## Appendix-7 Water Quality Survey

Report on the results of water analysis of samples collected at El-Mahala water treatment plant and distribution system:
1- Water quality at the in-take point of the New Water Treatment Plant (El-Malah Canal):

The quality of the raw water supply for the El-Mahala El-Kobra treatment plant is presented in Tables 1-1, 1-2 and 1-3. The water is characterized by relatively high turbidity ( $11-17 \mathrm{NTU}$ ). The pH was in the alkaline range. The other parameters reflect the nature of Nile River water with respect to TDS, total alkalinity, total hardness and chloride.

Algal content of the raw water was relatively high (10134-10208 cells $/ \mathrm{cm}^{3}$ ) and diatoms were the most dominant species which contribute to the problems of sand-filters clogging and backwash.

## 2- General characteristics of the wastewater discharged by the new WTP:

The value of COD (dichromate), $\mathrm{BOD}, \mathrm{Al}$ and Mn are relatively high. The quality of wastewater released by water treatment plants is controlled by items 11 and 15 of the low 48 issued in 1982. Bacteriological examination of the wastewater revealed the presence of low number of total Coliforms, Faecal Coliforms and Faecal Streptococci. Application of chlorine dose of $2 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ is suggested to control faecal contamination.


Quality of water samples collected from various sites at El-Mahala ElKobra Treatment Plans.

## 3- Treated water (T):

Water samples were collected from the following sites presented in Tables 1-1 to 1-5. The new WTP effluent after post-chlorination ( $T_{1}$ ) was generally complying with the Egyptian drinking water standards. However total Coliforms exceeded the permissible level. The dose of applied chlorine and contact time need to be controlled.

Water collected from the well at the New WTP $\left(\mathrm{T}_{2}\right)$ showed high TDS and chloride content, which exceed the acceptable limits of the Egyptian Drinking water standards. The values of the other parameters are within the range of drinking standards.

After post-chlorination of the old WTP water sample $\left(\mathrm{T}_{3}\right)$ showed high levels of manganese and iron. Water samples of the Old WTP intake $1\left(\mathrm{~T}_{4}\right)$ showed high iron ( $3.29 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ ) and manganese ( $0.635 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ ) contents. This water resource needs to be treated to match the water quality according to the Egyptian standards.

Water sample of the Old WTP intake 2 (T5) showed unacceptable characteristics with respect to TDS, chloride, iron, and manganese.

Water of the old WTP intake 3 (T6) and intake 4 (T7), showed high iron, and manganese contents exceeding the permissible level of Egyptian drinking water. In addition, the value of TDS of T6 is not acceptable.

Water supplied by the compact unit $1 \& 2$ at Omar Ibn El-Khatab (T8 and T9) were all of good quality with respective to the investigated items.

Meanwhile, all water samples collected from the compact units $1,2,3,4,5$ and 6 T10-T15) at Manshiat El-Bakri were of good quality.

On the other hand, water samples of Manshiat El-Bakri, namely well 1,2,3,4 and 5 ( $\mathrm{T} 16-\mathrm{T} 20$ ), respectively, showed high values with respect to iron, and manganese. In addition, the values of TDS, in case of T 18 exceeded the permissible level according to the Egyptian standards.

Water samples of the compact unit 1 and 2 at Abu-Ali, (T21 and T22) were of good quality except for iron content which slightly exceeds the permissible level.

Water samples collected from wells at Abu Ali (T23 and T24) were of good quality except for manganese content of sample T24 which slightly exceeds the permissible level. Finally water of the compact unit at Kafr ElGeania (T25) was of high quality.

## ${ }^{4}$-Water Quality in the distribution system:

Samples collected from the distribution system lines covered by New WTP, namely $S_{1}, S_{2}, S_{3}$ and $S_{4}$, showed good quality in respect to the investigated parameters except for the value of manganese in case of samples $S_{1}$ which is slightly high.

In case of areas covered by the old WTP, namely $\mathrm{S}_{5}, \mathrm{~S}_{6}, \mathrm{~S}_{7}$ and $\mathrm{S}_{8}$, the water quality matched that of the Egyptian Standards except for iron and manganese contents which exceeded the permissible level.

In case of samples collected from the wells of Old WTP, distribution line at $\mathrm{S}_{9}$ and Omar Ibn El-Khatab ( $\mathrm{S}_{10}$ ), the water was of good quality.

Water samples namely S11-S23 showed general characteristics that matched the Egyptian drinking water standard. Only, in case of water sample $\mathrm{S}_{15}$.(El-Qaisara), the level of manganese was slightly exceeding the permissible level.

## Optimal Alum Dose:

Several experiments were run to determine the optimal alum dose to be applied to achieve maximum removal of turbidity. The doses tested ranged between 10 and $40 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$. Maximum removal of turbidity was affected by a dose $20 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ alum. Use of calcium oxide, as coagulant aid ( $10 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{L}$ ) has no effect on the coagulation process.
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## Results of Water Quality Survey in El-Mahala El-Kobra

Sampling site: from the intake point of the new water treatment plant (El-Malah Canal).
Sampling date: 22/8/2005

Table (1-1) Raw Water Analysis

| Parameters | Unit | Result |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| Water temperature | C | 28 |
| Turbidity | NTU | $\mathbf{1 7}$ |
| Odor | - | Odorless |
| Color | Unit | 20 |
| pH | - | 8.0 |
| Total Dissolved Solids | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | 233 |
| Total Alkalinity $\left(\mathrm{CaCO}_{3}\right)$ | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | 134 |
| Total Hardness $\left(\mathrm{CaCO}_{3}\right)$ | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | 120 |
| Calcium | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | 30 |
| Magnesium | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | $\mathbf{1 1}$ |
| Chloride | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | 20 |
| Ammonia $\left(\mathrm{NH}_{4}-\mathrm{N}\right)$ | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | ND |
| Nitrite $\left(\mathrm{NO}_{2}-\mathrm{N}\right)$ | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | ND |
| Nitrate $\left(\mathrm{NO}_{3}-\mathrm{N}\right)$ | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | 0.081 |
| Iron | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | 0.066 |
| Manganese | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | ND |
| Fluoride | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | 0.1 |
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## Results of Water Quality Survey in El-Mahala El-Kobra

Sampling site: from the intake point of the new water treatment plant (El-Malah Canal).
Sampling date: 29/8/2005

Table (1-2) Raw Water Analysis

| Parameters | Unit | Result |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| Water temperature | C | 27 |
| Turbidity | NTU | 14 |
| Odor | - | Odorless |
| Color | Unit | 17 |
| pH | - | 8.1 |
| Total Dissolved Solids | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | 240 |
| Total Alkalinity $\left(\mathrm{CaCO}_{3}\right)$ | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | 134 |
| Total Hardness $\left(\mathrm{CaCO}_{3}\right)$ | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | 124 |
| Calcium | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | 30 |
| Magnesium | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | 12 |
| Chloride | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | 22 |
| Ammonia $\left(\mathrm{NH}_{4}-\mathrm{N}\right)$ | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | ND |
| Nitrite $\left(\mathrm{NO}_{2}-\mathrm{N}\right)$ | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | ND |
| Nitrate $\left(\mathrm{NO}_{3}-\mathrm{N}\right)$ | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | 0.111 |
| Iron | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | 0.071 |
| Manganese | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | ND |
| Fluoride | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | 0.069 |




