

## Original Article

# Suitability Model Development for Rooftop Rainwater Harvesting (RRWH) System in an Urban Area Using Geographical Information Systems

Nurul Ain Wahida Mohd Radzali<sup>1,2</sup>, Helmi Zulhaidi Mohd Shafri<sup>1,2\*</sup>, Badronnisa Yusuf<sup>1</sup> and Balqis Mohamed Rehan<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Department of Civil Engineering, Faculty of Engineering, Universiti Putra Malaysia, UPM Serdang, 43400, Malaysia

<sup>2</sup>Geospatial Information Science Research Centre (GISRC), Universiti Putra Malaysia, UPM Serdang, 43400, Malaysia

\* Corresponding author, Email address: helmi@upm.edu.my

## Abstract

Rooftop Rainwater Harvesting (RRWH) system is one of the solutions that may improve water security as it allows water collection to be done directly from home, especially in an urban area. Geographical Information System (GIS) approach has been utilized in this study as a platform for urban environmental analysis in which the suitability of the rooftop as a catchment area for RRWH system in terms of quality and quantity were evaluated. The GIS model was developed to simulate and predict the suitability of the rooftop based on the estimated volume of collected harvested rainwater and Water Index Quality (WQI). Furthermore, weightages for several criteria such as roof material (RM), roof condition (RC), roof area (RA) and runoff coefficient (RuCO) have been determined using Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) method. Then, Weighted Linear Combination (WLC) was applied to aggregate all these criteria according to their significance. The final map produced from the developed suitability model for RRWH system was categorized into three different categories: highly suitable, moderately suitable, and not suitable. The result demonstrated that asbestos is not suitable with a total of 53, concrete is moderately suitable with the total of 178, and metal

is highly suitable with the total of 150; to be used for rooftop rainwater harvesting. Overall, this study showed that the study area is moderately suitable for RRWH system adoption.

**Keywords:** Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP), Geographical Information System (GIS), Rooftop Rainwater Harvesting (RRWH), Water Quality Index (WQI), Weighted Linear Combination (WLC)

## 1. Introduction

Rainwater harvesting is a technique used to collect and store the harvested rainwater from land use/ land cover, water catchment, road surface and building (Ojwang, Dietrich, Anebagilu, Beyer & Rottensteiner, 2017). It has frequently been practised in different parts of the world. The climate change with rapid development at urban areas has affected the availability of water resources and thus, leads to rainwater harvesting as the chosen approach for the collection of harvested rainwater that partially meets the household water demand (Notaro, Liu & Freni, 2016). Besides, the advantages from this approach can help in non-potable usage for water-saving; inexpensive and highly decentralized, empowering individuals and communities to manage their water, mitigation of flooding at urban areas and reduction of nutrient loads to waterways (Lani, Syafiuddin, Yusop, Adam & Amin, 2018). It also environmentally safe and can be reasonably utilized. It provides a reliable renewable resource with special management and little investment. The harvested water can be transported with little energy. The potential of rainwater harvesting was divided based on the spatial scales; small scale (indicates large geographic areas such as cultivation area) and large scale (indicates greater detail such as building roof) (Nthuni, Lübker & Schaab, 2014). For large scale, geodata obtained from remote sensing (building footprint and roofing area) with ancillary data (roof material (RM), roof condition (RC), runoff coefficient (RuCO) and rainfall) were applied

mainly to generate a map that reveals the potential areas for implementing rainwater harvesting approach (Hari, Reddy, Vikas, Srinivas & Vikas, 2018). For an urban area, the roof is the first candidate for rainwater harvesting as it represents approximately half of the total sealed surface in cities (Farreny et al., 2011). However, Zhang et al. (2014) rose the issue of harvested rainwater quality from this resource as the rainwater might carry nutrient pollution (Vijayaraghavan, Joshi & Balasubramaniam, 2012), microbial pathogens (Simmons, Hope, Lewis, Whitmore & Gao, 2001), heavy metal (Lee, Bak & Han, 2012) and pesticides (Zobrist et al., 2000).

