PERCEPTIONS OF WATER QUALITY AND SUPPLY IN THE UNICORPORATED AREAS OF BERNALILLO COUNTY

Prepared for: Bernalillo County Environmental Health Department

June 2002

University of New Mexico

Bureau of Business and Economic Research



The University of New Mexico

Perceptions of Water Quality and Supply in the Unincorporated Areas of Bernalillo County

June 2002

University of New Mexico

Bureau of Business and Economic Research

TABLE OF CONTENTS

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY II
1: INTRODUCTION
2: SURVEY DISTRIBUTION AND RESPONSE RATES
2.1 Survey Design and Distribution2
2.2 Sample Selection and Response Rates2
2.3 Sample Bias
3: STUDY AREA SURVEY FINDINGS
3.1 Water Sytems and Treatment5
3.2 Waste Water Disposal6
3.3 Private Well Characteristics6
3.4 Community System Characteristics7
3.5 Public Perceptions73.5.1 Water Quality73.5.2 Delivery/Supply83.5.3 Water Policy9
4: FINDINGS BY GEOGRPAHIC AREA 11
4.1 Water Systems and Treatment 11
4.2 Public Perceptions 15 4.2.1 Quality 15 4.2.2 Delivery/Supply 18 4.2.3 Policy 20
5: FINDINGS BY TYPE OF WATER SYSTEM
5.1 Water Systems and Treatment24
 5.2 Perceptions by Water System Type
APPENDIX A: SURVEY INSTRUMENT
APPENDIX B: SANDIA FOOTHILLS TABLES

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

In 2001, the Bureau of Business and Economic Research surveyed 5,000 households in the unincorporated areas of Bernalillo County about residential water systems, perceptions of water quality, supply, delivery, and public policy related to water. The main findings of this survey, organized by topic and geographic area, include:

Survey finding for the entire study area:

Private individual wells supply most of the water used in the homes of almost half of survey respondents. Moreover, the overwhelming majority of residents with private wells consider their wells and plumbing to be in good or excellent condition while only 3% believe their private wells and plumbing are in poor condition. Two-thirds of all private wells are over 150 feet deep. Community systems provide water to an additional 40% of homes, of which roughly 50% are on community systems that serve 100 or more households. Well shares, on the other hand, are used by 11% of respondents. Water systems used in homes vary by geographic areas of the County.

The large majority of respondents (81%) believe unfiltered water from their faucet is safe to drink. A smaller percentage like the taste of their water, and about half believe that water stains household plumbing too much.

Slightly more than half of the respondents worry about the long-term supply of water to the households in their neighborhood, though most agree that their home has water whenever they need it. About 82% of respondents believe the water pressure in their home is good, and 45% believe that there is an adequate supply for fire protection. Additionally, 72% of respondents disagree with the statement "the cost of having water in my home is too high." The overwhelming majority of respondents support water policies related to protecting the water supply and ensuring water quality.

Survey findings for the East Mountains, the Sandia Foothills, the North Valley and the South Valley include:

East Mountains

Private individual wells (40%) and community systems (46%) provide most of the residential water in the East Mountain. In comparison to the entire study area, these homes are slightly less likely to have had their water quality tested in the past year. East Mountain residents are most likely to use some type of water treatment, with almost half of respondents using a water softener. Almost all East Mountain homes use septic tanks.

Compared to the entire study area, a slightly higher percentage of East Mountain respondents believe (strongly agreeing and agreeing responses combined) that unfiltered water from their faucet is safe to drink. A high proportion of residents are concerned about the long-term supply of water though a small percentage believe that there is enough water for fire protection.

Sandia Foothills

The majority of homes in the Sandia Foothills use community systems. Homes in this area are most likely to have had their water quality tested in the past year. Compared with the other areas, bottled water is least likely to always be used as drinking water. Almost three-quarter of the area's homes use septic tanks.

Water quality perceptions in the Sandia Foothills are the most positive of the four geographic areas. This area has the highest rate of respondents strongly agreeing that they have good water pressure, that there is enough water pressure for fire protection, though also that the cost of water in their home is too high. Roughly equal percentages of respondents worry and don't worry about the long-term water supply.

North Valley

Homes in the North Valley primarily use private individual wells, of which 40% are 151 to 250 feet deep. Residents in this area are less likely to have had water quality tested in the past year. When compared to the study area, a smaller percentage of North Valley homes use no water treatment and 43% use water softener. Septic tanks are the primary source of wastewater disposal in the North Valley (85%).

Perceptions of water quality in the North Valley generally reflect those of the overall study area, though this area has the highest rate of respondents not worried about the long-term water supply. Slightly more respondents agree than disagree that there is enough water for fire protection.

South Valley

Homes in the South Valley primarily use private individual wells, of which roughly 40% are 151 to 250 feet deep. South Valley homes are the most likely to have never had water quality tested and the least likely to have been tested less than one year ago. The South Valley has the highest rate of wells (17%) and plumbing in fair and poor condition (6%). Almost one-third of South Valley homes use the sewer system for wastewater disposal while the remaining two-thirds use septic tanks.

Perceptions of water quality in the South Valley are the least positive of the four geographic areas. Only 63% of respondents believe (strongly agree and agree combined) that unfiltered water from the faucet is safe to drink. Also, the area has the highest rates of respondents who strongly agree and who agree that unfiltered water from the faucet will make them ill. Almost one-third of respondents disagree strongly with the statement that "they like the taste of unfiltered water from the kitchen."

Survey findings for the different water systems, including private individual wells, well shares, and community systems include:

Private Individual Well

Private individual well respondents are most likely to use no water treatment in their homes, to strongly disagree their unfiltered water is safe to drink, and to strongly agree

that they are worried that their water will make them ill. Additionally, respondents using private individual wells are most likely to always use bottled water for home drinking water. Private well users are also the most likely to believe that their water stains plumbing fixtures too much.

Private individual well respondents are worried about the long-term supply of water although they have water whenever needed. Those with private wells have the lowest rates of respondents that strongly agree and agree that there is enough water for fire protection.

Well Share

Well share respondents are the least likely to always use (and the most likely to never use) bottled water for home drinking water. Well share respondents are the least likely to use no water treatment in their homes, and the most likely to use water softener, faucet filters, and reverse osmosis units. Only 4% of respondents on well share have never had their water quality tested.

Almost matching the study area rate, over one-third of well share users strongly agree that their unfiltered water is safe to drink. Well share users also have the highest rate of respondents strongly agreeing that they like the taste of their water and the lowest percentage believing their water stains plumbing fixtures. Sixty-two percent of well share respondents are worried (strongly agree and agree combined) about the longterm supply of water in their neighborhood, the highest rate of the three systems.

Community System

When compared to all water system users, a smaller percentage of community system respondents always use bottled water, use no water treatment systems, and are the least likely to use water softener. Community system users are also most likely to have had their water quality tested in the past year.

Community systems have the highest rate of respondents that strongly agree (40%) their unfiltered water is safe to drink, the lowest rate (11%) that believe (strongly agree and agree combined) that their water will make them ill, and the lowest rate stating that they like the taste of their water.

Community system users are the most satisfied with water supply/delivery, with the highest rate of respondents that strongly agree that their homes have water whenever they need it, that they have good water pressure, and that there is enough water near their home for fire protection. This being stated, community system users believe that the cost of having water in their home is too high. Community system users also have the smallest rate of responses that believe (strongly agree and agree combined) that they are worried about the long-term water supply.

1: INTRODUCTION

The findings within this report were based on data compiled from surveys distributed to targeted areas within Bernalillo County. Surveys were designed by the New Mexico Bureau of Business and Economic Research (BBER) in order to solicit the following information from respondents:

- Perceptions of water safety, taste, availability, and quality
- Perceptions of water testing, education, and regulation
- Type of water supply system (city or well)
- Use of in-house water purification systems
- Perceptions regarding the cost of water
- Demographical make-up including age, gender, household children, and length of residency.

Two survey pretests were conducted on April 16-17 and 30, 2001 in order to assess the effectiveness of the survey form as originally designed. Recommendations were generated and incorporated into the final survey form.

This report is organized into four sections. Section 1 describes the design of the survey instrument, sample selection, response rates, and defines the study area. Section 2 presents an overview of the survey findings for the entire study area. Most of the data in Section 2 are presented in charts for ease of interpretation. Section 3 presents the survey findings of four geographic sub-areas and explores the relationship of geography and resident perceptions. Section 4 completes a similar analysis using type of residential water system as the unit of analysis. Data in Sections 3 and 4 are presented using tables to allow for comparison among the different units of analysis though each table contains the findings for the entire study area.

2: SURVEY DISTRIBUTION AND RESPONSE RATES

The following subsections describe survey instrument design, sample selection, survey distribution, and response rates.

2.1 SURVEY DESIGN AND DISTRIBUTION

BBER, in consultation with Bernalillo County Environmental Health, designed the survey instrument. The instrument was a one-page bubble survey in both English and Spanish. The survey instrument was pre-tested twice to ensure that respondents accurately understood the questions, survey content, and to confirm internal validations.

The survey was distributed to households by mail and was accompanied by a cover letter with the signature of the director of BBER (Appendix A). The survey and cover letters were addressed to the property owner or current resident. A reminder postcard followed the initial survey mailing. Approximately three weeks after the initial mailing, non-respondents were mailed another survey. Self-addressed stamped envelopes were included in both mailings for the return of the survey.

2.2 SAMPLE SELECTION AND RESPONSE RATES

The survey sample was selected from an universe of approximately 12,900 households in the unincorporated area of Bernalillo County that were believed to not receive residential drinking water from the City of Albuquerque or New Mexico Utilities. To achieve a more accurate address set, BBER identified 5,700 properties that had the same site and owner's address. From these 5,700 properties, 5,000 households were randomly selected as the survey sample.

