

# AN INVESTIGATION OF THE WATER QUALITY OF ROOFTOP RAINWATER CATCHMENT SYSTEMS IN MICRONESIA

FOR DISPLAY ONLY


Theo A. Dillaha  
and  
William J. Zolan

*Water and Energy Research  
Institute  
of the  
Western Pacific*

UNIVERSITY OF GUAM

Technical Report No. 45

November, 1983



AN INVESTIGATION OF THE WATER QUALITY  
OF ROOFTOP RAINWATER CATCHMENT  
SYSTEMS IN MICRONESIA

By

Theo A. Dillaha  
and  
William J. Zolan

UNIVERSITY OF GUAM

*Water and Energy Research Institute  
of the  
Western Pacific*

Technical Report No. 45

November, 1983

Project Completion Report  
for

AN INVESTIGATION OF THE QUALITY OF ROOFTOP RAINWATER CATCHMENT  
SYSTEMS IN MICRONESIA

Project No. A-029-Guam, Agreement No. 14-34-0001-2112

Principal Investigators: Theo A. Dillaha and Stephen J. Winter

Project Period: January 1, 1982 to September 30, 1983

The work on which this report is based was supported in part by funds provided by the United States Department of the Interior as authorized under the Water Research and Development Act of 1978.

---

Contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the views and policies of the United States Department of the Interior, nor does mention of trade names or commercial products constitute their endorsement by the U. S. Government.

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

	PAGE
LIST OF FIGURES.....	vi
LIST OF TABLES.....	vii
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Significance of safe potable water supplies.....	1
Rainwater catchment systems in Micronesia.....	2
Literature Review.....	6
METHODOLOGY.....	7
Questionnaire.....	8
Bacteriological Water Quality.....	8
Statistical Methods.....	9
RESULTS.....	12
Inter-Island Variations.....	12
Factors Affecting Bacteriological Water Quality.....	19
SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS.....	22
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	24
LITERATURE CITED.....	25
APPENDICES.....	27
A. Household RWCS Questionnaire.....	28
B. Questionnaire and Parameters Codes.....	30
C. Coded Questionnaire Data.....	35

## LIST OF FIGURES

	PAGE
1. Rainwater catchment systems.....	3
2. Galvanized corrugated metal catchment tank with cover.....	4
3. Poured reinforced concrete catchment tank without a cover.....	4
4. Ferrocement catchment tank with cover.....	5
5. Ferrocement catch ment tank without cover.....	5

## ABSTRACT

This research involved an investigation of rainwater catchment system (RWCS) characteristics and water quality in Micronesia. The objectives of the research were to determine the bacteriological state of existing RWCS waters by analyses of fecal and total coliform bacteria and to try and identify those catchment characteristics and maintenance practices which affect catchment water quality.

A total of 203 different RWCS were sampled in Kosrae, Ponape, Yap and Palau. Seventy-one percent of the RWCS sampled had no fecal coliforms per 100ml and 37 percent had no total coliforms per 100ml. Eighty-five and 70 percent had 5 or less fecal and total coliforms respectively per 100ml. Cleaning the catchment tank, roof and gutters were not found to affect RWCS water quality significantly. Total coliforms counts were significantly affected by screening the tank inlet and by the type of catchment tank.

In general, screens and tank coverings improved water quality. The newer ferrocement tanks had the best water quality while metal barrels had the poorest.

Catchment tanks were the largest and most popular source of water in Yap where water is less plentiful. Catchment tanks were also popular in areas with other sources of water. Even in areas with treated piped public water supplies, catchment systems appeared to be preferred for drinking purposes because of objections to chlorine taste and mistrust of the quality of public water.

## LIST OF TABLES

	PAGE
1. Catchment parameters thought to affect RWCS bacteriological water quality.....	8
2. Questionnaire response summary by island.....	13
3. Coliform bacteria results breakdown by percent according to island.....	20
4. Correlations of bacteriological water quality with catchment characteristics.....	21
5. Mean coliform counts versus catchment characteristics.....	23

## INTRODUCTION

Historically, rainwater harvesting has been practiced for thousands of years. Systems in North Africa and the Middle East, such as the extensive hillside systems developed by the Nabateans in the Negev Desert of Israel were developed two thousand years ago. Today, rainwater catchment systems (RWCS) are found in almost every nation of the world.

In spite of their current and long historical use, RWCS receive little attention on a world wide basis as a significant water source. One indication of this lack of attention is the fact that little work has been conducted to quantitatively evaluate the water quality or potability of water from RWCS. Water resources planners and public health workers therefore have a difficult time evaluating the relative merits of RWCS surface and groundwater sources for which a bountiful supply of water quality information exists. The current research study was undertaken to obtain information concerning the water quality of RWCS. Specifically, this study attempts to evaluate the bacteriological water quality of RWCS against as a function of system design and management. In addition, the study provides general bacteriological water quality data about RWCS as a whole.

### Significance of Safe Potable Water Supplies

In Micronesia, as in most other areas of the developing world, the lack of a safe, dependable and convenient potable water supply is a major obstacle hindering economic development. A safe and adequate water supply is essential to protect the public health and for the development of industries such as food processing, fish freezing and tourism. Safe water not only minimizes suffering caused by water borne diseases but it also results in accelerated economic growth due to increased worker health and productivity.

Epidemicological studies have repeatedly identified contaminated water as the principal transmitting agent of typhoid, cholera and bacillary dysentery. A lack of safe water for drinking and washing is also an important factor affecting the spread of other diarrheal diseases. According to WHO estimates (WHO, 1981), a child under five dies every two seconds in the Third World from diarrheal disease (the most common cause of death in infants in the developing world). Infant mortality due to diarrheal diseases is so prevalent in some areas of Micronesia that infants are not even named unless they survive their first year. Diarrheal diseases are also a leading cause of death for the elderly in Micronesia.

Because of the previous reasons given, the United Nations has declared that the 1980's be designated as "The International Drinking Water Supply and Sanitation Decade". The goal of the Decade is "Safe water for all" by 1990. Considering that up to 75 percent of the population of Third World countries lack safe and adequate water supplies, the problem is immense. It is hoped that this study will contribute in a small way towards the achievement of the goal of the Decade.



## Rainwater Catchment Systems in Micronesia

Rainwater catchment systems are one of the primary sources of drinking water in Micronesia. On many of the low islands, rainwater catchments are the only significant source of freshwater because the islands have few if any springs or streams and because groundwater wells are often brackish or contaminated. On larger islands with adequate fresh groundwater and streamflow, RWCS are often still preferred because of the convenience of a source near the home or because of past bad health experiences with alternative sources. Many citizens (including environmental health and public works officials) in urban areas with piped public water supplies continue to use their RWCS for drinking and cooking because of taste and turbidity problems. Taste objections are usually due to chlorination while turbidity problems are generally caused by overloaded filtration plants and leaky distribution systems which allow infiltration of turbid groundwater into the system between water hour periods.

In Micronesia, RWCS generally consist of a collecting surface, a guttering system to concentrate and collect the flow and a storage tank. Figure 1 is an idealized schematic of a typical system. Typically, collecting surfaces are the rooftops of private homes or public buildings and the predominant roofing material is galvanized corrugated metal. Gutters and downspouts are usually of prefabricated or homemade galvanized metal but plastic pipe and bamboo are also used.

Storage tanks are made from a variety of materials. Older tanks are generally of poured reinforced concrete or steel tanks obtained as war surplus material. Tanks of more recent construction are usually of poured concrete or ferrocement type construction. Ferrocement tanks are becoming increasingly popular because of their lower materials costs. Discarded 55 gallon drums are another common storage device. These are particularly common in remote areas. Typically, the tops are removed and they are left open but some are covered with cloth, screen or tin. Water is usually withdrawn using a dipper (a potential source of bacteriological contamination). Figures 2 through 5 are typical Micronesians RWCS storage tanks.

Also shown in Figure 1 are two devices for removing contaminants from rainwater before the water enters the storage tank. These devices, a foul flush device and a filter device, are not normally found in Micronesian RWCS.

Foul flush devices seek to improve catchment water quality by diverting the early runoff of dirty water from a roof at the beginning of a storm from the storage tank. This water typically contains a high concentration of dust, leaves and other debris which has collected on the roof since the last runoff event.

Filtering devices are used to remove solid matter from the roof runoff by passing the runoff through a sand or fiber filter. There are several operational difficulties with filters such as flow retardance and required maintenance which may preclude their use. Filtering devices may be used with or without foul flush devices. Keller (1982) presents a good discussion of the foul flush and filter devices.




Figure 1. Rainwater catchment system.



Figure 2. Galvanized corrugated metal catchment tank with cover (photo on the left).



Figure 3. Poured reinforced concrete catchment tank without a cover (note gutter made from plastic pipe sawed in two).



Figure 4. Ferrocement catchment tank with cover (note bent tin gutter).




Figure 5. Ferrocement catchment tank without cover.

In Micronesia, the inlets to storage tanks are usually screened to prevent gross particles from entering the storage tanks. Normally, window screen type wire mesh is used but cloth is used in some locales. If the tank is covered, as it is in most cases, the screened inlet (and overflow outlet) also keeps insects, animals, leaves, etc from entering the tanks. Screen is particularly valuable in excluding mosquitoes which may otherwise breed in the tank.

All RWCS must be maintained properly if they are to provide safe water. Maintenance procedures include periodic cleaning of roofs, gutters, screens and the insides of the catchment tanks. Roofs and gutters are cleaned to minimize foul flush problems. Screens are cleaned to keep the inlet open and to prevent biological growth on them. Tanks are cleaned to remove objectionable materials which have entered and accumulated in the tank. Tanks are also normally disinfected with a chlorine wash during the cleaning process.

Another common maintenance procedure is the periodic addition of a disinfectant such as chlorine to the tank to kill any bacteria that are present. This practice is not common in Micronesia.

#### Literature Review

Though rainwater collection systems have been ignored as a research topic, recently, increased interest has focused on their potential for supplying drinking water. The International Conference on Rainwater Cistern Systems, co-sponsored and held at the University of Hawaii in 1982, was a product of this increased interest (University of Hawaii, 1982). Several studies were presented at the conference that dealt specifically with rainwater catchment systems in the tropical third world.

In Micronesia, Stephenson et al. (1982) investigated the use of water on Majuro atoll of the Marshalls Islands. Their sample of 41 households contained a clear majority, 61%, of homes using permanent to semipermanent structures to collect rainwater for a domestic water supply. The other households either utilized makeshift apparatus (e.g. plastic buckets) to collect direct runoff from the roofs of their homes or borrowed water from neighbors who had constructed a collection system. Socioeconomic factors (i.e. cost of materials), were determined to be the main characteristic in RWCS design and utilization. Romeo (1982) conducted a survey of 15 catchments in Koror, Palau, Western Caroline Islands, for total and fecal coliform bacteria, specific conductance and turbidity. His findings showed that catchment bacteriological water quality was good. Only 3 of 15 catchments sampled had fecal coliform present. O'Meara (1982) conducted an investigation into the social aspects of freshwater use, including rainwater, in selected villages in Palau. Of 30 households visited, 29 had devices for collection of rainwater and, despite the existence of a public system, rainwater was still mentioned as the primary source of drinking water.

In contrast to Micronesia, the islands of Bermuda have been in close, continuous contact with western civilization since they were settled the 16th century. Having no surface water sources and only brackish water in groundwater aquifers, the people of Bermuda have developed residential

rainwater catchments systems to an elaborate degree even to the point of legislating cistern size and maintenance requirements for residential roof areas (Waller, 1982). Bacteriological quality of Bermuda cisterns is quite high with typical cisterns having less than 3 total coliform colonies and no fecal coliform colonies per 100 ml. This shows the potential of RWCS to deliver safe water when they are adequately constructed and maintained. In contrast, an investigation of RWCS in St. Thomas, U.S. Virgin Islands, showed that a lack of proper design and maintenance of RWCS can result in contaminated water supplies that require tremendous amounts of chlorine addition (to overcome chlorine demand from organic debris) or boiling for cistern waters to be rendered safe for drinking purposes (Lee and Jones, 1982). Unfortunately, for many of the above studies, no detailed coliform analyses accompanied the investigations nor did they specifically investigate reasons for success or failure of systems to provide bacteriologically clean water. Numerous publications were found relating to design and construction methods (Hogge, 1983; Keller, 1982; Stern, 1982; Wagner and Lanoix, 1959; Wright, 1977; Feachem et al., 1978) but they addressed water quality aspects in only the most general terms. Almost all recommended boiling or chemically disinfecting and cleaning the catchment tanks, roofs and gutters regularly but that was the extent of information in the area of water quality.

The lack of information concerning the bacteriological water quality of RWCS in the literature was disturbing and justifies the intent of this research. Undoubtedly, many RWCS have been sampled in the past during routine water quality surveys but this study appears to be one of the first to intensively investigate RWCS bacterial water quality.

#### METHODOLOGY

The main objectives of this project were to investigate different types of RWCS in Micronesia to determine which types of systems produce the best quality water and to identify those catchment design and maintenance factors which have a significant affect on water quality. The catchment parameters thought to have the main influence on RWCS bacteriological water quality are shown in Table 1. The questionnaire was designed to obtain this information from each household sampled.

Rainwater catchment systems in four of the main island groups of Micronesia were selected for study. The islands were visited during 1982. RWCS were evaluated by collecting water samples from private and public rainwater cisterns. Observations were also recorded concerning RWCS characteristics and the catchment owner or person responsible for its maintenance was interviewed concerning his attitude about water quality, catchment use and maintenance practices. The water samples were subsequently analyzed for total and fecal coliform bacteria as an indication of their bacteriological water quality. Owners were notified during the course of the study if their catchments were found to be contaminated and remedial actions were recommended.

Table 1. Catchment parameters thought to affect RWCS bacteriological water quality.

---

<u>Parameter</u>
1. Island
2. Type of tank
3. Tank volume
4. Cover on tank
5. Screen on tank inlet
6. Tank cleaning frequency
7. Cleaning frequency of roof and gutters
8. Roof type

---

At the conclusion of the project, the water quality and interview results were analyzed statistically to identify predominate RWCS characteristics and practices. Inter-island differences were also investigated along with RWCS bacteriological water quality in general and as affected by RWCS characteristics.

### Questionnaire

Rainwater catchment system owners or operators were interviewed in the island groups of Kosrae, Ponape, Yap and Palau using the questionnaire shown in Appendix A. Interviews were conducted by project personnel or by local environmental health officers if the interviewees did not speak English. Some errors were undoubtedly introduced by different interviewing styles and translation difficulties and their affect on the data base is acknowledged.

Responses to specific questions were catagorized and coded according to the coding scheme presented in Appendix B. If a response did not fit one of the specified catagories it was classified as a missing value.

Questions 4 and 5 of the questionnaire caused problems during the initial surveys. Question 4 was found to not be specific enough in some areas as many people responded yes but only when making coffee and tea. After this problem was discovered, it was made clear that the question pertained to boiling the water to purify it. An interesting note is that many people on Kosrae said they boiled the water for infants and children but not for adults. This response was coded as "sometimes".

Question 5 also led to a lot of misunderstanding. Originally, the question was "How often to members of your family get diarrhea?" Some people were offended by the question or gave obviously erroneous reponses so the question was changed to its present form "Does the water ever make people sick?"

Catchment, roof and gutter descriptions presented are estimates by project personnel. Size dimensions were approximated as measuring devices were not used. The additional accuracy obtained by actual measuring was deemed unnecessary for the purposes of this project and if carried out would have significantly reduced the total number of catchments and water samples included in the study.

### Bacteriological Water Quality

Bacteriological water quality was determined through analyses of fecal and total bacteria present in the rainwater catchment waters. The analyses were performed using the membrane filter technique according to the procedures given in Standard Methods (1980).