The application of Geographical Information System (GIS) for rainwater harvesting showed good performance in both scales; small and large. As an example, Radwan, Alazba & Mossad (2018), Siddha and Sahu (2018) and Yousif and Bubenzer (2015) have performed the potential of rainwater harvesting at large area meanwhile Adugna, Jensen, Lemma and Gebrie (2018), Lani, Yusuf, and Syafiuddin (2018) and Sambhaji and Gaikwad (2016) have successfully evaluated the performance of rainwater harvesting at small scale. The quantity and quality of rooftop harvested rainwater were depending on the RMs and the formula used for volume estimation (VE) for harvested rainwater by Gould (2008) that has been enhanced by Prayogo and Susilo (2019). The type of RM used for the catchment area can affect the quality of the harvested rainwater (Jones & Hunt, 2010). Based on previous studies, the findings showed that asbestos is not suitable for rooftop rainwater harvesting as the material is easily mixed with other minerals that may affect the quality of rooftop harvested rainwater (Campopiano et al., 2009; Roy 2013). For quality assessment of the rooftop harvested rainwater, the “first flush” method was applied. This method must first be applied to remove the contaminated elements such as dirt, bird droppings and insect bodies before the quality assessment can be done. Furthermore, many studies have successfully developed suitability models for rainwater harvesting using Analytical Hierarchy Process (AHP) technique (Aydi,

Abichou, Nasr, Louati & Zairi, 2016; Gumusay, Koseoglu & Bakirman, 2016; Özkan, Dengiz & Turan, 2019) with different methods of model validation. These studies showed that the AHP technique can assist the suitability models development by assigning a certain weight corresponding to the criteria involved.

Although prior research has established the potential of rainwater harvesting to improve water security, there is a need to investigate how effective the urban environmental analysis can be used to assess the potential of rooftop rainwater harvesting (RRWH) adoption on urban area. Therefore, the aim of this research is to assess the potential of RRWH involving various RMs (metal, concrete, and asbestos) through VE, Water Quality Index (WQI) and suitability model using AHP in a GIS environment. This research integrated quantity and quality data of rooftop harvested rainwater for VE and WQI and combined RM, RC, RA and RuCO as the criteria to develop the suitability model for rooftop rainwater harvesting.

## **2. Materials and Methods**

Figure 1 illustrates the flow of the methodology for this study. The methodology was categorized into three phases, (i) database development (ii) volume estimation and WQI assessment, and (iii) GIS model development.

## **3. Study Area**

The study area for this research is in Taman Sri Serdang, Seri Kembangan. It lies between latitude 332600N – 333000N and longitude 412600E – 413200E, covering an area of 0.2 km<sup>2</sup>. According to the 2012 census, this area was occupied by 14360 people (Lim, Shaharuddin & Sam, 2013) and the area consists of commercial, residential, mosque, police station, and school. Meanwhile, the annual rainfall at this area was estimated to be around 2600 mm per year.

### 3.1 Data development

This study utilised a building footprint that was extracted from the previous work that was carried out by Norman, Shafri, Idrees, Mansor, and Yusuf (2019) and Norman, Shafri, Mansor, Yusuf, and Radzali (2020) specifically for RRWH system application in a heterogeneous urban area. It consists of three types of RMs; asbestos, concrete, and metal, and each with its RC that indicates the degradation level of the roof that is either new or old. All this information is proven as one of the confounding criteria in determining the quality of RRWH (Gwenzi, Dunjana, Pisa, Tauro & Nyamadzawo, 2015). Geodatabase of the obtained building footprint was developed using ArcGIS v10.8 software. Attributes for the geodatabase are RM, RC, RA, rainfall, RuCO and XY coordinates. The total number of roofs involved in this study is 762.

