

Domestic Customers' Views on the Loss of Water Supply and Compensation

Final Report

November 2007

Prepared by:

Accent
Chiswick Gate
598-608 Chiswick High Road
London
W4 5RT

Prepared for:

CCWater
Victoria Square House
Victoria Square
Birmingham
B2 4AJ

Contact: Teresa McGarry
E-mail: teresa.mcgarry@accent-mr.com
Tel: 020 8742 2211
Fax: 020 8742 1991

Contact: Diana Horth

File name: J:\1723 compensation for flood\WP\1723rep09.doc

CONTENTS

Executive Summary.....	i
1. INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 Objectives.....	2
2. METHODOLOGY.....	3
2.1 Introduction.....	3
2.2 Approach.....	3
2.3 Sample.....	3
2.4 Main Stage Interviews.....	5
2.5 Sample Outcome Codes.....	5
2.6 Pilot.....	5
2.7 Questionnaire Content.....	6
2.8 Respondent Age.....	6
2.9 Significance Tests.....	6
3. FINDINGS.....	7
3.1 Introduction.....	7
3.2 Screening Questions.....	7
3.3 Severn Trent’s Management of the Loss of Mains Water.....	8
3.4 Communication.....	9
3.5 Access to Temporary Water Supplies.....	13
3.6 Level of Inconvenience.....	17
3.7 Water Saving Devices.....	20
3.8 Current and Past Perceptions of Severn Trent.....	25
3.9 Respondent’s Willingness to Pay.....	29
3.10 Community Fund Allocation.....	30
3.11 Provision of Compensation.....	32
3.12 Respondent Characteristics.....	35
4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS.....	40
Appendix A: Questionnaire	

Executive Summary

Severn Trent's Management of the Loss of Mains Water (Section 3.3):

- Respondents were, overall, fairly pragmatic about the loss of mains water.
- Most respondents thought that Severn Trent had managed the loss of water supply either 'fairly well' or 'neither poorly nor well'.
- Respondents considered that Severn Trent were most effective at managing the organisation and distribution of temporary water supplies, but least effective at informing them about the loss of water supply.

Communication (Section 3.4):

- During the loss of water supply, the main information sources for respondents were local radio (53%) followed by television (45%).
- Most respondents (89%) did not try to contact Severn Trent during the loss of water supply. Those who did contacted them by telephone.
- A third of respondents thought that, with hindsight, Severn Trent could not have done anything differently regarding their communications, with 28% thinking that the company did their best in the circumstances.

Access to Temporary Water Supplies (Section 3.4 and 3.5):

- 89% of respondents said they had sufficient access to temporary water supplies.
- Most respondents got their water from free bottled water outlets (80%) and a further 64% got it from bowsers.
- Overall, respondents were quite pragmatic about Severn Trent's provision of temporary water supplies. 31% stated that they could have done nothing differently, and 28% said that they did their best in the circumstances.
- The main suggestions for alternative action that Severn Trent could have taken related to the bowsers. 16% suggested that the bowsers should have been filled more often, 10% wanted to see more bowsers and 8% wanted them more widely distributed.

Level of Inconvenience (Section 3.6):

- Just over half of respondents (57%) felt they had experienced a 'lot of inconvenience' as a result of losing their mains water supplies.
- The main inconveniences, in order of priority, were not being able to use the bath/shower (78%), flush the toilet (56%), wash clothes (41%) or wash up (38%).

Water Saving Devices (Section 3.7):

- For most respondents (88%), being without mains water in July 2007 made them view water as a more valuable resource.
- Two thirds of respondents had already adopted water saving devices prior to July 2007, whilst a third of respondents implemented further water saving measures when their mains water was restored in early August 2007.
- Of the third of respondents who implemented further water saving measures, the majority (72%) were still implementing these measures fully.

Current and Past Perceptions of Severn Trent (Section 3.8):

- Before they were without mains water, just over half of all respondents (55%) stated that they had no perception of Severn Trent, whilst a quarter said that they had a positive perception of the company.
- Nearly six in ten of all respondents (59%) said that Severn Trent's reputation did not change as a result of them being without mains water.
- For the vast majority of all respondents (93%) the passing of time had not affected their perception of how Severn Trent handled the loss of mains water.

Respondent's Willingness to Pay (Section 3.9):

- The majority of respondents would not be prepared to pay anything further on top of their current bill either to ensure that they do not lose their mains water again (78%) or to ensure that the treatment works do not flood again (76%).

Community Fund Allocation (Section 3.10):

- In terms of the allocation of funding set aside to help communities affected by flooding, almost half of all respondents (45%) wanted to see any remaining funds divided between individuals affected by flooding or used to protect the area from further flooding (45%).

Provision of Compensation (Section 3.11):

- The majority of respondents (61%) felt that it was not necessary to offer domestic customers compensation for the loss of mains water supply.
- The respondents who did want compensation considered that this should be for the inconvenience suffered as a result of being without mains water, with a suggested mean between £60 and £79.
- However, of the respondents who felt that compensation was appropriate, the majority were emphatic that water bills should not increase to provide this.

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

On 22 July 2007 Severn Trent's Mythe treatment works was submerged by rising flood water and subsequently shut down, cutting off the mains water supply to around 140,000 households in Tewkesbury, Cheltenham and Gloucester. Customers were informed that their mains water supply could be off for 14 days.

Supplies to all 140,000 households were not fully restored until Thursday 2 August and not declared fit to drink until Thursday 7 August. During the first week, Severn Trent progressively provided over 1,500 bowsers. Whilst 1,950 bowsers were actually provided, only around 1,500 were in service at any one time due to a number of reasons including accidental damage and vandalism.

In addition to bowsers, Severn Trent also set up 15 bottled water outlets. The Security and Emergency Measures Direction requires water companies to provide a minimum of 10 litres per person per day in emergency circumstances. Severn Trent reported that it provided 20 litres per person per day and in total distributed 3 million litres of bottled water each day.

The company's response to the incident appeared initially to be slow, and promises to refill bowsers were not met partly because the large tankers could not negotiate the narrow streets of Gloucester and Tewkesbury. The request nationwide for smaller lorries to fulfil these commitments went out on Wednesday 25 July. Severn Trent hoped to fill each bowser three times per day, although some people had heard that the company intended to re-fill five times per day.

Also, as Severn Trent was not readily aware of which areas were receiving water from Mythe, some villages in Stroud were overlooked. Communications to affected customers appeared to be mainly through the media but Severn Trent's website and telephone information line were considered up-to-date and informative.

Under normal circumstances of unplanned interruptions to supply on a strategic main, domestic customers receive an automatic payment under the Guaranteed Standards Scheme (GSS) of £20 for the first 48 hours, and £10 per each subsequent 24 hours. However, this does not apply in circumstances of extreme weather. Severn Trent discussed the incident with Ofwat who confirmed that under such extreme weather GSS did not apply. Severn Trent then confirmed that it would not pay compensation through this route.

In August 2007, CCWater commissioned Accent to undertake qualitative research to find out what people affected by the loss of water supply thought about the way the incident was managed, what their experiences were, learning points and how events had influenced their perceptions of Severn Trent. The research consisted of five focus groups in the affected area, and one control group outside the area. A key aim of the research was to gain an understanding of whether people in affected areas thought that Severn Trent should 'compensate' them for the loss of supply. The findings from this qualitative research were that most people did not want personal financial

compensation, but instead wanted to see investment into whatever was necessary to stop incidents like the flooding of Mythe water treatment works from happening again.

However, the research findings on the issue of compensation were questioned by the local press and councillors in the Gloucestershire area who felt that the findings were not representative, as only 50 people were questioned. Their opinion was that most people would actually welcome personal compensation.

Therefore CCWater wished to follow up this qualitative research with a quantitative study, in order to provide a more robust statistical analysis of domestic customers' views on the issue of compensation and what form it should take. These findings would also add weight to the messages CCWater were submitting to the Government's flood review, and ensure that customers' views remain central to that review process.

This quantitative research took place in the same towns in which the focus groups were held. However, the one change made was that having a 'control' town was not considered necessary to this research. The research focused exclusively on those households that lost their mains water supply in July 2007 for 72 hours or more.

1.2 Objectives

The business objectives of this research were to:

- validate the findings from the qualitative research and add weight to the messages CCWater would provide about customers' views in their submission to the Government's flood review
- inform CCWater if customers would like compensation as a result of the loss of mains water supply they suffered, and, if so, what form this should take.

2. METHODOLOGY

2.1 Introduction

This research aimed to quantify the requirements of domestic customers for compensation following their loss of mains water supply in July 2007.

2.2 Approach

Accent undertook 401 telephone interviews with domestic customers who lost their water supply following the submerging by rising flood waters of the Severn Trent Mythe treatment works in July 2007. The interviews were an average of 10 minutes in duration and were conducted from Accent's Bristol Telephone Unit.

2.3 Sample

In order to ensure that appropriate and comprehensive representation was made of those who were without water in July 2007, Severn Trent supplied Accent with a list of postcode sectors covering the in-scope areas. These postcodes are summarised in the following table.

Table 1: Postcodes included in research

Postcode	Area	Postcode	Areas	Postcode	Area
WR8	Upton upon Severn	GL51 8	Cheltenham	GL20 5	Tewkesbury
WR12 7	Cheltenham	GL51 7	Cheltenham	GL20 6	Tewkesbury
WR12 7	Rural - south of Evesham	GL51 6	Cheltenham	GL2 9	Gloucester
WR11 7	Evesham (and surrounding)	GL51 5	Cheltenham	GL2 7	Gloucester
GL6 8	Stroud	GL51 4	Cheltenham	GL2 5	Gloucester
GL6 7	Stroud	GL51 3	Cheltenham	GL2 4	Gloucester
GL6 6	Stroud	GL51 0	Cheltenham	GL2 3	Gloucester
GL54 5	Cheltenham	GL50 4	Cheltenham	GL2 2	Gloucester
GL54 4	Cheltenham	GL50 3	Cheltenham	GL2 0	Gloucester
GL53 9	Cheltenham	GL50 2	Cheltenham	GL2 0	Gloucester
GL53 8	Cheltenham	GL50 1	Cheltenham	GL19 4	Tewkesbury
GL53 7	Rural - south of Cheltenham	GL4 8	Gloucester	GL19 3	Rural - West of Tewkesbury
GL53 3	Cheltenham	GL4 6	Gloucester	GL18 1	Rural - West of Tewkesbury
GL53 0	Rural - south of Cheltenham	GL4 5	Gloucester	GL17 9	Rural - West of Gloucester
GL52 9	Cheltenham	GL4 4	Gloucester	GL17 0	Rural - West of Gloucester
GL52 8	Cheltenham	GL4 3	Gloucester	GL15 5	Rural - West of Stroud
GL52 7	Cheltenham	GL4 0	Gloucester	GL15 4	Rural - West of Stroud
GL52 6	Cheltenham	GL3 8	In Between Gloucester-Cheltenham	GL10 3	Stroud
GL52 5	Cheltenham	GL3 4	In Between	GL1 5	Gloucester

			Gloucester-Cheltenham		
GL52 4	Cheltenham	GL3 3	In Between Gloucester-Cheltenham	GL1 4	Gloucester
GL52 3	Cheltenham	GL3 2	In Between Gloucester-Cheltenham	GL1 3	Gloucester
GL52 2	Cheltenham	GL3 1	In Between Gloucester-Cheltenham	GL1 2	Gloucester
GL51 9	Cheltenham	GL20 8	Tewkesbury	GL1 1	Gloucester
GL51 9	Tewkesbury	GL20 7	Tewkesbury	GL 15 5	Rural - West of Stroud

Accent purchased Random Digit Dialling (RDD) sample based on these postcode sectors. Accent also set quotas to ensure that the sample had appropriate representation by age, gender, SEG and geography (including rural and urban). Census data was consulted to determine the age proportions. The quotas were as follows:

- age e.g. equitable split by age groups 18-44, 45-59 and 60+
- gender – even split by both male and female
- SEG – split into 2 groups i.e. ABC1 and C2DE with equal representation from both
- geographical location – representation by rural, semi rural and urban.

