

UNIVERSITÀ POLITECNICA DELLE MARCHE Repository ISTITUZIONALE

A methodology to estimate average flow rates in Water Supply Systems (WSSs) for energy recovery purposes through hydropower solutions

This is the peer reviewd version of the followng article:

Original

A methodology to estimate average flow rates in Water Supply Systems (WSSs) for energy recovery purposes through hydropower solutions / Rossi, Mosè; Spedaletti, Samuele; Lorenzetti, Matteo; Salvi, Danilo; Renzi, Massimiliano; Comodi, Gabriele; Caresana, Flavio; Pelagalli, Leonardo. - In: RENEWABLE ENERGY. - ISSN 0960-1481. - 180:(2021), pp. 1101-1113. [10.1016/j.renene.2021.09.005]

Availability:

This version is available at: 11566/291992 since: 2024-11-04T21:54:24Z

Publisher:

Published DOI:10.1016/j.renene.2021.09.005

Terms of use:

The terms and conditions for the reuse of this version of the manuscript are specified in the publishing policy. The use of copyrighted works requires the consent of the rights' holder (author or publisher). Works made available under a Creative Commons license or a Publisher's custom-made license can be used according to the terms and conditions contained therein. See editor's website for further information and terms and conditions. This item was downloaded from IRIS Università Politecnica delle Marche (https://iris.univpm.it). When citing, please refer to the published version.

A methodology to estimate average flow rates in Water Supply 2 Systems (WSSs) for energy recovery purposes through 3 hydropower solutions

Mosè Rossi^a, Samuele Spedaletti^{a,b}, Matteo Lorenzetti^b, Danilo Salvi^b, Massimiliano Renzi^c, Gabriele
Comodi^{a,*}, Flavio Caresana^a, Leonardo Pelagalli^a

^a Marche Polytechnic University, Department of Industrial Engineering and Mathematical Sciences, Via Brecce Bianche
12, Ancona – 60131, Italy

8 ^b Astea S.p.A., Via Guazzatore 163, Osimo (AN) – 60027, Italy

9 ^c Free University of Bozen-Bolzano, Faculty of Science and Technology, Piazza Università 1, Bolzano – 39100, Italy

10 *Corresponding author: Gabriele Comodi, PhD, Associate Professor. Faculty of Engineering, Department of Industrial

Engineering and Mathematical Sciences, Marche Polytechnic University, Via Brecce Bianche 12, 60131, Ancona, Italy.
 E-mail: g.comodi@univpm.it.

13

14 ABSTRACT

Energy efficiency interventions in Water Supply Systems (WSSs) need a precise evaluation of the 15 available water flow rates for energy recovery interventions; however, flow meters are generally too 16 costly for being installed in all the gravity adduction pipelines of a WSS. This paper presents a 17 methodology for predicting flow rates in gravity adduction pipelines based on the electricity bill 18 consumption. In this study, the predicted average flow rate is 0.0300 m³*s⁻¹, being 1.64% lower than 19 the real one. A Pelton turbine has been chosen as energy recovery unit for supplying electricity to a 20 21 pumping station of a preloading tank where the water is treated to make it drinkable. An energy saving of 475.26 (MW*h)*vear⁻¹ is achieved, which can be also expressed as 88.87 saved Tonnes of Oil 22 Equivalent (TOE) and 204.36 ktCO₂ not released into the atmosphere. The gross economic saving 23 due to the installation of the Pelton turbine is equal to 94.29 k€*year⁻¹ and it can be further increased 24

up to 116.51 k€*year⁻¹ if the energy efficiency certificates issued by the Italian Authorities are
considered. The Payback Period (PBP) of the intervention corresponds to 3 years, and a Net Present
Value (NPV) after twenty years is approximately 1.4 M€.

KEYWORDS

Economic saving; Energy efficiency; Flow rate estimation; Pelton turbine; Small-scale hydropower;
Water Supply System.

33 NOMENCLATURE

- A_{ind} = Area occupied by industrial users [m²]
- $A_{res} = Area$ occupied by residential users $[m^2]$
- $Ec_{eec} = Economic saving due to the energy efficiency certificates [<math>\notin$ *year⁻¹]
- $Ec_{saving_gross} = Gross \text{ economic saving } [€*year^{-1}]$
- $Ec_{saving_gross_final} = Gross$ economic saving considering the energy efficiency certificates [e^* year⁻¹]
- $\overline{En}_{after_turbine}$ = Electric energy consumed by the pumping station after the installation of the 40 hydraulic turbine [MW*h]
- $\overline{En}_{before_turbine}$ = Electric energy consumed by the pumping station before the installation of the 42 hydraulic turbine [MW*h]
- $\overline{En}_{electric_bill}$ = Average electricity bill consumption of the pumping station [MW*h]
- $\overline{En}_{electric_pump}$ = Average electricity consumption of the pumping station [MW*h]
- $\overline{En}_{electric_pump,i}$ = Average electricity consumption of a hydraulic pump [MW*h]

- $\overline{En}_{electric_turbine avg_monthly} = Monthly average electric energy produced by the hydraulic turbine$
- 47 [MW*h]
- $\overline{En}_{saving after turbine}$ = Electric energy saving after the installation of the hydraulic turbine [MW*h]
- $Fc_{tCO2} = Conversion factor from kW*h to tCO_2 [tCO_2*(kW*h)^{-1}]$
- $Fc_{TOE} = Conversion factor from kW*h to TOE [TOE*(kW*h)^{-1}]$
- F_{ec} = Conversion factor from kW*h to $\in [\in (kW*h)^{-1}]$
- $F_{eec} = Conversion factor from TOE to \in [\in *TOE^{-1}]$
- g = Gravity acceleration [m*s⁻²]
- H = Head[m]
- $H_{available} = Available head [m]$
- $H_{loss} = Head losses [m]$
- $H_{useful} = Useful head [m]$
- n_{ind} = Population density in industrial areas [person*m⁻²]
- $n_{res} = Population density in residential areas [person*m⁻²]$
- $\overline{P}_{hydraulic avg_yearly} = Average available hydraulic power [kW]$
- $\overline{P}_{turbine avg_monthly} = Average power produced by the hydraulic turbine [kW]$
- $\overline{\dot{Q}} = Flow rate [m^{3*}s^{-1}]$
- $\overline{\dot{Q}}_{avg_yearly} =$ Yearly average flow rate in a gravity adduction pipeline [m³*s⁻¹]
- $\overline{\dot{Q}}_{pump avg_monthly} =$ Monthly average flow rate elaborated by the pumping station [m³*s⁻¹]

 $\dot{Q}_{pump,i avg_monthly} = Monthly average flow rate elaborated by a hydraulic pump [m³*s⁻¹]$

