This presentation premiered at WaterSmart Innovations

watersmartinnovations.com





Residential End Uses of Water, Version 2 Final Results

Peter Mayer, P.E. Principal WaterDM Residential End Uses of Water, Version 2 EXECUTIVE REPORT



© 2016 Water Research Foundation. ALL RIGHTS RESERVED. No part of this presentation may be copied, reproduced, or otherwise utilized without permission.

Authors

- William B. DeOreo, Aquacraft, Inc. Pl
- Peter Mayer, WaterDM Co-PI
- Benedykt Dziegielewski, University of Southern Illinois
- Jack Kiefer, Hazen and Sawyer, P.C.

Sponsors

- Water Research Foundation
- City of Fort Collins Utilities
- City of Scottsdale Water Department
- Clayton County Water Authority
- Denver Water
- Portland Water Bureau
- Region of Peel
- Region of Waterloo
- San Antonio Water System
- Tacoma Public Utilities
- Toho Water Authority
- Tampa Bay Water
- Alliance for Water Efficiency

Project Advisory Committee

- Doug Bennett, Southern Nevada Water Authority
- David Bracciano, Tampa Bay Water
- Robert Day, San Jose Water Company
- Mary Ann Dickinson, Alliance for Water Efficiency
- Warren Liebold, New York City DEP
- Maureen Hodgins Water Research Foundation

Research Objective

Residential End Uses of Water Study Update - Version 2 provides an updated and expanded assessment of water use in single-family households across North America, and presents detailed information and data about how water use has changed since REU1999.

Regionally Diverse Study Sites



LEVEL 1 STUDY SITES: Clayton County, GA • Denver, CO • Fort Collins, CO • Peel, Ontario • San Antonio, TX Scottsdale, AZ • Tacoma, WA • Toho, FL • Waterloo, Ontario

LEVEL 2 STUDY SITES: Aurora, CO · Austin, TX · Cary, NC · Chicago, IL · Edmonton, Alberta Henderson, NV · Miami, FL · Mt. View, CA · New Haven, CT · Otay, CA · Philadelphia, PA · Portland, OR Santa Barbara, CA · Santa Fe, NM

Research Approach

- 9 utilities end use analysis
- 24 utilities contributed data and information
- Mail survey sent to 13,749 homes 5,574 returned (34%)
- Billed consumption data from ~ 23,749 homes
- End use data from 762 homes
- Paired hot water and cold water data from 94 homes
- Detailed landscape and outdoor use analysis for 838 homes
- Modeling
- Benchmarking



838 homes included and analyzed (762+76)

End Use Disaggregation



Final Reports & Database





Residential End Uses of Water, Version 2

PDF Report #4309b

Subject Area: Water Resources and Environmental Sustainability

Summary Results

- Single-family homes typically use the most water of any utility customer sector.
- Key comparisons between 1999 and 2016 studies.
- Substantial decreases in water use documented



Average annual Indoor household water use



Residential Indoor GPCD



Indoor GPCD Comparison



Indoor GPCD



Hot and Cold Water Household Use



Hot Water Per Capita Use



Efficiency Improvements

Efficiency criteria include: clothes washers <30 gal/load, toilets <2.0 gal/flush, showers <2.5 gal/minute.



Residential Outdoor Water Use



Residential Outdoor Water Use



Some Factors that Influence Indoor Water Use

- Number of people residing in the home (large + impact)
- Presence of a home water treatment system (+)
- Parcel size as a proxy for income (+)
- Presence of a swimming pool (+)
- Presence of efficient toilets (large impact)
- Increased sewer rates (-)
- Presence of a hot water recirculating system (-)
- Presence of efficient clothes washer (-)

Some Factors that Influence Outdoor Water Use

- Application of excess irrigation (large + impact)
- Net ET (large + impact)
- Presence of an in-ground sprinkler system (large + impact)
- Irrigated area (+)
- Presence of a swimming pool (+)
- Cost of water (-)

Questions on Part 1

Peter Mayer, P.E. Principal WaterDM peter.mayer@waterdm.com



Total Billed Consumption



Metered Demand By Sector



Avg. Demand by Sector



Water & Sewer Bill - 5, 25 kgal



Fixed Water and Sewer Charges



Indoor GPCD



Average # of Residents

REU1999 = 2.7
REU2016 = 2.6

Toilets

	REU1999	REU2016
Number of houses logged	1,187	762
Average flushes/household per day	12.4	13
Average flushes per person per day	5.05	5.0
Average flush volume	3.65 ± 0.06 gal	2.6 ± 0.01 gal
Average per capita toilet use (gpcd)	18.5	14.3

22.7% reduction in avg. per capita toilet use.