Socio economic groupings (SEGs) are drawn from occupational groupings and are widely used in market research. While the groupings are not based on income and people in the same group will not necessarily behave in the same way, there are likely to be similarities in tastes, habits and patterns of expenditure based on these groupings. These groups are

Non Manual:

- A Senior managerial, administrative or professional
- B Intermediate managerial, administrative or professional
- C1 Supervisory or clerical and junior managerial, administrative or professional

Manual

- C2 Skilled manual workers
- D Semi-skilled and unskilled manual workers

Manual and Non Manual

- E State pensioners, widows (with no other earner) and casual workers.

Appropriate representation was also made across the following five geographical areas:

- Cheltenham
- Gloucester
- Tewkesbury
- Stroud
- Upton upon Severn

2.4 Main Stage Interviews

The main stage fieldwork took place between 23 October and 4 November 2007. Interviews were conducted during both weekend days and weekdays to ensure the sample was representative. Furthermore, interviews were conducted between 9am and 9pm on weekdays, between 10am and 5pm on Saturdays and between 11am and 4pm on Sundays, unless a respondent requested an appointment outside of these times.

2.5 Sample Outcome Codes

The following table summarises the main outcome codes for the RDD sample that was purchased to cover the requisite geographical areas for this research.

Table 2: Sample outcome codes

Outcome Code	Sample size
Unused sample	7,391
Interview obtained	401
Interviewer requested to call again	219
Number engaged when called	56
No Reply/Answer phone	1,848
Refusal	190
Refusal Point Blank	230
Number Not Recognised	239
Respondent not available during the survey	8
Wrong Number	92
Out of quota (ie quotas set already filled)	88
Not In Scope for research	540
Other	81
All Sample	11,383

2.6 Pilot

A pilot of 10 interviews was conducted on Thursday 18 October to test the questionnaire and the responsiveness of respondents to completing it. Feedback from the pilot indicated that the questionnaire had worked well and that the refusal rate was low. A few minor modifications were made to the questionnaire as a result of the pilot which mainly consisted of the addition of further codes to some of the code frames.

One of the main changes made to the questionnaire related to a screening question which originally simply asked whether the respondent had lost their mains water supply in July 2007. However, as one of the pilot respondents had lost their mains water for only 12 hours the question was reworded to specify a minimum period without mains water of 72 hours.

Also for the main stage interviews prior to the start of the main questionnaire a statement was added reminding respondents that the research was looking for their views on the loss of mains water supply and the impact of this on their lives. This was to ensure that those respondents whose homes were flooded at this time, did not focus on the effects of this flooding.

2.7 Questionnaire Content

There were several screener questions designed to ensure that the interviewer spoke directly to a household in one of the five locations which had been without mains water for 72 hours or more. Furthermore, the respondent was required to personally contribute to the overall running of their household by, for example, contributing towards the payment of a utility bill.

The questionnaire, including the initial screening questions, may be viewed at Appendix A.

2.8 Respondent Age

In this research of the 401 respondents, three refused to provide their age. Hence, where sub-analysis is undertaken by age these three respondents have been given a separate column entitled 'Age refused' rather than remove them from the analysis. Hence, care should be taken with this column.

2.9 Significance Tests

Significance tests were undertaken on selected data using a Z test at a 95% confidence level. Z-tests are used to determine whether different proportions are significantly different to each other.

3. FINDINGS

3.1 Introduction


This research aimed to quantify the requirements of domestic customers for compensation following their loss of mains water supply in July 2007.

3.2 Screening Questions

There were initially a series of screening questions to ensure that respondents were relevant to participate in this research. (See Questionnaire at Appendix A).

The following figure depicts where respondents lived. The majority of the respondents lived in Gloucester (43%) or Cheltenham (38%). Fewer respondents lived in Tewkesbury, Stroud and Upton on Severn and so for reporting purposes these three areas were combined. This information is summarised in Figure 1 below.

Figure 1: Sample breakdown by area



The vast majority of houses did not flood in July 2007 when the mains water supply was cut off, as shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Whether house flooded in July 2007 by area

	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
Yes	4	3	4	7
No	96	97	96	93
Total respondents	401	154	171	76

Furthermore, the vast majority of respondents remained in their own homes for the whole period when they were without mains water in July 2007, as shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Whether stayed in own home when home was without mains water in July 2007 by area

	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
Stayed in own home all the time	92	93	92	91
Moved away from home for a few days only	8	7	8	9
Total respondents	401	154	171	76

3.3 Severn Trent’s Management of the Loss of Mains Water

Overall Message

Respondents were fairly pragmatic about Severn Trent’s handling of the loss of mains water supply in July 2007, submitting ratings of either ‘fairly well’ or ‘neither poorly nor well’ for each activity that the company managed. Respondents gave the highest rating to how Severn Trent managed the organisation and distribution of the temporary water supplies, but were least impressed with how the company had informed them about the loss of mains water supply.

Detailed Findings

All respondents were asked to consider on a scale of one to five, where one meant ‘very poorly’ and five meant ‘very well’, how well Severn Trent managed the loss of the mains water supply in terms of a number of service aspects.

Respondents were fairly pragmatic about Severn Trent’s activities, with ratings of either ‘fairly well’ managed or ‘neither poorly nor well’ managed for each. Respondents gave the highest rating to how Severn Trent had managed the organisation and distribution of the temporary water supplies, but were least impressed with how Severn Trent had informed them about the loss of mains water supply. But even here, respondents rated Severn Trent’s communication as being managed ‘neither poorly nor well’, rather than poorly, as shown in Table 5.

Table 5: Mean scores summarising how well Severn Trent managed a range of activities by area

Mean scores range from: 1 = 'very poorly' to 5 = 'very well'.	Total	Cheltenham	Gloucester	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton
Organising the distribution of temporary water supplies e.g. bowsers, bottled water outlets	3.9	3.97	3.85	3.87
Keeping you informed about whether or not you could drink the mains water when it returned	3.68	3.61	3.75	3.69
Overall management of the issue	3.58	3.65	3.46	3.68
Keeping the bowsers filled up	3.46	3.57	3.33	3.49
Keeping you informed about their progress in restoring mains water	3.31	3.26	3.39	3.22
Informing you about the loss of mains water	3.05	3.03	3.01	3.17
Total respondents	401	154	171	76

Respondents who indicated that they had experienced no inconvenience as a result of losing their mains water supply were more likely to state that Severn Trent had performed fairly well on each of these issues. This is summarised in Table 6.

Table 6: Mean scores summarising how well Severn Trent managed a range of activities by the level of inconvenience experienced as a result of being without their mains water supply

Mean scores range from: 1 = 'very poorly' to 5 = 'very well'	Total	Level of inconvenience		
		None	A little	A lot
Organising the distribution of temporary water supplies eg bowsers, bottled water outlets	3.9	4.53	4.18	3.66
Keeping you informed about whether or not you could drink the mains water when it returned	3.68	4.41	4.05	3.37
Overall management of the issue	3.58	4.19	3.87	3.33
Keeping the bowsers filled up	3.46	4.07	3.75	3.22
Keeping you informed about their progress in restoring mains water	3.31	4.25	3.56	3.06
Informing you about the loss of mains water	3.05	4	3.42	2.73
Total respondents	401	17	157	227

3.4 Communication

Overall Message

The main information source for respondents when they were without mains water in July 2007 was local radio followed by television. The vast majority of respondents did not try and make contact with Severn Trent when they were without mains water.

For those who did try to contact the company, this was most likely to have been done by telephone. The majority of respondents who tried to make contact were successful and felt that they had received a satisfactory response to their enquiry.

In terms of what Severn Trent could have done differently about communicating with customers and providing temporary water supplies, there was some pragmatism from respondents. Around a third of respondents stated that Severn Trent could have done nothing differently and just under three in ten stated that Severn Trent did their best in the circumstances.

Detailed Findings

All respondents were asked to state where they got their information from on what was happening with the mains water supply in their local area. Respondents could offer more than one information source so the percentages may add up to more than 100%.

Local radio was the main information source for just over half of the respondents (53%), with television (45%) and word of mouth (26%) the next most popular information sources, as shown in Table 7.

Table 7: Information sources for ascertaining what was happening by area

	Total	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
Local radio	53	52	55	49
Television	45	45	46	41
Word of mouth	26	25	23	34
Local newspapers	20	24	20	9
Internet/Web	17	20	15	16
Severn Trent	13	15	11	12
National radio	4	6	4	3
Local Council	4	3	3	11
Leaflets	4	3	5	4
National newspapers	1	-	2	-
Local voluntary organisation/charities	1	-	1	4
Other	3	2	4	3
Total respondents	401	154	171	76

There were some gender differences in terms of reliance on information sources, with males most reliant on both local radio (49%) and television (48%), whilst females were more reliant on local radio (56%) than television (42%). The greatest discrepancy between males and females related to the use of the internet with just over a fifth of males (22%) and just over one tenth of females (12%) obtaining information from this source, a significant difference. There is also a discrepancy over reliance on the internet as a contact method by respondent age with the likelihood of referring to the internet decreasing with age. Indeed a significant difference was recorded regarding reliance on the internet between the youngest (25% of 18 to 44 year-olds) and oldest respondents (9% of those aged 60 or more). Furthermore, a significant difference between younger and older respondents was also recorded for use of the television as an information source with younger respondents (55%) much more likely to rely on it than older respondents (33%). This is shown in Table 8.

