

"This is the peer reviewed version of the following article: [Journal of Industrial Ecology, 2018, 22 (6), pp. 1413 - 1424], which has been published in final form at [\[https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/jiec.12705\]](https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1111/jiec.12705) This article may be used for non-commercial purposes in accordance with Wiley Terms and Conditions for Self-Archiving

## Urban Metabolism of Bangalore City: A Water Mass Balance Analysis

Reba Paul<sup>1</sup>, Steven Kenway<sup>2</sup>, Brian McIntosh<sup>3</sup> and Pierre Mukheibir<sup>4</sup>

### Address correspondence to:

Reba Paul

Doctoral Researcher and Research Assistant

Institute for Sustainable Futures (ISF)

University of Technology Sydney

Level 11, Building 10

235 Jones Street, Ultimo NSW 2007

Email: reba.paul@uts.edu.au

## Abstract

Cities are increasingly depending on energy intensive water sources such as distant rivers and the ocean to meet their water demand. However, such expensive sources could be avoided using alternative local sources of water such as wastewater, rainwater and stormwater. Many cities do not have robust accounts of those localized water resources, as estimating those resources requires comprehensive accounting in complex urban water systems. In this article, we investigated whether an urban metabolism evaluation framework built on the Urban Water Mass Balance can help analyze these resources, especially in a rapidly growing developing city. We first refined the water mass balance equation developed by Kenway et al. (2011) for a developing country context with the inclusion of some significant components such as system loss. Then we applied it to Bangalore city for the year 2013-2014 which is a rare mass balance analysis in a developing country. The refined equation helped analyze Bangalore urban water system. The total available wastewater, stormwater and rainwater were 656 ggaliters. The gap between water demand and supply could be met if 54% of this recycled potential were harnessed. Wastewater had enough potential (362 ggaliters) to replace the whole centralized water supply from the Cauvery. A scenario analysis showed that the gap between water demand and supply in 2021 can be met if 60% of total recycled potential is utilized. This approach can be used to other cities to identify the potential of alternative water sources and help integrated water planning and monitoring water metabolic performances.

**Keywords:** urban water accounting, system boundary, alternative water resources, water reuse, urban water planning, water performance indicator

## Introduction

The growing population, urbanization and global climate change will increase demand for water, energy and other resources. By 2050, about two third of the world's population will be living in cities or urban areas (UN 2014). In 2014, 54% of the world's population was already living in urban areas (UN 2014). Fast growing cities will be facing serious problems to meet basic services needed for their people in terms of limited world resources such as water, energy and nutrients. Further, the current practice of linear (without resource reuse) management of resources is pushing cities to depend on their hinterlands to cope with growing pressures of resource supplies, which in many cases requires substantial energy (Bai 2007; Kenway et al. 2011; Kennedy et al. 2011; Agudelo-Vera et al. 2012).

Water is a major resource in an urban system which requires dedicated management attention. In 1965, Abel Wolman pioneered the use of Urban Metabolism as an evaluation framework to analyse a hypothetical American city (New York) with one million population. Wolman developed this concept to address the water and air quality of American cities (Wolman 1965). His study included only the inputs of centralized flows of water managed by urban infrastructure and estimated that the input of water was 625000 tons/day for one million people in the United States of America compared to just 9500 tons and 2000 tons of fuel and wood respectively (Wolman 1965). Most of this inflow is discharged as wastewater with the remainder being lost by various human activities. His study showed that wastewater (outflow) represents between 75% and 100% of supplied water (inflow). This was further stressed by Larsen et al. (2016) in her review article on 'Emerging Solutions to the water challenges of an Urbanized World'. The huge percentage of this wastewater can be tapped to meet urban water

1  
2  
3 demand to avoid importing of remote water resources which involves substantial energy.  
4  
5 Again system loss from a centralized urban water system is very significant in many  
6  
7 developing cities from 30-50% example for Bangalore city (CSE 2011; Raj et al. 2013; Mehta  
8  
9 et al. 2014; Kingdom et al. 2012) This water loss has also high potential to reduce water demand  
10  
11 in supply main.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

18 Few cities globally have a comprehensive accounting of their urban water resources.  
19  
20 Systematic quantification requires good data and a thorough understanding of resources  
21  
22 available (Kennedy et al. 2010; Kenway et al. 2011; Renouf et al. 2016). An urban  
23  
24 metabolism framework provides a broader picture of resources flow as well as quantitative  
25  
26 analysis of all inputs and outputs, stock of water, energy, waste, nutrients and other  
27  
28 materials (Wolman 1965; Kennedy et al. 2010; Kenway et al. 2011). This can be used as a  
29  
30 conceptual and analytical framework (Kenway et al. 2011, Renouf et al. 2016; Farooqui et al.  
31  
32 2016).  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38

39 There are many approaches and methods for analyzing resources flow in urban water  
40  
41 systems such as 'Life Cycle Assessment (LCA)', 'Environmental Footprints' and 'Integrated  
42  
43 Water Cycle Modelling'. LCA quantifies the resource use embodied in goods and services in  
44  
45 an urban system (such as water and energy foot prints), 'Environmental Footprints'  
46  
47 originates in LCA, and the Inputs-Outputs analysis is a top-down method to quantify  
48  
49 resources flows through an entire urban entity or economy (both direct and indirect flows).  
50  
51 Integrated Water Cycle Modelling considers a water system within an urban entity such as a  
52  
53 precinct but not the entire urban entity or whole economy (Bach et al. 2014).  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 Urban metabolism can be used at different scales from global to city and household  
4 levels (Agudelo-Vera et al. 2012) and can generate inventories of resources flow (water,  
5 energy, nutrients/pollutants, carbon and other materials) over time with trends of resource  
6 utilization (Kennedy et al. 2007). Such accounting also helps compare from city to city  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13 (Kennedy et al. 2015).  
14  
15  
16

17 Since Wolman (1965), several studies have been undertaken on Urban Metabolism,  
18 however few focused on water (Kenway et al. 2011; Hermanowicz and Asano 1999; Baker et al.  
19 2001; Thériault and Laroche 2009; Kenway et al. 2011). Kenway et al. (2011) developed a  
20 comprehensive Water Mass Balance Framework for a better understanding of water and related  
21 energy and material flows in cities, however system losses were not incorporated and can be a  
22 significant component of an urban water mass balance in a developing city. There are also other  
23 flows in a developing city such as water supplied by various water retailers (Raj 2013) which are  
24 important. Moreover, urban water mass balance analysis has been done so far for a limited  
25 number of cities as real case studies (Kenway et al. 2011; Farooqui et al. 2016).  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41 Consequently, in this study, we first refine the original water mass balance developed by  
42 Kenway et al. (2011) for a developing country context. Then we apply this to Bangalore, a fast  
43 growing developing city, as a real case study.  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

## 50 Literature Review

51  
52  
53  
54

55 Studies on Urban Metabolism focusing on water after Wolman were done in  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 the cities of Hong Kong, Toronto, Tokyo, Vienna, Brussels, London, Cape Town, Sydney as  
4 well as other Australian cities (Duvigneaud and Denaeyer-De Smet 1997; Hendriks et al. 2003;  
5 Gasson 2002; Chrysoulakis et al. 2015; Chartered Institute of Waste Management 2002;  
6 Sahely 2003; Gandy 2004; Kennedy et al. 2007, Decker et al. 2000; Browne et al. 2011;  
7 Kenway et al. 2011; Holmes and Pincetl 2012; Renouf and Kenway 2016). Kennedy et al.  
8 (2010) did an extensive literature review on Urban Metabolism which included more than 50  
9 papers on cities from eight global regions. His study showed that most Urban Metabolism  
10 studies had focused on the quantification of flows of energy, wastes, nutrients, materials,  
11 food, greenhouse gas emissions (GHG), food and eco-foot prints (Bhole 1994; Zucehetto 1995;  
12 Hanya and Ambe 1976; Nilson 1995; Huang 1998; Warren-Rhodes and Koenig 2001; Barrett et  
13 al. 2002; Baker et al. 2001; Gasson 2002; Zhang et al. 2009; Forkes 2007; Barles 2009). Only  
14 three papers in his study focused on water (Hermanowicz and Asano 1999; Baker et al. 2009;  
15 Gandy 2009). Some studies in his literature review were related to livability (Newman et al.  
16 1999) and eco-efficiency (Zhang and Yang 2007) and others were on comprehensive  
17 metabolism study (Newcombe et al. 1978 and Stimson et al. 1999). The per capita water use  
18 and wastewater flow of some cities as reported in Kennedy et al. (2007) (figure 1) illustrates that  
19 urban metabolism of cities (example for Sydney, Hong Kong from available data) are increasing  
20 over time. In the case of Toronto, the per capita water use declined over 1990s from 1970s which  
21 was due to reduction in industrial water consumption (Kennedy et al. 2007).




Figure 1: Inputs and Outputs of water flows in selected cities (Source: Kennedy et al. 2007)

Note: t/cap/yr. = tons/capita/year. One ton (t) =  $10^3$  kilograms (weight of 1 kiloliter water).

So t/cap/yr. can be represented in volume as kL/cap/yr.

A comprehensive Water Mass Balance considering all components of an urban water cycle (rainwater, imported supply, decentralized water, wastewater, stormwater, evapotranspiration, groundwater recharge and water reuse) rather counting just inputs and outputs as a whole (figure 1) is of utmost importance for better understanding of urban water metabolism of cities facing increased water scarcities so as to find alternative local water sources and quantify their recycling potentials. But past studies followed the method of Materials Flow Analysis (MFA). A MFA provides 1) the overall mass fluxes of resources (energy, materials, food and pollutants such as nutrients, carbon), 2) helps understand the use of resources and their trends over time, and 3) assists environmental reporting (Kennedy et al. 2007; Kenway et al. 2011; Renouf et al. 2016). But when it comes to water, MFA cannot integrate individual flows such as decentralized water supplies, or hydrological flows such as rainwater, groundwater infiltration, surface runoff, and evapotranspiration so cannot provide information for the improved and holistic management of water resources. This was first



1  
2  
3 understood by Kenway et al. (2011), who developed a comprehensive Urban Water Mass  
4  
5 Balance Framework for a better understanding of water and related energy and material flows in  
6  
7 a city.  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 Kenway et al (2011) explained the critical importance of a clear system boundary to  
13  
14 define the volume flowing across the boundary and volume stored within the boundary, as  
15  
16 shown in figure 2a (Kenway et al. 2011). If B is a defined system boundary and A is the  
17  
18 boundary area with a depth d, water mass balance based on principles of mass conservation is  
19  
20 inputs ( $Q_i$ ) minus outputs ( $Q_o$ ) and the change in storage (volume or mass)  $\Delta S$  in the system  
21  
22 boundary over a time period  $t_1-t_2$  can be expressed in equation (1).  
23  
24  
25

$$26 \quad \Delta S = (S_{t1}-S_{t2}) = Q_i(t_1-t_2) - Q_o(t_1-t_2) \text{ ----- (1)}$$

27  
28  
29 For a particular system, if time interval and system boundary have been defined and all  
30  
31 units are expressed as volumes or masses flowing through per unit time, equation (1) can be  
32  
33 simplified as follows:  
34  
35  
36

$$37 \quad \Delta S = Q_i - Q_o \text{ ----- (2)}$$

38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




Figure 2: a) Defining System Boundary and b) Water Mass Balance Framework considering groundwater under the urban entity and storages outside the urban entity (Sources: adapted from Kenway et al. 2011).