### 3.2 Volume estimation

The estimated volume for the RRWH system for each roof is dependent upon the size of the catchment area or RA, monthly rainfall received and RuCO. Subsequently, to calculate how much rainwater can be harvested, the value of RA (m<sup>2</sup>) will be multiplied with monthly rainfall (mm) and RuCO (Ghisi & Ferreira, 2007). The value of each parameter has been substituted into the following equation:

$$VE = RA \text{ (m}^2\text{)} \times (R \text{ (mm)} / 1000) \times RuCO \quad (1)$$

where,

VE	:	volume estimation of RRWH	R	:	monthly rainfall
RA	:	roof area	RuCO	:	runoff coefficient

### 3.3 WQI assessment

The quality of harvested rainwater plays an important role in defining the suitability of the roof as a catchment area for RRWH system in an urban area. The quality of harvested

rainwater is conducted by the measurement of physical and chemical parameters. The quality of harvested rainwater based on three different rooftop materials is checked before and after treatment of rainwater. The qualities of harvested rainwater based on different rooftop materials before and after treatment are compared with the Natural Drinking Quality Water Standard (NDWQS) as guidelines and references. The harvested rainwater is treated using coagulation and acid-based titration methods to remove colloidal impurities (Radzali, Shafri, Norman & Saufi, 2018). Hence, water quality index (WQI) of RRWH system in Taman Sri Serdang was assessed based on the observation of any change on the chemical of substances. In this assessment, the chemical parameters for instance pH; the measurement of the potential activity of hydrogen ions ( $H^+$ ) in moles per liter in the rainwater samples, heavy metals focusing on Zinc (Zn) and Manganese (Mg), and Chemical Oxygen Demand (COD); the estimation of the capacity of water to consume oxygen during decomposition, were evaluated and compared to the value of the Drinking Water Quality Standard from the Ministry of Health Malaysia (Talha, 2019). The guidelines from the Ministry of Health Malaysia used to assess the good quality of water for domestic used which is related to the safety of human contact and health of ecosystems. The laboratory procedures are conducted according to the standard operation of Standard Tests for Water and Wastewater. The laboratory experiment is done for before and after treatment of rainwater and repeated for three cycles on different rain pattern.

### 3.4 GIS development

Several confounding criteria have been determined before the GIS model for rooftop suitability as a catchment area for the RRWH system can be developed in Taman Sri Serdang. A total of 4 criteria were identified; RM, RC, RA and RuCO. The determination was done based on literature reviews and via a set of questionnaires responded by 30 experts. Furthermore, these criteria were based on the generality in the references and the availability

of the data within the study area. Then, all the selected criteria were adopted into multi-criteria decision analysis (MCDA) and the analytical hierarchy process (AHP) for further analysis.

Previous studies showed that AHP is the best method to be included in the GIS analysis to identify a suitable site for rainwater harvesting (Hari et al., 2018; Wu et al., 2018). This method can organize the complex decision and perform the analysis based on mathematic knowledge and experts. The main code in AHP is symbolizing the components of any problem hierarchically in displaying the relationships between each level. Following, the main goal should be on the uppermost level for resolving a problem meanwhile the lower level consists of more detailed criteria that influence the main objective. The matrix of pairwise comparison was applied to determine the weights for each criterion. The suitability assessment which involves two criteria was determined by their relative importance with the help of pairwise comparison.

Finally, the suitability index was calculated using the WLC method, whereby the product of each of the weight to each criterion was summed up with its standard score using Equation 1 as follow:

$$S = \sum_{i=1}^n W_i X_i \quad (1)$$

where S indicates the suitability,  $W_i$  is the weight for each factor and  $X_i$  is the rate or score for classes in the criteria.

## **4. Results and Discussion**

### **4.1 Database of the building footprint**

Example of attributes for building footprint in the study such as RM, RC, RuCO, slope length and size of roof area can be seen in Figure 2. All the information was then used and applied for further analysis.