Table 8: Information sources for ascertaining what was happening by gender and age¹

	Total	Gender		Age			
		Male %	Female %	18-44 %	45-59 %	60+ %	Age refused %
Local radio	53	49	56	47	57	53	100
Television	45	48	42	55	41	33	100
Word of mouth	26	25	27	21	30	28	33
Local newspapers	20	17	22	14	24	23	-
Internet/Web	17	22	12	25	16	9	-
Severn Trent	13	14	12	16	8	14	-
National radio	4	5	3	5	4	4	-
Local Council	4	3	6	3	2	9	-
Leaflets	4	3	6	5	4	4	-
National newspapers	1	4	2	3	3	2	-
Local voluntary organisation/charities	1	1	1	-	1	2	-
Other	3	1	1	1	2	2	-
Total respondents	401	191	210	150	128	120	3

All respondents were also asked to specify whether they, or anyone in their household, attempted to contact Severn Trent whilst their mains water supply was cut off.

The vast majority of respondents (89%) did not try and establish contact with Severn Trent when they were without mains water. However, respondents living in Stroud, Tewkesbury and Upton (16%) were slightly more likely to try and contact Severn Trent than respondents in Cheltenham (10%) and Gloucester (9%). This is shown in Table 9.

Table 9: Whether respondents tried to contact Severn Trent when their mains water supply was cut off by area

	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
Yes	11	10	9	16
No	89	90	91	84
Total respondents	401	154	171	76

Those respondents who tried to contact Severn Trent when they were without water were asked to indicate how they tried to make contact, what the outcome of this was and whether they received a satisfactory response to their query.

Respondents could offer more than one way in which they had tried to contact Severn Trent so the percentages may add up to more than 100%.

Although very few people tried to contact Severn Trent, respondents were most likely to try and contact them by telephone (95%), especially those in Stroud, Tewkesbury and Upton (100%). This is shown in Table 10 below.

¹Three respondents refused to give their age and so their responses have been presented separately in the 'Refused' column. This is the case for all tables where there is a 'refused' column.

Table 10: How respondents tried contacting Severn Trent by area

	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
Telephone	95	94	93	100
Web	7	6	13	-
Total respondents	43	16	15	12

Furthermore, it is interesting to note that of the minority of respondents who tried to contact Severn Trent, all female respondents and all older respondents did so by telephone, as shown in Table 11.

Table 11: How respondents tried contacting Severn Trent by gender and age

	Total	Gender		Age		
		Male %	Female %	18-44 %	45-59 %	60+ %
Telephone	95	91	100	95	93	100
Web	7	14	-	5	14	-
Total respondents	43	22	21	19	14	10

Of the forty-three respondents who tried to contact Severn Trent, the majority were successful as summarised below. Respondents may provide more than one response here and so the numbers add up to more than forty-three.

Success:

- 19 spoke to someone on the telephone
- 3 found relevant information on the website
- 1 spoke to someone in person
- 4 recorded automated messages.

Lack of success:

- 16 couldn't get through on the telephone
- 1 couldn't get through on the website

A further respondent could not remember the outcome and another said that they could only find out information they already knew.

Of the twenty seven respondents who successfully made contact with Severn Trent, sixteen felt they had received a satisfactory response, whilst eight did not and three were uncertain about their satisfaction with the level of response².

All respondents were asked to suggest what, with the benefit of hindsight, Severn Trent could have done differently to communicate with their customers. Respondents could offer more than one view on this so the percentages may add up to more than 100%.

² These figures are small and so should be treated with caution. They are included for indicative purposes only.

Whilst interviewers were provided with a pre-coded list of responses respondents were not actively prompted with these.

A third of respondents thought that Severn Trent could have done nothing differently regarding communicating with their customers and just under three in ten (28%) said that Severn Trent did the best they could in the circumstances.

The main suggestions for the action that Severn Trent could have taken were sending letters to update customers on the situation (11%), having a higher media profile (9%) and providing daily news bulletins updating customers on events/progress (8%). This information is summarised in Table 12.

Table 12: What Severn Trent could have done differently regarding communicating with their customers by area

	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
Nothing	33	31	34	36
Severn Trent did their best in the circumstances	28	27	26	32
Send letters to update customers on situation	11	12	11	9
Higher media profile	9	9	11	4
Provide daily news bulletins updating customers on events/progress	8	10	6	8
Send letters to all customers advising them that their mains water was restored	5	5	5	3
Distribute information on where temporary water supplies are located	5	5	5	7
Faster/quicker	3	4	3	1
More warning before cut-off	2	1	2	3
Using special announcements e.g. Tannoy or Radio	2	1	3	1
Better website/email information	2	2	2	1
Better/initial information	2	1	2	4
Know where all customers live	1	1	2	1
Work with local charities/volunteer groups to identify vulnerable people	1	1	1	1
Work with the local Council	1	1	1	3
Door-to-door information	1	2	1	-
Work with other government bodies	0	-	-	1
Leaflets distribution	0	1	-	-
Other	4	5	5	4
Total respondents	401	154	171	76

3.5 Access to Temporary Water Supplies

Overall Message

The vast majority of households felt that they had access to adequate temporary water supplies when they were without mains water in July 2007. Respondents primarily obtained their temporary water supplies from free bottled water outlets and bowser.

Detailed Findings

All respondents were asked to indicate whether they and their household had sufficient access to temporary water supplies during the loss of mains water supply.

The vast majority of households (89%) felt that they did have access to adequate temporary water supplies at this time. However, this level was slightly lower for respondents in Gloucester where slightly fewer felt they had access to sufficient water supplies (87%). This is shown in Table 13.

Table 13: Whether households had sufficient access to temporary water supplies by area

	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
Yes	89	90	87	89
No	10	8	12	9
Don't know	1	2	1	1
Total respondents	401	154	171	76

Analysis was also undertaken for all respondents in terms of whether or not they felt that domestic customers should be offered compensation. Of those respondents who had sufficient access to temporary water supplies, a statistically higher proportion felt that domestic customers should not be offered compensation (92%) compared with those that felt that compensation should be offered (83%). Conversely, of those who felt that they did not have access to sufficient temporary water supplies, respondents were statistically more likely to feel that compensation should be offered (16%) than those who felt that compensation was not required (7%) as shown in Table 14. Hence, there is a statistically significant link between those customers who felt that they did not have adequate access to temporary supplies and those who were more likely to seek compensation.

Table 14: Breakdown of views on compensation by whether households had sufficient access to temporary water supplies

Should customers be offered compensation?	Whether households had sufficient access to temporary water supplies (%)					
	%	Total respondents	Yes	No	Don't know	Total%
Yes	35	139	83	16	1	100
No	61	246	92	7	1	100
Don't know	4	16	81	-	19	100
	100	401				

Respondents who felt they did not have sufficient access to temporary water supplies, were asked to indicate why this was the case. Respondents could offer more than one view so the numbers may add up to more than the total number of respondents. Interviewers were provided with a pre-coded list of responses, but respondents were not prompted with these.

Forty respondents felt they did not have sufficient access to temporary water supplies when they were without mains water. The reasons they gave were:

- the bowsers were empty (22 respondents)
- they could not get to the bowsers (11 respondents)
- they could not get to the bottled water outlets (6 respondents)
- they did not know where the bowsers were located (5 respondents)
- the water allocation was insufficient for respondent needs (3 respondents)
- the bowsers were contaminated (3 respondents)
- the bowsers were stolen (2 respondents)
- the bottled water supplies had run out (2 respondents)
- there were not enough water supply outlets (2 respondents)
- they were elderly (1 respondent)
- supplies weren't available fast enough (1 respondent)
- they only had access to bottled water (1 respondent)
- it took too long for the bowsers to arrive (1 respondent)
- it was three days before free water arrived (1 respondent).

All respondents were asked to indicate where they got their temporary water supplies from. Respondents could suggest more than one outlet so percentages may add up to more than 100%.

The vast majority of respondents got their temporary water supplies from free bottled water outlets (80%) and bowsers (64%), as summarised in Table 15.

Table 15: Where respondents got their temporary water supplies from by area

	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
Free bottled water outlets	80	80	78	84
Bowsers	64	70	63	51
Purchased bottled water from supermarkets	30	29	32	25
Friends and neighbours	11	7	11	17
Water butt/rainwater storage	8	8	10	7
Nearby brook/spring/stream	2	1	2	3
Workplace	1	1	2	-
Outside the area	1	1	2	-
Police/Red Cross/Fire Brigade	1	1	1	-
Other	4	4	2	7
Total respondents	401	154	171	76

Younger respondents (85%) were significantly more likely than older respondents (72%) to get temporary water supplies from free bottled water outlets. This same trend can be seen for bowsers (68% and 57% respectively), although not significantly

different. Younger respondents were also statistically less likely to rely on friends and neighbours (7%) than older respondents (18%). This is shown in Table 16.

Table 16: Where respondents got their temporary water supplies from by age and SEG

	Total %	Age (%)			
		18-44	45-59	60+	Age refused
Free bottled water outlets	80	85	82	72	67
Bowsers	64	68	65	57	67
Purchased bottled water from supermarkets	30	27	37	24	67
Friends and neighbours	11	7	8	18	-
Water butt/rainwater storage	8	6	9	12	-
Nearby brook/spring/stream	2	1	2	3	-
Workplace	1	1	2	1	-
Outside the area	1	1	2	-	-
Police/Red Cross/Fire Brigade	1	1	-	3	-
Other	4	2	2	8	-
Total respondents	401	150	128	120	3

All respondents were asked to suggest what, with the benefit of hindsight, Severn Trent could have done differently regarding providing temporary water supplies to customers. Respondents could offer more than one opinion so the percentages may add up to more than 100%. Again whilst interviewers were provided with a pre-coded list of responses, participants were not actively prompted with these.

As with communications, respondents were quite pragmatic about what Severn Trent could have done differently with temporary water supplies. Just under a third of respondents (31%) stated that Severn Trent could have done nothing differently, and just under three in ten (28%) said that Severn Trent did their best in the circumstances.

The main suggestions for the action that Severn Trent could have taken related to the bowsers. It included that the bowsers should have been filled more often (16%), they should have had more bowsers (10%) and have had bowsers in more locations (8%). This information is summarised in Table 17.