Samples were collected in sterilized polyethylene bottles or Whirl-Pak sample bags. Samples from catchments with faucets were collected after the faucets had been running for 5 to 10 seconds. Catchments from which water was dipped (metal drums) were sampled using the catchment dipper or by dipping the sampling container into the catchment. Hands were kept out of the water during the dipping process to minimize sample and catchment



contamination. Samples were stored in an ice chest with ice (if available) during transport to the laboratory. Samples were normally processed within 3-5 hours after collection. Samples collected from the remote islands of Kayangel and Ulithi were stored on ice or refrigerated until they could be processed in the laboratory 12-24 hours later.

Dilution of RWCS water samples to obtain low bacterial plate densities was not performed in this study. Catchment water aliquots of 1 to 100 ml were filtered in all cases because coliform populations (fecal and total) were expected to be low (<100) in most cases. This expectation was found to be correct. Dilutions were also not performed because the study was trying to determine relative degrees of bacterial contamination and the greater accuracy achieved through dilutions was not deemed worthwhile in view of the added laboratory work required. It should be kept in mind that laboratory work conducted in Micronesia, as in other rural third world locales, must take into account unreliable power and water supplies and in some cases insufficient laboratory equipment and supplies. All supplies for this study including, in some cases, distilled water, were shipped into each study area by the Water and Energy Research Institute Laboratory on Guam.

All positive plates were counted as accurately as possible unless the coliform count was greater than 200/100 ml. Counts in excess of 200/100 ml were recorded as TNTC (too numerous to count). However, samples classified as TNTC were arbitrarily given a plate count of 200/100 ml in subsequent statistical analyses: so, average coliform counts will be conservative.

Plates which were grossly overcrowded with bacteria colonies so that coliform growth was inhibited or confluent were treated as missing data. The total coliform test results for Ponape were rejected because it was felt that the data were a product of bad media or too high a density of bacteria for proper total coliform sheen development.

#### Statistical Methods

The coded responses to the questionnaires were analyzed for statistical significance using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS for VM/CMS, Version M, Release 8.1, Aug. 15, 1980) programs available on the Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University computer system.

The rainwater catchment survey questionnaires (Appendix A) were coded according to the data coding scheme given in Appendix B. The final code responses for all the questionnaires are presented in Appendix C. This is the data file which was used in all the SPSS analyses.

Two SPSS programs were used in statistical analyses. An analysis of variance program, ONEWAY, was used for significance testing of dependent/independent variable relationships where the independent variable was a metric parameter (i.e., coliform counts, tank volume, roof area, etc). Only one-way analysis of variance was attempted in this study. Higher order analyses may be possible but a larger data base would have been better for the more advanced analyses required. For comparisons with

nonmetric independent variables (category type responses), the Chi-square test for statistical significance provided by the SPSS program, CROSSTABS, was used.

Two types of information were sought from the questionnaires. One type was a summary of the questionnaire responses as a whole and for each island. This summary was designed to both tabulate and to evaluate inter-island similarities and differences. The second type of information sought was the identification of parameters which had a significant impact on water quality throughout the islands.

A quick glance at the rainwater catchment survey sheet (Appendix A) shows that there are many possible combinations of parameters which could be investigated for possible statistical correlation. (378 for one-way correlations alone). The intent of this research, however, was to investigate only those catchment characteristics and management practices which were thought to have the highest probability of affecting bacteriological water quality. As indicated before, the total and fecal coliform tests were used as the standards from which to gage water quality. Table 1 is a summary of the catchment parameters and management practices which were thought to be factors significantly influencing catchment water quality. The data of Appendix C are available for those who wish to test other postulated relationships.

## RESULTS

Before proceeding with a discussion of the RWCS survey results, it is important to be aware of some of the limitations of the survey procedure. First, none of the islands were surveyed extensively except for Kosrae (where an investigator was trapped for several weeks due to an aviation fuel shortage). The islands of Truk, the Northern Marianas and the Marshall Islands were not visited at all due to time and budget limitations. Catchment systems in Ponape were sampled in only two municipalities. One had piped public water while the other had no piped public water. Sampling in Yap State included the capital, one municipality on the main island and the islands of Ulithi atoll. In the Republic of Palau a significant portion of the population with catchments was sampled but only those who requested sampling after public radio announcements of the project. Sampling was not therefore truly representative of the population. Sampling was also conducted on the islands of Peleliu and Kayangel but the water quality analyses were lost due to a data collection problem.

It is also important to note that the present study does not address the effects of seasonality on bacteriological water quality. One would intuitively expect water quality to be better during the wet season when roofs and gutters are cleaner due to more frequent precipitation and less dust and debris in the air. These effects were not addressed due to the short duration of the project and because individual RWCS were generally sampled only once.

The reader should therefore be cautious in interpreting the data contained herein. This study is the most comprehensive RWCS survey ever undertaken in Micronesia but it still has its limitations.

### Inter-Island Variations

Table 2 is a summary of information obtained from the survey questionnaires by island and for all the islands as a whole. The table presents the response distribution in the form of percentages for all categorical type responses. The mean value of the responses is given. The total number of valid responses for each question is enclosed within parenthesis. Also indicated in the table is the significance level for inter-island question response variation. Significance levels greater than .05 are not considered to be statistically significant and are so indicated with a N.S. designation.

Only a few of the significant results of Table 2 will be discussed here. Detailed analysis of the other parameters is left the reader.

#### Question 1.

The mean number of users per catchment sampled varies from 9 in Palau to 59 in Yap and 33 for all the islands. The inter-island variation in the number of users was also found to be statistically significant ( $P < .00$ ) indicating that there are probably sociological or economic differences relating to water use between the islands. This is a valid hypothesis

Table 2. Questionnaire response summary by island.

Question and Parameter	Level of Significance	Response Summary (no. of valid responses)*			
		Kosrae	Ponape	Yap	Palau All
1. Average Number of Users/catchment	.00	49(55)*	43(16)	59(29)	9(78) 33(178)
2. Users opinion of water, Percent	.04	(60)	(17)	(34)	(38) (149)
Bad		15	12	6	8 11
Good		78	59	88	87 80
Don't Know		7	29	6	5 9
3. What is Catchment water used for?, Percent	.00	(63)	(17)	(34)	(57) (171)
Drinking		6	12	27	28 18
Washing		0	6	0	0 1
Drinking and Cooking		89	77	32	42 61
Washing and Bathing		0	6	6	0 1
Cooking, Washing and Bathing		0	0	0	2 1
Everything		5	0	35	28 18
4. Is the water boiled for drinking? Percent	.00	(61)	(16)	(33)	(39) (149)
No		48	81	15	56 46
Yes		39	0	67	26 38
Sometimes		13	19	18	18 16
5. Does the water make people sick? Percent	.04	(59)	(14)	(33)	(39) (145)
No		69	86	97	79 80
Yes		7	0	0	13 6
Sometimes		19	14	3	8 12
Don't know		5	0	0	0 2
6. Average times per year catchment tank cleaned	N.S.	3.7(59)	4.1(15)	3.5(25)	2.4(50) 3.3(149)

Table 2. Continued.

Question and Parameter	Level of Significance	Response Summary (no. of valid responses)*				
		Kosrae	Ponape	Yap	Palau	All
7. Average times per year roof and gutters cleaned	N.S.	2.3(51)	1.3(15)	3.2(25)	1.1(49)	1.9(140)
8. Do you ever run out of water? Percent	N.S.	(61)	(13)	(31)	(57)	(162)
No		56	69	61	77	65
Yes		44	31	39	23	35
9. Do you use other sources of water? Percent	.00	(62)	(16)	(32)	(60)	(170)
No		0	0	19	5	5
Yes		100	100	81	95	95
10. What other sources of water are used? Percent	.00	(62)	(16)	(26)	(56)	(160)
Public		100	44	0	57	63
Streams		0	25	15	0	5
Springs		0	31	15	4	7
Wells		0	0	42	39	21
Other catchments		0	0	27	0	4
11. What is the other source used for? Percent	.00	(57)	(16)	(26)	(53)	(152)
Drinking		0	0	4	0	1
Washing		2	0	46	2	9
Drinking and Cooking		0	0	4	0	1
Washing and Bathing		95	56	15	60	65
Cooking, Washing and Bathing		3	19	0	23	11
Everything		0	25	31	15	13
12. Catchment type, Percent	.00	(63)	(17)	(36)	(84)	(200)
Poured Concrete		92	6	47	36	53
Ferrocement		2	47	0	6	7
Steel tanks		5	41	8	36	22
Metal drums		1	6	36	19	15
Other		0	0	9	3	3

Table 2. Continued.

