

Analyzing multiple-source water usage patterns and affordability in rural central Appalachia

Emerald Dudzinski^{1*}, Kimberly Ellis¹, Leigh-Anne Krometis², Kate Albi², Alasdair Cohen³

1 Grado Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, Virginia, United States of America

2 Department of Biological Systems Engineering, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, Virginia, United States of America

3 Department of Population Health Sciences, Virginia Tech, Blacksburg, Virginia, United States of America

* emerald@vt.edu

Technical Report, CELDi 2024-01

**Center for Excellence in Logistics and Distribution (CELDi)
Grado Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering
Virginia Tech
Blacksburg, VA 20406**

July 18, 2024

Abstract

Nearly 500,000 American households lack complete plumbing, and more than 21 million Americans are reliant on public drinking water systems with at least one annual health-based drinking water violation. Rural, low-income, and minority communities are significantly more likely to be burdened with unavailable or unsafe in-home drinking water. Lack of access and distrust of the perceived quality of municipally supplied water are leading an increasing number of Americans to rely instead on less regulated, more expensive, and potentially environmentally detrimental water sources, such as roadside springs and bottled water. Previous research studies have stressed the importance of considering the economic burden of all water related expenditures including financial and non-financial water related costs; however, past examinations of water costs have primarily focused on municipal water supplies. We propose an economic model to consider the full economic burden associated with multiple-source water use by incorporating both direct costs (e.g., utility bills, well maintenance, bottled water purchase, payments for water hauling/delivery) and indirect water-related expenditures (e.g., transportation costs to gather water, productivity lost due to time spent collecting). Using data gathered from household surveys along with the economic model, this study estimates the economic burden from two case studies in rural Central Appalachia with persistent water quality concerns: (1) McDowell County, WV (n=15) and (2) Letcher and Harlan Counties, KY (n=9). All surveyed households (n=24) rely on multiple-source water to meet their needs, frequently citing their perception of unsafe in-home tap water. Bottled water was the most common choice for drinking water in both settings (92%, n=24), though roadside spring use was also prevalent in McDowell County, WV (53%, n=15). The results show that multiple-water source use is associated with a large economic burden. Households reliant primarily on bottled water as their drinking water source spent 12.3% (McDowell County, WV) and 5.6% (Letcher and Harlan Counties, KY) of their respective county's median household income (MHI) on water related expenditures. Households reliant primarily on roadside springs as their drinking water source spent 11.8% (McDowell County, WV) of MHI on water related expenditures. Hence, the vast majority of participating households (92%, n=24) spend above the US water affordability threshold of 2% MHI. The application of this economic model highlights major water affordability concerns in water insecure Appalachian communities and provides a foundation for future studies and enhancements.

1 Introduction

1.1 Safe drinking water insecurity and inequality in the US

Issues related to drinking water safety persist in the United States. Nearly 500,000 American households lack complete plumbing, meaning they lack either (1) hot and cold running water, (2) a sink with a faucet, (3) a bath or a shower, or some combination [1]. Recent analyses have revealed that more than 1,000 community water systems do not consistently achieve the water quality and monitoring requirements of the US Safe Drinking Water Act (SDWA) [1]; this translates to an estimate of over 21 million Americans who are reliant on public drinking water systems with at least one annual health-based drinking water violation [2]. Apart from those reliant on federally regulated water sources (i.e. municipal water supplies), an additional 23 million American households rely on private, unregulated drinking water wells [3]. As the responsibility of all monitoring and maintenance is left to homeowners, private water sources have increased risk for contamination and reliability concerns [4–10].

Increasing evidence suggests that the burden of water access is not distributed equally. Socioeconomic factors consistent with well-recognized social inequalities including education, poverty, age, and race/ethnicity are associated with higher rates of incomplete plumbing and/or higher risk of water quality violations [1, 11–14]. Rurality is also highly predictive of challenges to safe household water access both because violations of public drinking water systems are spatially clustered in rural communities [2], and because reliance on unregulated private water systems is higher in rural regions [3, 4, 15].

1.2 Rise of bottled water reliance

The recent increase in bottled water use in American homes is complex, but has been primarily attributed to lack of access to and distrust in in-home tap water [16–18]. US sales of bottled water have increased more than twofold, from 6 billion gallons purchased in 2001 to 15 billion gallons totaling \$36.2 billion in 2020 [17]. In addition to negative environmental impacts at the source, high energy costs associated with processing and transportation, and plastic waste [16, 19–22], bottled water represents a financial burden for reliant homes. Estimates suggest bottled water is 500 to 1,000 times more expensive than municipal drinking water [19]. Given that low-income communities are more likely to struggle with issues of poor in-home water quality, the financial burden placed on these communities is significant [16].