Table 17: What Severn Trent could have done differently regarding providing temporary water supplies by area

	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
Nothing ³	31	31	29	36
Severn Trent did their best in the circumstances	28	27	26	33
Fill up bowsers more often	16	17	18	8
Have more bowsers	10	10	12	7

³ In this table when respondents say 'Nothing' could have been done differently they are acknowledging that Severn Trent managed the situation well, whereas those who said that 'Severn Trent did their best in the circumstances' are more positively stating that Severn Trent proactively did all they could in the difficult circumstances presented to them.

Have bowsers in more locations	8	7	9	5
Quicker provision of water/allocation of bowsers	6	6	5	9
Locate bowsers in more appropriate locations	4	4	5	5
Work with charities to support more vulnerable people	3	3	4	1
Have smaller bowsers able to navigate the streets	2	1	3	1
Supervise/police the bowsers to protect against contamination of temporary water supplies	2	3	2	1
Access to/delivery of water to those without transport/elderly	2	2	4	-
More bottled water/easier access	2	3	2	-
Know where all customers live	1		1	3
Supervise/police the distribution of water from bowsers to ensure fair distribution	1	3	-	-
Supervise/police the distribution of bottled water to ensure fair distribution	1	1	2	-
Better information re location of bowsers/water supply	1	-	2	3
Have contingency/emergency plans in place	1	1	2	-
Bowsers not a good idea/penalise vandals	1	1	-	1
Bigger bowsers	0	1	1	-
Other	4	6	3	1
Total respondents	401	154	171	76

3.6 Level of Inconvenience

Overall Message

Just over half of respondents felt that they had experienced a 'lot of inconvenience' as a result of losing their water supply. The main ways in which respondents were inconvenienced, in order of priority, were through being restricted or not able to use the bath/shower, flush the toilet, wash their clothes or wash up.

Detailed Findings

All respondents were asked to state the level of inconvenience experienced by their household as a result of losing the mains water supply to their homes.

Just over half of respondents felt that they had experienced a lot of inconvenience (57%) as a result of losing their mains water supply, as shown in Table 18.

Table 18: Level of inconvenience experienced by household as a result of losing mains water supply by area

	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
No inconvenience	4	4	2	11
A little inconvenience	39	38	43	32
A lot of inconvenience	57	58	55	58
Total respondents	401	154	171	76

Respondents classified as ABC1 were statistically more likely to state that they were inconvenienced ‘a lot’ by being without mains water (64%) than respondents classified as C2DE (46%), as shown in Table 19 .

Table 19: Level of inconvenience experienced by household as a result of losing mains water supply by SEG

	Total	SEG (%)		
		ABC1	C2DE	Refused
No inconvenience	4	2	7	4
A little inconvenience	39	34	47	32
A lot of inconvenience	57	64	46	64
Total respondents	401	210	166	25

The 384 respondents (96%) who felt that they were inconvenienced were asked to explain how they were inconvenienced. Respondents could give more than one explanation so the percentages may add up to more than 100%. Interviewers were provided with a pre-coded list of responses, but respondents were not prompted with these.

The main ways in which respondents were inconvenienced were through being restricted or not able to use the bath/shower (78%), flush the toilet (56%), wash clothes (41%) or wash up (38%). This is summarised in Table 20.

Table 20: Ways in which respondents were inconvenienced by being without mains water by area

	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
Restricted/Couldn't have a shower/bath	78	80	76	78
Restricted/Couldn't flush the toilet	56	60	58	44
Restricted/Couldn't wash clothes	41	45	40	35
Restricted/Couldn't wash up	38	41	39	26
Restricted/Couldn't cook	21	24	18	22
Had to travel to collect water	18	14	19	26
Had to purchase	6	6	4	13

bottled water				
Hygiene with children/babies/general hygiene	4	9	1	3
Having to handle/carry/store water	3	3	5	1
Could not go to work	2	2	1	3
Time consuming	2	2	1	1
Not having running/piped water or drinking water on tap	2	1	2	3
Had to move to hotel/B&B temporarily	1	1	1	1
Having to help the elderly	1	3	1	
Having to control water supply/usage, plan ahead	1	1	1	3
Other	5	2	7	6
Total respondents	384	148	168	68

These 384 respondents who felt they were inconvenienced were also asked to estimate the cost outlay for their household of being without mains water. Respondents were asked to only include the costs specifically related to being without their mains water supply, (for example, having to buy bottled water, driving to bowzers/bottled water outlets, driving to other accommodation, the cost of staying in a hotel) and not the costs related to their homes flooding.

Whilst a fifth of the respondents said they did not know what their cost outlay was (21%), nearly three in ten (29%) said it was nothing. For the remainder, the cost outlay was mainly less than £50 (35%) as shown in Table 21.

Table 21: Respondents estimate of their cost outlay when they were without mains water by area

£	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
Nothing	29	32	25	32
1-10	13	12	14	12
11-30	13	13	14	12
31-50	9	11	10	4
51-100	8	9	7	9
101-200	1	1	2	-
200+	5	5	5	4
Don't know	21	16	24	26
Total respondents	384	148	168	68

3.7 Water Saving Devices

Overall Message

For the vast majority of respondents, being without mains water encouraged them to consider water as a more valuable resource. Whilst two thirds of respondents had already adopted water saving devices before July 2007, a third more of them implemented further water saving measures when their mains water was restored in early August 2007. Of the latter, the majority were still implementing these water saving measures fully.

Detailed Findings

All respondents were asked to indicate what effect being without water had on their perception of the value of water.

For the vast majority of respondents, the loss of supply encouraged them to consider water to be more valuable (88%). However, a further four respondents stated that they already considered water to be a valuable resource prior to the events in July 2007. These and other responses were coded as 'other' and included the following comments:

- always held water in high regard (4 respondents)
- made you think about how you use water (1 respondent)
- you can get away with using a lot less water than we generally do in the west, and we waste water as a nation in such ways as using clean drinking water to flush the toilet (1 respondent)
- not a significantly higher regard (1 respondent)
- possibly (valued water) a little more and I did get to like bottled water which I didn't drink before (1 respondent)
- it made me realise that a lot of water could be saved, and the same way as the council offer cheap composters to save on refuse collection, Severn Trent should provide cheap water butts (1 respondent).

This is shown in Table 22.

Table 22: Effect of being without mains water on perception of the value of water by area

	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
No effect	9	10	6	14
Water considered more valuable	88	87	91	83
Water considered less valuable	0	1	1	-
Other	2	2	2	3
Total respondents	401	154	171	76

All respondents were asked which, if any, water saving devices they had used in their household before July 2007 and whether they had implemented any further water saving devices after their mains water was restored in August 2007. Respondents could offer more than one response so the percentages may add up to more than 100%. Whilst

interviewers were provided with a pre-coded list of responses, respondents were not prompted with these.

Approximately a third of respondents (34%) had not used any water saving devices before July 2007. Of those who had, the main devices mentioned were water butts in the garden (37%), taking showers instead of baths (16%) and turning the taps off when brushing teeth (12%). This is shown in Table 23.

Table 23: Water conservation measures already adopted by respondents prior to July 2007 by area

	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
Water butts in garden	37	40	36	32
None	34	33	32	38
Showers instead of baths	16	14	19	14
Turn off tap when brushing teeth	12	18	11	4
Hippo/Save A Flush device in toilet cistern	11	12	10	9
Reusing water eg bath water	9	9	9	9
Wait until full load for Washing Machine / dishwasher	7	10	5	4
Only put required amount in kettle	6	5	8	4
Water meter installed	4	5	4	3
Energy & Water efficient washing machine	4	4	4	5
Generally careful/sensible with water	3	2	4	3
Share shower/bath	2	1	4	1
Energy & Water efficient dishwasher	1	1	1	3
Flush toilet less/use less water when flushing	1	1	2	1
Don't water garden/recycle water in garden	1	1	2	-
Trigger device fitted to hosepipe	0	-	1	1
Other	4	5	2	7
Total respondents	401	154	171	76

Male respondents (38%) were slightly more likely than female respondents (30%) to indicate that they had not adopted any water conservation measures before July 2007.

Also, the younger the respondent, the less likely they were to have adopted water conservation measures; 45% of the under 45s had not done so compared with 20% of over 60s, a significant difference. Furthermore, younger respondents were statistically less likely to have water butts in their garden (27%) compared to either middle aged respondents (42%) or older respondents (43%). This is shown in Table 24.

Table 24: Water conservation measures already adopted by respondents prior to July 2007 by gender and age

	Total %	Gender (%)		Age (%)			
		Male	Female	18-44	45-59	60+	Age refused
No measures adopted	34	38	30	45	33	20	-
Water butts in garden	37	32	41	27	42	43	33
Showers instead of baths	16	15	18	14	18	17	-
Turn off tap when brushing teeth	12	9	15	11	16	11	-
Hippo/Save A Flush device in toilet cistern	11	13	9	11	9	13	-
Reusing water e.g. bath water	9	7	11	7	8	13	33
Wait until full load for Washing Machine / dishwasher	7	5	8	6	6	8	-
Only put required amount in kettle	6	5	7	5	5	9	-
Water meter installed	4	3	5	4	3	5	-
Energy & Water efficient washing machine	4	2	7	3	4	6	-
Generally careful/sensible with water	3	2	4	1	5	3	33
Share shower/bath	2	2	2	4	1	2	-
Energy & Water efficient dishwasher	1	2	1	3	2	-	-
Flush toilet less/use less water when flushing	1	2	1	1	1	3	-
Don't water garden/recycle water in garden	1	2	0	1	2	1	-
Trigger device fitted to hosepipe	0	1	0	-	2	-	-
Other	4	5	3	3	2	6	-
Total respondents	401	191	210	150	128	120	3

Of the 266 respondents (66%) who had installed water saving devices before July 2007 over half had installed a water butt in their garden (55%), whilst a quarter (24%) took showers in preference to baths, as shown in Table 25.

Table 25: Water conservation measures already adopted by respondents prior to July 2007 by area (i.e. removing those respondents who had said 'none')

	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
Water butts in garden	55	60	53	51
Showers instead of baths	24	20	28	23
Turn off tap when brushing teeth	19	27	16	6
Hippo/Save A Flush device in toilet cistern	16	18	15	15
Reusing water eg bath water	14	14	14	15
Wait until full load for Washing Machine / dishwasher	10	15	8	6
Only put required amount in kettle	9	8	12	6
Water meter installed	6	7	6	4
Energy & water efficient washing machine	6	6	6	9
Generally careful/sensible with water	5	3	6	4
Share shower/bath	3	2	5	2
Energy & Water efficient dishwasher	2	2	2	4
Flush toilet less/use less water when flushing	2	1	3	2
Don't water garden/recycle water in garden	2	2	3	-
Trigger device fitted to hosepipe	1	-	1	2
Other	6	7	3	11
Total respondents	266	103	116	47

A third of all respondents (33%) did implement further water saving measures when their mains water was restored in early August 2007, rising to four in ten implementing new water saving measures in Gloucester, as shown in Table 26.

