for each model. The distribution is roughly
 430 symmetric, with a median correlation coefficient of 0.531 and a standard deviation of 0.223.
 431 For the linear probes, the median correlation coefficient is 0.67 with a standard devia-
 432 tion of 0.237. This shows that for many sites, the LSTM successfully learns an accurate
 433 storage representation and is making release decisions aligned with physical understand-
 434 ing by incorporating mass balance in its latent feature embeddings. Additionally, we find
 435 that the learned storage state is distributed across multiple cell states and can be lin-
 436 early extracted, as demonstrated through the success of the linear probes to encode stor-
 437 age as opposed to individual cell states.




Figure 5. (a) Distribution of cell state-storage correlations over ResOPS reservoirs, using individual cells and a linear probe distributed across all cells; (b) map of linear probe correlation between cell states and observed storage.

438 Despite a high median linear probe correlation, the spread is large, suggesting that
 439 storage representations should be evaluated on a case by case basis. There also exists
 440 a geographic pattern in Figure 5b, where the southeast region appears to have stronger
 441 linear probe correlations. This can partly be explained by overlap with the reservoir's
 442 main use as identified by the GRaND dataset (see Supplemental Figure S3). Flood con-
 443 trol reservoirs have the highest median linear probe correlation (0.77), followed by nav-
 444 igation (0.74), hydroelectricity (0.72), irrigation (0.62), water supply (0.56), and recre-
 445 ation (0.40). This result is unsurprising: flood control storages are driven by flood peaks

446 and depend on shorter term accumulations, which are easier to model, while storage ac-
 447 cumulation for irrigation and water supply occur on longer timescales and require mod-
 448 eling longer-range dependencies. However, we note that real world reservoir operations
 449 incorporate additional complexity by balancing multiple competing objectives beyond
 450 a single main use.

451 Although statistically significant via permutation testing, we find in Figure 6a that
 452 the linear probe correlation is a weak predictor of model performance ($r=0.36$). That
 453 is, there are models with strong storage representations but poor performance, and mod-
 454 els with strong performance but poor storage representation. We also find that the high-
 455 est performing reservoirs with the lowest linear probe correlations also tend to have the
 456 lowest degrees of regulation as measured by the log inverse ratio of max storage and mean
 457 inflow. In this quadrant of the plot, learning storage is not necessary to produce accu-
 458 rate releases. However, looking at the relationship as a whole, we find no significant ev-
 459 idence that the linear probe correlation is related to the degree of regulation in Figure
 460 6b.

461 Figure 7 shows the timeseries of observed storages and the corresponding linear probe
 462 in the testing period for 6 specific sites: 1122 (Gillham), 898 (Glendo), 1755 (Barren River
 463 Lake), 1042 (Norfork), 895 (Gavins Point), and 601 (Navajo). These sites are chosen from
 464 different quadrants of Figure 6a and are also marked in Figure 5b. Both the linear probe
 465 and storages in these plots have been scaled. In the best case scenario, both storage rep-
 466 resentation and model accuracy are high. For example, the Gillham linear probe ($r=0.96$)
 467 accurately captures the storage dynamics driven primarily by short term accumulations
 468 of flood peak storage, and the accuracy is also high (test $R^2 = 0.79$). Similarly, the Glendo
 469 linear probe ($r=0.93$) successfully captures the annual seasonality of storage and the test
 470 $R^2 = 0.85$. However, a good storage representation does not guarantee good accuracy.
 471 For example, Barren River Lake's linear probe captures storage dynamics well ($r=0.90$)
 472 both for flood peak storage and annual seasonality, albeit performance is poor (test $R^2 =$
 473 0.47). Norfork is a starker example where the linear probe correlation is 0.82 but the test
 474 R^2 is only 0.09. In this case, we can deduce that the error in release predictions occurs
 475 between the mapping from storage to release, and not from inflow/outflow to storage.
 476 Conversely, good model accuracy can also be achieved with poor storage representation.
 477 For example, Gavins Point achieves a test $R^2 = 0.97$ but the linear probe poorly cap-
 478 tures storage dynamics ($r=0.31$). This is especially true for models with low degrees of
 479 regulation, since releases are more sensitive to inflows directly and may not require stor-
 480 age accumulation to make accurate predictions. Finally, in the worst case, poor per-
 481 formance is accompanied by poor storage representation, which is the case for Navajo (lin-
 482 ear probe $r=0.38$, model test $R^2 = -0.06$). In summary, we find that LSTMs are ca-
 483 pable of representing storage dynamics including flood peak accumulation and annual
 484 seasonality, but the relationship between linear probe accuracy and release accuracy varies
 485 widely across sites.




