



GUIDELINES FOR

**Assessing the
Risk to Groundwater
from On-Site
Sanitation**





**British
Geological Survey**

NATURAL ENVIRONMENT RESEARCH COUNCIL

DFID Department for
International
Development

BRITISH GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

COMMISSIONED REPORT CR/01/142

Guidelines for Assessing the Risk to Groundwater from On-Site Sanitation

A R Lawrence, D M J Macdonald

British Geological Survey, UK

A G Howard¹, M H Barrett, S Pedley

Robens Centre for Public and Environmental Health, UK

(¹ presently with Water, Engineering and Development Centre, UK)

K M Ahmed

University of Dhaka, Bangladesh

M Nalubega

Makerere University, Uganda

Key words

Groundwater, water supply,
sanitation, boreholes, wells,
springs, risk assessment,
monitoring, guidelines

Bibliographical reference

ARGOSS 2001. Guidelines for
assessing the risk to groundwater
from on-site sanitation. *British
Geological Survey
Commissioned Report*,
CR/01/142. 97pp.

© NERC 2001

British Geological Survey 2001

BRITISH GEOLOGICAL SURVEY

The full range of Survey publications is available from the BGS Sales Desks at Nottingham and Edinburgh; see contact details below or shop online at www.thebgs.co.uk

The London Information Office maintains a reference collection of BGS publications including maps for consultation.

The Survey publishes an annual catalogue of its maps and other publications; this catalogue is available from any of the BGS Sales Desks.

The British Geological Survey carries out the geological survey of Great Britain and Northern Ireland (the latter as an agency service for the government of Northern Ireland), and of the surrounding continental shelf, as well as its basic research projects. It also undertakes programmes of British technical aid in geology in developing countries as arranged by the Department for International Development and other agencies.

The British Geological Survey is a component body of the Natural Environment Research Council.

Keyworth, Nottingham NG12 5GG

☎ +44 115-936 3241 Fax +44 115-936 3488

e-mail: sales@bgs.ac.uk

www.bgs.ac.uk

Shop online at: www.thebgs.co.uk

Murchison House, West Mains Road, Edinburgh EH9 3LA

☎ +44 131-667 1000 Fax +44 131-668 2683

e-mail: scotsales@bgs.ac.uk

London Information Office at the Natural History Museum (Earth Galleries), Exhibition Road, South Kensington, London SW7 2DE

☎ +44 20-7589 4090 Fax +44 20-7584 8270

☎ +44 20-7942 5344/45 email: bgs_london@bgs.ac.uk

Forde House, Park Five Business Centre, Harrier Way, Sowton, Exeter, Devon EX2 7HU

☎ +44 1392-445271 Fax +44 1392-445371

Geological Survey of Northern Ireland, 20 College Gardens, Belfast BT9 6BS

☎ +44 28-9066 6595 Fax +44 28-9066 2835

Maclean Building, Crowmarsh Gifford, Wallingford, Oxfordshire OX10 8BB

☎ +44 1491-838800 Fax +44 1491-692345

Parent Body

**Natural Environment Research Council, Polaris House,
North Star Avenue, Swindon, Wiltshire SN2 1EU**

☎ +44 1793-411500 Fax +44 1793-411501

www.nerc.ac.uk



Appendix C

Sanitary inspection forms

I Type of facility	BOREHOLE WITH HANDPUMP	
1. General Information	District:	
	Parish	
	Organisation	
2. Village/zone:		
3. Date of Visit		
4. Water sample taken?	Sample No.	FC/100ml
II Specific diagnostic information for assessment		Risk
1. Is there a latrine withinm of the borehole (please put in distance calculated from the manual)		Y/N
2. Is there a latrine uphill of the borehole?		Y/N
3. Are there any other sources of pollution within 10m of borehole? (e.g. animal breeding, cultivation, roads, industry etc)		Y/N
4. Is the drainage faulty allowing ponding within 2m of the borehole?		Y/N
5. Is the drainage channel cracked, broken or need cleaning?		Y/N
6. Is the fence missing or faulty		Y/N
7. Is the apron less than 1m in radius?		Y/N
8. Does spilt water collect in the apron area?		Y/N
9. Is the apron cracked or damaged?		Y/N
10. Is the handpump loose at the point of attachment to apron?		Y/N
Total Score of Risks		.../10
Risk score: 9-10 = Very high; 6-8 = High; 3-5 = Medium; 0-3 = Low		
III Results and recommendations:		
The following important points of risk were noted:		(list nos. 1-10)
Signature of Inspector:		
Comments:		

