

Mono County public water systems

7 systems are Failing or At-Risk
35% of all systems in the county profile

Status classification

Share of listed systems, followed by the count, reported population, and funding in each status.

	Failing 10%	At-Risk 25%	Potentially At-Risk 15%	Not At-Risk 50%	Not Assessed
	Failing	At-Risk	Potentially At-Risk	Not At-Risk	Not Assessed
Systems	2	5	3	10	0
Population	2,894	4,499	915	10,423	0
Funding since 2017	\$2M	\$0	\$4M	\$0	\$0

Key figures

20

public water systems

18,731

reported population

65%


serve 500 people or fewer

\$6M

reported funding since 2017

System locations

Points show reported system locations. They do not represent service-area boundaries.



Each point represents one system record. Nearby or overlapping points can conceal multiple systems.

Summary


Mono County has 20 public water systems in the SAFER dataset. Of these, 7 (35%) are classified as Failing or At-Risk.

Those systems report serving 7,393 people. The county profile is also shaped by small systems: 13 systems serve 500 people or fewer.

Reported funding since 2017 totals \$6M across 2 systems. Technical assistance funding totals \$185K.

System counts and reported population





Potentially At-Risk systems make up 15% of listed systems and 5% of reported population. This status is concentrated in smaller systems, so it reaches fewer people than its system count suggests.



Risk profile

Risk in Mono County is distributed across four dimensions. Water Quality contributes the largest share of the combined weighted risk score at 38%. Across all individual indicators, No intertie appears most often, affecting 19 of 20 assessed systems.

Water Quality 38% of combined weighted risk State 32% · ▲ 6 pts MOST COMMON FLAG Water quality trends toward MCL	Accessibility 28% of combined weighted risk State 36% · ▼ 8 pts MOST COMMON FLAG No intertie	Affordability 19% of combined weighted risk State 17% · ▲ 2 pts MOST COMMON FLAG Household socioeconomic burden	TMF Capacity 15% of combined weighted risk State 15% · – 0 pts MOST COMMON FLAG Total net annual income
---	---	--	--




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 20 systems in Mono County.

Status by system size


SAFER status within each population group



Among systems serving 500 people or fewer, 4 of 13 are Failing or At-Risk. The highest concentration occurs among systems serving 501 to 3,300, at 50%.

Economic context


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



DAC and SDAC service areas contain 18 of 20 listed systems. Within those two groups, 7 systems are Failing or At-Risk.

Conditions among Failing systems

A system can appear under more than one condition




Frequently listed primary analytes

Arsenic 1

Among 2 Failing systems, 1 report primary MCL violation. The most frequently listed primary analytes are Arsenic.

Reported funding

Totals since 2017 and number of systems reporting funding



Funding since 2017 totals \$6M across 2 systems. Potentially At-Risk systems account for 68% of that total. Reported technical assistance funding adds \$185K.

Key takeaways

35%

of systems are Failing or At-Risk

That represents 7 systems reporting service to 7,393 people. That is above the statewide average of 33%.

38%

of weighted risk comes from Water Quality

The most widespread individual flag is no intertie, found in 19 of 20 assessed systems. Statewide, Water Quality accounts for 32% of weighted risk.

65%

of systems serve 500 people or fewer

Small systems account for 13 of the county's 20 listed systems. That is above 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.