1.3 Multiple-source water use in Central Appalachia

Central Appalachia is widely recognized as a region of water insecurity in the US [1, 23–27]. Previous work has documented in-home water quality issues in point of use water samples, including the presence of health-based contaminants such as fecal indicator bacteria (e.g., *E. coli*), heavy metals (e.g., Pb, Fe), and radon, as well as elevated concentrations of metals associated with aesthetic issues [9, 25, 26, 28–30]. Somewhat unique to the region, some residents rely wholly or partially on roadside spout springs, despite widespread contamination, to meet household needs [25, 31–33]. Consistent with the trends at the national level, to avoid poor in-home water quality, bottled water reliance is also quite common [34–37]. The associated economic burden with bottled water reliance has yet to be quantified. This study aims to quantify the expenditures associated with meeting household needs through multiple-source water use in Central Appalachia through two case studies: (1) McDowell County, West Virginia (WV) and (2) Letcher and Harlan Counties, Kentucky (KY).

1.4 Quantifying affordability

United Nations (UN) Sustainable Development Goal 6 (SDG6) calls for safe and affordable water for all by 2030 [38]; yet, there is ongoing debate regarding the definition of “affordability” [39, 40]. Previous works most commonly rely on affordability ratios comparing the water costs as a percentage of income [39, 41–44]. This approach allows for comparison to affordability thresholds set by individual countries (2% for the US) and international organizations such as the United Nations Development Programme, World Bank, Organisation for Economic Cooperation and Development (OECD), which have established thresholds between 3% and 5% of household income [40, 43, 45, 46]. Other proposed benchmarks for affordability take into account the volume used to meet basic needs or compare water expenditures to other utility bills [39, 41, 43].

Though multiple works have stressed the importance of considering all water related expenditures including financial and non-financial water related costs, the data-intensive nature of

such analyses renders this a challenging task [39,41,43]. Critically, past examinations of water costs have primarily focused on municipal water supplies alone; there are no available cost estimates even for the established practice of well water use [41]. In keeping with previous recommendations, this effort creates an economic model of water affordability, considering not a sole source, but the entire range of water sources used to meet household needs in rural settings, including municipal, well, bottled, and spring sources as well as taking into account both direct (e.g., purchase, payments) and indirect (e.g., transportation, productivity lost) expenditures related to the multiple-source water use. This research was conducted in collaboration with Kimberly Ellis, Associate Professor, Grado Department of Industrial and Systems Engineering; Leigh-Anne Krometis, Professor, Department of Biological Systems Engineering; Kate Albi, Masters student, Department of Biological Systems Engineering; and Alasdair Cohen, Assistant Professor, Department of Population Health Sciences.

2 Research settings

Given our intention to assess multiple-source water use and affordability in low-income rural households, we selected two case studies in communities in the Central Appalachian sub-region of the United States (Fig 1). This sub-region, as defined by the Appalachian Regional Commission, is particularly associated with environmental health disparities and severe poverty [23, 47, 48]. McDowell County, WV is the 3rd poorest county in the US [49], with a 2022 median household income of \$28,235 and 37.6% of residents living below the national poverty line [50]. Though slightly less severe, conditions in the Kentucky setting also reflect significant challenges. Letcher County had a median household income of \$38,466 and 28.7% of residents live below the national poverty line [50]. Harlan County has a median household income \$35,128 and 26.9% of residents live below the national poverty line [50]. The following analyses cluster these into two case studies: (1) McDowell County, West Virginia (n=15) and (2) Letcher and Harlan Counties, Kentucky (n=9).




Figure 1: **Research settings map.** Map of the Appalachian region as defined by the Appalachian Regional Commission with McDowell County, WV highlighted in purple and Letcher and Harlan Counties, KY highlighted in blue.

[51]

3 Methods

3.1 Ethics statement

This study uses findings obtained from distributed questionnaires to human participants. All recruitment methods, community partnerships, and research procedures were pre-approved and overseen by the Virginia Tech Institutional Review Board (VT IRB approval number #22-599). The recruitment period started on September 1, 2022 and ended on November 8, 2023. Informed consent was obtained from all participants via written consent forms.

3.2 Household recruitment and community partnerships

Participating households were recruited in partnership with local nonprofit organizations (Dig Deep Inc. and God's Outreach Center in West Virginia and Headwaters Inc. in Kentucky). Households represented families already working in partnership with the local nonprofits or friends and neighbors of those households who learned about the research study and expressed interest in participating.

All participants completed a survey detailing use, perceptions, motivations, and expenditures (both time and money) related to in-home piped, bottled water, and roadside spring use, if applicable. Data was collected in McDowell County, WV in November 2022 and in Letcher and Harlan Counties, KY in November 2023. Questions were adapted from those used in [10, 52] and in-brief addressed:

- demographics (i.e. racial identification, homeowner status, household income range, education level, marital status), specific water use behaviors (i.e. primary drinking water source, secondary drinking water source, primary cooking water source, primary bathing water source);
- financial costs (i.e. average water bill cost, cost of annual spring or private well maintenance, sewage costs, average electricity bill cost);
- behaviors and perceptions related to water quality (point-of-use water treatment habits and reasoning, perceptions of household non-bottled water quality, primary and secondary issues with households' water source);
- bottled water information (i.e. reasoning for consuming bottled water, size of bottle, frequency of purchase, go-to brand, estimated expenditure on bottled water purchase, store of purchase, distance from store);
- roadside spring information (i.e. reasoning for consuming roadside spring water, distance from roadside spring, frequency of collection);
- well-being (i.e. frequency of non-serious illness, frequency of serious illness, change in health of community);
- other (sweet beverage consumption, stain remover purchase, availability of hot running water, whether plumbing is complete (functioning toilet, sink, and shower), sewage type, septic tank maintenance, essential water uses).