Of the 5,000 surveys distributed, 348 surveys were "returned to sender" due to delivery complications, resulting in a total of 4,652 surveys actually reaching households. A total of 1,739 surveys were returned to BBER for a response rate of 37.4%. BBER excluded eight surveys due to incomplete responses that yielded the surveys unusable. Additionally, 66 surveys from respondents who indicated that most of their water was from the City of Albuquerque were also excluded from the analysis.

The sample was categorized into four geographical areas. These areas are identified in Map 2.1 and include the East Mountains, Sandia Foothills (which includes North Albuquerque Acres), North Valley, and South Valley. Table 2.1 presents the response rates for each of these areas and the study area as a whole. Response rates by geographic area range from 30.8% in the South Valley to 41.5% in the Sandia Foothills.

Survey responses from the Sandia Foothills were analyzed as a separate unit to identify water system characteristics and public perceptions within the area. The Sandia Foothills was divided into two sub-areas: North Albuquerque Acres (which is defined in this report as the unincorporated portion of the County west of Tramway Boulevard) and the area east of Tramway Boulevard. Data for these areas are included in tables presented in Appendix B.

Survey Distribution and Response Rates							
		Returned	Response				
	Surveys Sent	Surveys	Rate				
East Mountains	1,226	480	39.2%				
Sandia Foothills	1,730	718	41.5%				
North Valley	279	97	34.8%				
South Valley	1,417	436	30.8%				
Total	4,652	1,731	37.2%				

Table 2.1 Survey Distribution and Response Rates

Respondent surveys were scanned by the University of New Mexico – Department of Computer and Information Resources and Technology (CIRT) and analyzed by BBER. The analysis presented in this report uses unweighted survey responses.



Map 2.1 Geographic Sub-areas

2.3 SAMPLE BIAS

The survey instrument included two demographic questions to identify any sample bias. The survey responses to these questions were compared to 2000 Census data for the study area. This comparison shows that survey respondents are generally older than the population. Higher portions of survey respondents are in the older age categories than shown in Census data, 56.4% aged 45 to 64 (compared to 33.5% according to the

Census) and 22.3% aged 65 and older (compared to 13.6% according to the Census). Respondents under the age of 44, which make up 52.9% of the study area population, comprise 21.3% of responses. Additionally, males are over-represented in the survey responses. Of the total respondents, 57% are male compared to 50% according to Census data.

Almost all (98.8%) of the respondents own their residence, which was expected given that homeowners were targeted as survey recipients. Additionally, 90% of respondents have one or more children under the age of five living in their homes. Thirty-two percent of survey respondents have lived in their current residence for 6-10 years, 29% for 11-20 years, 21% for 0-5 years and the remainder, 18%, for more than 20 years.

3: STUDY AREA SURVEY FINDINGS

3.1 WATER SYTEMS AND TREATMENT

As shown in Figure 3.1, almost half (47.6%) of the survey respondents indicate that private individual wells supply most of the water used in the home. Community systems provide water to an additional 39.7% of homes, and well shares an additional 10.6 percent. While "hauled water" was included on the survev instrument, no responses indicated the use of this water system.

As shown in Figure 3.2, 41.0% of respondents indicate that they never use bottled water as a source of drinking water in the home and that 17.3% always use bottled water. The remaining respondents are split almost equally between those that "seldom" and "sometimes" use bottled water.

Over 41% of respondents report that "no water treatment" is used in their home, 32.3% indicated the use of a "water softener," 17.9% use a "faucet filter," 13.5% use a "reverse osmosis unit," 12.1% use a water pitcher with a filter on it, and 7.8% report that they use other methods, including boiling water. (Because survey respondents were asked to "mark ALL of the water treatment systems" which were used in their homes and were allowed to indicate more than one water treatment system, total responses exceed 100%). (Figure 3.3)

Figure 3.1



WATER SYSTEMS USED IN HOMES







Figure 3.3



WATER TREATMENT SYSTEMS USED IN HOMES

3.2 WASTE WATER DISPOSAL

Of total respondents, over threequarters (78.7%) use a septic tank for wastewater disposal and 20.5% use a sewer system. Less than one percent use "other" systems for wastewater disposal. (Figure 3.4)

3.3 PRIVATE WELLS

Figure 3.5 shows that of private wells users, 36.8% have wells more than 250 feet deep and 18.5% have wells between 151 to 250 feet deep. Approximately one-fifth of residents have wells of 150 feet deep or less. A relatively large portion (12.8%) of residents with private wells indicate they do not know the depth of their well.

The overwhelming majority of residents with private wells indicate their wells and plumbing are in good or excellent condition: 39.9% indicating excellent and 44.1% good. Only 3.3% state that their private wells and plumbing are in poor condition. Less than 4% indicate they do not know the conditions of their well and plumbing. (Figure 3.6)

Figure 3.4

WASTE WATER DISPOSAL SYSTEMS IN HOMES



Figure 3.5



DEPTH OF PRIVATE WELLS

Figure 3.6



CONDITION OF PRIVATE WELLS AND PLUMBING

3.4 COMMUNITY SYSTEM CHARACTERISTICS

Those residents receiving most of their water through community systems were asked the name of the system providing their water. Shown in Table 3.1, the grouped openended responses show that almost two-thirds (62.5%) of those on community systems receive their water from Sandia Heights Services. Entrosa Water provides water to an additional 23.2% of residences and the remaining 14.3% of residences use a variety of different community systems.

Roughly half of the households on community systems indicate that they are on systems which serve 100 or more households. Sixteen percent of respondents indicate that their system serves 2 to 5 households and an additional 8.7% are on systems serving between 6 and 100 households. Almost onequarter of respondents on a well share or community system do not know how many households the system serves. (Figure 3.7)

3.5 PUBLIC PERCEPTIONS

Residents were asked a series of questions relating to their perceptions of water quality, water supply and delivery, and public policy related to residential water. The study area responses, grouped by topic, are presented in Tables 3.2 to 3.4.

3.5.1 Water Quality

As shown in Table 3.2, the large majority of residents indicate that they feel the unfiltered water from the faucet in their home is safe to drink. Overall, 80.6% of residents perceive their water to be safe, with roughly one-third of respondents strongly agreeing and half agreeing that the unfiltered water from the faucet is safe to drink. These findings are supported by 79.4% of respondents either disagreeing or strongly disagreeing with the statement that they "are worried that unfiltered water from the faucet from the faucet will make them ill if they drink it."

Table 3.1 Community Systems Providing Residential Water

	Survey Respondents	Percent of Total
Sandia Heights Services	336	62.5%
Entranosa Water	125	23.2%
The Independent Utility Co.	27	5.0%
Tranquillo Pines Water Co-Op	10	1.9%
Other	40	7.4%
Total	538	100.0%

Figure 3.7



While the large majority (80.6%) of respondents believe their water is safe, a smaller portion likes the taste of the water coming directly from the kitchen. Overall, 63.4% of respondents strongly agree or agree that they like the taste of their water (28.2% and 35.2%, respectively) while the remaining 36.6% either disagree or strongly disagree. A slightly smaller portion of respondents, roughly half, believes that water does not stain household plumbing fixtures "too much."

P	erceptions	of Reside	ntial water			
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Don't Know / No Opinion	Total
Unfiltered water from faucet is	-	-	-			
safe to drink.						
Responses	528	743	137	103	65	1,576
Percent	33.5%	47.1%	8.7%	6.5%	4.1%	100.0%
Like taste of unfiltered water						
that comes directly from						
kitchen.						
Responses	444	554	289	260	29	1,576
Percent	28.2%	35.2%	18.3%	16.5%	1.8%	100.0%
Water in home stains						
plumbing fixtures too much.						
Responses	328	449	529	240	29	1,575
Percent	20.8%	28.5%	33.6%	15.2%	1.8%	100.0%
Worried that unfiltered water						
from faucet will make them ill						
if they drink it.						
Responses	106	154	552	699	64	1,575
Percent	6.7%	9.8%	35.0%	44.4%	4.1%	100.0%

Table 3.2

3.5.2 Delivery/Supply

Table 3.3 presents the study area survey findings on perceptions of residential water supply and delivery. Over half (55.1%) of the respondents worry about the long-term supply of water to the households in their neighborhood. While concerns over long-term supply exist, almost all (94.9%) of respondents agree or strongly agree that their home has water whenever they need it. A smaller portion of residents (81.5%) believes that the water pressure in their home is good. When asked if there was an adequate supply of water at or near their home for fire protection, 14.0% responded that they do not know. The remaining responses were almost equally divided between those that believe there is an adequate supply (44.8%) of water and those that disagree (41.2%). Additionally, 71.6% of respondents disagree with the statement "the cost of having water in my home is too high."

