Designation: D 6030 – 96 (Reapproved 2002)

Standard Guide for Selection of Methods for Assessing Ground Water or Aquifer Sensitivity and Vulnerability[1]

This standard is issued under the fixed designation D 6030; the number immediately following the designation indicates the year of original adoption or, in the case of revision, the year of last revision. A number in parentheses indicates the year of last reapproval. A superscript epsilon (ε) indicates an editorial change since the last revision or reapproval.

1. Scope

1.1 This guide covers information needed to select one or more methods for assessing the sensitivity of ground water or aquifers and the vulnerability of ground water or aquifers to water-quality degradation by specific contaminants.

1.2 This guide may not be all-inclusive; it offers a series of options and does not specify a course of action. It should not be used as the sole criterion or basis of comparison, and does not replace professional judgment.

1.3 This guide is to be used for evaluating sensitivity and vulnerability methods for purposes of land-use management, water-use management, ground-water protection, government regulation, and education. This guide incorporates descriptions of general classes of methods and selected examples within these classes but does not advocate any particular method.

1.4 *Limitations*—The utility and reliability of the methods described in this guide depend on the availability, nature, and quality of the data used for the assessment; the skill, knowledge, and judgment of the individuals selecting the method; the size of the site or region under investigation; and the intended scale of resulting map products. Because these methods are being continually developed and modified, the results should be used with caution. These techniques, whether or not they provide a specific numeric value, provide a relative ranking and assessment of sensitivity or vulnerability. However, a relatively low sensitivity or vulnerability for an area does not preclude the possibility of contamination, nor does a high sensitivity or vulnerability necessarily mean that ground water or an aquifer is contaminated.

1.5 The values stated in SI units are to be regarded as standard.

1.6 *This standard does not purport to address all of the safety concerns, if any, associated with its use. It is the responsibility of the user of this standard to establish appropriate safety and health practices and determine the applicability of regulatory limitations prior to use.*

1.7 *This guide offers an organized collection of information or a series of options and does not recommend a specific course of action. This document cannot replace education or experience and should be used in conjunction with professional judgment. Not all aspects of this guide may be applicable in all circumstances. This ASTM standard is not intended to represent or replace the standard of care by which the adequacy of a given professional service must be judged, nor should this document be applied without consideration of a project's many unique aspects. The word "Standard" in the title of this document means only that the document has been approved through the ASTM consensus process.*

2. Referenced Documents

2.1 *ASTM Standards:*

D 653 Terminology Relating to Soil, Rock, and Contained Fluids[2]

D 5447 Guide for Application of a Ground-Water Flow Model to a Site-Specific Problem[2]

D 5490 Guide for Comparing Ground-Water Flow Model Simulations to Site-Specific Information[2]

D 5549 Guide for the Contents of Geostatistical Site Investigation Report[2]

D 5717 Guide for the Design of Ground-Water Monitoring Systems in Karst and Fractured-Rock Aquifers[2]

D 5880 Guide for Subsurface Flow and Transport Modeling[3]

3. Terminology

3.1 *Definitions*—Many of the terms discussed in this guide are contained in Terminology D 653. The reader should refer to this guide for definitions of selected terms.

3.1.1 *ground-water region, n*—an extensive area where relatively uniform geology and hydrology controls ground water movement.

3.1.2 *hydrogeologic setting, n*—a composite description of all the major geologic and hydrologic features which affect and control ground-water movement into, through, and out of an area **(1)**.[4]

3.1.3 *sensitivity, n—in ground water*, the potential for ground water or an aquifer to become contaminated based on

[1] This guide is under the jurisdiction of ASTM Committee D18 on Soil and Rock and is the direct responsibility of Subcommittee D18.21 on Ground Water and Vadose Zone Investigations.

Current edition approved Oct. 10, 1996. Published May 1997.

[2] *Annual Book of ASTM Standards*, Vol 04.08.

[3] *Annual Book of ASTM Standards*, Vol 04.09.

[4] The boldface numbers in parentheses refer to a list of references at the end of this guide.

Copyright © ASTM International, 100 Barr Harbor Drive, PO Box C700, West Conshohocken, PA 19428-2959, United States.

intrinsic hydrogeologic characteristics. Sensitivity is not dependent on land-use practices or contaminant characteristics. Sensitivity is equivalent to the term *''intrinsic ground-water vulnerability*" **(2)**.

3.1.3.1 *Discussion*—Hydrogeologic characteristics include the natural properties of the soil zone, unsaturated zone, and saturated zone.

3.1.4 *vulnerability, n—in ground water*, the relative ease with which a contaminant can migrate to ground water or an aquifer of interest under a given set of land-use practices, contaminant characteristics, and sensitivity conditions. Vulnerability is equivalent to ''specific ground-water vulnerability."

4. Significance and Use

4.1 Sensitivity and vulnerability methods can be applied to a variety of hydrogeologic settings, whether or not they contain specifically identified aquifers. However, some methods are best suited to assess ground water within aquifers, while others assess ground water above aquifers or ground water in areas where aquifers have not been identified.

4.1.1 Intergranular media systems, including alluvium and terrace deposits, valley fill aquifers, glacial outwash, sandstones, and unconsolidated coastal plain sediments are characterized by intergranular flow, and thus generally exhibit slower and more predictable ground-water velocities and directions than in fractured media. Such settings are amenable to assessment by the methods described in this guide. Hydrologic settings dominated by fracture flow or flow in solution openings are generally not amenable to such assessments, and application of these techniques to such settings may provide misleading or totally erroneous results.