Figure 6. Scatterplots between (a) test R^2 score and linear probe correlation with observed storage, (b) linear probe correlation and the inverse degree of regulation (\log mean-inflow max-storage ratio), and (c) test R^2 score and the inverse degree of regulation




Figure 7. Timeseries of linear probes and observed storage in the test period for selected sites.

486 **3.3 Degree of Regulation and Model Performance**

487 We aim to further understand the model performance in the context of the degree
 488 of regulation. A lower degree of regulation may indicate shorter lag times between in-
 489 flow and release, i.e., release predictions are more directly sensitive to inflow, leading to
 490 better model accuracy. Figure 6c shows R^2 performance against the degree of regu-
 491 lation (inverted) and observed storage. We find that the Pearson correlation between R^2
 492 score and the degree of regulation is strong ($r=0.66$). Randomization inference shows
 493 that the correlation coefficients are significant at the 0.05 level, rejecting the null hypoth-
 494 esis of no correlation. The 95% CI of Thiel-Sen slopes (β) also does not contain zero, demon-
 495 strating that the association is robust to outliers. If the residence time of water is shorter
 496 (lower degree of regulation) and outflow is more directly sensitive to inflow, the model
 497 does not need to rely on storage as an intermediate state which may depend on longer
 498 range dependencies and adds an additional layer of modeling uncertainty, and therefore
 499 increases accuracy in general.

500 Four sites, Folsom (182), Shasta (132), Trinity (131), and New Melones (198), are
 501 selected from Figure 6c to represent different degrees of regulation. These reservoirs have
 502 longer inflow records from the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation dating back to the construc-
 503 tion of the reservoir, providing several additional decades prior to the ResOpsUS dataset
 504 that can be used to analyze performance behavior. Folsom represents a low degree of reg-
 505 ulation, while Trinity and New Melones have higher degrees of regulation. Shasta reser-
 506 voir falls in between. Figure 8 plots the predicted and observed releases for these four
 507 selected reservoirs using LSTM Model 1.

508 Both Shasta and Folsom capture peak releases reasonably well, but Shasta is more
 509 prone to false-positive peaks, which are especially prevalent in the test period compared
 510 to training or validation. Specifically, the test period has a lower frequency of release peaks
 511 compared to the training or validation periods, which indicates that the operating con-
 512 ditions (hydrology and/or operating policy) have shifted since the training period, lead-
 513 ing to poor performance. In contrast to Shasta, Folsom has a lower degree of regulation
 514 so the outflows are more sensitive to inflow directly. As previously discussed, predictions
 515 for low DOR reservoirs are less reliant on long range dependencies which corresponds
 516 to higher model performance. Consistent with Figure 6c, New Melones and Trinity reser-
 517 voirs have much lower performance corresponding to their high degree of regulation. While
 518 both learn reasonable seasonal releases, the models have largely ignored peak releases,
 519 especially for Trinity reservoir. These results confirm the finding that the degree of reg-
 520 ulation adversely affects model performance.




Figure 8. Timeseries plots for predicted and observed releases for Shasta, Folsom, New Melones, and Trinity Reservoirs using Model 1.

521 3.4 Performance Over Time

522 The drop in performance between the train and test period may be explained partly
 523 by changes in the reservoir operating policy during that time. We investigate this ques-
 524 tion using an “initial model” trained on the first 30 years of record and validated on the
 525 next 10 years for two reservoirs with longer records (USBR), reasonable performance,
 526 and differing degrees of regulation, specifically, Folsom and Shasta.

527 Figure 9 shows performance in 20-year rolling and sliding windows for these selected
 528 reservoirs. Folsom shows an initial drop in performance apparent in the rolling windows,
 529 but then stabilizes. This behavior is expected with some degree of overfitting, but in this
 530 case performance does not continue to decline. In contrast, performance for Shasta con-
 531 tinues to decline and does not stabilize. This is also consistent with declining train, val-
 532 idation, and test R^2 for Shasta in Table 1, and overall in Figure 3. This supports the
 533 hypothesis that changing operating policies and/or climatic conditions are resulting in
 534 declining performance. Further, this behavior can be exacerbated by the initial overfit-
 535 ting, that is, the model becomes overly attuned to operations in the training period which
 536 makes performance sensitive to even slight changes. This result suggests that performance
 537 should be monitored in time, and if performance drifts the model may require re-training.




