Statistical characterisation and estimation of non-domestic water demand

H. J. van Zyl, A. A. Ilemobade, J. E. van Zyl & Y. Le Gat

To cite this article: H. J. van Zyl, A. A. Ilemobade, J. E. van Zyl & Y. Le Gat (2017) Statistical characterisation and estimation of non-domestic water demand, Urban Water Journal, 14:7, 720-726, DOI: [10.1080/1573062X.2016.1253753](https://doi.org/10.1080/1573062X.2016.1253753)

To link to this article: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/1573062X.2016.1253753>

Published online: 22 Nov 2016.

Submit your article to this journal [↗](#)

Article views: 56

View related articles [↗](#)

View Crossmark data [↗](#)

RESEARCH ARTICLE

Statistical characterisation and estimation of non-domestic water demand

H. J. van Zyl^a, A. A. Illemobade^a, J. E. van Zyl^b and Y. Le Gat^c

^aSchool of Civil and Environmental Engineering, University of the Witwatersrand, Johannesburg, South Africa; ^bDepartment of Civil Engineering, University of Cape Town, Cape Town, South Africa; ^cResearch Unit REBX, Irstea Bordeaux, Cestas Cedex, France

ABSTRACT

Estimation of annual average water demand figures is critical for the design and evaluation of water distribution systems. This study evaluated the metered water consumption of more than 67,000 non-domestic consumers in six categories from cities and towns in South Africa. It was found that lognormal distributions provide good descriptions of the annual average daily demand (AADD) distribution in each category. The land use categories Business Commercial, Industrial, Agricultural holdings and Sports & Parks displayed similar median AADDs of between 1.5 and 1.7 kl/property/day. Educational properties used substantially more water (4.7 kl/property/day), while Government & Institutional properties used substantially less water (0.7 kl/property/day). A step-wise regression analyses showed that property size has the greatest impact on water demand for most categories. Finally, a novel statistically based method is proposed for estimating the average AADD of a given number of properties based on an acceptable risk of non-exceedance.

ARTICLE HISTORY

Received 31 March 2015
Accepted 20 October 2016

KEYWORDS

Water demand; non-domestic; design demand

Introduction

Accurate estimation of annual average daily demand (AADD) is important for the design of municipal water distribution systems. AADD values normally form the basis for water supply component sizing including pipelines, storage reservoirs, pump stations and water treatment plants. AADD estimates are also important for the sizing of wastewater distribution and treatment systems.

It is useful to distinguish between domestic and non-domestic consumers in the analysis of water demand. Domestic demand is driven by human needs and behaviour, and can be estimated from historic data and factors such as development level, property size, income and climate.

In comparison, non-domestic demand is highly variable and is primarily driven by the type of activity practiced on the property. For example, a drinks factory and storage depot may have similar property sizes, turnovers and staff numbers, but will consume vastly different quantities of water.

Non-domestic consumers include industrial, commercial and institutional (ICI) users, parks and agricultural holdings (large properties often used for small scale agriculture).

While studies have found relationships between non-domestic demand and parameters such as property size, developed area, economics, water rates and water restrictions (McCuen *et al.* 1975, Kollar and Brewer 1977, Stephenson and Turner 1996, Van Vuuren and Van Beek 1997, CSIR 2003, Zhou and Tol 2005, Reynaud 2003), these models require information at individual property level. They are less suitable for new areas where the

types of non-domestic users that will be established are unknown, or existing areas where the types of developments may change over time.

In recent years, municipal data management tools have become common in South African municipalities, giving researchers access to a large quantity of metered consumption data (GLS 2007, Jacobs and Fair 2012). This data formed the basis for a number of studies on water demand, which identified influencing parameters, investigated typical demand ranges and proposed new design guidelines for the estimation of domestic demands (e.g. Stephenson and Turner 1996, Van Vuuren and Van Beek 1997, Jacobs *et al.* 2004, Husselmann and Van Zyl 2006, Van Zyl *et al.* 2008, Griffioen and Van Zyl 2014), but did not consider non-domestic consumption.