In Figure 2b,

P - Precipitation or rainfall

ET- Evapotranspiration

C - Centralized water supply

S - Water stored by different subsystems

W – Wastewater

Rs- Stormwater runoff G - Groundwater

Dr - Decentralized water from rainwater

Dg- Decentralized water from groundwater

Rs - Surface runoff

Following equation 2,  $S = Q_i - Q_o$

1  
2  
3 From figure 2b,  $S = (P+C+Dr+Dg) - (W+Rs +G+ET)$

4  
5  
6 S can be further defined as  $S = \sum Qi$  (sum of all inflows) -  $\sum Qo$  (sum of all outflows)

7  
8  
9  
10 Kenway et al. (2011) used this comprehensive urban water mass balance framework for  
11 real case studies in Australian cities (Melbourne, Sydney, Brisbane, Gold Coast and Perth)  
12 to assess the potential of alternative water supply options to augment centralized inputs and  
13 reduce outputs. The framework included alternative sources of water such as rainwater,  
14 surface runoff, wastewater, decentralized water supply, evapotranspiration and groundwater  
15 infiltration. Recently this framework was further refined by Farooqui et al. (2016) by  
16 incorporating other flows such as decentralized recycled water within and outside an urban  
17 system. But Renouf et al. (2016) reported that the framework has further scope to develop by  
18 incorporating water use for ecosystem services. But they did not still underscore how this  
19 framework can be fit into a developing country context.  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35

36 Every city has its unique characteristics in respect to its water management and  
37 geographical location. Urban Water Metabolism Evaluation Framework (UWMF) may differ  
38 based on a city's typology (system boundary, types of water supplies/inputs, uses, reuses,  
39 losses, scales, time and other factors). Further past studies followed different scales, approaches  
40 and perspectives of UWMF (Kenway et al. 2011 and Farooqui et al. 2016). Moreover, the  
41 latest UWMF still does not include components such as system loss which is a significant  
42 flow component of UWMF (30-50%) in developing countries and also in some other parts of  
43 the world (CSE 2011; Kingdom et al. 2012; Raj 2013; Mehta et al. 2014). It also has large  
44 impact on hydrological cycle. One evidence is the study done by Mehta et al. (2014). He used  
45 Lump Model under a social-ecological framework, considering the loss of water from city  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 pipelines and city return flows with a number of assumptions because of the unavailability of  
4  
5 data to measure the groundwater recharge and variation in groundwater table in Bangalore. His  
6  
7 study found that the ground water table in Bangalore has increased in the core city area but not  
8  
9 in the periphery of the city where people experience more shortage of water and extract  
10  
11 ground water (Mehta et al. 2014). Kenway et al. (2011) also strongly recommended for  
12  
13 incorporation of such components within a defined system boundary to get better mass  
14  
15 balance results. Among other water flows in developing countries, water supplied by retailers  
16  
17 or water tankers are increasing when the utilities are failing to provide adequate water supply to  
18  
19 the city people. Such components need to be included in UWMF for a comprehensive water  
20  
21 mass balance analysis. In this study, we have refined the Urban Metabolism framework built  
22  
23 on Water Mass Balance developed by Kenway et al. (2011) by incorporating system loss and  
24  
25 other supplies to fit into a developing country context.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 Kenway et al. (2011) identified that a system boundary helps incorporate all water  
35  
36 inputs and outputs within an urban water system. Prior to Kenway et al. (2007), Water  
37  
38 Balance of an urban catchment was described by Mitchell et al. (2003) and Sahely et al.  
39  
40 (2003). They made efforts to include key inputs and outputs, but they excluded many  
41  
42 components in absence of a system boundary in their analysis. Again, Mitchell et al. (2003)  
43  
44 used a water balance equation to know the hydrological performance of a catchment but not the  
45  
46 performance of an urban entity. Sahely et al. (2003) however, used it for cities; no system  
47  
48 boundary was followed except for the 'greater Toronto' area and they used wastewater and  
49  
50 storm water as a joint output, with other flows not clearly incorporated. In 1991, Baccini and  
51  
52 Brunner developed MFA which was able to quantify the stocks and flows of resources in terms  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 of mass but it also did not consider a system boundary. In this study, selection of a system  
4  
5 boundary was given due importance to incorporate all inputs and outputs in Bangalore city.  
6  
7  
8  
9

10 Kenway et al. (2011) also developed some performance indicators such 'supply  
11 centralization', 'Centralized supply replaceability' and 'total water use replaceability' of  
12  
13 wastewater, rainwater and stormwater and developed methods to calculate these indicators  
14  
15 for a city (table 1). They applied these indicators in a number of Australian cities and found  
16  
17 variation from 0.1-22% in rainfall harvesting, 257-397% in centralized replaceability by  
18  
19 rainfall, 26-86% replaceability potential of wastewater recycling, 47-104% in stormwater  
20  
21 reuses potential and 1-4% in reuse of anthropogenic inputs water in 2004-2005. These  
22  
23 indicators illustrate that these cities are not designed appropriately to use the full potential of  
24  
25 these substantial flows and those are rather dependent on centralized fresh water supplies. But  
26  
27 Perth is an exception where recycled water is used to a great extent (Kenway et al. 2011). As  
28  
29 mentioned earlier a UWMF depends on various factors for a particular urban setting and  
30  
31 considerations of various water flows in and outside of a city. The new indicators could be  
32  
33 evolved, for example for 'water loss recovery' and could become important urban water  
34  
35 performance indicators in a developing country context.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45

46 The literature review found that a Urban Metabolism Framework built on Water  
47  
48 Mass Balance is useful to analyse complex urban water systems, but this framework has not  
49  
50 yet been tested with real cases in developing countries, for example the Urban Water  
51  
52 Metabolism Evaluation framework (UWMF) of Kenway et al. (2011) refined by Farooqui et al.  
53  
54 (2016) was tested for a hypothetical urban development area in Australia. In this study, we have  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 applied the refined Urban Metabolism framework/equation to Bangalore, a fast growing  
4  
5 developing city as a real case example.  
6  
7  
8  
9

## 10 **Background of Bangalore City**

11  
12  
13  
14  
15 Bangalore (officially called Bengaluru, the capital of Karnataka State in South India) is a  
16  
17 mega city situated in inland, in the middle of a semi- arid region of India. It is one of the fastest  
18  
19 growing city in India and the population was 8.5 million in 2011(Census of India. 2011). It is a  
20  
21 hub for education, IT & BT industries, sophisticated high tech health care and many MNC  
22  
23 industries and has nice climate which attract people to the city. The city is naturally water scarce  
24  
25 and has no perennial source of water in the city except some seasonal lakes and waterbodies  
26  
27 which are now polluted (CSE 2011; Lele et al. 2013; CGWB 2011). Groundwater is  
28  
29 overexploited and polluted by nitrates, pathogens and other contaminants (Mehta et al. 2013).  
30  
31 The water bodies have been filled up from rapid urbanization. The city now brings water from a  
32  
33 distant freshwater source (the Cauvery River, 100 km away and 500 meter below the city)  
34  
35 without due consideration of energy and cost, a disregard for the conflicts over the shared  
36  
37 river between its four states for irrigation, hydropower, water supply and other needs, and  
38  
39 dismissal of the process' ecological footprints (Gronwall, 2008, Novotny, 2010). BWSSB  
40  
41 spends 60-70% of their annual operating budget for energy to provide water services to the  
42  
43 people (CSE 2011; IBM 2010). The Cauvery Water Dispute Tribunal has earmarked 1,470  
44  
45 MLD or 600 Cusec for Bangalore city for its water supply (CSE 2011; Lele et al. 2013). There  
46  
47 is no further scope for Bangalore to withdraw water from the Cauvery River as per the Tribunal  
48  
49 agreement (Raj, 2013). However, Bangalore is still looking for more abstraction of water  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 from the Cauvery (Raj 2013).  
4  
5  
6

7  
8 Bangalore also faces power crisis, and the city is dependent on its State Karnataka to  
9 supply energy. On May 6, 2014, the Energy Minister announced that the current daily power  
10 cuts would vary from 2-6 hours across the state. In Bangalore core area it was two hours daily,  
11 with northern Bangalore influenced the most with more than six hours without power daily.  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17 (The Times of India 2014; The Hindu 2014).  
18  
19  
20  
21

22 Neither Bangalore nor any other city in India enjoys a 24 hour continuous water supply.  
23  
24 The piped water supply in Bangalore is intermittent and available only for a few hours a day  
25 (World Bank 2013; Raj 2013). Even the wealthy in Bangalore receive 2-4 hours water supply on  
26 alternate days ((Raj 2013). The rich install expensive water tanks, pumps and filters while the  
27 poor struggle to access water (World Bank 2013; Raj 2013). Further people in Bangalore has  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32 low per capita water consumption (75 lpcd) which is much below the requisite standard 150-200  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60  
61  
62  
63  
64  
65  
66  
67  
68  
69  
70  
71  
72  
73  
74  
75  
76  
77  
78  
79  
80  
81  
82  
83  
84  
85  
86  
87  
88  
89  
90  
91  
92  
93  
94  
95  
96  
97  
98  
99  
100  
101  
102  
103  
104  
105  
106  
107  
108  
109  
110  
111  
112  
113  
114  
115  
116  
117  
118  
119  
120  
121  
122  
123  
124  
125  
126  
127  
128  
129  
130  
131  
132  
133  
134  
135  
136  
137  
138  
139  
140  
141  
142  
143  
144  
145  
146  
147  
148  
149  
150  
151  
152  
153  
154  
155  
156  
157  
158  
159  
160  
161  
162  
163  
164  
165  
166  
167  
168  
169  
170  
171  
172  
173  
174  
175  
176  
177  
178  
179  
180  
181  
182  
183  
184  
185  
186  
187  
188  
189  
190  
191  
192  
193  
194  
195  
196  
197  
198  
199  
200  
201  
202  
203  
204  
205  
206  
207  
208  
209  
210  
211  
212  
213  
214  
215  
216  
217  
218  
219  
220  
221  
222  
223  
224  
225  
226  
227  
228  
229  
230  
231  
232  
233  
234  
235  
236  
237  
238  
239  
240  
241  
242  
243  
244  
245  
246  
247  
248  
249  
250  
251  
252  
253  
254  
255  
256  
257  
258  
259  
260  
261  
262  
263  
264  
265  
266  
267  
268  
269  
270  
271  
272  
273  
274  
275  
276  
277  
278  
279  
280  
281  
282  
283  
284  
285  
286  
287  
288  
289  
290  
291  
292  
293  
294  
295  
296  
297  
298  
299  
300  
301  
302  
303  
304  
305  
306  
307  
308  
309  
310  
311  
312  
313  
314  
315  
316  
317  
318  
319  
320  
321  
322  
323  
324  
325  
326  
327  
328  
329  
330  
331  
332  
333  
334  
335  
336  
337  
338  
339  
340  
341  
342  
343  
344  
345  
346  
347  
348  
349  
350  
351  
352  
353  
354  
355  
356  
357  
358  
359  
360  
361  
362  
363  
364  
365  
366  
367  
368  
369  
370  
371  
372  
373  
374  
375  
376  
377  
378  
379  
380  
381  
382  
383  
384  
385  
386  
387  
388  
389  
390  
391  
392  
393  
394  
395  
396  
397  
398  
399  
400  
401  
402  
403  
404  
405  
406  
407  
408  
409  
410  
411  
412  
413  
414  
415  
416  
417  
418  
419  
420  
421  
422  
423  
424  
425  
426  
427  
428  
429  
430  
431  
432  
433  
434  
435  
436  
437  
438  
439  
440  
441  
442  
443  
444  
445  
446  
447  
448  
449  
450  
451  
452  
453  
454  
455  
456  
457  
458  
459  
460  
461  
462  
463  
464  
465  
466  
467  
468  
469  
470  
471  
472  
473  
474  
475  
476  
477  
478  
479  
480  
481  
482  
483  
484  
485  
486  
487  
488  
489  
490  
491  
492  
493  
494  
495  
496  
497  
498  
499  
500  
501  
502  
503  
504  
505  
506  
507  
508  
509  
510  
511  
512  
513  
514  
515  
516  
517  
518  
519  
520  
521  
522  
523  
524  
525  
526  
527  
528  
529  
530  
531  
532  
533  
534  
535  
536  
537  
538  
539  
540  
541  
542  
543  
544  
545  
546  
547  
548  
549  
550  
551  
552  
553  
554  
555  
556  
557  
558  
559  
560  
561  
562  
563  
564  
565  
566  
567  
568  
569  
570  
571  
572  
573  
574  
575  
576  
577  
578  
579  
580  
581  
582  
583  
584  
585  
586  
587  
588  
589  
590  
591  
592  
593  
594  
595  
596  
597  
598  
599  
600  
601  
602  
603  
604  
605  
606  
607  
608  
609  
610  
611  
612  
613  
614  
615  
616  
617  
618  
619  
620  
621  
622  
623  
624  
625  
626  
627  
628  
629  
630  
631  
632  
633  
634  
635  
636  
637  
638  
639  
640  
641  
642  
643  
644  
645  
646  
647  
648  
649  
650  
651  
652  
653  
654  
655  
656  
657  
658  
659  
660  
661  
662  
663  
664  
665  
666  
667  
668  
669  
670  
671  
672  
673  
674  
675  
676  
677  
678  
679  
680  
681  
682  
683  
684  
685  
686  
687  
688  
689  
690  
691  
692  
693  
694  
695  
696  
697  
698  
699  
700  
701  
702  
703  
704  
705  
706  
707  
708  
709  
710  
711  
712  
713  
714  
715  
716  
717  
718  
719  
720  
721  
722  
723  
724  
725  
726  
727  
728  
729  
730  
731  
732  
733  
734  
735  
736  
737  
738  
739  
740  
741  
742  
743  
744  
745  
746  
747  
748  
749  
750  
751  
752  
753  
754  
755  
756  
757  
758  
759  
760  
761  
762  
763  
764  
765  
766  
767  
768  
769  
770  
771  
772  
773  
774  
775  
776  
777  
778  
779  
780  
781  
782  
783  
784  
785  
786  
787  
788  
789  
790  
791  
792  
793  
794  
795  
796  
797  
798  
799  
800  
801  
802  
803  
804  
805  
806  
807  
808  
809  
810  
811  
812  
813  
814  
815  
816  
817  
818  
819  
820  
821  
822  
823  
824  
825  
826  
827  
828  
829  
830  
831  
832  
833  
834  
835  
836  
837  
838  
839  
840  
841  
842  
843  
844  
845  
846  
847  
848  
849  
850  
851  
852  
853  
854  
855  
856  
857  
858  
859  
860  
861  
862  
863  
864  
865  
866  
867  
868  
869  
870  
871  
872  
873  
874  
875  
876  
877  
878  
879  
880  
881  
882  
883  
884  
885  
886  
887  
888  
889  
890  
891  
892  
893  
894  
895  
896  
897  
898  
899  
900  
901  
902  
903  
904  
905  
906  
907  
908  
909  
910  
911  
912  
913  
914  
915  
916  
917  
918  
919  
920  
921  
922  
923  
924  
925  
926  
927  
928  
929  
930  
931  
932  
933  
934  
935  
936  
937  
938  
939  
940  
941  
942  
943  
944  
945  
946  
947  
948  
949  
950  
951  
952  
953  
954  
955  
956  
957  
958  
959  
960  
961  
962  
963  
964  
965  
966  
967  
968  
969  
970  
971  
972  
973  
974  
975  
976  
977  
978  
979  
980  
981  
982  
983  
984  
985  
986  
987  
988  
989  
990  
991  
992  
993  
994  
995  
996  
997  
998  
999  
1000

## Methodology

### *Selecting System Boundary*

Identifying a system boundary is very important for a comprehensive water mass

1  
2  
3 balance analysis that considers all inflows and outflows within and throughout a city (Kenway  
4 et al. 2008)]. In this study, we define the system boundary as the core of Bangalore city and the  
5 adjacent built up area that is the Bangalore Water Supply and Sewerage Board (BWSSB)  
6 service area, called greater Bangalore, including 1 km under ground level (figureS 1). The sub-  
7 system boundaries have been identified as Water Treatment Plants (WTPs), Wastewater  
8 Treatment Plants (WWTPs), various sub-sectors or land uses such as residential, commercial,  
9 industrial, public and semi-public institutions, parks and open space, transport and  
10 communication, agriculture and lakes and ponds. Water storage outside the city and ground  
11 water aquifers beneath the city has not been considered part of the system. The inflows into  
12 and outflows from the city through natural waterbodies and streams have also been excluded  
13 in order to separate the city from the natural environment, as done by Kenway et al. (2011).  
14 The subsystem boundaries and their percentages compared to the system boundary are shown  
15 in table S 1. These values were used for the calculation of sub-boundary precipitation,  
16 runoff and groundwater recharge. The land use by WTP and WWTP were considered as  
17 negligible compared to the area of the system boundary, which is 800 sq.km(BWSSB 2013).  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60






Figure 3: Water Mass Balance Evaluation Framework (Refinement of original framework developed by Kenway et al. (2011) to apply for a developing country context)

In figure 4,

$P$  = Precipitation or Rainfall

$ET$  = Evapotranspiration

$C$  = Centralized water supply

$S$  = Water stored or utilized by different subsystems

$W$  = Wastewater flow

$Rs$  = Stormwater runoff

$G$  = Groundwater flow/recharge

$Dr$  = Decentralized rainwater supply

$Dg$  = Decentralized groundwater supply

Dsw = Decentralized surface water supply by private retailers/tankers

C<sub>ufw</sub>= System loss/leakages (Unaccounted for Water/Non-Revenue Water)

Rs= Surface water runoff Rw = Recycled water

$$S = (P+C+Dr+Dg +Dsw+Rw) - (W+Rs + G+ET+ C_{ufw})$$

Table 1: Performance indicators and their definition under the study

Indicators	Method	Formula
Water System Centralization Supply centralization (%)	Centralized Supply/Total Water Use	$C/(C+D)*100$
Rainfall Harvesting (%)	Decentralized sources/rainfall	$D/P*100$
Rainfall Potential for Water Supply Centralized supply replaceability (%) Total Use Replaceability (%)	Rainfall/Centralized water supplied Rainfall/Total Use	$P/C*100$ $P/(C+D)*100$
Wastewater Potential for Water Supply Centralized Supply Replaceability (%) Total Use Replaceability (%)	Wastewater Flow/Centralized water supplied Wastewater Flow/Total Water Use	$W/C*100$ $W/(C+D)*100$
Stormwater Potential for Water Supply Centralized Supply Replaceability (%) Total Use Replaceability (%)	Stormwater flow/centralized water supplied Stormwater flow/Total Water Supplied	$Rs/C*100$ $Rs/(C+D)*100$
Wastewater and stormwater combined Potential of 'total water use Replaceability' (%)	(Wastewater+stormwater)/ Total water use	$(W+Rs)/(C+D)*100$
Water Loss Recovery Potential of 'total water use Replaceability' (%)	Water Loss/Total water use	$C_{ufw}/(C+D)*100$

Source: Adapted from Kenway et al. (2011)

Note- C = Total Centralized Water Supply, D=Total Decentralized Water Supply, P= Rainfall, W=Wastewater Flow, Rs= Stormwater Runoff , C<sub>ufw</sub>= Unaccounted For Water

### ***Data collection and Interpretation***

Both secondary and primary data were collected based on the Water Mass Balance Framework described in figure 3, developed from the original framework by Kenway et al. (2011) (figure 2), and have been discussed in details in the supplementary Information.

Based on the availability of data, the time period for the study was considered as 2013-2014 (Jan-Dec).

The area of the system boundary, population, decentralized water supply, groundwater supply and other parameters were collected from various research reports, journals and official Information. The primary data for centralized water supply, wastewater generation and wastewater reuse, and rainfall for the year 2013-2014 was collected from Bangalore Water Supply and Sewerage Board (BWSSB) and Meteorological Centre, Bangalore and other government Information. These have been discussed in details in supplementary Information.

The water cycle in Bangalore is managed by various organizations such as BWSSB (responsible for water supply and sewerage), CGWB (groundwater monitoring and management), BBMP (Bhurat Bangalore Mahanagar Pallika) (stormwater drainage and solid waste management), Bangalore Development Authority (BDA) (city planning), private water suppliers and self-suppliers with overlapping responsibilities. There is no central water database for the city water supply which made measuring various inputs and outputs a challenging task.

1  
2  
3 Rainwater use, negligible compared to total water supply, was calculated based on  
4 rainwater plants installed in Bangalore city and assumed an average plant discussed in details in  
5 supplementary Information.  
6  
7  
8  
9

10  
11  
12 Measuring groundwater recharge was difficult due to the unavailability of continuous  
13 water table monitoring data in Bangalore city. It was therefore calculated following the  
14 detailed Guidelines for Implementing Groundwater Estimation Methodology (CGWB 2009)  
15 and the Groundwater Resource Estimation Methodology (GEM) Report -1997 (MoWR 2009)  
16 recommended by Groundwater Resource Estimation Committee (MoWR 2009) elaborated in  
17 supplementary information.  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26

27  
28  
29 The runoff coefficient for various land uses have been used for this study based on the  
30 typical values of runoff coefficients in an urban area as elaborated in Chapter-11 of the Urban  
31 Drainage Book (Butler and Davies 2011). Evapotranspiration for sub-boundaries has been  
32 calculated with the following formula from respective values:  $ET = P - R - G$ .  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39

## 40 **Results and Discussion**

41  
42  
43  
44  
45 The collected primary and secondary data were used for the water mass balance  
46 analysis of Bangalore city using the water mass balance equation described in methodology  
47 section and also mentioned below. The results of this analysis have been shown in table 2.  
48  
49 All inputs and outputs are considered in the analysis (details of water mass balance flow chart  
50 can be seen in figure S 5). The equation was applied to both system and sub-system  
51 boundaries, and found a positive change of 130.58 ggaliters (GL) in the storage of the city  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3 system:

4  
5  $S = \text{Inflows} - \text{Outflows}$

6  
7  
8  $S = (P + C + Dr + Dg + Ds + Rw) - (W + Rs + G + ET + C_{ufw})$

9  
10  $S = (77.6 + 356.3 + 0.004 + 288.4 + 23.73 + 2.9) - (362 + 40 + 4.4 + 33.28 + 178.6)$

11  
12  $= (749) - (618)$

13  
14  $= 131 \text{ GL}$

15  
16  
17  
18  
19 One Gigaliter (GL) =  $10^9$  liters (L)  $\approx 2.64 \times 10^8$  gallons (gal).

20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25 In reality inputs should be equal to outputs (Kenway et al. 2011). The high value of  
26  
27 change in storage may be due to some errors in calculation when quantifying the ground  
28  
29 water recharge value, use of assumed runoff co-efficient and other data inaccuracy. Further,  
30  
31 only data for the year 2013-2014 were used due to data unavailability. The data accuracy,  
32  
33 appropriate runoff coefficient in respect to Bangalore geography and soil situation, and a  
34  
35 longer timeframe for data could provide better results of water mass balance equation.  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40

41  
42 The total water availability of rainwater, stormwater and wastewater was 656 Giga liters  
43  
44 (GL) during the year 2013-2014 considering full reuse potential.  
45  
46  
47

48  
49 The water performance indicators were derived based on the formula described in table 1,  
50  
51 the results of which have been tabulated in table 3 and table 4.  
52  
53  
54

55  
56 The 'water supply centralization' of Bangalore city was 52% which illustrates that the  
57  
58  
59  
60

Bangalore water supply system is not fully centralized. About 48% of water demand is met from groundwater and other sources. The ‘total water use replaceability’ of wastewater was 55% and centralized replaceability was 107% which means the amount of wastewater (362 GL) could solely replace present centralized water supply in 2013 ( 356 GL), imported from the Cauvery river. The ‘total use replaceability’ of alternative rainwater and stormwater was 12% and 6%, respectively, which illustrates that 78 GL and 40 GL could be used as inputs in the whole urban system from these two sources. The replaceability potential of wastewater (362 GL) is about 5 times and 9 times higher than rainwater (78 GL) and stormwater (40 GL), respectively, which indicates Bangalore is a dry city.

Table 2: Inputs (Qi) and Outputs (Qo) of Bangalore city for the year 2013-2014

Inputs	Population (Million)	Area (Sq. km)	Centralized Surface Water Supply (GL/a)	Decentralized Groundwater Supply (GL/a)	Decentralized Surface Water Supply (GL/a)	Decentralized rainwater supply(rainwater tank) (GL/a)	Rainfall on Surface (GL/a)	Reuse of Wastewater (G/a)	
	9.5	800	356	288	24	0.004	78	3	
Outputs	Population (Million)	Area	Partially Treated Waste water Flow (GL/a)	Non-Treated Wastewater Flow (GL/a)	Treated Wastewater Flow (GL/a)	Surface Runoff (GL/a)	System Loss (GL/a)	Ground Water Recharge (GL/a)	Evapo-Transpiration (GL/a)
	9.5	800	167	171	24	40	179	4.4	33

Note: GL/a =Gigaliter/annum

The total inputs (749 GL) and outputs (618 GL) of Bangalore city and their different components have been shown in figure 4.




Figure 4: Inputs and Outputs of water in Bangalore city for the year 2013-1014.

Table 3: Centralized Supply Replaceability/ Supply Substitution of alternative sources of water including loss in the system for the year 2013-2014

Supply	% of potential replaceability/substitution of water supply						
	% of Total C/(C+D) *100	of Rain Water (P/C*100)	Storm Water (RS/C*100)	Waste Water (W/C*100)	Unaccounted For Water (UFW)/Non-Revenue Water (NRW)	Waste water and Rainwater (W+P/C* 100)	All alternative waters (W+P+Rs)/ C*100
Centralized	52	23	12	107	53	130	195

Table 4: 'Total Use Replaceability'/ Supply Substitution of alternative sources of water including loss in the system for the year 2013-2014

Supply	% of Total	% of potential replaceability/substitution of water supply					
		Rainwater	Storm Water	Waste Water	Unaccounted For Water (UFW)/ NRW	Wastewater and rainwater	All Alternative Waters
	$\frac{C}{C+D} * 100$	$\frac{P}{(C+D)} * 100$	$\frac{R_s}{(C+D)} * 100$	$\frac{W}{(C+D)} * 100$	$\frac{Cufw}{(C+D)} * 100$	$\frac{(W+P)}{(C+D)} * 100$	$\frac{(W+P+R_s)}{C} * 100$
Total Use	100	8	6	55	27	63	90

A new significant indicator was found for Bangalore city which is derived from system loss and has been termed here as 'Water Loss Recovery'. The 'total use replaceability' potential from 'Water Loss Recovery' was 27% and centralized replaceability was 53% shown in table 3 and table 4 which indicates that 179 GL could be used as inputs in the system (table 2). From this and earlier discussions, it is evident that wastewater recycling and improving water efficiency in the water supply network have good potential for augmenting water in the system.

Investigation of roof rainwater harvesting potential in Bangalore city found that out of total rainwater potential, the roof surface available in Bangalore currently can harvest 14 GL annually (BWSSB 2013, Citizen Charter, BWSSB and Rainwater Guidelines BWSSB). If we consider this potential of rainwater, the total potential of roof rainwater harvesting, stormwater and wastewater recycling and loss recovery stands at 550 GL annually or 46 GL monthly or 1.5 GL daily.



1  
2  
3 A scenario analysis was done using various water performance indicators and the  
4 current and projected water demand of Bangalore city as discussed in supplementary  
5 Information. The water demand in Bangalore in 2013 was 1260 million liters per day (MLD);  
6 the actual water supply was 927 MLD as found from primary data and thus the actual gap  
7 was 815 MLD (considering water received by the end users after system loss). It was found  
8 that this gap could easily be met if even 54% of recycling potential was utilized. The actual  
9 water supply in 2014 was 754 MLD (adding 500 MLD Cauvery Stage-IV Phase-II-supply and  
10 53% UFW) and the actual gap was 675 MLD. This gap could be met if 45% of recycling  
11 potential was utilized. The water demand of Bangalore is expected to rise to 1650 MLD in  
12 2021 as estimated based on Population growth by the census of Bangalore city with the  
13 addition of 10% more slum dwellers and using 120 lpcd. The gap between water demand and  
14 supply in 2021 was calculated as 895 MLD (if present UFW 53% prevails). This gap can easily  
15 be met if 60% of recycling potential is used.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

It was observed that a single source of water such as wastewater or rainwater or stormwater or system loss alone cannot meet the water demand of Bangalore. An integrated management of rainwater, stormwater and wastewater is of utmost importance along with current centralized water supply and system loss recovery is essential. This can avoid import of water from distant river the Cauvery and save energy. Recycling of water can ensure increased water security and reliability, and provide environmental benefits through reduction of water pollution and improvement in ecosystems.

## Conclusion

Many cities around the world do not have robust accounts of all alternative resources of water in their water systems. The first question of this study was to explore a suitable framework or method to apply in Bangalore city, a rapidly growing developing city which faces serious water stress, to quantify all of its alternative water resources. The refined urban water mass balance framework originally developed by Kenway et al. (2011) was found to be very useful in a developing country context, and could be used also as a physical model (Water Mass Balance Flow Chart in figure S 5). The new addition to the original equation was system loss which is a significant component of water mass balance in a developing country and other water supplies by private retailers, which is common in developing countries. It also included centralized recycled water though it is not common practice in developing countries. Because of a lack of data, decentralized recycled water was assumed 'zero'. The system boundary and the refined framework helped calculate all inflows and outflows within and outside Bangalore city. The high figure of water mass balance may be due to some errors in calculation especially those for quantifying the groundwater recharge value, which can be further studied. Moreover, data on decentralized recycled water can provide more accurate mass balance figure.

The second question was to explore how the refined water mass balance equation can improve accounting of all sources of water and help planners, engineers, water managers and policy makers improve the city water performance and management. The analysis found that the wastewater solely had the potential of 362 GL which was enough to replace centralized water supply (338 GL) However, it was found that a single alternative

1  
2  
3 source either rainwater or storm water or wastewater has not potential to meet the total water  
4 demand in Bangalore city. An integrated water management of all waters sources, including  
5 present centralized supply, and improving the efficiency of the water supply network to  
6 recover system loss is essential. This can avoid further withdrawal of water from the  
7 Cauvery River and reduce the energy cost to provide water services.  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17

18 The water performance indicators will help engineers and water managers to monitor  
19 water performance of Bangalore city and follow various strategies to improve its overall  
20 performance over time. The robust accounting followed in this study is not only important for  
21 Bangalore but also for other cities especially fast growing cities in developing countries which  
22 are facing serious water shortages and moving towards distant river sources or deep aquifers or  
23 seawater to meet demand.  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33

34 For improved results, more accurate data on groundwater infiltration rates and  
35 various coefficients based on local situations and decentralized water use from various sources  
36 were needed. Further this water mass balance needs to be updated as cities grow both  
37 horizontally and vertically with time.  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## Acknowledgement

This study was done by Reba Paul under her joint Master's Program on 'Integrated Water Management' between the University of Queensland, University of Western Australia, Monash University, Griffith University and International Water Centre. The study was funded by International Water Centre in Australia and Global Water Partnership at Stockholm, Sweden. The authors greatly acknowledge the support of Bangalore Water Supply and Sewerage Board (BWSSB) with providing data and information to enable this study especially Mr. S.M. Ravisankar, Former Chairman of BWSSB for his kind cooperation and instruction to the officials in accessing data. The authors provide their sincere gratitude to Dr. P.N. Ravindra, Executive Engineer, BWSSB; Mr. V.C. Kumar, Executive Engineer, BWSSB; Mr. Guru P. Srinath, Technical Assistant to Chief Engineer, Cauvery Division and his assistant or data keeper Mr. Eswara and other officials in BWSSB to make necessary data available for this study. The authors also thank the anonymous reviewers and their feedback particularly Erika Whillas for proof reading of part of the article at some stage and Gautam Joshii for his kind support to facilitate field work in Bangalore. The authors extend hearty thanks to Mr. V. C. Kumar for his kind support to Ms. Paul for her field visit to a number of wastewater treatment plants and access data. The authors finally thank the University of Queensland to use the wonder library facilities to access valuable journals for the study. Dr. Kenway acknowledges DECRA funding DE 160101322.

## References

- Agudelo-Vera, C. M., W. R. Leduc, A. R. Mels, and H. H. M., Rijnaarts. 2012. Harvesting urban resources towards more resilient cities. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling* 64: 3-12.
- Alberti, M. 1996. Measuring urban sustainability. *Environmental impact assessment review* 16(4-6):381-424
- Baccini, P. and P. H. Brunner. 1991. *Metabolism of the Anthroposphere (10-46)*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg.
- Bach, P. M., W. Rauch, P. S. Mikkelsen, D. T. McCarthy, and A. Deletic. 2014. A critical review of integrated urban water modelling—Urban drainage and beyond. *Environmental Modelling & Software* 54: 88-107
- Bai, X. 2007. Industrial Ecology and the Global Impacts of Cities. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*.
- Baker, L. A., D. Hope, Y. Xu, J. Edmonds, and L. Lauver. 2001. Nitrogen balance for the Central Arizona–Phoenix (CAP) ecosystem. *Ecosystems* 4(6): 582-602.
- Barles, S. 2009. Urban metabolism of Paris and its region. *Journal of Industrial Ecology*, 13(6):898-913
- Barrett, J., H. Vallack, A. Jones, and G. Haq. 2002. A material flow analysis and ecological footprint of York. *Stockholm, Stockholm Environment Institute*.
- Bohle, H.G. 1994. Metropolitan food systems in developing countries: The perspective of Urban Metabolism. *GeoJournal* 34(3):245-251
- Browne, D., B. O'Regan, and R. Moles. 2009. Assessment of total urban metabolism and metabolic inefficiency in an Irish city-region. *Waste Management* 29(10):2765-2771
- Center for Science and Environment (CSE). 2011. *Water waste Portrait*, viewed on 10 November 2013 at [http://cseindia.org/userfiles/bangaluru\\_portrait.pdf](http://cseindia.org/userfiles/bangaluru_portrait.pdf).
- Chartered Institute of Wastes Management (CIWM). 2002. *A Resource Flow and Ecological Footprint Analysis of Greater London*. Best Foot Forward, London.
- City Development Authority (CDA). 2009. *Bangalore Master Plan 2015*. Bangalore, India.
- Deccan Herald. 2013. *Only 44,000 houses in City have RWH*. published on 26 Feb. [www.deccanherald.com/content/315171/only-44000-houses-city-have.html](http://www.deccanherald.com/content/315171/only-44000-houses-city-have.html). Accessed on 3<sup>rd</sup> April, 2014
- Decker, E. H., S. Elliott, F. A. Smith, D. R. Blake, and F. S. Rowland. 2000. Energy and material