## Results of Water Quality Survey in El-Mahala El-Kobra

Sampling site: from the intake point of the new water treatment plant (EI-Malah Canal).
Sampling date: 4/9/2005

Table (1-3) Raw Water Analysis

| Parameters | Unit | Result |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Water temperature |  |  |
| Turbidity | NTU | 27 |
| Odor | - | 11 |
| Color | Unit | Odorless |
| pH | - | 14 |
| Total Dissolved Solids | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | 7.9 |
| Total Alkalinity $\left(\mathrm{CaCO}_{3}\right)$ | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | 240 |
| Total Hardness $\left(\mathrm{CaCO}_{3}\right)$ | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | 134 |
| Calcium | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | $\mathbf{1 2 6}$ |
| Magnesium $--\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | $\mathbf{3 0}$ |  |
| Chloride | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | $\mathbf{1 2}$ |
| Ammonia $\left(\mathrm{NH}_{4}-\mathrm{N}\right)$ | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | 24 |
| Nitrite $\left(\mathrm{NO}_{2}-\mathrm{N}\right)$ | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | ND |
| Nitrate $\left(\mathrm{NO}_{3}-\mathrm{N}\right)$ | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | ND |
| Iron | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | $\mathbf{0 . 0 6 6}$ |
| Manganese | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | 0.038 |
| Fluoride | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | ND |

r. . 0/9/11
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## Results of Water Quality Survey in El-Mahala El-Kobra

Sampling site: from the intake point of the new water treatment plant (El-Malah Canal).
Sampling date: 22/8/2005

Continue, Table (1-1) Raw Water Analysis
Algal Examination

| Parameters | Algal counts (Organisms/ml) |
| :--- | :---: |
| Diatoms | 9108 |
| Green Algae | 814 |
| Blue-Green Algae $:$ | 286 |
| Total Algal Counts | 10208 |

Y..0/9/11

رئيس اللوحدة الاستنثارية للبيئة المـائية


## Results of Water Quality Survey in EI-Mahala EI-Kobra

Sampling site: from the intake point of the new water treatment plant (EI-Malah Canal).
Sampling date: 29/8/2005

Continue, Table (1-2) Raw Water Analysis
Algal Examination

| Parameters | Algal counts (Organisms/ml) |
| :--- | :---: |
| Diatoms | 9000 |
| Green Algae | 860 |
| Blue-Green Algae | 274 |
| Total Algal Counts | 10134 |

r..o/q/11

رئيس الوحدة الاسنتشارية للبيئة الثمائية


Results of Water Quality Survey in El-Mahala El-Kobra
Sampling site: from the intake point of the new water treatment plant (EI-Malah Canal).
Sampling date: 4/9/2005

Continue, Table (1-3) Raw Water Analysis
Algal Examination

| Parameters | Algal counts (Organisms/ml) |
| :--- | :---: |
| Diatoms | 8725 |
| Green Algae | 1000 |
| Blue-Green Algae | 300 |
| Total Algal Counts | 10025 |

$r .0 / 9 / 11$

رئيس الوحدة الاستششارية للبيئة المائية


## Jar Test (Coagulant effectiveness)

First Run (22/8/2005)

| Coagulant dose <br> $(\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l})$ | Turbidity (NTU ) |  | \% Removal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Raw Water | Treated Water |  |
| 10 | 17 | 1.5 | 91.2 |
| 20 | 17 | 1.3 | 92.4 |
| 30 | 17 | 1.6 | 90.6 |
| 40 | 17 | 1.7 | 90 |

- Alum (Aluminum Sulfate) was used as coagulant material
- \% of Aluminum in Alum is 8.5
- The effective dose was $20 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ ( $1.7 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ Aluminum)

Second Run (29/8/2005)

| Coagulant dose <br> $(\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l})$ | Turbidity (NTU) |  | \% Removal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Raw Water | Treated Water |  |
| 10 | 14 | 1.4 | 90 |
| 20 | 14 | 1.2 | 91.4 |
| 30 | 14 | 1.5 | 89.3 |
| 40 | 14 | 1.5 | 89.3 |

- Alum (Aluminum Sulfate) was used as coagulant material
- \% of Aluminum in Alum is 8.5
- The effective dose was $20 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ ( $1.7 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ Aluminum)


[^0]Third Run (4/9/2005).

| Coagulant dose <br> $(\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l})$ | Turbidity (NTU ) |  | \% Removal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Raw Water | Treated Water |  |
| 10 | 10.5 | 1.2 | 88.6 |
| 20 | 10.5 | 1.0 | 90.5 |
| 30 | 10.5 | 1.3 | 87.6 |
| 40 | 10.5 | 1.3 | 87.6 |

- Alum (Aluminum Sulfate) was used as coagulant material
- \% of Aluminum in Alum is 8.5
- The effective dose was $20 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{I}$ ( $1.7 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ Aluminum)

Third Run (4/9/2005).

| Coagulant dose (mg/l) <br> + <br> $10 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l} \mathrm{CaO}$ | Turbidity (NTU ) |  | \% Removal |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Raw Water | Treated Water |  |
| 10 | 10.5 | 1.5 | 85.7 |
| 20 | 10.5 | 1.4 | 86.7 |
| 30 | 10.5 | 1.7 | 83.8 |
| 40 | 10.5 | 1.6 | 84.8 |

- Alum (Aluminum Sulfate) and $10 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ Lime (Calcium Oxide) were used as coagulant materials
- \% of Aluminum in Alum is 8.5
- The effective dose was $20 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{I}$ ( $1.7 \mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ Aluminum)
- The addition of Calcium Oxide as coagulant aid has no effect

$$
r .+\theta / 9 / 1 A
$$



اللوحتة الاستشارية للميئة المائية

## Results of Wastewater Quality Survey in EI-Mahala EI-Kobra

Sampling site: from the wastewater basin of the new water treatment plant (EI-Malah Canal).
Sampling date: 22/8/2005
Table (1) Wastewater Chemical Analysis

| Parameters | Unit | Result |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Water temperature | ${ }^{\circ} \mathrm{C}$ | 31 |
| pH | - | 8.1 |
| Chemical Oxygen Demand <br> (COD, dichromate) | $\mathrm{mg} \mathrm{O}_{2} / \mathrm{l}$ | 35 |
| Chemical Oxygen Demand <br> (COD, permanganate) | mg O |  |
| 2 |  |  | l.
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اللو حـة الاستشارية للميئة الفائيمة

Table (2) Wastewater Bacteriological Examination

| Parameter | Unit | Result |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Total Coliform | MPN/100 ml | 17 |
| Faecal Coliform | MPN $/ 100 \mathrm{ml}$ | 1 |
| Faecal Streptococci | MPN $/ 100 \mathrm{ml}$ | 4 |

$$
r \ldots 0 / 9 / 11
$$

رئيس الوحدة الاستنشارية للبيئة المائية أ.د/ أسسامة أحمد على
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اللوحصة الاستشارية للمبئة المائيمة

## Results of Water Quality Survey in El-Mahala El-Kobra

3- Treated Water (T)
Table (1-1)

| Parameters | Unit | Sampling Sites |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | T1 | T2 | T3 | T4 | T5 |
| Sampling Date | - | 29/8/05 | 22/8/05 | 29/8/05 | 29/8/05 | 29/8/05 |
| pH | - | 7.2 | 7.6 | 7.4 | 7.7 | 7.8 |
| Turbidity | NTU | 1.0 | 2.5 | 1.2 | 1.8 | 2.0 |
| Total Dissolved Solids | mg/l | 206 | 1560 | 218 | 881 | 1606 |
| Total Hardness ( $\mathrm{CaCO}_{3}$ ) | mg/l | 118 | 210 | 126 | 250 | 480 |
| Calcium | mg/l | 30 | 48 | 32 | 56 | 100 |
| Magnesium | mg/l | 10 | 22 | 11 | 27 | 56 |
| Nitrate ( $\mathrm{NO}_{3}-\mathrm{N}$ ) | mg/l | 0.066 | 0.063 | 0.068 | 0.219 | 0.356 |
| Fluoride | mg/l | 0.015 | 0.195 | 0.012 | 0.166 | 0.179 |
| Chloride | mg/l | 28 | 840 | 28 | 360 | 590 |
| Sulfate | mg/l | 16 | 46 | - 44 | 54 | 93 |
| Iron | mg/l | 0.096 | 0.215 | 3.9 | 3.29 | 3.53 |
| Manganese | mg/l | ND | 0.149 | 0.787 | 0.635 | 0.651 |
| Copper | mg/l | ND | 0.211 | 0.131 | ND | 0.168 |
| Lead | mg/l | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND |
| Zinc | mg/l | ND | 0.301 | 0.215 | ND | 0.254 |
| Total Coliform | MPN/100 ml | 16 | 1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

T1: Reservoir after post-chlorination new WTP
T2: Well at the new WTP
T3: Reservoir after post-chlorination old WTP
T4: Well at old WTP intake (1)
T5: Well at old WTP intake (2)
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## Results of Water Quality Survey in El-Mahala El-Kobra

## 3- Treated Water (T)

Table (1-2)

| Parameters | Unit | Sampling Sites |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | T6 | T7 | T8 | T9 | T10 |
| Sampling Date | - | 29/8/05 | 29/8/05 | 22/8/05 | 22/8/05 | 29/8/05 |
| pH | - | 7.6 | 7.7 | 7.4 | 7.4 | 7.5 |
| Turbidity | NTU | 2.1 | 1.7 | 1.2 | 1.0 | 0.95 |
| Total Dissolved Solids | mg/l | 1420 | 985 | 231 | 240 | 219 |
| Total Hardness ( $\mathrm{CaCO}_{3}$ ) | mg/l | 390 | 300 | 118 | 122 | 120 |
| Calcium | mg/l | 80 | 68 | 30 | 31 | 30 |
| Magnesium | mg/l | 46 | 32 | 11 | 11 | 11 |
| Nitrate ( $\mathrm{NO}_{3}-\mathrm{N}$ ) | mg/l | 0.331 | 0.233 | 0.143 | 0.148 | 0.119 |
| Fluoride | mg/l | 0.175 | 0.167 | 0.013 | 0.018 | ND |
| Chloride | mg/l | 450 | 420 | 22 | 25 | 28 |
| Sulfate | mg/l | 78 | 59 | 20 | 21 | 22 |
| Iron | mg/l | 3.411 | 3.321 | ND | 0.145 | 0.052 |
| Manganese | mg/l | 0.638 | 0.642 | ND | ND | ND |
| Copper | mg/l | 0.163 | 0.132 | ND | ND | ND |
| Lead | mg/l | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND |
| Zinc | mg/l | 0.264 | 0.194 | ND | ND | ND |
| Total Coliform | MPN/100 ml | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

T6: Well at old WTP intake (3)
T7: Well at old WTP intake (4)
T8: Compact unit 1 at Omar Ibn El-Khatab
T9: Compact unit 2 at Omar Ibn El-Khatab
T10: Compact unit 1 at Manshiat El-Bakri
رئيس الوحدة الانستثياريـة للبيئة المائية
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الوبطة الاستشارية للمبئة المائيمي

## Results of Water Quality Survey in El-Mahala El-Kobra

## 3- Treated Water (T)

Table (1-3)

| Parameters | Unit | Sampling Sites |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | T11 | T12 | T13 | T14 | T15 |
| Sampling Date | - | 29/8/05 | 29/8/05 | 29/8/05 | 29/8/05 | 29/8/05 |
| pH | - | 7.5 | 7.5 | 7.7 | 7.6 | 7.5 |
| Turbidity | NTU | 1.0 | 1.2 | 1.4 | 0.95 | 1.1 |
| Total Dissolved Solids | mg/l | 211 | 206 | 216 | 225 | 210 |
| Total Hardness ( $\mathrm{CaCO}_{3}$ ) | mg/l | 122 | 120 | 122 | 124 | 120 |
| Calcium | mg/I | 31 | 31 | 31 | 32 | 30 |
| Magnesium | mg/l | 11 | 11 | 11 | 12 | 11 |
| Nitrate ( $\mathrm{NO}_{3}-\mathrm{N}$ ) | mg/l | 0.116 | 0.106 | 0.113 | 0.126 | 0.109 |
| Fluoride | mg/l | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND |
| Chloride | mg/l | 30 | 28 | 28 | 30 | 28 |
| Sulfate | mg/l | 19 | 17 | 19 | 22 | 19 |
| Iron | mg/l | 0.058 | 0.033 | 0.051 | 0.059 | 0.036 |
| Manganese | mg/l | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND |
| Copper | mg/l | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND |
| Lead | mg/l | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND |
| Zinc | mg/l | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND |
| Total Coliform | MPN/100 ml | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

T11: Compact unit 2 at Manshiat EI-Bakri
T12: Compact unit 3 at Manshiat El-Bakri
T13: Compact unit 4 at Manshiat El-Bakri
T14: Compact unit 5 at Manshiat El-Bakri
T15: Compact unit 6 at Manshiat El-Bakri
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Results of Water Quality Survey in El-Mahala El-Kobra
3- Treated Water (T)
Table (1-4)

| Parameters | Unit | Sampling Sites |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | T16 | T17 | T18 | T19 | T20 |
| Sampling Date | - | 29/8/05 | 4/9/05 | 4/9/05 | 4/9/05 | 4/9/05 |
| pH | - | 7.4 | 7.5 | 7.4 | 7.6 | 7.3 |
| Turbidity | NTU | 1.8 | 1.6 | 2.0 | 1.6 | 2.0 |
| Total Dissolved Solids | mg/ | 972 | 1131 | 1235 | 965 | 1160 |
| Total Hardness ( $\mathrm{CaCO}_{3}$ ) | mg/l | 330 | 380 | 420 | 326 | 400 |
| Calcium | mg// | 76 | 96 | 98 | 74 | 98 |
| Magnesium | mg/l | 34 | 35 | 36 | 33 | 35 |
| Nitrate ( $\mathrm{NO}_{3}-\mathrm{N}$ ) | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | 0.277 | 0.298 | 0.311 | 0.271 | 0.291 |
| Fluoride | mg/l | 0.133 | 0.163 | 0.181 | 0.128 | 0.155 |
| Chloride | mg/l | 380 | 430 | 450 | 372 | 434 |
| Sulfate | mg/l | 70 | 93 | 96 | 68 | 94 |
| Iron | mg/ | 3.541 | 0.687 | 2.361 | 0.688 | 0.661 |
| Manganese | mg/I | 0.647 | 0.364 | 0.812 | 0.362 | 0.418 |
| Copper | mg/ | 0.121 | 0.109 | 0.132 | ND | 0.118 |
| Lead | mg/ | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND |
| Zinc | mg/l | ND | 0.132 | 0.168 | 0.111 | 0.148 |
| Total Coliform | MPN/100 ml | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

