SB10Brazil
Sao Paulo | 08 - 09 November 2010

# AN INTEGRATED ANALYSIS FOR RESERVOIR VOLUME CALCULATION IN RAINWATER HARVESTING SYSTEM

**Rodrigo B. MORUZZI Dr. Eng.**[1]
Samuel C. OLIVEIRA, Dr. Eng[2]
Marcelo L. GARCIA, Dr. Eng[3]

[1] *Geoprocessing and Territorial Planning Department (DEPLAN) from Geosciences and Exact Sciences Institute (IGCE) – Sao Paulo State University (UNESP).* Rio Claro - SP, Brazil, rmoruzzi@rc.unesp.br
[2] Petrology and Metallogeny Department (DPM) *from Geosciences and Exact Sciences Institute (IGCE) – Sao Paulo State University (UNESP)*, Rio Claro - SP, Brazil, scoliv@rc.unesp.br
[3] Petrology and Metallogeny Department (DPM) *from Geosciences and Exact Sciences Institute (IGCE) – Sao Paulo State University (UNESP)*, Rio Claro - SP, Brazil, mlgarcia@rc.unesp.br

Keywords: rainwater use, reservoir volume, design criteria

## Summary

This paper presents an integrated analysis for tank volume calculation in rainwater harvesting systems based on three important variables. These variables are water demand, system efficiency and repayment time. Several simulations were carried out in different scenarios considering typical values of both catchment area (for low- and medium-income households) and water demand, with fixed water and tank costs. Results showed that the integrated analysis of demand, efficiency and repayment time may assist designers to determine a more adequate reservoir volume.

## 1 Introduction and Background

An appropriate storage volume is essential for reservoir design of rainwater harvesting systems. It is crucial to maximize tank use as well as to minimize repayment time, especially in developing countries where the initial cost can be extremely high.

Several methods with their different fundamentals for tank volume calculation are described on the Brazilian Standard Norm, NBR15527/07. Some of them are essentially empirical and based on international experiences. Others are based on supplying full demand, which suggests the need of high volume tanks, resulting in high investment costs. The volume of reservoirs can substantially vary from one method to another for the same input (Amorim and Pereira, 2008), making it difficult for designers to choose a method. Here, we performed a rational analysis for tank volume calculation based on efficiencies (attending and harvesting), water demand and repayment time for several scenarios.

In addition, our presented analysis focuses on low- and medium-income households, meaning small and medium roof areas. In urban areas, small areas are critical for designing rainwater harvesting systems that will contribute partially to the water demand.

## 2 Approach / Experimental

The analysis of the main system variables was conduct based on the daily mass balance in the reservoir, for one year only, considering that the tank is fully emptied for maintenance, as recommended by NBR15527/07:

$$S_{(i)}=Vp_{(i)}+S_{(i-1)}-D_{(i)}\ ;\ i=1,2\ldots365 \text{ dias} \qquad (1)$$

*where:* $S_{(i)}, S_{(i-1)}$ *= volume of water in reservoir;* $Vp_{(i)}$*= rainwater volume;* $D_{(i)}$*=daily demand.*
The pluviometric data from 1961 to 1990, for the city of São Paulo, were downloaded from HidroWeb (available on the site: hidroweb.ana.gov.br/). The daily rainwater availability was estimated through Equation 2, as recommended by NBR15527/07, subtracting the first-flush (ff).

$$Vp_{(i)} = (C \times P_{(i)} \times A \times \eta) - ff \qquad (2)$$

where: $P_{(i)}$ = average precipitation; $A$ = catchment area; $C$ = runoff; and $\eta$ = catchment efficiency.

Additionally, the following variables were defined:

- Attending efficiency ($Ea$, $0<Ea<1$):

$$Ea = \sum_{i=1}^{365} Va(i) \Big/ \sum_{i=1}^{365} D(i) \qquad Va(i) = \begin{cases} D(i) & if\, Vp(i) + S(i-1) \geq D(i) \\ S(i-1) + Vp(i) & if\, 0 < S(i-1) + Vp(i) < D(i) \end{cases}$$

where: $Va_{(i)}$= used volume

- Harvesting efficiency ($Eh$, $0<Eh<1$)

$$Eh = \sum_{i=1}^{365} Va(i) \Big/ \sum_{i=1}^{365} Vp(i) \quad for \quad ff = 0$$

The *Eh* parameter indicates the harvesting potential and may fix the reservoir maximum use. The assumptions used in the simulations were: (a) constant daily demand; (b) the demand is lower than or equal to the total rainwater availability c) the maximum demand is equal to the rainwater availability, which implies *Ea*=*Eh*; (d) rainwater supply is equal to the maximum demand for studying different cost scenarios.
The investment return was calculated considering the prices of fiberglass tanks in PINI (2010), 7% of interest tax (Brazil-Central Bank, 2010)(Table 1), and government subsidy of 2%. Drinking water cost was estimated to be R$2.02.m$^{-3}$ according to SNIS (2007). The adopted values of *C*, *ff* and *η* were 0.8, 2 mm and 0.9, respectively.