	Strongly Aaree	Aaree	Disagree	Disagree Stronaly	Don't Know / No Opinion	Total
I worry about the long term						
supply of water to the						
households in my						
neighborhoods.						
Responses	318	550	433	202	75	1,578
Percent	20.2%	34.9%	27.4%	12.8%	4.8%	100.0%
My home has water whenever						
I need it.						
Responses	853	649	60	20	1	1,583
Percent	53.9%	41.0%	3.8%	1.3%	0.1%	100.0%
I have good water pressure in my home.						
Responses	611	676	207	85	1	1,580
Percent	38.7%	42.8%	13.1%	5.4%	0.1%	100.0%
There is enough water at or near my home for fire protection.						
Responses	280	428	307	344	221	1,580
Percent	17.7%	27.1%	19.4%	21.8%	14.0%	100.0%
The cost of having water in my home is too high.						
Responses	85	220	770	355	141	1,571
Percent	5.4%	14.0%	49.0%	22.6%	9.0%	100.0%

Table 3.3 Perceptions of Residential Water Supply/Delivery

3.5.3 Water Policy

The overwhelming majority of study area residents agree or strongly agree with statements supporting an active County role in water policies related to protecting the water supply and ensuring water quality (Table 3.4). Of the total residents responding to the survey, 87.6% agree that the County should provide education to the general public about protecting the water supply. Showing support for local water quality testing, 88.4% of respondents disagree with the statement "regular testing for water quality is NOT necessary" while only 8.1% agree or strongly agree. Over 90% of residents agree or strongly agree that the County should protect wells by passing and enforcing laws that make sure there is a safe distance between well and sources of pollution. There is also support for policies aimed at well drillers and water system operators: 86.7% of respondents agree/strongly agree that well drillers should be provided training about water quality and 85.6% believe (strongly disagree and disagree combined) that persons that operate water systems should NOT be required to be licensed and certified.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Don't Know / No Opinion	Total
Bernalillo County should provide education to the general public about protecting the water supply						
Responses	619	757	88	42	65	1 571
Percent	39.4%	48.2%	5.6%	2.7%	4.1%	100.0%
Well drillers should be provided with training about water quality.						
Responses	662	708	66	26	118	1,580
Percent	41.9%	44.8%	4.2%	1.6%	7.5%	100.0%
Persons who operate water systems should NOT be required to be licensed and certified. Responses Percent	45 2.9%	67 4.2%	384 24.3%	968 61.3%	114 7.2%	1,578 100.0%
Bernalillo County should pass and enforce laws to make sure that there is a safe distance between wells and sources of pollution such as septic tanks and gas stations.						
Responses	864	544	50	63	39	1.560
Percent	55.4%	34.9%	3.2%	4.0%	2.5%	100.0%
Regular testing for local water quality is NOT necessary.						
Responses	38	89	506	883	54	1,570
Percent	2.4%	5.7%	32.2%	56.2%	3.4%	100.0%

Table 3.4 Perceptions of Water Policy

4: FINDINGS BY GEOGRAPHIC AREA

This section presents the survey findings based on four different geographic areas and explores the relationship of geography, residential water use characteristics, and resident perceptions.

4.1 WATER SYSTEMS AND TREATMENT

Water systems used in homes vary by geographic areas of the County. Homes in the North Valley and South Valley primarily use private individual wells, 89.3% and 92.6%, respectively (compared to the study area average of 47.6%), with the remainder of homes using well shares and community systems at relatively equal rates. The majority of homes (62.8%) in the Sandia Foothills use community systems to provide water (compared to the study area average of 39.7%), though 20.8% use private individual wells and 14.2% use well shares. Residential users in the East Mountains use private individual wells and community systems almost equally, 39.4% and 45.4%, respectively. (Table 4.1)

Table 4.1							
	Water Sys	stems Us	sed in Homes	6			
	Private						
	Individual	Well	Community	Don't			
	Well	Share	System	Know	Total		
East Mountains	180	56	208	13	457		
	39.4%	12.3%	45.5%	2.8%	100.0%		
Sandia Foothills	136	93	411	14	654		
	20.8%	14.2%	62.8%	2.1%	100.0%		
North Valley	67	3	3	2	75		
	89.3%	4.0%	4.0%	2.7%	100.0%		
South Valley	374	17	10	3	404		
	92.6%	4.2%	2.5%	0.7%	100.0%		
Total	757	169	632	32	1,590		
	47.6%	10.6%	39.7%	2.0%	100.0%		

As shown in Table 4.2, the last time household water quality was tested also varies by geographic area. The water quality of homes in Sandia Foothills is most likely to have been tested in the past year and next to least likely to never have been tested. Homes in the South Valley are the most likely to have never been tested and the least likely to have been tested less than one year ago. Homes in the East Mountains are slightly less likely to have been tested in the past year compared to the study area (19.2% compared to 24.0%) though more likely to have been tested between 1 and 5 years ago (36.1% compared to 27.9%). Compared to the study area, water in North Valley homes was less likely to be tested in the past year and less likely to never have been tested, though more likely to have been tested so and less likely to never have been tested, though more likely to have been tested area.

			More than			
	Less than	Between 1	5 years		Don't	
	<u>1 year ago</u>	<u>& 5 yrs ago</u>	ago	Never	Know	Total
East Mountains	87	143	86	45	92	453
	19.2%	31.6%	19.0%	9.9%	20.3%	100.0%
Sandia Foothills	245	129	77	43	143	637
	38.5%	20.3%	12.1%	6.8%	22.4%	100.0%
North Valley	9	27	24	5	10	75
	12.0%	36.0%	32.0%	6.7%	13.3%	100.0%
South Valley	34	137	130	49	49	399
	8.5%	34.3%	32.6%	12.3%	12.3%	100.0%
Total	375	436	317	142	294	1,564
	24.0%	27.9%	20.3%	9.1%	18.8%	100.0%

Table 4.2 Last Time Household Water was Tested for Water Quality

Table 4.3 describes the use of bottled water by geographic area. Compared to the other areas, bottled water is most likely to always be used as a source of home drinking water in the South Valley (30.4% of respondents) and the least likely in Sandia Foothills (7.6% of respondents). Almost half the homes in the Sandia Foothills never use bottled water. Homes in the East Mountains are more likely to always, sometimes, and seldom use bottled water and less likely to never use bottled water.

Bottled Water as Source of Drinking Water in Home								
	Always	Sometimes	Seldom	Never	Total			
East Mountains	89	93	107	157	446			
	20.0%	20.9%	24.0%	35.2%	100.0%			
Sandia Foothills	49	128	157	311	645			
	7.6%	19.8%	24.3%	48.2%	100.0%			
North Valley	12	16	13	31	72			
	16.7%	22.2%	18.1%	43.1%	100.0%			
South Valley	120	64	71	140	395			
	30.4%	16.2%	18.0%	35.4%	100.0%			
Total	270	301	348	639	1,558			
	17.3%	19.3%	22.3%	41.0%	100.0%			

Table 4.3

Respondents from the South Valley and Sandia Foothills are most likely to use no water treatment (47.7% and 47.4%, respectively) (Table 4.4). The East Mountains are most likely to use some type of treatment (71.9% of homes) and almost half of respondents use a water softener. Only 34.0% of North Valley homes use no water treatment, compared to 41.4% of homes in the study area. Slightly more than 43% of North Valley respondents use water softener.

	Water	<u>Treatment</u>	<u>Systems</u>	<u>s Used in</u>	<u>Homes</u>		
	No water	Water	Faucet	Reverse osmosis	Water pitcher		
	treatment	softener	filter	unit	with filter	Other	Total
East Mountains	135	234	88	108	77	38	680
	28.1%	48.8%	18.3%	22.5%	16.0%	8.0%	141.7%
Sandia Foothills	340	157	125	78	97	42	839
	47.4%	21.9%	17.4%	10.9%	13.5%	5.8%	116.9%
North Valley	33	42	22	15	7	8	127
	34.0%	43.3%	22.7%	15.5%	7.2%	8.2%	130.9%
South Valley	208	126	74	33	29	47	517
	47.7%	28.9%	17.0%	7.6%	6.7%	10.8%	118.7%
Total	716	559	309	234	210	135	2,163
	41.4%	32.3%	17.9%	13.5%	12.1%	7.8%	125.0%

Table 4.4

Almost one-third of homes in the South Valley use the sewer system for wastewater disposal, with the remaining two-thirds primarily using septic tanks. Almost all East Mountain homes uses septic tanks (96.8%). Septic tanks are also the primary source of wastewater disposal for homes in the North Valley (84.9%) and Sandia Foothills (72.7%) (Table 4.5).

System	Used for V	Vastewate	r Dispos	al
		Septic		
	Sewer	Tank	Other	Total
East Mountains	8	422	6	436
	1.8%	96.8%	1.4%	100.0%
Sandia Foothills	180	481	1	662
	27.2%	72.7%	0.2%	100.0%
North Valley	12	73	1	86
	14.0%	84.9%	1.2%	100.0%
South Valley	121	255	5	381
	31.8%	66.9%	1.3%	100.0%
Total	321	1,231	13	1,565
	20.5%	78.7%	0.8%	100.0%

Table 4.5 System Used for Wastewater Disposal

The depth of private wells varies by geographic area. Sandia Foothills and the East Mountains have the highest percentage of wells that are more than 250 feet deep, 76.5% and 62.9%, respectively. In the South Valley and the North Valley, roughly 25% of private wells are 50 to 150 feet deep and an additional 40% are 151 to 250 feet deep (Table 4.6).

