

PUBLIC INTEREST REVIEW FOR GROUND WATER APPLICATIONS

TO: Water Rights Section Date 11/24/2009

FROM: Ground Water/Hydrology Section Donn Miller
Reviewer's Name

SUBJECT: Application G- 17282 Supersedes review of none
Date of Review(s)

PUBLIC INTEREST PRESUMPTION; GROUNDWATER

OAR 690-310-130 (1) *The Department shall presume that a proposed groundwater use will ensure the preservation of the public welfare, safety and health as described in ORS 537.525. Department staff review ground water applications under OAR 690-310-140 to determine whether the presumption is established. OAR 690-310-140 allows the proposed use be modified or conditioned to meet the presumption criteria. This review is based upon available information and agency policies in place at the time of evaluation.*

A. GENERAL INFORMATION: Applicant's Name: McNulty Water PUD County: Columbia

A1. Applicant(s) seek(s) 1.0 cfs from one well(s) in the Willamette Basin,
Columbia subbasin Quad Map: St Helens

A2. Proposed use: Quasi-municipal Seasonality: year round

A3. Well and aquifer data (attach and number logs for existing wells; mark proposed wells as such under logid):

Well l	Logid	Applicant's Well #	Proposed Aquifer*	Proposed Rate(cfs)	Location (T/R-S QQ-Q)	Location, metes and bounds, e.g. 2250' N, 1200' E fr NW cor S 36
1	To be built	McGilyra #2	CRB	1.0	5N/1W-S30 SWSE	591'N, 1950'W fr SE cor S 31
2						
3						
4						
5						

* Alluvium, CRB, Bedrock

Well	Well Elev ft msl	First Water ft bls	SWL ft bls	SWL Date	Well Depth (ft)	Seal Interval (ft)	Casing Intervals (ft)	Liner Intervals (ft)	Perforations Or Screens (ft)	Well Yield (gpm)	Draw Down (ft)	Test Type
1	~250	155	75	4/26/72	200(+)	0-31	0-31	-----	-----	30	----	A

Use data from application for proposed wells.

A4. **Comments:** The application cites an existing well (COLU 1225) at the location but notes that it will be replaced. Further, the application says that the new well may be deeper depending on what the driller recommends. At this point, the description of the existing well is a starting point. That information is presented in the entries above.

A5. ☐ **Provisions of the Willamette** Basin rules relative to the development, classification and/or management of ground water hydraulically connected to surface water ☐ are, or ☒ are not, activated by this application.
(Not all basin rules contain such provisions.)

Comments: The aquifer is not unconfined alluvium as referenced in OAR 690-502-0240.

A6. ☐ **Well(s) #** _____, _____, _____, _____, _____, tap(s) an aquifer limited by an administrative restriction.
Name of administrative area: _____
Comments: NA

B. GROUND WATER AVAILABILITY CONSIDERATIONS, OAR 690-310-130, 400-010, 410-0070

B1. **Based upon available data**, I have determined that ground water* for the proposed use:

- a. ☐ is over appropriated, ☐ is not over appropriated, or ☒ **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;
- b. ☐ **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
- d. ☒ **will, if properly conditioned**, avoid injury to existing ground water rights or to the ground water resource:
 - i. ☒ The permit should contain condition #(s) 7I (no predetermined reference level);
 - ii. ☐ The permit should be conditioned as indicated in item 2 below.
 - iii. ☐ The permit should contain special condition(s) as indicated in item 3 below;

- B2.
- 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 125 ft. below land surface;
 - c. ☐ **Condition** to allow ground water production only from the _____ ground 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): _____

- B3. **Ground water availability remarks:** There is only one nearby CRB well with a good sequence of water level data. McNulty Water PUD's Robinette Well (COLU 51275) in T5N/R2W-S 25 SESE has experienced water level declines with fairly modest pump testing use. That well has dropped about 100 feet since 1998 and is currently the subject of a proposed aquifer storage and recovery (ASR) project. Other CRB wells in the area are only domestic wells without much data and there are no indications of declines. The Robinette Well is a little over a mile away from the proposed well. I am inclined to conclude that the CRB at the proposed well is not declining but may be susceptible to declines with the proposed use. The Willamette Basin rules require a decline condition in any new permits for CRB aquifer wells. That is noted above in condition 7I.

