PUBLIC INTEREST REVIEW FOR GROUND WATER APPLICATIONS

TO:		Wate	r Rights S	ection				Date	e	Novembe	er 1, 200	06	
FROM:	:	Grou	nd Water/	Hydrology	Section _		ael Zwart						
SUBJE				16685		Reviewer's Name Supersedes review of							
OAR 69 welfare, to detern	00-310-1 safety ar nine whe	30 (1) ind heal ther the	The Depart th as descr e presumpt	<i>ibed in ORS</i> ion is establi	resume tha 537.525. I ished. OAR	it a proposi Department R 690-310-	ed groundwi staff review 140 allows t	ater use will y ground wate he proposed agency poli	er app use be	lications u modified	nder OA or condi	R 690-31 tioned to	0-140 meet
A. <u>GE</u> ľ	VERAL	INFC	RMATIO	<u>ON</u> : A	pplicant's l	Name:	Jack and	Sally Hay		Cou	inty: <u> </u>	'asco	
A1.	Applica	nt(s) se	ek(s) <u>3.0</u>	cfs fro	m <u>two</u>	well(s) in the	Hood					_Basin,
		Fifteen	Mile Cree	k		subb	asin Qu	ad Map: Po	etersb	urg			
A2. A3.	Propose Well an	d use: . d aquif	Irr er data (att	igation, 310 ach and nu	.9 ac. (P) mber logs	Seas	onality: g wells; ma	March 1 to	o Octo	ober 31 s as such u	ınder log	gid):	
Well	Logi	id	Applicant		oposed	Propos		Location		Location			
1	WASC 5		Well #		quifer* CRB	Rate(cf		(T/R-S QQ-Q) 1N/14E-12 SE-NW				fr NW cor	
2	Propo		2		CRB	3.0		1N/14E-12 NE-NW				r NW cor	
3 4													
5						+			-				
* Alluvit	ım, CRB,	Bedroc	k	<u> </u>									
Well	Well Elev ft msl	First Wate:	r SWL	SWL Date	Well Depth (ft)	Seal Interval (ft)	Casing Intervals (ft)	Liner Intervals (ft)		forations Screens (ft)	Well Yield (gpm)	Draw Down (ft)	Test Type
1	890	165	15	4/12/06	280	0-39	0-39	0-200	165-		520	100	Air
2	870	<u> </u>											
		2											
									-				
Use data	from app	lication	for proposed	l wells.					l				
A4.								nended log to					es (See
													-
									2	9			
A5. 🛛	manage (Not all	ment of basin r	ules contai	ater hydrauli n such provi	ically conne isions.)	ected to sur	face water	ıles relative t ☐ are, or ⊠	are	not, activa	ited by th	is applica	and/or ation.
A6. 🔲	Name o	f admir	nistrative ar	rea:	*		, ta	p(s) an aquif	er lim	ited by an	administ	rative res	triction.

8. <u>GF</u>	ROUN	ND WATER AVAILABILITY CONSIDERATIONS, OAR 690-310-130, 400-010, 410-0070
B1.	Bas	sed upon available data, I have determined that ground water* for the proposed use:
	a.	is over appropriated, is not over appropriated, or is cannot be determined to be over appropriated during any period of the proposed use. * This finding is limited to the ground water portion of the over-appropriation determination as prescribed in OAR 690-310-130;
	Ъ.	■ will not or ■ will likely be available in the amounts requested without injury to prior water rights. * This finding is limited to the ground water portion of the injury determination as prescribed in OAR 690-310-130;
	c.	will not or will likely to be available within the capacity of the ground water resource; or
	đ.	will, if properly conditioned, avoid injury to existing ground water rights or to the ground water resource: i. The permit should contain condition #(s)
32.	a.	Condition to allow ground water production from no deeper than ft. below land surface;
	b.	Condition to allow ground water production from no shallower than ft. below land surface;
	c.	Condition to allow ground water production only from the water reservoir between approximately ft. and ft. below land surface;
	d.	 Well reconstruction is necessary to accomplish one or more of the above conditions. The problems that are likely to occur with this use and without reconstructing are cited below. Without reconstruction, I recommend withholding issuance of the permit until evidence of well reconstruction is filed with the Department and approved by the Ground Water Section. Describe injury —as related to water availability—that is likely to occur without well reconstruction (interference w/
		senior water rights, not within the capacity of the resource, etc):
33.	<u>eve</u> If n	ound water availability remarks: Potential for water-level declines and overdraft of the resource exists virtually rywhere the Columbia River Basalt aquifers are developed, especially in Eastern Oregon where recharge is small. o measurement/decline condition is used, as recommended above, then I would need to re-review the file, with the ly result being that one or both of the boxes 'will not likely be available' being checked under B1b or B1c.
	=	
	10/2	
	-	
	3	
	-	

Date: November 1, 2006

Application G-16685

______continued

C. GROUND WATER/SURFACE WATER CONSIDERATIONS, OAR 690-09-040

C1. 690-09-040 (1): Evaluation of aquifer confinement:

Well	Aquifer or Proposed Aquifer	Confined	Unconfined
1, 2	Basalt of the Columbia River Basalt Group	\boxtimes	

Basis for aquifer confinement evaluation: <u>Basalt aquifers are typically confined unless they are very shallow or in hydraulic connection with an overlying alluvial aquifer.</u>

C2. 690-09-040 (2) (3): Evaluation of distance to, and hydraulic connection with, surface water sources. All wells located a horizontal distance less than ¼ mile from a surface water source that produce water from an unconfined aquifer shall be assumed to be hydraulically connected to the surface water source. Include in this table any streams located beyond one mile that are evaluated for PSI.