	Depth of Private Wells								
	0 to 50	50 to 150	151 to	more than	Don't				
	feet	feet	250 feet	250 feet	know	Total			
East Mountains	0	14	35	112	17	178			
	0.0%	7.9%	19.7%	62.9%	9.6%	100.0%			
Sandia Foothills	1	7	15	104	9	136			
	0.7%	5.1%	11.0%	76.5%	6.6%	100.0%			
North Valley	1	16	27	13	9	66			
-	1.5%	24.2%	40.9%	19.7%	13.6%	100.0%			
South Valley	13	101	145	45	60	364			
	3.6%	27.7%	39.8%	12.4%	16.5%	100.0%			
Total	15	138	222	274	95	744			
	2.0%	18.5%	29.8%	36.8%	12.8%	100.0%			

Table 4.6

Overall, the large majority of respondents believe their private wells and plumbing are in excellent or good shape. These responses combine to capture 91.0% of homes in the East Mountains, 92.3% in the Sandia Foothills, 85.7% in the North Valley and 76.9% in the South Valley. The South Valley has the highest portion of wells and plumbing in fair and poor condition, 16.7% and 5.5%, respectively. (Table 4.7)

	Condition o	of Private	Wells and	l Plumbin	g	
					Don't	
	Excellent	Good	Fair	Poor	Know	Total
East Mountains	68	83	11	3	1	166
	41.0%	50.0%	6.6%	1.8%	0.6%	100.0%
Sandia Foothills	73	48	6	0	4	131
	55.7%	36.6%	4.6%	0.0%	3.1%	100.0%
North Valley	25	29	7	2	0	63
	39.7%	46.0%	11.1%	3.2%	0.0%	100.0%
South Valley	109	144	55	18	3	329
	33.1%	43.8%	16.7%	5.5%	0.9%	100.0%
Total	275	304	79	23	8	689
	39.9%	44.1%	11.5%	3.3%	1.2%	100.0%

Table 4.7

Table 4.8 shows that households in the East Mountains and Sandia Foothills are most likely to be on community systems with 100 or more households, 44.4% and 56.7%, respectively. Of households on well shares and community systems, 29.4% of respondents in the East Mountains are on systems with less than 100 households compared to 20.2% in Sandia Foothills. While Table 4.8 reports the survey findings for the North Valley and South Valley, there are too few responses to interpret conclusively.

Survey findings on the number of households served by well share or community system by geographic area should be interpreted with care because of the small number of overall respondents and the large number of "don't know' responses (24.5% overall).

	Number of Households						
	Don't						
	2 to 5	6 to 14	15 to 25	26 to 100	100+	Know	Total
East Mountains	38	6	9	20	110	65	248
	15.3%	2.4%	3.6%	8.1%	44.4%	26.2%	100.0%
Sandia Foothills	64	10	2	10	241	98	425
	15.1%	2.4%	0.5%	2.4%	56.7%	23.1%	100.0%
North Valley	3 60.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	0 0.0%	1 20.0%	1 20.0%	5 100.0%
South Valley	7	1	1	2	3	7	21
	33.3%	4.8%	4.8%	9.5%	14.3%	33.3%	100.0%
Total	112	17	12	32	355	171	699
	16.0%	2.4%	1.7%	4.6%	50.8%	24.5%	100.0%

Table 4.8 Total Number of Households Served by Well Share or Community System

4.2 PUBLIC PERCEPTIONS

4.2.1 Quality

Table 4.9, on page 17, presents survey findings on perceptions of water quality by area. The following section summarizes these findings by area.

East Mountains

When compared to the overall study area, respondents from the East Mountains are slightly more likely to believe (strongly agree and agree combined) that unfiltered water from their faucet is safe to drink, and less likely to think this water will make them ill. When compared to the study area, a smaller portion of East Mountains respondents strongly agree/agree that they like the taste of the unfiltered water that comes directly from their kitchen faucet, 63.3% of respondents in the study area compared to 51.4%. Roughly equal portions, about half, of East Mountains and study area respondents indicate they strongly agree/agree that the water in their home stains their plumbing fixtures too much.

Sandia Foothills

Perceptions of water quality in the Sandia Foothills are the most positive of the four areas. In comparison to the other areas, Sandia Foothills has by far the highest portion (46.3%) of responses strongly agreeing that they feel the water that comes from the faucet is safe to drink. Consistent with this finding, the Sandia Foothills also has the lowest percentage of responses indicating that residents both strongly agree and agree that the water from the faucet will make them ill, 3.1% and 4.6%, respectively. Seventy-nine percent of residents (those who strongly agree and agree combined) responding also state that they like the

taste of the water that comes directly from the kitchen faucet (the North Valley is a distant second with 60.8% linking the taste of their water). Only 14.2% strongly agree and 25.8% agree - the lowest percentages of the areas in both categories - that the water in their home stains plumbing fixtures too much.

North Valley

Even though the number of North Valley responses is small, perceptions of water quality in the area generally reflect the findings for the overall study area. When compared to the overall study area, a smaller percentage of responses strongly agree that unfiltered water from the faucet is safe to drink, though the rate of strongly agree and agree combined in the North Valley exceeds the overall study area, 85.1% to 80.6%, respectively. The rate of North Valley residents that strongly agree and agree that the unfiltered water from the faucet will make them ill is slightly lower than in the overall study area, 14.9% compared to 16.5%. The North Valley has the smallest percentage of responses strongly agreeing that they like the taste of the unfiltered water directly from the kitchen faucet, though the area fares better when strongly agreeing and agreeing responses are combined (60.3% compared to 63.3% in the overall study area). The North Valley has the smallest portion of residents strongly agreeing that they like the taste of unfiltered water from the kitchen faucet. Responses regarding water staining plumbing fixtures closely resemble overall study area responses.

South Valley

Perceptions of water quality in the South Valley are the least positive of the four geographic areas. Only 63.1% of respondents strongly agree/agree that unfiltered water from the faucet is safe to drink compared to 80.6% in the overall study area. South Valley responses strongly agreeing and agreeing that unfiltered water from the faucet will make them ill if they drink it are the highest of the geographic areas. While a similar percentage of South Valley, East Mountain and North Valley responses strongly agree that they like the taste of unfiltered water from the kitchen, a much larger percentage of South Valley residents, 30.3%, strongly disagree. The South Valley also has the highest percent of responses strongly agreeing that the water in the home stains plumbing fixtures too much.

Unfiltered water f	Strongly Agree	Agree is safe to	Disagree drink.	Disagree Strongly	Don't Know / No Opinion	Total
Foot Mountaina	100	220	40	10	22	1E 1
East Mountains	29.1%	230 52.4%	42 9.3%	4.2%	23 5.1%	454 100.0%
Sandia Foothills	301	286	30	13	20	650
	46.3%	44.0%	4.6%	2.0%	3.1%	100.0%
North Valley	16	47	4	6	1	74
	21.6%	63.5%	5.4%	8.1%	1.4%	100.0%
South Valley	79	172	61	65	21	398
	19.8%	43.2%	15.3%	16.3%	5.3%	100.0%
Total	528	743	137	103	65	1,576
	33.5%	47.1%	8.7%	6.5%	4.1%	100.0%

Table 4.9Perceptions on Residential Water Quality by Area

Worried that the unfiltered water from faucet will make them ill if they drink it.

East Mountains	18	48	178	192	18	454
	4.0%	10.6%	39.2%	42.3%	4.0%	100.0%
Sandia Foothills	20	30	216	359	26	651
	3.1%	4.6%	33.2%	55.1%	4.0%	100.0%
North Valley	7	4	29	29	5	74
	9.5%	5.4%	39.2%	39.2%	6.8%	100.0%
South Valley	61	72	129	119	15	396
	15.4%	18.2%	32.6%	30.1%	3.8%	100.0%
Total	106	154	552	699	64	1,575
	6.7%	9.8%	35.0%	44.4%	4.1%	100.0%

Like the taste of unfiltered water that comes directly from kitchen.

East Mountains	101	132	113	94	13	453
	22.3%	29.1%	24.9%	20.8%	2.9%	100.0%
Sandia Foothills	242	268	88	38	14	650
	37.2%	41.2%	13.5%	5.8%	2.2%	100.0%
North Valley	15 20.3%	30 40.5%	22 29.7%	7 9.5%	0.0%	74 100.0%
South Valley	86	124	66	121	2	399
	21.6%	31.1%	16.5%	30.3%	0.5%	100.0%
Total	444	554	289	260	29	1,576
	28.2%	35.2%	18.3%	16.5%	1.8%	100.0%

Perceptions on Residential water Quality by Area (continued)								
	Strongly	Agroo	Dissarss	Disagree	Don't Know	Total		
	Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly	/ 110	Total		
Water in home st	tains plumb	ing fixture	es too muc	:h.				
East Mountains	95	139	154	54	12	454		
	20.9%	30.6%	33.9%	11.9%	2.6%	100.0%		
Sandia Foothills	92	168	251	128	11	650		
	14.2%	25.8%	38.6%	19.7%	1.7%	100.0%		
North Valley	16	21	25	9	2	73		
	21.9%	28.8%	34.2%	12.3%	2.7%	100.0%		
South Valley	125	121	99	49	4	398		
	31.4%	30.4%	24.9%	12.3%	1.0%	100.0%		
Total	328	449	529	240	29	1,575		
	20.8%	28.5%	33.6%	15.2%	1.8%	100.0%		

Table 4.9 Perceptions on Residential Water Quality by Area (continued)

4.2.2 Delivery/Supply

Table 4.10, on page 19, presents survey findings on perceptions of water supply and delivery by area. The following section summarizes these findings by area.

East Mountains

The East Mountains has the highest percentage of residents that strongly agree and agreeing that they worry about the long-term supply of water to households in their neighborhood (70.6% compared to 55.0% in the study area), and 92.1% strongly agree/agree that their home has water whenever they need it. Close to the study area average of 81.5%, 82.4% of East Mountains respondents strongly agree/agree that they have good water pressure in their home, though a much smaller percentage (36.3%) believes that there is enough water near their home for fire protection. The percentages of respondents that both strongly agree and agree that the cost of having water in their home is too high reflect the overall study area rates.

Sandia Heights

Roughly equal percentages of respondents strongly agree/agree (47.2%) and strongly disagree/disagree (48.2%) that they worry about the long-term supply of water to the households in their neighborhood (compared to 55.0% and 40.2%, respectively, in the study area) and almost all (98.6%) indicate that their home has water whenever they need it. Over 50% of the area's respondents (the highest of all areas) strongly agree that they have good water pressure in their home and almost two-thirds strongly agree/agree that there is enough water pressure at or near their home for fire protection, also the highest of the areas. By a very slight margin, Sandia Foothills also has the highest percentage of responses that strongly agree that the cost of water in their home is too high.

