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Introduction

Artificially enhancing recharge rates of surface waters into ground water aquifers at specially designed facilities is an attractive option for increasing the long-term storage capacity of potable water in arid areas such as the western United States. After residing in the subsurface for a period of time, which can be as short as a few days, the recharged water is extracted from these aquifers via production and irrigation wells. Artificial recharge has been conducted from many different types of facilities including spreading ponds, natural river channels, and injection wells (Bouwer 2002). It has also been used to combat sea water intrusion in some coastal areas.

Artificial recharge presents a few challenges, however. First, there needs to be an adequate supply of water for the recharge operation. This may involve importing water into the basin, diverting nearby rivers, capturing storm runoff, or recycling waste water. Second, there is a potential to degrade the quality of the native ground water because contaminants from industry, agriculture, or municipal sources may enter the surface water supply that will be used in the recharge operation. The introduction of disinfection byproducts, infective microorganisms, and organic compounds with unknown health risks into ground water supplies is a significant concern, especially when a component of the water supply is recycled waste water (National Research Council 1998).

Projects that propose to recharge recycled water into potable-supply aquifers in California may be evaluated in terms of residence time of recycled water in the aquifer, the amount of dilution with native ground water, and the documentation of in situ water quality changes within the aquifer. Development of field methodologies to evaluate these criteria will assist with permitting these projects as
well as validating numerical models of flow near recharge operations. Geochemical tracers are ideally suited for such studies (Muir and Coplen 1981; Ma and Spalding 1996; Gamlin et al. 2001).

Tracers that have been commonly used to investigate flow characteristics of relatively young ground water include chlorofluorocarbons (CFCs) and tritium/helium–3 (T/3He) dating techniques (Schlosser et al. 1989; Busenberg and Plummer 1992; Cook and Solomon 1997). These methods use preexisting signatures to determine ground water ages (up to 50 years) that typically have uncertainties of ± 2 years. Tracer ages are defined as the length of time that the ground water has been isolated from the soil atmosphere; hence, these geochemical clocks typically start at the time of recharge. They have been used to estimate recharge rates (Solomon et al. 1993), validate numerical models of flow (Reilly et al. 1994; Szabo et al. 1996; Tompson et al. 1999), determine rates of water-rock interactions (Rademacher et al. 2001), and provide chronologies to assess temporal variability in water quality parameters (Böhlike and Denver 1995). Because of their relatively large analytical errors, CFCs and T/3He dating are best suited for studying ground water flow over periods of decades that typically have path lengths of kilometers. These tracers are unable to resolve ground water ages between 0 and 2 years, and can give inappropriate travel times if mixing between different-aged waters occurs as is typical in long-screened production wells.

A second geochemical approach, such as deliberate tracer experiments, is needed to evaluate flow and transport during a period of 0 to 2 years. With this approach, trace substances are added to ground water in a controlled manner. By monitoring tracer concentration at wells, initial and mean arrival times can be determined. The initial arrival time represents the fastest flowpaths between the well and where the tracer was introduced. This information cannot be determined with a high degree of certainty using either geochemical dating techniques or numerical flow models. The mean arrival time (i.e., the arrival of the center of mass) is representative of the bulk flow or linear velocity.

Here, we summarize results from a study initiated in 1995 that used geochemical tracer techniques to examine ground water flow and transport near the Orange County Water District (OCWD) recharge operation. The study consisted of two phases. First, the T/3He dating technique was employed to determine long-term transport and identify areas of rapid flow near the recharge facilities. Second, deliberate tracer experiments were conducted to evaluate short-term transport. The latter included gas tracer experiments using sulfur hexafluoride (SF₆) and xenon isotopes (¹²³Xe, ¹²⁹Xe, ¹³⁶Xe) and experiments of “opportunity” using the stable isotopes of water. All data and experimental details can be found in Davisson et al. (2004).