For their participation in the study, households received free in-home water quality testing and analysis. Though the present study addresses the economic analysis, water quality results are analyzed and described by [28, 29] and overall relevant trends will be discussed briefly in

Results. The scope of this paper aims to characterize typical water usage patterns between sources and assess water affordability by considering recurring direct costs (e.g., purchase, payments) and indirect costs (e.g., transportation, productivity lost) associated with different sources.

3.3 Measuring affordability

We measured affordability using expenditures as a share of median household income (MHI) in each respective county as reported by the US Census Bureau and provide comparison to the US affordability threshold of 2% in the Results [43, 45, 50]. We aimed to consider the full economic burden by measuring both financial direct costs (i.e. utility bills, well maintenance, bottled water purchase, payments for water hauling/delivery) and non-financial indirect water related expenditures (i.e. transportation costs to gather water, productivity lost due to time spent collecting).

3.4 Data analysis

In this study, a set S of water sources is evaluated, including utility ($u \in S$), private wells ($w \in S$), bottled water ($b \in S$), and roadside springs ($r \in S$). For an individual residence or household, i , the objective is to estimate the cost (c_{is}) of obtaining water from each source used. One of the aims of this study was to integrate both direct costs (d_{is}) and indirect costs (n_{is}) for each residence and water source, such that

$$c_{is} = d_{is} + n_{is}.$$

The recurring annual costs for each resident to obtain water from all sources were estimated as follows:

$$C_i = \sum_{s \in S} c_{is}.$$

For each household, the reported **direct costs** (financial water related data) were converted into average annual payments per household. The potential direct costs include utility bill (b_{is}), maintenance costs for wells or other infrastructure (m_{is}), purchase costs of bottled water (p_{is}), and direct delivery or haulage costs (h_{is}). Reports of routinely paying a person outside the household for bottled water or roadside spring deliveries were considered direct costs. Thus, the direct costs for each residence and water source were estimated as follows:

$$d_{is} = b_{is} + p_{is} + m_{is} + h_{is}.$$

The **indirect costs** considered in this study include personal transportation costs (t_{is}) and potential productivity losses (l_{is}). These costs, which were not reported by the participants, were estimated using publicly available data on state gas prices, average miles per gallon in the US, and state minimum wage rates. Thus, the indirect costs for each residence and water source were estimated as follows:

$$n_{is} = t_{is} + l_{is}.$$

Transportation costs were estimated for trips to a store to purchase bottled water and trips to the roadside spring to haul water. Respondents reported the time from their residence to local stores and roadside springs in minutes spent on a one-way trip. We converted this time spent on a one-way trip to total hours spent traveling per year to a source (y_{is}) by using their

reported frequency of visiting the store or roadside spring, considering round trip distances, and converting these minutes to hours.

We then estimated their yearly mileage (m_{is}) by estimating average speed (s_i) that each resident could travel on such trips, such that $m_{is} = y_{is} \times s_i$. For this study, we used $s_i = 45$ miles per hour due to the rural locations of residents. For these settings, we assumed the residents were using gasoline powered vehicles. Thus, we converted the yearly mileage into the annual cost of gas for traveling to obtain bottled water or travel to haul roadside spring water by using the 2022 average US light duty vehicle efficiency ($e = 22.8$ miles per gallon) [53] and the yearly average of the price of regular gas (g_i) in the respective state (\$3.40 for residences in WV and \$3.16 for residences in KY) [54]. Thus, $t_{is} = m_{is} \times g_i / e$.

Similarly, to quantify productivity lost traveling to each source (l_{is}) we followed the World Health Organization’s (WHO) guide, comparing the opportunity cost of time to the minimum wage rate [55]. Productivity losses were estimated using the time lost for roundtrip travel to the store for bottled water purchases and the roadside springs. We converted the hours spent traveling to collect water per year (y_{is}) into productivity losses by using the minimum wage rate (w_i) in the respective state (\$8.75 for residences in in WV and \$7.25 for residences in KY) to estimate the opportunity cost of time spent collecting for working age adults [56]. Thus, $l_{is} = w_i \times y_{is}$.

For this study, Table 1 summarizes the types of costs that were reported or estimated for each water source. As shown, some residents hired someone outside their household to haul bottled water or roadside spring water for them and thus incurred a haulage cost (h_{is}). Some residents traveled to purchase bottled water or obtain roadside spring water and thus incurred personal transportation costs (t_{is}) and loss of productivity (l_{is}).

