

Leaking Shower Diverters: An Overlooked Energy Conservation Measure

By Betsy Jenkins, Senior Energy Engineer, Taitem Engineering

Original Issue November 2011

Summary

If a diverter valve leaks in shower mode, the water flowing out of the bathtub spout goes straight down the drain, wasting both water and the energy used to heat that water. It's like pouring money down the drain!

Background Information

A diverter is used in combination bath/shower units to direct flow either to the bathtub spout or to the showerhead. Diverter valves like the one shown in Figure 1 use a valve to direct the flow to the showerhead or the tub spout.

Plate diverters like those shown in Figure 2 use a plastic or metal plate to stop the water from flowing out of the tub spout. The water gets diverted to the showerhead instead. If the diverter is located on the tub spout, it is called a tub spout diverter.

When a diverter valve is working properly, water only flows out of either the tub spout *or* the showerhead. However, diverters very often leak and water flows out of the tub spout even when in shower mode (see Figure 3). This leakage goes directly down the drain without being available to the person taking a shower. Both the water and the energy used to heat the water are wasted.



Figure 1: A diverter valve as part of a three-handle shower valve



Figure 2: Examples of plate diverters. Clockwise from upper left: a lift on the tub spout diverter with a two-handle valve; a pull-down ring on the tub spout diverter with a single-handle valve; a sliding lever on the valve plate with a single-handle valve; and a button on the valve plate with a single-handle valve.



Figure 3: A leaking diverter allows water to flow out both the showerhead and the tub spout simultaneously.

Prevalence and Savings Potential

We surveyed approximately 130 apartments and houses, which collectively had 120 combination bath/shower units with diverters. We found that 34% of the diverters leaked more than 0.1 gallons per minute (gpm). The largest leak we saw was 3.0 gpm, and the average of all leaks greater than 0.1 gpm was 0.8 gpm.

Further testing showed that when a leaking diverter is fixed, some of the water that had been leaking out the tub spout is forced out of the showerhead. If a diverter is fixed and some of the water that had been leaking now

Leaking Shower Diverters: An Overlooked Energy Conservation Measures

comes out of the showerhead, this fraction of the water will not contribute to water or energy savings. However, even if we can only claim partial savings for fixing leaking diverters, the savings can still be substantial enough to justify the cost of the repair.

We also compared savings from fixing leaking diverters to installing low-flow showerheads. In our dataset of 130 homes, approximately 18% of the showerheads had a measured flow of 2.5 gpm or more. If these showers were used for 10 minutes per day, and we installed 2.0 gpm low-flow showerheads, the sum of all the potential water savings would be approximately 79,000 gallons of hot water per year. In the same dataset, 34% of the diverters leaked more than 0.1 gpm. Again assuming that the showers were used 10 minutes per day, and assuming a savings factor of 0.7 for fixing the leaking diverters, the sum of the potential water savings would be approximately 89,000 gallons of hot water per year. In other words, for the sample of homes we studied, savings from fixing diverters were higher than savings from installing low-flow showerheads! This is not to say that low-flow showerheads should not be installed, but rather to say that the potential savings from fixing diverters is very high.

Methods and Results

We constructed the test rig shown in Figure 4 to test how the flows through the showerhead and tub spout interact in various scenarios. We focused our testing on tub spout diverters and performed the three tests described below. We used a pressure reducing valve (not shown in Figure 4) at the main water supply for the building to vary the system pressure. We also installed a ball valve in place of the tub spout diverter to simulate various leak flows.

Test 1

Our primary goal for this project was to determine a savings factor for energy auditors to use in order to calculate achievable savings from replacing a leaking diverter. Test 1 focused on empirically determining the savings factor. We found that in general, at a given




Figure 4: Test rig with (1) multiple showerheads, each with their own shutoff valve; (2) a pressure gauge; and (3) a throttling valve to simulate various tub spout leak sizes




Figure 5: Calculated savings factor for SH-1 at various leaks and system static pressures

system pressure, the savings factor decreased as the size of the original leak got larger. (See Figure 5.) We also found that the savings factor was almost always greater than 0.7, regardless of the showerhead, system pressure, or leak flow.

Leaking Shower Diverters: An Overlooked Energy Conservation Measures

Test 2

In Test 2, we investigated the interaction between installing a low-flow showerhead and fixing a leaking diverter at the same time. We found that when we estimated savings from installing the low-flow showerhead, based on the rated flow of the new showerhead, our calculated savings were lower than the achieved savings. This is because in all cases, the flow through the showerhead was less than the rated flow.