Table 26: Whether respondents implemented further water saving measures when mains water was restored by area

	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
Yes	33	27	40	29
No	67	72	60	71
Don't know	0	1	-	-

Total respondents	401	154	171	76
--------------------------	------------	------------	------------	-----------

When asked to list the water saving devices used since August 2007, respondents could list more than one so the percentages may add up to more than 100%.

The main water saving measures implemented after August 2007 were water butts in the garden (37%), turning off taps when brushing teeth (29%) and having showers instead of baths (15%), as shown in Table 27.

Table 27: Water saving measures implemented since August 2007 by area

	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
Water butts in garden	37	43	38	23
Turn off tap when brushing teeth	29	38	25	27
Showers instead of baths	15	10	16	23
Hippo/Save A Flush device in toilet cistern	12	5	16	14
Wait until full load for Washing Machine / dishwasher	12	12	10	18
Reusing water e.g. bath water	12	5	16	14
Only put required amount in kettle	9	10	9	9
Generally use less water/more careful	6	7	6	5
Flush toilet less/only when necessary	5	2	7	5
Water meter installed	2	-	1	5
Water efficient shower/shower-head	2	-	1	5
Share shower/bath	2	-	3	5
Energy & Water efficient dishwasher	1	-	1	-
Energy & Water efficient washing machine	1	-	1	-
Other	11	12	12	5
Total respondents	133	42	69	22

These 133 respondents were then asked to state whether they were still implementing these further water saving measures. Nearly three quarters of them said they were still implementing these measures fully (72%), whilst a further fifth (21%) said they were implementing them somewhat. This is summarised in Table 28.

Table 28: Whether still implementing the new water saving measures by area

	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
Yes, fully	72	81	64	82
Yes, somewhat	21	12	29	14
No	7	7	7	5

Total respondents	133	42	69	22
--------------------------	------------	-----------	-----------	-----------

3.8 Current and Past Perceptions of Severn Trent

Overall Message

Just over half of all respondents stated that they had no perception of Severn Trent before they were without mains water in July 2007, whilst a quarter said that they had a positive perception of the company. Nearly six in ten of all respondents said that Severn Trent's reputation did not change as a result of being without mains water.

Of the 164 respondents (41%) who believed that Severn Trent's reputation had changed as a result of the incident, almost two thirds (105 respondents) felt that this was now a worsened reputation. Furthermore, of these 105 respondents a third suggested that in order to demonstrate its commitment to domestic customers, compensation should be paid whilst just under a third said that Mythe should be reinforced so that it does not flood again.

For the vast majority of all respondents the passing of time has not affected their perception of how Severn Trent handled the loss of mains water.

Detailed Findings

All respondents were asked to state what their perception of Severn Trent was before being without mains water in July 2007, and whether this perception had changed as a result of the loss of supply.

Just over half of respondents (55%) stated that they had no perception of Severn Trent before being without mains water, whilst a quarter said they had a positive perception of Severn Trent before this time. Perception of Severn Trent was similar across the different geographical areas, as shown in Table 29.

Table 29: Perception of Severn Trent as a company before July 2007 by area

	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
No perception of Severn Trent	55	59	53	54
Positive perception	25	25	26	22
Negative perception	15	14	16	13
Don't know	5	1	6	11
Total respondents	401	154	171	76

Nearly six in ten respondents (59%) said that Severn Trent's reputation did not change as a result of the events in July 2007. Again, perception of Severn Trent was similar across the different geographical areas, as shown in Table 30.

Table 30: Whether Severn Trent's reputation changed as a result of this incident by area

	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
--	----------------	---------------------	---------------------	------------------------------------

				%
Yes	41	42	39	43
No	59	58	61	57
Total respondents	401	154	171	76

The 164 respondents, who felt that Severn Trent's reputation changed as a result of the incident in July 2007, were asked to state in what way this reputation changed.

Almost two thirds of these respondents felt that this was a worsened reputation (64%), rising to almost three quarters (73%) of respondents in Gloucester and conversely declining to just under half (48%) of respondents in Stroud, Tewkesbury and Upton. This is illustrated in Table 31.

Table 31: The way in which Severn Trent's reputation changed by area

	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
Enhanced reputation	36	38	27	52
Worsened reputation	64	63	73	48
Total respondents	164	64	67	33

The following table focuses on further cross-analysis of whether Severn Trent's reputation had changed as a result of the incident by whether respondents believed that compensation should be paid.

In terms of those who said that Severn Trent's reputation changed as a result of the incident, a statistically higher proportion of respondents believed that domestic customers should be offered compensation (55%) than those who did not feel that customers should be offered compensation (34%).

Similarly, in terms of those who said that Severn Trent's reputation did not change as a result of the incident, a statistically lower proportion of respondents believed that domestic customers should be offered compensation (45%) than those who did not feel that customers should be offered compensation (66%).

In summary, significantly more respondents who felt compensation was appropriate felt that Severn Trent's reputation had changed and significantly more respondents who did not want compensation felt that Severn Trent's reputation did not change.

Table 32: Breakdown of views on compensation by whether Severn Trent's reputation changed as a result of the incident

Should customers be offered compensation?	Whether Severn Trent's reputations changed as a result of incident (%)				
	%	Total respondents	Yes	No	Total%
Yes	35	139	55	45	100
No	61	246	34	66	100
Don't know	4	16	19	81	100
	100	401			

The 105 respondents who said that Severn Trent's reputation had worsened were then asked what Seven Trent Water could do to demonstrate its commitment to domestic customers like them.

Of these respondents a third suggested that compensation should be paid, whilst three in ten said that Mythe should be reinforced so that it does not flood again (30%). This is summarised in Table 33.

Table 33: What Severn Trent could do to demonstrate its commitment to domestic customers by area

	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
Pay compensation to its customers	33	33	45	-
Reinforce Mythe so it does not flood again	30	28	29	44
Increased resilience against widespread flooding of people's homes	18	10	22	25
Reduce water bills	14	15	14	13
Better communication/more information	10	10	8	13
Nothing	5	10	-	6
Repair water mains/leaks	4	3	4	6
Need for contingency plan	4	8	2	-
Don't know	3	3	4	-
Other	12	8	12	25
Total respondents	105	40	49	16

All respondents were asked to sum up how they felt at the time when they were without mains water. Responses were divided into positive and negative reactions. Respondents could offer more than one word to describe how they felt so percentages may add up to more than 100%.

The main positive responses from respondents were that they felt accepting/pragmatic (25%), understanding (13%) and community spirited (11%), as shown in Table 34.

Table 34: Positive responses: How respondents felt when they were without mains water by area

	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
Accepting/pragmatic	25	22	27	28
Understanding	13	12	12	20
Community spirited	11	11	10	14
Neighbourly	7	8	6	11
Resourceful/creative	5	3	7	7
Grateful	1	1	2	-
Fortunate	1	2	1	1
Sense of adventure/a challenge	1	3	-	-

Other	3	1	4	8
Total respondents	401	154	171	76

The main negative responses from respondents were frustration (28%), especially noted by respondents in Cheltenham (36%), anger (16%) and worried (13%), as shown in Table 35.

Table 35: Negative responses: How respondents felt when they were without mains water by area

	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
Frustrated	28	36	27	13
Angry	16	16	18	11
Worried	13	16	11	13
Unclean	12	16	12	8
Inconvenienced	11	9	14	7
Depressed	8	6	11	7
Lost/helpless/fearful	4	5	3	3
Irritated/annoyed/fed up	3	3	4	3
Surprised/disbelief	2	3	2	3
Other	4	5	2	8
Total respondents	401	154	171	76

All respondents were asked to reflect back on their time without mains water, considering that a few months have now passed, and to appraise whether their opinion of how Severn Trent had handled the situation had changed in any way. If respondents had experienced a change in perception on the events, they were asked both to summarise this and to explain the catalyst for the change.

For the vast majority of respondents (93%) time has not affected their perception of how Severn Trent handled the loss of mains water, as shown in Table 36.

Table 36: Whether opinion of Severn Trent has changed over time in any way by area

	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
Yes	7	7	8	3
No	93	93	92	97
Total respondents	401	154	171	76

Only twenty seven respondents (7%) stated that their opinion of Severn Trent has now changed given the passing of time. Some respondents offered more than one response and indeed some offered both positive and negative comments. Hence, the number of respondents adds up to more than twenty-seven.

More respondents offered positive comments than negative comments.

Positive comments were noted by nineteen respondents and included:

- feel more calm about it (10 respondents)

- Severn Trent did their best (10 respondents)
- perception was poor to start with but I think that looking back on it, they ended up doing well after a few days (1 respondent)

Negative comments were mentioned by twelve respondents and included:

- feel Severn Trent should have done more to support customers (7 respondents)
- feel concerned about increases in water bill (2 respondents)
- now feel angry about it (1 respondent)
- Severn Trent are not listening to customers and all the offers of help they made were quickly forgotten about (1 respondent)
- concerned about quality of water (1 respondent).
- feel they should have foreseen the problem (1 respondent)
- don't feel confident in Severn Trent (1 respondent).

For seventeen respondents the passing of time had influenced their change of response. For four respondents the media coverage affected their opinions and for another four respondents it was talking to others in a similar situation. Furthermore, other comments offered by one respondent each were:

- they now had a better understanding of events
- no information was given to the people affected
- Severn Trent did not look after the vulnerable people
- Severn Trent is now seen as putting their hands in their pockets
- concern about the poor quality of water.

3.9 Respondent's Willingness to Pay

Overall Message

The majority of all respondents would not be prepared to pay anything further on top of their current bill either to ensure that they do not lose their mains water again or to ensure that the treatment works do not flood again.

Detailed Findings

All respondents were asked to indicate how much, if anything, their household would be prepared to pay on top of their current water bill to ensure that they did not lose their mains water supply again and to ensure that the water treatment works does not flood again.

Over three quarters of respondents (78%) would not be prepared to pay anything further on top of their current bill to ensure that they do not lose their mains water again, as shown in Table 37.

Table 37: How much households would be prepared to pay on top of current bill to ensure they don't lose their mains water supply again by area

	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
Nothing	78	79	78	78
Whatever it takes	5	5	5	7
Annual amount stated	7	8	7	7
Don't know	2	3	2	1
Refused	7	6	7	8
Total respondents	401	154	171	76

Twenty nine respondents (7%) mentioned an annual amount they would be prepared to pay on top of their current water bills. These were:

- £0 - £29: 9 respondents
- £30 - £99: 11 respondents
- £100+: 9 respondents.