Table 1: **Direct and indirect costs associated with each evaluated drinking water source.**

Source	Direct Costs (d_{is})				Indirect Costs (n_{is})	
	Utility bills	Maintenance	Purchase	Haulage	Transportation	Loss of productivity
Utility	b_{is}	–	–	–	–	–
Private well	–	m_{is}	–	–	–	–
Bottled water	–	–	p_{is}	h_{is}	t_{is}	l_{is}
Roadside spring	–	–	–	h_{is}	t_{is}	l_{is}

4 Results and discussion

4.1 Survey demographics

Overall, we collected data from 24 households: 15 households in McDowell County, WV and 9 households in Letcher and Harlan Counties, KY. Of the 15 households recruited in McDowell County, WV, nearly half (47%), reported an annual household income of less than \$15,000 (i.e. roughly half the MHI of the county). Approximately 80% of households were below the national poverty line for a family of four, and 80% of households also reported an education level of high school or lower. All but one survey respondent identified their race as White alone. In terms of health, 60% reported having a household member sick monthly or more and 60% feel the health of the community has worsened over the last two years.

Though participants in both case studies struggle with water access and water quality concerns, the demographics of participants in Letcher and Harlan Counties, KY were very different

than those in McDowell County. Of the 9 households, two-thirds (67%), reported an annual household income of more than \$50,000, which is above the MHI in each of the respective counties. These participants were also more educated: 89% of households also reported continuing education levels beyond high school. All survey respondents identified as White alone. Reported household health was much better than the McDowell County respondents with only 11% reported having a household member sick monthly or more. However, perceptions of community health were similar, with 67% reporting feelings that the health of the community has worsened over the last two years. Differences in participant demographics reflect the different populations currently working with each of the community nonprofit groups.

4.2 Water usage patterns

Multiple-source water use was prevalent among all participating households. Fig 2 illustrates the primary and secondary drinking water sources of the participants in each setting. Results from both settings were consistent with previous reports of multiple-source water use being motivated by perceived poor water quality [25, 27, 31, 33]. 73% of participants in McDowell County and 100% of participants in Letcher and Harlan Counties view their non-bottled water quality as satisfactory or less. Therefore, in each setting, all but one respondent reported relying on bottled water as a primary or secondary drinking water source. These findings are consistent with recent reports of increased bottled water reliance from Appalachian communities [24, 34–37]. The mostly frequently cited reason for bottled water use was perception of unsafe tap water.

Notably, in McDowell County, roadside spring reliance was also common, with over half of participating households collecting roadside spring water as a drinking water source. No roadside spring use was reported in Letcher and Harlan Counties, highlighting another major difference from the McDowell County case study. However, the bottled water reliance and perceptions of unsafe tap water showcase that the issues of trust in the public municipal water sources and subsequent reliance on other sources occurred irrespective of income or education level.




Figure 2: **Drinking water sources.** McDowell County, West Virginia (left) and Letcher and Harlan Counties, Kentucky (right) primary and secondary drinking water sources.

Though the present work is focused on quantifying the costs of water in these settings, it is worth noting that point of use water quality contamination was not uncommon. Particularly in samples collected in McDowell County, in-home water samples were frequently positive for coliform (83%) and *E. coli* (33%). A variety of additional contaminants associated with taste

and aesthetics (iron, manganese, aluminum) and health (sodium) were detected at concentrations above US Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) standards and guidelines in both well and municipal samples. Bottled water samples did not violate any health-based guidelines. In-home water samples contained detectable per- and polyfluoroalkyl substances (PFAS) compounds, and all in-home, roadside spring, and bottled water samples contained detectable concentrations of microplastics. A complete discussion of water quality data and methodological sampling details is available in [28].

4.3 Direct versus indirect water expenditures

In McDowell County, WV, on average, half (51%) of household water-related expenditures were indirect costs (i.e. travel costs, lost time), though there was considerable variability between participating households (Fig 3). Regardless of this variability, it is worth noting that the water expenditures exceed the US affordability threshold of 2% of MHI for all but one household (where residents reported drinking their municipally supplied piped water). The high indirect costs reflect both the long travel distances to grocery stores, as well as the use of water hauled from roadside springs. It appears lower income households may offset direct financial payments by substituting monetary payments with more time spent collecting roadside spring water. Critically, if indirect costs were not considered, the low-income households would appear to bear a much smaller burden than they face in actuality.




Figure 3: **WV direct and indirect expenditures.** McDowell County, West Virginia direct versus indirect water expenditures as a percentage of median county household income, ordered from lowest (left) to highest (right) reported household income.

An examination of household expenditures in Letcher and Harlan Counties, KY differs distinctly from that estimated for McDowell County. On average, only 9% of household water expenditures for these participating households were associated with indirect costs, and the variability in water expenditures as a percentage of MHI was much lower (Fig 4). They also

spent a smaller percentage of their respective MHI than the participating households in the McDowell County case study. However, again, expenditures for all but one home exceeded the US affordability standard of 2%.




Figure 4: **KY direct and indirect expenditures.** Letcher and Harlan Counties, Kentucky direct versus indirect water expenditures as a percentage of median county household income, ordered from lowest (left) to highest (right) reported household income.

4.4 Water expenditures by individual expense

Examination of water expenditures broken down by individual expense similarly reveals distinct differences in the sources of expense between the two participant settings (Figs 5 and 6). As mentioned previously, distance to local grocers adds considerable expense to participating households in McDowell County reliant on bottled water. Households reported purchasing bottled water every five days and spending an average of 39 minutes for a one-way trip to the store, which adds considerable time and expense (Fig 5). Though roadside springs are closer (14 minutes one-way), they are generally visited more frequently (every 2-3 days). Frequency of water collection and longer distances contribute to a high indirect cost from gas used and productivity lost, especially for more remote households.