North Valley

Compared to other areas, the North Valley has the highest percentage of respondents that disagree strongly and disagree that they are worried about the long-term supply of water to households in their neighborhoods. Almost 96% of respondents believe (strongly agree and agree combined) that their home has water whenever they need it and three-quarters of respondents believe (strongly agree and agree combined) that the homes have good water pressure. A slightly larger percentage of respondents agree than disagree that there is enough water pressure for fire protection, 45.3% compared to 41.3%. The North Valley has the highest percentage of respondents who strongly disagree/disagree that the cost of water in their home is too high.

South Valley

South Valley perceptions of water supply and availability generally follow those of the overall study area, though a slightly smaller percent of respondents believe (strongly agree and agree combined) that they have good water pressure. The percentage of respondents strongly disagreeing that there is enough water for fire protection (43.1%) far exceeds the rate of the overall study area (21.8%).

Perceptions on Residential Supply/Delivery by Area										
	Strongly			Disagree	Don't Know /					
	Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly	No Opinion	Total				
I worry about the	long term sup	oply of wate	er to the hous	seholds in m	y neighborhoods.					
East Mountains	148	174	83	35	16	456				
	32.5%	38.2%	18.2%	7.7%	3.5%	100.0%				
Sandia Foothills	68	239	216	97	30	650				
	10.5%	36.8%	33.2%	14.9%	4.6%	100.0%				
North Valley	10	24	25	12	4	75				
	13.3%	32.0%	33.3%	16.0%	5.3%	100.0%				
South Valley	92	113	109	58	25	397				
	23.2%	28.5%	27.5%	14.6%	6.3%	100.0%				
Total	318	550	433	202	75	1,578				
	20.2%	34.9%	27.4%	12.8%	4.8%	100.0%				
My home has wat	ter whenever l	need it.								
East Mountains	203	218	27	8	1	457				
	44.4%	47.7%	5.9%	1.8%	0.2%	100.0%				
Sandia Foothills	449	193	7	2	0	651				
	69.0%	29.6%	1.1%	0.3%	0.0%	100.0%				
North Valley	33	38	3	0	0	74				
	44.6%	51.4%	4.1%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%				
South Valley	168	200	23	10	0	401				
-	41.9%	49.9%	5.7%	2.5%	0.0%	100.0%				
Total	853	649	60	20	1	1583				
	53.9%	41.0%	3.8%	1.3%	0.1%	100.0%				

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Don't Know / No Opinion	Total
I have good wate	r pressure in	my home.	Diougroo	Ctrongly		10141
East Mountains	140	235	58	22	0	455
	30.8%	51.6%	12.7%	4.8%	0.0%	100.0%
Sandia Foothills	330	238	69	13	1	651
	50.7%	36.6%	10.6%	2.0%	0.2%	100.0%
North Valley	26	31	16	1		74
	35.1%	41.9%	21.6%	1.4%	0.0%	100.0%
South Valley	115	172	64	49	0	400
-	28.8%	43.0%	16.0%	12.3%	0.0%	100.0%
Total	611	676	207	85	1	1580
	38.7%	42.8%	13.1%	5.4%	0.1%	100.0%
There is enough	water at or ne	ar my home	e for fire prote	ection.		
East Mountains	59	106	121	114	54	454
	13.0%	23.3%	26.7%	25.1%	11.9%	100.0%
Sandia Foothills	187	235	78	48	104	652
	28.7%	36.0%	12.0%	7.4%	16.0%	100.0%
North Valley	11	23	21	10	10	75
	14.7%	30.7%	28.0%	13.3%	13.3%	100.0%
South Valley	23	64	87	172	53	399
-	5.8%	16.0%	21.8%	43.1%	13.3%	100.0%
Total	280	428	307	344	221	1,580
	17.7%	27.1%	19.4%	21.8%	14.0%	100.0%
The cost of havin	g water in my	home is to	o high.			
East Mountains	23	71	237	98	24	453
	5.1%	15.7%	52.3%	21.6%	5.3%	100.0%
Sandia Foothills	38	99	337	137	40	651
	5.8%	15.2%	51.8%	21.0%	6.1%	100.0%
North Valley	3	4	40	18	9	74
	4.1%	5.4%	54.1%	24.3%	12.2%	100.0%
South Valley	21	46	156	102	68	393
-	5.3%	11.7%	39.7%	26.0%	17.3%	100.0%
Total	85	220	770	355	141	1,571
	5.4%	14.0%	49.0%	22.6%	9.0%	100.0%

Table 4.10 Perceptions on Residential Supply/Delivery by Area (continued)

4.2.3 Policy

Table 4.11 presents the survey findings on water policy questions. With few exceptions, the perceptions of public regarding water policies follow the same pattern in the four

geographic areas. In all areas, over 85% of respondents believe (strongly agree and agree combined) that the County should provide education to the general public about protecting the water supply. The South Valley has the largest percentage of responses strongly agreeing and the North Valley the smallest. Over 85% of respondents believe (strongly agree and agree combined) that well drillers should be provided with training about water quality, again with the South Valley having the highest percentage strongly agreeing. Similar levels of support exist for licensing and certifying public water systems operators, with 85.7% of study area respondents indicating they do not believe (strongly disagree and disagree combined) that public water system operators should NOT be certified. The area with the highest percentage of respondents disagreeing is the Sandia Foothills and the smallest percentage was in the North Valley. Over 90% of study area responses believe (strongly agree and agree combined) that laws should be passed and enforced to make sure that there is safe distance between wells and sources of pollution. making it the policy with the largest amount of support. The Sandia Foothills has the largest percentage of responses that strongly agree (59.1%) while the South Valley has the largest percentage that strongly disagree (6.4%) that the County should make and enforce laws ensuring safe distances.

Perceptions on Residential Water Policy by Area									
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Don't Know / No Opinion	Total			
Bernalillo Count	y should pro ′.	vide educ	ation to the	general pu	ublic about pro	otecting			
East Mountains	169	224	27	12	19	451			
	37.5%	49.7%	6.0%	2.7%	4.2%	100.0%			
Sandia Foothills	262	309	35	14	28	648			
	40.4%	47.7%	5.4%	2.2%	4.3%	100.0%			
North Valley	25	42	3	2	1	73			
	34.2%	57.5%	4.1%	2.7%	1.4%	100.0%			
South Valley	163	182	23	14	17	399			
	40.9%	45.6%	5.8%	3.5%	4.3%	100.0%			
Total	619	757	88	42	65	1,571			
	39.4%	48.2%	5.6%	2.7%	4.1%	100.0%			

Table 4.11

Well drillers sho	Strongly Agree uld be provi	Agree ded with tr	Disagree aining abou	Disagree Strongly ut water qu	Don't Know / No Opinion ality.	Total
East Mountains	175	221	25	8	24	453
	38.6%	48.8%	5.5%	1.8%	5.3%	100.0%
Sandia Foothills	266	284	27	9	65	651
	40.9%	43.6%	4.1%	1.4%	10.0%	100.0%
North Valley	29	38	2	1	5	75
	38.7%	50.7%	2.7%	1.3%	6.7%	100.0%
South Valley	192	165	12	8	24	401
	47.9%	41.1%	3.0%	2.0%	6.0%	100.0%
Total	662	708	66	26	118	1,580
	41.9%	44.8%	4.2%	1.6%	7.5%	100.0%

Table 4.11

Perceptions on Residential Water Policy by Area (continued)

Persons who operate water systems should NOT be required to be licensed and certified.

East Mountains	11	13	130	275	24	453
	2.4%	2.9%	28.7%	60.7%	5.3%	100.0%
Sandia Foothills	16	27	146	419	43	651
	2.5%	4.1%	22.4%	64.4%	6.6%	100.0%
North Valley	3	3	24	35	9	74
	4.1%	4.1%	32.4%	47.3%	12.2%	100.0%
South Valley	15	24	84	239	38	400
	3.8%	6.0%	21.0%	59.8%	9.5%	100.0%
Total	45	67	384	968	114	1,578
	2.9%	4.2%	24.3%	61.3%	7.2%	100.0%

Bernalillo County should pass and enforce laws to make sure that there is a safe distance between wells and sources of pollution such as septic tanks and gas stations.

East Mountains	237	175	15	16	9	452
	52.4%	38.7%	3.3%	3.5%	2.0%	100.0%
Sandia Foothills	381	207	22	20	15	645
	59.1%	32.1%	3.4%	3.1%	2.3%	100.0%
North Valley	34	34	2	2	2	74
	45.9%	45.9%	2.7%	2.7%	2.7%	100.0%
South Valley	212	128	11	25	13	389
-	54.5%	32.9%	2.8%	6.4%	3.3%	100.0%
Total	864	544	50	63	39	1,560
	55.4%	34.9%	3.2%	4.0%	2.5%	100.0%

Perceptie	ons on Res	sidential	Water Pol	icy by Ar	<u>ea (continue</u>	d)
	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Don't Know / No Opinion	Total
Regular testing f	or local wate	er quality i	s NOT nece	essary.		
East Mountains	9	25	160	246	12	452
	2.0%	5.5%	35.4%	54.4%	2.7%	100.0%
Sandia Foothills	14	29	201	385	17	646
	2.2%	4.5%	31.1%	59.6%	2.6%	100.0%
North Valley	1	9	28	33	1	72
	1.4%	12.5%	38.9%	45.8%	1.4%	100.0%
South Valley	14	26	117	219	24	400
	3.5%	6.5%	29.3%	54.8%	6.0%	100.0%
Total	38	89	506	883	54	1,570
	2.4%	5.7%	32.2%	56.2%	3.4%	100.0%

Table 4.11

5: FINDINGS BY TYPE OF WATER SYSTEM

This section presents the survey findings grouped by type of residential water system and explores the relationship of geography and resident perceptions.