Similarly just over three quarters of respondents (76%) would not be prepared to pay anything to ensure that the treatment works do not flood again, as shown in Table 38.

Table 38: How much households would be prepared to pay on top of current bill to ensure Mythe does not flood again by area

	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
Nothing	76	77	77	72
Whatever it takes	7	6	6	9
Annual amount stated	8	10	7	8
Don't know	2	2	1	3
Refused	7	5	8	8
Total respondents	401	154	171	76

Thirty four respondents mentioned an annual amount they would be prepared to pay on top of their current water bills. These were:

- £0 - £29: 15 respondents
- £29 - £99: 11 respondents
- £100+: 8 respondents.

3.10 Community Fund Allocation

Overall Message

In terms of the allocation of the remaining funding set aside to help communities affected by flooding, the main recommendations offered by almost half of all respondents were that any remaining community fund money should be divided

between customers affected by flooding, as some form of compensation, or used to protect the area from further flooding.

Detailed Findings

All respondents were asked to consider where the remaining non-allocated funds set aside to assist communities affected by the flooding should now go. For those who stated community schemes and projects, they were asked to name these.

Primarily respondents wanted the remaining community fund money to be divided between customers affected, as compensation (45%) and used to protect the area from further flooding (45%). This is shown in Table 39.

Table 39: Where the remaining money Severn Trent allocated to communities should go, by area

	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
Divided between customers affected as compensation	45	41	48	49
To protect the area from future flooding	45	45	42	50
To cover community schemes and projects	9	11	10	3
Don't know	8	8	9	5
People without home insurance	7	5	8	8
Compensate those worst hit	6	8	5	4
Charity	2	3	2	1
Compensate businesses	1	1	2	1
Subsidise water bills	1	2	1	-
Clean-up of waterways, repair of water system	1	1	2	-
Other	5	3	6	5
Total respondents	401	154	171	76

Older respondents (58%) were also statistically more likely than younger respondents (43%) and middle aged respondents (35%) to suggest that the community funding should be divided between customers affected as compensation. This is summarised in Table 40.

Table 40: Where the money Severn Trent allocated to communities should go by age

	Total (%)	Age (%)			Age refused
		18-44	45-59	60+	
Divided between customers affected as compensation	45	43	35	58	67
To protect the area from future flooding	45	49	47	36	67
To cover community	9	11	8	8	-

schemes and projects					
Don't know	8	8	6	9	-
People without home insurance	7	5	7	8	-
Compensate those worst hit	6	8	6	3	-
Charity	2	3	2	-	-
Compensate businesses	1	1	2	2	-
Subsidise water bills	1	1	1	1	-
Clean-up of waterways, repair of water system	1	1	2	-	-
Other	5	6	5	3	-
Total respondents	401	150	128	120	3

Of the thirty six respondents (9%) who stated that the money should be given to specific community projects, ten had a specific project in mind, namely:

- help the communities
- theatre
- community boards for important information for the communities
- community centres to be repaired
- local hospital
- unblocking drains around Cheltenham
- sailing club/cricket club
- Abbeydale Community Centre
- emergency services
- local sports centres.

3.11 Provision of Compensation

Overall Message

Most respondents felt that it was not necessary to offer domestic customers compensation for the loss of their mains water supply. Of those who did think it necessary, compensation would primarily be for the inconvenience of being without mains water.

For the minority who did want compensation, the level suggested ranged from under twenty pounds to over £200, with a mean of between £60 and £79. However, the majority of these respondents were emphatic that water bills should not increase to provide this compensation.

Detailed Findings

All respondents were asked whether they felt it necessary to offer domestic customers like themselves personal compensation for being without mains water. Those who said 'no' were asked whether there were any exceptions to this and, if so, who they were.

Just over six in ten respondents (61%) felt that it was not necessary to offer domestic customers any compensation for the loss of their mains water supply, whilst just over a third (35%) thought it was necessary. Respondents in Gloucester were slightly more in favour of compensation (39%) than those in Stroud, Tewkesbury and Upton (28%) or Cheltenham (33%). This is summarised in Table 41 below.

Table 41: Whether it is necessary to offer domestic customers compensation, by area

	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
Yes	35	33	39	28
No	61	62	58	67
Don't know	4	5	3	5
Total respondents	401	154	171	76

The 246 (61%) respondents who said that compensation was not necessary were then asked whether there were any exceptions to this.

Over three quarters of these respondents (77%) felt that there were no exceptions required, as shown in Table 42.

Table 42: Any exceptions for those who felt compensation to domestic customers was not necessary by area

	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
Yes	23	22	27	18
No	77	78	73	82
Total respondents	246	96	99	51

For the minority who felt that there were exceptions, these included:

- elderly people (27 respondents)
- people worst affected/flooded (18 respondents)
- people with young children (7 respondents)
- disabled/vulnerable (6 respondents)
- people on low incomes (4 respondents)
- businesses who lost income/businesses (3 respondents)
- people without insurance (1 respondent)
- people who lost their lives (1 respondent)

These 155 respondents⁴ who said either 'yes' that compensation was necessary or that they did not know whether it was necessary, were then asked to specify what the compensation would actually be for.

Compensation would primarily be for the inconvenience suffered (63%), especially mentioned by respondents in Gloucester (71%), as shown in Table 43.

⁴ These 155 respondents represent 39% of the total number of 401 respondents.

Table 43: What compensation would be for by area

	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
Inconvenience suffered	63	60	71	44
Being without water for so long	25	26	19	40
For buying bottled water	12	10	14	12
Time spent finding/going to temporary water supplies	9	10	6	16
Petrol	9	12	8	4
For a service not provided	6	5	7	4
Goodwill gesture	5	7	3	4
Anxiety over not knowing when the water supply would be restored	1	-	3	-
Other	9	12	7	8
Total respondents	155	58	72	25

The respondents who felt that compensation was appropriate for domestic customers⁵ were also asked to indicate how much compensation they felt would be reasonable for their household to receive given the length of time they were without water.

A minority of these respondents (5%) now felt that no compensation was required and around a fifth (21%) were unsure how much compensation should be awarded. The majority, just over half of respondents (52%) felt that up to £79 would be appropriate, as shown in Table 44.

Table 44: Recommended level of compensation by area

	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
None	5	4	4	9
<£20	5	4	7	4
£20-£39	19	16	21	17
£40-£59	22	26	17	26
£60-£79	6	5	6	9
£80-£99	3	4	4	-
£100-£119	9	9	10	4
£120-£139	2	4	1	-
£140-£159	2	5	-	-
£180-£199	1	2	-	-
£200+	5	2	6	13
Don't know	21	21	23	17
Total respondents	150	57	70	23

⁵ Of the 155 who felt that compensation was appropriate, at this stage five now said that they did not require compensation. Hence the base is now reduced to 150 respondents.

These respondents were then asked whether they would still want compensation if customers' bills increased as a result of the provision of that compensation.

The majority of these respondents were still emphatic that compensation should be provided, but almost three quarters of respondents (73%) said that water bills should not increase to fund this.

A minority of these respondents (6%) said that compensation should still be provided even if bills increased as a result, whilst 16% of these respondents now said that compensation should not be provided. This is shown in Table 45.

Table 45: Whether compensation should be provided if customers' bills would rise in the future to accommodate this by area

	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
Yes, compensation should be provided	6	2	10	4
Yes, compensation should be provided but bills should not increase to provide compensation	73	74	76	65
No, compensation should not be provided	16	19	13	17
Don't know	5	5	1	13
Total respondents	150	57	70	23

For nine respondents adamant that compensation should still be provided, even if water bills were to increase to accommodate this, they were asked to state how much their household was prepared to pay for this on top on their current annual water bill.

Seven respondents stated that they did not know how much if anything their household was prepared to pay, whilst one respondent said £10 and one said £200 per year.

In summary, the majority of all respondents (61%) did not feel that it was appropriate to offer compensation to domestic customers for the loss of their mains water supply. Of the minority who either did feel that compensation was appropriate or who were uncertain about Severn Trent offering compensation to its domestic customers, a further 9% of all respondents changed their minds about the issue of compensation when they were either asked to consider the level of compensation (7 respondents), what the compensation should be for (5 respondents), or once they thought that water bills would have to increase as a result (24 respondents). Hence, overall nearly seven in ten respondents felt that compensation was not necessary.

3.12 Respondent Characteristics

All respondents were asked a series of questions in order to characterise them as individuals. These included questions relating to the respondents' age, the number of adults and children in the household, housing tenure, marital status, ethnicity and Social

Economic grouping (SEG). The gender of the respondents was also noted as was whether they lived in a rural, semi rural or urban area, and whether they had a water meter.

Respondent gender is summarised in the following table and illustrates a fairly even distribution across each of the geographical areas, as shown in Table 46.

Table 46: Respondent gender by area

	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
Male	48	49	46	50
Female	52	51	54	50
Total respondents	401	154	171	76

Accent endeavoured to achieve representation across rural, semi rural and urban areas, within the constraints of the geographical requirements of the research. The following table shows that good representation was made across each of the areas.

Table 47: Type of area that respondent lives in by area

	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
Rural	14	9	5	43
Semi rural	34	35	33	33
Urban	52	56	61	22
Don't know	0		1	1
Total respondents	401	154	171	76

Table 48 summarises the propensity of respondents to have a water meter by area, with the likelihood of having a water meter slightly higher in Cheltenham (31%) than in Gloucester (25%) and Stroud, Tewkesbury and Upton (26%).

Table 48: Whether respondents have a water meter by area

	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
Yes	28	31	25	26
No	72	67	75	74
Don't know	1	2	-	-
Total respondents	401	154	171	76

The following table contains a summary of the ages of respondents by geographical area, which illustrates an even spread across each area.

Table 49: Respondent age by area

	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
18-23	2	3	2	1
24-34	24	25	25	21
35-44	11	10	14	8
45-54	25	27	26	20
55-59	7	8	7	4
60-64	12	8	10	22
65 or more	18	18	16	24
Refused	1	1	1	-
Total respondents	401	154	171	76

Table 50 summarises the number of adults in the respondents' household.

Table 50: The number of adults in the household by area

	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
One	15	16	14	14
Two	62	58	64	68
Three	15	18	12	14
Four	6	4	10	3
Five	1	3	1	-
Refused	0	1	-	-
Total respondents	401	154	171	76

Table 51 summarises the number of children in the respondents' household.