Though travel to purchase bottled water still accounted for a large portion of indirect costs for households participating in Kentucky (Fig 6), it was not as extreme. Participants reported an average of 14 minutes one-way travel time to buy bottled water and visited the store for bottled water purchases, on average, once every 10 days. No participating households in Kentucky relied on roadside springs, though a few participants did report well maintenance costs which were not reported by the participating households in West Virginia.




Figure 5: **WV total expenditures.** McDowell County, West Virginia total water related expenditures as a percentage of median county household income, ordered from lowest (left) to highest (right) reported household income. Total dollar amount spent by each household on water related expenditures is presented at the top of each bar.

4.5 Average affordability

Considering annual expenditures by primary drinking water source, households relying on bottled water as their primary drinking water source spent the most on water expenses in both case studies (Fig 7) though the actual amount varied due to differences in average distance from store and frequency of visits as discussed above. It should also be noted that the difference in MHI by study area further contributes to differences in percent of expenditures: Letcher and Harlan Counties, KY have higher respective MHIs (\$38,466, \$35,128) than McDowell County, WV (\$28,235) [50]. In West Virginia, households relying primarily on roadside springs as their drinking water source also spent a large portion of MHI on water expenses (11.8%) reemphasizing the importance of quantifying the total economic burden rather than just direct financial expenditures because roadsides springs have no inherent direct costs. Households reliant primarily on piped water for drinking, in contrast, were roughly aligned with the US affordability standard: 1.9% in West Virginia and 2.3% in Kentucky. The one household relying primarily on well water in Kentucky spent the least of all households as a percentage of MHI, spending just 1.4%.

4.6 Cost of bottled water

All participating households relied on multiple sources of water to meet their household needs, including piped water, bottled water, well water, and in McDowell County, hauled water from roadside springs. Previous work has stressed that bottled water is much more expensive than other sources, so it is notable that bottled water is the beverage of choice in high poverty communities. 73% of households in McDowell County, WV and 67% in Letcher and Harlan Counties, KY reported relying primarily on bottled water for drinking. As illustrated in Fig 8, average bottled water expenditures alone (i.e. removal of costs associated with well mainte-




Figure 6: **KY total expenditures.** Letcher and Harlan Counties, Kentucky total water related expenditures as a percentage of median county household income, ordered from lowest (left) to highest (right) reported household income. Total dollar amount spent by each household on water related expenditures is presented at the top of each bar.

nance, utility bills, or roadside spring visits) exceed the US affordability standard of 2% of MHI for those households primarily reliant on bottled water for drinking. Although the WHO currently considers bottled (packaged) water an improved source [57], it is worth considering whether reliance on such an expensive water source during non-crisis time periods is acceptable for high poverty communities, as lost funds could be invested towards other needs to improve household standards of living and well-being.

4.7 Limitations

This study was not designed to be broadly generalizable to rural Appalachian populations or even those residing in the target counties. Given issues of trust, examinations of water insecurity often rely on small samples of convenience within communities [7, 25, 58]. However, there is an inherent recruitment bias (i.e. self-selection bias as participating households are working with the community partners and may be experiencing severe water insecurity that is not representative of the community at large). Conversely, willingness to participate may also indicate that these households have the privilege or confidence to seek out external support to help with their water insecurity. Regardless of motivation, survey participants are using personal recall to answer the survey questions which could lead to skewed data. To mitigate these biases, we compared the direct and indirect cost estimations to the median household income (MHI) for the respective county, rather than the reported household income. In McDowell County, WV, participating households had, on average, household income levels below the median county household income which led to our reported expenditures as a percentage of MHI being lower, on average, than the actual household expenditures experienced by participants. In Letcher and Harlan Counties, KY, participating households had, on average, higher household incomes than their respective median county household income which led to our reported expenditures as a




Figure 7: **Average expenditures.** McDowell County, West Virginia (left) and Letcher and Harlan Counties, Kentucky (right) average water related expenditures as a percentage of median county household income by primary drinking water source.




Figure 8: **Average bottled water expenditures.** Average bottled water expenditures as a percentage of MHI for households primarily reliant on bottled water for drinking.

percentage of MHI being higher, on average, than the actual household expenditures experienced by participating households.

This research begins to pave the way to considering a more holistic economic affordability approach to water expenditures. Additional indirect costs related to water insecurity that require attention include the costs of water treatment supplies (e.g., point-of-use filters), health-care costs associated with water insecurity (e.g., medical bills from conditions associated with poor in-home water quality), additional productivity losses (e.g., taking a day off work to fix a well or missing a day of school due to water-related illness), and environmental impacts (e.g., plastic waste associated with bottled water use). Thus, our findings in this paper are likely still an underestimate of the true total economic burden faced by these households due to water insecurity.

However, despite the limitations, this study highlights major water affordability concerns in water insecure Appalachian communities. The results also confirm the need previously expressed in the literature to consider direct and indirect costs to quantify of the total economic burden of water insecurity on households.