T16: Well 1 at Manshiat El-Bakari
T17: Well 2 at Manshiat El-Bakari
T18: Well 3 at Manshiat El-Bakari
T19: Well 4 at Manshiat El-Bakari
T20: Well 5 at Manshiat El-Bakari
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## Results of Water Quality Survey in El-Mahala EI-Kobra

3- Treated Water (T).
Table (1-5)

| Parameters | Unit | Sampling Sites |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | T21 | T22 | T23 | T24 | T25 |
| Sampling Date | - | 22/8/05 | 22/8/05 | 22/8/05 | 22/8/05 | 29/8/05 |
| pH | . - | 7.8 | 7.6 | 7.6 | 7.5 | 7.7 |
| Turbidity | NTU | 1.0 | 0.9 | 2.1 | 2.5 | 0.9 |
| Total Dissolved Solids | $\mathrm{mg} / 1$ | 245 | 236 | 1120 | 1086 | 260 |
| Total Hardness ( $\mathrm{CaCO}_{3}$ ) | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | 120 | 118 | 220 | 200 | 122 |
| Calcium | mg/l | 30 | 29 | 44 | 42 | 30 |
| Magnesium | mg/l | 11 | 10 | 27 | 26 | 11 |
| Nitrate ( $\mathrm{NO}_{3}-\mathrm{N}$ ) | mg/l | 0.135 | 0.140 | 0.052 | 0.061 | 0.032 |
| Fluoride | mg/l | 0.014 | 0.012 | 0.026 | 0.019 | ND |
| Chloride | mg/l | 26 | 22 | 380 | 374 | 26 |
| Sulfate | mg/l | 17 | 18 | 26 | 25 | 19 |
| Iron | mg/l | 0.410 | 0.493 | 0.077 | 0.106 | ND |
| Manganese | mg/l | ND | ND | 0.269 | 0.233 | ND |
| Copper | mg/l | ND | ND | 0.118 | 0.121 | ND |
| Lead | mg/l | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND |
| Zinc | mg/l | ND | ND | 0.132 | 0.164 | ND |
| Total Coliform | MPN/100 ml | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

T21: Compact unit 1 at Abu Ali
T22: Compact unit 2 at Abu Ali
T23: Well 1 at Abu Ali
T24: Well 2 at Abu Ali
T25: Compact unit at Kafr El-Geaina
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 اللوشـة الاستشارية للمبيرئة المائية

## Results of Water Quality Survey in El-Mahala El-Kobra

4- Supplied Water (S)
Table (1-1)

| Parameters | Unit | Sampling Sites |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | S1 | S2 | S3 | S4 | S5 |
| Sampling Date | - | 22/8/05 | 22/8/05 | 22/8/05 | 22/8/05 | 22/8/05 |
| pH | - | 7.5 | 7.4 | 7.6 | 7.4 | 7.7 |
| Turbidity | NTU | 0.7 | 0.5 | 0.4 | 0.7 | 0.6 |
| Total Dissolved Solids | mg/l | 298 | 327 | 318 | 322 | 232 |
| Total Hardness ( $\mathrm{CaCO}_{3}$ ) | mg/l | 124 | 126 | 128 | 126 | 122 |
| Calcium | mg/l | 30 | 31 | 30 | 30 | 28 |
| Magnesium | mg/l | 11 | 12 | 11 | 12 | 10 |
| Nitrate ( $\mathrm{NO}_{3}-\mathrm{N}$ ) | mg/l | 0.150 | 0.161 | 0.148 | 0.156 | 0.143 |
| Fluoride | mg/l | 0.010 | 0.010 | 0.011 | 0.010 | 0.010 |
| Chloride | mg/l | 72 | 74 | 72 | 72 | 21 |
| Sulfate | mg/l | 19 | 20 | 20 | 20 | 18 |
| Iron | mg/l | 0.189 | 0.209 | 0.211 | 0.196 | 0.124 |
| Manganese | mg/l | 0.456 | 0.122 | ND | 0.119 | ND |
| Copper | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | ND | 0.021 | ND | 0.018 | ND |
| Lead | mg/l | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND |
| Zinc | $\mathrm{mg} / \mathrm{l}$ | ND | ND | 0.025 | ND | ND |
| Total Coliform | MPN/100 mI | 0.0 | 1 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 |

S1: Distribution line at area covered by new WTP
S2: Distribution line at area covered by new WTP
S3: Distribution line at area covered by new WTP
S4: Distribution line at area covered by new WTP
S5: Distribution line at area covered by old WTP
رئيس الوحدة الالستثناريـة للبيئة المائية
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الهو

## Results of Water Quality Survey in El-Mahala El-Kobra

4- Supplied Water (S)
Table (1-2)

| Parameters | Unit | Sampling Sites |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | S6 | S7 | S8 | S9 | S10 |
| Sampling Date | - | 22/8/05 | 4/9/05 | 4/9/05 | 29/8/05 | 22/8/05 |
| pH | - | 7.5 | 7.8 | 7.8 | 7.6 | 7.4 |
| Turbidity | NTU | 0.5 | 0.88 | 1.1 | 1.0 | 1.2 |
| Total Dissolved Solids | mg/l | 245 | 268 | 250 | 233 | 446 |
| Total Hardness ( $\mathrm{CaCO}_{3}$ ) | mg/l | 122 | 126 | 124 | 132 | 134 |
| Calcium | mg/l | 29 | 30 | 29 | 30 | 32 |
| Magnesium | mg/l | 10 | 11 | 10 | 13 | 14 |
| Nitrate ( $\mathrm{NO}_{3}-\mathrm{N}$ ) | mg/l | 0.154 | 0.176 | 0.169 | 0.175 | 0.118 |
| Fluoride | mg/l | 0.010 | ND | ND | 0.011 | ND |
| Chloride | mg/l | 20 | 22 | 20 | 46 | 126 |
| Sulfate | mg/l | 17 | 17 | 17 | 19 | 22 |
| Iron | mg/l | 0.157 | 0.164 | 0.708 | ND | 0.061 |
| Manganese | mg/l | ND | 0.088 | 0.256 | ND | 0.012 |
| Copper | mg/l | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND |
| Lead | mg/l | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND |
| Zinc | mg/l | ND | ND | ND | ND | 0.01 |
| Total Coliform | MPN/100 ml | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND |

S6: Distribution line at area covered by old WTP
S7: Distribution line at area covered by old WTP
S8: Distribution line at area covered by old WTP
S9: Distribution line at area covered by wells of old WTP
S10: Distribution line at area covered by C.U. of Omar Ibn El-Khatab

رئبس الوحدة الاستنثاريهة للبيئة المـائية
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## Results of Water Quality Survey in El-Mahala El-Kobra

4- Supplied Water (S)
Table (1-3)

| Parameters | Unit | Sampling Sites |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | S11 | S12 | S13 | S14 | S15 |
| Sampling Date | - | 22/8/05 | 22/8/05 | 4/9/05 | 4/9/05 | 4/9/05 |
| pH | - | 7.6 | 7.8 | 7.7 | 7.7 | 7.9 |
| Turbidity | NTU | 0.8 | 1.2 | 1.6 | 1.4 | 1.5 |
| Total Dissolved Solids | mg/l | 232 | 446 | 459 | 451 | 944 |
| Total Hardness ( $\mathrm{CaCO}_{3}$ ) | mg/l | 120 | 130 | 220 | 200 | 270 |
| Calcium | mg/l | 28 | 28 | 56 | 40 | 68 |
| Magnesium | mg/l | 12 | 12 | 20 | 24 | 40 |
| Nitrate ( $\mathrm{NO}_{3}-\mathrm{N}$ ) | mg/l | 0.115 | 0.158 | 0.096 | 0.112 | 0.125 |
| Fluoride | mg/l | ND | 0.043 | 0.024 | ND | 0.116 |
| Chloride | mg/l | 50 | 126 | 150 | 90 | 270 |
| Sulfate | mg/l | 19 | 22 | 19 | 16 | 40 |
| Iron | mg/l | ND | 0.061 | 0.133 | ND | 0.244 |
| Manganese | mg/l | ND | 0.0146 | ND | ND | 0.167 |
| Copper | mg/l | ND | ND | ND | ND | 0.171 |
| Lead | mg/l | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND |
| Zinc | mg/l | ND | ND | ND | ND | 0.011 |
| Total Coliform | MPN/100 ml | 0.0 | 1 | ND | ND | ND |

S11: Distribution line at area covered by C.U. of Abu Ali
S12: Distribution line at area covered by Wells of Abu Ali
S13: Distribution line at area covered by C.U. of Manshiat EI-Bakari
S14: Distribution line at area covered by Wells of Manshiat El-Bakari
S15: In El-Qaisaria
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اللوبطة الاستشارية للبيئة الفائئية

## Results of Water Ouality Survey in El-Mahala El-Kobra

4- Supplied Water (S)
Table (1-4)

| Parameters | Unit | Sampling Sites |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | S16 | S17 | S18 | S19 | S20 |
| Sampling Date | - | 4/9/05 | 29/8/05 | 29/8/05 | 29/8/05 | 4/9/05 |
| pH | - | 7.5 | 7.6 | 7.7 | 7.6 | 7.7 |
| Turbidity | NTU | 0.95 | 1.1 | 0.95 | 1.0 | 0.61 |
| Total Dissolved Solids | mg/l | 232 | 224 | 236 | 243 | 239 |
| Total Hardness ( $\mathrm{CaCO}_{3}$ ) | mg/l | 120 | 122 | 120 | 122 | 150 |
| Calcium | mg/l | 30 | 31 | 31 | 32 | 32 |
| Magnesium | mg/1 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 10 | 17 |
| Nitrate ( $\mathrm{NO}_{3}-\mathrm{N}$ ) | mg/l | 0.123 | 0.116 | 0.109 | 0.143 | 0.205 |
| Fluoride | mg/l | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND |
| Chloride | mg/I | 26 | 26 | 26 | 26 | 60 |
| Sulfate | mg/l | 18 | 17 | 18 | 19 | 22 |
| Iron | mg/l | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND |
| Manganese | mg/l | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND |
| Copper | mg/l | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND |
| Lead | mg/l | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND |
| Zinc | mg/l | ND | ND | ND | ND | ND |
| Total Coliform | MPN/100 ml | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 0.0 | 1.0 |

S16: In Batina
S17: In Ezbat Toma
S18: In Ezbat Lona Kamar
S19: In Kafr El-Geaina
S20: In Manshiat El-Omara
辑 أ.د/ أسامة أحمد على
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## Results of Water Quality Survey in EI-Mahala El-Kobra

4- Supplied Water (S)
Table (1-5)

| Parameters | Unit | Sampling Sites |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | S21 | S22 | S23 |
| Sampling Date | - | 4/9/05 | 4/9/05 | 4/9/05 |
| pH | - | 7.8 | 7.9 | 7.7 |
| Turbidity | NTU | 1.2 | 1.4 | 1.2 |
| Total Dissolved Solids | mg/I | 272 | 348 | 285 |
| Total Hardness ( $\mathrm{CaCO}_{3}$ ) | mg/l | 260 | 280 | 260 |
| Calcium | mg/I | 60 | 64 | 60 |
| Magnesium | mg/l | 26 | 29 | 26 |
| Nitrate ( $\mathrm{NO}_{3}-\mathrm{N}$ ) | mg/l | 0.064 | 0.139 | 0.114 |
| Fluoride | mg/l | ND | 0.016 | ND |
| Chloride | mg/l | 24 | 32 | 28 |
| Sulfate | mg/l | 17 | 19 | 17 |
| Iron | mg/I | ND | ND | ND |
| Manganese | mg/l | ND | ND | ND |
| Copper | $\mathrm{mg} / 1$ | 0.007 | ND | ND |
| Lead | mg/l | ND | ND | ND |
| Zinc | mg/l | 0.01 | ND | 0.01 |
| Total Coliform | MPN/100 ml | ND | ND | ND |

S21: In Mahalat Hassan
S22: In Meit El-Lith Hashim
S23: In Diarb Hashim


## Appendix-8 Social Survey

## REPORT OF SOCIAL SURVEY

September 1, 2005

1. Objectives of the Survey

The Objectives of the Survey were basically as follows:
(1) Assess the water service conditions in the Project Area (consumption amount, water pressures, discharge)
(2) Assess the degree of satisfaction of the consumers
(3) Determine the potential revenue from the consumers' willingness-to-pay
2. Survey Methodology

The Survey was carried out through the interviews with consumers in urban and rural areas in four (4) of the Gharbia Governorate's six (6) cities (Markaz). The process followed is briefly described:
(1) Questionnaire Form

The questionnaire form and experience gained in Sharkia were the basis for preparing this survey's questionnaire form. The prepared questionnaire was discussed in detail with GACWASD in two sessions and modified based on the discussions.

The final form was translated into Arabic.
(2) Selection of the Samples

The BD Team proposed that the interviews be conducted in the four cities of Mahalla El Kobra (target city for the project), Tanta (capital city and similar in nature to MK in terms of population), and the two smaller cities of Sammanoud (east of MK) and Qotour (west of MK).