In this study, metered consumption data of more than 67,000 non-domestic properties were linked to various databases and analysed in six categories. The aims of the study were to:

- Estimate the statistical properties and distributions of the data in each category.
- Identify the main factors that influence non-domestic water demand in each category.
- Develop a method to estimate the average consumption of a given number of non-domestic properties for a chosen level of confidence.

While detailed guidelines for the water demand of different non-domestic uses are often given in table form, these guidelines are only useful if the types and properties of these users

are known. However, this is not the case for new developments and even in existing developments the types of non-domestic consumers are not fixed, but change over time. Thus this study approached non-domestic consumption using a statistical approach, rather than at individual property level.

It is hoped that the result of this study will encourage similar research in other countries, allowing for comparison of non-domestic demand parameters and improved estimation of non-domestic demands.

Methodology

The data-set used in this study is the same as that used by Van Zyl *et al.* (2008) for a study on domestic water demand. It included water meter readings from forty-eight municipal treasury databases totalling more than 2.5 million records in four metropolitan areas (Johannesburg, Tshwane, Ekurhuleni and Cape Town) and 151 other cities and towns. The data is described in detail in Van Zyl *et al.* (2008).

Approximately 438,400 non-domestic consumer records were extracted from the database, and subjected to a number of verification tests to exclude anomalies. The remaining 67,291 records were then separated into six land use categories, namely:

- Business Commercial.
- Industrial.
- Government & Institutional.
- Education, including schools, universities and other educational buildings and their grounds.
- Agricultural holdings, which are large properties serviced by municipal water distribution systems. Agricultural holdings may be used for small scale farming, although alternative sources of water would often be used for this purpose. These properties are also called 'small farms' or 'residential farms'.
- Sports & Parks.

Information on possible factors influencing non-domestic demand was collected from various sources and linked to the demand data to allow correlations to be analysed. This information was obtained from municipal treasury databases (property area, property value and improvements, monthly meter readings), the South African Weather Service (rainfall, average daily minimum and maximum temperatures) and a manuscript on the surface water resources of South Africa (Midgley *et al.* 1994).

The AADD for each record in the database was estimated from twelve consecutive months of monthly consumption values. This means that seasonal demand variations did not influence the values, and errors due to differences in reading dates or erroneous reading would be small. The meter readings exclude demand from other sources, such as boreholes and grey water.

To ensure the integrity of the data, three data cleaning phases were implemented. In the first phase, records with inconsistent readings or dates (e.g. due to meter replacements or clock-overs) and records with less than 12 consecutive months of data were excluded. In the second phase, records or properties identified as unmetered, vacant, pre-paid, duplicate (including more than one type of land use) or not classified as one of the target non-domestic categories were excluded. In the third phase, stands with

Table 1. Ranges of property areas and values included in this study.

Land use category	Property area (m ²)	Property value (Euro)
Business Commercial	20–50,000	1400–7,000,000
Industrial	20–50,000	1400–7,000,000
Government & Institutional	100–50,000	1400–1,400,000
Educational	100–75,000	1400–1,400,000
Agricultural holdings	> 5000	1400–700,000
Sport and Parks	500–100,000	1400–1,400,000

unrealistically high or low property sizes or values (municipal valuation of the property) were excluded as detailed in Table 1.

The final database contained the following parameters for each record:

- Land use code and suburb.
- AADD, based on 12 consecutive months of consumption.
- Property size.
- Property value (including improvements).
- Urbanisation level (city or town).
- Geographic location (coastal or inland).
- Mean annual precipitation.
- Mean annual evaporation.
- Average minimum daily temperature.
- Average maximum daily temperature.

The database was then used as the basis for analysing non-domestic demand characteristics and influencing factors.

Non-domestic demand characteristics

In the first phase of the study, the statistical characteristics of the non-domestic demand categories were calculated. It was found that log-normal distributions fit the data remarkably well as shown on the distribution density and cumulative distribution functions in Figures 1 and 2 respectively. Although the lognormal distributions didn't fit the data perfectly (the Kolmogorov Smirnov test rejected normality in the data), they clearly provide reasonable descriptions of the data and are mostly conservative for larger demands.

Table 2 summarises the mean, median and lognormal distribution parameters of the different categories.

Due to the long high-end tail of lognormal distributions, the mean demands are considerably larger than the median demands in each category. The median demands for the different categories are compared in Figure 3. The figure shows that Business Commercial, Industrial, Agricultural holdings and Sports & Parks have remarkably similar median demands of between 1.5 and 1.7 kl/property/day.

Figure 2 confirms the similarity of the median values, and further shows that the distributions of Sports & Parks, Industrial and Business Commercial properties are also similar. While Agricultural holdings have a similar median demand as the other three categories, it has significantly lower variability.

The two outermost demand distributions are Educational on the higher side, and Government & Institutional users on the lower side, with median demands of 4.71 and 0.67 kl/property/day respectively.

To remove the impact of property size on the demand distributions, the AADD of each property was divided by its size to obtain the unit demand (measured in L/m²/day). The cumulative distributions are shown in Figure 4 and the mean and median values in Figure 5.

Figure 1. Demand frequency distributions for the non-domestic categories a) Business Commercial, b) Industrial, c) Government & Institutional, d) Educational, e) Agricultural holdings and f) Sports & Parks. In each graph the X-axis represents the natural logarithm of the AADD, and the Y-axis the number of properties.

Figure 2. Cumulative distribution functions with lognormal distributions for different non-domestic categories. Solid lines show the data and dotted lines the lognormal distributions.

Table 2. Statistical descriptors and lognormal distribution parameters of the different non-domestic demand categories.

Category	No. of data points	Mean AADD (kl/property/day)	Median AADD (kl/property/day)	Lognormal distribution parameters	
				Mean Ln (kl/property/day)	Standard deviation Ln(kl/property/day)
Business Commercial	30,850	6.83	1.52	0.4392	1.592
Industrial	10,851	13.99	1.72	0.5345	1.754
Government & Institutional	12,731	5.07	0.67	-0.2634	1.399
Educational	2146	13.29	4.71	1.4251	1.714
Agricultural holdings	9612	3.56	1.56	0.3631	1.241
Sports & Parks	1101	9.05	1.67	0.4044	2.033

Figure 3. Median demands of non-domestic categories. **Figure 4.** Cumulative distributions of non-domestic demand per unit area.

While Government & Institutional users had the lowest consumption per property (Figure 3), Figure 5 shows that they had the highest median demand per unit area. The median demand per unit area of educational users ranks much lower compared to its demand per property, most likely due to the large stands with school playgrounds, parking and sports facilities that are common at these institutions.

An interesting result is that the demand per unit area of Agricultural holdings is by far the lowest of all the non-domestic categories.

Factors influencing non-domestic demand

To analyse the various factors influencing non-domestic water demand, a stepwise multiple regression analysis was performed on the data, using the independent variables listed in the Methodology section, and including the natural logarithms of the property area and property value parameters. Table 3 shows the number of statistically significant parameters identified, as well as the three most important parameters for each category.

Figure 5. Mean and median demands per unit area for non-domestic categories.

Table 3. Most important factors influencing non-domestic demand.

Category	No. of data points	No. of significant parameters	Most important factors	Cumulative adjusted R^2
Business Commercial	24,810	8	Ln(property value)	0.230
			Ln(property area)	0.283
			Location	0.303
Industrial	8000	8	Ln(property area)	0.313
			Property value	0.330
			Location	0.345
Government & Institutional	8259	8	Ln(property area)	0.336
			Ln(property value)	0.373
			Property value	0.387
Education	1447	5	Ln(Property area)	0.408
			Development level	0.422
			Property value	0.437
Agricultural holdings	8895	6	Ln(property value)	0.096
			Ave minimum temperature	0.113
			Property area	0.118
Sports & Parks	367	4	Ln(Property area)	0.137
			Ave minimum temperature	0.176
			Development level	0.191

Property size emerged as the most important factor in all categories except for Business Commercial and Agricultural holdings. For Business Commercial, property size was the second most important factor (after property value), and for Agricultural holdings, the third most important factor (after property value and temperature).