5 Conclusion

Though prior research in Appalachia has examined water quality metrics in line with United Nations Sustainable Development Goal 6, this study explicitly examined associated affordability. In keeping with previous national and regional studies, results suggest bottled water reliance is high in Central Appalachia and associated with perceptions of poor in-home water quality. Although the incidence of contamination in US bottled water appears low [28, 29, 59], which may make it palatable to communities with poor in-home quality, this effort highlights the high costs associated with bottled water acquisition. Reliance solely on bottled water to meet household potable needs inevitably exceeds proposed water affordability metrics, particularly in communities with high poverty. Improving in-home water access would likely result in freed income that could be invested in improving household education, health, and housing. At the community level, research suggests that there are economic returns of over 5:1 for money invested into improving water access [24, 55, 60]. Ideally, quantification of economic burden will serve as motivation for the design of novel strategies to reduce water insecurity and rebuild trust in areas of high water inequity.

6 Acknowledgments

This work was funded by the Institute for Society, Culture, and Environment at Virginia Tech as well as the Institute for Critical Technology and Applied Science at Virginia Tech. Community outreach was supported by Abigail Bradshaw (Engineering Project Coordinator, DigDeep Inc.), Teldia and Joe Haywood (Founders, God's Outreach Center), and Debi Sexton (Field Director, Headwaters Inc.). Leigh-Anne Krometis and Kate Abli collected the data through in-person community surveys. Alasdair Cohen helped to create the surveys. Leigh-Anne Krometis, Kate Albi, and Alasdair Cohen conducted research on the quality of water samples they collected in-tandem with the community surveys.

References

- [1] Mueller JT, Gasteyer S. The widespread and unjust drinking water and clean water crisis in the United States. *Nature Communications*. 2021;12. doi:10.1038/s41467-021-23898-z.
- [2] Allaire M, Wu H, Lall U. National trends in drinking water quality violations. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 2018;115:2078–2083. doi:10.1073/pnas.1719805115.
- [3] Murray A, Hall A, Weaver J, Kremer F. Methods for Estimating Locations of Housing Units Served by Private Domestic Wells in the United States Applied to 2010. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association*. 2021;57:828–843. doi:10.1111/1752-1688.12937.
- [4] Lee D, Murphy HM. Private Wells and Rural Health: Groundwater Contaminants of Emerging Concern. *Current environmental health reports*. 2020;7:129–139. doi:10.1007/s40572-020-00267-4.

- [5] Ingram JC, Jones L, Credo J, Rock T. Uranium and arsenic unregulated water issues on Navajo lands. *Journal of Vacuum Science Technology A: Vacuum, Surfaces, and Films*. 2020;38. doi:10.1116/1.5142283.
- [6] Lockhart S, Wood E, Gibson JM. Impacts of Exclusion From Municipal Water Service on Water Availability: A Case Study. *New Solutions*. 2020;30:127–137. doi:10.1177/1048291120932913/ASSET/IMAGES/LARGE/10.1177_1048291120932913-FIG2.JPEG.
- [7] Gibson JMD, Desclos A, Harrington J, McElmurry SP, Mulhern R. Effect of Community Water Service on Lead in Drinking Water in an Environmental Justice Community. *Environmental Science and Technology*. 2024;58:1441–1451. doi:10.1021/acs.est.3c01341.
- [8] Rowles LS, Hossain AI, Ramirez I, Durst NJ, Ward PM, Kirisits MJ, et al. Seasonal contamination of well-water in flood-prone colonias and other unincorporated U.S. communities. *Science of the Total Environment*. 2020;740. doi:10.1016/j.scitotenv.2020.140111.
- [9] Law RK, Murphy MW, Choudhary E. Private well groundwater quality in West Virginia, USA–2010. *Science of The Total Environment*. 2017;586:559–565. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2017.02.018.
- [10] Cohen A, Rasheduzzaman M, O’Connell B, Brown T, Taniuchi M, Krometis LA, et al. Drinking water sources, quality, and associated health outcomes in Appalachian Virginia: A risk characterization study in two counties. *International Journal of Hygiene and Environmental Health*. 2024;260:114390. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijheh.2024.114390.
- [11] Deitz S, Meehan K. Plumbing Poverty: Mapping Hot Spots of Racial and Geographic Inequality in U.S. Household Water Insecurity. *Annals of the American Association of Geographers*. 2019;109:1092–1109.
- [12] Switzer D, Teodoro MP. The Color of Drinking Water: Class, Race, Ethnicity, and Safe Drinking Water Act Compliance. *Journal AWWA*. 2017;109:40–45. doi:https://doi.org/10.5942/jawwa.2017.109.0128.
- [13] McDonald YJ, Jones NE. Drinking water violations and environmental justice in the United States, 2011–2015. *American Journal of Public Health*. 2018;108:1401–1407. doi:10.2105/AJPH.2018.304621.
- [14] III CWS, Krometis LA, Pingel T, Winling LD. Connections Between Present-Day Water Access and Historical Redlining. *Environmental Justice*. 2023;doi:10.1089/env.2022.0115.
- [15] Hernandez A, Pierce G. The geography and socioeconomic characteristics of U.S. households reliant on private wells and septic systems. *Journal of the American Water Resources Association*. 2023;59:1397–1412. doi:10.1111/1752-1688.13135.
- [16] Javidi A, Pierce G. U.S. Households’ Perception of Drinking Water as Unsafe and its Consequences: Examining Alternative Choices to the Tap. *Water Resources Research*. 2018;54:6100–6113. doi:10.1029/2017WR022186.
- [17] Teodoro MP, Zuhlke S, Switzer D. *The Profits of Distrust: Citizen-Consumers, Drinking Water, and the Crisis of Confidence in the American Government*. Cambridge University Press; 2022.