Figure 9. 20-year rolling and sliding R^2 performance for initial models trained for Shasta and Folsom reservoirs

538 Shasta reservoir has a higher degree of regulation and may be more sensitive to changes
 539 in policy, while Folsom has a lower degree of regulation so that releases that are more
 540 sensitive to inflows directly. We hypothesize a lower degree of regulation can make the
 541 model less prone to performance drift. Using the large ResOps sample, this conjecture
 542 is supported by a weak but statistically significant negative correlation ($r=-0.24$, $p=0.013$)
 543 between the difference in train and test R^2 and the log mean-inflow-max-storage ratio
 544 (See Supplemental Figure S4). Overall, we find that declines in performance over time
 545 due to changes in operating conditions are location specific and are only weakly explained
 546 by degree of regulation of each site. We contribute an approach to analyze the problem
 547 of performance drift using moving windows, provided that there is a long enough data
 548 record to train an initial model and track performance changes over time.

549 3.5 Pooled Training and Finetuning

550 After training models to reservoirs individually, we answer the question of whether
 551 stronger results can be achieved by training on a pool of reservoirs, and if pooling is gen-
 552 eralizable to out of sample sites (OOS). Figure 10 compares R^2 scores on the last 20%
 553 of record for OOS reservoirs, comparing individually trained models, the pooled model,
 554 as well as finetuning the pooled model with a 5-30 year horizon of data. Recall that the
 555 training and validation periods for each fine-tuning process do not align, although we
 556 can compare performance on the same testing period. The pooled model (median score
 557 of 0.363) performs significantly worse than training individually (median score of 0.577).
 558 This result confirms that given the feature space (that is, across standardized inflows,
 559 the main operating use, and the degree of regulation), we are unable to find a strong reser-
 560 voir policy that generalizes across reservoirs. This result suggests that the generaliza-
 561 tion ability of LSTMs observed in rainfall-runoff modeling may not extend to models of
 562 reservoir release policies, as these tend to be location-specific.

563 In finetuning or transfer learning, the pretrained (pooled) model undergoes site spe-
 564 cific training. This leverages knowledge from training on other reservoirs in the pool and
 565 can be especially useful when site specific data is scarce. In Figure 10, we also compare
 566 finetuning performance against individually trained models using the same data hori-
 567 zon. We find that finetuning generally improves performance compared to individual train-
 568 ing using the same data horizon; however, this effect shrinks for longer horizons and more
 569 available training data. For example, the median R^2 for finetuning on a 5 year horizon
 570 is 0.40 while the median R^2 for the individually trained model on a 5 year horizon is 0.32.
 571 For a 30 year horizon, the median R^2 score for both finetuning and individual training
 572 is 0.57. This suggests that while reservoir operations do not generalize across sites with
 573 pooled training, finetuning improves performance especially for data scarce scenarios.




Figure 10. R^2 performance scores on the last 20% of available record for out-of-sample (OOS) reservoirs ($n = 35$) for individual and pooled Model 1 and finetuning on 5-30 years data

574 4 Discussion and Conclusion

575 We find that across a large sample of reservoirs, LSTMs show the ability to model
 576 reservoir release policies as well as or better than other data-driven methods. In addi-
 577 tion, for many cases, the LSTM’s internal dynamics encode a latent state consistent with
 578 reservoir storage even without using observed storage as an input. This implies that the
 579 LSTMs have learned to use mass balance to integrate past inflows and outflows to pre-
 580 dict releases in a physically meaningful way. We demonstrate that these learned stor-
 581 age states can be linearly decoded from cell states in unseen data via ordinary least squares.
 582 This suggests that previous findings where LSTM rainfall-runoff models learn to repre-
 583 sent hydrologic states (Kratzert, Herrnegger, et al., 2019; Lees et al., 2022) are repro-
 584 ducible for the reservoir operations problem. However, we find that the relationship be-

585 tween cell-storage correlation and model accuracy is weak although statistically signif-
 586 icant. That is, for many reservoirs with strong performance, and especially for those with
 587 low degrees of regulation, there does not necessarily exist an interpretable storage rep-
 588 resentation in their cell states. In this case, future work should focus on enforcing phys-
 589 ical constraints directly in the model process, either through alternative architectures
 590 (Fuente et al., 2024; Hoedt et al., 2021), or by penalizing physical violations in custom
 591 loss functions (Zheng et al., 2022). Although including observed storage directly as an
 592 LSTM input is an alternative and improves model performance, this is impractical for
 593 many applications requiring projections beyond a single timestep, for example, climate
 594 scenario projections. We find that performance collapses when an LSTM release model
 595 is trained with observed storage but is instead run with simulated storage. While true
 596 observed storage inputs can allow the model to exploit persistence in recent observed re-
 597 leases, the same cannot be done for simulated implied storage.