Both urban and rural samples were to be taken from each of these cities.
The BD Team held discussions with GACWASD to select districts in the cities for the urban samples that would reflect the different income levels, and geographical conditions. The same procedure was adopted for selecting the rural samples from certain villages within the 6 cities.

After completing the identification of the districts and villages GACWASD proceeded to draw up names of consumers from their subscribers lists as candidates for the samples. Lists were prepared for each of the target district and village showing the consumer name, address, amount of billed water and value of the bill. The names in the lists were about 3 times the required number.
(3) Training of the Surveyors

A number of surveyors (around 20) living in MK and Tanta were introduced to the BD Team by staff of GACWASD. These surveyors were mainly university students.

Two training sessions were held with the surveyors to explain the questions in the Questionnaire and also on how to use the pressure gauges (for the urban districts of MK).

A pilot survey was done in MK using about 30 samples in order to finalize the questionnaire form and also detect any problems in the questions.
(4) Survey

The interview survey was implemented over 12 days. The surveyors were mobilized into groups of 3 and 4. GACWASD kindly arranged for the tariff collectors to accompany the surveyors in order to introduce them to the households to be surveyed.

For each survey team, a supervisor was assigned to check the completed questionnaire form and instruct the surveyors as required. In many instances the surveyors were sent back to the interviewed household to ask a question they may have missed, clarify an unclear reply or to try once more and obtain an answer for a question that was not answered at the first time.

Basically the GACWASD prepared lists for districts and villages were used. When the selected persons were not found random persons in the vicinity were selected. In such cases the subscriber number was asked in order to obtain data on the household (consumption and billed charge) from GACWASD data bank. When the names on the list were considered too closely clustered together, the surveyors, with the help of GACWASD identified other close by areas in the field.

All the households approached agreed to be interviewed and most were very kind in giving their time and opinions. As the water service is a burning issue for most of the citizens the interviewed households offered more information than was required in many instances. In some households the surveyors were shown samples of the water and
sometimes asked to taste the water for themselves!
(5) Data Input and Valediction

Data input proceeded in parallel with the surveys. The questionnaire forms were input into MS Excel spread sheets, in Arabic and in English.

Each entry was checked for inconsistencies and when these were found, the surveyor responsible for the questionnaire was called in to check the answers mostly be calling the surveyed household or paying a repeat visit.

Concerning the consumption amounts and billed costs, in most cases the data from GACWASD was used.
(6) Analysis

The input data was analyzed using the MS Excel spread. The main results are described hereafter.
3. Survey Coverage Area

Table 1 shows the districts and villages were the survey was implemented.

Table (1) Planned and Achieved Sample of Social Survey in Different Cities

| City | Location | District |  | Sample |  | (\%)* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Code | Name | Planned | Achieved |  |
| Mahala <br> El-Kobra <br> (210 <br> samples) | Urban(105) | 1 | Sabae Banat | 15 | 19 | 1.27 |
|  |  | 2 | Shokry El-Kowatly (CBD) | 15 | 20 | 1.33 |
|  |  | 3 | Sekka El-Westaneya | 15 | 20 | 1.33 |
|  |  | 4 | Sooq El-Laban | 15 | 23 | 1.53 |
|  |  | 5 | Gomhoreya | 15 | 23 | 1.53 |
|  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Rural } \\ & (105) \end{aligned}$ | 6 | Mehalet Hasan | 15 | 20 | 1.33 |
|  |  | 7 | Qaysareya Abo Aly | 15 | 23 | 1.53 |
|  |  | 8 | Dawakhleya | 15 | 20 | 1.33 |
|  |  | 9 | Kafr Hegazy | 15 | 21 | 1.40 |
|  |  | 10 | Mehalet Abo Aly | 15 | 21 | 1.40 |


| City | Location | District |  |  | Sample |  | (\%)* |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Code | Name |  | Planned | Achieved |  |
| Tanta <br> (161 <br> samples) | Urban (79) | 11 | Estad |  | 15 | 25 | 1.67 |
|  |  | 12 | Kafr Essam |  | 15 | 20 | 1.33 |
|  |  | 13 | Segar |  | 15 | 17 | 1.13 |
|  |  | 14 | Salam |  | 15 | 17 | 1.13 |
|  | Rural <br> (82) | 15 | Berma |  | 15 | 20 | 1.33 |
|  |  | 16 | Mehalet Marhoom |  | 15 | 20 | 1.33 |
|  |  | 17 | Ragdeya |  | 15 | 21 | 1.40 |
|  |  | 18 | Sperbay |  | 15 | 21 | 1.40 |
| Sammanoud (149 <br> samples) | Urban (61) | 19 | Sammanoud <br> El-Madina) | (Magles | 15 | 18 | 1.20 |
|  |  | 20 | Sooq |  | 15 | 20 | 1.33 |
|  |  | 21 | Samaha |  | 15 | 23 | 1.53 |
|  | Rural (88) | 22 | Rahebeen |  | 15 | 20 | 1.33 |
|  |  | 23 | Mehalet Zayad |  | 20 | 24 | 1.20 |
|  |  | 24 | Mit Asas |  | 20 | 24 | 1.20 |
|  |  | 25 | Nasereya |  | 15 | 20 | 1.33 |
| Qotour <br> (152 <br> samples) | Urban (60) | 26 | Sharei El-Bahr |  | 15 | 20 | 1.33 |
|  |  | 27 | Qotour El-Balad |  | 15 | 20 | 1.33 |
|  |  | 28 | Mostashfa El-Aam |  | 15 | 20 | 1.33 |
|  | Rural (92) | 29 | Beltag |  | 20 | 21 | 1.05 |
|  |  | 30 | Ebshaway El-Malaq |  | 20 | 25 | 1.25 |
|  |  | 31 | Damat |  | 15 | 26 | 1.73 |
|  |  | 32 | Hohowein |  | 15 | 20 | 1.33 |
| Total |  |  |  |  | 500 | 672 | 1.34 |

*Note: Achieved/Planned
A total of six-hundred and seventy-two households were surveyed. For MK the share was $31 \%$ (or slightly less than $1 / 3$ rd of the total sample) to reflect the position of MK as the project location. In terms of urban to rural split, the share was 1 to 1.2 .
4. Main Results of the Survey
(1) Household Attributes
(1) Interviewed Person


The majority of interviewees were conducted with the householder followed by the wife. In many cases both were present to answer the questions, especially in the rural areas.


Interviews of MK show the same tendency. There is also slight difference between urban and rural areas.
(2) Income Data


Interviewees were queried on how many people are earning an income within the household and the total income of those people. Surprisingly only $13 \%$ of the total queried households refused to answer. On the other hand potential deflation of the incomes could not be completely avoided. 70\% of the samples declared incomes of less than 500 LE monthly.


Overall the levels do not differ much in the case of MK only. As expected the households in urban areas declared higher income levels than rural households.
(2) Satisfaction with GACWASD Water Service

## (1) Water as Drinking Source



Households were asked whether they drink the GACWASD supplied water. Twenty-three (23\%) percent do not drink the water at all, while $64 \%$ drink it without any countermeasures. $13 \%$ either insert filter or boil the water before drinking.