- $\dot{Q}_{turbine avg_monthly}$ = Measured monthly average flow rate elaborated by the hydraulic turbine 67 $[m^{3*}s^{-1}]$
- $\dot{Q}_{turbine avg_monthly_meas}$ = Measured yearly average flow rate elaborated by the hydraulic turbine 69 $[m^{3*}s^{-1}]$
- $\overline{\dot{Q}}_{turbine avg_monthly_model} = Estimated monthly average flow rate potentially elaborated by the$ 71 hydraulic turbine [m³*s⁻¹]
- $\dot{\dot{Q}}_{turbine avg_yearly} =$ Measured average flow rate elaborated by the hydraulic turbine [m³*s⁻¹]
- $\overline{\dot{Q}}_{turbine avg_yearly_model} = Estimated yearly average flow rate potentially elaborated by the$ 74 hydraulic turbine [m³*s⁻¹]
- $\overline{\dot{Q}}_{wells avg monthly} = Monthly average flow rate coming from the wells [m³*s⁻¹]$
- $V_{monthly,end user,i} = Monthly water volume consumption of a generic end user [m³]$
- $V_{monthly_ind} = Monthly water volume consumption per each residential user [m³]$
- $V_{monthly_res} = Monthly water volume consumption per each industrial user [m³]$
- $tCO_{2_saving} = Tonnes of CO_2 [tCO_2] saving$
- $TOE_{saving} = Tonnes of Oil Equivalent [TOE] saving$
- $\Delta \overline{\dot{Q}} = \text{Relative percentage error related to the flow rate estimation [%]}$
- η_{pump} = Total efficiency of a hydraulic pump [-]
- $\eta_{turbine} = Total efficiency of the hydraulic turbine [-]$

- 84 ρ = Water density at normal conditions [kg*m⁻³]
- 85 ω = Angular rotational speed [rad*s⁻¹]
- 86 $\omega_s =$ Specific rotational speed [-]
- 87

88 ACRONYMS

- 89 BEP = Best Efficiency Point
- 90 NPV = Net Present Value
- 91 O&M = Operation & Management
- 92 PBP = Payback Period
- 93 PID = Proportional-Integral-Derivative
- 94 PRV = Pressure Reducing Valve
- 95 PSO = Particle Swarm Optimization
- 96 TOE = Tonnes of Oil Equivalent
- 97 WDN = Water Distribution Network
- 98 WSS = Water Supply System
- 99
- 100
- 101
- 102
- 103

104 **1. INTRODUCTION**

The water-energy nexus concept is becoming of great interest in the energy sector with the aim of 105 ensuring a sustainable exploitation of the water source on both environmental and energy points of 106 view [1, 2]. Within the water-energy nexus framework, one of the most important topics concerns the 107 use of water for power production. Hydropower plants generate clean energy by exploiting the energy 108 potential of a water reservoir and transforming it to electricity by a generator. Conversely, a 109 considerable amount of energy is required by several processes to pump and treat water in civil and 110 industrial contexts. The two perspectives can be combined in several applications, like in Water 111 Supply Systems (WSSs), Water Distribution Networks (WDNs) [3, 4] and in wastewater treatment 112 plants [5, 6] where a share of the energy required to run such plants can be potentially recovered. All 113 the previous mentioned applications present facilities, such as the pumping stations, that are highly 114 115 energy consuming, but also with considerable hydraulic head potentials. For this reason, the recovered energy can lead to an increase of the system efficiency, thus to a reduction of both 116 consumed Tonnes of Oil Equivalent (TOE) and CO₂ emissions released into the atmosphere [7, 8]. 117 WSSs are typically constituted by a water source connected to loading/head compensation tanks 118 downstream located at high geodetic altitudes, being in turn connected to other tanks [9] or directly 119 120 to the end users via distribution network. The extension of WSSs depends on the number of inhabitants of a city/town, as well as on its dimensions. The water source can be a reservoir filled by 121 water pumped from a low-level reservoir. About 2-3% of the electric energy consumption worldwide 122 derives from pumping stations of WSSs [10, 11] and 80-90% of this consumption is addressed to 123 pump motors [12, 13]. In this regard, some works in literature stated that the specific energy 124 consumptions measured in WSSs are below 0.30 (kW*h)*m⁻³ in developing countries and reach 125 values higher than 3 (kW*h)*m⁻³ in developed ones [14, 15]; in this last case, energy recovery 126

127 interventions are strongly recommended to improve the efficiency of WSSs.

The proper choice of the energy recovery intervention in WSSs depends on their design 128 characteristics [16, 17] and several authors investigated on the energy recovery potential through 129 hydropower solutions. Kucukali [18] estimated that this kind of recovery potential, which has been 130 applied in 45 WSSs located in Turkey, led to 173 GW*h saved per year. McNabola et al. [19] analysed 131 ten cases related to water industries in Ireland, where the hydraulic power is recovered through small-132 scale hydropower plants ranging between 2 and 115 kW. The installation of hydraulic turbines in 133 WSSs provides, beside the electricity production, the water pressure regulation inside the network, 134 which is usually performed by Pressure Reducing Valves (PRVs). Indeed, a reduction of the water 135 pressure leads to a decrease of the water losses throughout the pipelines [20, 21] that reached 136 137 nowadays a remarkable average value of 26% worldwide [22]. PRVs are installed not only in WDNs, but also in WSSs where high values of pressure are present. For instance, this situation occurs when 138 an upstream water source is placed at a very high altitude and connected to a preloading or a 139 140 loading/head compensation tank downstream that is at atmospheric pressure. The preloading tank has the aim to mix the water coming from the water source with the one coming from wells, whose 141 142 chemical properties are not still acceptable. After the mixing process, the water becomes drinkable and it is pumped to loading/head compensation tanks; subsequently, it is distributed to the end users 143 via distribution network. However, pumping stations withdraw water from the preloading tank and 144 145 provide it with the proper pressure in order to reach loading/head compensation tanks. Doing this, the potential energy content of the water due to the geodetic altitude difference between the water source 146 and the preloading tank is lost, since it is dissipated through a PRV for being lowered down to the 147 148 atmospheric pressure. It is worth noting that the mixing process can be also performed inside the pipelines, unless the water pressure is enough to provide the water to loading/head compensation 149 150 tanks.

151 In order to improve the efficiency of WSSs, hydraulic turbines can be installed upstream the 152 preloading tank, thus replacing PRVs in order to recover part of this water energy content and produce

the electric energy required by the pumping station. The installation of small-scale hydropower plants 153 154 in WSSs presents low implementation costs [23, 24]. The produced electric energy can be consumed by facilities and auxiliary systems of WSSs, thus lowering the amount of electricity withdrawn by the 155 national grid [18]. Energy recovery interventions through hydropower solutions in WSSs have also 156 three main advantages [25]: i) reduction of the greenhouse gas emissions due to the self-consumption 157 of the produced electric energy, as well as its production by means of a renewable source, ii) limitation 158 159 of civil works since they are adapted to the existing infrastructure, thus not requiring new spaces, and iii) to lower environmental impacts throughout the life cycle of WSSs. 160

Nevertheless, the correct average flow rate in gravity adduction pipelines has to be assessed in order 161 162 to perform the energy recovery interventions properly, mostly when flow meters are not installed. In literature there are several works, based on the evaluation of the water demand of the end users, that 163 analysed different deterministic, probabilistic and demand time-series approaches for predicting the 164 165 peak demand in WSSs. In this regard, Wong et al. [26] carried out a literature review on the previous mentioned approaches and proposed the Bayesian one, which bridges the gap between model-based 166 and field-measurement values, being more flexible and more reliable on the design point of view. 167 Letting et al. [27] presented a simulation model for the water demand using a Particle Swarm 168 Optimization (PSO) algorithm and compared the numerical results with the real ones obtained by 169 sensors. Results showed that both nodal demands and pipe flows can be accurately determined. 170 Balacco et al. [28] analysed the water demand in several towns in Puglia (Italy), leading to the 171 definition of a relationship between the peak factor and the number of inhabitants. They found out 172 that the design of WSSs can be done without considering the use of monthly and weekly peak factors. 173 Moreover, the magnitude of the peak factor obtained through measured data is considerably lower 174 compared to the literature values. However, detailed information related to WSSs and WDNs are 175 usually required, which are not always affordable and make difficult, as well as time demanding, the 176 calculation of the water demand, also considering the creation of optimization algorithms. Moreover, 177

to the authors' knowledge, a methodology to estimate the yearly average flow rate in gravityadduction pipelines has not be discussed and presented so far.

