

Water Board

In cooperation with the **California State Water Resources Control Board**

California GAMA Program: Ground-Water Quality Data in the San Diego Drainages Hydrogeologic Province, California, 2004

Data Series 129

Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) Program

U.S. Department of the Interior

U.S. Geological Survey

California GAMA Program: Ground-Water Quality Data in the San Diego Drainages Hydrogeologic Province, California, 2004

By Michael T. Wright, Kenneth Belitz, and Carmen A. Burton

In cooperation with the California State Water Resources Control Board

Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) Program

Data Series 129

U.S. Department of the Interior U.S. Geological Survey

U.S. Department of the Interior

Gale A. Norton, Secretary

U.S. Geological Survey

P. Patrick Leahy, Acting Director

U.S. Geological Survey, Reston, Virginia: 2005

For sale by U.S. Geological Survey, Information Services Box 25286, Denver Federal Center Denver, CO 80225

For more information about the USGS and its products: Telephone: 1-888-ASK-USGS World Wide Web: http://www.usgs.gov/

Any use of trade, product, or firm names in this publication is for descriptive purposes only and does not imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.

Although this report is in the public domain, permission must be secured from the individual copyright owners to reproduce any copyrighted materials contained within this report.

Suggested citation:

Wright, M.T.., Belitz, Kenneth, and Burton, C.A., 2005, California GAMA Program—Ground-water quality in the San Diego Drainages hydrogeologic province, California, 2004: U.S. Geological Survey Data Series 129, 91 p.

Contents

Figures

Tables

Conversion Factors, Abbreviations, and Acronyms

Inch/Pound to SI

SI to Inch/Pound

Temperature in degrees Fahrenheit (°F) may be converted to degrees Celsius (°C) as follows:

Specific conductance is given in microsiemens per centimeter at 25 degrees Celsius (μS/cm at 25°C).

Concentrations of chemical constituents in water are given either in milligrams per liter (mg/L) or micrograms per liter (μg/L).

Abbreviations and Acronyms

 $°C=(°F-32)/1.8$

Organizations

California GAMA Program: Ground-Water Quality Data in the San Diego Drainages Hydrogeologic Province, California, 2004

By Michael T. Wright, Kenneth Belitz, and Carmen A. Burton

Abstract

Because of concerns over ground-water quality, the California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB), in collaboration with the U.S. Geological Survey and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, has implemented the Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) Program. A primary objective of the program is to provide a current assessment of ground-water quality in areas where public supply wells are an important source of drinking water. The San Diego GAMA study unit was the first region of the state where an assessment of ground-water quality was implemented under the GAMA program. The San Diego GAMA study unit covers the entire San Diego Drainages hydrogeologic province, and is broken down into four distinct hydrogeologic study areas: the Temecula Valley study area, the Warner Valley study area, the Alluvial Basins study area, and the Hard Rock study area.

 A total of 58 ground-water samples were collected from public supply wells in the San Diego GAMA study unit: 19 wells were sampled in the Temecula Valley study area, 9 in the Warner Valley study area, 17 in the Alluvial Basins study area, and 13 in the Hard Rock study area. Over 350 chemical and microbial constituents and water-quality indicators were analyzed for in this study. However, only select wells were measured for all constituents and water-quality indicators. Results of analyses were calculated as detection frequencies by constituent classification and by individual constituents for the entire San Diego GAMA study unit and for the individual study areas. Additionally, concentrations of constituents that are routinely monitored were compared to maximum contaminant levels (MCL) and secondary maximum contaminant levels (SMCL). Concentrations of constituents classified as "unregulated chemicals for which monitoring is required" (UCMR) were compared to the "detection level for the purposes of reporting" (DLR).

Eighteen of the 88 volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and gasoline oxygenates analyzed for were detected in groundwater samples. Twenty-eight wells sampled in the San Diego

GAMA study had at least a single detection of VOCs or gasoline oxygenates. These constituents were most frequently detected in the Alluvial Basin study area (11 of 17 wells), and least frequently detected in the Warner Valley study area (one of nine wells). Trihalomethanes (THMs) were the most frequently detected class of VOCs (18 of 58 wells). The most frequently detected VOCs were chloroform (18 of 58 wells), bromodichloromethane (8 of 58 wells), and methyl *tert*-butyl ether (MTBE) (7 of 58 wells). Three VOCs were detected at concentrations greater than their MCLs. Tetrachloroethylene (PCE) and trichloroethylene (TCE) were detected in one well in the Hard Rock study area at concentrations of 9.75 and 7.27 micrograms per liter (μg/L), respectively; the MCL for these compounds is 5 μg/L. MTBE was detected in one well in the Alluvial Basins study area at a concentration of 28.3 μg/L; the MCL for MTBE is 13 μg/L.

Twenty-one of the 122 pesticides and pesticide degradates analyzed for were detected in ground-water samples. Pesticide or pesticide degradates were detected in 33 of 58 wells sampled, and were most frequently detected in the Temecula Valley study area wells (9 of 14 wells), and least frequently in the Warner Valley study area wells (3 of 9 wells). Herbicides were the most frequently detected class of pesticides (31 of 58 wells), and simazine was the most frequently detected compound (27 of 58 wells), followed by deethylatrazine (14 of 58 wells), prometon (10 of 58 wells), and atrazine (9 of 58 wells). None of the pesticides detected in groundwater samples had concentrations that exceeded MCLs.

Eight waste-water indicator compounds were detected in ground-water samples. Twenty-one of 47 wells sampled for waste-water indicator compounds had at least a single detection. Waste-water indicator compounds were detected most frequently in the Alluvial Basins study area (9 of 17 wells), and least frequently in the Temecula Valley study area (2 of 6 wells). Phenol was the most frequently detected waste-water indicator compound (14 of 47 wells). Perchlorate was detected in 14 of 50 wells in the San Diego GAMA study; it was most frequently detected in Temecula Valley study area (7 of 11 wells).

Nitrate was detected in 17 of 24 wells at concentrations (0.1 to 9.14 mg/L) less than the MCL of 10 mg/L. Total dissolved solids (TDS) concentrations (148 to 1,800 milligrams per liter, or mg/L) exceeded the recommended secondary maximum contaminant level (SMCL) of 500 mg/L in 12 of the 24 wells in which it was measured. The sample with the highest TDS also had concentrations of chloride (540 mg/L) and sulfate (421 mg/L) that exceeded recommended SMCL levels.

Arsenic and uranium were detected in all 24 wells where they were measured. Arsenic concentrations ranged from less than 0.5 μg/L to 7.8 μg/L, and uranium concentrations ranged from 0.06 μg/L to 17.8 μg/L. The MCLs for these compounds are 50 and 30 μg/L, respectively. The MCL for arsenic will be reduced to 10 μg/L in 2006. Total dissolved chromium (total chromium) was detected in 44 of 50 wells, and hexavalent chromium in 36 of 50 wells. Total chromium concentrations did not exceed 5.7 μg/L, which is well below the 50 μg/L MCL for total chromium. However, hexavalent chromium was detected in 7 of 50 wells at concentrations greater than the detection level for the purposes of reporting (DLR); the DLR for hexavalent chromium is 1 μg/L. Boron was detected at concentrations (6 to 1,054 μg/L) greater than its DLR in 15 of 24 wells, and vanadium was detected at concentrations (1 to 69 μg/L) greater than its DLR in 14 of 24 wells. Concentrations of iron $(4 \text{ to } 2,120 \text{ µg/L})$ and manganese $(0.2 \text{ to } 10,0.2 \text{ m})$ 492 μg/L) exceeded the SMCL in two and four wells, respectively. Mercury was not detected in any samples.

Radon-222 was detected in every ground-water sample in which it was analyzed for, with activities ranging from 180 to 4,820 picoCuries per liter (pCi/L). The proposed MCL and alternative MCL for radon-222 is 300 and 4,000 pCi/L, respectively. Tritium was detected in nearly all samples; the highest activity detected was 23.7 pCi/L, which is well below the tritium MCL of 20,000 pCi/L. Radium-226 and radium-228 were detected together in all but four ground-water samples. Activities detected for radium isotopes in ground water were low; radium-228 activities were below quantification levels in all but one sample. The combined MCL of 5 pCi/L for radium-226 and radium-228 was not exceeded.

Microbial constituents were analyzed in 24 ground-water samples. Total and *Escherichia* coliform were not detected in any samples. F-specific coliphage was detected in one sample collected in the Alluvial Basins study area. Somatic coliphage was detected in two ground-water samples, one in the Temecula Valley study area and one in the Warner Valley study area.

Introduction

Because of growing concerns over ground-water quality, the California State Water Resources Control Board (SWRCB) created the Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) program. The GAMA program falls under the California Ground-Water Quality Monitoring Act of 2001 (Sections 10780-10782.3 of the Water Code): a public mandate to assess and monitor the quality of ground water used as public supply for municipalities in California. The GAMA program is a comprehensive assessment of California's ground-water quality that is designed to help identify and understand risks to ground-water resources (Belitz and others, 2003). The U.S. Geological Survey (USGS) is cooperating with the SWRCB, and partnering with the California Department of Health Services (DHS) and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratories (LLNL) in the implementation of the GAMA program. The three main objectives of GAMA are (1) to provide a current status of ground-water quality, (2) to detect changes in ground-water quality, and (3) to understand how anthropogenic and natural factors affect ground-water quality (Kulongoski and Belitz, 2004). Additionally, the GAMA program will analyze a broader suite of compounds at detection limits that are lower than those currently required by the DHS. The resulting information about chemical compounds and constituents, which is not normally available, may help in the early identification of contaminants that can impact ground-water quality. This early identification is a key aspect in the long-term management of ground-water resources.

An assessment of ground-water quality needs to be representative of the range of hydrologic, geologic, and climatic conditions that exist in California. Therefore, the state was divided into 10 hydrogeologic provinces (Belitz and others, 2003). Areas making up each hydrologic province have relatively similar hydrologic, geologic, and climatic characteristics (*[fig. 1](#page-13-0)*). Each of these hydrogeologic provinces contains ground-water basins, which are generally composed of relatively permeable, unconsolidated deposits of alluvial or volcanic origin (California Department of Water Resources, 2003). The GAMA program focuses primarily on groundwater basins that have public supply wells as an important source of drinking water. Eighty percent of the public supply wells in California are located in ground-water basins. The other 20 percent of public supply wells are located outside of ground-water basins in relatively low permeability rock (Belitz and others, 2003). The non-basin areas are also targeted by the GAMA program, thus allowing for a full assessment of the quality of ground water used for drinking-water supply.

Base from U.S Geological Survey digital elevation data, 1999, Albers Equal Area Conic Projection

Provinces from Belitz and others, 2004

Figure 1. Hydrogeologic provinces of California.

Purpose and Scope

The purpose of this report is to present the results of analyses for organic and inorganic constituents and compounds, microbial constituents, and general water-quality indicators for ground-water samples collected for the San Diego GAMA study unit (*[fig. 2](#page-15-0)*). The chemical and microbial data presented in this report are meant to characterize the quality of the untreated ground-water resources in this study unit and not the treated drinking water delivered to consumers by water purveyors. The chemical and microbial composition of treated drinking water may differ from untreated ground water in that treated drinking water might be subjected to disinfection, filtration, mixing with other waters, and exposure to the atmosphere prior to being delivered to the consumer.

 Fifty-eight public-supply wells were sampled in San Diego, Riverside, and Orange Counties from May to July 2004. Three different sampling schedules (expanded, basic plus, and basic) were used in this study to collect chemical and microbial constituents (*[table 1](#page-38-0)*). The following chemical and microbial constituents were analyzed for in this study: 88 volatile organic compounds or VOCs (*[table 2A](#page-39-0)*) and gasoline oxygenates (*[table 2B](#page-41-0)*), 122 pesticides and pesticide degradates (*[table 2C](#page-42-0)* and *[D](#page-44-0)*), 63 waste-water indicator compounds (*[table 2E](#page-46-0)*), 24 pharmaceutical compounds (*[table 2F](#page-48-0)*), 3 emerging contaminants [N-nitrosodimethylamine (NDMA), 1,4-dioxane, and perchlorate] (*[table 2G](#page-49-0)*), 5 nutrients and dissolved organic carbon (*[table 2H](#page-49-0)*), 9 major ions (*[table 2I](#page-50-0)*), 25 trace elements, including reduction/oxidation speciation of arsenic, iron, and chromium (*[table 2I](#page-50-0)* and *[J](#page-51-0)*), 9 isotopic compounds (*[table 2K](#page-51-0)*), 5 noble gases (*[table 2L](#page-52-0)*), and the microbial constituents coliform and coliphage (*[table 2M](#page-52-0)*). The following general water-quality indicators were determined: dissolved oxygen (DO), pH, specific conductance (SC), alkalinity, turbidity, and temperature.

Concentrations detected in ground-water samples for constituents that are regularly monitored by the DHS are compared to State and Federal drinking water standards. Any constituents exceeding either primary (MCL) or secondary maximum contaminant levels (SMCL) are highlighted in this report. MCLs are established with regard to the protection of human health, whereas SMCLs are established with regard to the aesthetic qualities of drinking water such as taste, odor, and color. In addition, detections of constituents classified by DHS as "unregulated chemicals for which monitoring is required" (UCMR) are highlighted if concentrations in ground water exceed the "detection level for the purposes of reporting" (DLR). The DLR is used for reporting constituents on the UCMR list because MCLs have yet to be determined for these

chemicals. DLRs help in establishing MCLs by determining the extent of detections for the constituents of concern.

Detection frequencies are reported for each anthropogenic, or man-made, constituent (VOCs, pesticides and pesticide degradates, waste-water indicator compounds, perchlorate, NDMA, and 1,4-dioxane) that is detected in at least one ground-water sample. Regulated, anthropogenic, and UCMRclassified constituents detected at a frequency greater than, or equal to, 10 percent are highlighted. Frequently detected constituents may be predictive of future changes in groundwater quality.

Also presented in this report are the results and analysis of quality-control (QC) samples collected during the San Diego GAMA study. Results for pharmaceutical analyses of ground-water and quality-control samples will not be presented here, but instead will be published in a later report. This is because the pharmaceutical analytical method is still in the development stage and more quality-control data need to be collected in order to verify results. It is beyond the scope of this report to present a discussion of the factors that influence the distribution and occurrence of the chemical and microbial constituents detected in ground-water samples.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank the following cooperators and partners for their support: California State Water Resources Control Board, California Department of Health Services, and Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.

We also thank the following water purveyors for their generosity in letting the USGS collect samples from their water wells: Camp Pendleton Marine Base, Capistrano Valley Water District, City of Oceanside, County of San Diego, Del Dios Mutual Water Company, Elsinore Valley Municipal Water District, Julian Community Services District, Lake Cuyamaca Recreation and Park District, Lakeside Water District, Mataguay Scout Reservation, Mountain Empire High School, Murrieta County Water District, Oakvale RV Park, Ortega Oaks RV Park, Pala Rey Youth Camp, Palomar Mountain State Park, Pine Valley Mutual Water Company, Puerta La Cruz Conservation Camp, Ramona Municipal Water District, Rancho California Water District, Riverview Water District, Santa Margarita Water District, San Pasqual Academy, Sweetwater Authority, United States Forest Service, Vista Irrigation District, Warner High School, Warner Springs Ranch, Western Horizon's-Ramona Canyon RV Resort, and Yuima Municipal Water District.

Figure 2. San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study unit with locations of study areas.