Toilet Flush Distributions



Clothes Washers

	REU1999	REU2016
Number of houses logged	1,187	762
Average loads per household per day	0.81	0.78
Average loads uses per person per day	0.3	0.3
Average gallons per load	41	31
Per capita clothes washer use	15.0	9.8

34.6% reduction in avg. per capita clothes washer use.

Showers

	REU1999	REU2016
Number of houses logged	1,187	762
Average showers/household per day	1.8	1.8
Average showers per person per day	0.66	0.69
Average shower volume (gal.)	16.7	15.8
Average shower duration	7.8 ± 0.14 minutes	7.8 ± 0.02 minutes
Average flow rate for showers (gpm)	2.2 ± 0.04	2.1 ± 0 .04
Average per capita shower use	11.6	11.1

Shower Flow Rates



Shower Durations



Misc. Faucet Uses

	REU1999	REU2016
Number of houses logged	1,187	762
Average faucet uses/household per day	41 faucet uses	51 faucet uses
Average faucet uses per person per day	15 faucet uses	20 faucet uses
Average faucet use volume	0.7 gallons per use	0.5 gallons per use
Average faucet duration	30 seconds	30 seconds
Average per capita faucet use	10.9	11.1

Dishwashers

	REU1999	REU2016
Number of houses logged	1,187	762
Average dishwasher uses/household per day	0.24	0.26
Average dishwasher uses per person per day	0.09	0.10
Average dishwasher use volume	10.0 gallons	6.1 gallons
Average per capita dishwasher use	1	0.7

Do Dishwashers Save Water?

Dishwasher Present	Number of homes	Daily Faucet Use (Gal/HH/Day)
No	241	26.4
Yes	520	26.3

Leaks

	REU1999	REU2016
Number of houses logged	1,187	762
Average Gal/leak event	NA	0.15
Average leak events/household per day	NA	117
Average leak events per person per day	NA	43.3
Average per capita leakage	9.5	7.7

High Leakage Homes

Survey Item	Percent in group of 21 high leak	Percent in all survey respondents	Ratio
	homes		
Water feature	14%	2%	7.14
Auto fill system on pool	29%	5%	5.71
Pool	48%	13%	3.75
Leaky pool	5%	1%	3.66
Other leak	10%	3%	3.53
Leaky irrigation	10%	3%	3.17
Hot tub	29%	9%	3.14
Treatment	29%	15%	1.90
Other fixture or appliance not	14%	9%	1.59
listed in survey?			
Drip Irrigation	24%	15%	1.59
Ice Maker	86%	59%	1.45
Leaky toilet	10%	8%	1.27
In-ground irrigation	67%	53%	1.25
Dripping faucet	10%	8%	1.15
Evaporative cooler	5%	6%	0.79
Humidifier	10%	20%	0.48

Indoor Use Diurnal Curve



Indoor End Use Diurnal Curve



Residential Water Use is Variable

- REU2016 average annual per household water use was 88 kgal with a standard deviation of 32 kgal
- In REU1999 it was 146 kgal, but the location of study sites was quite different.
- Local weather conditions, the size of the irrigated area, the cost of water, and the type of plant materials are major drivers of outdoor use.
- Indoor use was less variable between participating study sites than outdoor use.

Indoor Use Reductions

- Average indoor per capita water use has decreased 15.4% from 69.3 gpcd (REU1999) to 58.6 gpcd (REU2016).
- Average indoor per household water use has decreased 22% from 177 gphd (REU1999) to 138 gphd (REU2016).
- Changes are due to more efficient fixtures and appliances, not occupancy or behavior.
- Primarily a result of high efficiency clothes washers and toilets.

Expect Further Indoor Reductions

- Substantial additional indoor conservation potential exists.
- Current average daily indoor per capita use of 58.6 gpcd is expected to reduce to below 40.0 gpcd through replacement of old toilets and clothes washers.
- Reductions below these levels can be expected as future fixtures and appliances become even more efficient and customer side leakage is reduced through automated metering and leak alert programs.

Outdoor Variability

- The majority of study participants in the Landscape Group (72%) applied considerably less water to their landscapes than was theoretically required.
- Another 16% of participants applied an amount of water that was close to the theoretical requirement.
- About 13% of participants applied in excess.

Targeting

- Outdoor efficiency can be maximized by targeting efforts at customers that are over-irrigating.
- Prevent deficit irrigators from increasing their irrigation to help maintain demand reductions.
- Pricing programs and reduction in planting areas may achieve outdoor demand reductions beyond efficiency measures.
- Savings estimates for landscape conservation programs range from 20% reduction to 50% for more aggressive programs that include price increases and reductions in areas requiring irrigation.

Thank You! Questions on Part 2

Peter Mayer, P.E. Principal WaterDM peter.mayer@waterdm.com