4.2 The methods discussed in this guide provide users with information for making land- and water-use management decisions based on the relative sensitivity or vulnerability of underlying ground water or aquifers to contamination. Most sensitivity and vulnerability assessment methods are designed to evaluate broad regional areas for purposes of assisting federal, state, and local officials to identify and prioritize areas where more detailed assessments are warranted, to design and locate monitoring systems, and to help develop optimum ground-water management, use and protection policies. However, some of these methods are independent of the size of the area evaluated and, therefore, can be used to evaluate the aquifer sensitivity and vulnerability of any specific area.

4.3 Many methods for assessing ground-water sensitivity and vulnerability require information on soils, and for some types of potential ground-water contaminants, soil is the most important factor affecting contaminant movement and attenuation from the land surface to ground water. The relatively large surface area of the clay-size particles in most soils and the soils' content of organic matter provide sites for the retardation and degradation of contaminants. Unfortunately, there are significant differences in the definition of soil between the sciences of hydrogeology, engineering, and agronomy. For the purposes of this guide, soils are considered to be those unconsolidated organic materials and solid mineral particles that have been derived from weathering and are characterized by significant biological activity. In the United States, these typically include unconsolidated materials that occur to a depth of 2 to 3 m or more.

4.3.1 In many areas, significant thicknesses of unconsolidated materials may occur below the soil. Retardation, degradation, and other chemical attenuation processes are typically less than in the upper soil horizons. These underlying materials may be the result of depositional processes or may have formed in place by long-term weathering processes with only limited biological activity. Therefore, when compiling the data required for assessing ground-water sensitivity and vulnerability, it is important to distinguish between the soil zone and the underlying sediments and to recognize that the two zones have significantly different hydraulic and attenuation properties.

5. Description of Methods

5.1 *Hydrogeologic Settings and Scoring Methods*—This group of methods includes those that involve geologic mapping, evaluation, and scoring of hydrogeologic characteristics to produce a composite sensitivity map or composite vulnerability map, or both. The methods range from purely descriptive of hydrogeologic settings to methods incorporating numerical scoring. They can include descriptive information or quantitative information, or both, and the maps can be applied as a "filter" to exclude specific hydrogeologic units from further consideration or select sensitive areas for further study.

5.1.1 The concept of assessing ground-water sensitivity and vulnerability is relatively recent and still developing. Thus, the methods presented differ because they have been developed for different purposes by different researchers using various types of data bases in several hydrogeologic settings. These methods have been divided into three groups: assessments using hydrogeologic settings without scoring or rankings, assessments in which hydrogeologic setting information is combined with ranking or scoring of hydrologic factors, and assessments using scoring methods applied without reference to the hydrogeologic setting. The groups are not exclusive but overlap. Each of these methods produces relative, not absolute, results whether or not it produces a numerical score. Sensitivity analyses can be used as the basis for a vulnerability assessment by adding the information on potential point and non-point contaminant sources.

5.1.2 *Hydrogeologic Settings, No Scoring or Ranking*—Hydrogeologic mapping has been widely used to provide aquifer sensitivity information. This subgroup of methods includes those that generally present information as composite hydrogeologic maps that can be used for multiple purposes. The maps can be used individually to make a variety of land-use decisions or used as a basis for ground-water and aquifer sensitivity evaluations. Although derivative ground-water and aquifer sensitivity maps can be prepared, any geologic or hydrogeologic map could potentially be used to assess sensitivity. In settings where quantitative data are lacking, hydrogeologic maps can allow the same conclusions, with the same level of confidence, as scoring methods. Hydrogeologic settings were mapped in detail without scoring or ranking in the Denver Colorado, United States area by Hearne and others **(3)**.

5.1.2.1 Sensitivity assessments based on hydrogeologic settings with no scoring or ranking can be used to assess

ground-water or aquifer vulnerability by overlaying information on potential point or non-point contamination sources. For example, the sensitivity map included in Ref **(3)** has been used in combination with a series of maps entitled "Land Uses Which Affect Ground-Water Management" **(4)** to conduct vulnerability assessments at specific sites within the greater Denver area.

5.1.3 *Hydrogeologic Settings with Ranking or Scoring, or Both*—This group of methods includes those which assess ground-water or aquifer sensitivity within or among various hydrogeologic settings using specific criteria to rank or score areas beneath which the ground water or aquifers have different potentials for becoming contaminated. The assessment is usually based on two or more hydrogeologic criteria. For example, material texture and depth to aquifer are parameters that are commonly used to establish criteria **(5-10)**. Criteria, once defined, can then be ranked or scored, or both.

5.1.3.1 Assessing vulnerability from point and non-point sources of potential contamination (for example, leaking tanks, waste generators, landfills, and abandoned hazardous waste sites) is accomplished by mapping their location on a sensitivity map (for example, numerous waste-generation sites in an area of low sensitivity would result in a relatively low vulnerability rank, all other factors being equal). This mapping method is particularly useful for evaluating the vulnerability of a large region. However, it can also be used to target smaller areas of particular concern where more detailed investigations may be needed. For example, Shafer **(11)** mapped regional aquifer vulnerability based on sensitivity analysis. Bhagwat and Berg **(12)** defined aquifer sensitivity according to depth to aquifers and the characteristics of the geologic materials. The sensitivity map was combined with information showing the distribution of waste-source sites per zip code per square mile. Highly vulnerable areas have aquifers at or near the surface and contain numerous point sources of potential contamination with mobile contaminants. Areas of low vulnerability have deep ground water or no aquifers and contain few potential contaminant sources or relatively immobile contaminants. This vulnerability information was then used to establish ground-water protection planning regions.