Hydrologic Setting of the San Diego GAMA Study Unit

The San Diego GAMA study unit was the first region where an assessment of ground-water quality was implemented under the GAMA program. The geographic boundaries of the study unit (*[fig. 2](#page-15-0)*) are the same as those of the San Diego Drainages hydrogeologic province (Belitz and others, 2003). The San Diego Drainages hydrogeologic province is described by the California Department of Water Resources (DWR) as the San Diego sub-hydrologic region, which corresponds to the southern portion of the South Coast hydrologic region (California Department of Water Resources, 2003). The San Diego GAMA study unit covers approximately 3,900 square miles (mi2) of the southwestern corner of California, and includes most of San Diego County, and southwestern Orange and Riverside Counties. Twenty-seven ground-water basins are located within the San Diego GAMA study unit; these basins underlie approximately 433 mi2 , or 11 percent, of the land surface. Boundaries of the San Diego GAMA study unit are the Transverse and Selected Peninsular Ranges province to the north, the Desert province to the east, the country of Mexico to the south, and the Pacific Ocean to the west.

The climate in the coastal area of the San Diego GAMA study unit is generally mild, with temperatures averaging 65 °F and average annual precipitation ranging from 10 to 13 inches (in.) (California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region, 1994). In the eastern portion of the study unit, annual temperatures in the Peninsular Ranges average in the mid fifties and average annual precipitation is approximately 45 in. The San Diego GAMA study unit is drained by a number of creeks and rivers, including the Santa Margarita and San Luis Rey Rivers in the north, and the San Diego and Sweetwater Rivers in the south. Runoff in the study unit is mainly due to rainfall; however, smaller amounts of runoff can be attributed to urban water use, snowmelt, and artesian springs. Ground- and surface-water flow primarily is from the mountainous east towards the west and the Pacific Ocean. .For the purposes of this study, the San Diego GAMA study unit consists of four study areas: the Temecula Valley study area, the Warner Valley study area, the Alluvial Basins study area, and the Hard Rock study area (*[fig. 2](#page-15-0)*).

Temecula Valley Study Area

The boundaries of the Temecula Valley study area (*[fig. 3](#page-17-0)*) are the same as those of the Temecula Valley Groundwater Basin (California Department of Water Resources, 2004a). The Temecula Valley study area is located principally in southwestern Riverside County with a very small portion of the basin extending into northern San Diego County. The Temecula Valley study area covers 137 mi², and is bounded by the crystalline rock of the Peninsular Ranges on all sides, except in the northwest where it is bounded by the Elsinore groundwater basin. Average annual precipitation ranges from 7 to 15 in. Surface-water drainage occurs by way of several creeks, including the ephemeral Temecula and Murrieta Creeks that discharge into the Santa Margarita River, which then flows westward out of the valley. The main water-bearing unit is Quaternary alluvium that is estimated to be up to 2,500 feet (ft) thick; it is generally unconfined except at deeper depths where it is semi-confined to confined (California Department of Water Resources, 1956). Sources of ground-water recharge in the basin include percolation of precipitation, infiltration of agricultural and domestic irrigation returns, and engineered recharge via spreading basins on Temecula Creek.

Warner Valley Study Area

The boundaries of the Warner Valley study area (*[fig. 4](#page-18-0)*) are the same as those of the Warner Valley Groundwater Basin, which is located in northeastern San Diego County (California Department of Water Resources, 2004b). The Warner Valley study area has a surface area of 37.5 mi²; it is bounded on the west by Lake Henshaw and on all other sides by the crystalline rocks of the Peninsular Ranges. Annual precipitation ranges from 15 to 21 in. The Warner Valley study area is drained by the ephemeral Agua Caliente and Buena Vista Creeks, as well as the San Luis Rey River, all of which flow westward into Lake Henshaw. The main water-bearing unit consists of residuum and alluvium (California Department of Water Resources, 1971). The alluvium is up to 900 ft thick and is generally unconsolidated. Sources of ground-water recharge include percolation of precipitation, and river and stream infiltration.

Figure 3. Temecula Valley study area and location of public-supply wells, San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study unit, California.

8 California GAMA Program: Ground-Water Quality Data, San Diego Drainages Hydrogeologic Province, California, 2004

Figure 4. Warner Valley study area and location of public-supply wells, San Diego Ground-Water Ambient and Assessment (GAMA) study unit, California.

Alluvial Basins Study Area

The Alluvial Basins study area (*[fig. 5](#page-20-0)*) consists of those DWR-defined alluvial basins in the San Diego Drainages study unit having one or more public supply wells. The 12 ground-water basins composing this study area are the San Juan, San Mateo, Santa Margarita, San Luis Rey, San Pasqual, Santa Maria, San Diego River, El Cajon, Sweetwater, Cottonwood, Campo, and Potrero Valleys (California Department of Water Resources, 2003). The total surface area of the study area is approximately 166 mi², with individual basins ranging in area from Potrero Valley, covering as little as 3.2 mi² (California Department of Water Resources, 2004c), to the San Luis Rey Valley, covering as much as 46 mi² (California Department of Water Resources, 2004d). Average annual precipitation ranges from 7 to 21 in. Runoff from precipitation primarily is drained to the southwest towards the Pacific Ocean, but some basins are internally drained. The main water-bearing units are Quaternary age alluvium and residuum, with an average thickness of alluvium that ranges from approximately 50 ft in the San Mateo Valley ground-water basin (California Department of Water Resources, 1991) to 200 ft in the San Luis Rey ground-water basin (Izbicki, 1985). Sources of ground-water recharge include percolation of precipitation, river and stream infiltration, irrigation returns, spreading basins, discharge of waste water to rivers, and septic systems.

Hard Rock Study Area

The Hard Rock study area (*[fig. 6](#page-21-0)*) consists of areas outside of ground-water basins that are within 3 kilometers (km) of a public-supply well. The study area covers approximately 865 mi2 , with the vast majority of the study area located in the inland areas of the study unit. Well completion reports for public-supply wells sampled in this study area show that wells are withdrawing water primarily from fractured granite. Sources of ground-water recharge include percolation of precipitation, and river and stream infiltration.

Methods

Sampling Design

Wells in the four study areas (*[figs. 3–6](#page-17-0)*) of the San Diego GAMA study unit were designated with the following nomenclature: The Temecula Valley study area (SDTEM), the Warner Valley study area (SDWARN), the Alluvial Basins study area (SDALLV), and the Hard Rock study area (SDHDRK). Additional wells were sampled in the Temecula Valley study area to ascertain how ground-water quality is affected as it moves along two flow paths; these wells were given the designation SDTEMFP. Ground-water basins, as defined by DWR, were used for study area boundaries, except for the Hard Rock study area. A boundary for the Hard Rock study area was created by placing a 3-km radius buffer around public-supply wells that did not fall within any ground-water basin. A 3-km radius was chosen because it would roughly equal one well per 25 square kilometers (km²), which is the desired sampling density for this study.

The Temecula Valley ground-water basin was chosen as a study area because it is the largest basin, with the most public supply wells, of any basin in the San Diego Drainages hydrogeologic province. The Warner Valley ground-water basin was chosen as a study area because of its relatively pristine condition, isolated location, small population, and scant development. The Alluvial Basins study area consists of 12 small to medium alluvial ground-water basins. By themselves, each alluvial ground-water basin has a small number of public supply wells that tap a small portion of the groundwater resources, but aggregated as one study area, the alluvial ground-water basins have a relatively large number of public supply wells that tap a large portion of the ground-water resources. Because there are a relatively large number of public supply wells outside ground-water basins in the San Diego GAMA study unit, the Hard Rock study area was created to assess water quality in fractured rock aquifers.

10 California GAMA Program: Ground-Water Quality Data, San Diego Drainages Hydrogeologic Province, California, 2004

Figure 5. Alluvial Basins study area and location of public-supply wells, San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study unit, California.

Figure 6. Hard Rock study area and location of public-supply wells, San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study unit, California.

The primary objectives in the selection of wells for GAMA study-area assessments are (1) to attain a sampling density of approximately one well per 25 km^2 , (2) randomly select at least 10 wells per study area whenever possible, and (3) minimize variability in well type (Gilliom and others, 1995) . These objectives will help to assure an adequate and unbiased assessment of the quality of ground-water resources used for public supply. Additionally, since the GAMA program focuses on ground water used as a drinking-water resource (Belitz and others, 2003), public supply wells that are used for drinking water are the primary focus of sampling efforts. The GAMA framework does allow irrigation, domestic, and/or monitoring wells to be sampled if needed to obtain adequate spatial coverage in a study unit. In the San Diego GAMA study unit, public supply wells provide good spatial coverage; therefore, domestic, irrigation, or monitoring wells were not part of the selection process. Wells with available construction information (well depth, depth of perforations, date constructed) were given priority for sampling.

Wells were selected for each study area using a gridbased program that produced random, equal-area cells (Scott, 1990). The program was used to generate 20 cells in the Temecula Valley study area, 10 cells in the Warner Valley study area, 20 cells in the Alluvium Basins study area, and 10 cells in the Hard Rock study area. Where a cell had multiple wells, each well in that cell was randomly assigned a rank. For each particular cell with multiple wells, the lowest ranked well was given priority for sampling. An attempt was made to select one well per cell, but this was not always possible. Wells from adjacent cells were used to populate cells that either had no active wells or contained wells that did not meet the selection criteria, such as those lacking well-construction data. The exception to the one well sampled per cell criterion was in the Temecula Valley study area where additional wells were sampled in cells that were important to the flow path study.

Wells were sampled for either an "expanded," "basic plus," or "basic" schedule (*[table 1](#page-38-0)*). Expanded schedule sampling entails collecting samples for analysis of a large number of chemical and microbial constituents and field measurable water-quality indicators. Consequently, sampling wells for an expanded schedule requires a substantial investment of time and labor. Wells that were located in areas of interest, such as along flow paths, were given priority for expanded schedule sampling. Initially, approximately 50 percent of the wells in the San Diego GAMA study were to be sampled for an expanded schedule, and 50 percent for the basic schedule. However, after completion of sampling in the first study area, the Temecula Valley, it was apparent that sampling 50 percent of the wells for an expanded schedule would be too time consuming. Therefore, for the other three study areas, the number of wells sampled for the expanded schedule was decreased to approximately 30 percent. To help adjust for the smaller number of wells sampled for the expanded schedule, the basic schedule was enhanced to include some compounds that were previously only collected for the expanded schedule. This basic-plus schedule did not significantly increase sampling time, yet allowed for a greater number of constituents to be collected than if the basic schedule had been used.

Sample Collection

[Table 2A−M](#page-39-0) shows the names of chemical and microbial constituents analyzed for in the ground-water samples from wells in the San Diego GAMA study unit. *[Table 3](#page-53-0)* gives the date and time that each well was sampled, along with the type of sampling schedule and well construction information. Samples were collected from 58 public supply wells from May to July 2004. Of the 58 wells sampled, 19 were in the Temecula Valley study area, 17 in the Alluvial Basins study area, 13 in the Hard Rock study area, and 9 in the Warner Valley study area. Twenty wells were scheduled to be sampled in the Alluvial Basins study area, but a review of the well completion reports showed that three of the wells sampled in this study area were withdrawing water from fractured rock, so these wells were reassigned to the Hard Rock study area (*[fig. 6](#page-21-0)*). Additionally, a well that was originally located in the Hard Rock study area was switched to the Alluvial Basins study area (*[fig. 5](#page-20-0)*) when a review of the well completion report showed that the well was withdrawing from an alluvial aquifer. Neither of these changes significantly affected the target sampling density for either the Alluvial Basins or Hard Rock study areas. Because of well availability, only nine wells were sampled in the Warner Valley study area. These nine wells provided good spatial distribution (*[fig. 4](#page-18-0)*).

Sampling procedures utilized by the USGS National Water Quality Assessment (NAWQA) program were implemented in this study to mitigate the potential for airborne contamination of samples and (or) cross contamination between wells (Koterba and others, 1995; U.S. Geological Survey, 1998; U.S. Geological Survey, 1999). Before the onset of sample collection, a set procedure was followed to help assure that a representative sample of ground water would be collected at each site; the procedure used was dependent on the sampling schedule employed at each particular site. If a site was to be sampled for a basic or basic-plus schedule, then the well was pumped continuously for a minimum of 20 minutes in order to purge the well of at least three casing-volumes of water. If a site was to be sampled for the expanded schedule, then ground water was pumped through a flow-through chamber fitted with a multi-probe meter that is able to simultaneously measure these water-quality indicators: dissolved oxygen (DO), temperature, pH, turbidity, and electrical conductivity (EC). Measurements were taken at 5-minute intervals; sampling did not begin until the water-quality indicators remained stable for at least 20 minutes.

Samples were collected by affixing Teflon tubing to the sampling point closest to the well head using stainless steel fittings. If a site was sampled for a basic, or basic-plus schedule, the sample was collected at the well head using a foot-long section of Teflon tubing. If a site was sampled for the expanded schedule, the sample was collected inside an enclosed chamber that was located in a mobile water-quality laboratory. The length of the Teflon tubing used for the expanded schedule ranged from 10 to 50 ft. All but two samples at a well were collected before any type of filtration or chemical treatment, such as chlorination, was done to the ground water. Chlorination of ground water that contains DOC may form trihalomethanes (THMs). Ground water from one well, SDHDRK-05, was passed through a sediment filter before the sampling port. This was not considered to have a significant effect on the water-quality assessment of this site. Two wells, SDHDRK-05 and SDALLV-16, had chlorination equipment in the well bore. The chlorinator for SDHRDK-05 was shut off, and the well was pumped for eight hours prior to sampling. Before sampling SDALLV-16, the well was pumped for one hour with the chlorinator shut off. The samples from both SDHDRK-05 and SDALLV-16 had THM detections.

 Filtering of samples in the field was done using a 0.45-μm capsule or disk filter. Polyethylene bottles were prerinsed with native water before sample collection. Samples requiring preservation with acid had the pH lowered to 2 or below. All samples were kept on ice and shipped immediately to the laboratory for analyses, except for samples collected for the analysis of chromium species, tritium, noble gases, stable isotopes of water, and carbon isotopes. Radium isotopes, gross alpha/beta radiation, and radon-222 samples were not kept on ice, but were shipped immediately after collection.

 Volatile organic compounds and gasoline oxygenates were collected in 40-mL sample vials that were purged using three vial volumes of sample water and then bottom filled to eliminate headspace. Six normal (N) hydrochloric acid (HCl) was added to the VOC samples, but not the gasoline oxygenate samples, as a preservative. Samples for stable isotopes of water were collected by filling a 60-mL clear glass bottle with unfiltered water, sealing with a conical cap, and securing with electrical tape to prevent leakage and evaporation. Samples for pesticides, pesticide degradation products, waste-water indicator compounds, pharmaceuticals, NDMA, and 1,4-dioxane were collected in 1-L baked amber bottles; these samples were not filtered in the field, but at their respective laboratories prior to analysis. Samples for major ions and trace elements were collected by filtering ground water into two 250-mL polyethylene bottles, and then preserving (the trace elements sample bottle only) with 7.5N nitric acid. Radium isotopes and gross alpha/beta samples were collected and preserved in the same manner as for trace elements, except 2- and 1-L aliquots of ground water were collected, respectively. Mercury samples

were collected by filtering ground water into a 250-mL glass bottle and preserving with 6N HCl. Arsenic and iron speciation samples were filtered into a 250-mL polyethylene bottle that was taped so the sample was not exposed to light; the sample was preserved with 6N HCl. Nutrient and perchlorate samples were each filtered into

125-mL polyethylene bottles. Carbon isotope samples were filtered and bottom filled into two 500-mL baked glass containers that were first purged using three bottle volumes of ground water. These samples had no headspace, and were sealed with a conical cap to resist evaporation. Samples for alkalinity were collected by filtering ground water into a 500 mL polyethylene bottle. Tritium samples were collected by bottom filling two 1-L bottles with unfiltered ground water, after first purging the bottle of three volumes of water.

Four constituents (chromium, DOC, radon-222, and noble gases) were collected at the well head, regardless of the sampling schedule (expanded, basic-plus, or basic). Samples collected for total dissolved chromium (total chromium) and hexavalent chromium were taken directly from the sampling port. For total chromium, a 10-mL syringe that had a small 0.45-mm disk filter connected directly to it was filled with ground water and 2 mL of the ground water was filtered into a small centrifuge tube. To collect the hexavalent chromium sample, a small ion-exchange column was attached to the disk filter and 2 mL of ground water was filtered into a second centrifuge vial. Both vials were preserved with $10 \mu L$ of $7.5N$ nitric acid (Ball and McClesky, 2003a).

