ALLIANCE FOR WATER EFFICIENCY

WATER EFFICIENCY & CONSERVATION SYMPOSIUM 2024

AUGUST 6-8, 2024 | CHICAGO, IL

Water Loss: Policy, Planning, and Practice

Track A Room 210 3:15pm-4:00pm



Water Loss Policy: Reflecting on the Past, Assessing the Present, and Anticipating Future Advancements Drew Blackwell

Director of Water Efficiency, Cavanaugh & Associates, NC





Reflecting on the Past

- Beecher Report
- Evolution of M36, FWAS, and WRF L1V Guidance



Beecher Survey

SURVEY OF STATE AGENCY WATER LOSS REPORTING PRACTICES

FINAL REPORT TO THE AMERICAN WATER WORKS ASSOCIATION

January 2002

Prepared by Janice A. Beecher, Ph.D. Beecher Policy Research, Inc. FIGURE 1 Selected quoted standards from the States Survey Project



Source: Beecher Policy Research Inc., 2002 "Standards" are various forms of the inconsistently defined "unaccounted-for" water percentage indicator.



Beecher Survey Conclusions

The results of the survey and analysis, summarized in Table 3, suggest a fair amount of state and regional policy activity regarding the issue of water losses. However, the prevailing policies are not entirely clear, consistent, or operational. Most of the identified policies are raising much-needed awareness of the loss issue and promoting better accounting and reporting, but most do not necessarily impose consequences through incentive or enforcement mechanisms.

The findings confirm the need to refine the definitions, measures, and standards for evaluating water losses. A uniform approach, advanced and adopted by authoritative organizations in the water industry, could play a vital role in policy development. It is not uncommon for public policies to refer to authoritative sources with regard to technical standards, such as those that might be developed for water losses.

A precursor to further policy development is the establishment of a uniform system of water accounting and the collection of valid and reliable data on water losses. Better accounting will promote a common understanding of the water-loss issue, as well as appropriate benchmarks and standards. Eventually, best practices for water accounting and loss management may emerge and find reflection in water-loss policies, as future surveys might reveal.



Evolution of Industry Standards





Assessing the Present

- AWWA TEC Survey of Governmental Water Loss Policies
- Recent examples



AWWA's 2020 Position on NRW KPIs

AWWA Water Loss Control Committee Report – December 2019



Water utilities use performance indicators in their efforts to control water loss.

Citing flaws in traditional percentage indicators for nonrevenue water, AWWA favors other indicators some in development, some already in use.

AWWA outlines criteria for evaluating key performance indicators in its 2020 position statement.

out imagery by ArtistName/Shutterstock.com

JANUARY 2020 • VOL.112 • NO.1 11



2020 AWWA Water Audit Method – Water Audit Outputs and Key Performance Indicators: Uses and Limitations									
	Indicator	Description	Suitable Purposes						
Туре			Assessment	<u>Bench-</u> marking	Target- Setting	Planning	Tracking	Uses and Limitations	Principal Users
Attribute	Apparent Loss Volume	Calculated by Free Water Audit Software	\checkmark				\checkmark	Assess loss level	Utility, Regulators
	Apparent Loss Cost	Calculated by Free Water Audit Software	\checkmark				\checkmark	Assess loss cost level	Utility, Regulators
	Real Loss Volume	Calculated by Free Water Audit Software	\checkmark				\checkmark	Assess loss level	Utility, Regulators
	Real Loss Cost	Calculated by Free Water Audit Software	\checkmark				\checkmark	Assess loss cost level	Utility, Regulators
	Unavoidable Annual Real Loss (UARL)	Calculated by Free Water Audit Software	\checkmark				\checkmark	Reveal theoretical technical low level of leakage	Utility, Regulators
Volume	Unit Apparent losses (vol / conn / day)	Strong and understandable indicator for multiple users	\checkmark	~	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	Used for performance tracking and target-setting	Utilities Regulators
	Unit Real Losses ^A (vol / conn / day)	Strong and understandable indicator for multiple users	\checkmark	✓	\checkmark	~	\checkmark	Used for performance tracking and target-setting	Utilities, Regulators, Policy Makers
	Unit Real Losses ^B (vol / pipeline length / day)	Strong and understandable indicator for use by utilities with low connection density	√	✓	\checkmark	~	√	Data collection and assessment of systems with "low" connection density	Utilities, Regulators, Policy Makers
	Unit Total losses (vol / conn / day) New KPI	Strong and understandable indicator; suitable for high-level performance measurement	V				√	High level indicator for trend analysis. Not appropriate for target-setting or benchmarking	Utilities, Customers
	Infrastructure Leakage Index (ILI)	Robust, specialized ratio KPI; can be influenced by pressure and connection density.	V	√			~	Benchmarking after pressure management is implemented	Utilities
Value	Apparent Loss Cost Rate (value / conn / year) New KPI	Indicators with sufficient technical rigor. Provide the unit financial value of each type of loss, which is very useful for	\checkmark			√	\checkmark	Data collection and assessment on AWWA indicators or contextual parameters to use in conjunction with Loss Cost Rates	Utilities, Regulators, Customers
	Real Loss Cost Rate (value / conn / year) New KPI	planning and assessment of cost efficiency of water loss reduction and control interventions and programs.	√			√	√		Utilities, Regulators, Customers
Validity	Data Validity Tier (DVT)*	Strong indicator of water loss audit data quality, if data has been validated. Tier provides guidance on priority areas of activity.	V	√		√	√	Assess caliber of data inputs of the water audit	Regulators, Utilities

