

PUBLIC INTEREST REVIEW FOR GROUND WATER APPLICATIONS

TO: Water Rights Section Date May 12, 2010

FROM: Ground Water/Hydrology Section Michael Zwart
Reviewer's Name

SUBJECT: Application G- 17368 Supersedes review of _____
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: Phillip Gerstner County: Grant

A1. Applicant(s) seek(s) 1.571 cfs from one well(s) in the John Day Basin,
Fox Creek subbasin Quad Map: Fox

A2. Proposed use: Irrigation, 127.6 ac (P & S) Seasonality: March 1 to October 31

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

Well 1	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	GRAN 183	1	CRB	1.571	11S/30E-5 SE-NW	1270' S, 2550' E fr NW cor S 5
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	4480	70	28	12/1/67	197	0-18	0-29	None	None	450		Air

Use data from application for proposed wells.

A4. **Comments:** The proposed use appears to have been in place for years.

A5. ☒ **Provisions of the John Day** 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: _____

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

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:
- ☒ The permit should contain condition #(s) 7N, 7T;
 - ☒ The permit should be conditioned as indicated in item 2 below.
 - ☐ 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 _____ ft. below land surface;
- c. ☒ Condition to allow ground water production only from a single basalt aquifer;
- 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: Nearest SOW (GRAN 176) displays relatively stable water levels. There is limited use of basalt groundwater in the immediate area.

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	Basalt of the Columbia River Basalt Group	☒	☐
		☐	☐
		☐	☐
		☐	☐
		☐	☐

Basis for aquifer confinement evaluation: Columbia River Basalt aquifers are typically confined. The static water level here is above the depth that groundwater was first encountered.

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	Smith Creek	4452	4430	1450	☐	☒	☐	☐	☒
1	2	Fox Creek	4452	4390	3800	☐	☒	☐	☐	☒
1	3	Spring to northwest	4452	4470	4800	☐	☒	☐	☐	☒
1	4	Spring to east #1	4452	4620	3500	☐	☒	☐	☐	☒
1	5	Spring to east #2	4452	4670	4100	☐	☒	☐	☐	☒
1	6	Spring to southeast	4452	4580	5200	☐	☒	☐	☐	☒
						☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
						☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
						☐	☐	☐	☐	☐
						☐	☐	☐	☐	☐

Basis for aquifer hydraulic connection evaluation: The creeks are flowing on deposits of alluvium or the Mascall Formation below about 4430 to 4460 feet in elevation upon descending from the upland areas to the east and north. Hydraulic connection with the creeks may be indirect as basalt groundwater may discharge to these deposits. Hydraulic connection with basalt springs and seeps is possible, but the nearest mapped springs are well above the elevation of the first water-bearing zone at the well and hydraulic connection with those points therefore appears unlikely.

Water Availability Basin the well(s) are located within: FOX CR > COTTONWOOD CR - AT MOUTH (30620218).

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: This section does not apply.

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
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
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													
(A) = Total Interf.													
(B) = 80 % Nat. Q													
(C) = 1 % Nat. Q													
(D) = (A) > (C)		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓	✓
(E) = (A / B) x 100		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%

Basis for impact evaluation:

[illegible]

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) 7J;

ii. ☐ The permit should contain special condition(s) as indicated in "Remarks" below;

This image shows a single sheet of white paper with horizontal ruling lines. The lines are evenly spaced and extend across the width of the page. There are no margins, text, or other markings on the paper.

D. WELL CONSTRUCTION, OAR 690-200

- D1. Well #: 1 Logid: GRAN 183
- 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).**