5.1 WATER SYSTEMS AND TREATMENT

Tables 5.1 to 5.3 present water use characteristics by three residential water system types: private individual well, well share and community system. The following narrative describes survey findings on water use by each type of system.

Private Individual Well

Respondents using private individual wells (21.3%) are most likely to always use bottled water for home drinking water, compared to those on well shares (12.7%), and community systems (13.5%). This being stated, the percentage of those homes never using bottled water is slightly higher than the study area average, 41.6% compared to 41.4%. Private individual well respondents are also most likely to use no water treatment in their homes (43.6%), and only 10.5% of respondents have had their water quality tested less than one year ago (compared to the system-wide average of 24.1%.)

Well Share

Respondents getting residential water through well share are the least likely to always use bottled water for home drinking water (12.7%) and the most likely to never use bottled water (47.6%). While this is the case, well share respondents are the least likely to use no water treatment in their homes and the most likely to use water softener, faucet filters, and reverse osmosis units. While 34.1% of well share respondents had their household water quality tested in the past year, only 3.6% never had their water quality tested. Slightly more than 16% of well share respondents did not know when their water quality was last tested.

Table 5.1

Bottled Water as Source of Drinking Water in Homes								
	Always	Sometimes	Seldom	Never	Total			
Private								
Individual Well	159	121	155	310	745			
	21.3%	16.2%	20.8%	41.6%	100.0%			
Well Share	21	26	40	79	166			
	12.7%	15.7%	24.1%	47.6%	100.0%			
Community								
System	84	146	147	247	624			
-	13.5%	23.4%	23.6%	39.6%	100.0%			
Total	264	293	342	636	1,535			
	17.2%	19.1%	22.3%	41.4%	100.0%			

	No water treatment	Water softener	Faucet filter	Reverse Osmosis unit	Water pitcher with filter	Other
Private						
Individual Well	332	250	125	94	58	80
	43.6%	32.9%	16.4%	12.4%	7.6%	10.5%
Well Share	65	61	36	33	18	8
	38.5%	36.1%	21.3%	19.5%	10.7%	4.7%
Community						
System	257	206	115	89	107	35
	40.4%	32.4%	18.1%	14.0%	16.8%	5.5%
Total	654	517	276	216	183	123
	41.8%	33.0%	17.6%	13.8%	11.7%	7.9%

Table 5.2Water Treatment Systems Used in Homes

Table 5.3
Last Time Household Water was Tested for Water Quality

	Don't	Less than 1	1 & 5 years	More than 5		
	Know	year ago	ago	years ago	Never	Total
Private						
Individual Well	66	79	287	254	67	753
	8.8%	10.5%	38.1%	33.7%	8.9%	100.0%
Well Share	27	57	48	29	6	167
	16.2%	34.1%	28.7%	17.4%	3.6%	100.0%
Community						
System	191	235	101	34	60	621
	30.8%	37.8%	16.3%	5.5%	9.7%	100.0%
Total	284	371	436	317	133	1,541
	18.4%	24.1%	28.3%	20.6%	8.6%	100.0%

Community System

When compared to all water system users, a smaller percentage of community system respondents always use bottled water, 17.2% and 13.5%, respectively. Almost 40% of community system homes never use bottled water. When compared to the study area average, community system respondents are slightly less likely to use no water treatment systems in their homes and are least likely to use water softener. Community system users are most likely to have had their water quality tested in the past year, though almost 31% indicated they did not know when their water was last tested.

5.2 PERCEPTIONS BY WATER SYSTEM TYPE

5.2.1 Quality

Tables 5.4, on the following page, presents survey findings on perceptions of water quality by residential water system. The following section summarizes these findings.

Private Individual Well

Private individual well users have the highest rate of respondents that do not believe (strongly disagreeing and disagree) that unfiltered water that comes from their faucet is safe to drink, 18.8% compared to 11.0% for all water systems, and the highest rate of respondents that both strongly agree and agree that they are worried that their unfiltered water will make them ill. Slightly more than 30% strongly agree that they like the taste of their water and 34.2% strongly disagree/disagree. Private well users also have the highest rates of respondents that both strongly agree and agree that their water stains plumbing fixtures too much.

Well Share

Almost matching the rate for all water systems, over one-third of well share users strongly agree that their unfiltered water is safe to drink and a higher rate of well users strongly disagree that their water will make them ill. Well share users also have the highest rate of respondents strongly agreeing (33.7%) that they like the taste of their water and the lowest rate of respondents that believe (strongly agree and agree combined) that their water stains plumbing fixtures too much (41.4%).

Community Systems

Community systems have the highest rate of respondents (39.4%) that strongly agree that their unfiltered water is safe to drink and the lowest rate of respondents (11.4%) that strongly believe that their unfiltered water will make them ill. While this is the case, community systems have the lowest rate of respondents that believe (strongly agree and agree combined) that they like the taste of their water from the kitchen faucet. The perceptions of community system respondents as to whether their water stains plumbing fixtures too much almost mirrors the system-wide findings.

Perc	ceptions or	n Resider	ntial Water	Quality by	Water System	า
	Strongly	A	Discourse	Disagree	Don't Know /	Tatal
	<u>Agree</u>	Agree	Disagree	Strongly		Total
i ne unfiltere	d water that	comes tro	m my faucet	is safe to dr	INK.	
Private						
Individual Well	223	350	70	71	35	749
	29.8%	46.7%	9.3%	9.5%	4.7%	100.0%
Well Share	57	80	14	10	8	169
	33.7%	47.3%	8.3%	5.9%	4.7%	100.0%
Community						
System	250	294	51	19	20	634
	39.4%	46.4%	8.0%	3.0%	3.2%	100.0%
Total	530	724	135	100	63	1,552
	34.1%	46.6%	8.7%	6.4%	4.1%	100.0%
Worried that	the unfiltere	d water fro	om faucet wil	I make them	ill if they drink i	it.
Private						
Individual Well	72	87	263	300	28	750
	9.6%	11.6%	35.1%	40.0%	3.7%	100.0%
Well Share	7	15	59	82	6	169
	4.1%	8.9%	34.9%	48.5%	3.6%	100.0%
Community						
System	25	47	216	316	28	632
	4.0%	7.4%	34.2%	50.0%	4.4%	100.0%
Total	104	149	538	698	62	1,551
	6.7%	9.6%	34.7%	45.0%	4.0%	100.0%
I like the tast	e of the unfil	tered wate	er that comes	s directly fro	m my kitchen.	
Private						
Individual Well	228	252	114	142	13	749
	30.4%	33.6%	15.2%	19.0%	1.7%	100.0%
Well Share	57	59	34	15	4	169
	33.7%	34.9%	20.1%	8.9%	2.4%	100.0%
Community						
System	161	236	129	96	12	634
,	25.4%	37.2%	20.3%	15.1%	1.9%	100.0%
Total	446	547	277	253	29	1,552
	28.7%	35.2%	17.8%	16.3%	1.9%	100.0%
The water in	my home et	ains nlumh	ina fixturee	too much		
Private	iny nome sta	ans plumu	my intuids			
Individual Well	174	220	242	106	8	750
	23.2%	29.3%	32.3%	14.1%	1.1%	100.0%
Well Share	25	45	63	32	4	169

Table 5.4

27

37.3%

220

525

34.8%

33.8%

14.8%

121

320

19.1%

20.6%

Community System

Total

26.6%

174

439

27.5%

28.3%

18.9%

102

240

16.1%

15.5%

2.4%

15

27

2.4%

1.7%

100.0%

100.0%

100.0%

1,551

632

	Strongly Agree	Aaree	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Don't Know / No Opinion	Total
My home has	s water when	ever I nee	d it.			
Private						
Individual Well	359	350	34	12	1	756
	47.5%	46.3%	4.5%	1.6%	0.1%	100.0%
Well Share	75	80	11	3	0	169
	44.4%	47.3%	6.5%	1.8%	0.0%	100.0%
Community						
System	414	205	11	4	0	634
	65.3%	32.3%	1.7%	0.6%	0.0%	100.0%
Total	848	635	56	19	1	1,559
	54.4%	40.7%	3.6%	1.2%	0.1%	100.0%

Table 5.4

Perceptions on Residential Water Quality by Water System (continued)

5.2.2 Delivery/Supply

Table 5.5, on page 29, presents survey findings on perceptions of delivery/supply by residential water system. The following section summarizes these findings.

Private Individual Wells

Private individual well users have the highest rate of respondents that strongly agree that they are worried about the long-term supply of water in their neighborhood. The rate of respondents that believe (strongly agree and agree combined) that their home has water whenever needed is only slightly lower than the system-wide rate. Compared to a study area rate of 39.1%, a slightly smaller portion (34.4%) of private well respondents strongly agree that they have good water pressure. Those on private wells had the lowest rates of respondents that strongly agree and agree that there is enough water near their home for fire protection. The rate (4.3%) of those that strongly agree the price of home water is too high is between the well share rate (1.8%) and the community system rate (7.6%).

Well Share

Well share respondents that believe (strongly agree and agree combined) that they are worried about the long-term supply of water in their neighborhood combine for 61.5% of responses, the highest rate of the three systems. Well share respondents have the highest rate of responses that disagree strongly and disagree that their home has water whenever they need it. Slightly more than half of the respondents don't believe (strongly disagree and disagree combined) that there is enough water near their home for fire protection, compared to 41.5% system-wide. Well share respondents have the highest rate of respondents that strongly disagree that the cost of their home water is too high.