5.1.4 *Scoring, Without Hydrogeologic Settings*—This category includes those methods that use qualitative ranking or quantitative scoring with hydrogeologic information, but without subdividing the area on the basis of hydrogeologic settings. Methods were developed to have universal application and were intended to be used consistently to provide uniform results regardless of location. The methods are useful for applications that require a consistent approach over large areas, however, these methods can be complex and may require much unnecessary data preparation. Furthermore, because criteria selection and ranking are subjective, the final scores may be misleading.

5.1.4.1 These methods classify a site or region based on a ranking or a numerical score derived from hydrogeological information irrespective of the different hydrogeologic settings that may be present within the mapped area. Scores are calculated from equations based on criteria assumed to apply to different geographic areas and different hydrogeologic conditions **(1,13–14)**. For example, in South Dakota **(15)**, drilling logs and soil survey maps were used to prepare maps based on hydraulic conductivity which was inferred from the percent and thickness of surface organic matter. Attenuation potentials of soil in selected Wisconsin counties **(16)** were mapped based on soil depth, permeability, drainage class, organic matter content, pH, and texture.

5.2 *Process-Based Simulation Models*—These methods for assessment of ground-water sensitivity and vulnerability use a variety of models, each of which simulates some combination of the physical, chemical, and biological processes that control the movement of water and chemicals from land surface through the unsaturated zone to and through the saturated zone. These processes are formulated in terms of equations that are derived theoretically or empirically. Analytical or numerical techniques are used, usually within a computer program, to solve the equations. The solutions take the form of predicted rates of water and chemical movement as a function of location and time. Models differ greatly in the degree of complexity used to incorporate actual processes, the amount of data required, the intended scale of the application, and the domain simulated. The latter criterion is arbitrarily selected here to categorize different simulation models. The three categories are: Root Zone Models, which simulate water and chemical movement through the portion of the unsaturated zone that is affected by vegetation; Unsaturated Zone Models, which simulate transport through the entire thickness of the unsaturated zone; and Saturated Zone Models which deal with processes occurring beneath the water table. Within each category there can be a wide range of model complexity with some models overlapping between different categories. Unsaturated-zone and root-zone models have been cataloged by van der Heijde **(17,18)** and van der Heijde and Elnawawy **(19)**.

5.2.1 Model complexity, data requirements, and scale of application are closely related and should be considered in conjunction with each other. As models increase in complexity, it is expected that the accuracy of their predicted results would be improved. However, there would also be a commensurate increase in the amount of data required by the models. The lack of requisite data often limits the scale at which complex models may be applied, and many model codes are restricted to field-scale applications.

NOTE 1—The term "field-scale" as used here refers to the typical size of an agricultural field. In general, this is an area of 65 hectares (160 acres) or less that is planted to a single crop. "Local scale" refers to an area the size of a 1:24 000-scale quadrangle or the area of a typical county, while "regional scale" refers to an area of from several counties to one or more states.

5.2.2 *Root-Zone Models*—Models in this category were developed primarily for the agricultural industry to assess and compare the effects of agronomic best management practices (BMPs) on the management, protection, and enhancement of the chemical quality of ground- and surface-water resources. These simulation models provide a relative prediction of the fate and transport of sediments, salts, pesticides, fertilizers, and organic wastes applied to crop production systems. Because of the specificity of these models, they are generally applied at the scale of a single farm field although they can be used for areal

management in combination with regional sensitivity maps.

5.2.2.1 Model components include the hydrology of the site (weather, surface runoff, return flow, percolation, evapotranspiration, lateral subsurface flow, and snow melt), erosion (water and wind), nitrogen and phosphorus cycling (loss in runoff, leaching, transport on sediment, mineralization, immobilization, and crop uptake as well as denitrification and nitrogen fixation), pesticide fate and transport, crop management factors (growth, yield, rotation, tillage, drainage, irrigation, fertilization, furrow diking, liming, and waste management), and economic accounting. Some models contain default values that allow them to be used for general planning, however, the user may supply site-specific values to improve the applicability of the result to the site of interest. These root-zone models usually calculate the amount of each pollutant of concern delivered out of the bottom of the root zone or unsaturated zone, but do not account for reactions in the saturated zone.

5.2.2.2 Examples of models in this category are the Pesticide Root Zone Model, PRZM **(20)**, the Groundwater Loading Effects of Agricultural Management Systems Model, GLEAMS **(21)**, the Chemical Movement in Layered Soils Model, CMLS **(22)**, and EPIC (Erosion Production/Impact Calculator) **(23)**. An application of the EPIC model is given in Williams **(24)**.

5.2.3 *Unsaturated-Zone Models*—Models in this category are capable of simulating processes throughout the entire unsaturated zone. Some models were developed specifically for agricultural applications, others were developed for more general problems of water and contaminant transport. In general, these models offer more sophistication in the treatment of the physical process of water movement than the root-zone models. Water movement through the unsaturated zone is usually described by Richard's Equation and the advection-dispersion equation is employed to describe solute transport. The equations are solved in one or two dimensions with primary consideration given to vertical water movement. Some models are capable of solving three-dimensional problems and others can account for both unsaturated and saturated movement of water and chemicals. Additional data are required for solving a more complex equation. For example, information on the relations between water and soil (that is, moisture-retention and relative permeability data) may be required.

5.2.3.1 Two problems limit the scale at which these models may be applied: the aforementioned lack of requisite data, and the fact that Richard's Equation is difficult to accurately solve for large regions. Application of these models is usually limited to areas less than or equal to the size of a single field. These models also require a certain amount of expertise to operate and to interpret results. Examples of these models include: LEACHM **(25)**, VS2DT **(26)**, RZWQM **(27,28)**, and SWMS_3D **(29)**. These models are used primarily for vulnerability assessment, although they can also be used for sensitivity analysis. A summary of commonly used unsaturated zone models, and their data requirements, is presented by Kramer and Cullen **(30)**.

5.2.4 *Saturated-Zone Models*—This category of models is limited to processes in the saturated zone. Effects of unsaturated zone processes such as recharge and evapotranspiration are often incorporated in an ad hoc fashion. For ground-water sensitivity studies, a ground-water flow model such as MODFLOW **(31)**, is often applied. Flow rates, position in the flow system, ground- and surface-water interaction, and recharge rates can be identified through model analysis. For example, regions with high simulated recharge rates may be considered to be highly sensitive to ground-water contamination. Data requirements are generally less stringent than for the previous category because Richard's Equation is not involved and chemical transport is often not addressed.

5.2.4.1 Ground-water modeling studies to evaluate sensitivity of a particular site should be developed in accordance with the procedures described in Guides D 5447 and D 5490. Ordinarily, these models are used to simulate primarily horizontal ground-water flow in two or three dimensions. These models have the advantage of also being applicable at large scales (regional analysis). A vulnerability analysis may be performed using a solute-transport model such as MOC **(32,33)** or MT3D **(34)** in conjunction with the guidance of Guide D 5880.

5.2.5 *Limitations*—Process-based simulation models are powerful and useful tools, but their application can be problematic. Uncertainty in simulation results can arise from two major causes: model-related errors and data-related errors. Modeling errors can arise from improper conceptualization of the problem or inappropriate application of a model on the part of the modeler. Also of concern is failure of the selected model to accurately and completely represent system processes. This matter is often a question of scale; while some very detailed processes can be addressed at the scale of a laboratory column experiment, it would not be practical to incorporate that detail into a regional-scale model. An example of such a process is preferential water flow through soils, such as flow through root or worm holes, desiccation cracks, and joints. The importance of this process is widely recognized, but because of the large amount of detailed data required to understand it, it is not practical to deterministically account for it in large-scale models.

NOTE 2—In karst or fractured-rock aquifers, velocity, turbulence, boundary conditions, directions of flow, and contaminant transport cannot be adequately simulated using currently available code **(50)**.

5.2.5.1 Data are needed in order to determine parameter values and to evaluate the accuracy of model results. A large constraint on model application is the availability of representative data. Representativeness refers to both the quality (all methods of data collection have some degree of error) and the quantity of data required to adequately represent the modeled region. Various approaches have been taken to study the effects of uncertainty in parameter values upon simulation results **(35)**. One approach is to use Monte Carlo techniques **(36)** and a large number of model simulations to assess parameters. Carsel and others **(36)** used this approach to assess leaching potential by applying PRZM in conjunction with probability distributions of soil properties in a simple screening procedure.

5.3 *Statistical Methods*—Statistical methods provide estimates of the likelihood of contamination based on the relationship of soil, hydrogeologic, or cultural factors to known or

calculated contaminant distributions. Statistical methods include discriminant analysis, regression analysis, and spatial estimation. These techniques are specific for hydrogeologic settings for which they were developed. Successful application of these methods to other sites has not been demonstrated.

5.3.1 *Discriminant Analysis*—Ground-water contamination by pesticides has been predicted using the Soil Conservation Service's Cooperative Soil Survey and a regional inventory of water-quality analyses from wells. The method has been applied to areas as large as a county and as small as 0.01 km^2**(37)**.

5.3.2 *Regression Analysis*—If adequate data are available, the frequency of occurrence of an individual contaminant in excess of a specified detection limit can be estimated using multiple-regression techniques. An example is a study of triazine-herbicide and nitrate concentrations in Nebraska **(38,39)**. Independent variables describing soil, hydraulic, and well properties were used to predict the concentration of triazine herbicides and nitrates in wells. Similarly, nitrate concentrations were predicted by Steichen and others **(40)** who related pesticide concentrations to the age of the well, land use, and the distance to the nearest possible source of pesticides.

5.3.3 *Geostatistics*—Contaminants with erratic spatial variability can be analyzed through the application of spatial estimation, using least-squares estimators such as kriging **(41,42)**. If information about the variability of values at a sampled point is to be presented, geostatistical simulation methods may be used **(43)**. The results for a specific site should be presented in accordance with Guide D 5549. For example, public domain software to assist in spatial analysis is presented in Englund and Sparks **(44)**.

6. Procedure

6.1 The procedure for the selection of methods for determining sensitivity and vulnerability is based on determining the appropriate type of method for the intended use. This requires an understanding of the scale of the problem and intended map products, the type of geologic setting, soil characteristics and distribution, and aquifer geometry and hydrology. For vulnerability methods, mappable data on the contaminants of concern as well as land use is necessary. Individual methods vary widely in their specific data requirements.

6.2 *Determine the Purpose of the Assessment*—Determine whether the assessment will be used to (*1*) assist policy analysis, planning, development, and program management; (*2*) make informed land-use decisions; or (*3*) improve general education **(35)** as stated in 1.3.

6.3 *Determine the Area to Be Assessed*—Maps should always be prepared at a scale that is appropriate for the density of the data. Three general classifications of scales are appropriate: regional, local, and field (see Note 1). Regional studies should be those presented at scales at or smaller than 1:100 000 (such as on a state-base map). Local studies are those presented at larger scales, typically about 1:24 000, such as for county studies or those based on a USGS quadrangle. Field-scale studies are those presented at an appropriate scale for the field in question, such as 1:6000 or less. The scales of maps or other graphic products determine the potential uses of the maps.

6.3.1 The validity of regional sensitivity and vulnerability assessments are particularly influenced by the density of the data and provide limited information for evaluating potential contamination at a specific field. Therefore, data from regional or local studies should only be used at the field level to give an indication of what to expect. Similarly, a field-scale sensitivity or vulnerability assessment should not be extrapolated to a larger area unless the hydrogeologic setting is the same and the regional variability of the physical setting is similar to that measured at the field. If field-scale conditions are to be assessed, then field-scale data are required.

