


Marin County public water systems

3
systems are Failing or At-Risk
16% of all systems in the county profile

Status classification					
Share of listed systems, followed by the count, reported population, and funding in each status.					
At-Risk 16%		Not At-Risk 74%			Not Assessed 11%
	Failing	At-Risk	Potentially At-Risk	Not At-Risk	Not Assessed
Systems	0	3	0	14	2
Population	0	4,079	0	86,466	187,107
Funding since 2017	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$847K	\$1M

Key figures

19 public water systems	277,652 reported population	53% serve 500 people or fewer	\$2M reported funding since 2017
----------------------------	--------------------------------	----------------------------------	-------------------------------------




Summary

Marin County has 19 public water systems in the SAFER dataset. Of these, 3 (16%) are classified as Failing or At-Risk.

Those systems report serving 4,079 people. The county profile is also shaped by small systems: 10 systems serve 500 people or fewer.

2 systems are listed as Not Assessed, serving 187,107 people, so Not Assessed should not be read as a low-risk classification.

Reported funding since 2017 totals \$2M across 3 systems. Technical assistance funding totals \$33K.



System counts and reported population

Not Assessed systems make up 11% of listed systems and 67% of reported population. That population sits in a few large systems outside the SAFER assessment's scope, which generally have more capacity, so this reflects scope rather than hidden risk.

Risk profile

Risk in Marin County is distributed across four dimensions. Accessibility contributes the largest share of the combined weighted risk score at 42%. Across all individual indicators, No intertie appears most often, affecting 13 of 17 assessed systems.

Water Quality

16%

of combined weighted risk

State 32% · ▼ 16 pts

MOST COMMON FLAG

Water quality trends toward MCL

Accessibility

42%

of combined weighted risk

State 36% · ▲ 6 pts

MOST COMMON FLAG

No intertie

Affordability

22%

of combined weighted risk

State 17% · ▲ 5 pts

MOST COMMON FLAG

Household socioeconomic burden

TMF Capacity

20%

of combined weighted risk

State 15% · ▲ 5 pts


MOST COMMON FLAG

Total net annual income

Water Quality

Water Quality accounts for 16% of the county's combined weighted risk score. Water quality trends toward MCL appears in 6 of 17 assessed systems. Past presence on Failing list is next, appearing in 2 of 17 assessed systems.


Each indicator was assessed for 17 systems.



Accessibility

Accessibility accounts for 42% of the county's combined weighted risk score. No intertie appears in 13 of 17 assessed systems. Limited water sources is next, appearing in 5 of 17 assessed systems.


Indicator denominators range from 15 to 17 assessed systems.



Affordability

Affordability accounts for 22% of the county's combined weighted risk score. Household socioeconomic burden appears in 5 of 17 assessed systems. Extreme water bill is next, appearing in 4 of 15 assessed systems.


Indicator denominators range from 15 to 17 assessed systems.



TMF Capacity

TMF Capacity accounts for 20% of the county's combined weighted risk score. Total net annual income appears in 8 of 17 assessed systems. Operating ratio is next, appearing in 6 of 17 assessed systems.

Each indicator was assessed for 17 systems.




Patterns and context

The countywide totals hide important differences among systems. The panels below show how SAFER status varies by system size and service-area economic status, what conditions appear among Failing systems, and how reported funding is distributed across the 19 systems in Marin County.

Status by system size


SAFER status within each population group



Among systems serving 500 people or fewer, 1 of 10 are Failing or At-Risk. The highest concentration occurs among systems serving 501 to 3,300, at 33%.

Economic context

Orange shows Failing or At-Risk systems within each service-area group



DAC and SDAC service areas contain 3 of 19 listed systems. Within those two groups, 1 systems are Failing or At-Risk.

Conditions among Failing systems

A system can appear under more than one condition


No systems are classified as Failing in this county.

No primary analytes were listed for Failing systems.

No systems in this county are classified as Failing.

Reported funding

Totals since 2017 and number of systems reporting funding



Funding since 2017 totals \$2M across 3 systems. Not Assessed systems account for 54% of that total. Reported technical assistance funding adds \$33K.

Key takeaways

16%

of systems are Failing or At-Risk

That represents 3 systems reporting service to 4,079 people. That is below the statewide average of 33%.

42%

of weighted risk comes from Accessibility

The most widespread individual flag is no intertie, found in 13 of 17 assessed systems. Statewide, Accessibility accounts for 36% of weighted risk.

53%

of systems serve 500 people or fewer

Small systems account for 10 of the county's 19 listed systems. That is below the statewide average of 61%.



Interactive SAFER dashboard

For system-level data and current maps, see the State Water Board's SAFER dashboard. Scan the code or visit waterboards.ca.gov/drinking_water/certlic/drinkingwater/saferdashboard.html.