## 4.2 Volume estimation

Table 1 showed most of the roofs in the study area is new concrete (179), having the minimum and maximum values of the calculated VE were 6.409 m<sup>3</sup> and 3,623.065 m<sup>3</sup> respectively. Meanwhile, the total VE of the potential harvested rainwater for the whole concrete (new) rooftop was predicted to be 62,315.64 m<sup>3</sup>. On the other hand, the minority rooftop (new asbestos) can potentially harvest an approximate of 1,685.858 m<sup>3</sup> of rainwater in a total of the minimum and maximum VE of 33.248 m<sup>3</sup> and 251.121 m<sup>3</sup> respectively. As for metal (87) rooftop, the potential volume of rooftop rainwater to be harvested was 19,004.529 m<sup>3</sup> in which the minimum and maximum values of the VE obtained were 0.149 m<sup>3</sup> and 721.808 m<sup>3</sup> respectively. Thus, from 276 new roofs in the study area can potentially provide 83,006.027 m<sup>3</sup> of harvested rainwater in a year.

## 4.3 WQI assessment

The level of quality for rooftop harvested rainwater was based on the calculated index value (IV). In this study, two categories of WQI were determined (good water and poor water) and the result was used to evaluate the suitability of the roof to be exploited for RRWH system. The ranking of the best rooftop for rainwater harvesting for standard roofing materials from the best to the worst quality was metal, concrete, and asbestos roofs. The ranking of rooftop harvested rainwater was identified according to the quality of rainwater samples. For the quality of the rainwater storage, the metal roof was recommended roofing material in urban or rainwater harvesting area implement.

Table 2 showed the result of the chemical content for each type of roof. The pH value for concrete was found to be higher than metal due to the presence of alkaline substances and metals (Zhang et al. 2014). Then, asbestos has the highest COD value with 37.33 while concrete and metal have values of 21.33 and 26.67 of COD respectively. The result indicates that asbestos is highly contaminated and could cause harmful effects (Smartt 2004).



Moving on to the WQI, the result tabulated in Table 3 illustrated that concrete roofs have good quality for harvesting rainwater with an IV value of 77.56. On the other hand, asbestos and metal roofs were categorized as poor quality due to the IVs obtained were 176.26 and 187.31 respectively.

#### 4.4 GIS model for RRWH system suitability

##### 4.4.1 AHP weightage for the criteria

The criteria shown in Table 4 have been used as inputs in the AHP method. The calculation of the matrix of pairwise comparison was carried out by defining the importance level between one criterion and another. Each attribute or class was given a score in which high score indicates that the criterion with that class is more favourable to be used for the RRWH and vice versa. Finally, the weightage obtained via the AHP was used in the formula as shown in the Equation 2.

$$\text{Suitability Index} = [(0.40 \times RM) + (0.43 \times RuCO) + (0.12 \times RC) + (0.05 \times RA)] \quad (2)$$

The final map of the suitability of RRWH system as shown in Figure 3 was produced by aggregating the criteria (RMs, RC (old and new), RA (old and new) and RuCO) and the classes using Weighted Overlay tool in ArcGIS software. The results of the suitability map were grouped into three categories; highly suitable; it recommended be used for non-portable usage, moderately suitable; it can be used for non-portable usage, and not suitable; it cannot be used either for drinking or non-portable usage in which each category indicates the suitability of the rooftop for implementing RRWH.

Table 5 showed the total of identified roofs (including new and old) based on the suitability of the roof for RRWH system. The result demonstrated that asbestos roof is not suitable to be used for rainwater harvesting with a total of 53 out of 53 (100%) roofs were identified as not suitable. This finding showed that asbestos is highly contaminated and not safe due to the chemical compounds from this material might leach into the runoff (Norman et

al., 2020) and consequently, affect the quality of the harvested rainwater. Thus, the harvested rainwater from this material cannot be used either for drinking or non-portable usage. On the other hand, the metal roofs categorised 100% as highly suitable for RRWH in the study area.

Then, from 559 concrete roofs, 31.84% were categorised as moderately suitable to be used for harvesting the rainwater while the remaining 68.16% were classified as not suitable. This is because metal and concrete roofs have smooth surfaces, thus these materials have a low degree of bacteria; highly recommended for rainwater harvesting purposes (Mendez et al. 2011).

## **Conclusion**

The suitability of the GIS model for RRWH system in this study has considered both significant elements in environmental monitoring; quality and quantity of collected rainwater. Significant criteria: RM, RC, RA, rainfall and RuCO have played an important role in determining the success of the proposed model. After the old type of roofs was excluded due to the high potential of contamination, the result of quantity assessment (VE) has presented concrete as the best material to be used as the catchment area for RRWH. This is because the concrete roof covered most of the study area with a coverage of 64.86% (179 out of 276) from the total new roofs with the highest total VE of 62,315.64 m<sup>3</sup>. The quality of harvested rainwater is important to ensure clean and safe water sources even though it is for non-portable uses such as toilet flushing, landscape irrigation and car washing. The WQI values produced were compared to the Drinking Water Quality Standard and hence, the result indicated that new concrete roofs are the most suitable rooftop for providing good water for rainwater harvesting. Besides VE and WQI, other criteria (RuCO, RMs, RC, RA (include old and new)) were considered to further analyze the overall quality and quantity of the potential rooftop in the study area for RRWH system. The result displayed that metal roofs are highly suitable for

RRWH system. Less contamination with lower pH value and high value of RuCO for metal have made this material as the best rooftop to be used for RRWH system.

## Acknowledgements

This study was a part of the project titled “Development of an Integrated Remote Sensing and GIS Approach for Assessing Urban Environmental Impacts on the Quality of Rooftop Harvested Rainwater” funded by the Universiti Putra Malaysia. The authors acknowledged the funding provided by UPM under the ‘Geran Putra Berimpak’; GPB/2017/9543100.

## References

- Adugna, D., Jensen, M.B., Lemma, B. & Gebrie, G.S. (2018). Assessing the potential for rooftop rainwater harvesting from large public institutions. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 15,336-346.  
doi:org/10.3390/ijerph15020336
- Aydi, A., Abichou, T., Nasr, I.H., Louati, M. & Zairi, M. (2016). Assessment of land suitability for olive mill wastewater disposal site selection by integrating fuzzy logic, ahp, and wlc in a gis. *Environ Monit Assess*, 188,1-13. doi:org/10.1007/s10661-015-5076-3
- Campopiano, A., Ramires, D., Zakrzewska, A.M., Ferri, R., D'annibale, A. & Pizzutelli, G. (2009). Risk assessment of the decay of asbestos cement roofs. *Annals Of Occupational Hygiene*, 53,627-638. doi:org/10.1093/annhyg/mep036
- Engineering Services Division. (2016). *Drinking water quality standard, Ministry of Health Malaysia*. Retrieved from  
<https://environment.com.my/wpcontent/uploads/2016/05/Drinking-Water-MOH.pdf>

272 Farreny, R., Morales-Pinzón, T., Guisasola, A., Tayà, C., Rieradevall, J. & Gabarrell, X.  
 273 (2011). Roof selection for rainwater harvesting: quantity and quality assessments in  
 274 Spain. *Water Research*, 45,3245-3254. doi:org/10.1016/j.watres.2011.03.036  
 275 Gumusay, M.U., Koseoglu, G. & Bakirman, T. (2016). An assessment of site suitability for  
 276 marina construction in Istanbul, Turkey, using GIS and AHP multicriteria decision  
 277 analysis. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment*, 188,1-15.  
 278 doi:org/10.1007/s10661-016-5677-5  
 279 Gwenzi, W., Dunjana, N., Pisa, C., Tauro, T. & Nyamadzawo, G. (2015). Water quality and  
 280 public health risks associated with roof rainwater harvesting systems for potable  
 281 supply: review and perspectives. *Sustainability of Water Quality and Ecology*, 6,107-  
 282 118. doi:org/10.1016/j.swaqe.2015.01.006  
 283 Hari, D., Reddy, K.R., Vikas, K., Srinivas, N. & Vikas, G. (2018). Assessment of rainwater  
 284 harvesting potential using GIS. *In IOP Conference Series: Materials Science and*  
 285 *Engineering*, 330,1-9. doi:org/10.1088/1757-899X/330/1/012119  
 286 Jones, M.P. & Hunt, W.F. (2010). Performance of rainwater harvesting systems in the  
 287 southeastern United States. *Resources, Conservation and Recycling*, 54,623-629.  
 288 doi:org/10.1016/j.resconrec.2009.11.002  
 289 Lani, N.H.M., Syafiuddin, A., Yusop, Z., Adam, U. & Amin, M.Z.M. (2018). Performance of  
 290 small and large scales rainwater harvesting systems in commercial buildings under  
 291 different reliability and future water tariff scenarios. *Science of The Total*  
 292 *Environment*, 636,1171-1179. doi:org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2018.04.418  
 293 Lani, N.H.M., Yusop, Z. & Syafiuddin, A. (2018). A review of rainwater harvesting in  
 294 Malaysia: prospects and challenges. *Water*, 10,506-527. doi:org/10.3390/w10040506

295 Lee, J.Y., Bak, G. & Han, M. (2012). Quality of roof-harvested rainwater—comparison of  
 296 different roofing materials. *Environmental Pollution*, 162,422-429.  
 297 doi:org/10.1016/j.envpol.2011.12.005

298 Lim, C.S., Shaharuddin, M.S. & Sam, W.Y. (2013). Risk assessment of exposure to lead in  
 299 tap water among residents of seri kembangan, selangor state, malaysia. *Global Journal*  
 300 *of Health Science*, 5,1-12. doi:org/10.5539/gjhs.v5n2p1

301 Mendez, C.B., Klenzendorf, J.B., Afshar, B.R., Simmons, M.T., Barrett, M.E., Kinney, K.A.  
 302 & Kirisits, M.J. (2011). The effect of roofing material on the quality of harvested  
 303 rainwater. *Water Research*, 45,2049-2059. doi:org/10.1016/j.watres.2010.12.015

304 Norman, M., Shafri, H.Z.M., Idrees, M.O., Mansor, S. & Yusuf, B. (2019). Spatio-statistical  
 305 optimization of image segmentation process for building footprint extraction using very  
 306 high-resolution worldview 3 satellite data. *Geocarto International*, 35,1124-1147.  
 307 doi:org/10.1080/10106049.2019.1573853

308 Norman, M., Shafri, H.Z.M., Mansor, S., Yusuf, B. & Radzali, N.A.W.M. (2020). Fusion of  
 309 multispectral imagery and lidar data for roofing materials and roofing surface  
 310 conditions assessment. *International Journal of Remote Sensing*, 41,7090-7111.  
 311 doi:org/10.1080/01431161.2020.1754493

312 Notaro, V., Liuzzo, L. & Freni, G. (2016). Reliability analysis of rainwater harvesting  
 313 systems in southern italy. *Procedia Engineering*, 162,373-380.  
 314 doi:org/10.1016/j.proeng.2016.11.077

315 Nthuni, S.M., Lübker, T. & Schaab, G. (2014). Modelling the potential of rainwater  
 316 harvesting in western kenya using remote sensing and gis techniques. *South African*  
 317 *Journal of Geomatics*, 3,285-301. doi:org/ 10.4314/sajg.v3i3.3