- [18] Hu Z, Morton LW, Mahler RL. Bottled water: United States consumers and their perceptions of water quality. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2011;8:565–578. doi:10.3390/ijerph8020565.
- [19] Ferrier C. Bottled Water: Understanding a Social Phenomenon. *Ambio*. 2001;30:118–119.
- [20] Merkel PE, Ditto EK, Robien K, Sylvetsky AC. Perspective: Chaos in a Bottle - A Critical Evaluation of Beverage Categorization in Nutrition Research; 2020.
- [21] Levêque JG, Burns RC. Drinkingwater in West Virginia (USA): Tapwater or bottled water - what is the right choice for college students? *Journal of Water and Health*. 2018;16:827–838. doi:10.2166/wh.2018.129.
- [22] Fantin V, Scalbi S, Ottaviano G, Masoni P. A method for improving reliability and relevance of LCA reviews: The case of life-cycle greenhouse gas emissions of tap and bottled water. *Science of The Total Environment*. 2014;476-477:228–241. doi:https://doi.org/10.1016/j.scitotenv.2013.12.115.
- [23] Krometis LA, Gohlke J, Kolivras K, Satterwhite E, Marmagas SW, Marr LC. Environmental health disparities in the Central Appalachian region of the United States. *Reviews on Environmental Health*. 2017;32:253–266. doi:10.1515/reveh-2017-0012.
- [24] McGraw G, Fox R. Closing the Water Access Gap in the United States: A National Action Plan; 2019. Available from: <https://www.digdeep.org/close-the-water-gap>.
- [25] Patton H, Krometis LA, Sarver E. Springing for Safe Water: Drinking Water Quality and Source Selection in Central Appalachian Communities. *Water* 2020, Vol 12, Page 888. 2020;12:888. doi:10.3390/W12030888.
- [26] Unrine JM. Preliminary Technical Report: The Martin County Kentucky Community-Engaged Drinking Water Health Pilot Study; 2020.
- [27] Hughes J, Whisnant R, Weller L, Eskaf S, Richardson M, Morrissey S, et al.. *Drinking Water and Wastewater Infrastructure in Appalachia An Analysis of Capital Funding and Funding Gaps*; 2005.
- [28] Albi KN, Krometis LA, Cohen A, Ling E. Implications of Bottled Water Use in Rural Central Appalachia. 2024;.
- [29] Albi K, Dudzinski E, Krometis LA, Ellis K, Ling E, Cohen A, et al. Water Quality and Economic Implications Related to Bottled Water Reliance in Rural West Virginia; 2023. Available from: https://assets-global.website-files.com/612ff65cbe2ea70d8520ad8b/6534517817ca225f10650f87_Abstacts
- [30] Cobb JC, Rulo GK, Carey DI, Stickney JF. Kentucky Geological Survey Ground-Water Resources of Martin County, Kentucky; 2001. Available from: <https://kgs.uky.edu/kgsweb/download/wrs/MARTIN.pdf>.
- [31] Krometis L, Patton H, Wozniak A, Sarver E. Water Scavenging from Roadside Springs in Appalachia. *Journal of Contemporary Water Research Education*. 2019;166:46–56. doi:10.1111/j.1936-704x.2019.03301.x.