In this work, a methodology based on the knowledge of the electricity bill consumption related to the 180 pumping station of a preloading tank to predict the yearly average flow rate that can be potentially 181 exploited for energy recovery purposes is presented. In particular, this methodology is thought to be 182 applied in branches where flow meters are not installed. First of all, gravity adduction pipelines where 183 184 the hydraulic turbine can be installed have to be identified, taking into account the connections between a water source and the preloading tank. The developed methodology was then validated 185 through measured data obtained by a flow meter installed upstream the preloading tank, after the 186 hydraulic turbine installation. Finally, energy, environmental and economic analyses have been 187 performed to assess the advantages of this energy efficiency intervention. 188

The present paper is structured as follows: Section 2 describes the methodology developed for 189 190 estimating the yearly average flow rate when flow meters are not installed; then, the head that can be exploited by the hydraulic turbine has been also calculated using a formula reported in literature. In 191 192 addition, the procedure to select the proper machine is also presented. Section 3 deals with the case 193 study of a WSS related to a mid-town located in the Center of Italy. After the analysis of the flow duration curve of the site of interest, the flow rates obtained through the methodology described in 194 195 Section 2 have been confirmed and validated with measured data from a flow meter installed after the hydraulic turbine installation, whose selection process has led to the choice of a Pelton machine. 196 Section 4 presents energy, environmental and economic analyses due to the energy efficiency 197 intervention. Finally, Section 5 reports the conclusions of the work. 198

- 200
- 201
- 202

203 **2. METHODOLOGY**

This Section aims at describing a methodology capable of identifying the hydropower potential in WSSs through the estimation of the flow rates in gravity adduction pipelines that connect the water source to the preloading tanks downstream. The presented methodology is based on the knowledge of the electricity bill consumption of the pumping station installed in the preloading tank. After the estimation of the yearly average flow rate, the head is evaluated by knowing the geodetic heights of each element previously mentioned in the site of interest and the relative head losses. The methodology is divided in three phases:

i) analysis of the WSS structure of the site of interest, taking into account the WSS layout composed
by a water source, a preloading tank with a pumping station, loading/head compensation tanks
and interconnections;

ii) estimation of the hydropower potential from sites identified in the previous phase, focusing the
attention to the one having the connection between the water source and the preloading tank.
Then, after the analysis of the flow duration curve, the yearly average flow rate, together with
the useful head, are calculated. Finally, the calculation of the power produced by the hydropower
system is also provided;

iii) assessment of energy, environmental and economic benefits due to the hydraulic turbine
 installation; specifically, the evaluation of the energy saving, also in terms of saved TOE and
 tCO₂ emissions not released into the atmosphere, and the economic saving due to the energy
 efficiency intervention are discussed.

223

224

226 2.1 Water Supply System (WSS) infrastructure and an overview of the site of interest

The water reservoir of the analysed WSS is located at 346 m a.s.l. with a height of 69.4 m (55 m of depth) and a capacity of 37.3 Mm³. The water coming from this reservoir feeds one preloading tank and then seven loading tanks placed in different zones, as reported in Figure 1 and Table 1.



Figure 1: Layout of the analysed WSS

230

232 Table 1: Water source, loading, preloading and head compensation tanks with respective geodetic heights

WATER SOURCE	LOADING AND PRELOADING TANK (GEODETIC HEIGTH)	HEAD COMPENSATION TANK (GEODETIC HEIGTH)	GEODETIC HEIGTH DIFFERENCE
	TANK A (57 m)	-	289 m
-	-	TANK 1 (57 m)	126 m
-	-	TANK 22 (220 m)	126 m
F	-	TANK 12 (120 m)	226 m
-	TANK 13 (260 m)	TANK 22 (220 m)	40 m
-	TANK 22 (220 m)	TANK 23 (140 m)	80 m
-		TANK 18 (200 m)	100 m
	TANK 14 (300 m)	TANK 19 (170 m)	130 m
		TANK 20 (210 m)	90 m
		TANK 15 (260 m)	40 m
CASTRECCIONI	TANK 15 (260 m)	TANK 17 (170 m)	90 m
DAM (346 m)		TANK 2 (180 m)	40 m
		TANK 3 (110 m)	110 m
		TANK 4 (150 m)	70 m
		TANK 5 (100 m)	120 m
	TANK 1 (220 m)	TANK 6 (160 m)	60 m
		TANK 7 (130 m)	90 m
		TANK 8 (98 m)	122 m
		TANK 10 (150 m)	70 m
		TANK 11 (185 m)	35 m
	TANK 11 (185 m)	TANK 12 (120 m)	65 m
-	TANK 8 (98 m)	TANK 9 (70 m)	28 m

In particular, Tank A is the preloading tank that collects the water coming from both water source and wells with the aim of making it drinkable after a mixing phase process. The preloading tank presents a pumping station that supplies water to Tanks 13, 22, 23 and 24 located at higher altitudes with respect to the preloading tank itself. Figure 2 shows a simplified scheme of the site of interest, namely the preloading tank where a hydraulic turbine has been subsequently installed.



239

240 Figure 2: Simplified scheme of the site of interest (preloading tank plus the new hydraulic turbine)

241

242 **2.2** Estimation of both yearly average flow rate and useful head of the hydraulic turbine

The flow rate elaborated by the hydraulic turbine can correspond either to the overall one that flows in gravity adduction pipelines or to a part of it, according to the number of deviations and design characteristics of the WSS. The evaluation of the flow rate can be done instrumentally through flow meters installed in pipelines that recreate the flow duration curve. Generally, flow meters are installed in adduction pipelines that connect the pumping stations to a loading/head compensation tank located at high altitude, while it is rare to find them in gravity adduction pipelines since they are costly. If a gravity adduction pipeline connects the water source to a loading/head compensation tank directly, the yearly average flow rate \bar{Q}_{avg_yearly} [m³ * s⁻¹] is evaluated through Eq. (1), which takes into account the population density n_{res} and n_{ind}, the occupied areas and the monthly water volume consumptions V_{monthly_res} [m³] and V_{monthly_ind} [m³] of both residential and industrial end users, respectively:

254
$$\overline{\dot{Q}}_{avg_yearly} = \frac{(n_{res} \cdot A_{res} \cdot V_{monthly_res} + n_{ind} \cdot A_{ind} \cdot V_{monthly_ind}) \cdot \# of months in a year}{86,400s \cdot \# of days in a year} [m^3 * s^{-1}]$$
 (1)

255

It is worth noting that Eq. (1) is valid when the flow rate coming from the water source is the same of the one that flows inside a loading/head compensation tank; indeed, the balance of the water consumption related to the end users served by a loading/head compensation tank returns the volume of the water entered the loading/head compensation tank itself. That said, Eq. (1) can be considered be a good starting point for estimating the flow rate of an ex-novo WSS.