Modelling the mean demand of k stands

The final aim of the study was to develop a model to predict the mean demand of k stands of a category at a given level of confidence. The theoretical question of finding a high quantile for a given probability level (95% was used in this study) of a sum of a given number of random variables seems to have received little attention in the statistical literature in the case where the distribution of the random variables is unspecified. This fact was

pointed out early by Watson and Gordon (1986), who investigated the relationship between the quantiles of a sum of two independent random variables and those of its components.

The problem was recently addressed by Klass and Nowicki (2010), but the method seems to only provide loose bounds not practically usable for the purposes of this study. Extensive work is reported by Nadarajah (2008) in the case where the distribution of the sum is parametrically defined, but the results related to the log-normal distribution cannot be applied to the consumption data of this study, for which the lognormal fit appears to be skewed by the weight of the upper tail of the empirical distributions.

Thus it was decided to adopt a heuristic approach based on discarding the highest values of the tail of the distribution, and then fitting an approximate model to the remaining cumulative distribution. In practical terms this means that a design based

on these values will not cater for properties with exceptionally high demands.

The model that was used has the form:

$$q_k = \mu + \frac{q_1 - \mu}{\sqrt{k}} \quad (1)$$

Where q_k is the design demand per property, μ the expected value of the distribution, q_1 the chosen percentile of the data, and k the number of properties.

The choice of the analytical form of the equation was guided by the following considerations:

- Compliance with the limit condition $q_k = q_1$ for $k = 1$, i.e. when only one property is selected, the design value should be at the chosen percentile of the original data.
- A decrease of the design value proportional to $1/\sqrt{k}$, by analogy to the decrease in the standard deviation.

The threshold value was determined by trading off two objectives: the first to discard as few data points as possible, and the second to find a suitable fit between the model and data. To achieve this, a data-set was first truncated at a given demand threshold, and the 95 percentile of the demand then determined as a function of the number of properties through Monte Carlo sampling. The model parameters giving the best fit to the 95-percentile curve were then estimated.

This model was only applied to the Business Commercial, Industrial and Agricultural holdings categories since, unlike the

other categories, these stands are normally grouped together. The demand threshold and model parameters determined for the three demand categories are summarised in Table 4, and the functions and data are shown in Figure 6 (for a certainty of 95% that they will not be exceeded).

Proposed design guideline

The models developed above provide a useful design guideline for Business Commercial, Industrial and Agricultural holdings developments where stands are grouped and the details of consumption are not known in advance.

The design mean demand for developments, based on a 95% certainty of non-exceedance, may be estimated using the equations:

Business commercial:

$$q_k = 3.806 + \frac{12.534}{\sqrt{k}} \quad (2)$$

Industrial:

$$q_k = 5.179 + \frac{17.853}{\sqrt{k}} \quad (3)$$

Agricultural holdings:

$$q_k = 2.276 + \frac{4.674}{\sqrt{k}} \quad (4)$$

Where q_k is the design AADD in kl/property/day and k the number of properties.

The design models, based on Monte Carlo sampling, are given in Figure 6. The models provide a good description of the demand behaviour, except for Commercial areas with less than six stands, where it is advisable to use the data points themselves.

As an example, consider a new industrial area with 50 stands. From Figure 6, the design demand can be estimated as 7.7 kl/property/day, or a total AADD of 385 kl/day for the 50 stands. This is significantly higher than the category mean demand of

Table 4. Model parameters for the 95 percentile curves.

Category	Demand threshold (kl/property/day)	Fraction of data excluded	q_1 (kl/property/day)	μ (kl/property/day)
Business Commercial	50	1.7%	16.340	3.806
Industrial	80	1.8%	23.032	5.179
Agricultural holdings	20	1.3%	6.950	2.276

Figure 6. Proposed design demand guidelines for Business Commercial, Industrial and Agricultural holdings properties.

5.2 kl/property/day, to accommodate the likelihood of a higher concentration of high-demand stands in the area.