 Table 2
 AWWA Water Audit Method – Key Performance Indicators (2020)

Governmental Policies for Drinking Water Utility Water Loss Control

E.



Minimum Standards:

- AWWA M36 Water Balance
- Data Validity Assessment
- Level 1 Validation

💋 Minimum Standards:

- AWWA M36 Water Balance
- Data Validity Assessment
- No Level 1 Validation (Self-Reported)

Minimum Standards:

- AWWA M36 Water Balance
- No Data Validity Assessment
- No Level 1 Validation (Self-Reported)



The Good News

Increase in Water audit data submission

Increase in utilization of the AWWA Water Audit Methodology

The AWWA FWAS is the recognized tool for standardized water audit data collection

AWWA's key performance indicators have garnered considerable attention from agencies



Still Work to be Done

Most agencies do not use the AWWA FWAS as their water audit data collection tool

Most agencies do not require water audit data validation.

"Unaccounted-for" water percentage language is still the most common indicator in use.

Policy and program changes still pose a challenge.

Agencies without AWWA programs remain wed to a dated, imprecise methodology with limited change.



Opportunities for Improvement

Continued adoption of programs based on the AWWA Water Audit Methodology.

Wider embrace of AWWA's key performance indicators.

Establishment of consistent, rational, and workable performance targets for agencies to employ.

Capacity Development (TMF) Utilization

Means to monitor and evaluate agency program success and costeffectiveness.





4

States Requiring Level 1 Water Audit Validation (CA, GA, HI, IN, QBC, TX*)

States With Water Audit Validator Certification Programs (CA, GA, IN, QBC)







2

States Requiring Water Auditing without Level 1 Validation (CO, FL, NV, MN, NM, NV, TN, WI)

States with Pending Water Auditing Legislation (NJ, VA)



States Reviewing Current Water Loss Control Policy (NJ, WA)



AWWA Section Water Loss Control Committees, 1 State Established Committee (CA-NV, CO, GA, IN, KY-TN, NJ, SC, TX)







Anticipating Future Advancements

 Opportunities to Advance AWWA Best Practices



Opportunities to Advance AWWA Best Practices

Water loss training

Regulatory requirements

Water audits

Water conservation planning

Outreach to water utilities

Water loss control plan and implementation



Anticipating Future Advancements

- Continue to evolve water loss industry standard tools
- Increasing awareness in water loss control
- Innovative/Complimentary solutions such as Leakage Emissions Initiative
- Incentivizing the use of AWWA best practices
- Local regulations
- Continue collaborative nature of water loss control policymakers need expertise from water loss experts and the utilities themselves. Policy as inseparable from practical outcomes.



Thank you!

Drew Blackwell Director of Water Efficiency 336-250-1298 drew.blackwell@cavanaughsolutions.com





Putting It All Together: From Planning to Progress and Everything in Between Amy McNulty

Water Efficiency Manager, Irvine Ranch Water District, CA







WATER LOSS CONTROL PLAN

AWE CONSERVATION & WATER EFFICIENCY SYMPOSIUM

AUGUST 7, 2024 AMY MCNULTY IRVINE RANCH WATER DISTRICT

AGENDA

- Background
 - Foundational programs
 - Technical assistance
- Water Loss Control Plan
 - Purpose
 - Programs
 - Policy

'ine Ranch

Planned activities



ABOUT IRWD

A not-for-profit local public agency serving residents and businesses throughout central Orange County.