6.3.2 County soil survey reports, for example, are useful sources of information for both regional and local assessments. Hydraulic properties and organic matter classifications are given for each soil series and for specific soil horizons within each series. For smaller-scale regional assessments requiring soils information, the procedure outlined by Keefer **(45)** could be followed. In that study the State Soil Geographic Data Base (STATSGO) was used to evaluate water movement through surface soils **(46)**. In addition, the presence of soil joints can affect the ease with which contaminants can move through the soil zone **(47)**. Jointing is best evaluated on a local scale, however, once established, the effects may be generalized to larger areas of similar hydgeologic setting.

6.4 *Determine the Availability and Quality of the Data Required to Assess the Area*—The methods that can be used to prepare sensitivity or vulnerability maps depend on the availability and quality of the resource data. For example, small-scale assessments using map overlays require less detailed information than simulation methods that require detailed information on hydraulic properties, geology, and soils. Table 1 shows the data required for the methods discussed in this guide. This table can be used to narrow the choice of methods; however, the documentation and examples of the methods should be reviewed in detail before a final selection is made.

6.4.1 Information from geologic reports and maps; field observations; water-well logs and samples; driller's records; engineering records, logs, and core samples; and test drilling data can be used to determine the stratigraphy, construct cross-sections, and identify the continuity of subsurface units, particularly aquifers and confining layers. A stack-unit map can be made based on the succession of geologic materials in their

TABLE 1 Summary of Data Requirements for Methods that Can Be Used for Assessing Sensitivity and Vulnerability

Methods	Data Required			
	Geology	Soils	Hydrology	Chemistry[A]
Hydrogeologic settings, no scoring or ranking	A[B]	M[C]	S[D]	M
Hydrogeologic settings, with scoring or ranking	A	M	M	M
Scoring, without Hydrogeologic settings	M	M	A	M
Root-zone models[E]	S	A	M	M
Unsaturated-zone models	M	A	A	A
Saturated-zone models	M	S	A	A

[A] Information about the chemistry of contaminants is not required for sensitivity assessments, but is needed for vulnerability assessments.
[B] A—Abundant, detailed data are required.
[C] M—Moderate amounts of less-detailed data are required.
[D] S—The assessment can be performed with sparse data.
[E] Root-zone models are not used for sensitivity assessments.

order of occurrence over specified areas and to a specified depth. It is important to show how earth materials are distributed both horizontally and vertically.

6.4.2 Delineate where aquifer materials (for example, unconsolidated sands and gravels; permeable sandstones and carbonates; and jointed or fractured rocks) and non-aquifer materials (diamictons, silts, shale, and other low-permeability rocks) lie in the vertical succession. Successions subsequently can be rated according to the proximity of aquifer materials to the surface and the thickness of confining layers. The closer the aquifer to the surface, and the thinner the confining layers, the greater the likelihood of it becoming contaminated.

6.4.3 Glacial terranes composed of porous rocks and similar hydrogeologic settings can be classified using the techniques of Berg and others **(5,6)**, Soller and Berg **(10)**, Berg **(48)**, and modified by Keefer **(45)** for specific land uses. For regional assessments, soils in glacial terrains may be classified according to the parent materials from which they formed and a soil-geologic or surficial geologic map can be constructed. This surficial geologic map would show the succession of materials to a depth of about 2 to 3 m.

6.5 *Determine Whether to Do a Sensitivity or Vulnerability Assessment, or Both*—The decision of whether to do a sensitivity or vulnerability analysis depends on the purpose of the project and the availability of information. A sensitivity assessment will provide a general framework for considering any contaminants. A vulnerability assessment provides information relative to a specific contaminant or group of contaminants. Ground-water and aquifer sensitivity assessments, done regionally or on a site-specific basis, evaluate the contamination potential or potential for ground-water and aquifer degradation within various hydrogeologic settings and can aid in identifying areas where more detailed assessments are warranted. Regions or specific sites that have been determined to be sensitive and that have been or may be subjected to adverse land-use practices can be assessed additionally using a vulnerability model. Therefore, ground-water and aquifer vulnerability assessments usually require sensitivity assessments.

6.5.1 In order to conduct a regional vulnerability assessment, the nature and distribution of actual or potential contaminant sources, contaminant characteristics, loading information, and land-use practices, together with a measure of aquifer sensitivity, need to be considered **(2)**. Detailed recharge information, piezometric surfaces, the ground-water flow regime, rates of contaminant loading, as well as chemical and biological reactions that may degrade a contaminant need to be considered for field-scale assessments.

6.6 *Select Appropriate Method*—Choose a method based on whether or not the contaminant is introduced at the land surface (such as agricultural chemicals, sewage sludge, septage, or accidental spills) or beneath the land surface (such as for pipeline breaks, landfills, leaking underground storage tanks, and septic tanks). If the purpose of the sensitivity assessment is to evaluate potential contamination from surface point or non-point sources, information such as the organic matter content and hydraulic conductivity of the soil, and information on other soil and vadose zone factors must be available at an appropriate scale and level of detail **(45)**. Sensitivity and vulnerability assessments focusing on potential contamination from subsurface sources usually do not require information on soils. Likewise, if a contaminant is introduced below the water table, it is not generally necessary to select a method that incorporates information on the vadose zone.

6.6.1 Table 2 and Table 3 summarize the appropriateness of the methods that can be used for sensitivity and vulnerability analyses at various scales. Statistical methods were considered too diverse and specialized to tabulate. These tables should only be considered as a general guide: other considerations such as purpose or data availability should also influence the selection. References and examples of the various methods should be reviewed in detail before a final selection is made.

6.7 *Determine Whether Special Conditions Exist*—Special conditions may exist which preclude the use of some or all aquifer sensitivity or vulnerability methods, or require their modification. Such conditions include settings where water may move from the surface to the aquifer with little interaction with the soil, sediments, or rocks, such as where karst or fractured rocks are present; and settings where ground-water flow is modified by interaction with streams or lakes. Ground water may be affected by leaky abandoned or improperly constructed wells. These and other special conditions require that the hydrology and potential flow paths of contaminants be understood in much greater detail for an assessment to be done.

6.7.1 Karst, volcanic, and fractured rock settings are generally very susceptible to potential contamination. Basalt and other extrusive volcanic rocks are characterized by fractures, interflow breccias, and lava tubes. Karst systems developed in soluble rocks contain large channels that provide little opportunity for interaction between the contaminated water and soil or the surrounding rock. Ground-water flow is often rapid in these systems and attenuation of contaminants insignificant. Also, in many cases, contaminants do not follow the apparent regional flow paths and discharge at unexpected locations and times. Whether a technique can be applied to a karst or fractured rock setting depends on whether, at the scale of interest, that setting can be approximated as an equivalent porous medium. Guidance in making this determination is provided in Guide D 5717, in Quinlan and Ewers **(49)**, and in Quinlan and others **(50)**. Modifications to scoring methods applied to a karst setting are discussed in Davis and others **(51)**.

6.7.2 Aquifers exchange water with surface-water sources in many hydrogeologic settings. Streams flowing through alluvial or glacio-fluvial valley-fill deposits often have a

TABLE 2 Methods of Conducting Sensitivity Assessments Depending on the Scale of the Assessment

Sensitivity Methods	Regional	Local	Field
Hydrogeologic settings, no scoring or ranking	4[A]	3	2
Hydrogeologic settings, with scoring or ranking	5	5	4
Scoring, without Hydrogeologic settings	1	3	4
Root-zone models	N[B]	N	N
Unsaturated-zone models	N	N	4
Saturated-zone models	3	4	4

[A] 1–5 indicates relative ranking of appropriateness, where 5 is most appropriate for the scale indicated.
[B] N—not appropriate.

TABLE 3 Methods of Conducting Vulnerability Assessments Depending on the Scale of the Assessment

Vulnerability Methods	Regional	Local	Field
Hydrogeologic settings, no scoring or ranking	3[A]	2	1
Hydrogeologic settings, with scoring or ranking	4	5	4
Scoring, without Hydrogeologic settings	1	3	4
Root-zone models	N[B]	N	3
Unsaturated-zone models	N	N	4
Saturated-zone models	1	3	3

[A] 1–5 indicates relative ranking of appropriateness, where 5 is most appropriate for the scale indicated.
[B] N—not appropriate.

significant hydraulic connection with those deposits. Such streams may receive poor-quality water from surface sources or from discharge from contaminated aquifers. This stream water may then recharge the aquifer elsewhere along the stream, either under natural ground-water gradients or gradients caused by pumping. In these hydrogeologic settings, the contact between the stream and the aquifer is often a chemically active zone. Because of this, the zone can affect the quality of water moving into the aquifer, either increasing or decreasing the level of contamination. The actual sensitivity of the aquifer may therefore be more or less than that determined using the hydrogeologic methods in this guide. The user of this guide thus should consider this interaction when evaluating the results of any method applied to hydrogeologic settings containing streams.

6.7.3 Abandoned wells that have not been properly plugged, and improperly constructed withdrawal or injection wells can provide pathways for the rapid movement of contaminants between the surface and an aquifer or between aquifers. Some wells have been constructed for the drainage of surface runoff, or for disposal of water from field tile drains. When these and similar wells are present, their role in the movement of contaminants must be understood to properly perform an assessment.

7. Keywords

7.1 aquifers; contamination; ground water flow; pollution

REFERENCES

(**1**) Aller, L. T., Bennet, T., Lehr, J. H., and Petty, R. J., *DRASTIC: A Standardized System for Evaluating Ground Water Pollution Potential Using Hydrogeologic Settings*, U.S. EPA Robert S. Kerr Environmental Research Laboratory, EPA/600/287/035, Ada, OK, 1987.

(**2**) U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (USEPA), *Ground Water Resource Assessment*, U.S. EPA Office of Ground Water and Drinking Water, EPA 813-R-93-003, 1993.

(**3**) Hearne, G. A., Wireman, M., Campbell, A., Turner, S., and Ingersoll, G. P.," Vulnerability of the Uppermost Ground Water to Contamination in the Greater Denver Area, Colorado," *U.S. Geological Survey Water Resources Investigations Report* 92-4143, 1995.

(**4**) Wireman, M., Campbell, A., and Marr, P., *Land Uses Which Affect Ground-Water Management*, USEPA and Colorado Department of Health, 1994.

(**5**) Berg, R. C., Kempton, J. P., and Cartwright, K.," Potential for Contamination of Shallow Aquifers in Illinois," *Illinois State Geological Survey Circular 532*, 1984a.

(**6**) Berg, R. C., Kempton, J. P., and Stecyk, A. N., "Geology for Planning in Boone and Winnebago Counties," *Illinois State Geological Survey Circular 531*, 1984b.

(**7**) Keefer, D. A., and Berg, R. C., with contributions by Day, W. S., *Potential for Aquifer Recharge in Illinois (Appropriate Recharge Areas)*, Illinois State Geol. Survey, 1 map sheet, 1990.