598 LSTM accuracy does not appear to be related to location, and by extension hy-
 599 droclimatic factors, alone. This is consistent with feature importance analysis from pre-
 600 vious studies which found that hydrologic variables such as precipitation and temper-
 601 ature are much less influential compared to inflow and storage for release predictions (Fan
 602 et al., 2023). Instead, we find that performance is strongly log-linearly related to the de-
 603 gree of regulation. For reservoirs with lower degrees of regulation, the release decision
 604 is more directly related to inflow and does not depend on longer-timescale accumulation,
 605 and consequently, accuracy is stronger for these models. These results are consistent with
 606 Ouyang et al. (2021) which found that LSTM runoff models perform worse on managed
 607 basins with higher degrees of regulation since these models need also to correctly account
 608 for the impact of reservoir operations on downstream discharge (Dang et al., 2020).

609 We also find that model performance may in some cases be unstable through time.
 610 While a decline in performance between the training and test periods is expected due
 611 to overfitting, performance may continue to decline due to distributional shift. That is,
 612 the learned operating policy under the training period may not apply to the future where
 613 operator preferences have evolved to adapt to changing hydroclimatic conditions (Mason
 614 et al., 2018). Although difficult to resolve due to the long data records needed to sup-
 615 port training, we retroactively monitor performance over moving windows after train-
 616 ing an initial model. We find that declines in performance are largely site specific, al-
 617 though they are weakly related to the degree of regulation. Looking forward, performance
 618 should be continuously monitored to account for accuracy drifts due to shifts in regu-
 619 lation or hydrology, and trigger retraining if necessary.

620 LSTM release policies may also struggle to generalize in space. Pooled training does
 621 not show an improvement on out-of-sample reservoirs, especially in the absence of fine-
 622 tuning. This suggests that the transferability of trained LSTMs for rainfall-runoff mod-
 623 eling, where additional hydrologic diversity is an asset to model performance, does not
 624 hold universally for modeling reservoir release policies (Kratzert et al., 2024). However,
 625 finetuning can help increase performance in data-scarce scenarios, although accuracy re-
 626 mains low. Future work can address regional pooling in contrast to continental scale pool-
 627 ing as done in this study; the performance of regional pooling compared to individual
 628 training remains an open question. This may be especially promising for basins that are
 629 jointly operated, since here we assume independent operations.

630 This study contributes a diagnostic framework for LSTM reservoir release mod-
 631 els focusing on their physical interpretability and generalization ability in space and time.
 632 LSTMs remain a promising fully empirical and data-driven method to efficiently embed
 633 human decision making in large scale hydrological models, owing in part to the strength
 634 of the artificial neural network as a universal approximator (Hornik et al., 1989) and the
 635 increasing availability of reservoir operational data (Steyaert et al., 2022; Hou et al., 2022).
 636 However, we highlight key difficulties to LSTM modeling for this purpose—in particu-
 637 lar, challenges in storage representation and maintaining stable performance—and pro-

638 vide a method to evaluate these challenges before and during coupling with larger mod-
 639 els to ensure both accuracy and physical realism.

640 Data Availability Statement

641 All code corresponding to methods and figure generation can be found in the pub-
 642 lic repository: <https://github.com/Matt2371/DL-reservoir-modeling>, which is perma-
 643 nently archived at (Chen, 2025).

644 Acknowledgments

645 This work was supported by the U.S. National Science Foundation Graduate Research
 646 Fellowship Program, as well as NSF Grants 2041826 and 2205239. All conclusions are
 647 those of the authors.