**Study Location**

A 9 km section of the Santa Ana River (SAR) and a series of spreading basins, including Warner Basin, Anaheim Lake, and Kraemer Basin, located near Anaheim, California, are used by OCWD as the principal recharge area for the Orange County ground water basin (Figure 1). Surface water has been artificially recharged at these facilities for more than 40 years (Mills 2002). Currently, OCWD recharges ~2.5 × 10⁸ m³ (200,000 acre-feet) per year at these locations. This constitutes ~60% of the average annual ground water production within the basin (Orange County Water District 1998). The off-river recharge facilities are filled by either diverting SAR water, or importing Colorado River or California State Water Project water that has been transported hundreds of kilometers in aqueduct systems. The SAR water is a mixture of seasonal upper watershed runoff, tertiary-treated waste water, and rising ground water (Mills 2002).

The artificially recharged surface water flows into an alluvial aquifer system consisting of sand, gravel, silt, and clay layers. The spatial extent of any given layer is poorly known (Orange County Water District 1998; Tompson et al. 1999). The ground water basin covers an area of ~900 km² and has a maximum thickness exceeding 600 m. The recharge facilities lie near the northeastern edge of the basin, in the “Forebay” or intake area, where the vadose zone is the thickest and impervious clay/silt deposits are generally thin and discontinuous. The total aquifer thickness in the vicinity of the recharge facilities increases from 30 m near the SAR at the Imperial Dam to 500 m near Kraemer Basin. The vadose zone thickness ranges from < 5 m adjacent to the SAR and recharge basins (during recharge) to ~40 m. In this area, the ground water levels are the highest and the piezometric surface indicates that ground water near the spreading areas flows predominately to the west/southwest (Figure 1).

**Principle of Tracer Techniques**

**Tritium/He Ground Water Dating**

A large quantity of tritium, a radioactive isotope of hydrogen that decays to ³He, was released into the atmosphere in the late 1950s and early 1960s as a result of above-ground nuclear bomb tests. Since that time, this tritium has...
entered the hydrologic cycle, significantly raising the tritium content of young ground water above natural levels. The T/He method of dating is based on the radioactive decay law and the ground water age is determined with

\[
t = \frac{t_{1/2}}{\ln(2)} \ln \left(1 + \frac{[{^3}\text{He}]_{\text{ini}}}{[T]}\right)
\]

where \(t\) is time (apparent ground water age), \(t_{1/2}\) is the half-life of tritium (12.43 years), \([T]\) is the tritium content, and \([{^3}\text{He}]_{\text{ini}}\) is the concentration of the \(^3\text{He}\) derived from the decay of tritium. When \([T]\) is measured directly, \([{^3}\text{He}]_{\text{ini}}\) is not; it is calculated from a helium mass balance that considers other helium sources (Schlosser et al. 1989; Cook and Solomon 1997).

**Stable Isotopes of Water**

Waters imported into ground water basins from great distances often can be distinguished from local water by their stable isotope compositions (i.e., \(^{18}\text{O}/^{16}\text{O}\) and D/H ratios). This difference reflects the well known geographical variation in the isotope composition of precipitation. Typically, precipitation with lower \(^{18}\text{O}/^{16}\text{O}\) and D/H ratios (i.e., isotopically light) falls inland, at cooler temperatures, and at higher elevations. Hence, imported water is often isotopically light and the migration of artificially recharged imported water can be easily traced in the subsurface (Muir and Coplen 1981; Ma and Spalding 1996). Williams (1997) demonstrated that the difference between local and imported water in Orange County is sufficient to use these tracers.