DOC was collected by filling a 50-mL syringe, that had a 0.45-μm disk filter connected directly to it, with ground water directly from the sampling port at the well head. The ground water was then filtered into a 125-mL baked glass bottle and preserved with 4.5N sulfuric acid. For the collection of radon-222, a stainless steel and Teflon valve assembly was attached to the sampling port at the well head. The valve was partially closed, and a 10-mL sample was taken through a Teflon septum on the valve assembly using a glass syringe affixed with a stainless steel needle. The sample was then injected into a 25-mL vial partially filled with scintillation cocktail. The vial was then placed in a cardboard tube in order to shield it from light during shipping (U.S. Geological Survey, 1999).

To collect noble gases, reinforced nylon tubing was attached to the sampling port at the well head. The reinforced tubing was attached to an approximately 12-in.-long, 3/8-in. ID copper tube with a back pressure valve attached to the other end. The copper tube was affixed to a metal plate with two clamps. Ground water was run through the copper tube, while it was firmly tapped for approximately 45 seconds. This was done to remove any gas bubbles that may have been trapped inside the tube. The back pressure valve was then closed almost completely, and the clamps tightened down in order to trap a sample of ground water with its associated noble gases (Weiss, 1968).

Samples for microbial constituents also were collected at the well head. Prior to the collection of samples, the sampling port was sterilized with isopropyl alcohol, and ground water was run through the sampling port for at least three minutes to remove any traces of the sterilizing agent. Two 250-mL sterilized bottles were then filled for the coliform samples (total and *Escherichia* coliform determinations), and one 3-liter sterilized carboy was filled for the coliphage samples (F-specific and somatic coliphage determinations).

Sample Analysis

Nine laboratories performed chemical and microbial analyses for the San Diego GAMA study. The following analytical methods were used for the determination of organic and inorganic constituents by the USGS National Water-Quality Laboratory (NWQL): VOCs by purge and trap capillary gas chromatography/mass spectrometry (Conner and others, 1998); gasoline oxygenates by heated purge and trap/gas chromatography/mass spectrometry (Rose and Sandstrom, 2003); pesticides by solid-phase extraction and chromatography/mass spectrometry (Furlong and others, 2001; Sandstrom and others, 2001); waste-water indicator compounds by polystyrenedivinylbenzene solid-phase extraction and capillary-column gas chromatography/mass spectrometry (Zaugg and others, 2002); pharmaceutical compounds by solid-phase extraction and high-performance liquid chromatography–electrospray ionization mass spectrometry (Cahill and others, 2004); major ions, trace elements, and nutrients by several methods (Fishman and Friedman, 1989; Fishman, 1993; McLain, 1993; Garbarino, 1999; Garbarino and Damrau, 2001; Patton and Kryskalla, 2003); DOC by UV-promoted persulfate oxidation and infrared spectrometry (Brenton and Arnett, 1993); and radon-222 by liquid scintillation counting (American Society for Testing and Materials, 1992).

The following methods were used for the determination of organic and inorganic and microbial constituents by laboratories other than the NWQL: Perchlorate, NDMA, and 1,4-dioxane analysis by Montgomery Watson and Harza Laboratory using chromatography and mass spectrometry (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1996; Hautman and others, 1999; U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1999); stable isotopes of water by the USGS Reston Stable Isotope Laboratory using gaseous hydrogen and carbon dioxide-water equilibration (Epstein and Mayeda, 1953; Coplen and others, 1991); chromium, iron, and arsenic analysis by the USGS NRP laboratory in Boulder, Colorado, using various techniques of UV-VIS spectrophotometry and atomic absorbance spectroscopy (Stookey, 1970; To and others, 1998; Ball and McCleskey, 2003b; McCleskey and others, 2003); F-specific

and somatic coliphage analysis by the USGS Ohio Microbiology Laboratory (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2000a); tritium analysis at the USGS NRP laboratory in Menlo Park, California, using electrolytic enrichment-liquid scintillation method (Thatcher and others, 1977); tritium (helium in-growth method) and noble gases analyzed by LLNL (Eaton and others, 2004); radium-226, radium-228, gross alpha and beta radioactivity analysis by Eberline Analytical Services using several methods (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1980); carbon isotopes analysis by the University of Arizona Accelerated Mass Spectrometry Laboratory (Donahue and others, 1990; Jull and others, 2004); and total and *Escherichia* coliform analyzed by USGS field personnel using the MI method (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2002b)**.**

Data Reporting

Laboratory Reporting Conventions

The NWQL uses laboratory reporting levels (LRLs) for reporting non-detections of constituents, but also is able to semi-quantitatively detect compounds below the LRL. The LRL and long-term method detection level (LT-MDL) are calculated on the basis of QC experiments conducted by the NWQL. The LT-MDL mitigates the reporting of false positive readings. The risk of reporting a false positive concentration equal to or greater than the LT-MDL when the constituent is not present is 1 percent or less. The LRL (LRL = $2 \times LT$ -MDL) is used to minimize the chance of reporting a false negative reading. The risk of reporting a false negative is 1 percent or less when the actual concentration is equal to or greater than the LRL (Childress and others, 1999).

Some constituent concentrations in this study are reported using method detection limits (MDLs), minimum reporting levels (MRLs), and method uncertainties. The MDL serves the same purpose as the LT-MDL: to reduce the risk of reporting false positives (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2002a). The risk of reporting a false positive concentration equal to or greater than the MDL when the constituent is not present is also 1 percent or less. However, the methods for establishing the LT-MDL are more robust than those used to establish the MDL. Therefore, the LT-MDL may be more representative of true method detection limits. The MRL is the smallest measurable concentration of a constituent that may be reliably reported using a given analytical method (Timme, 1995). The method uncertainty generally indicates the precision of a particular analytical measurement; it gives a range of values wherein the true value will be found.

Compounds on Multiple Analytical Schedules

Twenty-two constituents targeted in the San Diego GAMA study were determined by more than one analytical schedule (*[table 4](#page-55-0)*). Certain analytical schedules are "preferred" over others because the methodology is more accurate and precise, and generally yields a greater sensitivity for a given constituent. If a constituent appears on multiple analytical schedules, then only the detections determined by the preferred analytical schedule are given in this report.

Quality Control

During the San Diego GAMA study, quality-control samples were collected at approximately 10 percent of the sampling sites. Quality-control samples are collected to assess the validity of ground-water data that will be used for interpretation, and to describe bias and variability in data associated with sample collection, processing, storage, transportation, and laboratory analysis. Three types of quality-control samples were collected in the field during the San Diego GAMA study: blanks, sequential replicates, and matrix spikes.

Blanks

Four types of blanks were collected: trip, equipment, field, and source-solution.

Trip blanks are collected to determine if shipping, handling, and intermittent storage of sample containers produces contamination (bias) with respect to VOCs. Equipment blanks are used to determine if the fittings and tubing used to collect ground-water samples are introducing contamination. Field blanks are collected to determine if procedures used during sample collection and laboratory analysis introduce contamination, as well as to determine if the decontamination procedures used to clean sampling equipment are effective. Source solution blanks are collected to verify that the water used for field blanks has no detectable concentrations of VOCs and waste-water indicator compounds. Source solution blanks are only collected for VOCs and waste-water indicator compounds because these chemicals are volatile and ubiquitous, and therefore can contaminate blank water used for quality-control samples.

 All blanks were processed using Nitrogen-Purged Universal blank water that is certified for use in the collection of blanks for VOCs, pesticides, waste-water and pharmaceutical compounds, low-level nutrients, dissolved organic carbon, major ions, and trace elements. The trip blank consisted of blank water in a sealed sample vial that was kept with the other sample vials from the start of the field activities through laboratory analysis. The equipment blank was collected at the USGS San Diego laboratory using the field sampling equipment, and immediately shipped to the NWQL for analysis. Field blanks were collected at the sampling site. Depending on the schedule (expanded, basic-plus, basic) employed at a particular sampling site, blank water was either pumped, using a diaphragm pump equipped with a Teflon diaphragm, or poured through the sampling equipment (fittings and tubing) used to collect ground water. Blank samples were then processed and transported utilizing the same methods used for the collection of ground-water samples. Source-solution blanks also were collected at the sampling site by pouring blank water directly into sample containers that were then stored, shipped, and analyzed in the same manner as the ground-water samples.

Contamination may have been introduced into groundwater samples during collection, processing and transport if the following criteria are met: (1) a constituent is detected in trip, equipment, or field blanks, (2) the constituent is detected in ground-water samples, and (3) the minimum concentration detected in ground-water samples is less than the maximum concentration detected in field blanks. If a constituent was detected in a trip, equipment, or field blank, then the concentration detected in the blank was compared with the concentration detected in the associated source solution blank. If the source solution was identified as the origin of the detection in the blank, then contamination of ground-water samples by the constituent was not of concern.

Field blank detections that could not be attributed to the source solution were compared to detections in associated ground-water samples, and evaluated with respect to criterion 3 above. Associated ground-water samples are defined here as any sample collected on the same day as the field blank. If the field blank was collected at a well that was sampled on an expanded schedule, then the detection in the field blank was compared with detections in the ground-water sample collected immediately before the field blank. A detection of a constituent in the field blank that is also detected in the ground-water sample collected immediately before the field blank indicates possible carry-over contamination. Carry-over contamination occurs when a constituent is introduced into a sample from the sampling equipment, in spite of the cleaning of sample tubing and fittings. If carry-over contamination was identified as the cause of the detection in the field blank, subsequent ground-water samples and field blanks also were evaluated for evidence of carry-over contamination. Carryover contamination was not considered to be a problem if the constituent in question was not detected in the ground-water samples collected prior and subsequent to the field blank. Wells sampled on basic and basic-plus schedules do not use sample tubing and fittings that have been used previously to collect ground-water samples, and thus field blanks collected at these sites are not evaluated with respect to carry-over contamination.

Ground-water samples that were determined to have a detection of one or more constituents resulting from contamination were censored, and consequently not used in the analysis of ground-water quality. The threshold for censoring data was determined by summing the blank concentration and the LT-MDL, or MDL, for the constituent in question. For example, if toluene was detected in a field blank at a concentration of 0.02 μg/L, and the LT-MDL for toluene is 0.02 μg/L, then the concentration of toluene in the associated groundwater sample would have to be greater than, or equal to, 0.04 μg/L in order to be included in ground-water quality analyses. This method of censoring is based on the assumption that the amount of contamination in the field blank and the associated ground-water sample are comparable. Therefore, detections in ground-water samples that are not censored will have at least a concentration equal to the LT-MDL, or MDL, where the risk of reporting a false positive reading when a constituent concentration is greater than, or equal to, the LT-MDL, or MDL, is 1 percent or less (Childress and others, 1999). If a constituent was detected in multiple blanks (trip, equipment, or field), and the detections could not be attributed to the source solution or to carry-over contamination, then any ground-water sample that had a detection of the constituent in question was censored at the appropriate threshold.

Replicates

Sequential replicate samples assess variability in the processing and analyses of inorganic and organic constituents. Relative standard deviation (RSD) was used in determining the variability between replicate pairs. The RSD is defined as 100 times the standard deviation divided by the mean concentration for each replicate pair of samples. If one value in a sample pair was reported as a non-detection and the other value was reported as an estimate below the LRL or MRL, the RSD was set to zero because the values are analytically identical. If one value in a sample pair was reported as a non-detection and the other value was greater than the LRL or MRL, then the non-detection value was set equal to one-quarter of the LRL, and the RSD was calculated (Childress and others, 1999). RSD values less than 20 percent are considered acceptable in this study. High RSD values for a constituent likely indicate analytical uncertainty at low concentrations, particularly for concentrations within an order of magnitude of LT-MDL or MDL.

Matrix Spikes

Matrix spikes are used to evaluate bias and variability of analytical results related to matrix interferences. Matrix spike samples are prepared by adding solutions containing known amounts of organic compounds to replicate ground-water samples. The known compounds added in matrix spikes are the same as those being analyzed in the method. This enables an analysis of matrix interferences on a compound-by-compound basis. Matrix spikes in the San Diego GAMA study were always done by the laboratory performing the analysis. Compounds with low recoveries are of potential concern if environmental concentrations are close to the MCLs; a nonexceedance of an MCL could be falsely indicated. Conversely, compounds with high recoveries are of potential concern if the environmental concentrations exceed MCLs, since a high recovery could falsely indicate an exceedance of MCL. Recoveries between 70 to 130 percent for matrix spikes were considered acceptable in this study.

Surrogate Compounds

In addition to matrix spikes, surrogate compounds were added to all ground-water and quality-control samples that were analyzed for VOCs, gasoline oxygenates, pesticides, waste-water, and pharmaceutical compounds. Prior to analysis, each sample is spiked with surrogate compounds at the laboratory. Surrogate compounds are not normally found in the environment and are used to identify potential problems associated with laboratory analyses. Potential problems include matrix interferences (such as high levels of dissolved organic carbon) that produce a positive bias, and incomplete laboratory recovery (possibly due to improper maintenance and calibration of analytical equipment) that produces a negative bias. Surrogate compounds are used to identify general problems that may arise during sample analysis that can affect the analysis results for all compounds, whereas matrix spikes are used to indicate problems with specific compound analysis. A 70- to 130-percent recovery of surrogates is generally considered acceptable, except for pharmaceuticals where the acceptable range of recoveries is 75 to 115 percent; values outside these ranges indicate possible problems with the processing and analysis of samples (Connor and others, 1998).

Results

Quality-Control Samples

Detections in Blanks

A summary of constituent detections in trip, equipment, and field blanks is given in *[table 5](#page-56-0)*. No targeted constituents were detected in the trip blank. Three VOCs (trichloromethane, toluene, and acetone) and NDMA were detected in one of the five field blanks. The field blank detections were not of concern because these constituents were also detected in the associated source-solution blanks. Pesticides, nutrients, and dissolved organic carbon were not detected in any blanks. Silica and calcium were detected in two of two field blanks, and sodium was detected in one of two field blanks. Concentrations detected in the field blanks were at least two orders of magnitude below concentrations detected in groundwater samples; therefore, no data were censored. Copper was the only constituent detected in the equipment blank; it was detected at a concentration of 0.9 μg/L. Copper was also detected in one of two field blanks at a concentration of 1.2 μg/L. Because of these detections, all copper concentrations in ground-water samples that are below 1.4 μg/L are censored. In addition to copper, vanadium and zinc were detected in one of two field blanks at a concentration of 0.8 and 0.3 μg/L, respectively. Because of these field blank detections, three detections of vanadium and one detection of zinc were censored in ground-water samples.

Phenol, a waste-water indicator compound, has been a persistent contaminant found in field blanks collected across the nation (Jim Kingsbury, Hydrologist, U.S. Geological Survey, written commun., 2004). A review of quality-control data collected as part of the NAWQA Source Water Quality Assessment showed that phenol was present in 66 percent of field blanks nationwide. Because of this ongoing problem with phenol contamination, all phenol detections in this study were subjected to censoring. The maximum concentration detected in field blanks for the San Diego GAMA was 0.2 μg/L. Therefore, all phenol detections less than 0.4 μg/L were censored.

Variability in Replicate Samples

The majority of replicate pairs collected during the San Diego GAMA study had RSDs of less than 10 percent (*[table 6A-E](#page-57-0)*). Fifteen of nearly 1,500 replicate pairs, representing nine compounds and two measurements of gross radioactivity in water, exceeded the acceptable RSD set for this study of 20 percent. Perchlorate had one replicate pair that slightly exceeded the acceptable limit set for this study with a RSD of 21 percent. Nutrients, DOC, and major ions did not have

any replicate pairs with an RSD greater than 7 percent. Three trace elements had replicate pairs with high RSDs (*[table 6D](#page-59-0)*). Two chromium replicate pairs had RSDs of 47 and 57 percent; hexavalent chromium had two replicate pairs with RSDs of 47 and 85 percent, and vanadium had one replicate pair with a RSD of 31 percent. Constituents in these replicate pairs were detected at concentrations close to, or below, their LT-MDLs or MDLs.