Question and Parameter	Level of Significance	Response Summary (no. of valid responses)*		
		Kosrae	Ponape	Palau All
13. Average catchment volume, m <sup>3</sup>	.00	13.2(57)	5.5(16)	23.0(33) 6.3(72) 11.5(178)
14. Internal cleanliness of catchment Percent	N.S.	(40)	(2)	(24) (27) (93)
Good		40	0	46 63 47
Fair		40	100	21 22 31
Poor		20	0	33 15 22
15. Is catchment covered? Percent	N.S.	(62)	(16)	(36) (81) (195)
No		16	37	28 19 21
Yes		84	63	72 81 79
16. Cover type? Percent	.00	(50)	(10)	(26) (31) (117)
Tin		28	100	31 67 45
Concrete		72	0	57 16 48
Screen		0	0	8 7 3
Cloth		0	0	0 7 2
Wood		0	0	4 3 2
17. Is catchment inlet screened? Percent	.00	(50)	(16)	(32) (76) (174)
No		30	69	69 29 40
Yes		70	31	31 71 60
18. Roof type? Percent	N.S.	(63)	(16)	(34) (84) (197)
Tin		100	100	91 98 97
Concrete		0	0	9 2 3
19. Roof condition? Percent	.01	(58)	(14)	(33) (80) (185)
Good		40	50	49 69 55
Fair		46	43	27 22 32
Poor		14	7	24 9 13

Table 2. Continued.

Question and Parameter	Level of Significance	Response Summary (no. of valid responses)*				
		Kosrae	Ponape	Yap	Palau	All
20. Gutter Type? Percent		(61)	(14)	(34)	(83)	(192)
Plastic or prefabricated	N.S.	42	71	41	32	40
Bent tin		54	29	41	57	51
Bamboo		2	0	6	1	2
None		2	0	12	10	7
21. Gutter condition? Percent		(56)	(13)	(26)	(72)	(167)
Good	N.S.	57	61	54	60	58
Fair		20	31	19	32	26
Poor		23	8	27	8	16
22. Roof area, m <sup>2</sup>		85(50)	130(16)	75(33)	90(83)	90(182)
23. Percent of roof area used for water collection?	.00	45(61)	34(15)	79(33)	42(77)	49(186)
24. Fecal coliforms/100 m	N.S.	14(63)	15(17)	40(36)	18(60)	21(176)
25 Total coliforms/100m	.00	6(63)	-(0)	63(37)	38(55)	31(155)

\*where ( ) contains the number of valid responses to this question.

N.S. indicates that the inter-island differences are not significant at the 95 percent confidence level.

since much of Palau is served by public systems and water is much more available while the areas sampled in Yap had no public supplies.

Question 3.

Rainwater catchment water use was fairly consistent between islands. Seventy-nine percent of those interviewed indicated that they used their RWCS water exclusively for drinking and/or cooking purposes (79%). This indicates that Micronesians understand that their catchments' capacities are limited and they conserve water by restricting its use.

Question 4.

When asked if RWCS water was boiled prior to drinking, only 38 percent responded yes in spite of the fact that all Environmental Health officers have been trying to encourage disinfection prior to consumption. This response is supported as 80 percent of those interviewed reported that their catchment water was good and didn't make people sick. Yap was radically different with respect to the boiling question; 67 percent reported they boiled their water.

Questions 6 and 7.

The number of times that catchments, roofs and gutters were cleaned per year was not found to differ statistically between islands. The people of Yap appeared to be the most frequent cleaners while those on Palau were the least frequent. On the whole, catchment tanks and roofs and gutters were cleaned 3.3 and 1.9 times per year respectively. Obviously, not as much importance is given to roof and gutter cleaning.

Questions 9 and 10.

Ninty-five percent indicated that RWCS were not their only source of water. Only on Yap did a significant number of people indicate that RWCS water was their only source (19%). These individuals were from the Ulithi atoll. Atolls, because of their low elevation, generally have brackish ground water and no surface water resources. One hundred percent of the people on Kosrae indicated that their secondary source was a public system (untreated piped stream water) but none said they used the water for drinking or cooking. In Ponape, public, stream and spring-water was available but it was avoided as a potable source. In Yap all water sources available were used and the sources were used for drinking water supply. Public water and wells were the primary alternative sources in Palau but they were used for purposes other than drinking. Overall, the secondary sources were used for drinking only 14 percent of the time. Statistically significant inter-island effects existed for all these questions.

Question 12.

Poured concrete and steel catchment tanks were the predominant tank types observed with 53 and 22 percent respectively. Metal drums with 15 percent were the third most common storage vessel. Although not reflected in this survey, most new tanks appear to be being built using ferrocement construction techniques due to a special low cost, self help,



Micronesia-wide Environmental Health RWCS project. These economical tanks are constructed by plastering perforated flat tin shells with cement (see Figures 4 and 5).

Question 13.

Average catchment volume was found to vary significantly from island to island. Catchment tanks were largest on Yap ( $23 \text{ m}^3$ ) and Kosrae ( $13 \text{ m}^3$ ) where alternative supplies are untreated and smallest on Ponape ( $5\frac{1}{2} \text{ m}^3$ ) and Palau ( $6\frac{1}{3} \text{ m}^3$ ) where some treated public supplies are available. Average storage volume was  $11\frac{1}{2} \text{ m}^3$ . Combined with Question 1., the average number of users, the picture changes as the average water storage/user now becomes 700, 390, 270 and 130 liters/user for Palau, Yap, Kosrae and Ponape respectively. Kosrae and Ponape now appear to have low storage volumes but this is offset by their high annual rainfalls and lack of distinct wet and dry seasons. Palau and Yap which have distinct seasons have the larger storage volumes.

Question 17.

Screens were found on 60 percent of the catchment inlets overall but only 31 percent had screens in Palau and Yap, islands which also had lower numbers of catchments with covers. Screens should be incorporated into all RWCS because they remove some debris from inlet water and prevent animal access to the tank if it is covered properly.

Question 18 and 20.

Roofs were almost exclusively made from corrugated galvanized sheet metal (97%) with the remaining roofs being concrete. Gutters were predominantly home made using bent sheet metal (51%) or prefabricated from metal or plastic (40%). A few used bamboo guttering and 7 percent had no gutters; the rainfall just fell from the roof into the open cat tank.

Questions 22 and 23.

One important factor affecting RWCS use is the roof area available for rainfall collection and the percent of available roof area actually used. On the average, roofs were found to be about  $90 \text{ m}^2$  in area with about half that (49%) being used for rainwater collection. On Yap, the roofs were the smallest ( $75 \text{ m}^2$ ) but the percent used was the largest (79%); as a consequence, the Yapese had the largest average areas available for rainwater collection ( $59 \text{ m}^2$  versus 38, 44 and 38 for Kosrae, Ponape and Palau, respectively). Other areas should emulate Yap to improve their RWCS performance.

Questions 24 and 25.