However, when preloading tanks are located at lower geodetic heights than loading/head compensations ones, another approach for the evaluation of the flow rate is used. In this case, the monthly average flow rate pumped by the pumping station $\overline{Q}_{pump avg_monthly}$ [m³ * s⁻¹] is estimated by knowing its monthly electricity consumption $\overline{En}_{electric,pump}$ [MW * h]. The steps used in the presented methodology are explained hereinafter:

1. the number of end users served by each pump of the pumping station, as well as the monthly water volume consumption of each end user $V_{monthly,end user,i}$ [m³], are known; thus, the multiplication of the previous mentioned terms returns the water volume consumption of all the end users. Then, this value is divided by the period of operation of the WSS equal to

- 270 86,400 s times the number of days in a month, leading to the monthly average flow rate 271 $\overline{\dot{Q}}_{pump,i avg_monthly} [m^3 * s^{-1}]$ elaborated by each pump;
- 272 2. both dimensions and physical characteristics of the adduction pipelines that connect each 273 pump to the respective loading/head compensation tank are known as well. The monthly 274 average flow rate elaborated by each pump $\overline{\dot{Q}}_{pump,i avg_monthly} [m^3 * s^{-1}]$ previously 275 evaluated is used to calculate the head losses along each adduction pipeline, being a quadratic 276 function of the flow rate;
- 277 3. the useful head H_{useful} [m] provided by each pump is equal to the sum of the geodetic height
 278 difference between the head compensation tank and the preloading one H_{available} [m] plus
 279 the head losses along the adduction pipelines H_{loss} [m] using the one-term quadratic formula
 280 valid for fully turbulent flow regimes [29];
- 4. since the pumps are installed in parallel, the same hydraulic efficiency within all the operating 281 range is assumed, since they operate close to their Best Efficiency Point (BEP) most of the 282 monthly time. Therefore, Eq. (2)provides average electric 283 the energy $\overline{En}_{electric_pump,i}$ [MW * h] consumed by each pump: 284

285
$$\overline{En}_{electric_pump,i} = \frac{\rho \cdot g \cdot \dot{Q}_{pump,i} avg_monthly \cdot H_{useful}}{\eta_{pump} \cdot 10^6} \cdot (24 \ h \cdot \# of \ days \ in \ a \ month) \ [MW * h]$$
(2)

- 5. the sum of the electric energies consumed by each pump has to be equal to the one in the electric bill; if not, the monthly water volume consumption $\overline{V}_{monthly,end user,i}$ [m³] of each end user is modified iteratively until the solution converges;
- 6. finally, when the convergence of the solution is reached, the sum of the monthly average flow rates elaborated by each pump $\overline{\dot{Q}}_{pump,i avg_monthly}$ [m³ * s⁻¹] leads to the monthly average flow rate elaborated by the pumping station $\overline{\dot{Q}}_{pump avg_monthly}$ [m³ * s⁻¹].

In order to have a better overview of the entire process, Figure 3 shows the flow diagram related to the procedure previously explained, where the free parameter and the known values are highlighted in dark blue and red, respectively.



296

297 *Figure 3: Flow diagram related to the estimation of the flow rate elaborated by the pumping station* 16

As reported in Figure 3, the monthly average flow rate elaborated by the pumping station $\overline{\dot{Q}}_{pump avg_monthly} [m^3 * s^{-1}]$ is equal to the one elaborated by the hydraulic turbine $\overline{\dot{Q}}_{turbine avg_monthly_model} [m^3 * s^{-1}]$ plus the monthly average water flow rate coming from the wells $\overline{\dot{Q}}_{wells avg_monthly} [m^3 * s^{-1}]$, which is obtained through flow meters installed in correspondence of the wells. Using this procedure, the water mass balance in the preloading tank is assessed; however, it is worth noting that this methodology is valid only if the variability of the flow rate in gravity adduction pipelines is restricted close to its average value.

Knowing the monthly average flow rate elaborated the by hydraulic turbine 305 $\overline{\dot{Q}}_{turbine avg_monthly_model} [m^3 * s^{-1}]$, the yearly average flow rate $\overline{\dot{Q}}_{turbine avg_yearly_model} [m^3 * s^{-1}]$ 306 s^{-1}] is obtained through Eq. (3), where 12 stands for the number of months in a year: 307

308
$$\overline{\dot{Q}}_{turbine avg_yearly_model} = \frac{\sum_{1}^{12} \overline{\dot{Q}}_{turbine avg_monthly_model}}{12} [m^3 * s^{-1}]$$
 (3)

309

Then, knowing both dimensions and physical characteristics of the gravity adduction pipeline as well, the head losses in gravity adduction pipelines are obtained according to [29]. The useful head H_{useful} [m] that the hydraulic turbine has to exploit is equal to the difference between the available head $H_{available}$ [m] and the pressure losses H_{loss} [m] that the water encounters along the gravity adduction pipeline using the one-term quadratic formula valid for fully turbulent flow regimes [29], as described by Eq. (4):

316
$$H_{useful} = H_{gross} - H_{loss} \left(\overline{\dot{Q}}^2_{turbine avg_yearly_model} \right) [m]$$
 (4)

317

319 **2.3** Selection of the hydraulic turbine together with power and energy calculations

The values of both flow rate $\dot{Q} [m^3 * s^{-1}]$ and head H [m] of the hydraulic turbine, along with its angular rotational speed $\omega [rad * s^{-1}]$ that is dependent on both grid frequency and characteristics of the electric generator, allows to select the proper machine to be installed close to the preloading tank. In particular, the most important dimensionless parameter that characterizes which machine better suits the available operative conditions is the specific speed $\omega_s [-]$, as expressed by Eq. (5).

326
$$\omega_s = \omega \cdot \frac{\dot{Q}^{0.5}}{(gH)^{0.75}} [-]$$
 (5)

327

However, a machine capable to operate in a quite wide range of flow rates has to be selected, 328 preferably with a quite flat efficiency trend. Among traditional turbines, the Pelton one could be 329 the best choice according to what previously said: indeed, the efficiency trend is quite flat close 330 to the BEP, thus being suitable for this case study. Nevertheless, attention must be paid at strong 331 part-load conditions, since a consistent efficiency drop occurs. This situation mainly happens in 332 333 the summer season, when the water availability could be low [30]. The monthly average power that can be produced by the hydraulic turbine $\overline{P}_{turbine avg_monthly}$ [MW] is evaluated through Eq. 334 (6), while the potential monthly average energy recovery $\overline{En}_{electric turbine avg monthly}$ [MW * h] 335 is evaluated using Eq. (7), where a WSS operation of 24 h times the number days in a month has 336 been considered. The results can be widened to a yearly basis with equations similar to Eq. (3). 337

338
$$\bar{P}_{turbine\ avg_monthly} = \frac{\eta_{turbine} \cdot \rho \cdot g \cdot \bar{Q}_{turbine\ avg_monthly} \cdot H_{useful}}{10^6} = \frac{\eta_{turbine} \cdot \bar{P}_{hydraulic\ avg_monthly}}{10^6} [MW]$$
 (6)

340 $\overline{En}_{electric_turbine\ avg_monthly} = \overline{P}_{turbine\ avg_monthly} \cdot (24h \cdot days\ in\ a\ month)\ [MW * h]\ (7)$

342 3. CASE STUDY

343 3.1 Evaluation and assessment of the yearly average flow rate in gravity adduction pipelines

As already stated in Section 2, the monthly average electric energy 344 $\overline{En}_{electric turbine avg monthly}$ [MW * h] consumed by the pumping station, together with the useful 345 head H_{useful} [m] and their efficiencies η_{pump} [-] (see Table 2), allows to estimate the monthly 346 average flow rate elaborated by the pumping station $\overline{\dot{Q}}_{pump avg monthly} [m^3 * s^{-1}]$ through Eq. (2). 347 348 Furthermore, the obtained monthly average flow rate elaborated by the pumping station $\overline{\dot{Q}}_{pump avg_monthly} [m^3 * s^{-1}]$ has to be shortened by the the water flow rates coming from the wells 349 $\dot{\dot{Q}}_{wells avg, yearly} [m^3 * s^{-1}]$. Finally, the monthly average flow rate elaborated by the hydraulic 350 turbine $\overline{\dot{Q}}_{turbine avg_monthly_model} [m^3 * s^{-1}]$ is obtained, which can be also expressed as yearly 351 average flow rate $\overline{\dot{Q}}_{turbine avg_yearly_model} [m^3 * s^{-1}]$ according to Eq. (3). Table 3 sums up the 352 numerical values of the magnitudes previously mentioned related to the year 2018. 353

It is worth noting that the overall efficiency of each pump η_{pump} has been set equal to 0.65, according to the point 4 of Subsection 2.2 and the available datasheets. Furthermore, the monthly water consumption of each end user V_{monthly,end user,i} [m³] provided by each pump is considered the same and equal to 12 m³, taking into account an average water volume consumption of about 0.4 m³*day⁻¹ per each end user [29]. This was possible since the distribution of the end users per each pump is homogeneous in terms of both residential and industrial consumers.

360

361

362

# of the PUMP	# of end users	${f V}_{monthly,end\ user,i}$ $[m^3]$	Adduction pipeline length [km]	Adduction pipeline diameter [m]	H _{available} [m]	η _{pump} [–]
1 (TANK A to TANK 13)	7203	12	2.94	0.25	203	0.65
2 (TANK A to TANK 22)	668	12	2.65	0.15	163	0.65
3 (TANK A TO TANK 23)	379	12	2.02	0.15	83	0.65
4 (TANK A TO TANK 24)	710	12	2.84	0.15	63	0.65

Table 3: Estimated monthly average flow rates in the analysed gravity adduction pipelines (year 2018)

MONTH (YEAR 2018)	PUMP	En _{electric_pump,i} [MW*h]	Q̀pump,i avg_monthly_model [m ³ *S ⁻¹]	Żpump avg_monthly_model [m ³ *S⁻¹]	$\dot{Q}_{wells\ avg_monthly} [m^{3*}s^{-1}]$	Żturbine avg_monthly_model [m ³ *S⁻¹]
	1	83.55	0.03543			
	2	6.00	0.00328	0.04406	0.00703	0.03613
JANUAKI	3	1.73	0.00186	0.04400	0.00795	
	4	2.51	0.00349			
	1	73.86	0.03468			
	2	5.31	0.00321	0.04212	0.007763	0.03537
FEBRUARY	3	1.53	0.00182	0.04315		
	4	2.22	0.00342			
MARCH 2 3	1	94.37	0.04002		0.02241	0.02736
	2	6.79	0.00371	0.04077		
	3	1.96	0.00210	0.04977		
	4	2.83	0.00394			
	1	84.27	0.03693			
	2	6.06	0.00342	0.04502	0.01791	0.02802
AFNIL	3	1.75	0.00194	0.04393		
	4	2.53	0.00364			
	1	91.42	0.03877		0.01917	
	2	6.57	0.00359	0.04822		0.02905
MAI	3	1.90	0.00204	0.04822		
	4	2.75	0.00382			

	1	91.32	0.04002				
JUNE 2 3	6.57	0.00371	0.04077	0.0214	0.0005		
	3	1.89	0.00210	0.04977	0.0214	0.02837	
	4	2.74	0.00394				
	1	99.67	0.04227				
нну	2	7.18	0.00392	0.05259	0.02156	0.03102	
JULI	3	2.07	0.00222	0.03238	0.02130		
	4	3.00	0.00417				
	1	101.63	0.04310				
AUCUCT	2	7.30	0.00399	0.0526	0.02001	0.02250	
AUGUST	3	2.11	0.00226	0.0536	0.02091	0.03269	
	4	3.05	0.00425				
	1	91.89	0.04027	0.05000	0.02254	0.02755	
	2	6.61	0.00373				
SEPTEMBER 3	3	1.91	0.00212	0.05009			
	4	2.76	0.00397				
	1	97.32	0.04127				
OCTORER	2	6.99	0.00382	0.05122	0.00050		
OCTOBER	3	2.02	0.00217	0.05133 0.02258		0.02875	
	4	2.93	0.00407				
	1	91.32	0.04002				
NOVEMBED	2	6.57	0.00371	0.04077	0.0000	0.00.00	
NOVEMBER 3 4	3	1.89	0.00210	0.04977	0.0229	0.02687	
	4	2.74	0.00394				
	1	97.50	0.04135				
DECEMBED	2	7.01	0.00383	0.05142	0.02211	0.02022	
DECEIVIDEK	3	2.02	0.00217	0.03143	0.02211	0.02932	
	4	2.93	0.00408				

After the estimation of the monthly average flow rate that can be elaborated by the hydraulic turbine $\overline{Q}_{turbine avg_monthly_model} [m^3 * s^{-1}]$, the management of the WSS decided to install a flow meter in the gravity adduction pipeline that connects the water source to the preloading tank. The flow meter allows to evaluate the exact flow rate values that can be elaborated by the hydraulic turbine and, at the same time, to validate the estimated results obtained with the proposed methodology. Figure 4 shows the hydraulic turbine installation site highlighted in red and connected to the gravity adduction pipeline highlighted in magenta. The location of the PRV to be dismissed is

also present. Table 4 lists the estimated monthly average flow rate $\overline{\dot{Q}}_{turbine avg_monthly_model}$ [m³ * s⁻¹] and the measured ones $\overline{\dot{Q}}_{turbine avg_monthly_meas}$ [m³ * s⁻¹], along with the relative percentage errors expressed by Eq. (8).



Figure 4: Detailed view of the hydraulic turbine installation site

MONTH	$\dot{\mathbf{Q}}$ turbine avg_monthly_meas	\dot{Q} turbine avg_monthly_model	A (0/)	
(YEAR 2018)	[m ³ *s ⁻¹]	[m ³ *s ⁻¹]	Δ (70)	
JANUARY	0.03600	0.03613	0.36	
FEBRUARY	0.02940	0.02674	-9.05	
MARCH	0.02881	0.02736	-5.03	
APRIL	0.02994	0.02802	-6.41	
MAY	MAY 0.03074		-5.50	
JUNE	0.02983	0.02837	-4.89	
JULY	0.03183	0.03102	-2.54	
AUGUST	AUGUST 0.03497		-6.52	
SEPTEMBER	SEPTEMBER 0.02628		4.83	
OCTOBER	OCTOBER 0.02955		-2.71	
NOVEMBER	NOVEMBER 0.02935		-8.45	
DECEMBER	0.02939	0.02932	-0.24	
2018	0.03050	0.03000	-1.64	

384 Table 4 shows that the relative percentage errors related to the monthly average flow rates in the year 2018 are lower than 5% in six out of twelve months, while they are slightly higher (5-7%) in four out 385 386 of twelve months in the same year. The remaining months present relative percentage errors between 7-10%, which are still acceptable. Nevertheless, it is pointed out that the relative percentage error 387 referred to the yearly average flow rate potentially exploited by the hydraulic turbine 388 $\dot{\dot{Q}}_{turbine avg vearly model}$ [m³ * s⁻¹] is sensibly lower than 5%, namely 1.64% in absolute value. It can 389 be stated that the methodology presented in this paper is anyway a good approach for estimating the 390 yearly average flow rate in gravity adduction pipelines when flow meters are not installed. Knowing 391 the measured yearly average flow rate $\overline{\dot{Q}}_{turbine avg_yearly_meas} [m^3 * s^{-1}]$, which will be renamed 392

 $\overline{Q}_{turbine avg_yearly} [m^3 * s^{-1}]$ hereinafter, the pressure losses $H_{loss} [m]$ between the water source and the preloading tank is calculated, being equal to 68.1 m. Therefore, the useful head that can be exploited by the hydraulic turbine $H_{useful} [m]$, considering the respective geodetic heights of the water source (346 m) and the preloading tank (57 m), is equal to 220.9 m. Finally, the operative yearly average measured flow rate $\overline{Q}_{turbine avg_yearly} [m^3 * s^{-1}]$ of 0.0305 m³*s⁻¹ and the useful head exploited by the hydraulic turbine $H_{useful} [m]$ of 220.9 m allow to evaluate the available yearly average hydraulic power $\overline{P}_{hydraulic avg_yearly} [kW]$, which is approximately equal to 66 kW.

400

401 **3.2** Flow duration curve

In Section 2, the main operating magnitudes to evaluate the performance of the hydraulic turbine to be installed in the gravity adduction pipeline of interest have been assessed. Nevertheless, the yearly average flow rate that can be exploited by the hydraulic turbine $\overline{\dot{Q}}_{turbine avg_yearly}$ [m³ * s⁻¹] must be checked through the flow duration curve, which is fundamental to obtain the flow rate value that leads to the highest energy recovery. Immediately downstream the water reservoir, a flow meter is installed. Using data measured by this flow meter between the years 2012 and 2016 (see Table 5), both yearly average water volumes and flow rates coming from the water source are determined.

		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
ANY I ahle S. Yearly average water volumes and thow i	rates coming trom the water reservoir ()	/11//_/11/6
$-\tau_{0}$ I able 5. I cally average water volumes and power		2012 2010

YEAR	WATER VOLUMES [km ³]	YEARLY AVERAGE FLOW RATE [m ³ *s ⁻¹]
2016	946.08	0.03000
2015	1151.56	0.03652
2014	923.39	0.02928
2013	898.77	0.02850
2012	911.16	0.02889
AVERAGE VALUE	966.19	0.03064







Figure 5: Flow duration curve of the gravity adduction pipeline of interest

Figure 5 clearly shows that the monthly average flow rate of about $0.03064 \text{ m}^{3*}\text{s}^{-1}$ occurred more than 40% of the measured time period. That said, if a flow rate range of $\pm 0.005 \text{ m}^{3*}\text{s}^{-1}$ is considered during the operation of the hydraulic turbine, flow rates that occur up to 60% of the measured time period can be elaborated, thus further maximizing the energy recovery potential since the hydraulic turbine will be designed to have the maximum efficiency at almost 0.03064 m³*s⁻¹.

424 **3.3** Selection of the hydraulic turbine

After the flow duration curve analysis, which confirmed the correct evaluation of the yearly average 425 flow rate $\overline{\dot{Q}}_{turbine avg_yearly} [m^3 * s^{-1}]$ of 0.0305 m³*s⁻¹, this value and the useful head H_{useful} [m] 426 of 220.9 m, together with the rotational speed of the hydraulic turbine equal to 1000 rpm that is 427 imposed by the electric generator, are used to evaluate the specific speed value, which is equal to 428 0.057, in order to select the proper hydraulic machine by means of Eq. (5). It is worth noting that this 429 430 value is within the range of Pelton turbines (0.05-0.35); for this reason, this kind of hydraulic machine with two jets has been chosen for being installed in the WSS site of interest. Pelton turbines have a 431 432 wide range of operation in terms of flow rates; indeed, the efficiency curve is quite flat and constant down to 30% of the maximum load and between $\pm 40\%$ with respect to the design flow rate [30]. For 433 this reason, quite sensible flow rate variations from the design one do not affect too much the 434 efficiency of this machine. The efficiency of the turbine is always constant during its operation 435 since a Proportional-Integral-Derivative (PID) controller switch its functioning from one nozzle 436 437 to two according to the operative flow rate by monitoring the water level of the preloading tank. Table 6 resumes the main characteristics of the Pelton turbine at its BEP, while Figure 6 shows the 438 hydraulic machine installed in the site of interest. 439

440

Table 6: Pelton turbine characteristics at its BEP

MAGNITUDE	VALUE
Flow rate [m ³ *s ⁻¹]	0.0305
Useful Head [m]	220.9
Rotational speed [rpm]	1000
Total efficiency [-]	0.82
Power [kW]	54.19



Figure 6: Pelton turbine installed close to the preloading of the analysed WSS

445

446 **4. ENERGY, ENVIRONMENTAL AND ECONOMIC ANALYSES**

447 The values listed in Table 6 related to the Pelton turbine have been used to carry on the energy analysis 448 deriving by the installation of a small-scale hydropower plant in WSSs. It is worth noting that the 449 measured flow rate value at BEP has been used in these analyses.

450 The energy saving $\overline{En}_{saving_after_turbine}$ [MW * h] is evaluated by the difference between the 451 electricity consumption before, $\overline{En}_{before_turbine}$ [MW * h], and after, $\overline{En}_{after_turbine}$ [MW * h], the 452 installation of the small-scale hydropower plant, as reported by Eq. (8).

453
$$\overline{En}_{saving_after_turbine} = \left(\overline{En}_{before_turbine} - \overline{En}_{after_turbine}\right) [MW * h]$$
(8)

455 Precisely, 475.25 MW*h per year are saved. To better highlight this aspect, Figure 7 shows the energy 456 consumed by the pumping station before and after the energy recovery intervention, where the 457 produced electric power is used for supplying electric energy to the pumping station.