181 square miles 20% of Orange County





Irvine Lake Forest Newport Beach Tustin Costa Mesa Orange Unincorporated Orange County





BACKGROUND – FOUNDATIONAL PROGRAMS

- Proactive leak detection
- Lifetime based customer meter maintenance and replacement
- Annual supply meter testing (calibration)
- Annual water loss audits





BACKGROUND – TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE





DATA IMPROVEMENTS CAN CHANGE AUDIT RESULTS

	INDICATOR	FY 13-14	FY 14-15	FY 16-17	UNITS
	FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE INDICATORS				
1	Non-Revenue as % by volume of Water Supplied	10.7%	7.1%	6.8%	
2	Non-Revenue as percent by cost of operating system	14.7%	15.1%	17.1%	
3	Annual cost of Apparent Losses	\$1,275,162	\$714,816	\$828,315	Customer retail unit cost
4	Annual cost of Real Losses	\$3,756,605	\$3,672,216	\$3,200,547	Variable prod. cost
	OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCY PERFORMANCE INDICATORS				
5	Apparent Losses per service connection per day	12.7	7.4	6.8	gal /conn/day
6	Real Losses per service connection per day	38.1	28.3	20.8	gal /conn/day
7	Real Losses per service connection per day per PSI	0.5	0.3	0.3	gal/conn/day/ PSI
8	Unavoidable Annual Real Losses (UARL)	2,037	2,270	2,501	AF / yr
9	Current Annual Real Losses (CARL)	4,404	3,241	2,579	AF / yr
10	Infrastructure Leakage Index (CARL/UARL)	2.2	1.4	1.03	
	DATA VALIDITY PERFORMANCE INDICATOR				
11	Data Validity Score	75	78	76	scale 1- 100
and		IRWD Staff	Technical	Data	

Assistance

Validated

vine

WATER LOSS CONTROL PLAN PURPOSE

- Help plan, coordinate and manage activities related to water loss
- Provide support for program budget requests
- Incorporate results from water loss technical assistance
- Adapt programs to new data and technology
- Maintain a record of previous programs and activities







PLAN ORGANIZATION



28



WATER BALANCE

	Authorized Consumption	Billed Authorized	Billed Metered Consumption	Revenue Water
		Consumption	Billed Unmetered Consumption	
		Unbilled Authorized	Unbilled Metered Consumption	Non-Revenue Water
Water Supplied		Consumption	Unbilled Unmetered Consumption	
	Water Losses		Unauthorized Consumption	
		Apparent Losses	Customer Meter Inaccuracies	
			Data Handling Errors	
		Real L		

VIRVINE Ranch



APPARENT LOSSES







APPARENT LOSS PROGRAMS

- Meter replacement programs
 - Lifetime based on meter size
 - Performance based on read accuracy
- Meter tampering
- Unauthorized usage
 - Firelines
- Back billing





MALFUNCTIONING METERS



Double Zero & Field Test Results

Detection Criteria

- Double zero: register stops when last two digits are zeros.
 - Automatically sent for replacement without field test due to this known issue.
- Zero usage for two or three consecutive months, and previously had usage.
 - Meters are field tested and sent for replacement if not operating.



WATER & REVENUE LOSS PERFORMANCE BASED METER REPLACEMENT





UNAUTHORIZED USAGE

Common types

- Construction site and mobile unmetered hydrant use
- Meter boxes without meters

Pre-Construction Brochure

- Cross-connection dangers
- Do's and Don'ts
- District connection policy
- Escalating enforcement plan





PRIVATE FIRELINE USAGE

- ~ 4,500 private fireline accounts
- Billed based on:
 - Pipe diameter
 - Number of hydrants
 - Not billed for usage
- Target high use accounts
 - Unauthorized connections
 - Leaks
- Other issues

ne Ranch

- Bypass meters turned off or stolen
- Meters not read "90 route"