In the case of MK, the percent of households not drinking the GACWASD water was almost three times the respective urban share. This is indicative of the need to improve the service in rural areas. And $80 \%$ of the MK urban population drinks the water as it is.
(2) Specific Water Quality Characteristics


The characteristics with the highest degree of dissatisfaction were the taste and color. None of the five characteristics received even a $50 \%$ margin of satisfaction.


In general urban residents were more satisfied with GACWASD supplied water color and taste, than were their counterparts in the rural villages of MK. The largest degree of dissatisfaction was shown for the water pressure and urban residents complained vocally of the lack of water in the higher floors. Once more no quality received a degree of satisfaction higher than 34\%.
(3) Water Cutoffs

Residents were queried on the occurrence of water cut-offs on a scheduled (residents are informed before the cut-off occurs or are aware of these cutoffs) or random basis. Only $16 \%$ of the overall respondents stated that they do not experience any cutoffs. The following table shows the shares of respondents confirming frequent scheduled and random cutoffs by city.

| City | Scheduled cuts <br> $(\%)$ | Random cuts (\%) |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| MK | $48 \%$ | $37 \%$ |
| Tanta | $38 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| Samannoud | $45 \%$ | $45 \%$ |
| Qotour | $25 \%$ | $47 \%$ |
| TOTAL | $40 \%$ | $44 \%$ |

Excluding MK, for all the three other cities, random cuts are more common than scheduled cuts. For MK scheduled cuts are more.
(4) Overall Satisfaction Level

As a summation to the above the residents were queried on their overall degree of satisfaction with the GACWASD water services. Eighty-one percent (81\%) of the total respondents were not satisfied while in the case of MK the shares of those not satisfied were $91 \%$ both in the urban as well as rural areas.
(3) Use of Water other than the GACWASD Supply
(1) Water Purchase

Despite the widely spread dissatisfaction with GACAWSD water services $86 \%$ of the total respondents do not purchase water, mainly due to economical reasons. This was the same figure for MK also. In only a very few cases, less than 5\% of the total respondents, we were informed that some water is purchased for drinking for the ailing and sick people in the household.
(2) Free Water

Most urban and rural residents have access to free water such as wells, both private and public. Almost sixty percent (60\%) of the respondents replied that they
take water from wells, mostly on a daily basis, to use for drinking and cooking purposes.

In the case of MK 60\% of the rural residents interviewed fetched free water from wells on an almost daily basis for all purposes. The respective figure for MK urban residents was just over half of that, at $34 \%$. Ten (10\%) percent of MK urban residents mentioned that they obtain free water from neighbors.
(4) Information on Consumption and Billing

| Consumption level | $\%$ | LE/HH/m |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $(1)<50 \mathrm{l} / \mathrm{c} / \mathrm{d}$ | $21 \%$ | 2.8 |
| $(2) 51-100 \mathrm{l} / \mathrm{c} / \mathrm{d}$ | $24 \%$ | 3.7 |
| $(3) 101-150 \mathrm{l} / \mathrm{c} / \mathrm{d}$ | $19 \%$ | 5.1 |
| $(4) 151-200 \mathrm{l} / \mathrm{c} / \mathrm{d}$ | $12 \%$ | 6.7 |
| $(5) 201-250 \mathrm{l} / \mathrm{c} / \mathrm{d}$ | $6 \%$ | 10.2 |
| $(6) 251-300 \mathrm{l} / \mathrm{c} / \mathrm{d}$ | $5 \%$ | 12.3 |
| $(7) 301-400 \mathrm{l} / \mathrm{c} / \mathrm{d}$ | $6 \%$ | 12.4 |
| $(8) 401-500 \mathrm{l} / \mathrm{c} / \mathrm{d}$ | $3 \%$ | 15.4 |
| $(9)>501 \mathrm{l} / \mathrm{c} / \mathrm{d}$ | $5 \%$ | 17.9 |
| Average | 171.8 | 6.7 |

The consumption rates summarized for the total samples are shown in the above table, along with the billing per household monthly. The largest share (24\%) is for the 51-100 l/cap/d category. The average monthly payments correspond well to the categories of consumption. Of the total samples, average consumption and monthly billing were 171.8 l/cap/d and LE 6.7 per household per month.

| Consumption <br> Category | Urban |  | Rural |  |
| :---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  | $\%$ | LE/month | $\%$ | LE/month |
| $(1)<50 \mathrm{l} / \mathrm{c} / \mathrm{d}$ | $14 \%$ | 2.9 | $26 \%$ | 2.1 |
| $(2) 51-100 \mathrm{l} / \mathrm{c} / \mathrm{d}$ | $16 \%$ | 3.0 | $28 \%$ | 3.2 |
| $(3) 101-150 \mathrm{I} / \mathrm{c} / \mathrm{d}$ | $21 \%$ | 6.0 | $18 \%$ | 4.5 |
| $(4) 151-200 \mathrm{l} / \mathrm{c} / \mathrm{d}$ | $12 \%$ | 5.9 | $10 \%$ | 6.4 |
| $(5) 201-250 \mathrm{l} / \mathrm{c} / \mathrm{d}$ | $9 \%$ | 7.7 | $8 \%$ | 15.1 |
| $(6) 251-300 \mathrm{l} / \mathrm{c} / \mathrm{d}$ | $9 \%$ | 7.3 | $3 \%$ | 11.7 |
| $(7) 301-400 \mathrm{l} / \mathrm{c} / \mathrm{d}$ | $10 \%$ | 9.8 | $5 \%$ | 11.5 |
| $(8) 401-500 \mathrm{I} / \mathrm{c} / \mathrm{d}$ | $4 \%$ | 22.0 | $2 \%$ | 9.7 |
| (9) $>501 \mathrm{l} / \mathrm{c} / \mathrm{d}$ | $5 \%$ | 31.9 | $2 \%$ | 19.8 |
| AVERAGE | 200 | 7.5 | 129 | 5.7 |

The above table shows the respective values for MK. In principle water consumption in rural villages is less than in urban districts (average $200 \mathrm{l} / \mathrm{cap} / \mathrm{d}$ for urban residents versus $129 \mathrm{l} / \mathrm{cap} / \mathrm{d}$ for their rural counterparts). Monthly payments correspond well to the respective consumption category.
(5) Willingness to Pay

When asked to select the infrastructure which requires major improvement in their residential area (water supply, waste management, sewage, telephones, electricity, and public transport), $78 \%$ of the total respondents selected improvement or water supply as their top priority.

And of all the four cities the figures for MK were the highest, in terms of selection of water supply with a share of $91 \%$, followed by Qotour (76\%), Tanta (74\%) and Samannoud (65\%).