Two measures of gross radioactivity in water, and two radioisotopes, had replicate-pair RSDs that were higher than the acceptable limits set for this study (*[table 6E](#page-60-0)*). Two replicate pairs for 30-day counts of alpha radioactivity had RSDs of 66 and 60 percent, and one replicate pair for a 72-hour count of beta radioactivity had a slightly high RSD of 21 percent. The activities detected in these replicate pairs were at, or below, MDLs except for the replicate pair of 72-hour beta radioactivity that had activities approximately two and four times higher than the MDL. Radium-228 had a replicate pair RSDs of 37 and 26 percent, and one tritium replicate pair had a RSD of 91 percent; detections in these replicates were at activities that were at, or below, MDLs.

Matrix Spike Recoveries

A summary of matrix spike recoveries for the San Diego GAMA study is shown in *table [7A-C](#page-61-0)*. Nineteen VOCs had at least one matrix spike recovery greater than 130 percent (*[table 7A](#page-61-0)*). Four of the 19 VOCs were detected in groundwater samples; chloroform was detected in 18 ground-water samples, and benzene, chloromethane, and 1,2-dichloroethane were each detected in one ground-water sample. All detections in ground-water samples were at concentrations well below MCLs. Styrene was the only VOC that had a matrix spike recovery below 70 percent; it was not detected in any groundwater samples.

Sixteen pesticides had at least one matrix spike recovery greater than 130 percent (*[table 7B](#page-64-0)*). Two of the 16 pesticides were detected in ground-water samples; imazethapyr was detected in one ground-water sample and hydroxyatrazine was detected in two ground-water samples. Neither compound has a drinking-water standard. Sixty-six pesticides had matrix spike recoveries below 70 percent (*[table 7B](#page-64-0)*). Of the 66 pesticides, the following 13 were detected in ground-water samples: 3,4-dichloroaniline, acetochlor, deethylatrazine, deisopropyl atrazine, desulfinyl fipronil, hexazinone, metalaxyl, metolachlor, myclobutanil, prometon, prometryn, simazine, and tebuthiuron. Of the pesticides with a low matrix spike recovery, simazine is the only one that is regulated, with an MCL of 4 μg/L. Concentrations of simazine in ground-water samples did not exceed 0.03 μg/L except in one case where a concentration of 0.2 μg/L was detected.

One waste-water indicator compound, caffeine, had a matrix spike recovery greater than 130 percent (*[table 7C](#page-68-0)*). Caffeine was detected in one ground-water sample, and does not have an MCL. Twelve waste-water indicator compounds had at least one matrix spike recovery below 70 percent. Of the twelve compounds, only D-limonene was detected; it was detected in one ground-water sample at concentrations below the LT-MDL. D-limonene does not have an MCL.

Surrogate Compound Recoveries

A summary of surrogate compound recoveries for ground-water and quality-control samples is given in *[table 8](#page-69-0)*. Four ground-water samples analyzed for VOCs had recoveries of the surrogate 1,2-dichloroethane-d4 that were higher than the acceptable limit of 130 percent; recoveries ranged from 132 to 142 percent. Two of the four ground-water samples with high surrogate recoveries had VOC detections. The wells SDHDRK-05 and SDALLV-11 had one and six VOC detections, respectively. All detections in these wells were at least an order of magnitude below MCLs, except for a MTBE detection in SDALLV-11 which was detected at 28.3 μg/L; the MCL for MTBE is 13 μg/L.

Analyses for gasoline oxygenates in two field blanks and two source solution blanks had recoveries of the surrogate isobutyl alcohol-d6 that were below the acceptable limit of 70 percent; recoveries ranged from 60 to 64 percent. Each blank had a detection of acetone; however, acetone was not detected in any ground-water samples. VOC analysis for one replicate had a recovery of 144 percent for the surrogate 1,2 dichloroethane-d4. No VOCs were detected in the replicate.

All surrogate recoveries for pesticide and pesticide degradates in ground-water and quality-control samples analyzed by analytical schedule 2003 were within acceptable limits. Twelve surrogate recoveries were outside the acceptable limits for nine ground-water samples analyzed for pesticides and pesticide degradates by analytical schedule 2060. The surrogate caffeine-13C had nine recoveries that ranged from 131 to 141 percent, the surrogate barban had recoveries of 140 and 150 percent, and the surrogate 2,4,5-T had a recovery of 62 percent. A total of five pesticides were detected in two ground-water samples that had high surrogate recoveries. The well SDTEM-01 had one detection, and the well SDTEM-06 had four detections. None of the pesticides detected in either sample has a drinking-water standard.

One field blank sample had a recovery of 145 percent for the surrogate caffeine-13C. No pesticide or pesticide degradates were detected in this sample. One replicate had recoveries of 138 and 152 percent for the surrogates barban and

caffeine-13C, respectively. No pesticides or pesticide degradates were detected in this sample. A matrix spike sample had recoveries of 152 and 135 percent for the surrogates barban and caffeine-13C, respectively. Eighteen compounds in the matrix spike sample had recoveries of greater than 130 percent.

Forty-three ground-water samples analyzed for wastewater indicator compounds had surrogate recoveries outside acceptable limits. Ranges for surrogate recoveries were bisphenol A-d3 from 0 to 150 percent; caffeine-13C from 83 to 152 percent; decafluorobiphenyl from 35 to 86 percent; and fluoranthene-d10 from 66 to 154 percent. Twenty wells had a total of 23 waste-water indicator compound detections; all 20 wells had surrogate recoveries outside the acceptable limits. The majority (70 percent) of surrogate recoveries were below the acceptable limit of 70 percent. None of the waste-water indicator compounds has a drinking-water standard.

Based on surrogate recoveries, results for some wastewater indicator compound analyses of quality-control samples may have been biased due to problems with sample processing and/or analytical methods. One field blank had surrogate recoveries of 150 percent for caffeine-13C and 146 percent for fluoranthene-d10, and one source-solution blank had surrogate recoveries of 146 percent for caffeine-13C and 145 percent for fluoranthene-d10. No waste-water indicator compounds were detected in either blank sample. Three replicates had surrogate recoveries outside the acceptable limits. Bisphenol A-d3 was recovered in two replicates at 44 and 45 percent, and decafluorobiphenyl was recovered in one replicate at 58 percent. Waste-water indicator compounds were not detected in either replicate. One matrix spike had a recovery of bisphenol A-d3 at 134 percent, and a recovery of decafluorobiphenyl at 54 percent. Ten compounds in the matrix spike had recoveries of less than 70 percent. The low surrogate recovery for decafluorobiphenyl indicates that results for this sample may be negatively biased, which may explain the low recoveries observed in the matrix spike.

Ground-Water Quality

The San Diego GAMA ground-water quality data presented in this report are available in the USGS National Water Information System database (NWIS), except for the following constituents: tritium and noble gases analyzed at LLNL; chromium, arsenic, and iron speciation analyzed at the USGS national research program (NRP) laboratory in Boulder, Colorado; and perchlorate, NDMA, and 1,4-dioxane analyzed at Montgomery Watson and Harza laboratory.

[Table 9](#page-70-0) shows the general water-quality indicators determined in the field; *[tables 10-20](#page-73-0)* show the results of analyses of ground-water samples organized by constituent class and microbial constituents. For simplicity, tables presenting the results of analyses are summarized for the following constituent classes: VOCs, gasoline oxygenates, pesticides and pesticide degradates, and waste-water indicators. In these tables, only constituents that were detected, and wells that had at least a single constituent detection, are shown. Each table shows the number of times a constituent was detected, the frequency at which the constituent was detected, and the number of constituents detected per well. Additionally, VOCs and gasoline oxygenates are combined into one table. Concentrations, or activities, that exceed MCLs are highlighted in the tables by bold font with an asterisk; exceedances of SMCLs are highlighted by bold font; and exceedances of DLRs are highlighted by bold, italicized font.

Detections in the Temecula Valley study area are divided into two categories, detections in non-flow path wells, which are referred to simply as Temecula Valley study area wells, and detections in flow path wells. Flow path wells are not included in comparisons of detections between study areas because the addition of flow-path wells introduces possible spatial bias in the Temecula Valley study area; the bias could arise from sampling additional wells in a relatively small area.

The chemical and microbial data presented in this report are meant to characterize the quality of the untreated groundwater resources in the San Diego GAMA study unit and not the treated drinking water delivered to consumers by water purveyors. The chemical and microbial composition of treated drinking water may differ from untreated ground water in that treated drinking water may be subjected to disinfection, filtration, mixing with other waters, and exposure to the atmosphere prior to being delivered to the consumer.

VOCs and Gasoline Oxygenates

VOC and gasoline oxygenate samples were collected at all 58 wells sampled in the San Diego GAMA study unit. Twenty-eight wells had at least a single detection of a VOC or gasoline oxygenate (*[table 1](#page-73-0)0*). VOCs and gasoline oxygenates were detected in 11 of 17 wells in the Alluvial Basins study area, 7 of 14 wells in the Temecula Valley study area, 4 of 13 wells in the Hard Rock study area, and 1 of 9 wells in the Warner Valley study area. VOCs and gasoline oxygenates were detected in 5 of 5 Temecula Valley study area flow path wells.

Eighteen of the 88 VOCs and gasoline oxygenates analyzed for were detected in the ground-water samples. Triha-

lomethanes were the most frequently detected class of VOCs; they were detected in 18 of 58 wells. The next most frequently detected class of VOCs were solvents, detected in 12 of 58 wells, followed by VOCs found in gasoline, 9 of 58 wells, and VOCs used in manufacturing (organic synthesis), 3 of 58 wells. Chloroform was the most frequently detected constituent, detected in 18 of 58 wells, followed by bromodichloromethane, 8 of 58 wells, and methyl *tert*-butyl ether (MTBE), 7 of 58 wells. Three VOCs were detected at concentrations greater than the MCL (*[table 10](#page-73-0)*). Tetrachloroethylene (PCE) and trichloroethylene (TCE) were both detected in SDHDRK-01 at concentrations of 9.75 μ g/L and 7.27 μ g/L, respectively. The MCL for both of these constituents is $5 \mu g/L$. MTBE was detected in SDALLV-11 at a concentration of 28.3μ g/L; the MCL for MTBE is $13 \mu g/L$.

Pesticides and Pesticide Degradates

Pesticide and pesticide degradate samples determined by analytical schedule 2003 were collected at all 58 wells sampled for the San Diego GAMA study unit, and pesticides and pesticide degradate samples determined by analytical schedule 2060 were collected at 24 wells. Because pesticide analytical schedule 2060 was not sampled at a uniform rate across the four study areas, constituents detected by this method will not be included when calculating the detection frequency of pesticides and pesticide degradates in the individual study areas. Thirty-three of 58 wells sampled had at least a single detection of a pesticide or pesticide degradate (*[table 11](#page-77-0)*). Pesticides and pesticide degradates were detected in 9 of 14 wells in the Temecula Valley study area, 10 of 17 wells in the Alluvial Basins study area, 7 of 13 wells in the Hard Rock study area, and 3 of 9 wells in the Warner Valley study area. Pesticides and pesticide degradates were detected in 4 of 5 flow-path wells in the Temecula Valley study area.

Twenty-one of the 122 pesticides and pesticide degradates analyzed for were detected in ground-water samples. Herbicides were the most frequently detected class of pesticides; they were detected in 31 of 58 wells. Pesticide degradates were detected in 19 of 58 wells, and fungicides were detected in 4 of 58 wells. Simazine was the most frequently detected pesticide, detected in 27 of 58 wells. The degradation product deethylatrazine was the second most frequently detected constituent, identified in 14 of 58 wells, and the pesticides prometon and atrazine were detected in 10 and 9 wells, respectively. None of the pesticide concentrations detected exceeded MCLs.

Waste-Water Indicator Compounds

Waste-water indicator compounds were collected at 50 wells, but three samples were ruined before analysis, and consequently no waste-water analyses are available for SDWARN-08, SDTEM-10, and SDHDRK-11. Eight different waste-water indicator compounds were detected in samples. Twenty of 47 wells sampled had at least a single detection of a waste-water indicator compound (*[table 12](#page-81-0)*). These constituents were detected in 9 of 17 wells in the Alluvial Basins study area, 6 of 12 wells in the Hard Rock study area, 3 of 8 wells in the Warner Valley study area, and 2 of 6 wells in the Temecula Valley study area. Waste-water indicator compounds were detected in 1 of 5 flow-path wells in the Temecula Valley study area. Phenol was the most frequently detected constituent, being identified in 14 of 47 wells. However, given the fact that phenol has been a persistent contaminant found in field blanks, and that 10 of 14 detections in this study were at, or within, 0.1 μg/L of the censoring threshold, phenol data should be used with caution when interpreting ground-water quality in the San Diego GAMA study unit. None of the waste-water indicator compounds detected in this study has a drinking-water standard.

Perchlorate, NDMA, and 1,4-dioxane

Perchlorate and NDMA were collected at 50 wells, and 1,4-dioxane at 24 wells (*[table 13](#page-82-0)*). Of the 50 wells in which perchlorate was measured, 14 of them had detections. Perchlorate was detected in 4 of 7 wells in the Temecula Valley study area, 2 of 9 wells in the Warner Valley study area, 3 of 17 wells in the Alluvial Basins study area, and 2 of 13 wells in the Hard Rock study area. Perchlorate was also detected in 3 of 4 flow-path wells in the Temecula Valley study area. Perchlorate was detected in SDALLV-05 at a concentration of 4.2 μg/L, which is above the DLR concentration of 4 μg/L. NDMA and 1,4-dioxane were not detected in any samples.

Nutrients and Dissolved Organic Carbon

Nutrients and DOC samples were collected at 24 wells (*[table 14](#page-84-0)*). Nitrate was detected in 17 of 24 wells, whereas nitrite was detected in only 2 wells. Concentrations of nitrate as N did not exceed the MCL of 10 mg/L; values range from less than 0.1 mg/L to 9.14 mg/L. Nitrite was detected in two wells at estimated concentrations of 0.006 mg/L and 0.028

mg/L. Neither of these concentrations is close to the nitrite MCL of 1 mg/L. Ammonia was detected in 6 of 24 wells at concentrations less than or equal to 0.18 mg/L. Dissolved phosphorus and DOC were both detected in all but two wells.

Major Ions and Total Dissolved Solids

Major ion and total dissolved solids (TDS) samples were collected at 24 wells (*[table 15](#page-85-0)*). Nine of 24 wells had TDS concentrations that exceeded the recommended SMCL of 500 mg/L, and 3 of 24 wells had TDS concentrations that exceeded the upper limit of the SMCL of 1,000 mg/L. Concentrations of TDS that exceeded SMCLs ranged from 508 to 1,800 mg/L. All six wells in the Alluvial Basins study area, in which TDS was measured, had concentrations above the SMCL; four wells had concentrations greater 500 mg/L, and two wells had concentrations above 1,000 mg/L. Four of seven wells sampled for TDS in the Temecula Valley study area had concentrations greater than 500 mg/L, one of four wells in the Hard Rock study area had a TDS concentration greater than the upper-limit SMCL (1,198 mg/L), and none of the three wells sampled for TDS in the Warner Valley had concentrations greater than 325 mg/L. One of four flow-path wells in the Temecula Valley study area had a TDS concentration greater than 500 mg/L. However, two of the flow path wells had TDS concentrations of 478 and 494 mg/L.

Two wells had exceedances of the chloride SMCL and three wells had exceedances of the sulfate SMCL. SDALLV-06, which had a TDS concentration of 1,800 mg/L, had a chloride concentration of 540 mg/L and sulfate concentration of 421 mg/L. This well exceeded the upper limit chloride SMCL of 500 mg/L and the recommended sulfate SMCL of 250 mg/L. SDALLV-03, which had a TDS concentration of 1,240 mg/L, had a chloride concentration of 472 mg/L, and SDALLV-01 and SDHDRK-05 had sulfate concentrations of 271 and 320 mg/L, respectively.

Trace element samples were collected at 24 wells (*[table 16](#page-87-0)*). Of the 25 trace elements measured, 11 have a MCL, six have a SMCL, and three are listed as UCMR constituents, and therefore have a DLR. Beryllium and mercury were the only trace elements not detected in any sample; the LRL for these constituents are 0.01 and $0.06 \mu g/L$, respectively. Arsenic was detected in all 24 wells at concentrations ranging from less than $0.5 \mu g/L$ to 7.8 $\mu g/L$. These concentrations are below the current arsenic MCL of 50 μ g/L, as well as the proposed MCL of 10 μg/L that is scheduled to take effect in 2006. Uranium, barium, and nickel also were detected in all 24 wells sampled. Uranium concentrations range from 0.06 μ g/L to 17.8 μ g/L. When converted from mass units to activities using the standard conversion factor of 0.67 pCi/ μ g, all uranium activities are below the DHS MCL of 20 pCi/L (U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2004). Barium concentrations range from $2 \mu g/L$ to 147 $\mu g/L$, and nickel concentrations range from $0.14 \mu g/L$ to 3.44 $\mu g/L$. Concentrations for these constituents are well below the MCLs for both barium $(1,000 \mu g/L)$ and nickel $(100 \mu g/L)$. Selenium has a MCL of 50 mg/L, and was detected in all but one well. Detections of selenium are at concentrations below $3 \mu g/L$, except for the sample collected at SDALLV-01, where the concentration is $30.9 \mu g/L$.

Chromium analysis of samples was done at two different laboratories. Total chromium was analyzed in 24 samples at the NWQL (*[table 16](#page-87-0)*), and in 50 samples at the Boulder NRP laboratory (*[table 17](#page-90-0)*). The NRP laboratory method of chromium analysis is more sensitive than the method used by the NWQL. In addition, the NRP laboratory analyzes for hexavalent chromium, which is classified as an UCMR constituent. Total chromium, as determined at the NRP laboratory, was detected in 44 of 50 wells. Concentrations range from 0.1 μ g/L to 5.7 μ g/L, with the majority of samples having concentrations less then $2 \mu g/L$. The MCL for total chromium is 50 μg/L. Hexavalent chromium was detected in 36 of 50 wells. Much like total chromium, hexavalent chromium concentrations range from 0.1 μ g/L to 5.6 μ g/L, with the majority of samples having concentrations less then $2 \mu g/L$. Seven wells with hexavalent chromium detections have concentrations that exceed the DLR of $1 \mu g/L$; four of these wells are in the Temecula Valley study area.

Iron was detected in two wells at concentrations above its SMCL of 300 mg/L (*[table 16](#page-87-0)*). The wells SDALLV-06 and SDALLV-13 had iron concentrations of $2,120 \mu g/L$ and 578 µg/L, respectively. Manganese was detected in four wells at concentrations that exceed its SMCL of 50 μg/L. The wells SDALLV-03, SDALLV-06, SDALLV-13, and SDHDRK-06

had manganese concentrations of 169 µg/L, 492 µg/L, 362 µg/L, and 178 µg/L, respectively.

Boron was detected in 23 of the 24 wells sampled. Of those 23 detections, 15 exceed the boron DLR of 100 μ g/L. Boron concentrations exceed the DLR most frequently in the Alluvial Basins study area (5 of 6 wells), followed by the Temecula Valley study area (5 of 7 wells), the Warner Valley study area (1 of 3 wells), and the Hard Rock study area (1 of 4 wells). Boron concentrations are also greater than the DLR in three of four Temecula Valley study area flow-path wells. Vanadium was detected in 20 of the 24 wells sampled. Of those 20 detections, 14 have concentrations that exceed the vanadium DLR of 3 µg/L. Vanadium concentrations exceed the DLR most frequently in the Warner Valley study area (3 of 3 wells), followed by the Temecula Valley study area (5 of 7 wells), the Hard Rock study area (2 of 4 wells), and the Alluvial Basins study area (1 of 6 wells). Vanadium concentrations are also greater than the DLR in three of four Temecula Valley study area flow-path wells.

Isotopes, Radioactivity, and Noble Gases

Isotope activities, stable isotopes, and gross alpha/beta radioactivity were determined in ground-water samples collected for the San Diego GAMA study unit (*[tables 18](#page-92-0)* and *[19](#page-95-0)*). Stable isotopes of water, tritium (using two methods of analysis), and noble gases were collected at all 58 wells, whereas radium-226, radium-228, radon-222, alpha radioactivity (72-hour and 30-day count), beta radioactivity (72-hour and 30-day count), and carbon isotopes were collected at 24 wells. Tritium samples, determined by the helium in-growth method, and noble gas samples were collected at all 58 wells (*[table 19](#page-95-0)*). These samples were analyzed at LLNL, and the results can be used to help determine the chronology and source of ground-water recharge.

Tritium was detected in most samples (*[table 19](#page-95-0)*). The highest activity detected in any sample was 23.7 pCi/L; the MCL for tritium is 20,000 pCi/L. Radium-226 was detected in all samples, but concentrations never exceeded 0.41 pCi/L. Radium-228 was detected in all but four samples. Detections were so low that quantification is not possible except for one sample where it was detected at an activity of 2 pCi/L. No wells exceeded the combined radium-226 and radium-228 MCL of 5 pCi/L. Alpha radioactivity in samples ranged from below quantification limits to 9 pCi/L for both 72-hour and 30-day counts, which does not exceed the alpha radioactivity MCL of 15 pCi/L. Beta radioactivity ranges from below quantification limits to 7 pCi/L for 72-hour counts, and from 2 pCi/L to 11 pCi/L in 30-day counts. The MCL for beta radioactivity is 50 pCi/L.

22 California GAMA Program: Ground-Water Quality Data, San Diego Drainages Hydrogeologic Province, California, 2004

Radon-222 was detected in every ground-water sample in which it was analyzed, with activities ranging from 180 to 4,820 pCi/L. In 15 of 24 wells, radon-222 activities exceed the proposed MCL of 300 pCi/L (*[table 18](#page-92-0)*), and one sample exceeds the proposed alternate maximum contaminant level (AMCL) of 4,000 pCi/L (U.S. Environmental Protection, Agency, 2000b). Radon-222 exceeded the proposed MCL in three of three wells in the Warner Valley study area, four of four wells in the Hard Rock study area, three of six wells in the Alluvial Basins study area, and two of seven wells in the Temecula Valley study area. In addition, radon-222 was measured at activities greater than 300 pCi/L in three of four Temecula Valley study area flow-path wells.

Microbial Constituents

Microbial constituents were analyzed for in 24 groundwater samples collected for the San Diego GAMA study (*[table 20](#page-101-0)*). The following microbial constituents were determined: total coliform and *Escherichia* coliform, and the viruses F-specific coliphage and somatic coliphage. Total coliform and *Escherichia* coliform were not detected in any samples. F-specific coliphage was detected in one well, SDALLV-13, and somatic coliphage was detected in two wells, SDTEM-13 and SDWARN-04. Coliphage results are reported as being either present or absent.

Summary

The GAMA program provides a comprehensive statewide assessment of ground-water quality in areas of California where public-supply wells provide an important source of drinking water. The San Diego GAMA study unit is the first region where an assessment of ground-water quality was implemented under the GAMA program. The San Diego GAMA study unit covers the entire San Diego Drainages hydrogeologic province, and consists of four distinct hydrogeologic study areas: the Temecula Valley study area, the Warner Valley study area, the Alluvial Basins study area, and the Hard Rock study area. A total of 58 ground-water samples were collected from public-supply wells in the San Diego GAMA study unit: 19 wells were sampled in the Temecula Valley study area, 9 wells in the Warner Valley study area, 17 wells in the Alluvial Basins study area, and 13 wells in the Hard Rock study area.

This report presents the results of sample analyses for over 350 chemical and microbial constituents, and water-quality indicators collected from the 58 public supply wells from May to July 2004. The results of sample analyses are presented as detection frequencies for individual constituents, and classes of constituents, for the entire San Diego GAMA study unit and for the individual study areas. In addition, results of sample analyses are compared to MCLs, SMCLs, and DLRs. The chemical and microbial data presented in this report are meant to characterize the quality of the untreated ground-water resources in this study unit and not the treated drinking water delivered to consumers by water purveyors. The chemical and microbial composition of treated drinking water may differ significantly from untreated ground water in that treated drinking water may be subjected to disinfection, filtration, mixing with other waters, and exposure to the atmosphere prior to being delivered to the consumer.

 Eighteen of the 88 VOCs and gasoline oxygenates analyzed were detected in samples. VOCs and gasoline oxygenates were detected in 28 of 58 wells sampled. These constituents were most frequently detected in wells located in the Alluvial Basins study area (11 of 17 wells), and least frequently in the Warner Valley study area (1 of 9 wells). Trihalomethanes were the most frequently detected classes of constituents, being identified in 18 of 58 wells. Chloroform was the most frequently detected constituent (18 of 58 wells). MTBE was also relatively frequently detected; it was identified in 7 of 58 wells. Three constituents had detections that exceeded MCLs (*[table 10](#page-73-0)*). PCE and TCE were detected in SDHDRK-01 at concentrations of 9.75 μg/L and 7.27 μg/L, respectively. The MCL for these constituents is 5 ug/L. MTBE was detected in well SDALLV-11 at a concentration of 28.3 μg/L, which exceeds the MCL of 13 μg/L.

Twenty-one of the 122 pesticides and pesticide degradates analyzed were detected in this study. Pesticides and pesticide degradates were detected in 33 of 58 wells sampled. These constituents were detected most frequently in the Temecula Valley study area (9 of 14 wells), and least frequently in the Warner Valley study area (3 of 9 wells). Herbicides were the class of constituents most frequently detected throughout the study unit (31 of 58 wells), and simazine, a herbicide, was the most frequently detected compound (27 of 58 wells). None of the concentrations of pesticides and pesticide degradates exceeded MCLs.

Eight waste-water indicator compounds were identified in samples. Twenty of 47 wells sampled for waste-water indicator compounds had at least a single detection. These constituents were detected most frequently in the Alluvial Basins study area (9 of 17 wells), and least frequently in the Temecula Valley study area (2 of 6 wells). Phenol was the most frequently detected constituent; it was found in 14 of 47 wells. However, phenol has been a persistent contaminant in field blanks, and therefore phenol results should be used with caution when interpreting water quality in this study. Perchlorate was detected in 14 of 50 wells in the San Diego GAMA study unit. Perchlorate was detected in one well, SDALLV-05, at a concentration (4.2 μg/L) above the DLR.

Nitrate was detected in 17 of the 24 wells that were sampled for nutrients. None of the nitrate concentrations in samples exceeded the MCL of 10 mg/L. Twelve of the 24 wells sampled for major ions had TDS concentrations that exceeded the recommended SMCL of 500 mg/L, with three of these wells also exceeding the upper-limit SMCL of 1,000 mg/L. All six wells in the Alluvial Basins study area, in which TDS was measured, had concentrations greater than the SMCL; four wells had concentrations greater than 500 mg/L, and two wells had concentrations greater than 1,000 mg/L. None of the wells measured for TDS in the Warner Valley study area had concentrations that exceeded SMCLs. Four wells with high TDS also had concentrations of chloride and sulfate that exceeded SMCLs. Well SDALLV-06 had a chloride concentration of 540 mg/L and a sulfate concentration of 421 mg/L, which exceeds the chloride upper limit SMCL of 500 mg/L and the recommended sulfate SMCL of 250 mg/L. Well SDALLV-03 had a chloride concentration of 472 mg/L, and wells SDALLV-01 and SDHDRK-05 had sulfate concentrations of 271 and 320 mg/L, respectively.

Of the 25 trace elements analyzed in this study, only beryllium and mercury were not detected at the LRL of 0.01 and 0.06 μg/L, respectively. Arsenic and uranium were detected in all 24 wells in which they were measured, but at concentrations below their respective MCLs. Additionally, arsenic concentrations did not exceed the 10 μg/L MCL that will replace the current MCL of 50 μg/L in 2006. Forty-four of 50 wells that were analyzed for chromium had detectable concentrations; all total chromium concentrations were below its MCL of 50 μg/L. Thirty-six of 50 wells had detectable amounts of hexavalent chromium; seven of these wells had concentrations that exceeded the hexavalent chromium DLR of 1 μg/L.

Iron concentrations exceeded the SMCL of 300 μg/L in two wells; SDALLV-06 and SDALLV-13 had iron concentrations of 2,120 μg/L and 578 μg/L, respectively. Manganese was detected in four wells at concentrations that exceeded the SMCL of 50 μg/L; wells SDALLV-03, SDALLV-06, SDALLV-13, and SDHDRK-06 had manganese concentrations of 169 μg/L, 492 μg/L, 362 μg/L, and 178 μg/L, respectively. Boron was detected in 23 of 24 wells; 14 of those detections exceeded the boron DLR of 100 μg/L; the DLR was most frequently exceeded in the Alluvial Basins study area, and least frequently detected in the Hard Rock study area. Vanadium was detected in 20 of 24 wells; 11 of those detections had concentrations that exceeded the vanadium DLR of 3 μg/L; the DLR was most frequently exceeded in the Warner Valley study area, and least frequently exceeded in the Alluvial Basins study area.

Tritium was detected in the majority of samples; activities were well below the MCL of 20,000 pCi/L. Radium-226 and radium-228 was detected together in all but four samples; however, activities detected in samples were low. Activities of radium-228 were below quantification limits in all but one sample. No wells exceeded the combined radium-226 and radium-228 MCL of 5 pCi/L. Alpha and beta radioactiv-

ity were detected in all but two samples; activities did not exceed the respective MCLs of 15 and 50 pCi/L. Radon-222 was detected in every ground-water sample in which it was analyzed. Radon-222 activities in 62 percent of the samples exceeded the proposed MCL of 300 pCi/L, and one sample exceeded the proposed alternate maximum contaminant level (AMCL) of 4,000 pCi/L (*[table 18](#page-92-0)*). Radon-222 activities exceeded the proposed MCL in all Warner Valley and Alluvial Basins study area wells in which it was measured.

 Total coliform and *Escherichia* coliform were not detected in any of the 24 samples analyzed for microbial constituents. F-specific coliphage was detected in one well, SDALLV-13, and somatic coliphage was detected in two wells, SDTEM-13 and SDWARN-04. Coliphage results are reported as the organism either being present or absent.

References

- American Society for Testing and Materials, 1992, Annual book of ASTM standards, Water and Environmental Technology: Philadelphia, v. 11.02 [pagination unknown].
- Ball, J.W., and McCleskey, R.B., 2003a, A new cationexchange method for accurate field speciation of hexavalent chromium: U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 03–4018, 17 p.
- Ball, J.W., and McCleskey, R.B., 2003b, A new cationexchange method for accurate field speciation of hexavalent chromium: Talanta, v. 61, p. 305–313.
- Belitz, Kenneth, Dubrovsky, N.M., Burow, Karen, Jurgens, Bryant, and Johnson, Tyler, 2003, Framework for a groundwater quality monitoring and assessment program for California: U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 03–4166, 78 p.
- Brenton, R.W., and Arnett, T.L., 1993, Methods of analysis by the U.S. Geological Survey National Water-Quality Laboratory—Determination of dissolved organic carbon by UVpromoted persulfate oxidation and infrared spectrometry: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 92–480, 12 p.
- Cahill, J.D., Furlong, E.T., Burkhardt, M.R., Kolpin, Dana, and Anderson, L.G., 2004, Determination of pharmaceutical compounds in surface and ground-water samples by solidphase extraction and high-performance liquid chromatography–electrospray ionization mass spectrometry: Journal of Chromatography A, v. 1041 (2004), p. 171–180.
- California Department of Water Resources, 1956, Santa Margarita River Investigation: Bulletin 57, 273 p.
- California Department of Water Resources, 1971, Water wells in the San Luis Rey River Valley area, San Diego County, California: Bulletin 91–18, 347 p.

24 California GAMA Program: Ground-Water Quality Data, San Diego Drainages Hydrogeologic Province, California, 2004

California Department of Water Resources, Southern District, 1991, San Diego Region groundwater studies, Phase V—Ramona hydrologic subarea and Jamacha hydrologic subarea: Memorandum Report, 92 p.

California Department of Water Resources, 2003, California's groundwater: Bulletin 118, 246 p.

California Department of Water Resources, 2004a, California Department of Water Resources, Individual basins description web page: accessed December 2004 at *[http://www.](http://www.dpla2.water.ca.gov/publications/groundwater/bulletin118/basins/pdfs_desc/9-5.pdf) [dpla2.water.ca.gov/publications/groundwater/bulletin118/](http://www.dpla2.water.ca.gov/publications/groundwater/bulletin118/basins/pdfs_desc/9-5.pdf) [basins/pdfs_desc/9–5.pdf](http://www.dpla2.water.ca.gov/publications/groundwater/bulletin118/basins/pdfs_desc/9-5.pdf)*

California Department of Water Resources, 2004b, California Department of Water Resources, Individual basins description web page: accessed December 2004 at *[http://www.](http://www.dpla2.water.ca.gov/publications/groundwater/bulletin118/basins/pdfs_desc/9-8.pdf) [dpla2.water.ca.gov/publications/groundwater/bulletin118/](http://www.dpla2.water.ca.gov/publications/groundwater/bulletin118/basins/pdfs_desc/9-8.pdf) [basins/pdfs_desc/9–8.pdf](http://www.dpla2.water.ca.gov/publications/groundwater/bulletin118/basins/pdfs_desc/9-8.pdf)*

California Department of Water Resources, 2004c, California Department of Water Resources, Individual basins description web page: accessed December 2004 at *[http://www.](http://www.dpla2.water.ca.gov/publications/groundwater/bulletin118/basins/pdfs_desc/9-29.pdf) [dpla2.water.ca.gov/publications/groundwater/bulletin118/](http://www.dpla2.water.ca.gov/publications/groundwater/bulletin118/basins/pdfs_desc/9-29.pdf) [basins/pdfs_desc/9–29.pdf](http://www.dpla2.water.ca.gov/publications/groundwater/bulletin118/basins/pdfs_desc/9-29.pdf)*

California Department of Water Resources, 2004d, California Department of Water Resources, Individual basins description web page: accessed December 2004 at *[http://www.](http://www.dpla2.water.ca.gov/publications/groundwater/bulletin118/basins/pdfs_desc/9-7.pdf) [dpla2.water.ca.gov/publications/groundwater/bulletin118/](http://www.dpla2.water.ca.gov/publications/groundwater/bulletin118/basins/pdfs_desc/9-7.pdf) [basins/pdfs_desc/9–7.pdf](http://www.dpla2.water.ca.gov/publications/groundwater/bulletin118/basins/pdfs_desc/9-7.pdf)*

California Regional Water Quality Control Board, San Diego Region, 1994, Water quality control plan for the San Diego Basin (9): sec 1, p. 3.

Childress, C.J.O., Foreman, W.T., Connor, B.F., and Maloney, T.J., 1999, New reporting procedures based on longterm method detection levels and some considerations for interpretations of water-quality data provided by the U.S. Geological Survey National Water Quality Laboratory: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 99–193, 19 p.

Connor, B.F., Rose, D.L., Noriega, M.C., Murtagh, L.K., and Abney, S.R., 1998, Methods of analysis by the U.S. Geological Survey National Water Quality Laboratory—Determination of 86 volatile organic compounds in water by gas chromatography/mass spectrometry, including detections less than reporting limits: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 97–829, 78 p.

Coplen, T.B., Wildman, J.D., and Chen, J., 1991, Improvements in the gaseous hydrogen-water equilibrium technique for hydrogen isotope analysis: Analytical Chemistry, v. 63, p. 910–912.

Donahue, D.J., Linick, T.W., and Jull, A.J.T., 1990, Ratio and background corrections for accelerator mass spectrometry radiocarbon measurements: Radiocarbon, v. 32, p. 135–142. Eaton, G.F., Hudson, G.B., and Moran, J.E., 2004, Tritiumhelium-3 age-dating of groundwater in the Livermore Valley of California: American Chemical Society ACS Symposium Series, no. 868, p. 235–245.

Epstein, S., and Mayeda, T., 1953, Variation of O–18 content of water from natural sources: Geochimica Cosmochimica Acta, v. 4, p. 213–224.

Fishman, M.J., and Friedman, L.C., 1989, Methods for determination of inorganic substances in water and fluvial sediments: U.S. Geological Survey Techniques of Water-Resources Investigations, book 5, chap. A1, 545 p.

Fishman, M.J., ed., 1993, Methods of analysis by the U.S. Geological Survey National Water Quality Laboratory— Determination of inorganic and organic constituents in water and fluvial sediments: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 93–125, 217 p.

Furlong, E.T., Anderson, B.D., Werner, S.L., Soliven, P.P., Coffey, L.J, and Burkhardt, M.R., 2001, Methods of analysis by the U.S. Geological Survey National Water Quality Laboratory—Determination of pesticides in water by graphitized carbon-based solid-phase extraction and high-performance liquid chromatography/mass spectrometry: U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 01–4134, p. 73.

Garbarino, J.R., 1999, Methods of analysis by the U.S. Geological Survey National Water Quality Laboratory—Determination of dissolved arsenic, boron, lithium, selenium, strontium, thallium, and vanadium using inductively coupled plasma-mass spectrometry: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 99–093, 31 p.

Garbarino, J.R., and Damrau, D.L., 2001, Methods of analysis by the U.S. Geological Survey National Water Quality Laboratory—Determination of organic plus inorganic mercury in filtered and unfiltered natural water with cold vapor—atomic fluorescence spectrometry: U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 01–4132, 16 p.

Gilliom, R.J., Alley, W.M., and Gurtz, M.E., 1995, Design of the National Water-Quality Assessment Program—Occurrence and distribution of water-quality conditions: U.S. Geological Survey Circular 1112, 33 p.

Hamlin, S.N., Belitz, Kenneth, Kraja, S., and Dawson, B.J., 2002, Ground-water quality in the Santa Ana watershed, California—Overview and data summary: U.S. Geological Survey Water Resource Investigations Report 02–4243, 137 p.

Hautman, D.P., Munch, D.J., Eaton, A.D., and Haghani, A.W., 1999, Method 314.0 Determination of perchlorate in drinking water using ion chromatography, revision 1.0: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, accessed on June 22, 2004 at URL *http://www.epa.gov/safewater/methods/ met314.pdf*

Izbicki, J.A., 1985, Evaluation of the Mission, Santee, and Tijuana hydrologic subareas for reclaimed-water use, San Diego County, California: U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 85–4032, 99 p.

Jull, A.J.T., Burr, G.S., McHargue, L.R., Lange, T.E. , Lifton, N.A., Beck, J.W., Donahue D.J., and Lal, D., 2004, New frontiers in dating of geological, paleoclimatic and anthropological applications using accelerator mass spectrometric measurements of 14C and 10 Be in diverse samples: Global and Planetary Change, v. 41, p. 309–323.

Koterba, M.T., Wilde, F.D., and Lapham, W.W., 1995, Ground-water data-collection protocols and procedures for the National Water-Quality Assessment Program—Collection and documentation of water-quality samples and related data: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 95–399, 113 p.

Kulongoski, Justin, and Belitz, Kenneth, 2004, Ground-water ambient monitoring and assessment program: U.S. Geological Survey Fact Sheet 2004–3088.

McCleskey, R.B., Nordstrom, D.K., and Ball, J.W., 2003, Metal interferences and their removal prior to the determination of As(T) and As(III) in acid mine waters by hydride generation atomic absorption spectrometry: U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 03–4117.

McLain, Betty, 1993, Methods of analysis by the U.S. Geological Survey National Water Quality Laboratory—Determination of chromium in water by graphite furnace atomic absorption spectrophotometry: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 93–449, 16 p.

Patton, C.J., and Kryskalla, J.R., 2003, Methods of analysis by the U.S. Geological Survey National Water Quality Laboratory—Evaluation of alkaline persulfate digestion as an alternative to Kjeldahl digestion for determination of total and dissolved nitrogen and phosphorus in water: Water-Resources Investigations Report 03–4174, 33 p.

Rose, D.L., and Sandstrom, M.W., 2003, Methods of analysis by the U.S. Geological Survey National Water Quality Laboratory—Determination of gasoline oxygenates, selected degradates, and BTEX in water by heated purge and trap/gas chromatography/mass spectrometry: U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 03–4079, 31 p.

Sandstrom, M.W., Stroppel, M.E., Foreman, W.T., and Schroeder, M.P., 2001, Methods of analysis by the U.S. Geological Survey National Water Quality Laboratory—Determination of moderate-use pesticides and selected degradates in water by C–18 solid-phase extraction and gas chromatography/mass spectrometry: U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 01–4098, 70 p.

Scott, J.C., 1990, Computerized stratified random site selection approaches for design of a ground-water quality sampling network: U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 90–4101, 109 p.

Stookey, L.L., 1970, FerroZine–a new spectrophotometric reagent for iron: Analytical Chemistry, v. 42, p. 779–781.

Thatcher, L.L., Janzer, V.J., and Edwards, K.W., 1977, Methods for the determination of radioactive substances in water: U.S. Geological Survey Techniques of Water-Resources Investigations, chapter A5, 95 p.

Timme, P.J., 1995, National Water Quality Laboratory 1995 services catalog: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 95–352, 120 p.

To, T.B., Nordstrom, D.K., Cunningham, K.M., Ball, J.W., and McCleskey, R.B., 1998, New method for the direct determination of dissolved Fe(III) concentration in acid mine waters: Environmental Science and Technology, v. 33, p. 807–813.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1980, Prescribed procedures for measurement of radioactivity in drinking water: EPA/600/4–80–032, pagination unknown.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1996, Method 8270C, semivolatile organic compounds by gas chromatography/ mass spectrometry, revision 3: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, accessed on December 1, 2004, at URL *http:// www.epa.gov/epaoswer/hazwaste/test/pdfs/8270c.pdf*

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 1999, Method 1625 revision B—semivolatile organic compounds by isotope dilution GC/MS, 40 CFR Part 136, Appendix A (Current Edition): accessed on December 1, 2004, at URL *http:// www.epa.gov/waterscience/methods/guide/1625.pdf*

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2000a, Method 1601—Male-specific (F+) and somatic Coliphage in water by two-step enrichment procedure—April 2000 Draft: Washington, D.C., EPA–821–R–00–009.

U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2000b, Drinking water regulations and health advisories: Office of Water, EPA 822–B–00–001, Washington D.C., revised August 2000, 18 p.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2002a, Guidelines for establishing procedures for the analysis of pollutants: U.S. Code of Federal Regulations, Title 40, pt.136, revised as of July 2002.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2002b, Method 1604—Total coliforms and *Escherichia coli* in water by membrane filtration using a simultaneous detection technique (MI medium): Washington D.C., EPA 821–R–02– 024, 14 p.
- U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, 2004, National primary drinking water regulations—analytical method for uranium: U.S. Code of Federal Regulations, Title 40, pt.141, revised as of June 2004, p. 31008–31013.
- U.S. Geological Survey, 1998, National Field Manual for the collection of water quality data: U.S. Geological Survey Techniques of Water Resources Investigations, book 9, variously paged.
- U.S. Geological Survey, 1999, National Field Manual for the collection of water quality data: U.S. Geological Survey Techniques of Water Resources Investigations, book 9, variously paged.
- Weiss, R.F., 1968, Piggyback sampler for dissolved gas studies on sealed water samples: Deep Sea Research, v. 15, p. 721–735.
- Zaugg, S.D., Smith, S.G., Schroeder, M.P., Barber, L.B., and Burkhardt, M.R., 2002, Methods of analysis by the U.S. Geological Survey National Water Quality Laboratory— Determination of wastewater compounds by polystyrenedivinylbenzene solid-phase extraction and capillary-column gas chromatography/mass spectrometry: U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 01–4186, p. 37.

Tables

Table 1. Classes of chemical and microbial constituents and water-quality indicators collected for the expanded, basic-plus, and basic sampling schedules in the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004.

[SC, specific conductance; DO, dissolved oxygen; NDMA, N-nitrosodimethylamine]

2 Analyzed at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory, Livermore, California.

Table 2A. Volatile organic compounds, primary use or source, Chemical Abstract Service (CAS) number, and laboratory reporting level (LRL) for the U.S. Geological Survey's National Water Quality Laboratory analytical schedule 2020.

Table 2A. Volatile organic compounds, primary use or source, Chemical Abstract Service (CAS) number, and laboratory reporting level (LRL) for the U.S. Geological Survey's National Water Quality Laboratory analytical schedule 2020—Continued.

Table 2A. Volatile organic compounds, primary use or source, Chemical Abstract Service (CAS) number, and laboratory reporting level (LRL) for the U.S. Geological Survey's National Water Quality Laboratory analytical schedule 2020—Continued.

[μg/L, micrograms per liter]

Table 2B. Gasoline oxygenates and gasoline oxygenate degradates, primary use or source, Chemical Abstract Service (CAS) number, and laboratory reporting level (LRL) for the U.S. Geological Survey's National Water Quality Laboratory analytical schedule 4024.

Table 2C. Pesticides and pesticide degradates, primary use or source, Chemical Abstract Service (CAS) number, and laboratory reporting level (LRL) for the U.S. Geological Survey's National Water Quality Laboratory analytical schedule 2003.

[NA, not available; µg/L, micrograms per liter]

Table 2C. Pesticides and pesticide degradates, primary use or source, Chemical Abstract Service (CAS) number, and laboratory reporting limits (LRLs) for the U.S. Geological Survey's National Water Quality Laboratory analytical schedule 2003—Continued.

[NA, not available; µg/L, micrograms per liter]

Table 2D. Pesticides, pesticide degradates, and caffeine, primary use or source, Chemical Abstract Service (CAS) number, and laboratory reporting level (LRL) for the U.S. Geological Survey's National Water Quality Laboratory analytical schedule 2060.

Table 2D. Pesticides, pesticide degradates, and caffiene, primary use or source, Chemical Abstract Service (CAS) number, and laboratory reporting level (LRL) for the U.S. Geological Survey's National Water Quality Laboratory analytical schedule 2060—Continued.

Table 2E. Waste-water indicator compounds, primary use or source, Chemical Abstract Service (CAS) number, and laboratory reporting level (LRL) for the U.S. Geological Survey's National Water Quality Laboratory analytical schedule 1433.

Table 2E. Waste-water indicator compounds, primary use or source, Chemical Abstract Service (CAS) number, and laboratory reporting level (LRL) for the U.S. Geological Survey's National Water Quality Laboratory analytical schedule 1433—Continued.

Table 2F. Pharmaceutical compounds, primary use or source, Chemical Abstract Service (CAS) number, and method detection limit (MDL) for the U.S. Geological Survey's National Water Quality Laboratory custom laboratory code 9003.

[CNS, central nervous system; NA, not available; µg/L, micrograms per liter]

1 Concentrations of these compounds are reported as estimates only.

Table 2G. The emerging contaminant compounds perchlorate, 1,4-dioxane, and N-nitrosodimethylamine (NDMA), Chemical Abstract Service (CAS) number, and minimum reporting level (MRL) for Montgomery Watson Harza Laboratory.

[ug/L, micrograms per liter]

Table 2H. Nutrients and dissolved organic carbon, Chemical Abstract Service (CAS) number, and laboratory reporting level (LRL) for the U.S. Geological Survey's National Water Quality Laboratory analytical schedule 2755 and laboratory code 2613.