Table 51: The number of children in the household by area

	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
None	71	73	69	72
One	12	15	11	11
Two	12	8	16	11
Three	3	3	3	3
Four	1	1	1	3
More than six	0	-	1	-
Refused	0	1	-	1
Total respondents	401	154	171	76

The following table shows the housing status of respondents by area, which shows that the majority of respondents are owner occupiers or are purchasing their home on a mortgage.

Table 52: Housing status of respondents by area

	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
Owned outright	47	48	44	50
Buying on mortgage	35	31	38	34
Rent from council	4	6	2	3
Rent from housing association/trust	5	6	4	4
Rent from private landlord	8	7	9	5
Other	2	1	2	4
Total respondents	401	154	171	76

The table below summarises the marital status of respondents, and it can be seen that three quarters of respondents are married or cohabiting.

Table 53: Marital status of respondents by area

	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
Single	12	14	13	8
Married/co-habiting	75	70	78	79
Separated/divorced	5	7	4	5
Widowed	5	6	3	8
Living with parents	0	1	1	-
In a house share	0	1	-	-
Refused	1	2	1	-
Total respondents	401	154	171	76

The vast majority of respondents were White, either White British or White 'other' as shown in Table 54.

Table 54: Ethnicity of respondents by area

	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
White British	93	92	92	99
White other	3	5	3	-
Asian	0	-	1	-
Asian British	1	1	1	-
Black	0	-	1	-
Mixed	1	1	1	-
Refused	2	1	2	1
Total respondents	401	154	171	76

The sample for this research comprised a fairly even distribution by the social classifications ABC1 and C2DE, as shown in Table 55.

Table 55: Socio economic grouping of respondents by area

	Total %	Cheltenham %	Gloucester %	Stroud, Tewkesbury, Upton %
AB	22	25	15	34
C1	30	30	35	20
C2	19	15	24	16
D	10	10	10	12
E	12	15	10	12
Refused	6	6	6	7
Total respondents	401	154	171	76

4. CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Respondents were fairly pragmatic about Severn Trent's management of a range of activities related to the loss of mains water supply in July 2007. They thought that Severn Trent managed the organisation and distribution of the temporary water supplies best, but were least impressed with how Severn Trent had informed them about the loss of mains water supply. However, the overall impression from the majority of respondents, was that Severn Trent did the best they could in the circumstances presented to them.

The main information sources for respondents when they were without mains water in July 2007 were local radio followed by television. Few tried to make contact directly with Severn Trent at this time but those who did, contacted them by telephone. The small minority of respondents who tried to make contact were successful and felt that they had received a satisfactory response to their enquiry. So for most of the respondents who tried to make contact with Severn Trent, communication seemed to work well.

The vast majority of households felt that they did have access to adequate temporary water supplies when they were without mains water, with bottled water outlets the main water source, followed by bowsers.

Just over half of respondents felt that they had experienced a 'lot of inconvenience' as a result of losing their mains water supplies, mainly through being restricted or not able to use the bath/shower, flush the toilet, wash their clothes or wash up.

For the vast majority of respondents being without mains water encouraged them to consider water to be a more valuable resource, although some said that they had already felt water was a valuable resource. Two thirds of respondents had adopted water saving devices prior to July 2007, whilst a third of respondents took up further water saving measures when their mains water was restored in early August 2007. Of the latter, the majority were still implementing these water saving measures fully in late October 2007. Hence there have been some fairly positive outcomes from this time in terms of the adoption of water saving devices.

Just over half of all respondents stated that they had no perception of Severn Trent before they were without mains water in July 2007, whilst a quarter said that they had a positive perception of the company. Nearly six in ten of all respondents said that Severn Trent's reputation did not change as a result of being without mains water. Of the minority who believed that Severn Trent's reputation had changed as a result of being without mains water, almost two thirds felt that this was now a worsened reputation. Severn Trent may wish to look at how it can improve its public profile in order to ensure that such respondents view Severn Trent more favourably in the future.

There is definite reticence from respondents towards paying any more for their water bills either to ensure that they do not lose their mains water again or to ensure that the treatment works do not flood again. Over three quarters of respondents stated they would not be prepared to pay anything further on top of their current bill. Hence, if water bills were to increase in the near future for this type of reason, Severn Trent

would need to clearly explain to domestic customers the motivation behind such increases.

In terms of the allocation of the remaining funding to help communities affected by flooding, almost half of all respondents felt that any remaining community fund money should be divided between customers affected by flooding as compensation or used to protect the area from further flooding.

Nevertheless, the majority of respondents felt that it was not necessary to offer domestic customers compensation for the loss of their mains water supply. For the minority who felt compensation was necessary, compensation would primarily be for the inconvenience suffered for being without mains water at this time. For those respondents who felt that compensation was appropriate, the majority were emphatic that bills should not increase to provide this compensation.

APPENDIX A

Questionnaire

Record no:
Computer no:
Interviewer name: Interviewer no:
Date:
Time:

Recruitment

Good morning/afternoon/evening. My name is from Accent and I am carrying out research for the Consumer Council for Water (CCWater), who represent the interests of consumers in the water industry. We have been commissioned to carry out research to look at the views of residential customers regarding the loss of mains water supply experienced in July of this year. Any answer you give will be treated in confidence in accordance with the Code of Conduct of the Market Research Society.

Q1. Can you please confirm that you live in:
INTERVIEWER: READ OUT AS APPROPRIATE FROM THE SAMPLE

1. Cheltenham
2. Gloucester
3. Stroud
4. Tewkesbury
5. Upton on Severn
6. Other **THANK AND CLOSE**

Q2. In July of this year heavy rains caused widespread disruption to water supplies. At that time did your home lose its mains water supply for 72 hours or more?

1. Yes
2. No **THANK AND CLOSE**
3. Don't know/Can't remember **THANK AND CLOSE**

Q2b And at this time did your house flood?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know/ can't remember

Q3. And do you personally contribute to the overall running cost of your household eg by contributing towards the payment of a utility bill?

1. Yes
2. No – **ASK TO SPEAK WITH A RELEVANT PERSON. IF REFUSED THANK AND CLOSE**
3. Don't know **THANK AND CLOSE**

Q4. In July when your home was without mains water, did you stay in your own home or move to another address (with access to mains water)?

1. Stay in own home all the time **GO TO Q6**
2. Moved away from home for a few days only **GO TO Q6**
3. Moved away from home until mains water supply was reinstated

Q5. Why did you leave your home at that time?

1. No access to water
 2. Could not take a shower
 3. Could not flush the toilet
 4. House was flooded
 5. Had a baby in the household
 6. Had elderly/immobile people in household
 7. Other (specify)
- THANK AND CLOSE**

Main Questionnaire

Thank you for that. The questionnaire will take about 10 minutes to complete. You do not have to answer questions you do not wish to and you can terminate the interview at any point. Please note that this research is looking for your views on the loss of mains water supply in July of this year and the impact of this loss on your life

Q6. On a scale of 1 to 5, where 1 is very poorly and 5 is very well, how well do you feel that Severn Trent Water managed the loss of the mains water supply in terms of:

ROTATE THESE

	Very Poorly	fairly poorly	neither	Fairly well	very well	dk	NA
1. Informing you about the loss of mains water.....	1	2	3	4	5		67
2. Keeping you informed about their progress in restoring mains water	1	2	3	4	5		67
3. Keeping you informed about whether or not you could drink the mains water when it returned	1	2	3	4	5		67
4. Organising the distribution of temporary water supplies eg bowsers, bottled water outlets	1	2	3	4	5		67
5. Keeping the bowsers filled up.....	1	2	3	4	5		67
6. Overall management of the issue.....	1	2	3	4	5		67

Communication

Q7. At this time where did you get your information from on what was happening with the mains water supply in your local area? **CODE ALL THAT APPLY**

1. Word of mouth
2. Local radio
3. National radio
4. Television
5. Local newspapers
6. National newspapers
7. Severn Trent Water
8. Local voluntary organisation/charities
9. Local Council
10. Other (specify)

Q8. When your water was cut off did you, or anyone in your household, try and contact Severn Trent?

1. Yes
2. No **GO TO Q12**

Q9. How did you try contacting Severn Trent?

1. Telephone
2. Web
3. Other (specify)

Q10. What was the outcome of this?

1. Spoke to someone on telephone
2. Found relevant information on the website
3. Spoke to someone in person
4. Couldn't get through on telephone **GO TO Q12**
5. Couldn't get through on website **GO TO Q12**
6. Other (specify)

Q11. Did you get a satisfactory answer to your query?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know

Q12. **ASK ALL:** With the benefit of hindsight what, if anything, do you feel that Severn Trent Water could have done differently regarding communicating with their customers? **PROBE BUT DO NOT PROMPT. CODE ALL THAT APPLY**

1. Severn Trent did their best in the circumstances
2. Higher media profile
3. Know where all customers live
4. Provide daily news bulletins updating customers on events/progress
5. Send letters to update customers on situation
6. Send letters to all customers advising them that their mains water was restored
7. Distribute information on where temporary water supplies are located
8. Work with local charities/volunteer groups to identify vulnerable people
9. Work with the local Council
10. Work with other government bodies
11. Nothing
12. Other (specify)

Q13. Again with the benefit of hindsight, what if anything do you feel that Severn Trent Water could do differently regarding providing temporary water supplies to customers? **PROBE BUT DO NOT PROMPT. CODE ALL THAT APPLY**

1. Severn Trent did their best in the circumstances
2. Know where all customers live
3. Have more bowsers
4. Have smaller bowsers able to navigate the streets
5. Have bowsers in more locations
6. Locate bowsers in more appropriate locations
7. Fill up bowsers more often
8. Supervise/police the distribution of bottled water to ensure fair distribution
9. Supervise the distribution of the water from the bowsers
10. Supervise/police the bowsers to protect against contamination of temporary water supplies
11. Work with charities to support more vulnerable people
12. Nothing
13. Other (specify)

Access to temporary Supplies

Q14. When you were without mains water did your household have sufficient access to temporary water supplies?

1. Yes **GO TO Q16**
2. No
3. Don't know **GO TO Q16**

Q15. Why did you **not** have access to sufficient temporary supplies of water?

1. Did not know where the bowsers were located
2. Could not get to the bowsers
3. Bowsers were empty
4. Could not get to the bottled water outlets
5. Bottled water supplies had run out
6. Water allocation was insufficient for our needs
7. Other (specify)

Q16. **ASK ALL:** Where did you get your temporary water supplies from? **CODE ALL THAT APPLY**

1. Bowsers
2. Free bottled water outlets
3. Purchased bottled water from supermarkets
4. Friends and neighbours
5. Other (specify)

Q17. What level of inconvenience, if any, did your household experience as a result of losing the mains water supply to your home?