1  
2  
3 flow through the urban ecosystem. *Annual review of energy and the environment* 25.  
4

5  
6 Duvigneaud, P., and S. Denayer-De Smet. 1977. The urban ecosystem of Brussels.  
7 L'Ecosystème Urbs, in L'Ecosystème Urbain Bruxellois, in Productivité en Belgique. In:  
8 Duvigneaud, P., Kestemont, P. (Eds.), Travaux de la Section Belge du Programme Biologique  
9 International Bruxelles 581-597  
10

11  
12 ETH Globe. 2010. *Future Cities*. International Edition. Zurich  
13

14  
15 Færge, J., J. Magid, and F. W. P. de Vries. 2001. Urban nutrient balance for  
16 Bangkok. *Ecological modelling* 139(1): 63-74.  
17

18  
19 Farooqi, M. A. 2011. Groundwater Management in Bangalore: Impact of Municipal Waste  
20 Disposal Practices on Groundwater Quality. *Journal of the Geological Society of India*  
21 78(5): 488-489  
22

23  
24 Farooqui, T. A., M. A. Renouf, and S. J. Kenway. 2016. A metabolism perspective on  
25 alternative urban water servicing options using water mass balance. *Water research* 106:  
26 415-428  
27

28  
29 Gandy, M. 2004. Rethinking urban metabolism: water, space and the modern city. *City* 8(3),  
30 363-379.  
31

32  
33 Gasson, B. 2002. The ecological footprint of Cape Town: Unsustainable resource use and  
34 planning implications. Paper presented a National Conference of the South African  
35 Planning Institution, 18-20 September, Durban, South Africa  
36

37  
38 Gronwall, J.T., M. Mulenga, and G. McGranahan. 2010. *Groundwater, self-supply and*  
39 *poor urban dwellers: A review with case studies of Bangalore and Lusaka.*  
40 Human Settlements Working Paper Series, Water and Sanitation 26, International  
41 Institute for Environment and Development, London, UK.  
42

43  
44 Hanya, T. and Y. Ambe. 1976. A Study on the Metabolism of Cities, In: *Science for a Better*  
45 *Environment*. HSEC, Science Council of Japan, 228-233  
46

47  
48 Hermanowicz, S.W. and T. Asano. 1999. Abel Wolman's "The Metabolism of Cities" revisited: a  
49 case for water recycling and reuse. *Water Science and Technology* 40(4-5): 29-36  
50

51  
52 Hegde, G. V. and K.S. Chandra. 2012. Resource availability for water supply to Bangalore city,  
53 Karnataka." *Current Science (Bangalore)* 102(8): 1102-1104.  
54

55  
56 Hendriks, C., R. Obernosterer, D. Müller, S. Kytzia, P. Baccini, and P. H. Brunner. 2000.  
57 Material flow analysis: a tool to support environmental policy decision making. Case-  
58 studies on the city of Vienna and the Swiss lowlands. *Local Environment* 5(3): 311-328.  
59

60  
Holmes, T. and S. Pincetl. 2012. Urban metabolism literature review. *Los Angeles, California*

Centre for Sustainable Communities at UCLA.

- International Business Machines (IBM). 2010. *Rain to Drain: A roadmap to gaining control over water resource management using Information management and predictive analytics*. NY, USA.
- Kennedy, C., J. Cuddihy, and J. Engel-Yan. 2007. The changing metabolism of cities. *Journal of industrial ecology* 11(2): 43-59
- Kennedy, C., S. Pincetl, and P. Bunje. 2011. The study of urban metabolism and its applications to urban planning and design. *Environmental pollution* 159(8):1965-1973.
- Kenway, S., A. Gregory and J. McMahon. 2011. Urban water mass balance analysis. *Journal of Industrial Ecology* 15(5): 693-706.
- Kenway, S. J. 2013. *The water-energy nexus and urban metabolism-Connections in cities*. Brisbane: Urban Water Security Research Alliance.
- Kenway, S., J. McMahon, V. Elmer, S. Conrad, and J. Rosenblum. 2013. Managing water-related energy in future cities—a research and policy roadmap. *Journal of Water and Climate Change*, 4(3), 161-175.
- Kingdom, B., R. Liemberger, and P. Marin. 2006. *The challenge of reducing non-revenue water (NRW) in developing countries. How the private sector can help: A look at performance-based service contracting*. World Bank Group; Water Supply & Sanitation Sector Board; PPIAF, Discussion Paper Series, 8, Washington DC. USA
- Lele, S., V. Srinivasan, P. Jamwal, B.Thomas, M. Eswar, and T. Zuhail. 2013. *Water Management in Arkabhaty River: A Situation Analysis, Environment and Development*, Working paper No-1, Ashoka Trust for Research in Ecology and the Environment (ATREE), Bangalore, Karnataka, India.
- Mitchell, V.G., R. G. Mein, and T. A. McMahon. 2001. Modelling the urban water cycle. *Environmental Modelling & Software* 16(7), 615-629
- Newcombe, K., J. D. Kalma, and A. R. Aston. 1978. The metabolism of a city: the case of Hong Kong. *Ambio* 3-15
- Newman, P. W. 1999. Sustainability and cities: extending the metabolism model. *Landscape and urban planning* 44(4): 219-226.
- Nilsson, J. 1995. A phosphorus budget for a Swedish municipality. *Journal of Environmental Management* 45(3): 243-253.



- 1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60
- Novotny, V., V. Elmer, H. Furumai, S. Kenway, and O. Phills. 2010. *Water and Energy Footprints for sustainable communities*, International Water Association. Monteval, Canada.
- Mehta, V. K., R. Goswami, E. Kemp-Benedict, S. Muddu, and D. Malghan. 2014. Metabolic urbanism and environmental justice: the water conundrum in Bangalore, India. *Environmental Justice*, 7(5):130-137
- Pincetl, S., P. Bunje, and T. Holmes 2012. An expanded urban metabolism method: Toward a systems approach for assessing urban energy processes and causes. *Landscape and urban planning* 107(3):193-202.
- Raj, K. 2013. *Where All the Water has gone? An Analysis of Unreliable Water Supply in BangaloreCity*. Working Paper, Institute of Social and Economic Change (ISEC). Bangalore, India
- Rapoport, E. 2011. *Interdisciplinary Perspectives on Urban Metabolism. A Review of Literature*. UCI Environmental Institute Working Paper. London: University College London, Development Planning Unit.
- Renouf, M., S. Kenway, S. Seroo-Neumann, and D. Low Choy. 2016. *Urban Metabolism for Planning Water Sensitive Cities: Concept for an Urban Water Metabolism Framework*. Victoria: Cooperative Research Centre for Water Sensitive Cities.
- Sahely, H. R., S. Dudding, and C.A. Kennedy. 2003. Estimating the urban metabolism of Canadian cities: GTA case study. *Canadian Journal for Civil Engineering* 30: 468–483.
- Schulz, N.B. 2007. The direct material inputs into Singapore's development. *Journal of Industrial Ecology* 11 (2): 117-131.
- Stimson, R., J. Western, P. Mullins, and R. Simpson. 1999. Urban metabolism as a framework for investigating quality of life and sustainable development in the Brisbane-Southeast Queensland Metro region. *Urban quality of life: Critical issues and options* 43-168
- The Hindu. 2014. Karnataka resorts to load-shedding. [www.thehindu.com/todays paper/tp\\_national/karnataka-resorts-to-loadshedding/article5980608.ece](http://www.thehindu.com/todays-paper/tp-national/karnataka-resorts-to-loadshedding/article5980608.ece). Accessed May 2014.
- The Times of India. 2014. Karnataka to face two-hour long power cuts daily. <http://timesofindia.indiatimes.com/city/bengaluru/Karnataka-to-face-two-hour-long-power-cuts-daily/articleshow/34706488.cms?>. Accessed on May 2014
- Theriault, J. and A.M. Laroche. 2009. Evaluation of the urban hydrologic metabolism of the Greater Moncton region, New Brunswick. *Canadian Water Resources Journal* 34 (3):255-268.



- 1  
2  
3 United Nations (UN). 2014. *World Urbanization Prospects The 2014 Revision*  
4 *Highlights*. Economic and Social Affairs, New York, USA  
5  
6  
7 Warren-Rhodes, K. and A. Koenig. 2001. Escalating Trends in the Urban  
8 Metabolism of Hong Kong: 1971–1997, *AMBIO: A Journal of the Human*  
9 *Environment*, 30(7):429-438.  
10  
11 Van Leeuwen, C. J., J. Frijns, A. Van Wezel, and F. H. M. Van De Ven. 2012. City  
12 Blueprints: 24 Indicators To Assess The Sustainability of The Urban Water  
13 Cycle. *Water Resources Management*, 26, 2177-2197.  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19 World Bank. 2013. Karnataka: Three Towns Pilot 24/7 Water Supply.  
20 <http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2013/01/01/karnatak>  
21 [a-three-towns-pilot-water-supply](http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/feature/2013/01/01/karnatak). Accessed April 2014.  
22  
23  
24 Zhang, Y. and Z. Yang. 2007. Eco-efficiency of urban material metabolism: a case study in  
25 Shenzhen, China. *Acta Ecologica Sinica* 27 (8): 3124-3131.  
26  
27  
28 Zucchetto, J. 1975. Energy, economic theory and mathematical models for combining the  
29 systems of man and nature. Case study, the urban region of Miami. *Ecological*  
30 *Modelling* 1, 241-268  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

## About the Authors

1. Reba Paul was a Masters Student at University of Queensland, Australia when the article was written. Now she is a PhD Student and Research Assistant at Institute for Sustainable Futures (ISF) in the University of Technology Sydney (UTS), Australia.
2. Steven Kenway is an Associate Professor and Research Group Leader for Water-Energy-Carbon Group at School of Chemical Engineering in University of Queensland (UQ), Brisbane, Australia.
3. Brian McIntosh is an Education Director at International Water Centre (IWC) and Senior Lecturer at University of Queensland (UQ), Brisbane, Australia.
4. Pierre Mukheibir is an Associate Professor and Research Director at Institute for Sustainable Futures (ISF) in the University of Technology Sydney (UTS), Australia

**Supplementary Information****Urban Metabolism of Bangalore City: A Water Mass Balance Analysis**Reba Paul<sup>1</sup>, Steven Kenway<sup>2</sup>, Brian McIntosh<sup>3</sup> and Pierre Mukheibir<sup>4</sup>**Address correspondence to:**

Reba Paul

Doctoral Researcher and Research Assistant

Institute for Sustainable Futures (ISF)

University of Technology Sydney

Level 11, Building 10

235 Jones Street, Ultimo NSW 2007

Email: reba.paul@uts.edu.au

## Summary

This document discusses 1) system and sub-systems boundaries how those were selected 2) all primary and secondary data collected and how those interpreted and used for water mass balance analysis 3) water mass balance analysis of Bangalore city (can be interpreted as a physical model) 4) various performance indicators to monitor metabolic performances of Bangalore city and 5) a scenario analysis presenting the future challenges of Bangalore city in respect of water demand and supply and how those can be met from harnessing alternative sources of water and stop for further withdrawal of water from the Cauvery river which involves more than 60% of their annual operating budget (CSE 2011; IBM 2010 and BWSSB 2014) for energy.