[NA, not available; µg/L, micrograms per liter]

Table 2I. Major ions and trace elements, Chemical Abstract Service (CAS) number, and laboratory reporting level (LRL) for the U.S. Geological Survey's National Water Quality Laboratory analytical schedule 1948.

[NA, not available; µg/L, micrograms per liter; mg/L, milligrams per liter]

Table 2J. Iron, arsenic, and chromium speciation, Chemical Abstract Service (CAS) number, and method detection limit (MDL) for the U.S. Geological Survey's National Research Program Laboratory, Boulder, Colorado.

[µg/L, micrograms per liter; oxidation states in parentheses]

Table 2K. Isotopic and radioactive constituents, Chemical Abstract Service (CAS) number, reporting level type, reporting level/uncertainty, and reporting units for the U.S. Geological Survey's National Water Quality Laboratory, Stable Isotope and Tritium Laboratory, Menlo Park, Californiaª, Stable Isotope Laboratory, Reston, Virginiaʰ, and the contract laboratories Eberline Analytical Servicesº and University of Arizona, Accelerator Mass Spectrometry Laboratory^d.

[NA, not applicable; SSMDC, sample specific minimum detectable concentration; MU, method uncertainty; pCi/L, pico curies per liter]

Table 2L. Tritium and noble gases, Chemical Abstract Service (CAS) number, method uncertainty (MU), and reporting units for Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.

[NA, not available; ND, no data; pCi/L, picocuries per liter; cm³STP/g, cubic centimeter of gas at standard temperature and pressure per gram of water]

Table 2M. Microbial constituents, primary use and source, and method detection limit (MDL) for the U.S. Geological Survey's Ohio Microbiology Laboratory parameter codes 90901, 90900, 99335, and 99332.

[NA, not available; ml, milliliters]

Table 3. Identification, sampling, and construction information for sampled wells in the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study unit, California, May to July 2004.

[ft, foot; LSD, land surface datum; SDTEM, Temecula Valley study area; SDTEMFP, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well; SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV, alluvial study area; SDHDRK, hard rock study area; NA, not available]

Table 3. Identification, sampling, and construction information for sampled wells in the San Diego Ground -Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study unit, California, May to July 2004—Continued.

[ft, foot; LSD, land surface datum; SDTEM, Temecula Valley study area; SDTEMFP, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well; SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV, alluvial study area; SDHDRK, hard rock study area; NA, not available]

Table 4. Compounds analyzed for in ground-water samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004, that appear on multiple analytical schedules, primary compound classification, analytical schedules compound appears on, and preferred analytical schedule.

[VOC, volatile organic compound]

1 Preferred analytical schedules are the most accurate and precise methods of analysis for the compound shown.

Table 5. Quality-control summary for volatile organic compounds and gasoline oxygenates, waste-water indicator compounds, emerging contaminant compounds, pesticide compounds, nutrients and dissolved organic carbon, major ions, and trace elements detected in trip blanks, equipment blanks, field blanks anc ground-water samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004.

[µg/L, micrograms per liter; E, estimated value; NA, not available; NC, sample not collected; —, not detected; NDMA, N-nitrosodimethylamine]

1 Compounds also detected in associated source solution blanks.

2 Waste-water indicator compound detected in one of two associated source solution blanks.

3 Because of ongoing problems with the analytical procedures used to determine phenol, all ground-water samples with concentrations less than 0.4 µg/L are censored.

4 Dissolved organic carbon not determined.

5 Concentration in milligrams per liter.

Table 6A. Quality-control summary of replicate volatile organic compounds and gasoline oxygenates, pesticides and pesticide degradates, and emerging contaminant samples with relative standard deviations greater than zero, collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004.

[NA, not available; no replicate pairs of waste-water compounds, or coliphage, had a relative standard deviation greater than zero]

1 Due to the large number of compounds, only compounds with relative standard deviations above zero are shown.

Table 6B. Quality-control summary of replicate nutrient and dissolved organic carbon samples collected for the San Diego Ground Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004.

[NA, not available]

Table 6C. Quality-control summary of replicate major ion samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004.

[NA, not available]

Table 6D. Quality-control summary of replicate trace-element samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004.

[NA, not available]

1 Samples analyzed at U.S. Geological Survey national research program laboratory, Boulder, Colorado.

Table 6E. Quality-control summary of replicate isotope and radioactivity samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004.

[NA, not available]

1 Analysis done at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory.

2 Analysis done at U.S. Geological Survey, Menlo Park, California.

Table 7A. Quality-control summary of volatile organic compound, gasoline oxygenate, NDMA, and 1,4-dioxane matrix spike recoveries for samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004.

Table 7A. Quality-control summary of volatile organic compound, gasoline oxygenate, NDMA, and 1,4-dioxane matrix spike recoveries for samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004—Continued.

Table 7A. Quality-control summary of volatile organic compound, gasoline oxygenate, NDMA, and 1,4-dioxane matrix spike recoveries for samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004—Continued.

1 Compounds on schedules 2020 and 4024; only 2020 values are reported because it is the preferred analytical schedule.

Table 7B. Quality-control summary of matrix pesticide spike recoveries for samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004.

[—, not detected]

Table 7B. Quality-control summary of matrix pesticide spike recoveries for samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004—Continued.

[—, not detected]

Table 7B. Quality-control summary of matrix pesticide spike recoveries for samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004—Continued.

[—, not detected]

Table 7B. Quality-control summary of matrix pesticide spike recoveries for samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004—Continued.

[—, not detected]

1 Compounds on schedule 2003 and 2060; only 2003 values are reported because it is the preferred analytical schedule.

Table 7C. Quality-control summary of matrix waste-water compound spike recoveries for samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004.

Table 7C. Quality-control summary of matrix waste-water compound spike recoveries for samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July, 2004—Continued.

1 Analyzed on pesticide schedule 2060.

Table 8. Summary of surrogate compound recoveries for ground-water and quality-control analyses of volatile organic compounds, gasoline oxygenates, pesticides and pesticide degradates, and waste-water indicator compound samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004.

Table 9. General water-quality parameters determined in the field for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July **Table 9.** General water-quality parameters determined in the field for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004.

 $\overline{1}$ [The five-digit number below the constituent name, the data parameter code, is used in the U.S. Geological Survey computerized data system, National Water Information System (NWIS), to uniquely identify [The five-digit number below the constituent name, the data parameter code, is used in the U.S. Geological Survey computerized data system, National Water Information System (NWIS), to uniquely identify **Carbonate,** a specific constituent or property; NTU, nephelometric turbidity unit; SDTEM, Temecula Valley study area; SDTEMFP, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well; SDWARN, Warner Valley study area;
SDALLV alluvial study area; SD a specific constituent or property; NTU, nephelometric turbidity unit; SDTEM, Temecula Valley study area; SDTEMFP, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well; SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV alluvial study area; SDHDRK, hard rock study area; µS/cm, microsiemens per centimeter; C, Celsius; mg/L, milligrams per liter; mm, millimeter; NC, sample not collected; —, not detected] **Bicarbonate, Alkalinity, Total conductance, Specific standard pH, Dissolved Barometric Turbidity, GAMA**

Table 9. General water-quality parameters determined in the field for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July, **Table 9.** General water-quality parameters determined in the field for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July, 2004-Continued. 2004—Continued.

[The five-digit number below the constituent name, the data parameter code, is used in the U.S. Geological Survey computerized data system, National Water Information System (NWIS), to uniquely identify a specific constitu [The five-digit number below the constituent name, the data parameter code, is used in the U.S. Geological Survey computerized data system, National Water Information System (NWIS), to uniquely identify a specific constituent or property; NTU, nephelometric turbidity unit; SDTEM, Temecula Valley study area; SDTEMFP, Temecula Valley study area flow path well; SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV alluvial study area; SDHDRK, hard rock study area; µS/cm, microsiemens per centimeter; C, Celsius; mg/L, milligrams per liter; mm, millimeter; NC, sample not collected; —, not detected]

 \overline{a}

Table 9. General water-quality parameters determined in the field for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July **Table 9.** General water-quality parameters determined in the field for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004-Continued. 2004—Continued.

[The five-digit number below the constituent name, the data parameter code, is used in the U.S. Geological Survey computerized data system, National Water Information System (NWIS), to uniquely identify [The five-digit number below the constituent name, the data parameter code, is used in the U.S. Geological Survey computerized data system, National Water Information System (NWIS), to uniquely identify a specific constituent or property; NTU, nephelometric turbidity unit; SDTEM, Temecula Valley area; SDTEMFR, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well; SDWARN, Warner Valley study area;
SDALLV alluvial study area; SDHDRK, a specific constituent or property; NTU, nephelometric turbidity unit; SDTEM, Temecula Valley study area; SDTEMFP, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well; SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV alluvial study area; SDHDRK, hard rock study area; µS/cm, microsiemens per centimeter; C, Celsius; mg/L, milligrams per liter; mm, millimeter; NC, sample not collected; —, not detected]

Table 10. Analysis for volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and gasoline oxygenates in ground-water samples collected in the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring **Table 10.** Analysis for volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and gasoline oxygenates in ground-water samples collected in the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004. and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004. [Bold, astericked numbers indicate VOCs detected at concentrations above the maximum contaminant level (MCL); percentage values are detection frequencies; the five-digit number below the compound name, the data parameter c laboratory reporting level; SDTEM, Temecula Valley study area; SDTEMFP, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well; SDMARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV alluvial study area; SDHDRK, hard [Bold, astericked numbers indicate VOCs detected at concentrations above the maximum contaminant level (MCL); percentage values are detection frequencies; the five-digit number below the compound name, the data parameter code, is used in the U.S. Geological Survey computerized data system, National Water Information System (NWIS), to uniquely identify a specific constituent or property; LRL, not detected] rock study area; $\mu g/L$, microgram per liter; E, estimated value; NQ, compound identified but not quantified; —, not detected] rock study area: $\log L$, microoram per liter: E, estimated value: NO, compound identified but not quantified:

Table 10. Analysis for volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and gasoline oxygenates in ground-water samples collected in the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Table 10. Analysis for volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and gasoline oxygenates in ground-water samples collected in the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004-Continued. Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004—Continued.

name, the data parameter code, is used in the U.S. Geological Survey computerized data system, National Water Information System (NWIS), to uniquely identify a specific constituent or property; LRL, laboname, the data parameter code, is used in the U.S. Geological Survey computerized data system, National Water Information System (NWIS), to uniquely identify a specific constituent or property; LRL, laboratory reporting level; SDTEM, Temecula Valley study area; SDTEMFP, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well; SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV alluvial study area; SDHDRK, hard rock ratory reporting level; SDTEM, Temecula Valley study area; SDTEMFP, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well; SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV alluvial study area; SDHDRK, hard rock [Bold, astericked numbers indicate VOCs detected at concentrations above the maximum contaminant level (MCL); percentage values are detection frequencies; the five-digit number below the compound [Bold, astericked numbers indicate VOCs detected at concentrations above the maximum contaminant level (MCL); percentage values are detection frequencies; the five-digit number below the compound study area; µg/L, microgram per liter; E, estimated value; NQ, compound identified but not quantified; --, not detected] study area; µg/L, microgram per liter; E, estimated value; NQ, compound identified but not quantified; —, not detected]

Table 10. Analysis for volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and gasoline oxygenates in ground-water samples collected in the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and **Table 10.** Analysis for volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and gasoline oxygenates in ground-water samples collected in the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004-Continued. Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004—Continued. [Bold, astericked numbers indicate VOCs detected at concentrations above the maximum contaminant level (MCL); percentage values are detection frequencies; the five-digit number below the compound
name, the data parameter c name, the data parameter code, is used in the U.S. Geological Survey computerized data system, National Water Information System (NWIS), to uniquely identify a specific constituent or property; LRL, laboratory reporting level; SDTEM, Temecula Valley study area; SDTEMFP, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well; SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV alluvial study area; SDHDRK, hard rock [Bold, astericked numbers indicate VOCs detected at concentrations above the maximum contaminant level (MCL); percentage values are detection frequencies; the five-digit number below the compound

Table 10. Analysis for volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and gasoline oxygenates in ground-water samples collected in the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and **Table 10.** Analysis for volatile organic compounds (VOCs) and gasoline oxygenates in ground-water samples collected in the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July, 2004-Continued. Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July, 2004—Continued. [Bold, astericked numbers indicate VOCs detected at concentrations above the maximum contaminant level (MCL); percentage values are detection frequencies; the five-digit number below the compound name, the data parameter c name, the data parameter code, is used in the U.S. Geological Survey computerized data system, National Water Information System (NWIS), to uniquely identify a specific constituent or property; LRL, laboratory reporting level; SDTEM, Temecula Valley study area; SDTEMFP, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well; SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV alluvial study area; SDHDRK, hard rock ratory reporting level; SDTEM, Temecula Valley study area; SDTEMFP, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well; SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV alluvial study area; SDHDRK, hard rock [Bold, astericked numbers indicate VOCs detected at concentrations above the maximum contaminant level (MCL); percentage values are detection frequencies; the five-digit number below the compound

Table 11. Analysis for pesticides in ground-water samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004. Table 11. Analysis for pesticides in ground-water samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004. Percentage values are detection frequencies; the five-digit number below the compound name, the data parameter code, is used in the U.S. Geological Survey computerized data system, National Water Information System (NWIS), SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV alluvial study area; DHDRK, hard rock study area; µg/L, microgram per liter; E, estimated value; NQ, compound identified but not quantified; —, not detected] [Percentage values are detection frequencies; the five-digit number below the compound name, the data parameter code, is used in the U.S. Geological Survey computerized data system, National Water Information System (NWIS), to uniquely identify a specific constituent or property; LRL, laboratory reporting level; SDTEM, Temecula Valley stract; SDTEMFP, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well;

Table 11. Analysis for pesticides in ground-water samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004-**Table 11**. Analysis for pesticides in ground-water samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004— Continued. Continued.

Percentage values are detection frequencies; the five-digit number below the compound name, the data parameter code, is used in the U.S. Geological Survey computerized data system, National Water Information System (NWIS), SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV alluvial study area; DHDRK, hard rock study area; µg/L, microgram per liter; E, estimated value; NQ, compound identified but not quantified; —, not detected] [Percentage values are detection frequencies; the five-digit number below the compound name, the data parameter code, is used in the U.S. Geological Survey computerized data system, National Water Information System (NWIS), to uniquely identify a specific constituent or property; LRL, laboratory reporting level; SDTEM, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well;

Table 11. Analysis for pesticides in ground-water samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004— Table 11. Analysis for pesticides in ground-water samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004— Continued. Continued. Percentage values are detection frequencies; the five-digit number below the compound name, the data parameter code, is used in the U.S. Geological Survey computerized data system, National Water Information System (NWIS), SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV alluvial study area; DHDRK, hard rock study area; µg/L, microgram per liter; E, estimated value; NQ, compound identified but not quantified; —, not detected] [Percentage values are detection frequencies; the five-digit number below the compound name, the data parameter code, is used in the U.S. Geological Survey computerized data system, National Water Information System (NWIS), to uniquely identify a specific constituent or property; LRL, laboratory reporting level; SDTEM, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well;

Table 11. Analysis for pesticides in ground-water samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004-**Table 11**. Analysis for pesticides in ground-water samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004— Continued. Continued. [Percentage values are detection frequencies; the five-digit number below the compound name, the data parameter code, is used in the U.S. Geological Survey computerized data system, National Water Information System (NWIS) [Percentage values are detection frequencies; the five-digit number below the compound name, the data parameter code, is used in the U.S. Geological Survey computerized data system, National Water Information System (NWIS), to uniquely identify a specific constituent or property; LRL, laboratory reporting level; SDTEM, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well;

Table 12. Analysis for waste-water indicator compounds in ground-water samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004.