**Deliberate Gas Tracers**

Tracing the movement of artificially recharged water in the subsurface over a period longer than a year with deliberate tracers presents a number of challenges. First, a large volume of water (> 10^6 m^3) is typically needed to be tagged. Second, dispersion within the aquifer can significantly reduce the tracer's initial concentration. Third, to ensure that buoyancy does not influence the vertical flow, the density of the tagged water cannot be significantly different than the untagged water (Istok and Humphrey 1995). Hence, the tracer needs to be relatively inexpensive, have a very low background concentration, and behave conservatively in the aquifer. Gas tracers such as sulfur hexafluoride (SF\(_6\)) and noble gas isotopes (e.g., \(^4\text{He}, {^{22}}\text{Ne}, {^{123}}\text{Xe}, {^{129}}\text{Xe}, \) and \(^{136}\text{Xe}\)) are ideally suited for this application (Gupta et al. 1994; Wilson and Mackay 1996; Dillon et al. 1999; Gamlin et al. 2001; Clark, 2003). Because of gas transfer at the air-water interface in surface water, the use of these tracers presents a major challenge in that, after introduction, their concentrations in the recharge water must be monitored to determine the amount of tracer lost due to gas exchange. This is especially true if the artificial recharge is taking place in a shallow river or spreading pond.

**Methods**

**Tritium/\(^3\text{He}\) Ground Water Age Dating**

Samples were collected between 1995 and 1997 from 57 locations near the OCWD recharge operation using both monitoring and public supply wells. At 15 locations, multilevel monitoring wells were sampled. All tritium and \(^3\text{He}\) samples were collected in 500 mL glass bottles and 10 mL copper tubes, respectively. The copper tubes were sealed with steel pinch-off clamps after they were thoroughly flushed.

At Lawrence Livermore National Laboratory (LLNL), the copper tubes were attached to a high vacuum inlet system that led to a VG5400 noble-gas mass spectrometer. The \(^3\text{He}/^{4}\text{He}\) isotope ratio and the concentrations of \(^4\text{He}, \) neon, and argon were determined using the method described by Radamacher et al. (2001). The mass spectrometer was calibrated with equilibrated water samples and known quantities of air. The uncertainties of \(^3\text{He}/^{4}\text{He}\) isotope ratio and the \(^4\text{He}, \) neon, and argon concentration measurements were ± 0.5% and ±1%, respectively.

Tritium, which is reported in tritium units (1 TU equals a tritium to hydrogen ratio of 10^-18), was measured by a \(^3\text{He}\) accumulation method (Clarke et al. 1976; Surano et al. 1992). The samples were vacuum degassed and sealed for ~60 days to allow for the growth of \(^3\text{He}\) from tritium decay. The uncertainty in the tritium measurement was ± 0.5 TU.

**SF\(_6\) Analysis**

Samples of surface water for SF\(_6\) analysis were collected in 50 mL glass syringes and analyzed within four hours on a gas chromatograph (GC) equipped with an electron capture detector using the headspace method described by Wanninkhof et al. (1987). SF\(_6\) was separated from other gases with a molecular sieve 5Å column held at room temperature. The detector response was calibrated about every 30 minutes with gas standards (~148.1 ppt and ~1947 ppt) certified by Scott-Marrin Inc. (Riverside, California, [909] 653-6780). The precision and detection limit were ± 3% and 0.04 pmol l\(^{-1}\), respectively.

Following the tracer injection, OCWD staff collected ground water samples every two to 12 weeks from up to nine production wells and 31 monitoring wells, of which 11 were screened at multiple discrete depths. Initially, SF\(_6\) samples were collected in copper tubes (~ 10 mL) that were sealed with steel pinch-off clamps and sent to the University of California, Santa Barbara (UCSB), where they were analyzed using a method developed by Gamlin et al. (2001). The detection limit and precision of the copper tube method were 0.2 pmol l\(^{-1}\) and ± 15%, respectively. After two years, SF\(_6\) samples were collected in a preweighed 15 or 20 mL Vacutainer™. These containers were partially filled (5 to 12 mL of water) at the wellhead and shipped to UCSB for analysis. (Tests have shown that samples can be stored for more than six months in a Vacutainer.) In the laboratory, these containers were weighed (to determine the sample size) and carefully filled with ultrahigh purity nitrogen gas (so that the final pressure was equal to ~1 atm). After one minute of shaking to equilibrate the nitrogen gas with the water sample, the headspace gas was analyzed on the GC. With this method, the detection limit was 0.03 pmol l\(^{-1}\).