Coliform counts are used to assess the possible presence of pathogenic organisms. They are not normally pathogenic themselves but they are almost always found when pathogens are present. They are also relatively easy and safe to culture. Therefore, they are used as an indicator of pathogenic contamination. The World Health Organization (1971) recommends that 90

percent of all water samples from a water source should have a total coliform count of less than 10 per 100 ml. If the counts are consistently greater than 20 per 100 ml, then consideration should be given to treating the source. Total coliform bacteria are not always of fecal origin. Some are normal soil bacteria. Fecal coliform bacteria counts should be lower than total coliforms counts since they are an indication of recent human or animal fecal contamination. The presence of pathogenic organisms is therefore probable when fecal coliform are found.

The average total and fecal coliform counts for the RWCS tested were high, 21 and 31/100ml for fecal and total coliform respectively. These counts, particularly for total coliform, would have been even higher if dilution techniques had been used to accurately measure coliform populations instead of using 200/100ml as the upper limit on coliform numbers. Coliform counts were the highest in Yap where catchments are the predominant potable water source (40 and 63/100ml for fecal and total, respectively) and lowest in Kosrae. These numbers are somewhat discouraging with respect to RWCS water quality as whole. However, there were plenty of catchments that provided water of good bacteriological quality. The problem appears to be in gaging the maintenance effort needed for RWCS when such a variety of designs, materials and usage patterns exist.

Table 3 is a more detailed summary of the coliform counts by island. These numbers are much more encouraging as 56 and 34 percent of all the RWCS tested were found to have no fecal and total coliforms, respectively. If a coliform standard of less than or equal to 5 is used, then 75 percent of the RWCS had acceptable fecal counts and 58 percent had acceptable total coliform counts. These numbers suggest that RWCS are doing an acceptable job of providing drinking water in the majority of cases but problems do exist.

#### Factors Affecting Bacteriological Water Quality

Table 4 is a summary of the RWCS characteristics and management practices which were tested to see if they affected catchment bacteriological water quality. As shown in the table, none of the catchment characteristics had a statistically significant effect on fecal coliform counts. However, total coliforms were found to be influenced significantly by the island, whether or not the tank was screened, and by the type of tanks. Other parameters such as catchment cover, cleaning frequencies, and tank volume did not appear to influence water quality at the 95 percent level of confidence. This does not influence water quality, it just means that no statistically significant correlation existed with the present data base. A more comprehensive study over a longer period with a larger data base would very likely find more significant cause and effect relationships. For example, 79 and 82 percent of the catchments which had no fecal or total coliform bacteria, respectively, had covers. This seems like a strong indication that covers improve bacteriological water quality but other uncertainties in the data preclude a definitive statement concerning cause and effect.

Table 3. Coliform bacteria results breakdown by precent according to island.

	Kosrae	Ponape	Yap	Palau	All
<hr/> Fecal Coliform/100ml					
0	71	47	42	53	56
1-5	14	18	25	20	19
< 5	85	65	67	73	75
6-20	7	18	3	10	8
21-100	2	12	14	7	7
100+	6	5	16	10	10
<hr/>					
Total Coliform/100ml					
0	37	-	27	36	34
1-5	33	-	16	18	24
< 5	70	-	43	54	58
6-20	24	-	14	16	19
21-100	6	-	16	15	12
100+	0	-	27	15	11
<hr/>					

Table 4. Correlations of bacteriological water quality with catchment characteristics. N.S. signifies no statistically significant correlation at the 95 percent confidence level.

Catchment Characteristic	Level of Significance	
	Fecal Coliforms	Total Coliforms
Island	N.S.	.00
Is catchment tank covered?	N.S.	N.S.
Is tank inlet screened?	N.S.	.00
Type of catchment tank	N.S.	.00
Tank volume	N.S.	N.S.
Tank cleaning frequency	N.S.	N.S.
Roof and gutter cleaning frequency	N.S.	N.S.

PROPERTY OF  
W.E.R.I.  
UNIVERSITY OF GUAM

Table 5 presents mean coliform counts as a function of the same parameters in Table 4. As shown in this table, screens and catchment covers appear to greatly improve water quality in all cases except with fecal coliform counts and covered catchments. The reason for exception is unknown. The relationship between tank, roof and gutter cleaning are much less certain and the results of Table 4 are reaffirmed. Catchment tank type also appears to affect water quality as both total and fecal coliforms follow the same trends with catchment tank. Steel barrels consistently have the poorest quality followed by steel tanks which are mostly World War II vintage and the poured cement tanks which are generally older and in poorer conditions than the newer ferrocement tanks.

#### SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

This study shows that in the majority of cases, RWCS provide a relatively high quality water for domestic purposes. Fifty-six percent of the RWCS tested had no fecal coliform bacteria and 37 percent had no total coliform present. Of course, it is desired that coliform organisms be totally absent from drinking water but this is not always economically or technically feasible in present RWCS, especially in developing areas. In such cases, a standard of less than or equal to five total coliforms per 100 m/l might be more appropriate. In this case, RWCS performed satisfactorily for fecal and total coliforms in 75 and 58 percent of the cases tested. The remaining instances of contamination give evidence that improved maintenance and design of RWCS is needed.

Because coliform organisms were found in many catchments, some at very high and potentially dangerous levels, it is recommended that catchment users boil water before using it for drinking and cooking purposes. Thirty-eight percent of those interviewed said they currently boil water for drinking. Increased public education and catchment system testing could help increase the percentage who boil their water.

Fecal coliform counts were found to vary greatly and no statistically significant relationships were found between fecal counts and catchment characteristics. Fecal counts did appear to be lower in screened tanks though. Catchment coverings and cleaning frequencies had no apparent effect on the presence and numbers of fecal coliforms.

Total coliform counts were more visibly influenced by catchment characteristics and practices. The presence of covers and screens appeared to greatly improve water quality. Screens improved water quality to a statistically significant extent. The island the RWCS was on and the catchment tank type also statistically affected total coliform count. Kosrae had the lowest total coliform counts and ferrocement tanks had the best water quality. Metal barrels had the poorest water bacteriologically.

While not conclusive, the results of this study suggest that screening and covering RWCS can greatly improve RWCS water quality. It is therefore recommended that all catchment tanks that do not have screens and covers should have them installed. It is also important that the screens be cleaned regularly to prevent organic buildup on them.

Table 5. Mean coliform counts versus catchment characteristics.

Catchment Characteristic	Coliform count/100ml	
	Fecal	Total
Island		
Kosrae	14	6
Ponape	15	-
Yap	40	63
Palau	18	38
All	21	31
Covered catchment tank?		
No	19	45
Yes	20	24
Tank inlet screened?		
No	26	55
Yes	11	13
Catchment tank type?		
Poured cement	17	14
Ferro-cement	5	6
Steel tanks	21	37
Steel drums	40	73
Other	11	9
Tank cleanings/year		
0	16	24
1-3	28	41
4-6	13	15
6+	7	25
Roof and gutter cleanings/year		
0	9	23
1-3	35	50
4-6	20	17
7+	5	25

Cleaning the catchment tank, roof and gutters was found to have little positive effect on water quality. In spite of this, it is recommended that users continue to clean their catchments, roofs and gutters as dictated by common sense. Tanks should be cleaned and disinfected 3 to 4 times per year and roofs and gutters should be cleaned often monthly if possible.

To further understand RWCS dynamics it is recommended that the Environmental Health offices of each island start sampling a few (5 to 6) typical RWCS on a routine basis (monthly) to collect long term RWCS water quality data. The effect of first flush diverters should also be investigated and a few simple designs adopted for use in Micronesia since diverters may offer the greatest potential for improving RWCS bacteriological water quality at minimal cost.

The diversity of RWCS designs and materials presently utilized and the varying usage patterns from household to household makes it difficult to prescribe a set maintenance program for RWCS that is suitable for everyone. Nevertheless, the maintenance RWCS has to become a scheduled household activity. Public education programs can be initiated with the objective of encouraging uniform, effective designs and material in RWCS besides maintenance procedures. Perhaps in areas where dependence on RWCS is nearly total for drinking water (e.g. Ulithi) government subsidized materials and designs can be provided to the public.

Consideration should also be given to periodic private or public sponsored disinfection of catchment tanks using chemical disinfectants. A quarterly disinfection program with 1 ppm residual chlorine would probably greatly improve RWCS water quality and community health.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Special recognition is due to the Department of Agricultural Engineering, Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, for the use of its computer facilities in data analysis and for providing time to allow Dr. Dillaha to write this report.

We acknowledge the excellent support provided by the Trust Territory Environmental Protection Board Environmental Laboratories in Kosrae, Ponape, Yap, Truk and Palau districts. Their personnel assisted in interpreting and conducting interviews, providing logistical help, selecting households to be sampled and in analyzing of water samples.

We acknowledge Russell N. Clayshulte of the Water and Energy Research Institute of the Western Pacific for inking of figures and our secretaries Angela Duenas and Evelyn Paulino for manuscript processing.

## LITERATURE CITED

- American Public Health Association, 1980. Standard methods for the examination of water and wastewater, 14th Ed., Washington, D. C. 1193 p.
- Feachem, R. G., Bradley, D. J., Gorelick, H. and D. D. Mara, 1978. Health aspects of excreta and wastewater management. World Bank, Washington, D. C.
- Hogge, Ralph, 1983. Construction of a water storage tank for Micronesia, Guam Community College, Mangilao, Guam. 42 p.
- Keller, Kent, 1982. Rainwater harvesting for domestic water supplies in developing countries, WASH Working Paper No. 20, U. S. Agency for International Development, Washington, D. C. 76 p.
- Lee, F. G. and R. A. Jones, 1982. Quality of the St. Thomas, U. S. Virgin Islands household cistern water supplies. pp. 233-243.
- Nie, N., Hull, C., Jenkins, J., Steinbrenner, K. and Bent, D., 1975. Statistical package for the social sciences, 2nd edition, McGraw-Hill Book Co., NY, NY. 675 p.
- O'Meara, Christine, 1982. An investigation of social aspects of freshwater use in selected hamlets of Belau. University of Guam Micronesia Area Research Center. Special Report no. 1, 46 p.
- Romeo, Charles, 1982. A water quality agreement for rainwater catchment development in Belau. pp. 257-265. In proceeding of the international conference on rainwater cistern systems. University of Hawaii. 396 p.
- Stephenson, R. A., H. Kurashina, and S. J. Winter, 1982. Assessment of rainwater catchment and storage systems in Majuro. pp. 158-163. In proceeding of the international conference on rainwater cistern systems. University of Hawaii. 396 p.
- Stern, Peter, 1982. Rainwater harvesting, waterlines: the J. of appropriate water supply and sanitation technology, Vol. 1, p. 14-17.
- University of Hawaii. 1982. Proceedings of the International Conference on Rainwater Cistern Systems. University of Hawaii. 396 p.
- Wagner, E. G. and Lanoix, J. N., 1959. Water supply for rural areas and small communities, World Health Organization, Geneva, Switzerland. 340 p.
- World Health Organization. 1971. International standards for drinking water. 3 ed. Geneva.
- \_\_\_\_\_. 1981. Drinking-water and sanitation, 1981-1990. A way to health. 56 p.



- \_\_\_\_\_. 1981. Water and Sanitation for all by 1990. 15 p.
- Wright, Forrest, 1977. Rural water supply and sanitation, 3rd Ed., Robert E. Krieger Pub. Co., Inc., Huntington, NY. 305 p.

## APPENDICES

APPENDIX A  
Household RWCS

RAINWATER CATCHMENT SURVEY

OWNER:  
ADDRESS:

DATE:  
TIME:  
Sampled by:

1. How many people use this catchment?
2. Is the water good?
3. What is the water used for?
4. Do you boil the water?
5. Does the water ever make people sick?
6. How often do you clean the catchment?
7. How often do you clean the roof and gutters?
8. Do you ever run out of water?
9. Do you use other sources of water? (Specify)
10. What do you use this water for?

Catchment Description

Type:  
Dimensions:  
Condition:  
Cover:  
Screen:  
Internal cleanliness:

Roof & Gutter Description

Roof type:  
Dimensions:  
Condition:  
Gutter type:  
Gutter condition:  
% used for water collection:

Coliform Tests

Fecal Coliforms	Bottle No. _____	_____ /100ml
Total Coliforms	Bottle No. _____	_____ /100ml

Other Chemical Tests or Notes

APPENDIX B  
QUESTIONNAIRE PARAMETER CODES

RAINWATER CATCHMENT PROJECT: QUESTIONNAIRE & PARAMETER CODES

<u>Column(s)</u>	<u>Description &amp; Codes</u>	<u>Parameter Code</u>																												
1	Island (1 - 4) (1) Kosrae (2) Ponape (3) Yap (4) Palau	ISLAND																												
2	State, Municipality or Village (016) (0) Missing value	VILLAGE																												
	<table><tr><td><u>Kosrae</u></td><td><u>Ponape</u></td><td><u>Yap</u></td><td><u>Palau</u></td></tr><tr><td>(1) Leu</td><td>(1) Oh</td><td>(1) Yap</td><td>(1) Koror Area</td></tr><tr><td>(2) Tafunsak</td><td>(2) Sokesh</td><td>(2) Ulithi</td><td>(2) Peleiu</td></tr><tr><td>(3) Toful</td><td>(3) Colonia</td><td></td><td>(3) Kayangel</td></tr><tr><td>(4) Malem</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>(5) Utwe</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr><tr><td>(6) Walung</td><td></td><td></td><td></td></tr></table>	<u>Kosrae</u>	<u>Ponape</u>	<u>Yap</u>	<u>Palau</u>	(1) Leu	(1) Oh	(1) Yap	(1) Koror Area	(2) Tafunsak	(2) Sokesh	(2) Ulithi	(2) Peleiu	(3) Toful	(3) Colonia		(3) Kayangel	(4) Malem				(5) Utwe				(6) Walung				
<u>Kosrae</u>	<u>Ponape</u>	<u>Yap</u>	<u>Palau</u>																											
(1) Leu	(1) Oh	(1) Yap	(1) Koror Area																											
(2) Tafunsak	(2) Sokesh	(2) Ulithi	(2) Peleiu																											
(3) Toful	(3) Colonia		(3) Kayangel																											
(4) Malem																														
(5) Utwe																														
(6) Walung																														
3 - 4	ID (1-99)	ID																												
5 - 10	Date (Day, Month, Year)	DATE																												
11 - 13	How many people use the catchment? (0-999) (0) Missing value	USERS																												
14	Is the water good? (0-3) (0) Missing value (1) no (2) yes (3) don't know	QUALITY																												
15	What is the water used for ? (0-8) (0) Missing value (1) drinking (2) cooking (3) washing (4) bathing (5) drinking & cooking (6) washing & bathing (7) cooking, washing, & bathing (8) everything	USE <sup>1</sup>																												

17	Do you boil the water? (0-3)	BOIL
	(0) Missing value	
	(1) no	
	(2) yes	
	(3) sometimes	
18	Does the water ever make people sick? (0-4)	SICK
	(0) Missing value	
	(1) no	
	(2) yes	
	(3) sometimes	
	(4) don't know	
19-20	How often do you clean the catchment?	CLEAN C
	(0) never	
	(1-98) times/year	
	(99) missing value	
21-22	How often do you clean the roof and gutter? (0-99)	CLEAN R
	(0) never	
	(1-98) times/year	
	(99) missing value	
23	Do you ever run out of water? (0-3)	RUNOUT
	(0) Missing value	
	(1) no	
	(2) yes	
24	Do you use other sources of water?	SOURCE 2
	(0) Missing value	
	(1) no	
	(2) yes	
25	What other sources of water do you use? (0-9)	SOURCES
	(0) Missing value	(5) ST & SP
	(1) public, P	(6) ST & W
	(2) stream, ST	(7) SP & W
	(3) spring, SP	(8) ST & SP & W
	(4) well, W	(9) other catchments

CATCHMENT DESCRIPTION

28	Type? (0-9)	CTYPE
	(0) Missing value (1) poured concret (2) perforated tin/concrete (3) ferrocement (4) stainless steel (5) corrugated metal (6) miscellaneous steel (7) fiberglass/plastic (8) metal barrels (9) other	
29-32	Volume, ft <sup>3</sup> (0-9999)	VOLUME
	(0) Missing value (9999) $\geq$ 9999 cu. ft.	
33	Internal cleanliness? (0-3)	CCOND
	(0) Missing value (1) good (2) fair (3) poor	
34	Cover? (0-20)	COVER
	(0) Missing value (1) no (20) yes	
35	Cover type? (0-4)	CVTYPE
	(0) Missing value (1) tin (2) concrete (3) screen (4) cloth	
36	Screen? (0-2)	SCREEN
	(0) Missing value (1) no (2) yes	

ROOF AND GUTTER DESCRIPTION

37	Roof type (predominant) (0-5)	RTYPE
	(0) Missing value (1) tin (2) concrete	



	(3) thatch (4) wood (5) other	
38-41	Roof area, ft <sup>2</sup> (0-9999)	RAREA
	(0) Missing value (9999) $\geq$ 9999 sq. ft.	
42	Roof condition (0-30)	RCOND
	(0) Missing value (1) good (2) fair (3) poor	
43	Gutter type (predominate) (0-5)	GTYPE
	(0) Missing value (1) prefab (2) bent tin (3) bamboo (4) none (5) other	
44	Gutter condition (0-3)	GCOND
	(0) Missing value (1) good (2) fair (3) poor	
45-46	Percent of roof used for catchment (0-99)	PERCENT
	(0) Missing value (99) 100%	
47-49	Fecal Coliforms (counts/100 ml)	FECALC
	(0-200) Bacteria/100 ml (998) too numerous to count, TNTC (999) missing value	
50-52	Total coliforms (counts/100 ml)	TOTALC
	(0-200) bacteria/100 ml (998) TNTC (999) missing value	

APPENDIX C  
CODED QUESTIONNAIRE DATA

1102250582	302	533	1	0221	31	34002021	60032030	0	1	KOSRAE DATA
1103250582	202	531	1	1221	06	18001001	36022137	0	12	
1104250582	103	521	1	1121	01	73032201	36032240	0	2	
1105250582	252	511	1	0121	01	34002221	80032340	1	10	
1106250582	121	531	0	0221	61	51002221	48002199	0	3	
1107250582	501	511	1	0221	61	51012221	113012150	0	0	
1108270582	1002	521	2	2121	61	022221	021250	0	3	
1109270582	102	521	4	1121	61	022221	012250	0	7	
1110270582	142	511	4	4121	61	32032011	022155	0	19	
1111270582	302	521	1	12121	61	020001	012125	0	3	
1112270582	502	522	1	1221	61	022221	031150	0	14	
1113020682	502	513	2	0121	61	15002121	90011170	0	0	
1114020682	1002	521	0	0121	61	57032211	60021260	0	8	
1115020682	502	531	1	0121	61	72032221	48011170	0	1	
1116020682	2002	104	199	200	01	100012221	200021050	0	1	
1117020682	252	533	0	0221	61	38002111	40021150	0	0	
1118020682	353	513	199	121	61	16031011	20022340	0	0	
1119020682	252	532	1	0221	61	22031011	20012310	0	2	
1120020682	502	511	1	0121	61	60012221	48022335	0	4	
1121020682	1502	511	1	0221	61	51032221	44031350	0	2	
1122020682	1603	533	199	221	61	51012201	225022175998	10		
1123070682	320	521	1	0221	61	45012221	50011130	0	13	
1124070682	101	511	1	1221	61	51022221	96021250	0	0	
1125070682	350	521	1	0221	61	51032221	530323	0	1	54
1126070682	152	821	999	9021	61	98012221	43012125	0	0	
1127170682	302	513	199	121	61	22022201	0001	0998	12	
1128170682	351	513	2	0121	61	10021011	021150	3	28	
1129170682	452	513	1	1121	61	34012221	002250	1	0	
1130170682	192	811	0	0121	61	80012221	012250998	1		
1131170682	252	813	1	1121	61	012101	012125998	2		
1232030682	52	521	1	299121	68	712121	50021215	10	2	
1234030682	2002	522	4	1221	61	58002221	60021350	2	46	
1235030682	502	511	12	0121	62	30012111	60032310	0	3	
1236030682	502	521	1	0121	61	0221111	126012115	0	2	
1337240582	02	111	0	0121	71	80022221	1300012350	0	2	
1338240582	02	511	0	0221	01	34002121	1120031350	0	0	
1339240582	02	514	0	0221	61	34021011	1150011199	0	0	
1340240582	02	110	0	0121	61	60022221	58021265	0	0	
1341240582	02	124	1	299121	61	97012221	72011115	0	15	
1442200582	72	523	12	1121	61	60021211	120012115	0	4	
1443200582	53	523	12	12121	61	18002211	1240022310	0	1	
1444200582	22	521	12	12121	61	34002211	1120012050	28	0	
1445200582	302	521	12	0221	66	8002121	75023335	6	0	
1446200582	1002	521	12	12121	61	29002221	14012199	12	14	
1447200582	202	531	12	12121	61	25001011	90011165	8	44	
1448200582	1002	521	12	1121	61	34002221	70022155	0	0	
1449200582	1002	521	4	1121	61	221002221	1105021120	0	0	
1450200582	502	521	12	12221	61	18002221	60020050	0	0	
1451200582	1002	521	12	0121	61	34002221	0011050	0	0	
1452200582	00	500	999	9021	01	34002221	1250022135	0	0	
1453200582	02	510	991	2221	61	18002121	13000221	5	0	0
1454250582	1002	521	12	12121	71	14022121	40012140	1	0	
1455250582	452	511	1	1121	61	24022101	48022350	0	0	
1456250582	1002	512	1	1121	61	100002201	140011199	0	1	

1457250582	382	511	1	1221	61	34012221	48001150	0	0	
1558260582	171	511	199221	61	22021011	021150	1	10		
1559260582	181	511	1	0221	61	34012101	021030	0	2	
1560260582	351	511	199221	61	700210111100002150		0	4		
1561260582	151	511	199221	61	34021011	40024010	0	0		
1562260582	122	511	1	1221	61100002201120022150		0	6		
1563260582	101	511	0	0221	66	10002101	22521299	2	12	
1664290582	02	5209999121			611300110011500121	5	1	15		
1665290582	452	511	1	1221	61	51012201	72011250	0	0	
2101260582	142	51112	0122	62	5002121	80021030	0999			PONAPE DATA
2102260582	63	513	5	0123	62	23001011	60011240	0999		
2103260582	303	513	3	0122	62	23002111	88012225	0999		
2104260582	302	510	3	1222	62	30002121200012125	0999			
2105260582	1003	11112	0223	72	30210119000111	3	45999			
2106260582	102	511	3	0123	62	20002111	60012120	1999		
2107260582	01	3109999023	88		701011	62000015150999				
2108260582	193	511	2	1223	82	25021011150011150	1999			
2109260582	202	511	3	0022	62	10002111	40000025	0999		
2210250582	502	531	6	6121	86	14002111	75021250	27999		
2211250582	252	111	1	1121	76	16002121	50031230	1999		
2212250582	1003	511	0	1121	74	20002121	600123	0	10999	
2213250582	1002	511	1	1121	64	57002121	62021199	18999		
2214250582	72	531	6	6221	61	50001011	75021165	0999		
2215250582	1502	531	4	1021	85	7001011120021115	0999			
2316250582	152	511	1	1121	65	8002111120021120	0999			
2317250582	151	4009999000	05		000000	0000	0	8999		
3101201282	02	611	2	2123	38	1531011	18032399	57998		YAP DATA
3102201282	52	821	2	2123	88	6031011	12034080	0	0	
3103201282	32	621	2	2123	88	1531011	20011180998998			
3104201282	00	0009999000	08		1521011	30022340998998				
3105201282	92	82112	2229	68	3031011	45021150999998				
3106201282	32	821	1	2122	88	1511011	28032399	2	30	
3107201282	82	821	2	4122	88	3032111	12034060	26998		
3108201282	82	821	1	1123	88	2022111	15013399998998			
3110201282	92	821	2	1122	88	5022111	40023260998998			
3111121082	00	0009999000	08		711010	000000000	3			
3112121082	3502	531	299129	81	78012111120021250	2	23			
3113121082	61	521	1	3224	68	732321	40031335	6	4	
3114121082	03	8009999000	01		43031011120024020	0	0			
3115121082	652	111	0	0110	01	84012111260021033	0	12		
3116121082	62	821	0	1210	09	5012511200001099	51	0		
3117121082	153	821	1	0210	08	2931011	62012330	0	5	
3118151282	152	5219999024	34		011011125022	99	2	3		
3119151282	00	0009999000	01205002221		0121	0	0	0		
3120151282	602	521	4	4224	31	45012212126011199	1	2		
3121151282	4002	5312020224	31320002220		0000	0	4	0		
3122151282	01	113	120000	00	000000	0000	0	3998		
3123151282	902	5219999124	31320012221		80011150	25	30			
3124151282	192	5211212124	31	51002201	25012299	0	19			
3125151282	502	1219999124	313200	2211240011199		0	19			
3126151282	152	8219999124	31	65002201	36011199	0	0			
3127151282	202	821	1	1122	31	012221	36012199998	46		
3128151282	02	1219999229	16	1812111	20021199	0	0			
3129151282	02	1119999110	07	79002321160011199		0	0			

3130151282	22	5219999229	81	15022201	60012199	0	0
3131151282	502	831 0 0110	07265002201250012099	5	30		
3132151282	252	52112 0229	31 13002211 30031250	0	0		
3133151282	3502	13199 0129	31320002221240012199	1	10		
3134151282	452	531 1 1224	31320002222120011199998998				
3135151282	252	131 0 2124	61 10002211 45032399	42998			
3136151282	402	111 2 0110	01 90012222 30014099	0	1		
3137151282	122	121 3 0224	68 1522111 30032299	0	97		
3138151282	152	521 3 1229	56 002121 20022199	2	8		
4101090882	172	531 4 0221	86 9002121 80013250	6	1	PALAU DATA	
4102090882	102	511 3 0221	88 2221011 90032310	0	93		
4103090882	122	111 1 0121	76 11002101 80021125135200				
4104090882	201	511 3 2121	61 43002221250011140	0	0		
4105090882	152	111 3 6121	71 50002121120011350	0	0		
4106090882	00	0009999000	06 19002122250011125	2	16		
4107090882	71	11116 3121	78 1531011120032110	3	10		
4108090882	202	531 1 0121	66130002121900001110	4	18		
4109090882	52	121 1 1121	76 27002121240021115	0	0		
4110090882	132	131 1 0121	83 2531021250032220	0	2		
4111090882	202	51112 1121	66 18002111160012215	49998			
4112090882	72	531 1 1221	66 18002111100011150	0	0		
4113090882	72	121 2 0121	76 14002111 70011150	1	79		
4114090882	123	113 2 0121	83 5000001 90011130	0	0		
4115151082	142	531 0 0123	61120002221 62012250	1	8		
4116200982	42	511 0 0121	65 002121200012150	0	0		
4117151082	102	111 2 0121	88 1512421 90012110	20998			
4118200982	92	51112 0221	88 1531021 30032380	0	0		
4119151082	202	522 0 0121	66 17002321250022225	0	25		
4120200982	32	511 0 0221	66 001021 30012250	1	1		
4121200982	162	111 0 0121	76 001011 80032250	26998			
4122200982	122	13299 4121	76 002121 60012199	0	4		
4123151082	42	5129999121	63 3502321 90002025	13	24		
4124151082	32	122 6 6121	68 2222121 75002230121	21			
4125151082	52	122 0 0121	77 25021212400111	5	0	5	
4126200982	02	111 099210	03180002512120012250	6	0		
4127151082	102	511 5 2121	66 14022121250021240	15	4		
4128151082	752	511 0 0121	61200002201 70011160	0	0		
4130151082	52	121 6 6121	78 15124211200140	5	3	35	
4131151082	01	0209999021	81 80012201 900100	0102998			
4132151082	03	1119999110	06130002101360021099	0	28		
4133151082	62	521 0 0121	66 14022121160021150	45	20		
4134171182	82	5211212121	63 001011 450240	5	0999		
4135171182	152	5319999221	89 5012121 50011150	1999			
4136171182	52	5139999121	76 27032111 80021230998999				
4137171182	502	513 0 0123	01 40002221990002250	0999			
4138171182	82	5219999121	76 170010100000000000	1999			
4248181182	30	0009999000	04 012011 20022150	0	1		
4249181182	30	0009999000	06 000001 15012150998998				
4250181182	50	0009999000	01 002001 30012050	0	0		
4251181182	30	0009999000	06 3300011 22522350	2	11		
4252181182	40	0009999000	08 721021 37512250	0	0		
4253181182	20	0009999000	08 2212021 37512150	7	17		
4254181182	30	0009999000	08 2912001 150240	5	0	0	
4255181182	40	0009999000	06 20002001 30022250	1	3		

4256181182	60	0009999000	08	722011	30022130	0	3
4257181182	40	0009999000	08	712011	11050240	5	0139
4258181182	20	0009999000	06	002021	30012299	0	0
4259181182	40	0009999000	06	3000011	22522250	113998	
4260181182	50	0009999000	08	712021	11050140	5	0 18
4261181182	60	0009999000	06	012011	22522140	0	3
4262181182	60	0009999000	06	002021	22512130	0	0
4263181182	30	0009999000	08	2211021	75014005	4	99
4264181182	30	0009999000	08	2911021	45012125	0	0
4265181182	70	0009999000	06	002121	24012130	0	0
4266181182	40	0009999000	04	1612111	22512150	21	13
4267181182	20	0009999000	08	4410021	500140	5	0 0
4268181182	50	0009999000	08	711021	450140	5	0 0
4269181182	60	0009999000	06	002011	60012150	0	0
4271181182	60	0009999000	06	8002001	225121	0	0 0
4372	1282	82 811 0 0224	61	12001021	40011150999999		
4373	1282	82 711 1 1124	61	12011011	28012380999999		
4374	1282	110 800 2 2124	61	20012021	46011167999999		
4375	1282	80 811 2 2224	61	4001021	23021133999999		
4376	1282	80 0009999024	01	16002020	0000 09999999		
4377	1282	00 0009999124	61	10002011	18011150999999		
4378	1282	00 0009999000	01	28002021	14012250999999		
4379	1282	50 800 2 2224	01	18002021	20022275999999		
4380	1282	100 800 1 0224	71	14002021	12011150999999		
4381	1282	60 800 1 0124	61	10002021	10011150999999		
4382	1282	80 800 1 0124	31	002021	860311 09999999		
4383	1282	70 800 3 0124	61	10002111	18032250999999		
4384	1282	110 800 1 0124	61	13002021	250111 09999999		
4385	1282	30 800 1 1124	61	9002021	80122509999999		
4386	1282	40 8009999020	61	10002021	90122259999999		
4387	1282	150 800 0 0124	61	11002021	28012175999999		
4388	1282	120 500 1 0124	61	10002021	70121509999999		
4389	1282	90 800 199224	61	10002021	18012150999999		
4390	1282	90 500 1 0224	61	10002021	27011167999999		
4391	1282	60 500 1 0124	61	10002021	160122 09999999		
4392	1282	00 0009999000	00	50002021	011199999999		
4393	1282	50 800 2 0124	61	180 2021	1500111 09999999		
4394	1282	20 800 2 0124	01	10002021	18012150999999		
4395	1282	00 100 1 1110	00	4502011	960122 09999999		
4397	1282	50 801 2 2124	69	6002021	26012150999999		
4398	1282	70 500 1 1124	61	10002021	80123509999999		