[Concentrations preceded by a "V" indicate detections attributed to contamination, and are not included in ground-water quality analysis; percentage values are detection frequencies; the five-digit number below the compound name, the data parameter code, is used in the U.S. Geological Survey computerized data system, National Water Information System (NWIS), to uniquely identify a specific constituent or property; LRL, laboratory reporting level; SDTEM, Temecula Valley study area; SDTEMFP, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well; SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV alluvial study area; SDHDRK, hard rock study area; µg/L, microgram per liter; E, estimated value; NQ, compound identified but not quantified; —, not detected]

1 Caffeine comcentration determined by the preferred analysis method, pesticide analytical schedule 2060.

72 California GAMA Program: Ground-Water Quality Data, San Diego Drainages Hydrogeologic Province, California, 2004

Table 13. Analysis for emerging contaminant compounds perchlorate, 1,4-dioxane, and N-nitrosodimethylamine (NDMA) in groundwater samples collected in the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004.

[Bold, italicized numbers indicate perchlorate detections at concentrations above the detection level for the purposes of reporting (DLR); percentage values are detection frequencies; MRL, minimun reporting level; SDTEM, Temecula Valley study area; SDTEMFP, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well; SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV alluvial study area; SDHDRK, hard rock study area; µg/L, microgram per liter; NC, sample not collected; <, less than; --, not detected]

Tables 73

Table 13. Analysis for emerging contaminant compounds perchlorate, 1,4-dioxane, and N-nitrosodimethylamine (NDMA) of the groundwater samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004—Continued.

[Bold, italicized numbers indicate perchlorate detections at concentrations above the detection level for the purposes of reporting (DLR); percentage values are detection frequencies; MRL, minimun reporting level; SDTEM, Temecula Valley study area; SDTEMFP, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well; SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV alluvial study area; SDHDRK, hard rock study area; µg/L, microgram per liter; NC, sample not collected; <, less than; —, not detected]

1 Four different MRLs were used for perchlorate analysis; therefore, non-detects were reported as less than the MRL.

74 California GAMA Program: Ground-Water Quality Data, San Diego Drainages Hydrogeologic Province, California, 2004

Table 14. Analysis for nutrients and dissolved organic carbon in ground-water samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004.

[The five-digit number below the constituent name, the data parameter code, is used in the U.S. Geological Survey computerized data system, National Water Information System (NWIS), to uniquely identify a specific constituent or property; LRL, laboratory reporting level; SDTEM, Temecula Valley study area; SDTEMFP, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well; SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV alluvial study area; SDHDRK, hard rock study area; mg/L, milligram per liter; E, estimated value; —, not detected]

1 Total nitrogen in these samples is less than the sum of the filtered nitrogen analytes, but falls within the U.S. Geological Survey National Water Quality Laboratory acceptance criterion of a 10 percent relative percent difference.

Table 15. Analysis for major ions and total dissolved solids in ground-water samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) **Table 15.** Analysis for major ions and total dissolved solids in ground-water samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004. study, California, May to July 2004. [Bold numbers indicate major ion and total dissolved solid concentrations above the recommended secondary maximum contaminant level (SMCL); the five-digit number below the compound name, the data
parameter code, is used in parameter code, is used in the U.S. Geological Survey computerized data system, National Water Information System (NWIS), to uniquely identify a specific constituent or property; LRL, laboratory reporting level; SDTEM, Temecula Valley study area; SDTEMFP, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well; SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV alluvial study area; SDHDRK, hard rock study area; mg/L, [Bold numbers indicate major ion and total dissolved solid concentrations above the recommended secondary maximum contaminant level (SMCL); the five-digit number below the compound name, the data milligram per liter; -- not detected milligram per liter; —, not detected]

Table 15. Analysis for major ions and total dissolved solids in ground-water samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) Table 15. Analysis for major ions and total dissolved solids in ground-water samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004—Continued. study, California, May to July 2004-Continued.

parameter code, is used in the U.S. Geological Survey computerized data system, National Water Information System (NWIS), to uniquely identify a specific constituent or property; LRL, laboratory reporting level; SDTEM, Temecula Valley study area; SDTEMFP, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well; SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV alluvial study area; SDHDRK, hard rock study area; mg/L, parameter code, is used in the U.S. Geological Survey computerized data system. National Water Information System (NWIS), to uniquely identify a specific constituent or property; LRL, laboratory reporting level; SDTEM, Temecula Valley study area; SDTEMFP, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well; SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV alluvial study area; SDHDRK, hard rock study area; mg/L, [Bold numbers indicate major ion and total dissolved solid concentrations above the recommended secondary maximum contaminant level (SMCL); the five-digit number below the compound name, the data [Bold numbers indicate major ion and total dissolved solid concentrations above the recommended secondary maximum contaminant level (SMCL); the five-digit number below the compound name, the data milligram per liter; -, not detected] milligram per liter; —, not detected]

Table 16. Analysis for trace elements in ground-water samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004.

[Beryllium and mercury were not detected in any samples; concentrations preceded by a "V" indicate detections attributed to contamination, and are not counted in ground-water quality analysis; numbers in bold indicate concentrations that exceed secondary maximum contaminant levels (SMCL); bold italics indicate concentrations that exceed detection levels for the purposes of reporting (DLR); the five-digit number below the compound name, the data parameter code, is used in the U.S. Geological Survey computerized data system, National Water Information System (NWIS), to uniquely identify a specific constituent or property; LRL, laboratory reporting level; SDTEM, Temecula Valley study area; SDTEMFP, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well; SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV alluvial study area; SDHDRK, hard rock study area; µg/L, microgram per liter; E, estimated value; —, not detected]

Table 16. Analysis for trace elements in ground-water samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004—Continued.

[Beryllium and mercury were not detected in any samples; concentrations preceded by a "V" indicate detections attributed to contamination, and are not counted in ground-water quality analysis; numbers in bold indicate concentrations that exceed secondary maximum contaminant levels (SMCL); bold italics indicate concentrations that exceed detection levels for the purposes of reporting (DLR); the five-digit number below the compound name, the data parameter code, is used in the U.S. Geological Survey computerized data system, National Water Information System (NWIS), to uniquely identify a specific constituent or property; LRL, laboratory reporting level; SDTEM, Temecula Valley study area; SDTEMFP, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well; SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV alluvial study area; SDHDRK, hard rock study area; µg/L, microgram per liter; E, estimated value; —, not detected]

Table 16. Analysis for trace elements in ground-water samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004—Continued.

[Beryllium and mercury were not detected in any samples; concentrations preceded by a "V" indicate detections attributed to contamination, and are not counted in ground-water quality analysis; numbers in bold indicate concentrations that exceed secondary maximum contaminant levels (SMCL); bold italics indicate concentrations that exceed detection levels for the purposes of reporting (DLR); the five-digit number below the compound name, the data parameter code, is used in the U.S. Geological Survey computerized data system, National Water Information System (NWIS), to uniquely identify a specific constituent or property; LRL, laboratory reporting level; SDTEM, Temecula Valley study area; SDTEMFP, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well; SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV alluvial study area; SDHDRK, hard rock study area; µg/L, microgram per liter; E, estimated value; —, not detected]

80 California GAMA Program: Ground-Water Quality Data, San Diego Drainages Hydrogeologic Province, California, 2004

Table 17. Analysis for chromium, arsenic, and iron speciation by the U.S. Geological Survey National Research Progam in ground-water samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004.

[Concentrations preceded by a "V" indicate detections attributed to contamination, and are not included in ground-water quality analysis; numbers in bold indicate concentrations that exceed secondary maximum contaminant levels (SMCL); bold italics indicate concentrations that exceed detection levels for the purposes of reporting (DLR). MDL, method detection limit; SDTEM, Temecula Valley study area; SDTEMFP, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well; SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV alluvial study area; SDHDRK, hard rock study area; µg/L, microgram per liter; NC, sample not collected or ruined before analysis; —, not detected]

Table 17. Analysis for chromium, arsenic, and iron speciation by the U.S. Geological Survey National Research Progam in groundwater samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004—Continued.

[Concentrations preceded by a "V" indicate detections attributed to contamination, and are not included in ground-water quality analysis; numbers in bold indicate concentrations that exceed secondary maximum contaminant levels (SMCL); bold italics indicate concentrations that exceed detection levels for the purposes of reporting (DLR). MDL, method detection limit; SDTEM, Temecula Valley study area; SDTEMFP, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well; SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV alluvial study area; SDHDRK, hard rock study area; µg/L, microgram per liter; NC, sample not collected or ruined before analysis; —, not detected]

Table 18. Analysis for isotopes and radioactivity in ground-water samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, Table 18. Analysis for isotopes and radioactivity in ground-water samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004. California, May to July 2004. [The five-digit number below the constituent name, the data parameter code, is used in the U.S. Geological Survey computerized data system, National Water Information System (NWIS), to uniquely
identify a specific constitu [The five-digit number below the constituent name, the data parameter code, is used in the U.S. Geological Survey computerized data system, National Water Information System (NWIS), to uniquely identify a specific constituent or property. SDTEM, Temecula Valley study area; SDTEMFP, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well; SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV alluvial study area; SDHDRK, hard rock study area; pCi/L, picocuries per liter; NA, not applicable; NC, sample not collected or ruined before analysis; NQ, detected but not quantified;—, not detected]

Table 18. Analysis for isotopes and radioactivity in ground-water samples collected in the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, **Table 18.** Analysis for isotopes and radioactivity in ground-water samples collected in the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004-Continued. California, May to July 2004—Continued. [The five-digit number below the constituent name, the data parameter code, is used in the U.S. Geological Survey computerized data system, National Water Information System (NWIS), to uniquely identify a specific constitu [The five-digit number below the constituent name, the data parameter code, is used in the U.S. Geological Survey computerized data system, National Water Information System (NWIS), to uniquely identify a specific constituent or property. SDTEM, Temecula Valley study area; SDTEMFP, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well; SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV alluvial study area; SDHDRK, hard rock study area; pCi/L, picocuries per liter; NA, not applicable; NC sample not collected or ruined before analysis; NQ, detected but not quantified;—, not detected] hard rock study area; pCi/L, picocuries per liter; NA, not applicable; NC sample not collected or ruined before analysis; NQ, detected but not quantified;—, not detected]

Table 18. Analysis for isotopes and radioactivity in ground-water samples collected in the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, **Table 18.** Analysis for isotopes and radioactivity in ground-water samples collected in the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004-Continued. California, May to July 2004—Continued. [The five-digit number below the constituent name, the data parameter code, is used in the U.S. Geological Survey computerized data system, National Water Information System (NWIS), to uniquely identify [The five-digit number below the constituent name, the data parameter code, is used in the U.S. Geological Survey computerized data system, National Water Information System (NWIS), to uniquely identify a specific constituent or property. SDTEM, Temecula Valley study area; SDTEMFP, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well; SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV alluvial study area; SDHDRK, a specific constituent or property. SDTEM, Temecula Valley study area; SDTEMFP, Temecula Valley study area; SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV alluvial study area; SDHDRK, hard rock study area; pCi/L, picocuries per liter; NA, not applicable; NC, sample not collected or ruined before analysis; NQ, detected but not quantified;—, not detected hard rock study area; pCi/L, picocuries per liter; NA, not applicable; NC, sample not collected or ruined before analysis; NQ, detected but not quantified;—, not detected]

Table 19. Analysis for tritium and noble gases done at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and **Table 19.** Analysis for tritium and noble gases done at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004. Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004.

[Duplicate noble gas analyses are shown for each sample; SDTEM, Temecula Valley stree; SDTEMFP, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well; SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV allu-
vial study area; SDHDRK, hard rock s [Duplicate noble gas analyses are shown for each sample; SDTEM, Temecula Valley study area; SDTEMFP, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well; SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV alluvial study area; SDHDRK, hard rock study area. NA, not available; NC, sample not collected or ruined before analysis; —, not detected]

Table 19. Analysis for tritium and noble gases done at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and **Table 19.** Analysis for tritium and noble gases done at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004-Continued. Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004—Continued. [Duplicate noble gas analyses are shown for each sample; SDTEM, Temecula Valley streed; SDTEMEP, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well; SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV allu-
vial study area; SDHDRK, hard rock [Duplicate noble gas analyses are shown for each sample; SDTEM, Temecula Valley study area; SDTEMFP, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well; SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV alluvial study area; SDHDRK, hard rock study area. NA, not available; NC, sample not collected or ruined before analysis; —, not detected]

Table 19. Analysis for tritum and noble gases done at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and
Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004— **Table 19.** Analysis for tritum and noble gases done at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004—Continued.

[Duplicate noble gas analyses are shown for each sample; SDTEM, Temecula Valley study area flow-gath well; SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV allu-
vial study area; SDHDRK, hard rock study area. NA, not available; NC [Duplicate noble gas analyses are shown for each sample; SDTEM, Temecula Valley study area; SDTEMFP, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well; SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV alluvial study area; SDHDRK, hard rock study area. NA, not available; NC, sample not collected or ruined before analysis; —, not detected]

Table 19. Analysis for tritum and noble gases done at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and **Table 19.** Analysis for tritum and noble gases done at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004-Continued. Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004—Continued.

 $\overline{1}$ \blacksquare **(cm3STP/g) Xenon** 10/06/06/11 1.1412 1.172 1.172 1.172 1.172 1.172 1.172 1.172 **x 10-6 x 10-7 x 10-7 x 10-4 x 10-8 x 10-8** UZ UZ UZ UZ UZ UZ UZ UZ UZ A [Duplicate noble gas analyses are shown for each sample; SDTEM, Temecula Valley strety, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well; SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV alluvial study area; SMAN, hard rock study area. N [Duplicate noble gas analyses are shown for each sample; SDTEM, Temecula Valley study area; SDTEMFP, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well; SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV **(cm3STP/g) Krypton (cm3STP/g) Argon (cm3STP/g) Neon** alluvial study area; SDHDRK, hard rock study area. NA, not available; NC, sample not collected or ruined before analysis; —, not detected] **(cm3STP/g) Helium-4 (atom ratio) Helium-3/ Helium-4** Dissolved **Dissolved analysis date gas uncertainty Tritium 2- sigma, combined (pCi/L Tritium (pCi/L) Collection date identification GAMA No.**

Table 19. Analysis for tritum and noble gases done at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and **Table 19.** Analysis for tritum and noble gases done at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004-Continued. Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004—Continued.

[Duplicate noble gas analyses are shown for each sample; SDTEM, Temecula Valley stree; SDTEMFP, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well; SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV
alluvial study area; SDHDRK, hard rock stu [Duplicate noble gas analyses are shown for each sample; SDTEM, Temecula Valley study area; SDTEMFP, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well; SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV alluvial study area; SDHDRK, hard rock study area. NA, not available; NC, sample not collected or ruined before analysis; —, not detected]

Table 19. Analysis for tritum and noble gases done at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Table 19. Analysis for tritum and noble gases done at Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory in samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004-Continued. Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004—Continued.

[Duplicate noble gas analyses are shown for each sample; SDTEM, Temecula Valuey area; SDTEMFP, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well; SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV alluvial
study area; SDHDRK, hard rock stud [Duplicate noble gas analyses are shown for each sample; SDTEM, Temecula Valley study area; SDTEMFP, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well; SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV alluvial study area; SDHDRK, hard rock study area. NA, not available; NC, sample not collected or ruined before analysis; —, not detected]

Table 20. Microbial analysis of ground-water samples collected for the San Diego Ground-Water Ambient Monitoring and Assessment (GAMA) study, California, May to July 2004.

[The five-digit number below the microbe name, the data parameter code, is used in the U.S. Geological Survey computerized data system, National Water Information System (NWIS), to uniquely identify a specific constituent or property; LRL, laboratory reporting level; SDTEM, Temecula Valley study area; SDTEMFP, Temecula Valley study area flow-path well; SDWARN, Warner Valley study area; SDALLV alluvial study area; SDHDRK, hard rock study area; mL, milliliter; NQ, microbial constiuent identified but not quantified; —, not detected]

