				Data Component Ranking Value								Overall		
Basin Number	Basin Name	Sq. Mile	2010 Population	Population	Population Growth	Public Supply Wells	Total Wells *	Irrigated Acreage	GW Use **	Impacts	Other Information	Overall Basin Priority	Impact Comments	Other Information Comments
6-32	BROADWELL VALLEY	144.8	8	0	0	1	0.75	0	0	0	0	Very Low		
6-40	LOWER MOJAVE RIVER VALLEY	449.3	32,938	1	1	2	0.75	1	3.5	5	1	Medium	Groundwater basin has been in overdraft. Water quality has been impaired from natural sources, leaking tanks, and superfund sites from military bases.	Basin is adjudicated. USGS reports GW Level declines of 100 ft since the 1930s
7-1	LANFAIR VALLEY	247.4	19	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	Very Low		
7-10	TWENTYNINE PALMS VALLEY	98.2	22,113	1	2	0	0.75	1	3	1	0	Low	Some wells in the basin exceed the recommended levels for drinking water in fluoride, TDS, and sulfate concentrations. Thermal waters also occur in this basin (DWR 1984).	
7-11	COPPER MOUNTAIN VALLEY	47.7	6,085	1	5	1	0.75	1	0	1	0	Very Low	Locally high TDS and septic tank problems.	
7-12	WARREN VALLEY	37.4	22,860	2	5	4	0.75	0	2.5	0	1	Medium		Basin is adjudicated.
7-13.01	DEADMAN VALLEY	140.3	22	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	Very Low		
7-13.02	DEADMAN VALLEY	46.1	179	0	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	Very Low		
7-14	LAVIC VALLEY	161.1	0	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	Very Low		
7-15	BESSEMER VALLEY	61.5	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Very Low		
7-16	AMES VALLEY	170.8	4,540	1	0	1	0.75	0	0	2	0	Very Low	Groundwater in the basin has locally high TDS, fluoride, and chloride contents (DWR 1975). TDS content reaches about 1,000 mg/L southwest of Emerson Lake (MWA 1999)	
7-17	MEANS VALLEY	23.5	46	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	0	Very Low	Fluoride, nitrate, and TDS concentrations are impairments locally.	
7-18.01	JOHNSON VALLEY - SOGGY LAKE	121.7	354	0	0	1	0.75	0	0	0	0	Very Low		
7-18.02	JOHNSON VALLEY - UPPER J.V.	54.8	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Very Low		
7-2	FENNER VALLEY	715.1	31	0	0	1	0.75	0	0	0	0	Very Low		
7-20	MORONGO VALLEY	11.4	2,983	2	5	5	3	0	0	0	0	Very Low		
7-21.02	COACHELLA VALLEY	76.5	18,974	1	5	2	0.75	0	4	2	1	Medium	Radiological and nitrate issues in the basin (B-118).	Mission Creek GW also supplies drinking water to Desert Hot Springs and part of Indio subbasins
7-3	WARD VALLEY	882.1	22	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	Very Low		
7-4	RICE VALLEY	297.8	23	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	Very Low		
7-41	CALZONA VALLEY	127.7	1,608	1	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	Very Low		
7-42	VIDAL VALLEY	218.1	10	0	0	1	0.75	0	0	4	0	Very Low	Fluoride, chloride, sulfate, and TDS concentrations are high (DWR 1975). GW near town of Vidal has fluoride concentrations making water unusable domestically and sodium contents make water marginal for irrigation.	
7-43	CHEMEHUEVI VALLEY	430.8	395	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	3	0	Very Low	Concentrations of sulfate, chloride, fluoride, and TDS are high (DWR 1975).	
7-44	NEEDLES VALLEY	139.2	4,902	1	0	2	0.75	1	0.5	3	0	Low	Concentrations of sulfate, chloride, fluoride, and TDS content levels are high in the basin (DWR 1975).	
7-45	PIUTE VALLEY	277.1	2	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	Very Low		
7-49	PIPES CANYON FAULT VALLEY	5.3	5	0	0	0	1.5	0	0	0	0	Very Low		
7-50	IRON RIDGE AREA	8.3	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Very Low		
7-51	LOST HORSE VALLEY	27.3	0	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	Very Low		
7-53	HEXIE MOUNTAIN AREA	17.6	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	Very Low		
7-6	PINTO VALLEY	288.1	7	0	0	1	0.75	0	0	0	0	Very Low		
7-62	JOSHUA TREE	42.8	4,951	1	5	3	0.75	0	0	1	0	Very Low	Fluoride concentration in water from some wells has reached 9.0 mg/L, exceeding recommended maximum concentration levels of 1.4 mg/L (B-118, DWR 1984).	
7-7	CADIZ VALLEY	426.5	10	0	0	0	0.75	0	0	0	0	Very Low		
7-8	BRISTOL VALLEY	784.1	27	0	0	1	0.75	1	2.5	3	0	Low	Fluoride content in some wells exceeds the recommended MCL level (C-118). TDS content is extremely high in some wells near Bristol Lake (DWR 1967)	
7-9	DALE VALLEY	335.4	1,197	0	0	1	0.75	1	0	5	0	Very Low	Groundwater quality in basin is generally unsuitable for domestic and agricultural uses (DWR 1979). TDS and F concentrations impair for domestic use, and B and Na concentrations impair agricultural use in basin (DWR 1979). USGS data shows declining water	

NOTE: * Data component values were reduced by 25% due to data confidence, prior to calculating total GW basin ranking value

** Sub-fields that are used to determine the overal GW Reliance Total ((GW Use + GW %)/2)

*** Overall Basin Ranking Score = Population + Population Growth + PSW + (Total Wells x .75) + Irr Acreage + (GW Use + GW %)/2 + Impacts + Other