Well	SW #	Surface Water Name	GW Elev ft msl	SW Elev ft msl	Distance (ft)	Hydraulically Connected? YES NO ASSUMED	Potential for Subst. Interfer. Assumed? YES NO
1	1	Company Hollow	875	885	100		
1	<u>1</u> a	Company Hollow @ spring	875	710	7700		
1	2	Eightmile Creek	875	440	11400		
2	1	Company Hollow	860±	870	50		
2	1a	Company Hollow @ spring	860±	710	6600		
2	2	Eightmile Creek	860±	430	11900		

Basis for aquifer hydraulic connection evaluation: <u>Local small creeks are incised into the Dalles Fm. Major creeks are incised below the Dalles Fm. and into the CRB. Hydraulic connection is indirect or nonexistent with local reaches, but more likely where the basalt aquifer is likely to be breached. The spring identified is likely issuing from the basalt at an elevation similar to that of the water-bearing zone.</u>

Water Availability Basin the well(s) are located within: Fifteemile Cr > Col. R ab Eightmile Cr (30410546).

C3a. 690-09-040 (4): Evaluation of stream impacts for each well that has been determined or assumed to be hydraulically connected and less than 1 mile from a surface water source. Limit evaluation to instream rights and minimum stream flows that are pertinent to that surface water source, and not lower SW sources to which the stream under evaluation is tributary. Compare the requested rate against the 1% of 80% natural flow for the pertinent Water Availability Basin (WAB). If Q is not distributed by well, use full rate for each well. Any checked box indicates the well is assumed to have the potential to cause PSI.

Well	SW #	Well < ½ mile?	Qw > 5 cfs?	Instream Water Right ID	Instream Water Right Q (cfs)	Qw > 1% ISWR?	80% Natural Flow (cfs)	Qw > 1% of 80% Natural Flow?	Interference @ 30 days (%)	Potential for Subst. Interfer. Assumed?
						1 2				

Date:	November	1,	2006		

C3b. 690-09-040 (4): Evaluation of stream impacts by total appropriation for all wells determined or assumed to be hydraulically connected and less than 1 mile from a surface water source. Complete only if Q is distributed among wells. Otherwise same evaluation and limitations apply as in C3a above.

SW #	Qw > 5 cfs?	Instream Water Right	Instream Water Right Q (cfs)	Qw > 1% ISWR?	80% Natural Flow	Qw > 1% of 80% Natural	Interference @ 30 days (%)	Potential for Subst. Interfer.
		ID	(cfs)		(cfs)	Flow?	(50)	Assumed?
					<u></u>			

Comments:	

C4a. 690-09-040 (5): Estimated impacts on hydraulically connected surface water sources greater than one mile as a percentage of the proposed pumping rate. Limit evaluation to the effects that will occur up to one year after pumping begins. This table encompasses the considerations required by 09-040 (5)(a), (b), (c) and (d), which are not included on this form. Use additional sheets if calculated flows from more than one WAB are required.

Non-Di	istributed	Wells											
Well	SW#	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
		%	9/0	9/6	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Well Q	as CFS						İ						
	nce CFS												
Dietwib	uted Well												
Well	SW#	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
		%	9/0	9/6	9/6	%	9/0	%	%	%	9/0	9/6	%
Well Q	as CFS			- 10		- 215	- 303	17.					
	nce CFS												
		%	9/0	9/0	%	%	%	%	1/0	9/0	1/6	0/0	%
Well Q	as CFS												
	ence CFS												
		%	9/6	9/0	%	%	9/0	%	1/0	1/0	9/₀	9/6	%
Well Q	as CFS												
Interfere	nce CFS				_								
		%	%	9/0	9/4	%	%	%	1/6	1%	%	9/4	%
Well Q	as CFS												
	ence CFS												
		%	1/0	9/6	%	%	1/0	9/0	%	%	%	%	0/0
Well Q							Ì						
Interfere	nce CFS												
		%	.9/6	11/6	%	%	1/6	%	%	%	%	0/a	9/6
Well Q													
Interfere	nce CFS							ĺ				<u> </u>	
(A) = To	tal Interf.										I		
	% Nat. Q	-				_							
(C) = 1 %	% Nat. Q												
(D) = (A) > (C)	- V	7	7	1	1	1	7	1	V	7	1	1
	/ B) x 100	%	%	9/6	%	9/4	9/6	9/6	1/6	%	%	9/0	%
(L) (A	_	- GDO	(D) - 117.4	D 1 1	- 20	200	- 32	D.C.					