**Stable Isotope Analysis**

Stable isotope samples were collected in 60 mL glass bottles and sent to LLNL for analysis. The \(^{18}\text{O}/^{16}\text{O}\) ratios were determined using the CO\(_2\) equilibration method.
(Epstein and Mayeda 1953) on an isotope ratio mass spectrometer. Analyses are reported in the standard δ notation (Craig 1961):

\[
\delta^{18}O = \left( \frac{R}{R_{SMOW}} - 1 \right) \times 1000
\]  

where R and R_{SMOW} are the 18O/16O isotope ratio of the sample and of the SMOW (standard mean ocean water) standard, respectively. The reproducibility was better than ±0.1 ‰ for the δ^{18}O analyses.

**Xenon Isotope Analysis**

The xenon isotope samples were collected in 10 mL copper tubes sealed with hardened steel pinch-off clamps. At LLNL, the tubes were attached to a sample manifold using flare compression fittings that lead to a VG–5400 mass spectrometer. Each water sample was released into a 250 cm³ evacuated stainless steel flask by removing the bottom pinch-off clamp and heating the copper tube. The receiving volume was heated with a hot air gun to boil the sample for ~1 minute to completely degas the sample. The water was then frozen with liquid nitrogen (77 K) leaving the noncondensable gases in the headspace volume. This gas was expanded and cleaned using a series of cold-traps and titanium-alloy getters. Xenon was then collected on activated charcoal cooled to 77 K. After warming, the xenon was expanded into the mass spectrometer for isotope analysis.

**Results and Discussion**

T/3 He apparent ages of ground water in the Forebay area ranged from < 2 years near the artificial recharge facilities to > 40 years downgradient (Figure 2). Most of the ground water in the top 300 m of the aquifer was younger than 30 years and hence recharged after the initiation of the artificial recharge program. Downgradient from Anaheim Lake and Kraemer Basin, apparent ages increased with depth and to the west following the hydraulic gradient (Figure 2). Average linear velocities, implied by distances between apparent age contours, decrease away from the spreading centers. This is anticipated since the ground water basin increases in width and depth to the west. The T/3 He ages define an area of very rapid flow; apparent ages of < 2 years is penetrating to depths > 200 m below the northern spreading basins (Figure 2b).

T/3 He ages near the SAR indicate a much more complicated flow system than downgradient from Anaheim Lake and Kraemer Basin. Relatively young water (< 2 years) was found at the up- and downstream ends for the recharge section; however, ground water with apparent ages between 10 and 20 years was found near the river at relatively shallow depths between this young water.

T/3 He samples were collected from 11 wells more than once. Replicate ages agreed very well (within the analytical uncertainty), suggesting a relatively stable ground water flow system exists in the Forebay area.

**SAR Tracer Experiment**

99.8% pure SF₆ gas was released at three points along the length of the SAR for a period of 15 days in 1998 (July 20, 11:50 A.M. to August 4, 2:10 P.M.) by bubbling through diffusing stones (Gamlin et al. 2001). Concentration measurements in the SAR immediately downstream of the injectors indicate that only ~4% of the 7.8 kg released during the injection dissolved. The remainder was transferred directly to the atmosphere by the rising bubbles.

At the time of the experiment, the discharge rate in the SAR at the Imperial Dam (elevation = 80.5 m asl), the upstream end of the recharge section, averaged 2.8 m³/sec and the entire flow percolated into the subsurface before Ball Road (Figure 1). Thus, ~4 × 10⁶ m³ (3000 acre-feet) of surface water were tagged in the SAR recharge area with SF₆. Mean concentrations in the SAR ranged between ~20 and ~300 pmol l⁻¹. The highest concentrations were found immediately below the gas injectors. Farther downstream, the concentration decreased as a result of gas loss across the air-water interface (Gamlin et al. 2001).