1. No inconvenience **GO TO Q20**
2. A little inconvenience
3. A lot of inconvenience
4. Don't know/can't say **GO TO Q20**

Q18. In what ways were you inconvenienced?

1. Restricted/Couldn't have a shower/bath
2. Restricted/Couldn't flush the toilet
3. Restricted/Couldn't cook
4. Restricted/Couldn't wash up
5. Restricted/Couldn't wash clothes
6. Had to move to hotel/B&B temporarily
7. Could not go to work
8. Had to purchase bottled water
9. Had to travel to collect water
10. Other (specify)

Q19. Bearing this in mind, could you estimate what the cost outlay was to your household of being without mains water at this time? Only include the costs specifically related to being without your mains water supply, for example, having to buy bottled water, driving to bowsers/bottled water outlets, driving to other accommodation, the cost of staying in a hotel, etc. and not the costs related to flooding.

INTERVIEWER: THIS DOES NOT INCLUDE DAMAGE CAUSED BY FLOODING. ASK RESPONDENT TO GIVE AN INDICATIVE AMOUNT TO THE NEAREST POUND

1. Don't know/can't say
2. Other (specify) **WRITE IN AMOUNT**

Water Efficiency/Water Saving Devices

Q20. Before being without mains water in July, what water conservation devices / measures did you use in your household? **DO NOT PROMPT. CODE ALL THAT APPLY**

1. None
2. Water meter installed
3. Showers instead of baths
4. Water efficient shower/shower-head
5. Energy & Water efficient dishwasher
6. Energy & Water efficient washing machine
7. Trigger device fitted to hosepipe
8. Hippo/Save A Flush device in toilet cistern
9. Lag pipes to protect against bursting
10. Water butts in garden
11. Turn off tap when brushing teeth
12. Wait until full load for Washing Machine / dishwasher
13. Only put required amount in kettle
14. Reusing water eg bath water
15. Share shower/bath
16. Other (specify)

Q21. What effect, if at all, did being without mains water have on your perception of the value of water?
READ OUT

1. No effect
2. Water considered more valuable
3. Water considered less valuable
4. Other (specify)

Q22. Did you implement any further water saving measures when your mains water supply was restored in early August?

1. Yes
2. No **GO TO Q25**
3. Don't know/can't remember **GO TO Q25**

Q23. What did you do? **DO NOT PROMPT. CODE ALL THAT APPLY**

1. Water meter installed
2. Showers instead of baths
3. Water efficient shower/shower-head
4. Energy & Water efficient dishwasher
5. Energy & Water efficient washing machine
6. Trigger device fitted to hosepipe
7. Hippo/Save A Flush device in toilet cistern
8. Lag pipes to protect against bursting
9. Water butts in garden
10. Turn off tap when brushing teeth
11. Wait until full load for Washing Machine / dishwasher
12. Only put required amount in kettle
13. Reusing water eg bath water
14. Share shower/bath
15. Other (specify)

Q24. Are you still implementing these water saving measures?

1. Yes, fully
2. Yes, somewhat
3. No
4. Don't know

Perception/Reputation of Severn Trent

Q25. What was your perception of Severn Trent as a company before this incident in July 2007?

1. No perception of Severn Trent Water
2. Positive perception
3. Negative perception
4. Don't know

Q26. In your opinion did Severn Trent's reputation change as a result of this incident?

1. Yes
2. No **GO TO Q29**

Q27. In what way did their reputation change?

1. Enhanced reputation **GO TO Q29**
2. Worsened reputation

Q28. What, if anything, should Severn Trent do to demonstrate its commitment to domestic customers like yourself?

1. Nothing
2. Pay compensation to its customers
3. Reinforce Mythe so it does not flood again
4. Increased resilience against widespread flooding of people's homes
5. Reduce water bills
6. Other (specify)

Q29. **ASK ALL:** How would you sum up how you felt at this time when you were without mains water?
PROBE BUT DO NOT PROMPT. CODE ALL THAT APPLY

Negative

1. Angry
2. Frustrated
3. Depressed
4. Unclean
5. Worried
6. other (specify)

Positive

7. Accepting/pragmatic
8. Understanding
9. Resourceful/creative
10. Neighbourly
11. Community spirited
12. other (specify)

Q30. And looking back on this time, considering that a few months have now passed, has your opinion on how Severn Trent handled the loss of mains water supply changed in any way?

1. Yes
2. No **GO TO Q33**

Q31. What has changed?

Negative

1. Now feel angry about it
2. Feel Severn Trent should have been done more to support customers
3. Feel concerned about increases in water bill
4. Other (specify)

Positive

5. Feel more calm about it
6. Severn Trent did their best
7. Other (specify)

Q32. What influenced this change?

1. Passing of time
2. talking to others in similar situation
3. media coverage
4. Other (specify)

Q33. **ASK ALL:** How much, if anything, would your household be prepared to pay on top of your current water bill to ensure that you don't lose your mains water supply again?

1. Nothing
2. Whatever it takes
3. Other (specify) **INCLUDE AMOUNT**

Q33b Over what time period does this amount refer to?

1. One off payment
2. Weekly payment
3. Monthly payment
4. Quarterly payment
5. Six monthly payment
6. Annual payment
7. Other (specify)

Q34. How much, if anything, would your household be prepared on top of your current water bill to pay to ensure that water treatment works do not flood again?

1. Nothing
2. Whatever it takes
3. Other (specify) **INCLUDE AMOUNT**

Q34b Over what time period does this amount refer to?

1. One off payment
2. Weekly payment
3. Monthly payment
4. Quarterly payment
5. Six monthly payment
6. Annual payment
7. Other (specify)

Allocation of funds

Q35. Severn Trent has provided £3.5 million to help communities affected by the flooding. Some of this money has yet to be allocated. Where do you think that this money should go?

1. Divided between customers affected as compensation **GO TO Q37**
2. To cover community schemes and projects
3. To protect the area from future flooding **GO TO Q37**
4. People without home insurance
4. Don't know **GO TO Q37**
5. Other (specify) **GO TO Q37**

Q36. Do you have a specific community project or scheme in mind? **WRITE IN**

1. Yes (specify)
2. No

Compensation

Q37. Do you think that it is necessary to offer domestic customers like yourself personal compensation for the loss of their mains water supply?

1. Yes **GO TO Q40**
2. No
3. Don't know **GO TO Q40**

Q38. Are there any exceptions to this?

1. Yes
2. No **GO TO Q44**

Q39. Who or what are they?

1. Elderly people
2. People on low incomes
3. People without insurance
4. Other (specify)

GO TO Q44

Q40. If your household were to receive compensation for being without your mains water supply, what would this compensation actually be for?

1. Do not require compensation **GO TO Q44**
2. Being without water for so long
3. For buying bottled water
4. Inconvenience suffered
5. Anxiety over not knowing when the water supply would be restored
6. Time spent finding/going to temporary water supplies
7. Petrol
8. Other (specify)

Q41. How much compensation would be reasonable for your household to receive for the length of time that you were without drinking water? **TICK ONE ONLY**

1. None
2. <£20
3. £20-£39
4. £40-£59
5. £60-£79
6. £80-£99
7. £100-£119
8. £120-£139
9. £140-£159
10. £160-£179
11. £180-£199
12. £200+

Q42. Now if you consider that providing customers with compensation could mean that customer bills would rise in the future (as a result of the company incurring greater risk), do you still feel that compensation should be provided?

1. Yes compensation should be provided
2. Yes compensation should be provided but bills should not increase to provide compensation **GO TO Q44**
3. No compensation should not be provided **GO TO Q44**
4. Don't know **GO TO Q44 (H | Q44)**

Q43. In terms of your annual household water bill how much if anything is your household prepared to pay for this?

1. Nothing
2. Don't know
3. Other (specify) **INCLUDE AMOUNT**

Q44. **NULL QUESTION.**

Respondent Characteristics

Q45. **INTERVIEWER: RECORD RESPONDENT GENDER**

1. male
2. female

Q46. What is your annual water bill? **INTERVIEWER: GET BEST GUESS**

Q47. Do you live in a rural, semi rural or urban location? **RECORD RESPONDENTS PERCEPTION OF THEIR AREA**

1. Rural
2. Semi rural
3. Urban
4. Don't know

Q48. Do you have a water meter?

1. Yes
2. No
3. Don't know

Q49. Which of the following age groups are you in?

READ OUT

1. 18-23
2. 24-34
3. 35-44
4. 45-54
5. 55-59
6. 60-64
7. 65 or more
8. Refused

Q50. How many adults are there in your household, including yourself? An adult is a person aged 16 or over. **PLEASE WRITE IN THE NUMBER OF ADULTS**

number of adults

Q51. How many children are there in your household? A child is a person aged 15 or under. **PLEASE WRITE IN THE NUMBER OF CHILDREN**

1. None
2. One
3. Two
4. Three
5. Four
6. Five
7. Six
8. More than six

Q52. Do you own or rent your current accommodation? **CLARIFY RESPONSE AND CODE ONE ONLY**

1. Owned outright
2. Buying on mortgage
3. Rent from council
4. Rent from housing association/trust
5. Rent from private landlord
6. Other (please specify)

Q53. Are you:

- 1 Single
- 2 Married/co-habiting
- 3 Separated/divorced
- 4 Widowed
- 5 Living with parents
- 6 In a house share
- 9 Refused (**DO NOT READ OUT**)

Q54. Which of the following best describes your ethnic background?

- 1 White British
- 2 White other
- 3 Asian
- 4 Asian British
- 5 Black
- 6 Black British
- 7 Chinese
- 8 Mixed
- 9 Other (SPECIFY) _____
- 99 Refused (**DO NOT READ OUT**)

Q55. What is the job title of the head of the household?

RECORD: _____

Highest level qualification achieved by chief income earner?

.....

How many people the chief income earner is responsible for at work?

.....

Q56. **INTERVIEWER: RECORD SOCIO ECONOMIC GROUP**

- 1 AB
- 2 C1
- 3 C2
- 4 D
- 5 E
- 6 Refused

Thank you for your help in this research

This research was conducted under the terms of the MRS code of conduct and is completely confidential. If you would like to confirm my credentials or those of Accent please call the MRS free on 0500 396999. **HAND OVER THE THANK YOU SLIP.**

Please can I take a note of your name and where we can contact you for quality control purposes?

Respondent name:

Telephone: home:..... work:.....

Thank you

I confirm that this interview was conducted under the terms of the MRS code of conduct and is completely confidential

Interviewer's signature: