<u>PUBLI</u>	C INTE	REST 1	REVIEW I	FOR GRO	UND WAT	ER APPL	ICATIONS	_						
TO:		Wate	r Rights So	ection			Date January 31, 2011							
FROM	:	Grou	nd Water/I	Hydrology	Section	J. Hac	kett							
SUDIE	CT·	Appli	ination G	17/16		Revi	ewer's Name	viou of						
SODIE	CI:	Аррп	cation G-	1/410	<u> </u>	Suj	perseues re-			Date of Rev	view(s)			
PUBLI OAR 69 welfare, to detern the press A. GEN	C INTH 90-310-1 safety an mine whe umption ERAL IN	ERES 30 (1) <i>2</i> <i>ad heal</i> ether th criteria	T PRESU The Departa th as descri- e presumpt . This revio MATION:	MPTION; ment shall p ibed in ORS ion is establ ew is based Applicant';	GROUN oresume that 537.525. E lished. OAF upon avail s Name:	DWATE at a propos Department & 690-310- lable infor Toyo Tan	<u>R</u> ed groundwa staff review 140 allows t rmation and so USA, Inc	ater use will a ground wate he proposed agency poli	ensure the pre er applications use be modific cies in place a County:	servation of under OA ed or condi at the time Multnom	of the pul IR 690-3 itioned to e of evalu ah	<i>blic</i> 10-140) meet 1 ation .		
Δ1	Applica	nt(s) so	ek(s) = 0.3	34 of st	from 1 u	vall(s) in the	will	motto				Basin		
лі.	Арриса	nus) su	$\operatorname{N}(S) = 0.5$	<u>54</u> 0151	110111 <u>1</u> w	ouht	n <u>vvin</u> a	ad Mapy Co	m 0.6			_ Dasiii,		
		Joiuiiii	Ла			subt	asiii Qu	au Map. <u>Ca</u>	unas					
A2.	Propose	d use:	Indu	ustrial/Man	ufacturing a	and Irrigati	on Sea	sonality: Ye	ar-round and	March 1 –	October	31		
A3.	Well an	d aquif	er data (att	ach and nu	mber logs	for existin	g wells; ma	rk proposed	wells as such	under log	gid):			
Well	Log	id	Applicant's Well #	s Propos	Proposed Aquifer*		Proposed Location Rate(cfs) (T/R-S QO		Loca 2250	tion, metes a ' N. 1200' E 1	nd bounds, fr NW cor S	e.g. 3 36		
1	Propo	sed	1	Sand an	d Gravel AQ	0.334	1N/	3E-23 NW-SW	510'N,	390'E fr SW	cor, NWSV	V, S 36		
2 3														
4														
5 * Alluviu	ım, CRB,	Bedrocl	k											
	Well	First			Well	Seal	Casing	Liner	Perforations	Well	Draw			
Well	Elev	Water	ft bls	SWL Date	Depth	Interval	Intervals	Intervals	Or Screens	Yield	Down	Test Type		
1	11 msl	ft bls	15'		(ft) 250 est.	(ft) 0-18 est.	(ft) 0-250 est.	(ft)	(ft)	(gpm)	(ft)	<i>J</i> 1		
			est.											
II data		:4:	6											
Use data	from app	lication	for proposed	wells.										
A4.	Comme	ents:												
A5. 🖂	Provisi	ons of	the	Willamette	e		Basin ru	les relative to	o the develop	nent, classi	ification	and/or		
	manage	ment of	f ground wa	ater hydraul	ically conne	ected to su	rface water	are, or	are not , acti	vated by the	his applic	cation.		
	(Not all	basin r nts: Tl	ules contain	n such prov	isions.)	roduce fro	m an uncon	fined aquifor	within 14 of a	surface w	ater cour	20		

Comments: <u>The applicant's proposed well will produce from an unconfined aquifer within ¹/₄ of a surface water source</u> (Arata Creek) and therefore is subject to OAR 690-502-0240.

A6. Well(s) #_____

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* **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;
 - 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) 7B
 - 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 ______ 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: _____

The hydrogeologic units of the Portland Basin have been defined and described by the U.S. Geological Survey in a series of reports published in the 1990s (Swanson et al., 1993, McCarthy and Anderson, 1990). Two aquifers, the shallow Unconsolidated Sedimentary aquifer (US), and the deeper Sand and Gravel aquifer (SG) occur in the vicinity of the proposed well. In most areas in the basin, these aquifers are separated by fine-grained alluvial sediments that act as confining units; however, these units are either very thin or are absent locally. The USGS has mapped a thin layer of Undifferentiated Fine-grained sediments (UF) in the area, but very little clay was described on driller's logs for nearby wells (MULT 1313, MULT 1314, MULT 1315) suggesting the UF layer is not aerially extensive. As a result, the US and SG probably behave as one aquifer locally.

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	Unconsolidated Sedimentary, Sand and Gravel		\boxtimes

Basis for aquifer confinement evaluation: Locally, the aquifer system is composed largely of coarse-grained alluvial sediments. Confinement probably increases with depth.

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 ¹/₄ 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	Columbia River	10	10-20	4100		
1	2	Arata Creek	10	20	130		
1	3	Salmon Creek	10	20	1000		\square

Basis for aquifer hydraulic connection evaluation: USGS reports indicate upward vertical flow for both local and regional groundwater flow paths in the area.

Water Availability Basin the well(s) are located within: None (administratively in the Columbia Sub-basin)

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?
1	1						~265,000		<25%	
1	2								<25%	\boxtimes
1	3								<25%	\boxtimes

C3b. **690-09-040 (4):** Evaluation of stream impacts <u>by total appropriation</u> 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.

sume e araan	in and minit	anone ap	p1) us in eet						
SW #		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?

Comments: <u>Interference at 30 days to Arata and Salmon creeks was assumed to be less than 25% due to the likely presence of fine-grained sediments in the channel bottom of each creek. Interference at 30 days with the Columbia River will be less than 25% because of the well's distance from the river.</u>

Note: The proposed well is hydraulically connected to the Sandy River, but because it is closer to the Columbia River, impacts to the Sandy are likely to be negligible as the cone of depression will probably not expand much once it gets to the Columbia. As a result, the Sandy River was not included in table C2.

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 V	Vells											
Well	SW#	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Well Q	as CFS												
Interfer	ence CFS												
Distrib	uted Wells												
Well	SW#	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Well Q	as CFS												
Interfer	ence CFS												
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Well Q	as CFS												
Interfer	ence CFS												
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Well Q	as CFS												
Interfer	ence CFS												
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Well Q	as CFS												
Interfer	ence CFS												
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Well O	as CFS												
Interfer	ence CFS												
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Well O	as CFS												
Interfer	ence CES												
merrer	0.00 01 0			I									
$(\mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{T}\mathbf{c}$	otal Interf.												
(B) = 80	% Nat. Q												
(C) = 1	% Nat. O												
(=) 1	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·												

$(\mathbf{D}) = (\mathbf{A}) > (\mathbf{C})$	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark	\checkmark
$(E) = (A / B) \times 100$	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
(A) = total interferen CFS; (D) = highligh Basis for in	ce as CFS; at the check apact eval	(B) = WA kmark for e luation: _	AB calculat each month	ed natural a where (A)	flow at 80 is greater	% exceed. a than (C); (as CFS; (C (E) = total i) = 1% of nterference	calculated e divided b	natural flov by 80% flov	w at 80% e: w as percen	xceed. as tage.

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:

- 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: <u>Most of the production from this proposed use will be realized by capture of water that</u> would naturally discharge to the Columbia River. However, the impact to surface water supply will be minuscule because pumping rates are very small compared to flow in the river.

References Used:

Swanson, R.D., McFarland, W.D., Gonthier, J.B., and Wilkinson, J.M., 1993, A description of hydrogeologic units in the Portland Basin, Oregon and Washington: U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 90-4196, 56 p.

McCarthy, K.A., and Anderson, D.B., 1990, Ground-water data for the Portland Basin, Oregon and Washington: U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 90-126, 56 p.

McFarland, W.D., and Morgan, D.S., 1996, A description of the ground-water flow system in the Portland Basin, Oregon and Washington: U.S. Geological Survey Water-Supply Paper 2470-A, 58 p.

D. WELL CONSTRUCTION, OAR 690-200

D1.	Well #: Logid:
D2.	THE WELL does not meet current well construction standards based upon: a. review of the well log; b. field inspection by
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 , <i>or</i> 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	ECTION 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