Table 1 Tank size, cost and interest tax

| Tank (m$^3$) | Tank Cost (R$)[1] | Tank Cost (US$)[2] | Interest tax (%)[3] |
|---|---|---|---|
| 0,5 | 127.19 | 70.82 | 7.0 |
| 1 | 217.23 | 120.96 | |
| 3 | 544.53 | 303.21 | |
| 6 | 1,065.50 | 593.3 | |
| 15 | 2,654.89 | 1,478.31 | |

[1]PINI (2010); [2]1.7959 R$/US$ reference dez/2007; [3]Brazil-Central Bank (2010).

Based on the tank prices presented in PINI (2010), a non-linear regression was performed to correlate reservoir unit cost with volume values within ranging from 6 to 15 m$^3$. This procedure was adopted because prices for this volume range were not available.

$$y = 0{,}1776 + 0{,}1486 \exp(-x / 755{,}4285) \qquad (3)$$

*where: y = unit cost (R$/L); x = tank volume (L)*

All simulations were carried out according to the algorithm shown in the Figure 1. The scenarios were composed of some parameters, such as rainwater demand, drinking water cost, reservoir volume, reservoir cost and repayment time. Three different roof areas were simulated for each scenario (Table 2).

Table 2 Variable and fixed parameters on the simulated scenarios

| Scenarios | Rainwater demand | Reservoir volume | Drinking water cost | Reservoir cost | Repayment time |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| 1 | V | V | F | V | V |
| 2 | F | V | V | V | F |
| 3 | F | V | F | V | F |

V = variable; F = fixed

## 3 Results and Discussion

Our first simulation was performed utilizing a 0,5 $m^3$ tank and a 60 $m^2$ roof area with a water charge of U$ 1.12.$m^{-3}$. It is clear that both the *Ea* and the repayment time decrease with increasing the demand (Figure 2). On the other hand, as the demand increases, the *Eh* parameter also increases (Figure 2). The *Ea* and *Eh* parameters converge to the same value in the maximum demand, which is in this case 0.2$m^3$.$day^{-1}$ (Figures 2 and 3). A systematic behavior can be observed when simulating different reservoir volumes for different demands (Figure 3). Indeed, it is noted that the lowest payment times occur at the maximum demand values (*Ea*=*Eh*), for all reservoir volumes (Figures 3, 4 e 5).




*Figure 1. Flowchart of the algorithm utilized for simulations. Vp = rainwater volume; Va = used volume; P = precipitation; c = runoff coefficient; Vr = assumed (or adopted) tank volume; $Disp_{(t)}$ = delivered volume*

*(correspondent to the sum of used volumes); $N_{(t)}$ = fail counter (computes the number of times that the tank is empty); ff = first flush; Ov = overflow; t = time (days).*




*Figure 2. Efficiencies, payback time and demand relationship. Data: roof area=60m², ff=2mm, C=0.85, η =0.9, tank cost (Table 1), 0,5m³ tank and drinking water of R\$2.02.m⁻³(US\$1.12.m⁻³)*

In the Figures 3, 4 and 5 the horizontal dashed lines indicate the maximum attending demand, according to previously adopted hypotheses. Biased conclusions can be taken by analyzing only the parameter *Ea*, because it suggests high efficiencies for low demands. That is, the water level in the reservoir will always be much greater than zero, indicating low use of the installed capacity or simply overestimated tank volume.

On the other hand, it is observed that the *Ea* and *Eh* curves tend to converge as the demand increases (Figure 3, 4 and 5), resulting in the same value on the maximum demand point (for fixed tank volumes). This suggests that the reservoir optimization should be considered by maximizing its use, which is characterized by attending the highest possible demand. In these conditions, one has the smallest investment return period, which can again be verified on the intersection of *Ea* and *Eh* curves (Figures 3, 4 and 5). Additionally, it is noted that an increment on the reservoir volume, for the maximum demand, does not result in a significative increase of *Eh*, but it does increase the investment return time.

Figure 5 shows the simulations for 300 m² roof area. The best result is obtained on the first convergence point of *Ea* and *Eh*, meaning relatively high efficiencies and optimum reservoir use, as highlighted on the graph (dashed box) (6 m³; 3.1 years for repayment). Note that *Ea* and *Eh* values did not encounter each other for the reservoirs volumes of 0.5; 1.0 and 3.0m³. It is important to point out that all simulated cases were made considering partial attending demand, i.e., the collected rainwater is used as a complement of the municipal drinking water distribution system and so there is an alternative water source. In the case in which rainwater is the only water source, flow equalization must be considered.