I Type of facility **PROTECTED SPRING**

1. General Information District:
 Parish
 Organisation
2. Village/zone:
3. Date of Visit
4. Water sample taken? Sample No. FC/100ml

II Specific diagnostic information for assessment

Risk

- | | |
|---|-----|
| 1. Is the spring unprotected? | Y/N |
| 2. Is the masonry protecting the spring faulty? | Y/N |
| 3. Is the backfill area behind the retaining wall eroded? | Y/N |
| 4. Does spilt water flood the collection area? | Y/N |
| 5. Is the fence absent or faulty? | Y/N |
| 6. Can animals have access within 10m of the spring? | Y/N |
| 7. Is there a latrine uphill and/or within ...m of the spring?
(please put in distance calculated from the manual) | Y/N |
| 8. Does surface water collect uphill of the spring? | Y/N |
| 9. Is the diversion ditch above the spring absent or non-functional? | Y/N |
| 10. Are there any other sources of pollution uphill of the spring?
(e.g. solid waste) | Y/N |

Total Score of Risks

.../10

Risk score: 9-10 = Very high; 6-8 = High; 3-5 = Medium; 0-3 = Low

III Results and recommendations:

The following important points of risk were noted:

(list nos. 1-10)

Signature of Inspector:

Comments:

I Type of facility	DUG WELL WITH HANDPUMP/WINDLASS	
1. General Information	District:	
	Parish	
	Organisation	
2. Village/zone:		
3. Date of Visit		
4. Water sample taken?	Sample No.	FC/100ml
II Specific diagnostic information for assessment		Risk
1. Is there a latrine withinm of the well? (please put in distance calculated from the manual)		Y/N
2. Is the nearest latrine uphill of the well?		Y/N
3. Is there any other source of pollution within 10m of well? (e.g. animal breeding, cultivation, roads, industry etc)		Y/N
4. Is the drainage faulty allowing ponding within 2m of the well?		Y/N
5. Is the drainage channel cracked, broken or need cleaning?		Y/N
6. Is the fence missing or faulty?		Y/N
7. Is the cement less than 1m in radius around the top of the well?		Y/N
8. Does spilt water collect in the apron area?		Y/N
9. Are there cracks in the concrete apron?		Y/N
10. Is the handpump loose at the point of attachment to well head?		Y/N
11. Is the well-cover insanitary?		Y/N
Total Score of Risks		.../11
Risk score: 9-11 = Very high; 6-8 = High; 3-5 = Medium; 0-3 = Low		
III Results and recommendations:		
The following important points of risk were noted:		(list nos. 1-11)
Signature of Inspector:		
Comments:		

I Type of facility DEEP BOREHOLE WITH MECHANICAL PUMPING

1. General Information District:
 Parish
 Organisation
2. Village/zone:
3. Date of Visit
4. Is water sample taken? Sample No. FC/100ml

II Specific diagnostic information for assessment

Risk

- | | |
|---|-----|
| 1. Is there a latrine or sewer withinm of the pumphouse?
(please put in distance calculated from the manual) | Y/N |
| 2. Is the nearest latrine unsewered?
(a pit latrine that percolates to soil) | Y/N |
| 3. If there any other source of pollution within 10m of the borehole?
(e.g. animal excreta, rubbish, surface water) | Y/N |
| 4. Is there an uncapped well within 15-20m of the borehole? | Y/N |
| 5. Does the apron at the wellhead extend for less than 2m radius? | Y/N |
| 6. If the drainage area around the pumphouse faulty?
(is it broken, permitting ponding and/or leakage to ground) | Y/N |
| 7. If the fencing around the installation damaged in any way which
would allow animals access or any unauthorised entry? | Y/N |
| 8. Is the floor of the pumphouse permeable to water? | Y/N |
| 9. Is the well seal insanitary? | Y/N |
| 10. Is the top 3m of the borehole sealed with an impermeable lining? | Y/N |

Total Score of Risks

.../10

Risk score: 9-10 = Very high; 6-8 = High; 3-5 = Medium; 0-3 = Low

III Results and recommendations:

The following important points of risk were noted:

(list nos. 1-10)

Signature of Inspector:

Comments: