

Interactive Groundwater Sustainability Agency Boundaries

Updated interactive Groundwater Sustainability Agency (GSA) layer for the Drinking Water Tool (2025).
Data processed and joined by Clare Pace and Ari Libenson, Water Equity Science Shop, UC Berkeley.
Contact: cpace@berkeley.edu

File name: GSA_interactive_final_050625.shp

Spatial Reference

| | | | |
|------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Geographic Coordinate System | NAD 1983 | Projected Coordinate System | NAD 1983 (Teale) Albers (Meters) |
| WKID | 4269 | Projection | 3310 |
| Authority | EPSG | Authority | EPSG |
| Angular Unit | Degree (0.0174532925199433) | Linear Unit | Meters (1.0) |
| Prime Meridian | Greenwich (0.0) | False Easting | 0.00 |
| Datum | D North American 1983 | False Northing | -4000000.0 |
| Spheroid | GRS 1980 | Central Meridian | -120.0 |
| Semimajor Axis | 6378137.0 | Standard Parallel 1 | 34.0 |
| Semiminor Axis | 6356752.314140356 | Standard Parallel 2 | 40.5 |
| Inverse Flattening | 298.257222101 | Latitude of Origin | 0.0 |

Description

This shapefile contains a feature class with polygons that represent 353 Groundwater Sustainability Agencies (GSA) formed under the Sustainable Groundwater Management Act (SGMA). The GSA boundaries were downloaded from the Department of Water Resources (August 7, 2023). To estimate a count of each entity per GSA, the following fields were spatially joined to the GSA boundaries: domestic wells locations, Groundwater Sustainability Agencies, public supply well locations, water system boundaries, severely disadvantaged and disadvantaged census places, drinking water threats, results for the Central Valley Drought Analysis, and drinking water affordability data.

Methods:

Updating GSA layer attributes

1. Spatially joined public supply wells¹ to GSA polygons² in ArcGIS Pro, using the “Completely Contained” argument.
 - a. Created a new field, Num_MunPub, populated with the sum of wells per GSA.
2. Spatially joined domestic well points³ to GSA polygons, using the “Completely Contained” argument.
 - a. Created a new field, Count, populated with the count of wells per GSA.
 - b. Selected all domestic wells with completed depth > 0 ft. Used summarize within function to calculate average and standard deviation of completed well depth.

3. Performed a pairwise intersection to identify overlaps between water system boundaries⁴ and GSAs.
 - a. Slivers were identified and excluded.
 - b. Dissolved by GSA ID and calculated the sum of systems per GSA.
4. Joined updated contact information for GSAs shared by the CA Department of Water Resources on August 7, 2023.
5. Calculated population served by domestic wells³ and population served by water system (Pace et al., 2023) for each GSA.
 - a. Used geoprocessing tool “make feature layer” and selected the option for “use ratio policy” for population field.
 - b. Intersected layer with GSA boundaries.
 - c. Dissolved by GSA ID and calculated sum of population.
6. Calculated number of disadvantaged communities (DAC) and severely disadvantaged communities (SDAC) census designated places⁵ in each GSA.
 - a. Intersected 2021 census designated places and GSA boundaries.
 - b. Selected by DAC and dissolved by GSA.
 - c. Selected by SDAC and dissolved by GSA.
7. Spatially joined with point data for the following drinking water threats layers:
 - a. Drinking water wells with PFAS detections,⁶ wastewater treatment facilities,⁷ landfills,⁷ refineries and terminals,⁷ chrome plating facilities,⁷ active oil and gas wells,⁸ sites permitted to discharge animal waste discharge.⁹
 - b. Used the geoprocessing tool “summarize within” function to count the number of each threat by GSA.
 - c. Calculated the percent of drinking water wells that had at least one sample that exceeded the detection limit.
 - d. Calculated the percent of drinking water wells that had at least one sample that exceeded one or more PFAS maximum contaminant level (MCL).
8. Merged drinking water threat polygons representing superfund sites;¹⁰ military installations, ranges, and training areas;¹¹ and airports permitted to use aqueous film-forming foam (AFFF)¹² into a single shapefile.
 - a. Removed duplicates, dummy coded polygons based on which dataset (or combination of datasets) it came from.
 - b. Intersected polygons with GSAs and added the number of each type of facility by GSA.
9. Spatially intersected polygons representing biosolid application areas¹³ with districts to calculate the number of sites per district.
10. Calculated total pesticide application (pounds) for each district.
 - a. Calculated the total application of pesticide active ingredients that are classified as groundwater threats (2011-2019)¹⁴ and as PFAS chemicals (2019-2022).¹⁵
 - b. Used geoprocessing tool “make feature layer” and selected the option for “use ratio policy” for pesticide sum.
 - c. Intersected layer with county boundaries.
 - d. Dissolved by county ID and calculated sum of pesticides.

11. Spatially joined the Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC) Drought Analysis¹⁶ results to GSA polygons, using the “Completely Contained” argument.
 - i. Calculated the count of domestic wells included in the drought analysis.
 - ii. Calculated the count of domestic wells fully dewatered and partially dewatered under both the Measurable Objective and Minimum Threshold conditions.
 - iii. Calculated the percent of domestic wells fully dewatered and partially dewatered under both the Measurable Objective and Minimum Threshold conditions.
12. Spatially joined Water System Affordability data¹⁷ to GSA using the pairwise intersect and pairwise dissolve functions.
 - a. Performed a pairwise intersection to identify overlaps between water system boundaries and GSAs.
 - i. Slivers were identified and excluded.
 - b. Dissolved by GSA ID
 - i. Calculated the sum of systems assessed for: affordability, percent median household income (%MHI), extreme water bill, and household socioeconomic burden.
 - ii. Calculated the sum of systems that have a high affordability burden and thresholds exceeded for %MHI, extreme water bill, and household socioeconomic burden.
 - iii. Calculated the percent of systems assessed that have a high affordability burden and thresholds exceeded for %MHI, extreme water bill, and household socioeconomic burden.

Attribute Table

| Field Heading | Field type | Field Description | Source |
|---------------|------------|--------------------------------|--------|
| GSA_ID | Long | GSA ID | DWR |
| GSA_Name | Text | GSA name | DWR |
| GSA_URL_1 | Text | URL | DWR |
| POC_Name_1 | Text | Person of contact name | CWC |
| POC_Email_ | Text | Person of contact email | CWC |
| POC_Phone_ | Text | Person of contact phone number | CWC |
| Local_ID | Text | Local ID | DWR |

| | | | |
|-------------|--------|---|-------------|
| Posted_DT | Date | Date GSA posted to DWR database | DWR |
| Av_depth | Double | Average total completed depth of wells | WESS |
| SD_depth | Double | Standard deviation of total completed depth for wells | WESS |
| Count | Long | Count of domestic wells | WESS |
| Num_MunPub | Long | Count of public supply wells | WESS |
| Basin_Numb | Text | Basin Number (B118) | DWR, B118 |
| Basin_Subb | Text | Sub-Basin Number (B118) | DWR, B118 |
| Basin_Name | Text | Basin Name (B118) | DWR, B118 |
| Basin_Su_1 | Text | Sub-Basin Name (B118) | DWR, B118 |
| Basin_1 | Text | Sub-Basin Number (B118) | DWR, B118 |
| Region_Off | text | | |
| Hydrologic | Text | Hydrologic Region (DWR) | DWR, CASGEM |
| DWR_Projec | Long | DWR CASGEM Project Phase | DWR, CASGEM |
| Adjud_C8c | Long | Adjudicated Basin [True / False] | DWR, CASGEM |
| CritOvrdrft | Long | Critically Overdrafted Basin [True / False] | DWR, CASGEM |
| PriorityCh | Text | Change in CASGEM Priority between 2014 | DWR, CASGEM |

| | | | |
|------------|--------|--|-------------|
| | | and 2018 | |
| CASGEMPhas | Text | CASGEM Priority Ranking (Phase 2) | DWR, CASGEM |
| WS_count | Long | Count of water systems | WESS |
| CWS_pop_fi | Double | Population served by water systems | WESS |
| DWA_pop_To | Double | Population served by domestic wells | WESS |
| Num_DAC | Double | Count of disadvantaged communities | WESS |
| Num_SDAC | Double | Count of severely disadvantaged communities | WESS |
| WWTFs | Double | Count of wastewater treatment facilities (WWTFs) | WESS |
| Excd_MCL | Float | Count of wells with at least one water sample with PFAS measured above any EPA Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) | WESS |
| Excd_DL | Float | Count of wells with at least one water sample with PFAS measured above the detection limit but below any EPA Maximum Contaminant Level (MCL) | WESS |

| | | | |
|------------|--------|---|------|
| n_PFAS_sam | Float | Count of wells that were sampled and tested for PFAS. | WESS |
| p_excd_MCL | Float | Percent of wells sampled with at least one water sample with PFAS measured above any EPA MCL. | WESS |
| p_excd_DL | Float | Percent of wells sampled with at least one water sample with PFAS detected above the detection limit but below any EPA MCL. | WESS |
| RefsTerms | Double | Count of refineries and bulk terminals | WESS |
| Landfills | Double | Count of municipal landfills in GSA | WESS |
| ChromePlat | Double | Count of chrome-plating facilities in GSA | WESS |
| Num_OG | Double | Count of oil and gas wells in GSA | WESS |
| Total_pest | Double | Total pounds of pesticide active | WESS |

| | | | |
|------------|--------|---|------|
| | | ingredients that are classified as groundwater threats applied between 2011-2019 | |
| pfas_pest_ | Double | Total pounds of pesticide active ingredients that are classified as PFAS applied between 2019-2022. | WESS |
| SRP | Double | Count of Superfund Sites | WESS |
| MIRTA | Double | Count of Military Installations, Ranges and Training Areas (MIRTA) | WESS |
| P139 | Double | Count of airports permitted to use aqueous film-forming foam (contains PFAS) | WESS |
| MIRTA_SPR | Double | Count of sites listed as both a MIRTA and Superfund Site (SRP) | WESS |
| MT_fully | Float | Count of fully dewatered domestic wells based on the Minimum Threshold (MT) groundwater | EKI |

| | | | |
|------------|-------|---|-----|
| | | level. | |
| MT_partial | Float | Count of partially dewatered domestic wells based on the MT groundwater level. | EKI |
| MO_fully | Float | Count of fully dewatered domestic wells based on the Measurable Objective (MO) groundwater level. | EKI |
| MO_partial | Float | Count of partially dewatered domestic wells based on the MO groundwater level. | EKI |
| n_wells_sm | Float | Total number of domestic wells included in the Sustainable Management Criteria (SMC) drought analysis. | EKI |
| p_mt_full | Float | Percent of fully dewatered wells based on the MT groundwater level. Denominator is the total number of domestic wells included in the SMC drought analysis. | EKI |
| p_mt_part | Float | Percent of partially dewatered wells based on the MT groundwater level. Denominator is the total number of | EKI |

| | | | |
|------------|--------|--|-------|
| | | domestic wells included in the SMC drought analysis. | |
| p_mo_full | Float | Percent of fully dewatered wells based on the MO groundwater level. Denominator is the total number of domestic wells included in the SMC drought analysis. | EKI |
| p_mo_part | Float | Percent of partially dewatered wells based on the MO groundwater level. Denominator is the total number of domestic wells included in the SMC drought analysis. | EKI |
| afford_hig | Double | Count of water systems located partially or fully within GSA boundaries with a high affordability burden, based on the SWRCB's 2024 Affordability Assessment. | SWRCB |
| pMHI_yes | Double | Count of water systems located partially or fully within GSA boundaries that exceeded the threshold for percent Median Household Income (MHI), based on the SWRCB's 2024 Affordability | SWRCB |

| | | | |
|------------|--------|---|-------|
| | | Assessment. | |
| EWB_yes | Double | Count of water systems located partially or fully within GSA boundaries that exceeded the threshold for extreme water bill, based on the SWRCB's 2024 Affordability Assessment. | SWRCB |
| hseSES_yes | Double | Count of water systems located partially or fully within GSA boundaries that exceeded the threshold for household socioeconomic burden, based on the SWRCB's 2024 Affordability Assessment. | SWRCB |
| n_ws_affor | Long | Count of water systems that were included in the affordability assessment and assigned an affordability burden. | SWRCB |
| n_ws_pMHI | Long | Count of water systems that were included in the affordability assessment and evaluated for the percent MHI indicator. | SWRCB |
| n_ws_EWB | Long | Count of water systems that were included in the affordability assessment and | SWRCB |

| | | | |
|------------|-------|--|-------|
| | | evaluated for the extreme water bill indicator. | |
| n_ws_hseSE | Long | Count of water systems that were included in the affordability assessment and evaluated for the household socioeconomic burden indicator. | SWRCB |
| p_afford_h | Float | Percent of water systems with a high affordability burden. Denominator is the count of water systems included in the assessment. | SWRCB |
| p_pmhi | Float | Percent of water systems that exceeded the threshold for percent MHI. Denominator is the count of water systems evaluated for percent MHI. | SWRCB |
| p_ewb | Float | Percent of water systems that exceeded the threshold for extreme water bill. Denominator is the count of water systems evaluated for extreme water bill. | SWRCB |
| p_hseSES | Float | Percent of water systems that exceeded the threshold for | SWRCB |

| | | | |
|------------|-------|---|-------------|
| | | household socioeconomic burden. Denominator is the count of water systems evaluated for household socioeconomic burden. | |
| Num_biosol | Float | Number of sites historically and actively permitted to apply biosolids to land. | WESS |
| an_wst_dis | Float | Number of sites historically and actively permitted to discharge animal waste. | SWRCB/CIWQS |

References

1. Municipal Wells Dataset (2025). California State Water Resources Control Board, Groundwater Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA), Groundwater Information System. Available from <https://gamagroundwater.waterboards.ca.gov/gama/gamamap/public/>. Accessed February 5, 2025.
2. Dept. of Water Resources (2023). i03 Groundwater Sustainability Agencies MapService. Available from <https://data.ca.gov/dataset/i03-groundwater-sustainability-agencies-mapservice>. Accessed August 7, 2023.
3. Rempel, J., Pace, C., Cushing, L., Morello-Frosch, R. (2023). Domestic Well Areas Version 2.0, Drinking Water Tool metadata, prepared by the Water Equity Science Shop, UC Berkeley.
4. Pace, C., Bangia, K., Fisher, E., Cushing, L., Morello-Frosch, R. (2023). Water system boundaries version 2.0, Drinking Water Tool metadata, prepared by the Water Equity Science Shop, UC Berkeley.
5. U.S. Census Bureau. B19013: MEDIAN HOUSEHOLD INCOME IN ... - Census Bureau Table. 2017-2021 American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates. Available from <https://data.census.gov/table?q=B19013>
6. Karasaki, S., Pace, C., Cushing, L., Morello-Frosch, R. (2025). PFAS detections in water samples. Drinking Water Tool metadata, prepared by the Water Equity Science Shop, UC Berkeley.
7. Karasaki, S., Pace, C., Cushing, L., Morello-Frosch, R. (2023). Additional PFAS sources – landfills, chrome plating facilities, water treatment facilities, and refineries and terminals. Drinking Water Tool metadata, prepared by the Water Equity Science Shop, UC Berkeley.
8. All Wells Dataset, GIS Mapping, (2025). California Department of Conservation, California Geologic Energy Management Division (CalGEM). Available from <https://www.conservation.ca.gov/calgem/maps/Pages/GISMapping2.aspx>.

Accessed March 28, 2025.

9. Animal Waste Program Regulated Facilities Report, California Water Boards. Available from <https://ciwqs.waterboards.ca.gov/ciwqs/readOnly/CiwqsReportServlet?inCommand=reset&reportName=RegulatedFacility>. Accessed November 2024.
10. Pace, C., Karasaki, S., Cushing, L., Morello-Frosch, R. (2023). Superfund sites in California. Drinking Water Tool metadata, prepared by the Water Equity Science Shop, UC Berkeley.
11. Karasaki, S., Pace, C., Cushing, L., Morello-Frosch, R. (2023). Military installations ranges and training areas (MIRTA). Drinking Water Tool metadata, prepared by the Water Equity Science Shop, UC Berkeley.
12. Karasaki, S., Pace, C., Cushing, L., Morello-Frosch, R. (2023). Airports permitted to use aqueous film-forming foam (AFFF). Drinking Water Tool metadata, prepared by the Water Equity Science Shop, UC Berkeley.
13. Libenson, A., Pace, C., Alam, Z., Tran, T., Cushing, L.J., Morello-Frosch, R. (2024). Biosolids Land Application Sites, 1995-2024. Drinking Water Tool metadata, prepared by the Water Equity Science Shop, UC Berkeley.
14. Libenson, A., Pace, C., Cushing, L., Morello-Frosch, R. (2023). Pesticide application in California, 2011-2019. Drinking Water Tool metadata, prepared by the Water Equity Science Shop, UC Berkeley.
15. Libenson, A., Pace, C. (2024). PFAS Pesticide Application, California, 2019-2022. Drinking Water Tool metadata, prepared by the Water Equity Science Shop, UC Berkeley.
16. EKI Environment & Water, Inc. (2024). Community Water Center Drinking Water Tool 2024 Well Impact Analysis Update.
17. Affordability Assessment. California State Water Resources Control Board (2024). Available from https://www.waterboards.ca.gov/drinking_water/certlic/drinkingwater/documents/needs/2024/2024affordabilityassessment-metodology.pdf. Accessed July 22, 2024.