- [32] Arcipowski E, Schwartz J, Davenport L, Hayes M, Nolan T. Clean Water, Clean Life: Promoting Healthier, Accessible Water in Rural Appalachia. *Journal of Contemporary Water Research Education*. 2017;161:1–18. doi:10.1111/j.1936-704x.2017.3248.x.
- [33] Wies JR, Mays A, Collins SM, Young SL. “As Long As We Have the Mine, We’ll Have Water”: Exploring Water Insecurity in Appalachia. *Annals of Anthropological Practice*. 2020;44:65–76. doi:10.1111/napa.12134.
- [34] McSpirit S, Reid C. Residents’ perceptions of tap water and decisions to purchase bottled water: A survey analysis from the Appalachian, Big Sandy coal mining region of West Virginia. *Society and Natural Resources*. 2011;24:511–520. doi:10.1080/08941920903401432.
- [35] Cohen A, Cui J, Song Q, Xia Q, Huang J, Yan X, et al. Bottled water quality and associated health outcomes: a systematic review and meta-analysis of 20 years of published data from China. *Environmental Research Letters*. 2022;17. doi:10.1088/1748-9326/ac2f65.
- [36] Marion JW. Self-Reported Consumption of Bottled Water v. Tap Water in Appalachian and Non-Appalachian Kentucky. *Journal of Appalachian Health*. 2023;5:32–49. doi:https://doi.org/10.13023/jah.0502.04.
- [37] Grupper MA, Schreiber ME, Sorice MG. How perceptions of trust, risk, tap water quality, and salience characterize drinking water choices. *Hydrology*. 2021;8. doi:10.3390/hydrology8010049.
- [38] Nations U. The Sustainable Development Goals Report; 2023. Available from: <https://unstats.un.org/sdgs/report/2023/The-Sustainable-Development-Goals-Report-2023.pdf>.
- [39] Goddard JJ, Ray I, Balazs C. Water affordability and human right to water implications in California. *PLOS ONE*. 2021;16:e0245237. doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0245237.
- [40] for Europe UNEC, for Europe WHO. Making Water and Sanitation Affordable for All Policy Options and Good Practices to Ensure the Affordability of Safe Drinking Water and Sanitation Services in the Pan-European Region. United Nations Publications; 2022.
- [41] Goddard JJ, Ray I, Balazs C. How should water affordability be measured in the United States? A critical review. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Water*. 2022;9:e1573. doi:10.1002/WAT2.1573.
- [42] Martins R, Quintal C, Teotónio C, Antunes M. Water affordability across and within European countries: a microdata analysis. *Utilities Policy*. 2023;83. doi:10.1016/j.jup.2023.101609.
- [43] Mack EA, Wrase S. A Burgeoning Crisis? A Nationwide Assessment of the Geography of Water Affordability in the United States. *PLOS ONE*. 2017;12:e0169488. doi:10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0169488.
- [44] Consulting S. Affordability Assessment Tool for Federal Water Mandates; 2013.

- [45] Programme WJM, Analysis UWG, of Sanitation A, Water D. The measurement and monitoring of water supply, sanitation and hygiene (WASH) affordability: a missing element of monitoring of Sustainable Development Goal (SDG) Targets 6.1 and 6.2. United Nations Children’s Fund (UNICEF) and the World Health Organization; 2021.
- [46] Nations U. Global Issues: Water;. Available from: <https://www.un.org/en/global-issues/water>.
- [47] Gohlke JM. In: Zipper CE, Skousen J, editors. Human Health in Coalfield Communities of Appalachia. Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2021. p. 311–336. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-57780-3_12.
- [48] Santopietro GD, Zipper CE. In: Zipper CE, Skousen J, editors. Economic Trends in Appalachian Coalfield Counties. Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2021. p. 287–310. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-57780-3_11.
- [49] of Wisconsin Population Health Institute U. County Health Rankings Roadmaps; 2023. Available from: <https://www.countyhealthrankings.org>.
- [50] Bureau USC. Quick Facts United States; 2022. Available from: <https://www.census.gov/quickfacts/fact/table/US/PST045221>.
- [51] Commission AR. Appalachian Region;. Available from: <https://www.arc.gov/wp-content/uploads/2021/11/Appalachian-County-Map.pdf>.
- [52] Cohen A, Rasheduzzaman M, Darling A, Krometis LA, Edwards M, Brown T, et al. Bottled and Well Water Quality in a Small Central Appalachian Community: Household-Level Analysis of Enteric Pathogens, Inorganic Chemicals, and Health Outcomes in Rural Southwest Virginia. *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*. 2022;19. doi:10.3390/ijerph19148610.
- [53] of Transportation USD, Administration FH. Highway Statistics; 2022. Available from: <http://www.fhwa.dot.gov/policyinformation/statistics.cfm>.
- [54] Prices AG. State Gas Price Averages; 2023. Available from: <https://gasprices.aaa.com/state-gas-price-averages/>.
- [55] Hutton G, Haller L. Evaluation of the Costs and Benefits of Water and Sanitation Improvements at the Global Level; 2004.
- [56] of State Legislatures NC. State Minimum Wages; 2024. Available from: <https://www.ncsl.org/labor-and-employment/state-minimum-wages>.
- [57] Organization WH. Improved sanitation facilities and drinking-water sources; 2024. Available from: <https://www.who.int/data/nutrition/nlis/info/improved-sanitation-facilities-and-drinking-water-sources>.
- [58] Garcia LB, Sobin C, Tomaka J, Santiago I, Palacios R, Walker WS. A Comparison of Water-Related Perceptions and Practices Among West Texas and South New Mexico Colonia Residents Using Hauled-Stored and Private Well Water. *National Environmental Health Association (NEHA) Source: Journal of Environmental Health*. 2016;79:14–21. doi:10.2307/26330513.

- [59] Bradley PM, Romanok KM, Smalling KL, Focazio MJ, Evans N, Fitzpatrick SC, et al. Bottled water contaminant exposures and potential human effects. *Environment International*. 2023;171. doi:10.1016/j.envint.2022.107701.
- [60] Holm R, Singini W, Gwayi S. Comparative evaluation of the cost of water in northern Malawi: from rural water wells to science education. *Applied Economics*. 2016;48:4573–4583. doi:10.1080/00036846.2016.1161719.