Linked to this question, residents were then asked what additional money they were willing to pay monthly in order to improve the water supply service. The replies were categorized and the shares and are shown in the following table.

| Add sum | Urban | Rural | Total |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| LE/month |  | 1. All Samples |  |  |
| 0 | $52 \%$ | $43 \%$ | $47 \%$ |
| $0-2$ | $15 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $19 \%$ |
| $2-5$ | $23 \%$ | $25 \%$ | $24 \%$ |
| $5-10$ | $7 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| $10-20$ | $1 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $2 \%$ |
| $>20$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| $2 . \mathrm{MK}$ |  |  |  |
| 0 | $53 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $46 \%$ |
| $0-2$ | $14 \%$ | $20 \%$ | $17 \%$ |
| $2-5$ | $18 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $23 \%$ |
| $5-10$ | $11 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| $10-20$ | $2 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| $>20$ | $1 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| AVERAGE <br> (LE/HH/m) | 3.7 | 3.2 | 3.3 |

A clear majority of urban residents were not willing to pay any additional money, while in the case of rural residents; the majority was willing to pay some money. For both urban and rural households willing to pay some money, the amount was mostly less than

## LE 5 per month.

Figures are similar for MK, with $53 \%$ of the urban respondents refusing to pay any additional money. Of the MK respondents willing to pay additional money the average sum of $3.3 \mathrm{LE} /$ household/month was obtained.
(6) Tap Pressure and Discharge in MK Urban Districts

Tap pressure and discharge were measured in the urban households in MK. The results are shown in the following table.

|  | No. | \% |  | No. | \% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1. Tap Pressure |  |  | 2. Discharge (cm3/sec) |  |  |
| < 1.0 | 11 | 10\% | 10-20 | 2 | 2\% |
| 1 | 4 | 4\% | 21-30 | 4 | 4\% |
| 1.5 | 2 | 2\% | 31-40 | 5 | 5\% |
| 2 | 4 | 4\% | 41-50 | 4 | 4\% |
| 2.5 | 5 | 5\% | 51-60 | 1 | 1\% |
| 3 | 2 | 2\% | 61-70 | 5 | 5\% |
| 4 | 3 | 3\% | 71-80 | 3 | 3\% |
| 5 | 2 | 2\% | 81-90 | 2 | 2\% |
| 6 | 3 | 3\% | 91-100 | 1 | 1\% |
| 6.5 | 1 | 1\% | 101-110 | 6 | 6\% |
| 7 | 1 | 1\% | 111-120 | 5 | 5\% |
| 7.5 | 4 | 4\% | 121-130 | 5 | 5\% |
| 8 | 6 | 6\% | 131-140 | 4 | 4\% |
| 9 | 2 | 2\% | 141-150 | 2 | 2\% |
| 10 | 8 | 8\% | 151-160 | 2 | 2\% |
| 11 | 3 | 3\% | 161-170 | 1 | 1\% |
| 12 | 5 | 5\% | 171-180 | 1 | 1\% |
| 14 | 1 | 1\% | 181-190 | 6 | 6\% |
| 16 | 2 | 2\% | 191-200 | 2 | 2\% |
| 18 | 1 | 1\% | 201-300 | 3 | 3\% |
| No Water | 35 | 33\% | 301-400 | 6 | 6\% |
| TOTAL | 105 |  | No Water | 35 | 33\% |
|  |  |  |  | 105 | 100\% |
| Average | 6.1 |  | Average | 129.0 |  |
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## Social Survey Questionnaire



|  | 23. Availability of water meter <br> 1) None <br> 2) Independent <br> 3) Shared <br> \|_I <br> 4) Number of units sharing meter $\square$ <br> 5) Number of persons sharing meter |  |  | 24. Arrange water uses <br> 1) Cooking $\qquad$ <br> 2) Drinking $\qquad$ <br> 3) Dish washing \|__| <br> 4) Clothes washing \|__| <br> 5) Bathing $\qquad$ <br> 6) Others $\qquad$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 25. Use of public water (multi answer) <br> 1) $\mathrm{No} \mid \_$ <br> 2) Yes, Well or pump <br> 3) Yes, canal <br> 4) Yes, public tap or mosque <br> 5) Yes, Others $\qquad$ \|__| |  |  | 26. Arrange water uses <br> 1) Cooking $\qquad$ <br> 2) Drinking $\qquad$ <br> 3) Dish washing \|__| <br> 4) Clothes washing \|__| <br> 5) Bathing $\qquad$ <br> 6) Others $\square$ |
|  | 27. Distance from public water source <br> 1) $\qquad$ meter $\qquad$ minutes on foot <br> 2) $\qquad$ meter $\qquad$ minutes on foot |  | 28. Frequency of water use <br> 1) Daily <br> 2) Once/ 2 days <br> 3) Twice weekly <br> 4) Once weekly <br> 5) Others $\qquad$ \|_1 |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  | 30. Arrange water uses <br> 1) Cooking - $\qquad$ <br> 2) Drinking $\qquad$ _ <br> 3) Dish washing $\qquad$ I <br> 4) Clothes washing $\qquad$ <br> 5) Bathing $\qquad$ <br> 6) Others $\qquad$ |  | 31. Do you drink from water tap $\qquad$ <br> 1) No <br> 2) Yes; as it is <br> 3) Yes; after filtering <br> 4) Yes; after boiling |  |
| - | 32. Toilet type $\qquad$ <br> 1) W/ flush <br> 2) W/o flush | 33. Bathroom type \|__| <br> 1) W/ shower 2) Withou |  | 34. Washing machine <br> 1) None <br> 2) Ordinary <br> 3) Automatic |


|  | 35. Type of sanitary drainage $\qquad$ <br> 1) Don't know <br> 2) Government drainage system <br> 3) Canal/ drain <br> 4) Septic tank | 36. Quality of company water <br> 1) Color satisfactory <br> 1) Yes 2$) \mathrm{No}$ <br> _ _ <br> 2) Taste satisfactory <br> 1) Yes 2) No $\square$ <br> 3) Odor satisfactory <br> 1) Yes 2) No $\square$ <br> 4) Pressure satisfactory <br> 1) Yes 2) No $\square$ <br> 5) Quantity satisfactory <br> 1) Yes 2) No $\qquad$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | 37. Water cut-offs <br> 1) None <br> 2) Regular cut-offs <br> 3) Random cut-offs <br> 4) $\qquad$ times a day $\qquad$ times a week <br> 6) $\qquad$ times a month <br> 7) Cut-off $\qquad$ hours/time |  |  |
|  | 38. Overall are you satisfied with the company water <br> 1) Yes <br> 2) No <br> 3) Other reasons for not being satisfied |  |  |
|  | 39. What is the additional sum that you are willing to pay to improve the water service to the degree that satisfies you?$\qquad$ LE/month/dwelling |  |  |
|  | 40. Arrange your priorities for the following services | 41. Meter operating <br> 1) Yes <br> 2) No $\qquad$ | 42. Pump available <br> 1) Yes <br> 2) No $\qquad$ |
|  | 3) Transport $\qquad$ 4) Electricity $\square$ <br> 5) Waste $\qquad$ 6) Telephone $\qquad$ | 43. Evaluate dwelling <br> 1) Clean <br> 2) Accept | conditions \|__| <br> 3) Poor |
|  | 44. Water pressure $\qquad$ 45. Floor $\qquad$ 46. Time required to fill bottle $\qquad$ sec |  |  |
|  | 47. Include any remarks that may be useful: |  |  |
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