648 References

- 649 Adams, L. E., Lund, J. R., Moyle, P. B., Quiñones, R. M., Herman, J. D., &
 650 O'Rear, T. A. (2017, 9). Environmental hedging: A theory and method
 651 for reconciling reservoir operations for downstream ecology and water supply.
 652 *Water Resources Research*, 53, 7816-7831. doi: 10.1002/2016WR020128
- 653 Addor, N., Newman, A. J., Mizukami, N., & Clark, M. P. (2017, 10). The camels
 654 data set: catchment attributes and meteorology for large-sample studies. *Hy-
 655 drology and Earth System Sciences*, 21, 5293-5313. Retrieved from <https://hess.copernicus.org/articles/21/5293/2017/> doi: 10.5194/hess-21-5293
 656 -2017
- 657 Alain, G., & Bengio, Y. (2018, 11). Understanding intermediate layers using linear
 658 classifier probes. Retrieved from <http://arxiv.org/abs/1610.01644>
- 659 Belinkov, Y. (2021, 9). Probing classifiers: Promises, shortcomings, and advances.
 660 Retrieved from <http://arxiv.org/abs/2102.12452>
- 661 Biemans, H., Haddeland, I., Kabat, P., Ludwig, F., Hutjes, R. W., Heinke, J., ...
 662 Gerten, D. (2011). Impact of reservoirs on river discharge and irrigation
 663 water supply during the 20th century. *Water Resources Research*, 47. doi:
 664 10.1029/2009WR008929
- 665 Boulange, J., Hanasaki, N., Yamazaki, D., & Pokhrel, Y. (2021, 12). Role of dams in
 666 reducing global flood exposure under climate change. *Nature Communications*,
 667 12. doi: 10.1038/s41467-020-20704-0
- 668 Chen, M. (2025). *Matt2371/dl-reservoir-modeling: first submission (v1.0.0)*. Zen-
 669 odo. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.17861203> doi: 10
 670 .5281/zenodo.17861203
- 671 Chen, M., & Herman, J. D. (2024, 4). Detection time for nonstationary reservoir
 672 system performance driven by climate and land-use change. *Journal of Water
 673 Resources Planning and Management*, 150. doi: 10.1061/jwrmd5.wreng-6184
- 674 Coerver, H. M., Rutten, M. M., & Giesen, N. C. V. D. (2018). Deduction of reser-
 675 voir operating rules for application in global hydrological models. *Hydrology
 676 and Earth System Sciences*, 22, 831-851. doi: 10.5194/hess-22-831-2018
- 677 Dang, T. D., Chowdhury, A. F. K., & Galelli, S. (2020, 1). On the representa-
 678 tion of water reservoir storage and operations in large-scale hydrological
 679 models: Implications on model parameterization and climate change im-
 680 pact assessments. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 24, 397-416. doi:
 681 10.5194/hess-24-397-2020
- 682 Dong, N., Guan, W., Cao, J., Zou, Y., Yang, M., Wei, J., ... Wang, H. (2023, 4).
 683 A hybrid hydrologic modelling framework with data-driven and conceptual
 684 reservoir operation schemes for reservoir impact assessment and predictions.
 685 *Journal of Hydrology*, 619. doi: 10.1016/j.jhydrol.2023.129246