Community System

Community system users have the highest rate of responses that strongly agree that their homes have water whenever they need it, that they have good water pressure, that there is enough water near their home for fire protection and also that the cost of having water in

their home is too high. Community system users also had the smallest rate of responses that are (strongly agree and agree) worried about the long-term supply of water in their neighborhood.

			Table 5.5			
Perce	eptions on	Resident	ial Supply/	Delivery by	y Water Syste	m
	Strongly Agree	Aaree	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Don't Know /	Total
I worry about	t the long ter	m supply (of water to th	ne household	ds in my neighbo	orhoods.
Private	-					
Individual Well	172 22.9%	253 33.7%	198 26.4%	93 12.4%	35 4.7%	751 100.0%
Well Share	31 18.3%	73 43.2%	46 27.2%	10 5.9%	9 5.3%	169 100.0%
Community System	111	215	180	99	29	634
Total	<u> </u>	<u> </u>	<u>28.4%</u> 424 27.3%	<u>15.6%</u> 202 13.0%	4.6% 73 4.7%	<u>100.0%</u> 1,554 100.0%
My home has	s water wher	never I nee	d it.			
Private Individual Well	359	350	34	12	1	756
	47.5%	46.3%	4.5%	1.6%	0.1%	100.0%
Well Share	75 44.4%	80 47.3%	11 6.5%	3 1.8%	0 0.0%	169 100.0%
Community System	414	205	11	4	0	634
Total	<u>65.3%</u> 848 54.4%	<u>32.3%</u> 635 40.7%	<u>1.7%</u> 56 3.6%	<u>0.6%</u> 19 1.2%	<u> </u>	<u>100.0%</u> 1,559 100.0%
I have good v	water pressu	ire in my h	ome.			
Private	•	,				
Individual Well	259 34.4%	340 45.1%	106 14.1%	49 6.5%	0 0.0%	754 100.0%
Well Share	51 30.4%	78 46.4%	30 17.9%	8 4.8%	1 0.6%	168 100.0%
Community						
System	298 47.0%	244 38.5%	66 10.4%	26 4.1%	0 0.0%	634 100.0%
Total	608 39.1%	662 42.5%	202 13.0%	83 5.3%	1 0.1%	1,556 100.0%

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Don't Know / No Opinion	Total
There is eno	ugh water at	or near my	y home for fi	re protection	ı.	
Private						
Individual Well	72 9.5%	142 18.8%	192 25.5%	260 34.5%	88 11.7%	754 100.0%
Well Share	23 13.6%	39 23.1%	50 29.6%	35 20.7%	22 13.0%	169 100.0%
Community						
System	182	237	63	45	106	633
	28.8%	37.4%	10.0%	7.1%	16.7%	100.0%
Total	277	418	305	340	216	1,556
	17.8%	26.9%	19.6%	21.9%	13.9%	100.0%
The cost of h	aving water	in my hom	ie is too high	1		
Private						
Individual Well	32	58	341	218	95	744
	4.3%	7.8%	45.8%	29.3%	12.8%	100.0%
Well Share	3	23	76	54	13	169
	1.8%	13.6%	45.0%	32.0%	7.7%	100.0%
Community						
System	48	130	341	85	30	634
	7.6%	20.5%	53.8%	13.4%	4.7%	100.0%
Total	83	211	758	357	138	1,547
	5.4%	13.6%	49.0%	23.1%	8.9%	100.0%

Table 5.5Perceptions on Residential Supply/Delivery by Water System(continued)

APPENDIX A: SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Your Thoughts	uo	Your Home's V	Vater System
About Water	ee ongly Vo opini	16. What type of system for waste water disposal	does your home have ?
Tell us whether you agree or disagree with the following statements about <u>the water in your</u> home.	Strongly Agr Agree Disagree Disagree Str Don't know/N	 Sewer TSeptic Ta From what type of sy the water you use in you Albuquerque City Water Private Individual Well 	onk @Other(specify) vstem do you get most of r home? Don't know CCommunity System
1. The unfiltered water that comes	43210	Well Share	name
 I like the taste of the unfiltered water that comes directly from my kitchen faucet 	43210	17.a. If you have a private well, ()less than 50 feet ()50 to 150 feet	how deep is the well? ③ 151 to 250 feet ④ more than 250 feet
3. My home has water whenever I	43210	ODon't know 17 b. If you have a well share of	 not applicable community system what is the total
4. I have good water pressure in my	43210	number of households served t	by your <u>well share or community</u>
5. There is enough water at or near my home for fire protection.	43210	 12 to 5 households 5 to 14 households 	(5) more than 100 households (0) Don't know
6. The water in my home stains plumbing fixtures too much.	43210	315 to 25 households 18. What is the condition	⊙Not applicable
7. I worry that the unfiltered water from my faucet will make me ill if I drink it.	43210	plumbing? ①Excellent ②Good (19. When was the last tir	ODon't Know APoor Apoor
 I worry about the long term supply of water to the households in my neighborhood. 	43210	was tested for water qua ①Less than 1 year ago ②Between 1 & 5 yrs ago	lity? (3)More than 5 years ago (4)Never (6)Don't know
The cost of having water in my home is too high.	43210	20. How often do you us source of drinking water	e bottled water as your in your home?
10. Bernalillo County should provide education to the general public about protecting the water supply	43210	(1)Always (2)Sometime 21. Mark ALL of the water use in your home?	es (3) Seldom (4) Never er treatment systems you
 Well drillers should be provided with training about water quality. 	43210	Gaucet filter	Owater pitcher with a filter on i Oboil water before drinking
 Persons who operate water systems should NOT be required to 	43210	Oreverse osmosis unit	Other(specify)
be licensed and certified. 13. Bernalillo County should pass and	143210	22 Age"	About Fourseir.
enforce laws to make sure that there is a safe distance between wells and sources of pollution such		①Under 18 years ②18-24 years ③25-44 years	(a)45-64 years (s)65 years and over
as septic tanks and gas stations. 14. Regular testing for local water quality is NOT necessary.	43210	23. Gender: MMale 24. Are there one or mor years old living in your he 25. How long have, you	(F) Female (
15. What should Bernalillo County do water quality? (write-in below)	to protect	address? (a) 0 to 5 years (2) 11 to 2 (a) 6 to 10 years (3) more to 10 years (1)	20 years han 20 years
0		26. Do you own or rent or residence? OWn	RRent

	ģ	El Sistema de A	Agua en Su Casa
Agua	do a opini	16. ¿Qué clase de siste	ema tiene su casa para
Díganos si usted esta de acuerdo o no con las siguientes declaraciones <u>sobre el agua en su</u>	de acuredo cuerdo escacuerdo en desacuero /no tengo un	 Alcantarillado (2) Tanqu ¿Desde que clase o mayoría del agua que u 	de sistema recibe usted la usted usa en su casa?
Casa. USEA No. 2 PENCIL	en de muy e en de muy e	Agua Municipal de Albuque Pozo privado individual Pozo compartido	rque (D)No se (C)Sistema comunitario
segura para tomar.	43200	HAqua traída de otro lugar	(nonible)
2. Me gusta el sabor del agua no filtrada que	43210	17.a. 2 Si usted tiene un pozo	privado, cuantos pies tiene de
viene directamente del chorro en mi cocina.		profundidad?	
3. Mi casa tiene agua en cualquier tiempo		(1)menos de 50 pies	(3)151 to 250 pies
que yo la necesite.		(2)entre 50 y 150 pies	(4)más de 250 pies
4. El agua en mi casa tiene buena presión.	43210	(i)No sé	Ono se aplica
5. Hay bastante agua en o cerca de mi casa	43210	17.b. 3 Si usted tiene un pozo	compartido o un sistema comunitario.
para proveer protección en caso de		cuantas viviendas les sirve.	(4)26 a 100 viviendas
incendio.		(1)entre 2 y 5 viviendas	(5)mas que 100 viviendas
3. El agua en mi casa mancha las cañerías	43210	(2)5 a 14 viviendas	0 no sé
demasiado.		(3)15 a 25 viviendas	Ono se aplica
7. Me preocupo que el agua no filtrada del	43210	18. ¿En que condicion	está su pozo v su plomeria?
chorro en mi casa me pondrá enfermo si la		(1)Excelente (2)Buena	(3)Regular (4)Mala
tomo.		19. Cuando fue la últir	ma vez que el aqua es su
3. Me preocupo del abastecimiento a largo	43210	casa fue examinada pa	ra observar su cualidad?
plazo de agua a las viviendas en mi barrio.	00000	Hace menos que uno a	año ③más que 5 años
). El costo de tener agua en mi casa es	43210	2)Hace entre 1 y cinco a	ños (4)nunca
demasiado alto.	00000		() no sé
10. El Condado de Bernalillo debe proveer	43210	20. Con que frecuenci	ia usa usted aqua embotellad
educación al público general sobre como		como su fuente de aqui	a potable en su casa?
proteger el abastecimiento del agua.		(1)Siempre (2)a vece	es (3)rara vez (4)nunca
11. Se debe proveerles entrenamiento sobre	43210	21. Cuales de los sigu	uientes sistemas de
la calidad de agua a los cavadores de	00000	tratamiento de agua us	a usted en su casa? (marque
pozos.		todos que usted usa)	Ono hay tratamiento
12. Las personas que operan el sistema de	43210	Filtro en el chorro)jarra de agua con filtro
agua NO tienen que tener una licencia o		Oablandador de agua	Hervir el agua antes de beberla
certificación.		Oun aparato "reverse	Ootra(escriba)
13. El Condado de Bernaillo debe pasar y	43210	osmosis en reverso"	
enforzar leyes que aseguren que haya una		Por Favor Cuénte	enos más sobre usted:
distancia segura entre los pozos y las			
fuentes de contaminación como los tanques	5	22. Edad:	(3)entre 25-44 años
sépticos y las gasolineras.		(1)menos de 18 años	(4)entre 45-64 años
14.Examinar regularmente el agua local para	43210	(2)entre 18-24 años	(5)65 años o más
		23. Sexo: MMasculino	(F)Feminino
observar su calidad NO es necesario.	11111	24. ¿Hay uno o más ni	ños menores de 5 años
observar su calidad NO es necesario.			
observar su calidad NO es necesario.	11111	viviendo en su casa?	s)Si (N)No
observar su calidad NO es necesario. 15. ¿Que debe hacer el Condado de Bernaill	o para	viviendo en su casa? (25.) Por cuanto tiempo	sSi NNo
observar su calidad NO es necesario. 15. ¿Que debe hacer el Condado de Bernaill proteger la calidad del agua? (escriba su re	o para spuesta)	viviendo en su casa? (25. ¿Por cuanto tiempo actual? @entre 0-5 añ	s)Si (NNo) ha vivido en la dirección ios (2)entre 11 a 20 años
observar su calidad NO es necesario. 15. ¿Que debe hacer el Condado de Bernaill proteger la calidad del agua? (escriba su re	o para spuesta)	viviendo en su casa? (25. ¿Por cuanto tiempo actual? ()entre 0-5 añ	Si No ha vivido en la dirección ios Centre 11 a 20 años años Centre 20 años
observar su calidad NO es necesario. 15. ¿Que debe hacer el Condado de Bernaill proteger la calidad del agua? (escriba su re	o para spuesta)	viviendo en su casa? (25. ¿Por cuanto tiempo actual? @entre 0-5 añ ①entre 6 a 10 26. ¿Es usted dueño o	Si (NNo) ha vivido en la dirección hos (2) entre 11 a 20 años hos (3) Más de 20 años hos (3) Más de 20 años

