Hydrology and
Earth System
Sciences

Open Access

Discussions

Interactive comment on "Household water use and conservation models using Monte Carlo techniques" *by* R. Cahill et al.

Anonymous Referee #2

Received and published: 16 May 2013

The authors present two models for estimating household water use: (1) an "existing conditions" model which is used to reproduce household water used in San Ramon, CA, and (2) a "least-cost conservation" model, which is used to estimate conservation savings under different water shortage scenarios. This research is important for addressing water scarcity challenges. The methods also illustrate practical way that water utilities can optimize their water conservation strategies.

The authors clearly identify the scope of previous research on this subject and the contribution of their research to the overall subject field. The assumptions of the model are clearly defined and based on previous work of others. The "existing conditions" model reproduces the CDF of household water use quite well in both summer and winter conditions. The "least-cost conservation" model is used to estimate an upper

Full Screen / Esc

Printer-friendly Version

Interactive Discussion

Discussion Paper

bound on the water savings of a customer base that minimizes its costs related to water use. The authors also identify useful insights based on the results of this model. For instance, they note which water-use efficiency improvements (such as high efficiency toilets or stress irrigation) could be most effective in conserving water under normal pricing. The model is also utilized to estimate the effectiveness of indoor device rebate programs.

There were some areas that were unclear to me, in particular with regards to the implementation of the integer programming model. While someone more familiar with this method may understand the implementation better, I nonetheless suggest some clarifications in my comments below. The manuscript is well written (though see typographical errors below) and I have no major comments.

Minor comments:

1. It would be useful to include a citation for the statistical approaches mentioned on page 4873, line 5.

2. I suggest the authors explicitly note the calibration strategy used for the existing conditions model (e.g., manual calibration) and that only one parameter needed tuning (the percentage of landscaped area that is lawn), which was fixed to the amount given by EBMUD in 2002.

3. The least-cost conservation model utilizes a Monte Carlo method, but I am unclear of the random variables that are sampled in each iteration.

4. It took me some time to understand the relationships and distinctions between the existing conditions model and least-cost conservation model (While Table 1 is very useful in illustrating what the models do, I'm referring to how the models are constructed and applied). I think that a more detailed written explanation of Figure 1 would clarify this issue, as well as reinforcing this distinction in a couple more locations as described in the following two notes.

5. In section 2.2 (P4877, L7), the authors state: "The 'least-cost conservation' component incorporates household behavior into the 'existing conditions' component." If I am understanding the model correctly, I think it would be more appropriate to state: "The results from the existing conditions model are used as a starting point (or original household water use) for the 'least-cost conservation' model". Since the models are somewhat intertwined, being more deliberate about such distinctions will help the reader. I suggest such a clarification be made in section 2.2 and in section 3.

6. In section 4.1 (P4884, L21), the authors state: "The results from 'base condition' runs are a benchmark for all alternative runs." I think it should be clarified that the base condition run is a run of the least-cost conservation model using prices from 2010. It should also be clear that the existing conditions model is the benchmark for understanding the savings from the base condition run. Then, in section 4.2, the above quoted sentence could be appropriately modified and included as: "The results from 'base conditions' runs are a benchmark for estimating the effectiveness of indoor device rebates."

7. In the integer programming optimization, I was expecting a constraint (section 3.3) connecting the water use U with water savings W, and water savings W with conservation actions S and L. I don't see how the optimization can work without this connection, and I think this connection should be more clearly noted within section 3.

I suggest that more details be added to some of the figures, in particular:

Figure 1: The inputs, processes, and outputs are not clearly defined in the figure, nor in the text that references it.

Figure 2: I suggest adding that the results in this figure are from the existing conditions model.

Figure 3: It is not fully clear whether these results are from winter, summer, or an average of the two.

C1822

Figure 7: I suggest clarifying that the money invested is invested as rebates (in other words, it is not the money invested by the household in purchasing the device).

Grammatical and typographic notes

1. Page 4870, line 4: remove comma

2. Page 4873, line 23: "...model *that* builds..."

3. Page 4874, line 6: the sentence wording should be reviewed (e.g., "of a models" changed to "from a model"?)

4. Page 4885, line 16: missing space at beginning of sentence

Interactive comment on Hydrol. Earth Syst. Sci. Discuss., 10, 4869, 2013.

Discussion Paper