318 Ojwang, R.O., Dietrich, J., Anebagilu, P.K., Beyer, M. & Rottensteiner, F. (2017). Rooftop  
 319 rainwater harvesting for mombasa: scenario development with image classification and  
 320 water resources simulation. *Water*, 9,359-377. doi:org/10.3390/w9050359  
 321 Özkan, B., Dengiz, O. & Turan, İ.D. (2019) Site suitability assessment and mapping for rice  
 322 cultivation using multi-criteria decision analysis based on fuzzy-ahp and topsis  
 323 approaches under semihumid ecological condition in delta plain. *Paddy and Water*  
 324 *Environment*, 17,665-676. doi:org/10.1007/s10333-019-00692-8  
 325 Prayogo, T.B. & Susilo, G.E. (2019). rainwater harvesting and electricity saving on  
 326 household scale. *International Journal of GEOMATE*, 17,92-100.  
 327 doi:org/10.21660/2019.62.91544  
 328 Radzali, N. A. W. M., Shafri, H. Z. M., Norman, M., & Saufi, S. (2018). Roofing assessment  
 329 for rooftop rainwater harvesting adoption using remote sensing and GIS approach.  
 330 *International Archives of the Photogrammetry, Remote Sensing and Spatial Information*  
 331 *Sciences - ISPRS Archives*, 42(4/W9), 129–132. doi:org/10.5194/isprs-archives-XLII-4-  
 332 W9-129-2018  
 333 Radwan, F., Alazba, A.A. & Mossad, A. (2018). Estimating potential direct runoff for  
 334 ungauged urban watersheds based on rst and gis. *Arabian Journal of*  
 335 *Geosciences*, 11,748-759. doi:org/10.1007/s12517-018-4067-4  
 336 Shinde, S.D. & Gaikwad, V.P. (2016). Application of gis for mapping rainwater harvesting  
 337 potential: a case study of nidhal village in satara district. *International Journal of*  
 338 *Research in Applied, Natural and Social Sciences*, 4,139-146.  
 339 Siddha, S. & Sahu, P. (2018). Assessment of groundwater potential of gandhinagar region,  
 340 gujarat. *Journal of the Geological Society of India*, 91,91-98. doi:org/10.1007/s12594-  
 341 018-0824-y

342 Simmons, G., Hope, V., Lewis, G., Whitmore, J. & Gao, W. (2001). Contamination of  
 343 potable roof-collected rainwater in auckland, new zealand. *Water Research*, 35,1518-  
 344 1524. doi:org/10.1016/S0043-1354(00)00420-6  
 345 Smartt, P. (2004). Mortality, morbidity, and asbestosis in new zealand: the hidden legacy of  
 346 asbestos exposure. *The New Zealand Medical Journal*, 117,1205.  
 347 Talha, M.Z.M. (2019). *Seminar pencemaran sungai dan impak terhadap bekalan air di*  
 348 *semenanjung malaysia*. Retrieved from [https://enviro2.doe.gov.my/ekmc/wp-](https://enviro2.doe.gov.my/ekmc/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/Pencemaran-Sungai-di-Malaysia-_PghBAM.pdf)  
 349 [content/uploads/2020/03/Pencemaran-Sungai-di-Malaysia-\\_PghBAM.pdf](https://enviro2.doe.gov.my/ekmc/wp-content/uploads/2020/03/Pencemaran-Sungai-di-Malaysia-_PghBAM.pdf)  
 350 Vijayaraghavan, K., Joshi, U.M. & Balasubramanian, R. (2012). A field study to evaluate  
 351 runoff quality from green roofs. *Water Research*, 46,1337-1345.  
 352 doi:org/10.1016/j.watres.2011.12.050  
 353 Wu, R.S., Molina, G.L.L. & Hussain, F. (2018). Optimal sites identification for rainwater  
 354 harvesting in northeastern guatemala by analytical hierarchy process. *Water Resources*  
 355 *Management*, 32,4139-4153. doi:org/10.1007/s11269-018-2050-1  
 356 Yousif, M. & Bubenzer, O. (2015). Geoinformatics application for assessing the potential of  
 357 rainwater harvesting in arid regions. case study: el daba'a area, northwestern coast of  
 358 egypt. *Arabian Journal of Geosciences*, 8,9169-9191. doi:org/10.1007/s12517-015-  
 359 1837-0  
 360 Zhang, Q., Wang, X., Hou, P., Wan, W., Li, R., Ren, Y. & Ouyang, Z. (2014). Quality and  
 361 seasonal variation of rainwater harvested from concrete, asphalt, ceramic tile and green  
 362 roofs in chongqing, china. *Journal of Environmental Management*, 132,178-187.  
 363 doi:org/10.1016/j.jenvman.2013.11.009  
 364 Zobrist, J., Müller, S.R., Ammann, A., Bucheli, T.D., Mottier, V., Ochs, M., Schoenenberger,  
 365 R., Eugster, M. & Boller, M. (2000). Quality of roof runoff for groundwater  
 366 infiltration. *Water Research*, 34,1455-1462. doi:org/10.1016/S0043-1354(99)00290-0

367

368







Figure 1 Flowchart of methodology.



Identify	
Identify from: <Top-most layer>	
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>building_footprint           <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Building</li> <li>Building</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	
Location: 413,162.938 333,021.549 Meters	
Field	Value
FID	10
Shape	Polygon
OBJECTID	10
small_area	Building
Roof_Mate	Metal
Roof_Cond	New
Slope	20
Area	123.307
Total_Area	125.229598
Building_T	Commercial
POI	HERO MART (Sri Serdang)
Cond_Comb	6
Cond_RM	3
Cond_RC	2
Run_Coef	0.9
Cond_RuCo	2
Shape_Leng	50.021037
Shape_Length	50.021037
Shape_Area	123.485032

**Figure 2 Attributes of the building footprint.**



**Figure 3 Map of suitability for RRWH system.**

**Table 1 VE of new roofs for RRWH system.**

Roof materials (RM)	Number of roofs	Min VE (m <sup>3</sup> )	Max VE (m <sup>3</sup> )	Total VE (m <sup>3</sup> )
New asbestos	10	33.248	251.121	1,685.858
New concrete	179	6.409	3,623.065	62,315.64
New metal	87	0.149	721.808	19,004.529

**Table 2 Result of chemical testing.**

Roofing Material	Chemical Parameter (mg/L)							
	pH	QS	Heavy Metal				COD	QS
			Zn	QS	Mg	QS		
Asbestos	7.5	5.5-9.0	0.18	0.20	0.0005	3	37.33	10
Concrete	7.45	5.5-9.0	0.24	0.20	0.0005	3	21.33	10
Metal	6.93	5.5-9.0	1.37	0.20	0.010	3	26.67	10

Note: QS (Quality Standard) value for pH, Zn, Mg, and COD above showed the permissible limit of the Drinking Water Quality Standard from the Ministry of Health Malaysia (2016).

**Table 3 WQI of new RM.**

Roofing material	Number of roofs	Index value (IV)	Category
New asbestos	10	176.26	Poor Water
New concrete	179	77.56	Good Water
New metal	87	187.31	Poor Water

**Table 4 Weightage and the score for each criterion.**

Criteria	Class	Score	Weightage	
RM	Asbestos	1	0.40	
	Concrete	2		
	Metal	3		
RuCO	Asbestos (0.85)	1	0.43	
	Concrete (0.95)	3		
	Metal (0.90)	2		
RC	Asbestos	New	2	0.12
		Old	1	
	Concrete	New	4	
		Old	3	
	Metal	New	6	
		Old	5	
RA (m <sup>2</sup> )	<130	3	0.05	
	< 480 – 130	2		
	> 480	1		

**Table 5 Roofs selection for RRWH system suitability map.**

	Not suitable	Moderately suitable	Highly suitable	Total
Asbestos	53	0	0	53
Concrete	381	178	0	559
Metal	0	0	150	150

Total	434	178	150	762
-------	-----	-----	-----	-----

---