After percolating into the subsurface, the tracer was transported by the ground water flow system and observed at many wells. The duration the tracer was observed at each well varied considerably. Near the SAR, it was detected for as short as a tenth of a year (six weeks) while farther away it was observed for more than one year (Figure 3). The movement of the tracer within the ground water system was...
easily mapped (Figure 4). Initially, ground water flow was perpendicular to the river and two separate plumes formed up- and downstream of Warner Basin. At the time of the experiment, Warner Basin was recharging the aquifer with SF$_6$-free water at a rate of $\sim$0.8 m$^3$/sec. Thus, Warner Basin created a water mound that diverted the flow of tagged ground water originating from the SAR. After about one year, these two plumes merged and began to flow to the west following the regional hydraulic gradient.

The effects of the water mound below Warner Basin were most dramatically seen at two wells, OCWD-FH1 and WBS–2A. At OCWD-FH1, which lies between the SAR and the basin (Figure 4), tracer arrived much later than at nearby wells. At WBS–2A, the tracer was never detected at the shallowest zone (59 m asl) while it was detected at the deeper zones (47 and 33 m asl), suggesting that ground water from the SAR was flowing beneath water from Warner Basin.

At many wells, tracer was observed for more than a half-year showing the effects of dispersion and the complex flow field. The latter was best illustrated at a few wells such as AM–5A that showed multiple peaks in their breakthrough curves (Figure 3). Each peak probably represents a different flowpath from the river.

The tracer plume almost always arrived first at the shallower zones of the multilevel monitoring wells. A notable exception to this trend was observed at WBS–4 where three levels were monitored (zone 1, 53 m asl; zone 2, 36 m asl, zone 3, 9 m asl). At this well, the tracer arrived at zone 1 after 0.1 year, at zone 3 after 0.4 year, and was not detected at zone 2 until the third year. The relative late arrival at zone 2 is consistent with the T/$^3$He data which indicates that zone 2 water (19 years) is substantially older than zone 3 (< 2 years).

The tracer data can be used to determine two important timescales of ground water flow. First, the initial arrival times of the tracer plumes represent the quickest flowpath from the SAR to the wells and are important when considering the transport of contaminants. The leading edge of the plume was traveling horizontally at rates between 0.1 and 4.3 km/year depending on location and depth of well (Figure 5a). Second, the arrival times of the center of mass were determined from the ratio of first and 0 moments following the procedure developed for river tracer experiments.
The center of mass moves at a rate equivalent to the mean linear ground water velocity. Thus, velocities calculated with the center of mass arrival times are comparable to flows calculated by Darcy’s law. Near the SAR, linear velocities varied between ~0.3 and 2.9 km/year (Figure 5b). These variations in flow velocities are indicative of the complex hydrogeology of this basin.

Five multilevel and two single-level monitoring wells are located within 250 m of the SAR. The leading edge of the plume percolated into the top 50 m of the aquifer within 0.4 year (Figure 6), indicating the vertical velocity near the top of the aquifer averaged ~0.13 km/year, an order of magnitude less than the observed horizontal velocities. The plume arrived at the deepest monitoring wells (~ 90 m below the SAR) after about two years, demonstrating the vertical velocity was decreasing with depth.

The vertical migration was not uniform along the river. A zone with reduced vertical flow was identified with the SF6 data midway through the recharge area near SAR–8, SAR–7, and WBS–4. This region is also apparent on the map of T/3 He ages (Figure 2). While the SF6 plume showed very rapid flow to the shallowest zones (SAR–8 #1 and WBS–4 #1: > 53 m asl), the flow to deeper zones was slower than elsewhere along the river (Figure 6). While tracer did arrive at WBS–4 #2 and #3, it did not arrive at SAR–8 #2 and #3 or at SAR–7 #1 and #2. This may be explained by the slight upward flow potential between the deeper and shallower zones at these wells.