FIRELINE INVESTIGATIONS

- Out of 4,000 firelines
- 759 had high usage
- 176 investigated
- 43 had leaks

ie Ranch

• 16.58 AF measured on bypass meter since 2022



BACK BILLING

- Malfunctioning meters
 - Volume calculated based on historical use or peer group
- Firelines
 - 3 accounts have been billed
 - Construction rate \$3.25
 - Base rate \$2.65
 - Wasteful rate \$16.46
 - Pipe diameter multiplier







REAL LOSSES







38

REAL LOSS PROGRAMS

- Leak Detection Program
 - Acoustic walking residential and commercial development
 - Drive major arterial streets for mainlines
- Future
 - Considering sensors to monitor system pressure





DISTRICT POLICIES

IRWD Rules and Regulations

- Prohibits diversions, tampering and unpermitted fire hydrant connections
- Fireline use is for fire fighting only
 - All other use deemed wasteful
 - Subject to revocation of service which would require customer to provide fire watch protection

Rates and Charges

• Wasteful rate and non-compliance charges

<u>Future</u>

- Include language to address unauthorized connections to private firelines, leaks, and ownership/customer is always known
- Bill fireline usage routinely?

VIER BISTRICT

PLANNED ACTIVITIES AND PROGRAMS

- Technical activities
 - Water audit gap assessment
 - Leak simulation modeling
 - Component Analysis of Real Losses
 - Capital Improvement Plan
- Sewer pipe cleaning metering
- Firelines
- Policy
- Water Loss Control Plan updates
 - Align with 2-year budget cycle
 - Reflect new data, methods and technologies







QUESTIONS

4

Pilot Prep: Making the Most of Leak Detection & Recovery Work Kate Gasner

Vice President, Water Loss Consulting, E Source, OR



E Source Water Loss Consulting

Services for California Water Utilities

Kate Gasner, Vice President



We know utilities.

June 20, 2024 © Proprietary and confidential

Water Loss Consulting, E Source



Leakage Recovery Interventions

Surfaced Leal

Background Leakage

- Pressure reduction
- Main & service replacement
- Reduce # of joints and fittings

Unreported Leakage

- Pressure reduction
- Main & service replacement
- Reduce # of joints and fittings
- Proactive leak detection

Reported Leakage

- Pressure reduction
- Main & service replacement
- Optimized repair time

Leak Detection Technology Experience Unreported Leakage

Acoustic Survey



Manual Leak Detection

Acoustic Logger

Sensors deployed throughout system to capture leak noise

Remote Imaging Analysis



Satellite or Aerial

Images analyzed for

anomalies

District Metered Areas

Loss monitoring in sub-regions



Phases of Unreported Leakage Recovery Work





Planning & Preparation

- Main goals of leakage recovery pilot program?
- Mapping!
- Anticipated challenges?
- Team development and cross-department involvement
 - Operations; repair crews; customer service/public relations/marketing



Planning & Preparation





Deployment









Survey initiated.

Sensors installed and data collection and monitoring begins.

Satellite or aerial images captured and assessed.

DMAs "installed", data collection and monitoring begins



Investigation & Pinpointing

Area of Interest





Pinpointed location of suspected leak

Experience with sounding an area for leak noise is critical.

Repair

Leak Repair Crew Capacity?

Commitment to Repair or Threshold for Repair Action?

Special Budget for Pilot Leak Repair?

Unsurfacing Leaks!



Documentation

- What: Leak findings and leak characteristics (infrastructure failure type, flow rate, repair costs, etc)
- Where: which database?
 Existing or new? Work orders involved?
- Who: Field crews? Technology provider?
- When: Multiple points of data collection (leak finding, leak investigation, leak repair)

Analysis & Reflection

- Cost Data: Cost per leak found
 - Labor included?
 - Repair included?
- Savings Data:
 - Volume saved per leak found
 - Avoided leakage calculations (counter-factual data!?)
 - Value of water saved calculations?
- False positives
- False negatives
- Rate of findings

54

Phases of Unreported Leakage Recovery Work





Thank you!



Kate Gasner VP, Water Loss Consulting

E Source

415-533-0419 kate_gasner@esource.com



Audience Q&A

VIDENCY & COLORINATION

Please provide feedback on this session & continue the conversation in Whova!

Explore more

Add your thoughts

• Use the session chat function to

Uhova

ask questions, share your

insights, and more!

- Polling results
- Articles and resources speakers recommended
- Contact speakers



CEUs: Session is AWWA CA-NV WUEP eligible. Please see room monitor if applicable to you.