459 *Figure 7: Electric energy consumed by the pumping station before and after the hydraulic turbine installation*

460

It is worth noticing that the electricity consumption after the energy recovery intervention includes: i) the electricity withdrawn from the grid to feed the pumping station that is lowered due to the installation of the hydraulic turbine and ii) the electricity consumed by auxiliary devices of both pumps and turbine. Knowing the energy saving $\overline{En}_{saving_after_turbine}$ [MW * h], 88.87 TOE are saved according to Eq. (9):

466
$$TOE_{saving} = \overline{En}_{saving_after_turbine} \cdot Fc_{TOE}$$
 [TOE] (9)

467

468 Fc_{TOE} [TEP * (kW * h)⁻¹] is the conversion factor equal to 0.000187 TOE * (kW * h)⁻¹ [31] for the 469 Italian scenario. This saving can be also expressed by means of tCO₂ not released into the atmosphere, 470 as expressed by Eq. (10), that leads to a value of 204.36 ktCO₂:

471
$$tCO_{2_saving} = \overline{En}_{saving_after_turbine} \cdot Fc_{tCO2} [tCO_2]$$
 (10)

Fc_{tCO2} [tCO₂ * (kW * h)⁻¹] is the conversion factor equal to 0.43 tCO₂ * (kW * h)⁻¹ [32]. Finally,
the gross economic saving is then obtained using Eq. (11), being equal to 94.29 k€*year⁻¹:

475
$$Ec_{saving_gross} = \overline{En}_{saving_after_turbine} \cdot F_{ec} \ [\in^* year^{-1}]$$
 (11)

476

F_{ec} [€*year⁻¹] is the gross electricity cost in 2018 for non-residential consumers with an overall consumption of 20-500 MW*h [33]. The gross economic saving Ec_{saving_gross} [€ * year⁻¹] has to be reduced by the Operation & Management (O&M) costs that have not been taken into account in this work. Nevertheless, the Italian Authorities introduced incentives for energy efficiency interventions: in this regard, energy efficiency certificates are issued according to the amount of saved TOE. In this case, the possible economic income is calculated through Eq. (12) and it is equal to 22.22 k€*year⁻¹:

483
$$Ec_{eec} = TOE_{saving} \cdot F_{eec} \left[\in^* year^1 \right]$$
(12)

484

F_{eec} [\in *TOE⁻¹] corresponds to the economic income obtained per each saved TOE, considering a maximum value of 250 \notin *TOE⁻¹ [34]. Then, Ec_{eec} [\notin *year⁻¹] is summed to the net economic saving Ec_{saving_gross} [\notin *year⁻¹], obtaining 116.51 k \notin *year⁻¹ that is the new economic saving Ec_{saving_gross_final} [\notin *year⁻¹]. This value is sensibly high and it is expected to keep such interesting results also in the upcoming years since the flow rate elaborated by the Pelton turbine is almost constant throughout the year. Table 7 resumes main energy and economic items reported in this section.

$\overline{En}_{saving_after_turbine} \left[MW * h\right]$	TOE _{saving}	ktCO _{2_saving}	Ec _{savinggross} [k€*year ⁻¹]	Ec _{cert} [k€*year ⁻¹]	Ec _{saving_gross_final} [k€*year ⁻¹]
475.26	88.87	204.36	94.29	22.22	116.51

The management of the WSS under investigation have calculated that the construction of the civil, hydraulic, and electromechanical works to build and install the hydraulic turbine are equal to 130 k€, while the yearly operating cost is 20 k€. Thus, considering an Ec_{saving_gross} [€ * year⁻¹] of 116.51 k€*year⁻¹ and a discount rate of 2%, a Payback Period (PBP) of 3 years is achieved, as well as a Net Present Value (NPV) equal to 1,388,000 € in 20 years.

500

501 **5. CONCLUSIONS**

502 This paper proposes a novel methodology capable of estimating the average flow rate in a gravity 503 adduction pipeline, upstream the preloading tank of a WSS, to evaluate a possible energy recovery 504 intervention.

Since the installation of flow meters in gravity adduction pipelines is quite rare and the knowledge of 505 506 the average flow rate is necessary to maximize the exploitation of the recoverable energy, a simple 507 methodology for flow rate evaluation is necessary. This methodology is based on the electric energy consumption of the pumping station, since the sum of flow rates supplied by each pump is equal to 508 the one flowing in the gravity adduction pipeline reduced by the flow rate coming from wells. It is 509 510 worth noting that this methodology is valid only if the variability of the flow rate in gravity adduction pipelines is restricted close to its average value. The energy recovery intervention is evaluated for a 511 WSS located in a mid-town in the Center of Italy. A Pelton turbine has been selected for recovering 512

the water energy content, supplying electricity to the pumping station. The useful head exploited by the hydraulic turbine is evaluated by knowing the flow rates and the dimensions, as well as the physical characteristics, of the gravity adduction pipeline in which it can be installed.

516 This methodology has been then validated using flow rates values recorded by a flow meter installed in the gravity adduction pipeline after the installation of the Pelton turbine. The validation phase has 517 shown monthly relative percentage errors lower than 5% in six out of twelve months, a slightly higher 518 519 (5-7%) in four out of twelve months in the same year, and a still acceptable relative percentage error between 7-10% in the remaining months. Nevertheless, considering the yearly average flow rate 520 value, an absolute relative percentage error of only 1.64% with respect to measured value has been 521 522 obtained. Always using the measured data, an energy saving equal to 475.26 MW*h (88.87 TOE and 204.36 ktCO₂) is obtained, which results to a gross economic saving of 94.29 k€*year⁻¹. The gross 523 economic saving increases up to 116.51 k€*year⁻¹ if energy efficiency certificates issued by Italian 524 Authorities are considered, leading to a PBP of 3 years and a NPV after twenty years of 1,388,000 €. 525

This study confirmed that energy recovery interventions improve the efficiency of a WSS when a proper methodology for the evaluation of the flow rates in gravity adduction pipelines is performed, which is fundamental for assessing its profitability when flow meters are not present.

In terms of future developments of this research, it would be interesting to increase the flexibility of 529 the proposed methodology by extending the validity of the estimation of water flows, also when the 530 flow rate to the preload tank is distributed discontinuously and not close to the yearly average one. 531 For instance, the operation of the water pumping station could be regulated according to the average 532 set-point level in the preloading tank by means of inverters that modulate the flow rate supplied by 533 the pumps. Another possible development could be the evaluation of strategies that increase the self-534 consumption of the energy produced by the turbine (ideally up to 100%) to feed the pumping station, 535 and modulate the pumps that feed the preload tank via inverters. Finally, another point of reflection 536

concerns the chance of increasing the energy produced by the turbine by varying the set-point levelin the preload tank and thus optimizing the regulation of the spear valve.

539

540 **REFERENCES**

[1] W. Hickman, A. Muzhikyan, A.M. Farid, The synergistic role of renewable energy integration
into the unit commitment of the energy water nexus, Renewable Energy, Year 2017, Vol. 108, Pages
220-229.

- 544 [2] E. Ahmadi, B. McLellan, T. Tezuka, The economic synergies of modelling the renewable energy-
- water nexus towards sustainability, Renewable Energy, Year 2020, Vol. 162, Pages 1347-1366.
- 546 [3] J.C. Alberizzi, M. Renzi, M. Righetti, G.R. Pisaturo, M. Rossi, Speed and Pressure Controls of
- Pumps-as-Turbines Installed in Branch of Water-Distribution Network Subjected to Highly Variable
 Flow Rates, Energies, Year 2019, Vol. 12(24), Article 4738.
- [4] M. Stefanizzi, T. Capurso, G. Balacco, M. Binetti, S.M. Camporeale, M. Torresi, Selection,
 control and techno-economic feasibility of Pumps as Turbines in Water Distribution Networks,
 Renewable Energy, Year 2020, Vol. 162, Pages 1292-1306.
- [5] N.F. Tumen Ozdil, A. Tantekin, Exergy and exergoeconomic assessments of an electricity
 production system in a running wastewater treatment plant, Renewable Energy, Year 2016, Vol. 97,
 Pages 390-398.
- [6] M. Renzi, P. Rudolf, D. Štefan, A. Nigro, M. Rossi, Installation of an axial Pump-as-Turbine
 (PaT) in a wastewater sewer of an oil refinery: A case study, Applied Energy, Year 2019, Vol. 250,
 Pages 665-676.