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	Columbia River Basalt	☒	☐
		☐	☐
		☐	☐
		☐	☐
		☐	☐

Basis for aquifer confinement evaluation: proxy well log information on COLU 1225 and CRB aquifers generally

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?			Potential for Subst. Interfer. Assumed?	
						YES	NO	ASSUMED	YES	NO
1	1	Milton Creek	175	170	265	☐	☒	☐	☐	☒
1	2	Unnamed trib Milton Creek	175	185	200	☐	☒	☐	☐	☒
						☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
						☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
						☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
						☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
						☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
						☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
						☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
						☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Basis for aquifer hydraulic connection evaluation: The close head relationships speak generally to hydraulic connection. The application is not specific on well construction for the proposed well but does reference replacing COLU 1225, possibly to a greater depth. I am aware that there is a need to avoid hydraulic connection since there is the potential for substantial interference which would block permit issuance. Therefore, I am directing well construction to a deeper casing and sealing to achieve a no hydraulic connection conclusion.

Water Availability Basin the well(s) are located within: Milton Creek>Scappoose Bay @ the mouth

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 < ¼ 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?
		☐	☐			☐		☐		☐
		☐	☐			☐		☐		☐
		☐	☐			☐		☐		☐
		☐	☐			☐		☐		☐
		☐	☐			☐		☐		☐

		☐	☐			☐		☐		☐
		☐	☐			☐		☐		☐
		☐	☐			☐		☐		☐

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 #		Q _w > 5 cfs?	Instream Water Right ID	Instream Water Right Q (cfs)	Q _w > 1% ISWR?	80% Natural Flow (cfs)	Q _w > 1% of 80% Natural Flow?	Interference @ 30 days (%)	Potential for Subst. Interfer. Assumed?
			☐			☐		☐		☐
			☐			☐		☐		☐
			☐			☐		☐		☐
			☐			☐		☐		☐

Comments: NA

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-Distributed Wells													
Well	SW#	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
NA		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Well Q as CFS													
Interference CFS													
Distributed Wells													
Well	SW#	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Well Q as CFS													
Interference CFS													
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Well Q as CFS													
Interference CFS													
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Well Q as CFS													
Interference CFS													
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Well Q as CFS													
Interference CFS													
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Well Q as CFS													
Interference CFS													
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Well Q as CFS													
Interference CFS													
(A) = Total Interf.													
(B) = 80 % Nat. Q													
(C) = 1 % Nat. Q													
(D) = (A) > (C)		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
(E) = (A / B) x 100		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%

(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 lack of hydraulic connection is the basis for impact evaluation. The department commonly assumes that, for permitting purposes, CRB aquifers are not hydraulically connected to surface water.

C4b. **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:
- ☐ The permit should contain condition #(s) _____;
 - ☐ The permit should contain special condition(s) as indicated in "Remarks" below;

C6. **SW / GW Remarks and Conditions** CRB aquifers are generally confined and separated hydraulically from near streams. The log for COLU 1225 supports the confinement issue but there could be some under-reporting of shallower water occurrence. The head relationships between the well and the nearby creeks are very similar. This is often a tip-off of connection. The construction of the well is important. Since the application does not really propose a well construction, I have prescribed one that will aid the application to get to permit by avoiding hydraulic connection and the potential for substantial for with the creeks.

References Used: USGS WRIS 90-4196, USGS Professional Paper 1424-A, USGS Water Supply Paper 2470-A, well logs in the area

D. WELL CONSTRUCTION, OAR 690-200

D1. Well #: NA Logid:

D2. THE WELL does not meet current well construction standards based upon:

- a. ☐ review of the well log;
b. ☐ field inspection by _____;
c. ☐ report of CWRE _____;
d. ☐ other: (specify) _____

D3. THE WELL construction deficiency:

- a. ☐ constitutes a health threat under Division 200 rules;
b. ☐ commingles water from more than one ground water reservoir;
c. ☐ permits the loss of artesian head;
d. ☐ permits the de-watering of one or more ground water reservoirs;
e. ☐ other: (specify) _____

D4. THE WELL construction deficiency is described as follows:

D5. THE WELL a. ☐ was, or ☐ was not constructed according to the standards in effect at the time of original construction or most recent modification.b. ☐ I don't know if it met standards at the time of construction.D6. ☐ Route to the Enforcement Section. I recommend withholding issuance of the permit until evidence of well reconstruction is filed with the Department and approved by the Enforcement Section and the Ground Water Section.**THIS SECTION TO BE COMPLETED BY ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL**D7. ☐ Well construction deficiency has been corrected by the following actions:

_____, 200____.
(Enforcement Section Signature)D8. ☐ Route to Water Rights Section (attach well reconstruction logs to this page).

Well Location Map

Application G-17282, McNulty Water PUD

