Synergistic Water and Energy Demand Modeling and Management





David E. Rosenberg

August 23, 2016

Smart Systems for Water Management Monte Verita, Switzerland





Utah's Conservation Targets

Reduce 2000 water use by 25% by 2025



Reduce 2005 emissions by 80% by 2050



Motivating Questions

- What home-owner actions jointly conserve water and energy?
- 2) Which **cost effective** actions should cities synergistically promote?
- 3) How to target households to adopt actions?
- 4) What is next?

Data-Driven Simulation-Optimization (PhD research of Adel Abdallah)

1. Collect high-freq. behavior data

2. Identify key parameters & distributions

3. Monte Carlo simulate

4. City-scale optimization

5. Mine results to target

High-Frequency Behavioral Data

Water (Aquacraft, 2005, 2009)



Energy (DOE, 2009)

- Water heater market shipments (709 models)
- Plumbing/heating contractor firms (343)
- Average annual potable water temperatures (74 cities across the U.S.)

Dataset	Number of Cities	Data collection period	Number of houses	Monitoring days	Water use events
USEPA Retrofit	3	2000-03	88	4,036	753,076
New Single Family Homes	9	2005-09	305	3,885	648,719

Technology



Key Parameters

Energy Embedded for Utility Operations

(~1/15 energy needed to heat water inside the home 92,000 KWh to heat one million gallon of water)



Monte Carlo Simulation (1,000 households)

Water

Energy



Model Calibration – Salt Lake City



Simulated indoor water and energy uses

(largest 12% of users use 21% and 24% of water and energy)



City-Scale Optimization

Decisions

Conservation actions implemented (binary) by:

- Household (1,000)
- End use/Appliance (8)
- Method (4)

Objective function (\$)

Minimize total cost to implement conservation actions

Subject to:

- Meet city water reduction target
- Meet city direct energy reduction target
- Lower and upper bounds on number of actions
- Mutually exclusive actions
- Upper bound on payback period for actions



Action	Cost
Retrofit toilet	\$150
Retrofit shower	\$40
Retrofit faucet	\$40
Retrofit clothes washer	\$500
Reduce outdoor 10%	\$200
Lower heater to 120°F	\$100

Costs to meet reduction targets



Heterogeneity of household savings and payback periods



Payback periods for actions



Household share of conservation effort



15

Identifying who to target



Apply the results

- Target customers with large water and/or energy use
- Encourage to implement one or more conservation actions
- Shower + faucet actions save water + energy with shorter payback periods
- Reduce heater temperature to save energy
- Outdoor conservation actions save water

Make Dumb Meters Smarter

Low cost



18



USU Business Building Male + Female Bathrooms



Preliminary results

20

Other Locations

- Single-family residences
- Dormitories
- Non-residential users

Smarter Water-Energy Monitoring Activity (10 min)

Where to place low-cost, open-source computers and sensors to synchronously monitor a household's water and energy use at high frequency?

- Discuss in small groups (2-3 people)
- Enter recommendations at: <u>http://tinyurl.com/govvlvp</u>

Conclusions

Couple high-frequency data collection with simulation and optimization modeling

Salt Lake City, Utah can save substantial water and energy

Several actions save water and energy simultaneously with short payback periods

Profile and target to motivate savings

Further Info

- Adel Abdallah and David E. Rosenberg (2014). "<u>Heterogeneous</u> <u>Residential Water and Energy Linkages and Implications for</u> <u>Conservation and Management</u>." ASCE-Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management. 140(3). pp. 288-297. doi: 10.1061/(ASCE)WR.1943-5452.0000340.
- Francisco Suero, David E. Rosenberg, Peter Mayer (2012). "<u>Estimating</u> and Verifying United States Households' Potential to Conserve <u>Water</u>." *ASCE-Journal of Water Resources Planning and Management*. 138(3), pp. 209-306. doi: 10.1061/(ASCE)WR.1943-5452.0000182.

Questions?

David E. Rosenberg david.rosenberg@usu.edu http://rosenberg.usu.edu @WaterModeler