*Figure 3. Efficiencies, payback time and demand relationship for several reservoir volumes. Data: roof area=60m$^2$, ff=2mm, C=0.85, η =0.9, tank cost (Table 1), and drinking water = R\$2.02.m$^{-3}$.*




*Figure 4. Efficiencies, payback time and demand relationship for several reservoir volumes. Data: roof area=150m$^2$, ff=2mm, C=0.85, η =0.9, tank cost (Table 1), and drinking water = R\$2.02.m$^{-3}$.*




*Figure 5. Efficiencies, payback time and demand relationship for several reservoir volumes. Data: roof area=300m$^2$, ff=2mm, C=0.85, η =0.9, tank cost (Table 1), and drinking water = R\$2.02.m$^{-3}$.*

The lowest repayment times (RT) were obtained for the highest demands, i.e when $V_{ap}$=D. Optimized systems, meaning short payback periods, are found when the maximum installed capacity is approached, for all reservoir volumes and roof areas.

Based on these findings, other simulations were carried out to answer the following question: How expensive should the reservoir (or the drinking water cost) be so that the desired repayment periods could be reached? Figures 6 and 7 present drinking water supply price and tank cost simulations, respectively, for roof areas of 60, 150 and 300 m$^2$ and fixed repayment times (RT), represented by the flat line of repayment time curve. Firstly, reservoir cost was kept fixed (according to Table 1) and drinking water cost was calculated for determined values of repayment time and reservoir volume (Figure 6). Secondly, drinking water supply cost was fixed to obtain reservoir cost at desired values of repayment times (Figure 7). The demand was kept constant and equal to the maximum one in these simulations ($E_a$=$E_h$ condition).

These results show that the water supply and reservoir prices need to be higher for the roofs with lower area in order to the investment pay itself off. The values of projected water cost (per m$^3$) were R$ 3.5 and 26.6 for volume tanks of 0.5 and 6 m$^3$, respectively, a catchment area of 60 m$^2$ and an investment return period of one year (Figure 6). The actual market price is R$ 2.02.m$^{-3}$. These water prices reduce with increasing catchment area values (150 e 300 m$^2$). If the water price is kept at R$ 2.02 m$^{-3}$ and the desired investment return period is between one and two years, it is observed that there is a need of reservoir cost reduction for few low-income household cases from the prices that are practiced in the market, whereas a positive scenario can be obtained for households with larger roof areas (Figure 7 and Table 1). The projected values obtained in Figure 7 show the reservoir prices that would have to be fixed in the real market in order to make the rainwater use viable economically. For example, the reservoir of 0,5 m$^3$ would have to cost around R$ 80, 150 and 320 for roof area households of 60, 150 and 300 m$^2$ (Figure 7), respectively, and for a repayment time of one year. The market price for this case is R$ 127.19. Thus, Figure 7 shows the limit from which the costs will not be paid.




*Figure 6. Water cost simulations for different reservoir volumes (Table 1) at fixed repayment times (RT).*




*Figure 7. Tank cost simulations for different reservoir volumes at fixed repayment times (RT). Cost of drinking water was extracted from SNIS (2007) and fixed at R$2.02.m$^{-3}$.*

## 4 Summary and Conclusions

In cases in which rainwater can be used to partially attend the water demand, i.e. communities with drinking water supply system, the integrated analysis here proposed showed to be a powerful tool to assist designers for reservoir volume calculation. The reservoir use can be optimized by calculating the appropriate demands so that the efficiencies are higher and the repayment times are shorter.

If the conditions $E_a=E_h$ are reached, the repayment times are shorter. These vary from 1.6 to 30 years for reservoirs from 0.5 to 6 m$^3$ for roof area of 60 m$^2$; from 0.7 to 6.7 years for reservoirs from 0.5 to 6 m$^3$ and area of 150 m$^2$; and from 3.1 to 17 years for reservoirs from 6 to 15 m$^3$ and area of 300 m$^2$. The paybacks are significantly increased with demand reduction ($E_a>E_h$).

## References

ABNT. ASSOCIAÇÃO BRASILEIRA DE NORMAS TÉCNICAS. NBR15527/07. Aproveitamento de água de chuva para fins não potáveis em áreas urbanas – Diretrizes. Rio de Janeiro, 2007. 7p

Amorim, S.V de; Pereira, D.J. de A. Estudo comparativo dos métodos de dimensionamento para reservatórios utilizados em aproveitamento de água pluvial. Ambiente Construído, Porto Alegre, v.8, n.2, p.53-66, abr./jun.2008.

Brasil. Banco Central do Brasil. Tarifas Bancárias. Disponível em: http://www.bcb.gov.br/?TARIFA. Acesso em 03/02/2010.

PINI (2010). Guia da Construção e Mercado: Preços Pesquisados. Disponível em: http://www.construcaomercado.com.br/pmp/default.asp?urlBusca=http://www.construcaomercado.com.br/. Acesso em 01/02/2010.

SISTEMAS DE INFORMAÇÕES HIDROLOGICAS – HIDROWEB. Agência Nacional de Águas (ANA) disponível no em: http://hidroweb.ana.gov.br/ acesso em 26/06/2009.

SNIS. Sistema Nacional de informação em Saneamento, 2007. Disponível em: http://www.pmss.gov.br/snis/index.php. Acesso em 15/01/2010.