Northern Basin Tracer Experiments

The northern recharge basins lie ~1.5 km from the SAR and recharge annually approximately the same amount of water as the river. These basins can be filled with either SAR or imported water. Over a period of ~6 weeks during the fall of 1996 and 1998, OCWD recharged, respectively, 7.4 × 10^6 and 12 × 10^6 m³ (6000 and 9500 acre-feet) of imported Colorado River water in Anaheim Lake and Kraemer Basin (1998 only). Prior to and after the introduction of imported water, these basins were recharging SAR water.

Because of its distant mountain origin, the δ18O composition of the imported water (~ –11.5 ‰) was ~4 ‰ lighter than both local ground water and SAR water (~7 ‰ to –8 ‰). The plume of recharged imported water downgradient of Kraemer Basin and Anaheim Lake could be detected using δ18O to dilutions of ~10 to 1. During these experiments, rapid vertical transport was observed at wells adjacent to the spreading basins (A–27, A–28, AMD–9/1 near Anaheim Lake; and KB–1, AMD–10/1 near Kraemer Basin). As documented by the ~4 ‰ change in δ18O (Figure 7), the recently recharged imported water completely replaced earlier recharged local water within a month at some of these wells (A–27, AMD–9/1, KB–1). The arrival of imported water became difficult to determine with δ18O at wells > 1.5 km from the spreading ponds because of the natural variability of the δ18O composition of local ground water and dispersion.

About one week after filling the previously dry basins, isotopes of xenon gas (124Xe in Anaheim Lake in 1996; 129Xe in Anaheim Lake in 1998, 136Xe in Kraemer Basin in 1998) were injected into the basin water. After introduction, the concentrations of the xenon isotopes were ~1000 times greater than the atmospheric solubility equilibrium values. Xenon isotope concentrations decreased exponentially with a timescale of ~1 week in the spreading basins; hence, the basins were enriched with xenon isotope tracers for ~3 weeks, half of the six-week percolation time of isotopically light imported water.

During the 1998 experiment, the 136Xe tracer originating at Kraemer Basin could be detected at wells > 1.5 km from the spreading ponds and over a period of more than two years. The 136Xe plume had a pie-wedge shape and was restricted to a region of high hydraulic conductivity material defined by the T/3 He ages (Figures 2 and 4). The arrival times of the xenon isotope tracers were approximately the same as δ18O, demonstrating that xenon was neither retarded within the aquifer nor lost in the vadose zone beneath the ponds (Figure 7). The computed ground water linear velocity was 1.8 ± 0.2 km/year (Figure 5b). The rapid transport southwest of Kraemer Basin determined by the xenon tracer experiment is consistent with the T/3 He apparent ages which indicate that the ground water is < 2 years old. The half-peak width of the breakthrough curves, which

Figure 6. Vertical travel times to wells located within 250 m of the SAR determined during the SF6 tracer experiment.

Figure 7. δ18O and 136Xe breakthrough curves determined during the 1998 Kraemer Basin experiment. The sample dates have been adjusted so that 0 time corresponds to the start of each experiment. The δ18O axis has been reversed.
were calculated from the mean velocity and the duration tracer observed at each well, increased linearly with distance. The width was approximately two-thirds of the distance traveled (Figure 8).

The velocity field downgradient from Kraemer Basin appeared to be more uniform than near the SAR (Figures 4 and 5). This difference was partially caused by the geometry of the tracer source. In the case of Kraemer Basin, it was approximately a point source, whereas the SAR was a 9 km long line source.

Ground water recharged at Anaheim Lake was detected in very few wells away from the lake. The tracer plume was detected in the lower zones of AMD–10, which lie to the west of Kraemer Basin, indicating that the Anaheim Lake water was traveling beneath this basin (Figure 2). The plume water was also detected farther downgradient at two wells (AMD–11 and PBF3) outside of the plume emanating from Kraemer Basin. Based on these results, the water recharged at Kraemer Basin appears to deflect the westerly flow of water recharged at Anaheim Lake in a manner similar to the effect of Warner Basin’s recharge mound on SAR-recharged water noted previously.