Leak (gpm)	% of Spouts that Leaked Less than Stated Leak at ALL Pressures
0.01	20%
0.02	45%
0.05	65%
0.10	75%

Table 1: Summary of all tub spout tests

Test 3

Test 3 investigated the different types of tub spout diverters available on the market. Our research was by no means exhaustive – we tested only 18 different spouts, and only one of each model. We labeled each tub spout with a unique identifier, starting with TS-1 and ending with TS-20. Please see the Appendix for a list of the tub spouts we tested and how much they leaked. We found two patterns worth noting:

First, the amount of the leak through almost all of the tub spouts increased as the system pressure decreased. This is because all of the tub spouts we tested use water pressure to create the seal that prevents water from continuing to flow out of the tub spout when the diverter is in shower mode. Table 1 summarizes our results. We have presented the number of showerheads that leaked less than a given leak rate at *all* pressures. TS-2, -6, -7, and -20 leaked less than 0.01 gpm at all pressures.

Second, many of the tub spouts leaked significantly even though they were newly purchased. One manufacturer stated that a pencil-sized leak was normal. It may be

normal, but we do not think it is acceptable! Also, our field survey results imply that leaks increase as time passes, making this a good retrofit measure as well as an important issue to guard against in new construction.

Out of all the tub spout diverters we tested, four performed the best: TS-2, 6, 7, and 20 leaked minimally at all system pressures. TS-2, 6, and 7 are standard models; we can identify no design feature that would make them perform better than any of the other spouts we tested. TS-20, however, has a different design: it is the Positive Action Shut-off Mixet diverter by BrassCraft. Like the pull-down ring type diverters, a spring holds the diverter plate in the open position. Instead of pulling up on a lift to engage the diverter, one pulls straight out, in line with the tub spout. (See Figure 6.) When the water is turned on and the lift is pulled, water pressure causes the diverter to stay in the closed position. According to the product literature available from BrassCraft, the internal configuration of the spout was designed to make the seal very effective even at low pressures. Our testing showed that this tub spout diverter was the most effective; none of the other diverters performed so consistently well across all pressures.




Figure 6: TS-20, the Positive Action Shut-off Mixet tub spout diverter by BrassCraft

Leaking Shower Diverters: An Overlooked Energy Conservation Measures

Conclusions and Recommendations

Test 1

A large majority of the measurements we took in Test 1 showed a savings factor greater than 0.7. We therefore recommend that auditors use a savings factor of 0.7 to estimate the achievable savings from fixing a leaking tub spout diverter. We feel that this savings factor will result in a conservative estimate of savings without understating the savings to the point where the measure will become not cost effective.

Test 2

Based on our results for Test 2, we conclude that auditors do not need to worry about overestimating the savings when replacing a showerhead and fixing a leaking diverter in the same bathroom. We recommend estimating the achievable savings by taking the difference between the existing measured showerhead flow and the proposed rated showerhead flow, and adding the total diverter leak flow. It is not necessary to multiply the leak by a savings factor.

Test 3

We recommend using the BrassCraft Positive Action Shut-off Mixet tub spout diverter, or a diverter with similar functionality, where possible. This spout is currently available from several sellers on the internet, and its price (approximately \$20) is in line with the other spouts we tested. It is available in both threaded and slip-on configurations, in two lengths, and with a variety of finishes.

If for some reason the Positive Action Shut-off Mixet is not available or appropriate for a given installation, we recommend the following performance standard for replacement tub spouts. We recommend testing any replacement spout after it is installed, and accepting it only if it leaks less than 0.02 gpm. If it leaks more than that, the spout should be returned to the manufacturer as faulty and a new spout should be installed.

Calculating Energy Savings and Payback

Using our results above, it is easy for an auditor to calculate the annual savings that can be achieved by fixing a leaking diverter. (See “Calculating Potential Energy Savings” in the Resources section, below, for conversion factors, reasonable assumptions, and a step-by-step description of the calculations.) Once an auditor has calculated annual dollar savings, they must

Existing Leak (gpm)	Heated by Electricity		Heated by Gas	
	Annual Savings	Payback (yrs)	Annual Savings	Payback (yrs)
0.1	\$4.60	21.7	\$1.70	58.8
0.2	\$9.20	10.9	\$3.40	29.4
0.3	\$13.80	7.2	\$5.10	19.6
0.4	\$18.40	5.4	\$6.80	14.7
0.5	\$23.00	4.3	\$8.50	11.8
0.6	\$27.60	3.6	\$10.20	9.8
0.7	\$32.20	3.1	\$11.90	8.4
0.8	\$36.80	2.7	\$13.60	7.4
0.9	\$41.30	2.4	\$15.30	6.5
1	\$45.90	2.2	\$17.00	5.9

Note: The savings in this chart include a savings factor of 0.7 to account for the additional water that comes out of the showerhead when a leaking diverter is fixed. Electricity is assumed to be \$0.12/kWh and gas is assumed to be \$1.10/therm. We assume the shower is used for 10 minutes/day and that a gas water heater has an efficiency of 83% and an electric heater has an efficiency of 98%. Payback is calculated based on an installed cost of \$100 per diverter. Savings do not include the cost of water.

Table 2: Annual savings and payback for various leak flows

determine if the savings justify the cost of installing the new diverter. A new tub spout diverter costs approximately \$20. If the installation is straightforward, it should take a plumber less than one hour to install a new tub spout diverter. We therefore estimate a total installed cost of between \$50 and \$100 per tub spout.

Leaking Shower Diverters: An Overlooked Energy Conservation Measures

In general, it makes sense to install an energy conservation measure only if the replacement will save more than the installed cost over the lifetime of the replacement. We estimate a lifetime of between 15 and 20 years for a tub spout diverter. See Table 2 for sample savings and payback results.

Other Benefits:

Comfort

When you fix a leaking diverter valve, more water is available for the person taking a shower. In the case of a very badly leaking diverter valve, the increase in water pressure may be noticeable, leading to a more comfortable shower.

Persistence of Energy Savings

Low-flow showerheads are frequently removed by tenants who dislike how low the new flow is. We predict that this will not be a problem for new diverters both because a non-leaking diverter will typically make the shower more comfortable and because it takes more effort and plumbing knowledge to replace a diverter than to replace a showerhead.

Leaking Shower Diverters: An Overlooked Energy Conservation Measures

Other Issues

Leaking diverters can cause auditors to miss low-flow opportunities because the leak reduces the flow from the showerhead. Showerhead flow should be re-measured after a leaking diverter is fixed, and a new showerhead should be installed if the existing one has a flow higher than 2.5 gpm.

Resources

Measuring Leaks

Measuring an existing diverter leak is straightforward. It requires a stopwatch, a bucket to collect the water, and a measuring device (for example, a measuring cup from your kitchen or a water bottle marked in milliliters and/or fluid ounces). Turn on the shower, then use the bucket to collect water leaking from the tub spout, using the stopwatch to time 60 seconds. Very carefully pour the water from the bucket into your measuring device and count how many cups, fluid ounces, or milliliters you collected. Then convert your measurement into gallons. Since you measured the flow for one minute, you now have gallons per minute.

Calculating Potential Energy Savings

To calculate potential savings, multiply your measured flow rate by a savings factor of 0.7 to account for the water that gets forced through the showerhead when you fix the leak. Then multiply by the number of minutes per year your

Measured flow rate	x	Savings Factor	=	Achievable savings flow rate
1.1 gpm	x	0.7	=	0.77 gal/min

shower is used to calculate potential savings in gallons of water per year. Finally, gallons per year of hot water should be converted into saved therms or kilowatt hours, depending on how you heat your hot water.

Savings flow rate	x	Minutes/year the shower is used	=	Gallons/year saved
0.77 gpm	x	3,650 minutes/year	=	2,810 gallons/year

Using a sample measured flow rate of 1.1 gpm, here is how we calculate dollar savings per year:

1. Calculate the achievable savings by multiplying the measured flow rate by 0.7:
2. Calculate the gallons saved per year by multiplying the achievable savings rate by the number of minutes per year the shower is in use. Assuming one person lives in the apartment and that he showers 10 minutes per day, that is 10 minutes/day times 365 days/yr, or 3,650 minutes/year:

Gallons saved/year	x	Specific Heat of Water	x	Weight of Water	x	Temperature Rise	=	Btu/year saved
2,810 gallons/year	x	1.0 Btu/lb-°F	x	8.3 lbs/gal	x	60°F	=	1,399,380 Btu/yr

Leaking Shower Diverters: An Overlooked Energy Conservation Measures

3. Calculate how much energy it takes to heat 2,810 gallons of water up to the showering temperature by multiplying the gallons saved/year by the specific heat of water and by the temperature rise in the water. Estimate that the cold water from the street enters the building at 50°F and that the person in the apartment showers at 110°F. This is a temperature rise of 60°F. It takes one Btu to raise one pound of water one degree Fahrenheit. Water weighs approximately 8.3 pounds/gallon.

Btu/yr saved	÷	Btu/therm natural gas	÷	Efficiency	=	Therms/yr saved
1,399,380 Btu/yr	÷	100,000 Btu/therm	÷	0.83	=	16.9 therms/yr

Btu/yr saved	÷	Btu/kWh electricity	÷	Efficiency	=	kWh/yr saved
1,399,380 Btu/yr	÷	3,412 Btu/kWh	÷	0.98	=	419 kWh/yr

4. Calculate therms/year or kWh/year saved by dividing by the appropriate conversion factor and then by the efficiency of the heater. There are 100,000 Btu/therm and 3,412 Btu/kWh. Assume a natural gas heater has an efficiency of 83% and an electric heater has an efficiency of 98%.

Natural Gas:

Therms/yr saved	x	\$/therm	=	\$/yr saved
16.9 therms/yr	x	\$1.10/therm	=	\$18/yr saved

OR Electricity:

kWh/yr saved	x	\$/kWh	=	\$/yr saved
419 kWh/yr	x	\$0.12/kWh	=	\$50/yr saved

5. Calculate dollars saved per year by multiplying by the cost of energy. In this article, we have assumed natural gas costs \$1.10/therm and electricity costs \$0.12/kWh.

Natural Gas:

Electricity:

Please note that we have not included the cost savings due to reducing water consumption in the above calculation. Including those savings will improve the payback time of replacing a leaking diverter.

Leaking Shower Diverters: An Overlooked Energy Conservation Measures

Fixing Leaking Diverter Valves

It is relatively simple to replace a leaking tub spout diverter. However, especially in older showers, it is common for the tub spout to have become stuck to the water pipe. If the spout is stuck, be very careful to not break the pipe behind the wall of the shower. It may be impossible to replace the tub spout without opening up the shower wall and also replacing some of the piping. It may also be impossible to replace some kinds of diverters without opening the shower wall. A plumber or a building maintenance person with basic plumbing knowledge should be able to replace a tub spout diverter in less than an hour if the diverter is not stuck.

Be extremely careful not to damage the existing shower wall and piping. Removing the existing fixture can require significant force, especially if the fixture is old and may have rusted to the pipe. Protect the wall and pipe from damage. Also, if you can feel the piping flex as you attempt to loosen the tub spout, proceed only if you are willing to cut a hole in the shower wall to repair a broken pipe.

Acknowledgements

Research conducted for the NYS Housing and Community Renewal Weatherization Assistance Program. Many thanks to Bill King for building our test rig and lifting many buckets of water, to Rob Rosen for his last-minute testing efforts, to Fred Schwartz for hours of consulting, to Ian Shapiro for his enthusiasm for this project, and to Evan Hallas for recognizing that auditors everywhere are overlooking this issue.

Appendix: Tub Spouts Tested

Tag	Manufacturer	Model #	Price	Diverter Mechanism	Leak Rate (gpm)		
					Low Pressure	Medium Pressure	High Pressure
TS-1	Danze	D606225	\$24.00	Lift	0.02	0.01	0.00
TS-2	LDR	BT129/502 4250	\$15.05	Lift	0.00	0.00	0.00
TS-4	American Standard	8888025.002	\$19.25	Lift	0.02	0.03	0.03
TS-5	American Standard	8888055.002	\$21.45	Lift	0.10	0.08	0.05
TS-6	Moen	391	\$32.41	Lift	0.00	0.00	0.00
TS-7	Grohe	13 611 000	\$30.00	Lift	0.00	0.00	0.00
TS-8	Moen	IPS 3830	\$30.09	Lift	0.01	0.01	0.00
TS-9	Delta	RP 19820/ 33714	\$21.63	Lift	0.01	0.16	0.06
TS-10	unknown		--	Lift	0.01	0.00	0.00
TS-11	Kohler	389-CP/ Devonshire	\$25.50	Lift	0.26	0.02	0.00
TS-12	Danco	34224CCB	\$12.58	Lift	0.03	0.03	0.00
TS-13	unknown	17463CV	--	Ring and Spring	0.01	0.00	0.00
TS-14	Delta/Brass Craft	SWD0205/ RP17453	\$20.38	Ring and Spring	0.03	0.01	0.00
TS-15	Waxman/Spray Sensations	24501	\$7.95	Lift	0.01	0.01	0.01
TS-17	Waxman/Spray Sensations	26629	\$15.98	Lift	0.02	0.01	0.01
TS-18	Danco/Universal	88703	\$16.97	Lift	0.12	0.03	0.03
TS-19	Kohler	Coralais/ 15136-S-CP	\$19.22	Lift	0.09	0.09	0.08
TS-20	BrassCraft/OEM Mixet	SWD0411	\$20.00	Positive Pressure	0.00	0.00	0.00

Note: TS-3 and TS-16 were old tub spouts not specifically purchased for this project. We did not include the test results from either spout in our analysis. All of the other spouts were new, out-of-the-box when tested. The results of our field survey imply that leaks worsen significantly over time.