(**8**) Pettyjohn, W. A., Savoca, M., and Self, D., *Regional Assessment of Aquifer Vulnerability and Sensitivity in the Conterminous United States*, U.S. EPA Robert S. Kerr Environmental Research Laboratory, EPA/600/2-91/043, 1991.

(**9**) Lusch, P. P., Rader, C. P., Barrett, L. R., and Barrett, K., *Aquifer Vulnerability to Surface Contamination in Michigan*, Michigan State University, Center for Remote Sensing and Department of Geography, East Lansing, MI, 1:1,500 000-scale map, 1992.

(**10**) Soller, D. R., and Berg, R. C., "A Model for the Assessment of Aquifer Contamination Potential Based on Regional Geologic Framework," *Environmental Geology and the Water Sciences*, Vol 19, 1992, pp. 205–213.

(**11**) Shafer, J. M., "An Assessment of Ground Water Quality and Hazardous Substances for a Statewide Monitoring Strategy," *Illinois State Water Survey Contract Report 367*, 1985.

(**12**) Bhagwat, S. B., and Berg, R. C., "Benefits and Costs of Geologic Mapping Programs in Illinois," *Case study of Boone and Winnebago Counties and its statewide applicability: Illinois State Geological Survey Circular 549*, 1991.

(**13**) Moore, J. S., "SEEPPAGE: A System for Early Evaluation of Pollution Potential of Agricultural Ground Water Environments," *Geology Technical Note 5 (Revision 1)*, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, 1988.

(**14**) Soller, D. R., "Applying the DRASTIC Model—A Review of County-Scale Maps," *U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report*, 92–297, 1992.

(**15**) Lemme, G., Carlson, C. G., Dean, R., and Khakural, B., "Contamination Vulnerability Indexes: A Water-Quality Planning Tool," *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation 2*, 1990, pp. 349–351.

(**16**) Cates, K. J., and Madison, F. W., *Soil-Attenuation Potential Map of Pepin County, Wisconsin*, University of Wisconsin, Extension Soil Map 10, 1990.

(**17**) van der Heijde, P. K. M., *Identification and Compilation of Unsaturated/Vadose Zone Models*, Environmental Protection Agency EPA/600/R-94/028, 1994.

(**18**) van der Heijde, P. K. M., *Compilation of Saturated and Unsaturated Zone Modeling Software*; Update of EPA/600-/R-93/118, EPA/600/R-96/009, 1996.

(**19**) van der Heijde, P. K. M., and Elnawawy, O. A., *Compilation of Ground-Water Models*, EPA/600/R-93/118, 1993.

(**20**) Carsel, R. F., Smith, C. N., Mulkey, L. A., Dean, J. D., and Jowise, P., *User's Manual for the Pesticide Root-Zone Model (PRZM)*, Athens, Georgia: U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Environmental Research Laboratory, 1984.

(**21**) Leonard, R. A., Knisel, W. G., and Still, D. A., "GLEAMS: Groundwater Loading Effects of Agricultural Management Systems," *Transactions of the ASCE 30*, 1987, pp. 1403–1418.

(**22**) Nofziger, D. L., and Hornsby, A. G., *Chemical Movement in Soil, User's Guide*, University of Florida, Gainsville, 1985.

(**23**) A. N., Sharpley, and J. R., Williams, eds., "Epic-Erosion/Productivity Impact Calculator: 1. Model Documentation," *USDA Technical Bulletin 1768*, 1990.

(**24**) Williams, J. R., "The Erosion-Productivity Impact Calculator (EPIC)

Model: A Case History," *Phil. Trans. Royal Soc. London B. 329*, 1990, pp. 421–428.

(**25**) Wagenet, R. J., and Hutson, J. L, *LEACHM: A Finite-Difference Model for Simulating Water, Salt, and Pesticide Movement in the Plant Root Zone, Continuum 2*, New York State Resources Institute, Cornell University, 1987.

(**26**) Healy, R. W., "Simulation of Solute Transport in Variably Saturated Porous Media with Supplemental Information on Modifications to the U.S. Geological Survey's Computer Program VS2D," *U.S. Geological Survey Water Resources Investigation Report 90-4025*, 1990.

(**27**) RZWQM Team, "Root Zone Water Quality Model, Version 1.0, User's Manual," *GPSR Technical Report No. 3*, USDA-ARS-GPSR, Fort Collins, CO, 1992.

(**28**) Ma, Q. L., Ahjua, L. R., Rojas, K. W., Ferreira, V. F., and DeCoursey, D. F., "Measures and RZWQM Predicted Atrazine Dissipation and Movement in a Field Soil," *Transactions of the American Society of Agricultural Engineers 38*, 1995, pp. 471–479.

(**29**) Simunek, J., Huang, K., and van Genuchten, M. Th., "The SWMS-3D Code for Simulating Water Flow and Solute Transport in Three-Dimensional Variably Saturated Media," *U.S. Salinity Laboratory Research Report 139*, Agricultural Research Service, Riverside, CA, 1995.

(**30**) Kramer, J. H., and Cullen, S. J., "Review of Vadose Zone Flow and Transport Models," *Handbook of Vadose Zone Characterization and Monitoring*, L. G. Wilson, L. G. Everett, and S. J. Cullen, eds., Lewis Publishers, 1995, pp. 267–289.

(**31**) McDonald, J. M., and Harbaugh, A. W., "A Modular Three-Dimensional Finite-Difference Ground-Water Flow Model," *Techniques of Water Resources Investigations of the U.S. Geological Survey, Book 6*, 1988.

(**32**) Konikow, L. F., Granato, G. E., and Hornberger, G. Z., "User's Guide to Revised Method-of-Characteristics Solute-Transport Model," *U.S. Geological Survey Water Resources Investigations Report*, 94-4115, 1994.