(A) = total interference as CFS; (B) = WAB calculated natural flow at 80% exceed, as CFS; (C) = 1% of calculated natural flow at 80% exceed, as CFS; (D) = highlight the checkmark for each month where (A) is greater than (C); (E) = total interference divided by 80% flow as percentage.

	Basis for impact evaluation: The usual models to calculate stream depletion are not likely appropriate to use for calculation of interference with limited stream reaches or at point discharges, such as springs. However, it is very likely
<u>v</u>	hat pumping of the wells will impact (reduce) flows of the identified spring (see map), which discharges into surface vater source #1a. Eightmile Creek is likely incised well below the aquifer at the distance identified. Hydraulic connection may be more distant at an upstream reach, depending on the regional dip.
	onnection may be more distant at an obstream reach, depending on the regional dip.
-	
-	
-	
_	
-	
10 m	
-	
-	
С4Ь.	690-09-040 (5) (b) The potential to impair or detrimentally affect the public interest is to be determined by the Water Rights Section.
C5. 🗌	If properly conditioned, the surface water source(s) can be adequately protected from interference, and/or ground water use under this permit can be regulated if it is found to substantially interfere with surface water: i. The permit should contain condition #(s)
	ii. The permit should contain special condition(s) as indicated in "Remarks" below;
C6. SW	// GW Remarks and Conditions
_	
-	
=	
Ref	erences Used: <u>Nearby well logs; nearby recent reviews; regional geologic mapping, esp. by Hodge, 1941; personal munication with Marc Norton & Brian Mayer.</u>
Ref	erences Used: Nearby well logs; nearby recent reviews; regional geologic mapping, esp. by Hodge, 1941; personal imunication with Marc Norton & Brian Mayer.
Ref	erences Used: Nearby well logs; nearby recent reviews; regional geologic mapping, esp. by Hodge, 1941; personal imunication with Marc Norton & Brian Mayer.
Ref	erences Used: <u>Nearby well logs; nearby recent reviews; regional geologic mapping, esp. by Hodge, 1941; personal munication with Marc Norton & Brian Mayer.</u>
Ref	erences Used: <u>Nearby well logs; nearby recent reviews; regional geologic mapping, esp. by Hodge, 1941; personal munication with Marc Norton & Brian Mayer.</u>

Date: November 1, 2006

Application G-16685 continued

Appli	cation G-1	6685	continued		Date: November 1, 2006	
D. W	ELL CO	NSTRUCTION	, OAR 690-200			
 D1.		:1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	WASC 51466		
D2.	a. b. c.	review of the we field inspection to report of CWRE	ll log; by			;
D3.	a. 🗌 b. 🗍	commingles water permits the loss of permits the de-w	lth threat under Division 2 er from more than one gro	und water reservoir; ound water reservoirs;		
D4.	<u>filed. F</u> inform	<u>Ie reported that on the same one that of the same that of th</u>	ne was received in Pendl	leton on November 2 nd . I on file in Salem. My revie	yer has requested that an amended log leave not modified the construction wof the downhole video indicates that	
D5.	THE V	b. [original construction or I don't know if it met s	most recent modification.		
D6.				nforcement Section and the	e permit until evidence of well reconstruc Ground Water Section.	tion
THIS	SECTION	ON TO BE COM	MPLETED BY ENFO	RCEMENT PERSONN	TEL.	
D7.	□ Well co	onstruction deficies	ncy has been corrected by	the following actions:		
	_		100			
	-	312-3-35				
		(Enforcement Se	ction Signature)		, 200	
D8. [☐ Route	to Water Rights	Section (attach well reco	nstruction logs to this pag	ge).	
-						

WATER RESOURCES DEPARTMENT

MEM	0							Nov	ember	, 2	00_6_		
TO: FROM		Application G-16685 GW: Michael Zwart (Reviewer's Name) Scenic Waterway Interference Evaluation											
	_YES _NO	The so	arce of	appropr	iation is	s within	or abov	e a Scei	nic Wat	erway			
V	_YES _NO	Use the	Scenic	Water	way con	dition (Conditie	on 7J)					
	Per ORS 390.835, the Ground Water Section is able to calculate ground water interference with surface water that contributes to a Scenic Waterway. The calculated interference is distributed below. Per ORS 390.835, the Ground Water Section is unable to calculate ground water interference with surface water that contributes to a scenic waterway; therefore, the Department is unable to find that there is a preponderance of evidence that the proposed use will measurably reduce the surface water flows necessary to maintain the free-flowing character of a scenic waterway.												
Calculate calculate informing Exercise Watervalue	te the per ted, per co ng Water se of thi way by t	ON OF Incentage of the control of th	f consum 390.835, at the Dep is calca wing ar	ptive use do not fil partment ulated to nounts	by monti ll in the to is unable o reduce	ible but contact to make the month	heck the 'a Prepon ly flows	"unable" derance d	option al of Eviden	bove, thus ce finding	s Scenic		
Jan	Feb	Mar	Арг	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec		