- [7] T. Lydon, P. Coughlan, A. McNabola, Pressure management and energy recovery in water
 distribution networks: Development of design and selection methodologies using three pump-asturbine case studies, Renewable Energy, Year 2017, Vol. 114, Pages 1038-1050.
- [8] A. Strazzabosco, S.A. Conrad, P.A. Lant, S.J. Kenway, Expert opinion on influential factors
 driving renewable energy adoption in the water industry, Renewable Energy, Year 2020, Vol. 162,
 Pages 754-765.
- [9] C.M. Papapostolou, E.M. Kondili, D.P. Zafirakis, G.T. Tzanes, Sustainable water supply systems
 for the islands: The integration with the energy problem, Renewable Energy, Year 2020, Vol. 146,
 Pages 2577-2588.
- [10] X. Liu, Y. Tian, X. Lei, H. Wang, Z. Liu, J. Wang, An improved self-adaptive grey wolf
 optimizer for the daily optimal operation of cascade pumping stations, Applied Soft Computing, Year
 2019, Vol. 75, Pages 473-493.
- [11] W. Chen, T. Tao, A. Zhou, L. Zhang, L. Liao, X. Wu, K. Yan, C. Li, T.C. Zhang, Z. Li, Genetic
 optimization toward operation of water intake-supply pump stations system, Journal of Cleaner
 Production, Year 2021, Vol. 279, Article 123573.
- 573 [12] X. Zou, H. Huang, L. Li, Z. Liu, An Improved Energy-Saving Design Method for Drive System
 574 with Multi Motor-Pumps by Using Genetic Algorithm, Procedia CIRP, Year 2019, Pages 79-83.
- 575 [13] C. Zhang, L. Wang, H. Li, Optimization method based on process control of a new-type 576 hydraulic-motor hybrid beam pumping unit, Measurement, Year 2020, Vol. 158, Article 107716.
- 576 hydraulic-motor hybrid beam pumping unit, Measurement, Year 2020, Vol. 158, Article 107716.
- 577 [14] A. Mamade, D. Loureiro, D. Covas, H. Alegre, Energy Auditing As a Tool for Improving Service
- 578 Efficiency of Water Supply Systems, Procedia Engineering, Vol. 89, Year 2014, Pages 557-564.

[15] C. Huang, Y. Li, X. Li, H. Wang, J. Yan, X. Wang, J. Wu, F. Li, Understanding the water-energy
nexus in urban water supply systems with cities features, Energy Procedia, Vol. 152, Year 2018,
Pages 265-270.

[16] M.R. Nogueira Vilanova, J.A. Perrella Balestieri, Energy and hydraulic efficiency in
conventional water supply systems, Renewable and Sustainable Energy Reviews, Year 2014, Vol.
30, Pages 701-714.

[17] G. Meirelles Lima, B. Melo Brentan, E. Luvizotto, Optimal design of water supply networks
using an energy recovery approach, Renewable Energy, Year 2018, Vol. 117, Pages 404-413.

[18] S. Kucukali, Hydropower potential of municipal water supply dams in Turkey: a case of study
in Ulutan Dam, Energy Policy, Year 2010, Vol. 38, Pages 6534-6539.

[19] A. McNabola, P. Coughlan, A.P. Williams, Energy recovery in the water industry: an assessment
of the potential of micro-hydropower, Water Environmental Journal, Year 2013, Vol. 27, Pages 1-11.

[20] J. Saldarriaga, C.A. Salcedo, Determination of Optimal Location and Settings of Pressure
Reducing Valves in Water Distribution Networks for Minimizing Water Losses, Procedia
Engineering, Year 2015, Vol. 119, Pages 973-983.

594 [21] F. García-Ávila, A. Avilés-Añazco, J. Ordoñez-Jara, C. Guanuchi-Quezada, L. Flores del Pino,
595 L. Ramos-Fernández, Pressure management for leakage reduction using pressure reducing valves.

596 Case study in an Andean city, Alexandria Engineering Journal, Year 2019, Vol. 58, Pages 1313-1326.

597 [22] C. Van den Berg, The Drivers of Non-Revenue Water: How Effective Are Non-Revenue Water
598 Reduction Programs?, Policy Research Working Paper, 6997, Year 2014. Available at:

599http://documents1.worldbank.org/curated/en/949281468161359020/pdf/WPS6997.pdf(last

600 accessed on the 05/07/2021).

- [23] F. Vieira, H.M. Ramos, Hybrid solution and pump-storage optimization in water supply system
 efficiency: a case of study, Energy Policy, Year 2008, Vol. 36, Pages 4142-4148.
- [24] Z. Xu, L. Yao, X. Chen, Urban water supply system optimization and planning: Bi-objective
 optimization and system dynamics methods, Computers & Industrial Engineering, Year 2020, Vol.

605 142, Article 106373.

- 606 [25] S. Kucukali, Municipal water supply dams as a source of small hydropower in Turkey,
 607 Renewable Energy, Vol. 35, Year 2010, Pages 2001-2007.
- [26] L-T. Wong, K-W Mui, A Review of Demand Models for Water Systems in Buildings including
- a Bayesian Approach, Water, Volume 10(8), Year 2018, Article 1078.
- [27] L.K. Letting, Y. Hamam, A.M. Abu-Mahfouz, Estimation of Water Demand in Water
 Distribution Systems Using Particle Swarm Optimization, Water, Volume 9(8), Year 2017, Article
 593.
- 613 [28] G. Balacco, A. Carbonara, A. Gioia, V. Iacobellis, A.F. Piccinini, Evaluation of Peak Water
- 614 Demand Factors in Puglia (Southern Italy), Water, Volume 9(2), Year 2017, Article 96.
- [29] V. Milano, Acquedotti Guida alla progettazione (in Italian), HOEPLI, Year 2012, Pages 650.
- [30] H. Jeon, J. Hoon Park, Y. Shin, M. Choi, Friction loss and energy recovery of a Pelton turbine
 for different spear positions, Renewable Energy, Year 2018, Vol. 123, Pages 273-280.
- [31] Autorità Regolazione Energia Reti e Ambiente (ARERA), Deliberazione dell'Autorità
 618/2013/R/EFR (in Italian). Available at: https://www.arera.it/allegati/docs/13/618-13.pdf (last
 accessed on the 05/07/2021).
- [32] Agenzia nazionale per le nuove tecnologie, l'energia e lo sviluppo economico sostenibile
 (ENEA), Rapporto Energia e Ambiente 2002 (in Italian). Available at:
 http://old.enea.it/com/web/pubblicazioni/REA_02/analisi_02.pdf (last accessed on the 05/07/2021).

624 [33] European Statistical Office (EUROSTAT). Available at:
625 https://ec.europa.eu/eurostat/web/energy/data/database (last accessed on the 05/07/2021).

626 [34] Gestore dei Servizi Energetici (GSE), Certificati bianchi (in Italian). Available at:

627 https://www.gse.it/servizi-per-te/efficienza-energetica/certificati-bianchi (last accessed on the

628 05/07/2021).