## Selection of System boundary and Boundaries and data collection

### *System Boundary*

Identifying a 'system boundary' was very important to include all water data in a system (both inputs and outputs). A large city usually has three to four different boundaries – a) the core city or area, b) the built up area adjacent to the core area, c) the metropolitan area, and d) extended planning region (Satterthwaite 2008 and Kenway 2013). In this research, the core city and adjacent built up are (BWSSB service area) shown in figure S1 has been considered as the system boundary. The system boundary was taken as the service area of Bangalore Water Supply and Sewerage Board (BWSSB) which is 800 sq.km (BWSSB 2013).






Figure S 1: System Boundary for Water Mass Balance Analysis for Bangalore city (BWSSB 2013) (Bangalore Water Supply and Sewerage Board Service Area (800 sq. km) showing various features such as building, open space, green space, transport network (considered as system boundary with 1km under the ground level) (Sources: Google Earth)

### *Sub-system boundaries and their areas*

The sub-system boundaries within system boundary were taken as Water Treatment Plants (WTPs), Wastewater Treatment Plants (WWTPs), various sub-sectors such as residential, commercial, industrial, public and semi-public institutions, parks and open space, transport and communication, agriculture, lakes and ponds. The subsystem boundary areas and their percentages against system boundary have been calculated in table S1 based on land use in Bangalore city in table S3 and System Boundary (figure S1). These values were used for calculation for sub-boundary precipitation, runoff and groundwater recharge.

Assumptions: The areas of WTPs and WWTPs were assumed minimal or zero compared to areas of other sub-systems.

Table S 1: Sub-systems boundaries and their areas

Land Use	Area (sq.km)	Distribution (%)
Residential	243.7	30.5
Commercial	16.4	2.0
Industrial	38.4	4.8
Institutional and Public	166.0	20.7
Transport and	117.0	14.7
Open and green space	100.0	12.5
Tank and lakes	39.2	4.8
<u>Agricultural areas</u>	<u>117.6</u>	<u>14.7</u>
Total	800	100

Source: CDA 2009 and BDA 2011

### ***Organizations responsible for water supply and sewerage services***

The water cycle in Bangalore is managed by various organisations such as BWSSB (responsible for water supply and sewerage), CGWB (groundwater monitoring and management), BBMP (Bruhut, Bangalore, Mahanagar, Pallika (stormwater drainage and solid waste management), Bangalore Development Authority (BDA) (city planning), private water suppliers (sell water) and self-suppliers with overlapping responsibilities and there is no central water database for water. This makes measuring of various inputs and outputs a challenging task (BWSSB 2013; CGWB 2009; Department of Water Resources 2011; GEC 1997; CGWB 2009).

### ***Population and percentage of built up area in Bangalore over last 40 years***

The evaluation of density of population and Percentage of built-up (concrete) Area in Bangalore in last 40 years is shown in table S2. BWSSB 2013 and Hedge and Subhash 2012 report that due to rapid urbanization, most rainfall, over 90%, flows to lakes and open water bodies with groundwater recharge being reduced to 5% or even less. Due to decreased vegetation, evapotranspiration has also decreased to 5% or even less.

Table S 2: Population and change in built-up (concrete) Area in Bangalore over last 40 years

Year	Population (in millions)	Built up or concrete area
1971	1.7	20
1981	2.9	26
1991	4.1	39
2001	5.7	69
2011	8.5	No area

Source: Census of India 2011 and Hedge and Subhash 2012

As per Census of India (2011) the growth rate during 2001-2011 was of 47.2% (Census of India 2011). The population of the BWSSB service area (800.29 km<sup>2</sup>) was 8.5 million in 2011 and 5.7 million in 2001 (Census 2001 and census 2011). The total population figure includes a 10% urban slum population (KSCB 1999 and Mallick 2009) but actual slum population is an urban agglomeration<sup>1</sup>. About 90.94% of people live in the city core/municipal area and only 9.06% live in rural areas (Census of India 2011). Considering the growth rate 47.2% over 2001-2011, the total population in Bangalore service area in 2013-2014 can be calculated as 9.5 million and in 2014 is 10 million (indianonlinepages 2014). Assuming the same growth rate and including all slum population, the population of Bangalore city can reach 12.5 million by 2021.

Precipitation/Rainfall (P) BWSSB 2013 and Hedge 2012 report that due to rapid urbanization, most rainfall, over 90%, flows to lakes and open water bodies with groundwater recharge being reduced to 5% or even less. Due to decreased vegetation, evapotranspiration has also decreased to 5% or even less.

Bangalore has a dry and tropical climate with four seasons. The city receives an average annual rainfall of 830-970 mm. The average annual rainfall over the past 100 years was 972 mm (BWSSB 2013 and Meteorological Centre Bangalore 2014). Climate change however can affect average annual

<sup>1</sup> Urban agglomeration is known as an extended city/town area consisting of the built-up area of a central core of city (in this case core area is BMP/municipal area) and any district or suburbs linked by continuous urban area (ULB and 110 villages).



precipitation and actual evapotranspiration with extreme drought and flood (Gronwall 2008 and IIHS 2014). Rainfall in Bangalore is irregular but sometime causes urban floods especially during monsoons (June-November) (IIHS 2012). Bangalore experiences flood from heavy rainfall (IIFS 2014). The monthly rainfall varies and number of rainy days are 60 (Vishwanath 2012, BWSSB 2013 and Meteorological Centre Bangalore 2014.). Large parts of Bangalore are characterized by undulating terrain having a natural gradient with low hills and a number of valleys (Gronwall 2008).

### Land Use in Bangalore City

The land use data in Bangalore city was taken from Bangalore Master Plan 2015 (CDA 2009) which is mentioned in table S3.

Table S 3: Land Use in Bangalore City

Land Use	Land use (2011) <sup>1</sup> (sq.km)	Distribution (%)	Land use in 2003 (sq.km)	Distribution %
Residential	243.7	43.2	159.8	37.9
Commercial	16.4	2.9	12.8	3.0
Industrial	38.4	6.8	58.8	13.9
<i>Public:</i>				
Open space	77.9	13.8	13.1	3.1
Public and semi- public uses	49.1	8.7	46.6	11.0
Public Utilities		0	2.5	0.6
Offices and services		0	4.3	1.0
Transport and communication	116.9	20.7	88.3	20.9
Unclassified	22.2	3.9	35.3	8.4
Total	564.6	100	421.4	100
Agriculture			649.3	
Lake and tank			39.0	
Quarry			9.6	
Vacant			187.7	
Grand Total			1307	

Sources: CDA 2009



### Centralized Raw Water and Treated Water Supply ( $C_{raw}$ and $C$ )

The centralized water supply for Bangalore over 12 months for 2013-2014 was collected from the Cauvery Water Division of BWSSB to get the daily average centralized water supply.

The average supply during 2013-2014 was 977 MLD. Figure S2 shows variation in average daily water withdrawal and its variation over various months. Figure-3 shows the daily treated water supply during 2013-2014, the average of which 927 MLD.




Figure S 2: Raw water withdrawn from the Cauvery during 2013-2014




Figure S 3: Daily water supply to the city at various months during 2013-2014

The primary data shows that there is variation in data found from various technical

reports of BWSSB. In 2013 the average water supply was 927 MLD against reported value 1,260 MLD (Raju 2014). This may be Cauvery supply from stage-IV (Phase –II) 500 MLD was not added in that year (the project was supposed to finish in that year).

### ***Decentralized Groundwater Supply (Dg) and Surface water supply Ds***

There is no accurate information on groundwater use Dg and the total figure could not be collected from any agencies in Bangalore such as CGWB, BWSSB. The related data was however found in some secondary sources as mentioned in table S4 (IIHS 2012). The decentralized surface water supply Ds was also found in the same source (table S4).

Table S 4: Decentralized Groundwater and Surface Water Use by retailers in Bangalore

	Decentralized Water Supply (MLD)				Total use
	BWSSB registered private tube wells	Private Tankers	Self-supply by households	Self-supply by others	
Groundwater	200	162	261	167	790
Surface Water	-	65	-	-	65

Source: IISC 2012

### ***Decentralized Rainwater Supply (Dr)***

In the current context of Bangalore, it is difficult to calculate decentralized rainwater as data is not available. It was found from various sources that so far 44,000 houses in Bangalore have installed rainwater tank systems and they are also recharging groundwater from rainwater in addition to using it for non-potable purposes (FirstPost 2013, Citizen Matters 2013; Deccan Herald 2013 and The Hindu 2013). No data is available on how many rainwater plants have been constructed in residential, commercial, industrial and other areas (BWSSB 2013; Vishawnath 2012; Vishawnath 2001).

In 2009, Bangalore amended the *Bangalore Water Supply and Sewage Act* to modify Bangalore Rainwater Harvesting Regulations (BWSSB 2014; BWSSB 2014a). It is now

1  
2 obligatory that every house owner install rainwater tanks or harvesting structures in all old  
3  
4 buildings with a built-up area of 2,400 square feet (sq ft - 40'x60' or 12m x 20m) and future  
5  
6 buildings of 1,200 sq ft (30'x40' or 10m x 12m) (BWSSB 2013).  
7  
8  
9

10  
11 Assuming that 44000 properties harvest rainwater (Deccan Herald 2013) on an  
12  
13 average area of  $(120 + 240 \text{ sq ft})/2 \sim 200 \text{ sq. m}$  each, a rough estimate of rainwater use has  
14  
15 been calculated. Rainwater harvesting potential =  $970\text{mm} \times 200 \text{ m}^2 \times 0.9 \times 44,000 = 0.0077 \text{ GL}$   
16  
17  
18 *Where* roof runoff coefficient is 0.9.  
19

20  
21  
22  
23 Assuming 50% of this is stored and 50% is used for groundwater recharge, the  
24  
25 rainwater use by households or properties is 0.0039 GL ~ 0.004 GL and groundwater  
26  
27 recharge is also 0.004 GL. The city is harvesting a very little amount of rainfall and  
28  
29 therefore if the data varies to some extent, it will have insignificant impact of Mass balance  
30  
31 calculation.  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37

### 38 **Groundwater Recharge (G)**

39  
40  
41 It is also difficult to estimate the groundwater recharge due to unavailability of  
42  
43 continuous water table monitoring data in Bangalore. But as per the detailed Guidelines for  
44  
45 Implementing Groundwater Estimation Methodology (CGWB 2009; CGWB 2011; CGWB  
46  
47 2013) and the Groundwater Resource Estimation Methodology (GEM) Report -1997  
48  
49 (MoWR 2009) recommended by Groundwater Resource Estimation Committee (MoWR  
50  
51 2009), the groundwater recharge based on the groundwater fluctuation approach for granite  
52  
53 terrain (as in Bangalore) is estimated as 8.7% of rainfall (GEC 1997). But according to  
54  
55 BWSSB, the groundwater recharge in Bangalore has reduced to 5% (BWSSB 2013). The  
56  
57 rainfall infiltration in built up or concrete areas and asphalt roads, can be assumed as zero  
58  
59 but still there must be some open areas in between the built up areas. So the groundwater  
60

1  
2 recharge in built up area in this study, has been considered as 2% and in open area or green  
3  
4 space, a higher value of 6% (in between 5% and 8.7%) (Hedge and Subhash 2012).  
5  
6  
7

8  
9 Bangalore has about 39.2 sq. km of water bodies. This value has been used for this  
10  
11 study (table S2) (CSE 2011; Ramachandra and Kumar 2008). The recharge rate from water  
12  
13 bodies has been considered as 50% (MoWR 2009 and GEC1997).  
14  
15  
16  
17

18  
19 Precipitation, runoff, groundwater recharge and evaporation from WTPs and WWTPs  
20  
21 have been taken negligible.  
22  
23  
24  
25

### 26 ***Runoff (Rs)***

27  
28  
29 The runoff coefficient for various land use (table S5) have been used for this study  
30  
31 based on the typical values of runoff coefficient in an urban area as elaborated in Chapter-  
32  
33 11 of the Urban Drainage Book (Butler and Davies 2011).  
34  
35  
36  
37

38 Table S 5: Runoff Coefficient used for Bangalore

Land Type	Runoff Coefficient
Residential	0.5
Commercial	0.8
Industrial	0.7
Open Space and Garden/Park	0.2
Transport (concrete Paving and asphalt)	0.9
Agriculture and Vacant Land	0.07

53  
54 Source: Butler and Davies 2011

55  
56 Precipitation, runoff, groundwater recharge and evaporation from WTPs and WWTPs have  
57  
58 been taken negligible.  
59  
60

### *Evapotranspiration (ET)*

Evapotranspiration for sub-boundaries has been calculated with the following formula from respective values:

$$ET = P - R - G$$


### *The Centralized Water Distribution in Various Subsectors*

The centralized water supply in various subsectors as mentioned in table S6 and graphically shown in figure-S4 has been calculated based on percentage distribution of the total centralized water as collected from BWSSB's Maintenance Division.

Table S 6: Distribution of centralized water supply in 2013-2014

Subsectors	Monthly Water Consumption (MLD)	Percentage (%)
Residential	14169	36.8%
Commercial	1343	3.5%
Public and semi-public Institutions	1893	4.9%
Industries	514	1.3%
Open and Green space	260	0.7%
Unaccounted for Water (UFW)	20322	52.8%

Source: BWSSB (primary data)



25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31

Figure S 4: Centralized water supply distribution in various subsectors and Unaccounted for Water (UFW)/Non-Revenue Water (NRW)

### 32 33 34

#### *Wastewater flows*

35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52

From secondary sources it was found that Bangalore city generates about 1,000 MLD of wastewater daily (BWSSB 2014). To date, the BWSSB has installed 14 wastewater treatment plants (WWTPs) (10 secondary and four tertiary), the total capacity of which is 721 MLD (Kumar 2013 and BWSSB 2014). The four tertiary treatment plants can produce 73 MLD of recycled water. Treated water so far has only been used for industrial purposes and to a very limited extent (Kumar 2013 and Ravindra 2013). Secondary WWTPs usually use Activated Sludge and tertiary WWTPs use Trickling Filters.

53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

From primary data it was found that Bangalore can treat a total of 525 MLD out of which 65 MLD is treated up to tertiary level. Bangalore can sell 8 MLD out of this 65 MLD highly treated wastewater and other they discharge to open water bodies as reaching this treated water back to city which is far from wastewater treatment plant is very expensive. Out of 1000 MLD generated wastewater, 475 MLD found as not treated. These data were used for mass balance

1  
2 analysis.  
3  
4  
5  
6

### 7 **Water Mass Balance Analysis**

8  
9

10  
11 Using various data, all inflows and outflows in the systems and sub-systems were  
12 calculated in Gigalitres (GL) yearly for the year 2013-2014 and have been represented in the  
13 flow chart in figure-5. The water mass balance was calculated using the following equation.  
14  
15  
16  
17

18  
19  
20  
21  $\Delta S = \text{all inflows} - \text{all outflows}$   
22

$$23 \quad S = \sum Q_i - \sum Q_o = (P + C_{\text{raw}} + D_r + D_g + D_s + R_w) - (W_{\text{nt}} + W_{\text{pt}} + W_{\text{tu}} + G + R_s + ET + C_{\text{ufw}}) \text{-----}(1)$$

24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




Figure S 5: Water Mass Balance Flow Chart of Bangalore city for the year 2013-2014



Where:

P = Precipitation/Rainfall

C = Centralized water

Dr = Decentralized Rainwater

Dg = Decentralized Groundwater

Craw = Raw Water from Cauvery

Wit = wastewater inflow to WWTPs

I = Industrial

Tc = transport and communication

Ag = Agriculture

W<sub>pt</sub> = Partially Treated (secondary) wastewater

W<sub>nt</sub> = Non treated Wastewater

W<sub>tu</sub> = Treated (Tertiary) Unused Wastewater

Rw = Recycled water

Cufw = Unaccounted for water (UFW)

D = Total Decentralized Water

(Dr +Dg +Ds)

c = commercial

ps = public and semipublic

Wr = Total Wastewater Runoff

Rs = Surface Runoff

ET = Evapotranspiration

G = Total Groundwater Recharge

Ds = Decentralized surface water

r = residential

o = open and green space L

= lakes and ponds

D<sub>g</sub> = Utility registered supply (73 GL) + Private Tankers (59.13 GL) + Self supply by households (95.3 GL) + Self supply by others (60.96 GL) = 288.39 GL

D<sub>s</sub> = 23.73 GL, D<sub>r</sub> = 0.004 GL, D<sub>s</sub> = 23.7 GL. R<sub>w</sub> = 2.9 GL

G = G<sub>r</sub> + G<sub>c</sub> + G<sub>i</sub> + G<sub>p</sub> + G<sub>t</sub> + G<sub>o</sub> + G<sub>ag</sub> + G<sub>L</sub> = 4.4 GL

ET = ET<sub>s</sub> + ET<sub>c</sub> + ET<sub>i</sub> + ET<sub>p</sub> + ET<sub>t</sub> + ET<sub>ag</sub> + ET<sub>L</sub> = 33.28 GL

Cufw = 178.6 GL

Total wastewater flow = W<sub>r</sub> = W<sub>nt</sub> + W<sub>pt</sub> + W<sub>tu</sub> = 362 GL

Using equation – (1), the Water Mass Balance of Bangalore city for 2013-2014 can be calculated as follows:

$$S = \sum Q_i - \sum Q_o = (P + C_{raw} + D_r + D_g + D_s + R_w) - (W_{nt} + W_{pt} + W_{tu} + G + R_s + ET + Cufw) \text{ -----(1)}$$

$$S = (77.6 + 356.3 + 0.004 + 288.4 + 23.73 + 2.9) - (171 + 167 + 23.7 + 4.4 + 40 + 33.28 + 178.6)$$

$$= (749 - 618)$$

$$= 131 \text{ GL}$$

One Gigaliter GL) = 10<sup>9</sup> liters (L) ≈ 2.64 × 10<sup>8</sup> gallons (gal).

1  
2  
3 ***Water Mass Balance Indicators***  
4  
5  
6

7  $C = 338 \text{ GL}$

8  
9  $D_r = 0.004 \text{ GL}$

10  
11 Total water use  $T = C + D = 338 + 312 = 653 \text{ GL}$

12  
13  $P = 77.6 \text{ GL},$

14  
15  $R_s = 40 \text{ GL},$

16  
17  $W_r = 362 \text{ GL}$

18  
19  $R_s = 40 \text{ GL}$

20  
21  
22  $C_{ufw} = 178.6 \text{ GL}$

23  
24 Using Water Mass Balance Indicators as discussed in the Main article water replaceability potentials were  
25 calculated below in table S 7.  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49

Table S 7: Water Replaceability Calculation

Supply Centralization C/T (%)	Rainfall Potential/ Centralized Supply Replaceability (D <sub>r</sub> /P) (%)	Rainfall Potential Total Use Replaceability (P/T) (%)	Wastewater Potential/ Centralized Supply replaceability (W <sub>r</sub> /C) (%)	Wastewater Potential/ Total Use replaceability (W <sub>r</sub> /T) (%)	Stormwater Potential/ Centralized Supply replaceability ( R <sub>s</sub> /C) (%)	Stormwater Potential/ Total Use replaceability (R <sub>s</sub> /T) (%)	Stormwater and Wastewater combined Potential/ Total Use Replaveability (R <sub>s</sub> +W <sub>r</sub> )/T (%)	Water Loss Recovery Potential/Cent ralized Supply replaceability (Cufw /C) (%)	Water Loss Recovery Potential/ Total Use replaceability (Cufw /T) (%)
52	0.005	12	107	56	12	6	62	53	27

## Scenario Analysis

Water demand in Bangalore in 2013 was 1260 MLD and in 2014 and 2021, it will be 1320 MLD and 1650 MLD respectively using 120 lpcd and population 10.45, 11 and 13.75 million respectively (adding 10% more slum people and other unaccounted people such as daily migrated flux).

From this study, the actual water supply in 2013 was 927 MLD and the actual gap was 815 MLD. This gap could easily be met in 2013 if even 54% of 1.5 GL daily potential was harnessed. Current (2014) gap is about 675 MLD and actual supply is 754 MLD (adding 500 MLD Cauvery Stage-IV Phase-II-supply and considering 52.8% UFW) and in 2021, the water supply gap will be around 895 MLD (if 2013 UFW 52.8% prevails). The gap in 2014 and 2021 can be met if 45% and 60% of this potential (1.5 GL daily) respectively can be recycled or reused. The water demand and actual supply available under prevailing condition and recycling need can be represented in figure-S.




Figure S 6: Water Demand and Supply Scenario in Bangalore city

1 Assumption=No recycle and no further withdrawal of water from the Cauvery and  
2  
3  
4 considering 52.8% system loss Water Demand based on 120 lpcd and including 10%  
5  
6 more slum population which is not counted in population Projection of Bangalore city.  
7  
8  
9 Though standard per capita in water demand in Bangalore city is 150 lpcd, conservative  
10  
11 estimation of 120 lpcd was considered. Further water loss was considered 52.8% as found  
12  
13 from the actual investigation in the field. Such conservative estimation can supplement per  
14  
15 capita water demand more than 120 lpcd.  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60

For Review Only

## References

- Bangalore Water Supply and Sewerage Board (BWSSB). 2013. *BWSSB Presentation*, Bangalore, India.
- Bangalore Water Supply and Sewerage Board (BWSSB). 2014. [www.bwssb.gov.in](http://www.bwssb.gov.in). accessed 2014
- Bangalore Water Supply and Sewerage Board (BWSSB) a. 2014. Rainwater Guidelines BWSSB, [bwssb.org/pdf/Guidlines.pdf](http://bwssb.org/pdf/Guidlines.pdf). Accessed in April, 2014
- Butler, D. and J. W. Davis. 2011, *Runoff Coefficient, Forman, R.T.T. Urban Ecology: Science of Cities, p-383*, Cambridge, Harvard University, USA.
- Census of India. 2001. *Provisional population totals, census of India, 2001; urban agglomerations/cities having population 1 lakh and above*, New Delhi, India.
- Census of India. 2011. *Provisional population totals, census of India, 2011; urban agglomerations/cities having population 1 lakh and above*, New Delhi, India.
- Center for Science and Environment (CSE). 2011. Water waste Portrait. [http://cseindia.org/userfiles/bangaluru\\_portrait.pdf](http://cseindia.org/userfiles/bangaluru_portrait.pdf). Accessed in November, 2013.
- Central Groundwater Board (CGWB). 2011. *Groundwater scenario in major cities of India*. Faridabad. Ministry of Water Resources. Government of India.
- Central Groundwater Board (CGWB). 2013. *Groundwater Information Booklet: Bangalore Urban District*. Ministry of Water Resources. Government of India.
- Central Groundwater Board (CGWB). 2009. *Details Guidelines for Implementing the Groundwater Estimation Methodology*. Ministry of water Resources. Government of India
- Citizen Matters. 2013. <http://bengaluru.citizenmatters.in/587-rwh-guide-587>. Accessed in April, 2014
- City Development Authority (CDA). 2009. *Bangalore Master Plan 2015*. Bangalore, India.
- Deccan Herald. 2013, *Only 44,000 houses in City have RWH*, published on 26 Feb, [www.deccanherald.com/content/315171/only-44000-houses-city-have.html](http://www.deccanherald.com/content/315171/only-44000-houses-city-have.html). Accessed in April, 2014.
- Department of Water Resources (DoWR) 2011. *The Karnataka Groundwater Act*. Department of Water Resources. Government of Karnataka. Bangalore.
- FirstPost. 2013. Will Bangalore have to be evacuated by 2023. [www.firstpost.com/india/will-bangalore-have-to-be-evacuated-by-2023-697649.html](http://www.firstpost.com/india/will-bangalore-have-to-be-evacuated-by-2023-697649.html). Accessed in April, 2014
- Global Voices. 2013. Water Shortage Crisis looms Large in Bangalore, India, <http://globalvoicesonline.org/2013/07/26/water-shortage-crisis-looms-large-in-Bangalore-india/>. Accessed in November, 2013
- Green Governance (GG). 2013. *People's Voices Do Matter*, Volume-1, Number-4.

- 1 Grönwall, J. T. 2008. Access to water: Rights, obligations, and the Bangalore situation. Ph.D.,  
2 Linköping University.
- 3  
4 Gronwall, J. T., M. Mulenga, and G. McGranahan. 2010. *Groundwater, self-supply and poor urban*  
5 *dweller: A review with case studies of Bangalore and Lusaka, Water and Sanitation -26,*  
6 *Human Settlements Working Paper Series, IIED, ISBN: 978-1-84369-770-1.*
- 7  
8  
9 Groundwater Estimation Committee (GEC). 1997. *The Groundwater Estimation Methodology,*  
10 *Ministry of Water Resources. Government of India*
- 11  
12 Hegde, G. V. and K. C. Subhash. 2012. Resource availability for water supply to Bangalore city.  
13 Karnataka, Science Correspondence. Current Science Vol. 102, No. 8, 25.
- 14  
15  
16 International Business Machines (IBM). 2010. *Rain to Drain: A roadmap to gaining control over*  
17 *water resource management using Information management and predictive analytics, NY,*  
18 *USA.*
- 19  
20  
21 Indian Institute for Human Settlements (IIHS). 2014. *Final Urban Diagnostic for Bangalore, Atkins*  
22 *International Ltd in partnership with UCL, The Climate and Development Knowledge*  
23 *Network Project Report, DFID and DGIS, Bangalore, India.*
- 24  
25  
26 Indiaonlinepags. 2014. Population of Bangalore. [www.indiaonlinepages.com/population/bangalore-](http://www.indiaonlinepages.com/population/bangalore-population.html)  
27 [population.html](http://www.indiaonlinepages.com/population/bangalore-population.html). Accessed in April, 2014
- 28  
29  
30 Indian Institute of Science (IISc). 2012. *Urban Water Supply and Management.*  
31 [cistup.iisc.ernet.in/presentations/Research%20project/CIST012.pdf](http://cistup.iisc.ernet.in/presentations/Research%20project/CIST012.pdf). Accessed in April, 2014
- 32  
33  
34 Meteorological Centre Bangalore (MCB). 2014. <http://www.imdbangalore.gov.in/>. accessed in April,  
35 2014
- 36  
37  
38 Ministry of Water Resources (MOWR). 2009. Ground Water Resource Estimation Methodology,  
39 report of Ground Water Resource Estimation Committee, Government of India, Bangalore.
- 40  
41  
42 Ramachandra, T. and U. Kumar. 2008. Wetlands of Greater Bangalore, India: automatic  
43 delineation through pattern classifiers. Electronic Green Journal [Online], 1, 26, Available:  
44 <http://escholarship.org/uc/item/3dp0q8f2> [Accessed July 29, 2013].
- 45  
46  
47 Ravindra, P.N. 2013. Reuse and Recycle. [www.elcia.in/images/Sustainability/Ravindra.pdf](http://www.elcia.in/images/Sustainability/Ravindra.pdf) viewed on  
48 15 February 2014, BWSSSB, Bangalore. Accessed in February, 2014
- 49  
50  
51 The Hindu. 2014, Karnataka resorts to load-shedding. [www.thehindu.com/todays-paper/tp-](http://www.thehindu.com/todays-paper/tp-national/karnataka-resorts-to-loadshedding/article5980608.ece)  
52 [national/karnataka-resorts-to-loadshedding/article5980608.ece](http://www.thehindu.com/todays-paper/tp-national/karnataka-resorts-to-loadshedding/article5980608.ece). Accessed in April, 2013
- 53  
54  
55 Vishawnath,S. 2012. *Domestic Rainwater Harvesting: Some Application in Bangalore, India.*
- 56  
57  
58 Vishwanath, S. 2001. Domestic Rainwater Harvesting, Bangalore. India.
- 59  
60

## About the Authors

1. Reba Paul was a Masters Student at University of Queensland, Australia when the article was written. Now she is a PhD Student and Research Assistant at Institute for Sustainable Futures (ISF) in the University of Technology Sydney (UTS), Australia.
2. Steven Kenway is an Associate Professor and Research Group Leader for Water-Energy-Carbon Group at School of Chemical Engineering in University of Queensland (UQ), Brisbane, Australia.
3. Brian McIntosh is an Education Director at International Water Centre (IWC) and Senior Lecturer in the University of Queensland (UQ), Brisbane, Australia.
4. Pierre Mukheibir is an Associate Professor and Research Director at Institute for Sustainable Futures (ISF) in the University of Technology Sydney (UTS), Australia.






Figure 1: Inputs and Outputs of water flows in selected cities (Source: Kennedy et al. 2007)  
 Note: t/cap/yr. = tons/capita/year. One ton (t) = 103 kilograms (weight of 1 kiloliter water).  
 So t/cap/yr. can be represented in volume as kL/cap/yr.

130x49mm (96 x 96 DPI)




Figure 2: a) Defining System Boundary (Sources: adapted from Kenway et al. 2011).

92x55mm (96 x 96 DPI)

Review Only

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60





Figure 2: b) Water Mass Balance Framework considering groundwater under the urban entity and storages outside the urban entity (Sources: adapted from Kenway et al. 2011).

99x90mm (96 x 96 DPI)



30 Figure 3: Water Mass Balance Evaluation Framework (Refinement of original framework developed by  
31 Kenway et al. (2011) to apply for a developing country context)

32 229x154mm (72 x 72 DPI)

1  
2  
3  
4  
5  
6  
7  
8  
9  
10  
11  
12  
13  
14  
15  
16  
17  
18  
19  
20  
21  
22  
23  
24  
25  
26  
27  
28  
29  
30  
31  
32  
33  
34  
35  
36  
37  
38  
39  
40  
41  
42  
43  
44  
45  
46  
47  
48  
49  
50  
51  
52  
53  
54  
55  
56  
57  
58  
59  
60




Figure 4: Inputs and Outputs of water in Bangalore city for the year 2013-1014.

155x127mm (96 x 96 DPI)

Only

Table 1: Performance indicators and their definition under the study

Indicators	Method	Formula
Water System Centralization Supply centralization (%)	Centralized Supply/Total Water Use	$C/(C+D)*100$
Rainfall Harvesting (%)	Decentralized sources/rainfall	$D/P*100$
Rainfall Potential for Water Supply Centralized supply replaceability (%) Total Use Replaceability (%)	Rainfall/Centralized water supplied Rainfall/Total Use	$P/C*100$ $P/(C+D)*100$
Wastewater Potential for Water Supply Centralized Supply Replaceability (%) Total Use Replaceability (%)	Wastewater Flow/Centralized water supplied Wastewater Flow/Total Water Use	$W/C*100$ $W/(C+D)*100$
Stormwater Potential for Water Supply Centralized Supply Replaceability (%) Total Use Replaceability (%)	Stormwater flow/centralized water supplied Stormwater flow/Total Water Supplied	$Rs/C*100$ $Rs/(C+D)*100$
Wastewater and stormwater combined Potential of 'total water use Replaceability' (%)	(Wastewater+stormwater)/ Total water use	$(W+Rs)/(C+D)*100$
Water Loss Recovery Potential of 'total water use Replaceability' (%)	Water Loss/Total water use	$Cufw/(C+D)*100$

Source: Adapted from Kenway et al. (2011)

Note- C = Total Centralized Water Supply, D=Total Decentralized Water Supply, P= Rainfall, W=Wastewater Flow, Rs= Stormwater Runoff , Cufw= Uncounted For Water

Table 2: Inputs (Qi) and Outputs (Qo) of Bangalore city for the year 2013-2014

Inputs	Population (Million)	Area (Sq. km)	Centralized Surface Water Supply (GL/a)	Decentralized Groundwater Supply (GL/a)	Decentralized Surface Water Supply (GL/a)	Decentralized rainwater supply(rainwater tank) (GL/a)	Rainfall on Surface (GL/a)	Reuse of Wastewater (G/a)	
	9.5	800	356	288	24	0.004	78	3	
Outputs	Population (Million)	Area	Partially Treated Waste water Flow (GL/a)	Non-Treated Wastewater Flow (GL/a)	Treated Wastewater Flow (GL/a)	Surface Runoff (GL/a)	System Loss (GL/a)	Ground Water Recharge (GL/a)	Evapo-Transpiration (GL/a)
	9.5	800	167	171	24	40	179	4.4	33

Note: GL/a =Gigaliter /annum

Table 3: Centralized Supply Replaceability/ Supply Substitution of alternative sources of water including loss in the system for the year 2013-2014

Supply	% of potential replaceability/substitution of water supply						
	% of Total C/(C+D) *100	Rain Water (P/C*100)	Storm Water (RS/C*100)	Waste Water (W/C*100)	Unaccounted For Water (UFW)/Non-Revenue Water (NRW)(Cufw / C*100)	Waste water and Rainwater (W+P/C* 100)	All alternative waters (W+P+Rs)/ C*100
Centralized	52	23	12	107	53	130	195



Table 4: 'Total Use Replaceability'/ Supply Substitution of alternative sources of water including loss in the system for the year 2013-2014

Supply	% of potential replaceability/substitution of water supply						
	% of Total	Rainwater	Storm Water	Waste Water	Unaccounted For Water (UFW)/ NRW	Wastewater and rainwater	All Alternative Waters
	$\frac{C}{C+D} * 100$	$\frac{P}{(C+D)} * 100$	$\frac{R_s}{(C+D)} * 100$	$\frac{W}{(C+D)} * 100$	$\frac{C_{ufw}}{(C+D)} * 100$	$\frac{(W+P)}{(C+D)} * 100$	$\frac{(W+P+R_s)}{C} * 100$
Total Use	100	8	6	55	27	63	90