Conclusion

This study analysed six categories of non-domestic demand in South Africa based on metered consumption data for a large number of stands. Basic statistical descriptors and distributions are reported and compared. The lognormal distribution was found to provide a good description of the demand distribution for all categories. A stepwise regression analysis was used to analyse various influencing factors, and property size was found to be the most important factor.

From the results obtained, guidelines for estimating water demand based on a 95% certainty of non-exceedance were developed for Business Commercial, Industrial and Agricultural property areas. It is hoped that this study will encourage comparative studies in other countries leading to a better understanding of the range of demand parameters and improved design guidelines for non-domestic water demand.

Acknowledgement

The authors would like to acknowledge the water demand data supplied by GLS Consulting.

Disclosure statement

No potential conflict of interest was reported by the authors.

Funding

Financial support for the project was provided by the Water Research Commission (Project K5/1525).

References

CSIR, 2003. *Guidelines for human settlement planning and design*. 3rd. Pretoria, South Africa: Council for Scientific and Industrial Research.

GLS, 2007. *Swift*. Available from: <http://www.gls.co.za/Gls/pages/swift/overview.html>.

Griffioen, M.L. and Van Zyl, J.E., 2014. Modelling water demand on a suburb level. *Journal of the South African Institution of Civil Engineering*, 56 (1), 63–68.

Husselmann, M.L. and Van Zyl, J.E., 2006. Effect of property size and income on residential water demand. *Journal of the South African Institution of Civil Engineering*, 48 (3), 12–16.

Jacobs, H.E., et al., 2004. Estimating residential water demand in Southern Africa. *Journal of the South African Institution of Civil Engineering*, 46 (4), 2–13.

Jacobs, H.E. and Fair, K.A., 2012. Evaluating a tool to increase information processing capacity for consumer water meter data. *South African Journal of Information Management*, 14 (1), 1–7.

Klass, M.J. and Nowicki, K., 2010. Uniformly accurate quantile bounds for sums of arbitrary independent random variables. *Journal of Theoretical Probability*, 23, 1068–1091.

Kollar, K.L. and Brewer, R., 1977. The impact of industrial water use on public water supplies. *Journal American Water Works Association*, 69 (9), 468–473.

McCuen, R.H., Sutherland, R.C., and Kim, J.R., 1975. Forecasting urban water use: Commercial establishments. *Journal American Water Works Association*, 67 (5), 239–244.

Midgley, D.C., Pitman, W.V., and Middleton, B.J., 1994. *Surface water resources of South Africa*. WRC Report No. 298/1/94. Water Research Commission, Pretoria, South Africa.

Nadarajah, S., 2008. A review of results on sums of random variables. *Acta Applicandae Mathematicae*, 103, 131–140.

Reynaud, Arnaud, 2003. An econometric estimation of industrial water demand in France. *Journal of Environmental and Resource Economics*, 25 (2), 213–232.

Stephenson, D. and Turner, K., 1996. Water demand patterns in Gauteng. *Institute of Municipal Engineering of Southern Africa*, 21 (1), 11–16.

Van Vuuren, S.J. and Van Beek, J.C., 1997. *Herevaluer van die Bestaande Riglyne vir Stedelike en Industriële Watervoorsiening gebaseer op Gemete Waterverbruik Fase 1: Pretoria Voorsieningsgebied* [Re-evaluation of the existing guidelines for urban and industrial water supply based on measured water demands. Phase 1: Pretoria supply area], WRC Report No. 705/1/97, Water Research Commission, Pretoria, South Africa.

Van Zyl, H.J., Illemobade, A.A., and Van Zyl, J.E., 2008. An improved area-based guideline for domestic water demand estimation in South Africa. *Water SA*, 34 (3), 381–392.

Watson, R. and Gordon, I., 1986. On quantiles of sums. *Australian Journal of Statistics*, 28 (2), 192–199.

Zhou, Y. and Tol, R.S.J., 2005. *Water use in China's domestic, industrial and agricultural sectors: An empirical analysis*. Working paper-67. FNU University, Hamburg, Germany.