**Summary**

The geochemical techniques employed here successfully imaged the flow near the OCWD recharge operations over a range of temporal and spatial scales. $^{3}$He measurements were able to identify large-scale features and broadly define ground water ages, while the deliberate tracer experiments were able to define flow patterns in detail over short periods. Most importantly, the deliberate tracer techniques developed for OCWD were able to determine flowpaths over a period of at least two years due to the sufficiently large volumes of recharge water tagged and low detection limits of the tracers used. Using the arrival time information, both mean (linear) and maximum ground water velocities were calculated from the experimental data.

The deliberate tracer data depict a rapid flow system in the upper 100 to 200 m of the aquifer near the recharge facilities. Horizontal velocities were on the order of 1 km/year. In the study area, the hydraulic gradient ranged between 0.010 and 0.005; hence, the tracer plumes were flowing through material with a hydraulic conductivity on the order of $10^2$ m/day. Whether the plume was traveling through the entire aquifer or only the most conductive layers is difficult to determine directly with the tracer data; however, given the very heterogeneous hydrostratigraphy of the aquifer (OCWD 1998; Tompson et al. 1999) and the very high velocities observed, it is likely that the tracer plumes were moving primarily through the most conductive layers. This is especially true near the river where adjacent wells often displayed very different breakthrough curves that could include very long tails and multiple peaks.

Both $^{3}$He ages and gas tracer travel times were determined at 19 narrow screened monitoring wells. With only three exceptions, the mean travel times and the apparent ages agreed within the analytical uncertainties of the methods. The agreement was also very good at two of the three production wells sampled for both tracers. The poor agreement was found at wells near the SAR where the flow and hydrogeology is more complicated.

The very fast travel times, good agreement with $^{3}$He ages, and the similar $^{18}$O breakthrough curve indicate that the gas tracers behaved conservatively in the aquifer and were not significantly retarded during infiltration from the spreading facilities. Laboratory experiments have demonstrated gas tracers are retarded when traveling through partially saturated zones (Gupta et al. 1994). The absence of retardation indicates the tracers were infiltrating primarily through saturated material.

The tracer plume originating from the SAR was found to the south of the plume originating from Kraemer Basin. Tracer from the different experiments was never detected at the same well. It is likely that a very narrow mixing zone exists between these recharge plumes that could not be defined because of the limited number of existing monitoring wells. Nevertheless, the experimental results indicate Kraemer Basin is replenishing a different part of the aquifer than the SAR. In a similar fashion, recharge plumes originating from Anaheim Lake and the SAR were found to flow around or beneath downgradient plumes associated with recharge from Kraemer and Warner basins, respectively. There are no known geological features that could cause these plume separations; hence, they are features of the flow system.

In addition to providing direct measurements of travel times to wells and mapping the flow field, the tracer data can be used to validate future and existing models of flow (Thomson et al. 1999) and determine relatively large-scale hydraulic conductivity for the aquifer material. Numerical models are needed to assess how changes in recharge and pumping rates may affect travel times in the future. The tracer techniques also provide critical data for evaluating water quality variation by establishing hydraulic connections between the recharge locations and wells.

The timescales of flow determined by deliberate tracer experiments are needed to assess the potential transport of time-sensitive contaminants. These timescales are very difficult to determine with other means, especially if the flow is occurring preferentially in zones of high conductivity as observed in our experiments. Results from Orange County
indicate that potential recharge regulations for recycled water based solely on limiting how close production wells are to recharge areas would be inadequate for ensuring recharge water residence times of at least six months in the subsurface prior to extraction for potable supply. Close to the SAR and the northern spreading ponds, recharge water arrival times at downstream wells were a function of horizontal distance, inferred aquifer properties, and depth. Regulations need to consider all of these parameters.
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