(**33**) Konikow, L. F., and Bredehoeft, J. D.," Computer Model of Two-Dimensional Solute Transport and Dispersion in Ground Water," *Techniques of Water Resources Investigations of the U.S. Geological Survey, Book 7*, C2, 1978.

(**34**) Zheng, C., *MT3D, A Modular Three-Dimensional Transport Model*, S. S. Papadopulos and Assoc., Bethesda, MD, 1992.

(**35**) National Research Council, *Ground Water Vulnerability Assessment, Predicting Relative Contamination Potential under Conditions of Uncertainty*, National Academy Press, Washington DC, 1993.

(**36**) Carsel, R. F., Parrish, R. S., Jones, R. L., Hansen, J. L., and Lamb, R. L.," Characterizing the Uncertainty of Pesticide Leaching in Agricultural Soils," *Journal of Contaminant Hydrology 2*, 1988, pp. 111–124.

(**37**) Teso, R. R., Younglove, T., Peterson, M. R., Sheeks, D. L., III, and Gallavan, R. E., "Soil Taxonomy and Surveys: Classification of Areal Sensitivity to Pesticide Contamination of Groundwater," *Journal of Soil and Water Conservation 43*, 1988, pp. 348–352.

(**38**) Chen, H., and Druliner, A. D., "Agricultural Chemical Contamination of Ground Water in Six Areas of the High Plains Aquifer, Nebraska," *National Water Summary 1986—Hydrologic Events and Ground-Water Quality: U.S. Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper 2325*, 1988.

(**39**) Druliner, A. D., "Overview of the Relations of Nonpoint Source Agricultural Chemical Contamination to Local Hydrologic, Soil, Land-Use, and Hydrochemical Characteristics of the High Plains Aquifer of Nebraska," *U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 88-4220*, 1989.

(**40**) Steichen, J., Koelliker, J., Grosh, D., Heiman, A., Yearout, R., and Robbins, V., "Contamination of Farmstead Wells by Pesticides, Volatile Organics, and Inorganic Chemicals in Kansas," *Ground-Water Monitoring Review 8*, 1988, pp. 153–160.

(**41**) Delhomme, J. P., "Kriging in the Hydrosciences," *Advances in Water Resources 1*, 1978, pp. 475–499.

(**42**) Hoeksema, R. J., and Kitanidis, P. K., "Analysis of the Spatial Structure of Properties of Selected Aquifers," *Water Resources Research 21*, 1985, pp. 536–572.

(**43**) McBratney, A. B., Webster, R., and Burgess, T. M., "The Design of Optimal Sampling Schemes for Local Estimation and Mapping of Regionlized Variables—I & II," *Computer and Geosciences 7*, 1981, pp. 331–365.

(**44**) Englund, E. J., and Sparks, A. R., *Geo-EAS (Geostatistical Environmental Assessment Software) User's Guide*, Environmental Monitoring Systems Lab, Las Vegas, NV EPA/600/4-88/033, 1988.

(**45**) Keefer, D. A., *Potential for Agricultural Chemical Contamination of Aquifers in Illinois: 1995 Revision*, Illinois State Geological Survey, Environmental Geology 148, 1995.

(**46**) U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA), *State Soil Geographic Data Base (STATSGO)*, U.S. Department of Agriculture, Soil Conservation Service, Miscellaneous Publication 1492, 1991.

(**47**) Kirkaldie, L., "Potential Contaminant Movement Through Soil Joints," *Bull. Assoc. Eng. Geol. 25*, 1988, pp. 520–524.

(**48**) Berg, R. C., "Geologic Aspects of a Groundwater Protection Needs Assessment for Woodstock, Illinois: A Case Study," *Illinois State Geological Survey Environmental Geology 146*, 1994.

(**49**) Quinlan, J. F., *Special Problems of Ground-Water Monitoring in Karst Terranes, Ground Water and Vadose Zone Monitoring, ASTM STP 1053*, D. M. Nielsen and A. I. Johnson, eds., ASTM, 1990, pp. 275–304.

(**50**) Quinlan, J. F., Davies, G. J., Jones, S. W., and Huntoon, P. W., *The Applicability of Numerical Models to Characterize Ground-Water Flow in Karstic and Other Triple-Porosity Aquifers, Substance Fluid-Flow (Ground-Water) Modeling, ASTM STP 1288*, J. D. Ritchey and J. O. Rumbough eds., ASTM, 1996.

(**51**) Davis, A. D., Long, A. J., Nazir, M., and Tan, X., "Ground Water Vulnerability in the Rapid Creek Basin above Rapid City, South Dakota," *South Dakota School of Mines and Technology Final Technical Report: U.S. EPA Contract X008788-01-0*, 1994.

ASTM International takes no position respecting the validity of any patent rights asserted in connection with any item mentioned in this standard. Users of this standard are expressly advised that determination of the validity of any such patent rights, and the risk of infringement of such rights, are entirely their own responsibility.

This standard is subject to revision at any time by the responsible technical committee and must be reviewed every five years and if not revised, either reapproved or withdrawn. Your comments are invited either for revision of this standard or for additional standards and should be addressed to ASTM International Headquarters. Your comments will receive careful consideration at a meeting of the responsible technical committee, which you may attend. If you feel that your comments have not received a fair hearing you should make your views known to the ASTM Committee on Standards, at the address shown below.

This standard is copyrighted by ASTM International, 100 Barr Harbor Drive, PO Box C700, West Conshohocken, PA 19428-2959, United States. Individual reprints (single or multiple copies) of this standard may be obtained by contacting ASTM at the above address or at 610-832-9585 (phone), 610-832-9555 (fax), or service@astm.org (e-mail); or through the ASTM website (www.astm.org).