APPENDIX B: SANDIA FOOTHILLS TABLES

I	Nater Systems	s Used i	n Homes		
	Private Individual Well	Well Share	Community System	Don't Know	Total
North Albuquerque Acres	117	73	72	3	265
	44.2%	27.5%	27.2%	1.1%	100.0%
Sandia Foothills	19	20	339	11	389
	4.9%	5.1%	87.1%	2.8%	100.0%
Total	136	93	411	14	654
	20.8%	14.2%	62.8%	2.1%	100.0%

TABLE B1

Table B2
Time Household Water was Tested for Water Quality

	Less than 1 year ago	Between 1 & 5 yrs ago	More than 5 years ago	Never	Don't Know	Total
North Albuquerque Acres	63	78	60	25	45	271
	23.2%	28.8%	22.1%	9.2%	16.6%	100.0%
Sandia Foothills	202	61	19	25	113	420
	48.1%	14.5%	4.5%	6.0%	26.9%	100.0%
Total	265	139	79	50	158	691
	38.4%	20.1%	11.4%	7.2%	22.9%	100.0%

Table B3 Bottled Water as Source of Drinking Water in Home

	Always	Sometimes	Seldom	Never	Total
North Albuquerque Acres	25	51	58	142	276
	9.1%	18.5%	21.0%	51.4%	100.0%
Sandia Foothills	28	93	111	192	424
	6.6%	21.9%	26.2%	45.3%	100.0%
Total	53	144	169	334	700
	7.6%	20.6%	24.1%	47.7%	100.0%

Table B4									
Depth of Private Wells									
	0 to 50	50 to 150	151 to	more than	Don't				
	feet	feet	250 feet	250 feet	know	Total			
North Albuquerque Acres	1	6	6	158	16	187			
	0.5%	3.2%	3.2%	84.5%	8.6%	100.0%			
Sandia Foothills	0	4	11	8	4	27			
	0.0%	14.8%	40.7%	29.6%	14.8%	100.0%			
Total	1	10	17	166	20	214			
	0.5%	4.7%	7.9%	77.6%	9.3%	100.0%			

Table B5 Condition of Private Wells and Plumbing

				Don't	
	Excellent	Good	Fair	Know	Total
North Albuquerque Acres	109	75	7	4	195
	55.9%	38.5%	3.6%	2.1%	100.0%
Sandia Foothills	39	46	6	13	104
	37.5%	44.2%	5.8%	12.5%	100.0%
Total	148	121	13	17	299
	49.5%	40.5%	4.3%	5.7%	100.0%

Table B6

Total Number of Households Served by Well Share or Community System								
	2 to 5	6 to 14	15 to 25	26 to 100	100+	Don't Know	Total	
North Albuquerque Acres	63	10	2	6	28	27	136	
	46.3%	7.4%	1.5%	4.4%	20.6%	19.9%	100.0%	
Sandia Foothills	6	1	0	5	224	85	321	
	1.9%	0.3%	0.0%	1.6%	69.8%	26.5%	100.0%	
Total	69	11	2	11	252	112	457	
	15.1%	2.4%	0.4%	2.4%	55.1%	24.5%	100.0%	

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Disagree	Disagree Strongly	Don't Know / No Opinion	Total
Unfiltered water from fau	cet is safe	to drink.				
North Albuquerque Acres	120	120	16	9	12	277
	43.3%	43.3%	5.8%	3.2%	4.3%	100.0%
Sandia Foothills	201	198	17	6	11	433
	46.4%	45.7%	3.9%	1.4%	2.5%	100.0%
Total	321	318	33	15	23	710
	45.2%	44.8%	4.6%	2.1%	3.2%	100.0%
Worried that the unfiltere	d water fro	m faucet v	will make th	em ill if the	y drink it.	
North Albuquerque Acres	12	12	95	148	12	279
	4.3%	4.3%	34.1%	53.0%	4.3%	100.0%
Sandia Foothills	10	22	141	240	18	431
	2.3%	5.1%	32.7%	55.7%	4.2%	100.0%
Total	22	34	236	388	30	710
	3.1%	4.8%	33.2%	54.6%	4.2%	100.0%
Like the taste of unfiltere	d water tha	at comes d	irectly from	n the kitchei	n.	
North Albuquerque Acres	113	107	30	17	11	278
	40.6%	38.5%	10.8%	6.1%	4.0%	100.0%
Sandia Foothills	144	197	61	24	6	432
	33.3%	45.6%	14.1%	5.6%	1.4%	100.0%
Total	257	304	91	41	17	710
	36.2%	42.8%	12.8%	5.8%	2.4%	100.0%
Water in home stains plu	mbing fixtu	ures too m	uch.			
North Albuquerque Acres	40	73	113	49	4	279
	14.3%	26.2%	40.5%	17.6%	1.4%	100.0%
Sandia Foothills	60	114	160	90	8	432
	13.9%	26.4%	37.0%	20.8%	1.9%	100.0%
Total	100	187	273	139	12	711
	14.1%	26.3%	38.4%	19.5%	1.7%	100.0%

Table B7Perceptions on Residential Water Quality by Area

Percepti	ons on R	esident	iai Suppi	y/Delivery	by Area	
	Strongly			Disagree	Don't Know /	
	Agree	Agree	Disagree	Strongly	No Opinion	Total
I worry about the long ter	m supply o	of water to	o the house	holds in my	y neighborhood	s.
North Albuquerque Acres	32	120	86	29	13	280
	11.4%	42.9%	30.7%	10.4%	4.6%	100.0%
Sandia Foothills	44	139	151	78	19	431
	10.2%	32.3%	35.0%	18.1%	4.4%	100.0%
Total	76	259	237	107	32	711
	10.7%	36.4%	33.3%	15.0%	4.5%	100.0%
My home has water when	ever I need	d it.				
North Albuquerque Acres	175	98	4	2	0	279
	62.7%	35.1%	1.4%	0.7%	0.0%	100.0%
Sandia Foothills	308	122	3	0	0	433
	71.1%	28.2%	0.7%	0.0%	0.0%	100.0%
Total	483	220	7	2	0	712
	67.8%	30.9%	1.0%	0.3%	0.0%	100.0%
I have good water pressu	re in my ho	ome.				
North Albuquerque Acres	120	110	36	13	0	279
	43.0%	39.4%	12.9%	4.7%	0.0%	100.0%
Sandia Foothills	237	151	42	2	1	433
	54.7%	34.9%	9.7%	0.5%	0.2%	100.0%
Total	357	261	78	15	1	712
	50.1%	36.7%	11.0%	2.1%	0.1%	100.0%
There is enough water at	or near my	/ home fo	r fire proted	ction.		
North Albuquerque Acres	65	77	52	37	49	280
	23.2%	27.5%	18.6%	13.2%	17.5%	100.0%
Sandia Foothills	142	182	29	15	65	433
	32.8%	42.0%	6.7%	3.5%	15.0%	100.0%
Total	207	259	81	52	114	713
	29.0%	36.3%	11.4%	7.3%	16.0%	100.0%
The cost of having water	in my hom	e is too h	igh.			
North Albuquerque Acres	19	44	122	76	19	280
	6.8%	15.7%	43.6%	27.1%	6.8%	100.0%
Sandia Foothills	21	73	245	70	23	432
	4.9%	16.9%	56.7%	16.2%	5.3%	100.0%
Total	40	117	367	146	42	712
	5.6%	16.4%	51.5%	20.5%	5.9%	100.0%

Table B8 Percentions on Residential Supply/Delivery by Area