- 687 Ehsani, N., Fekete, B. M., Vörösmarty, C. J., & Tessler, Z. D. (2016, 4). A neural
 688 network based general reservoir operation scheme. *Stochastic Environmental*
 689 *Research and Risk Assessment*, 30, 1151-1166. doi: 10.1007/s00477-015-1147
 690 -9
- 691 Fan, M., Zhang, L., Liu, S., Yang, T., & Lu, D. (2023, 3). Investigation of hy-
 692 drometeorological influences on reservoir releases using explainable ma-
 693 chine learning methods. *Frontiers in Water*, 5. Retrieved from <https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/frwa.2023.1112970/full> doi:
 694 10.3389/frwa.2023.1112970
- 695 Fuente, L. A. D. L., Ehsani, M. R., Gupta, H. V., & Condon, L. E. (2024, 2). To-
 696 toward interpretable lstm-based modeling of hydrological systems. *Hydrology and*
 697 *Earth System Sciences*, 28, 945-971. doi: 10.5194/hess-28-945-2024
- 698 Galelli, S., Turner, S. W. D., Pokhrel, Y., Ng., J. Y., Castelletti, A., Bierkens,
 699 M. F. P., ... Biemans, H. (2025, 7). Advancing the representation of
 700 human actions in large-scale hydrological models: Challenges and future
 701 research directions. *Water Resources Research*, 61. Retrieved from
 702 <https://agupubs.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1029/2024WR039486>
 703 doi: 10.1029/2024WR039486
- 704 Gangrade, S., Lu, D., Kao, S. C., & Painter, S. L. (2022, 12). Machine learning
 705 assisted reservoir operation model for long-term water management simulation.
 706 *Journal of the American Water Resources Association*, 58, 1592-1603. doi:
 707 10.1111/1752-1688.13060
- 708 Giuliani, M., Lamontagne, J. R., Reed, P. M., & Castelletti, A. (2021, 12). *A*
 709 *state-of-the-art review of optimal reservoir control for managing conflict-*
 710 *ing demands in a changing world* (Vol. 57). John Wiley and Sons Inc. doi:
 711 10.1029/2021WR029927
- 712 Haddeland, I., Skaugen, T., & Lettenmaier, D. P. (2006, 4). Anthropogenic impacts
 713 on continental surface water fluxes. *Geophysical Research Letters*, 33. doi: 10
 714 .1029/2006GL026047
- 715 Hanasaki, N., Kanae, S., & Oki, T. (2006, 7). A reservoir operation scheme for
 716 global river routing models. *Journal of Hydrology*, 327, 22-41. doi: 10.1016/j
 717 .jhydrol.2005.11.011
- 718 Hewitt, J., & Liang, P. (2019, 9). Designing and interpreting probes with control
 719 tasks. Retrieved from <http://arxiv.org/abs/1909.03368>
- 720 Hochreiter, S., & Schmidhuber, J. U. (1997). Long short-term mem-
 721 ory. *Neural Computation*, 9, 1735-1780. Retrieved from http://direct.mit.edu/neco/article-pdf/9/8/1735/813796/neco.1997.9.8.1735.pdf?casa_token=Styd-71DQioAAAAA:QvJW2dBxd-5ihwSumWqKKmT6VaWieXAj1b5KxTSL4OM1002orOYbd4NVUKQraCEmRfAQ doi:
 722 <https://doi.org/10.1162/neco.1997.9.8.1735>
- 723 Hodgkins, G. A., Over, T. M., Dudley, R. W., Russell, A. M., & LaFontaine,
 724 J. H. (2024, 2). The consequences of neglecting reservoir storage in
 725 national-scale hydrologic models: An appraisal of key streamflow statistics.
 726 *Journal of the American Water Resources Association*, 60, 110-131. doi:
 727 10.1111/1752-1688.13161
- 728 Hoedt, P.-J., Kratzert, F., Klotz, D., Halmich, C., Holzleitner, M., Nearing, G.,
 729 ... Klambauer, G. (2021, 1). Mc-lstm: Mass-conserving lstm. *Proceedings*
 730 *of the 38th International Conference on Machine Learning*, 139, 4275-4286.
 731 Retrieved from <http://arxiv.org/abs/2101.05186>
- 732 Hornik, K., Stinchcombe, M., & White, H. (1989, 1). Multilayer feedforward net-
 733 works are universal approximators. *Neural Networks*, 2, 359-366. Retrieved
 734 from <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/0893608089900208>
 735 doi: 10.1016/0893-6080(89)90020-8
- 736 Hou, J., Dijk, A. I. V., Beck, H. E., Renzullo, L. J., & Wada, Y. (2022, 7). Re-
 737 motely sensed reservoir water storage dynamics (1984-2015) and the influence
 738

- of climate variability and management at a global scale. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 26, 3785-3803. doi: 10.5194/hess-26-3785-2022
- Iorga, C., & Neagoe, V.-E. (2019, 6). A deep cnn approach with transfer learning for image recognition. In *2019 11th international conference on electronics, computers and artificial intelligence (ecai)* (p. 1-6). IEEE. doi: 10.1109/ECAI46879.2019.9042173
- Jordan, I. D., Sokół, P. A., & Park, I. M. (2021, 7). Gated recurrent units viewed through the lens of continuous time dynamical systems. *Frontiers in Computational Neuroscience*, 15. doi: 10.3389/fncom.2021.678158
- Kingma, D. P., & Ba, J. (2015, 12). Adam: A method for stochastic optimization. In *Proceedings of the 3rd international conference on learning representations (iclr 2015)* (p. 1-15). Retrieved from <http://arxiv.org/abs/1412.6980>
- Kratzert, F., Gauch, M., Klotz, D., & Nearing, G. (2024). Hess opinions: Never train an lstm on a single basin. *Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss. [preprint]*, 1-19. Retrieved from <https://doi.org/10.5194/hess-2023-275> doi: 10.5194/hess-2023-275
- Kratzert, F., Herrnegger, M., Klotz, D., Hochreiter, S., & Klambauer, G. (2019). Neuralhydrology – interpreting lstms in hydrology. In *Explainable ai: Interpreting, explaining and visualizing deep learning* (Vol. 11700, p. 347-362). doi: 10.1007/978-3-030-28954-6_19
- Kratzert, F., Klotz, D., Brenner, C., Schulz, K., & Herrnegger, M. (2018, 11). Rainfall-runoff modelling using long short-term memory (lstm) networks. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 22, 6005-6022. doi: 10.5194/hess-22-6005-2018
- Kratzert, F., Klotz, D., Shalev, G., Klambauer, G., Hochreiter, S., & Nearing, G. (2019, 12). Towards learning universal, regional, and local hydrological behaviors via machine learning applied to large-sample datasets. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 23, 5089-5110. doi: 10.5194/hess-23-5089-2019
- Lees, T., Reece, S., Kratzert, F., Klotz, D., Gauch, M., Bruijn, J. D., ... Dadson, S. J. (2022). Hydrological concept formation inside long short-term memory (lstm) networks. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*, 26, 3079-3101. doi: 10.5194/hess-26-3079-2022
- Lehner, B., Liermann, C. R., Revenga, C., Vörösmarty, C., Fekete, B., Crouzet, P., ... Wisser, D. (2011, 11). High-resolution mapping of the world's reservoirs and dams for sustainable river-flow management. *Frontiers in Ecology and the Environment*, 9, 494-502. Retrieved from <https://esajournals.onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/10.1890/100125> doi: 10.1890/100125
- Li, M., Soltanolkotabi, M., & Oymak, S. (2019, 3). Gradient descent with early stopping is provably robust to label noise for overparameterized neural networks. In *Proceedings of machine learning research* (Vol. 108, p. 4313-4324). Retrieved from <https://proceedings.mlr.press/v108/1i20j.html>
- Liu, N. F., Gardner, M., Belinkov, Y., Peters, M. E., & Smith, N. A. (2019, 4). Linguistic knowledge and transferability of contextual representations. Retrieved from <http://arxiv.org/abs/1903.08855>
- Longyang, Q., & Zeng, R. (2023, 6). A hierarchical temporal scale framework for data-driven reservoir release modeling. *Water Resources Research*, 59. doi: 10.1029/2022WR033922
- Mason, E., Giuliani, M., Castelletti, A., & Amigoni, F. (2018, 4). Identifying and modeling dynamic preference evolution in multipurpose water resources systems. *Water Resources Research*, 54, 3162-3175. doi: 10.1002/2017WR021431
- Nilsson, C., Catherine, Reidy, A., Dynesius, M., & Revenga, C. (2005). Fragmentation and flow regulation of the world's large river systems. *Science*, 308, 405-408. Retrieved from www.sciencemag.org SCIENCEVOL30815APRIL2005

- 797 Oliveira, R., & Loucks, D. P. (1997). Operating rules for multireservoir systems.
 798 *Water Resources Research*, 33, 839-852. doi: 10.1029/96WR03745
- 799 Ouyang, W., Lawson, K., Feng, D., Ye, L., Zhang, C., & Shen, C. (2021, 8).
 800 Continental-scale streamflow modeling of basins with reservoirs: Towards
 801 a coherent deep-learning-based strategy. *Journal of Hydrology*, 599. doi:
 802 10.1016/j.jhydrol.2021.126455
- 803 Paszke, A., Gross, S., Massa, F., Lerer, A., Bradbury, J., Chanan, G., ... Chintala,
 804 S. (2019, 12). Pytorch: An imperative style, high-performance deep learning
 805 library. In *33rd conference on neural information processing systems (neurips*
 806 *2019*) (p. 1-12). Retrieved from <http://arxiv.org/abs/1912.01703>
- 807 Pokhrel, Y. N., Hanasaki, N., Wada, Y., & Kim, H. (2016, 7). *Recent progresses in*
 808 *incorporating human land–water management into global land surface models*
 809 *toward their integration into earth system models* (Vol. 3). John Wiley and
 810 Sons Inc. doi: 10.1002/wat2.1150
- 811 Ruder, S., Peters, M. E., Swayamdipta, S., & Wolf, T. (2019). Transfer learning in
 812 natural language processing. In *Proceedings of the 2019 conference of the north*
 813 *(p. 15-18)*. Association for Computational Linguistics. doi: 10.18653/v1/N19
 814 -5004
- 815 Sen, P. K. (1968, 12). Estimates of the regression coefficient based on kendall's tau.
 816 *Journal of the American Statistical Association*, 63, 1379-1389. Retrieved from
 817 <http://www.tandfonline.com/doi/abs/10.1080/01621459.1968.10480934>
 818 doi: 10.1080/01621459.1968.10480934
- 819 Steinschneider, S., Herman, J. D., Kucharski, J., Abellera, M., & Ruggiero, P. (2023,
 820 1). Uncertainty decomposition to understand the influence of water systems
 821 model error in climate vulnerability assessments. *Water Resources Research*,
 822 59. doi: 10.1029/2022WR032349
- 823 Steyaert, J. C., Condon, L. E., Turner, S. W., & Voisin, N. (2022, 2). Resopsus, a
 824 dataset of historical reservoir operations in the contiguous united states. *Scienc-*
 825 *ific Data*, 9, 34. doi: 10.1038/s41597-022-01134-7
- 826 Tefs, A. A., Stadnyk, T. A., Koenig, K. A., Déry, S. J., MacDonald, M. K., Slota, P.,
 827 ... Hamilton, M. (2021, 7). Simulating river regulation and reservoir perfor-
 828 mance in a continental-scale hydrologic model. *Environmental Modelling and*
 829 *Software*, 141. doi: 10.1016/j.envsoft.2021.105025
- 830 Thompson, S. E., Sivapalan, M., Harman, C. J., Srinivasan, V., Hipsey, M. R., Reed,
 831 P., ... Blöschl, G. (2013, 12). Developing predictive insight into changing
 832 water systems: Use-inspired hydrologic science for the anthropocene. *Hydrology*
 833 *and Earth System Sciences*, 17, 5013-5039. doi: 10.5194/hess-17-5013-2013
- 834 Tran, H., Zhou, T., Tan, Z., Fang, Y., & Leung, L. R. (2025, 11). Improving the pre-
 835 diction of daily reservoir releases over the conus using conditioned lstm. *Jour-*
 836 *nal of Hydrology*, 661. doi: 10.1016/j.jhydrol.2025.133750
- 837 Turner, S. W., Doering, K., & Voisin, N. (2020, 10). Data-driven reservoir simu-
 838 lation in a large-scale hydrological and water resource model. *Water Resources*
 839 *Research*, 56. doi: 10.1029/2020WR027902
- 840 Turner, S. W., & Galelli, S. (2016, 2). Water supply sensitivity to climate change:
 841 An r package for implementing reservoir storage analysis in global and re-
 842 gional impact studies. *Environmental Modelling and Software*, 76, 13-19. doi:
 843 10.1016/j.envsoft.2015.11.007
- 844 Turner, S. W., Steyaert, J. C., Condon, L., & Voisin, N. (2021, 12). Water storage
 845 and release policies for all large reservoirs of conterminous united states. *Jour-*
 846 *nal of Hydrology*, 603. doi: 10.1016/j.jhydrol.2021.126843
- 847 Wang, Y. (2017, 5). A new concept using lstm neural networks for dynamic system
 848 identification. In *2017 american control conference (acc)* (p. 5324-5329). IEEE.
 849 doi: 10.23919/ACC.2017.7963782
- 850 Yang, T., Gao, X., Sorooshian, S., & Li, X. (2016, 3). Simulating california reservoir
 851 operation using the classification and regression-tree algorithm combined with

- 852 a shuffled cross-validation scheme. *Water Resources Research*, 52, 1626-1651.
853 doi: 10.1002/2015WR017394
- 854 Yassin, F., Razavi, S., Elshamy, M., Davison, B., Sapriza-Azuri, G., & Wheater, H.
855 (2019, 9). Representation and improved parameterization of reservoir operation
856 in hydrological and land-surface models. *Hydrology and Earth System Sciences*,
857 23, 3735-3764. doi: 10.5194/hess-23-3735-2019
- 858 Yin, X. A., Yang, Z. F., Petts, G. E., & Kondolf, G. M. (2014, 5). A reservoir
859 operating method for riverine ecosystem protection, reservoir sedimenta-
860 tion control and water supply. *Journal of Hydrology*, 512, 379-387. doi:
861 10.1016/j.jhydrol.2014.02.037
- 862 Zhao, G., Gao, H., Naz, B. S., Kao, S. C., & Voisin, N. (2016, 12). Integrating a
863 reservoir regulation scheme into a spatially distributed hydrological model. *Ad-
864 vances in Water Resources*, 98, 16-31. doi: 10.1016/j.advwatres.2016.10.014
- 865 Zheng, Y., Liu, P., Cheng, L., Xie, K., Lou, W., Li, X., ... Zhang, W. (2022, 4).
866 Extracting operation behaviors of cascade reservoirs using physics-guided long-
867 short term memory networks. *Journal of Hydrology: Regional Studies*, 40,
868 101034. Retrieved from <https://linkinghub.elsevier.com/retrieve/pii/S2214581822000477> doi: 10.1016/j.ejrh.2022.101034
- 869 Zhou, T., Nijssen, B., & Lettenmaier, D. P. (2016). The contribution of reservoirs
870 to global land surface water storage variations*. *J. Hydrometeor.*, 17, 309-325.
871 Retrieved from [http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/JHM-](http://dx.doi.org/10.1175/JHM-D-15-) doi: 10.1175/JHM
872 -D-15
- 873