PUBLIC INTEREST REVIEW FOR GROUND WATER APPLICATIONS

TO:		Water	Rights Se	ection				Date	e June 14,	2011		
FROM	:	Groun	nd Water/H	Hydrology	Section _	J. Hac	kett					
SUBJE	CT:	Appli	cation G-1	7454			ewer's Name persedes rev	view of				
		rr								Date of Rev	view(s)	
OAR 69 welfare, to determ	90-310-13 safety ar mine whe	30 (1) 7 and healt ther the	The Departr th as descri e presumpti	<i>bed in ORS</i> on is establi	resume tha 537.525. I shed. OAF	at a propose Department R 690-310-	ed groundwa staff review 140 allows t	ground wat he proposed	ensure the pres er applications use be modified icies in place an	under OA d or condi	R 690-31 tioned to	10-140 meet
A. GEN	ERAL IN	NFORM	IATION: A	Applicant's	Name: _	NRI Inc.			County:	Multnom	<u>ah</u>	
A1.	Applica	nt(s) se		cfs fi					ount Tabor			
A2. A3.	Propose	d use: _	Gro	und-source	heat pump	Seas	onality:	year-round				
l 1			Applicant'	0		Propose		Location				
Well	Log		Well #	Propose	d Aquifer*	Rate(cfs	Rate(cfs) (Ta		2250' N	Location, metes and bounds, e.g. 2250' N, 1200' E fr NW cor S 36		
1	MULT 1 105704			Alluvium		0.123 1N/2			155' S, 870' E, fr NW cor S 23			
3	Propose	Proposed*** 2		All	Alluvium		1N/2	E-23 NW-NW	V 120' S	, 765' E, fi	NW cor	\$ 23
4												
5 * Alluviu	ım, CRB,	Bedrock										
Well	Well Elev ft msl	First Water ft bls	SWL ft bls	SWL Date	Well Depth (ft) 120 est.	Seal Interval (ft)	Casing Intervals (ft) 0-120 est.	Liner Intervals (ft)	Perforations Or Screens (ft) 100-130 est.	Well Yield (gpm)	Draw Down (ft)	Test Type
2	20				120 est.	TBD	0-120 est.		100-130 est.			
A4. is not in ***The	Comme GRID y propose	ents: vet. Thi d use o	s review u	rd 1013171 ses the prop lication is g	osed cons	truction p	rovided by	the applicar	ell is probably nt. 105704) will be			
A5. 🛚	manage (Not all Comme	ment of basin ri nts:	ground wa ules contair The applic	iter hydrauli 1 such provi	cally connesions.) sed well wi	ected to sur	rface water from an unc	🛛 are, or 🗌	o the developm are not, activ	ated by the	nis applic	ation.
A6. 🗌	Name of	f admin	istrative are	ea:				o(s) an aquife	er limited by an	administi	rative res	triction.

Version: 08/15/2003

т.	
Bas	ed 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 an 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.	\square will not or \square 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) 7L 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;
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):
Gra	ound water availability remarks:
	ound water availability remarks:
The	ound water availability remarks: e findings of this review are based on the assumption that the extracted groundwater will be re-injected into the ne aquifer.
The sam	e findings of this review are based on the assumption that the extracted groundwater will be re-injected into the ne aquifer.
The sam	e findings of this review are based on the assumption that the extracted groundwater will be re-injected into the ne aquifer.
The The report	e findings of this review are based on the assumption that the extracted groundwater will be re-injected into the ne aquifer. Expermit should contain a condition that requires any extracted groundwater be re-injected into the same aquifer shydrogeologic units of the Portland Basin have been defined and described by the U.S. Geological Survey in a series of ports published in the 1990s (Swanson et al., 1993, McCarthy and Anderson, 1990). As indicated by the proposed well struction, the applicant's well will produce from the shallow Unconsolidated Sedimentary aquifer (US) and the Troutday
The sam	e findings of this review are based on the assumption that the extracted groundwater will be re-injected into the ne aquifer. The permit should contain a condition that requires any extracted groundwater be re-injected into the same aquifer. The hydrogeologic units of the Portland Basin have been defined and described by the U.S. Geological Survey in a series of orts published in the 1990s (Swanson et al., 1993, McCarthy and Anderson, 1990). As indicated by the proposed well struction, the applicant's well will produce from the shallow Unconsolidated Sedimentary aquifer (US) and the Troutdal vel aquifer (TG). Locally the US is approximately 80 feet thick and the TG is about 120 feet thick. The applicant's well be open to the entire thickness of the US and the upper 40 feet of the TG. Most of the production in the well will bably come from the US. Wells tapping this aquifer are typically capable of pumping several hundreds to several
The sam The report consideration of the will probability thou	e findings of this review are based on the assumption that the extracted groundwater will be re-injected into the ne aquifer. The permit should contain a condition that requires any extracted groundwater be re-injected into the same aquifer. The hydrogeologic units of the Portland Basin have been defined and described by the U.S. Geological Survey in a series of orts published in the 1990s (Swanson et al., 1993, McCarthy and Anderson, 1990). As indicated by the proposed well struction, the applicant's well will produce from the shallow Unconsolidated Sedimentary aquifer (US) and the Troutdal vel aquifer (TG). Locally the US is approximately 80 feet thick and the TG is about 120 feet thick. The applicant's well be open to the entire thickness of the US and the upper 40 feet of the TG. Most of the production in the well will bably come from the US. Wells tapping this aquifer are typically capable of pumping several hundreds to several usands of gallons per minute with a relatively small amount of drawdown. This is probably due to the efficient hydraulic
The sam The report consideration of the will probability thou	e findings of this review are based on the assumption that the extracted groundwater will be re-injected into the ne aquifer. The permit should contain a condition that requires any extracted groundwater be re-injected into the same aquifer. The hydrogeologic units of the Portland Basin have been defined and described by the U.S. Geological Survey in a series of orts published in the 1990s (Swanson et al., 1993, McCarthy and Anderson, 1990). As indicated by the proposed well struction, the applicant's well will produce from the shallow Unconsolidated Sedimentary aquifer (US) and the Troutdal vel aquifer (TG). Locally the US is approximately 80 feet thick and the TG is about 120 feet thick. The applicant's well be open to the entire thickness of the US and the upper 40 feet of the TG. Most of the production in the well will bably come from the US. Wells tapping this aquifer are typically capable of pumping several hundreds to several
The sam The report consideration of the will probability thou	e findings of this review are based on the assumption that the extracted groundwater will be re-injected into the ne aquifer. The permit should contain a condition that requires any extracted groundwater be re-injected into the same aquifer. The hydrogeologic units of the Portland Basin have been defined and described by the U.S. Geological Survey in a series of orts published in the 1990s (Swanson et al., 1993, McCarthy and Anderson, 1990). As indicated by the proposed well struction, the applicant's well will produce from the shallow Unconsolidated Sedimentary aquifer (US) and the Troutdal vel aquifer (TG). Locally the US is approximately 80 feet thick and the TG is about 120 feet thick. The applicant's well be open to the entire thickness of the US and the upper 40 feet of the TG. Most of the production in the well will bably come from the US. Wells tapping this aquifer are typically capable of pumping several hundreds to several usands of gallons per minute with a relatively small amount of drawdown. This is probably due to the efficient hydraulic
The sam The report consideration of the report will probability thou	e findings of this review are based on the assumption that the extracted groundwater will be re-injected into the ne aquifer. The permit should contain a condition that requires any extracted groundwater be re-injected into the same aquifer. The hydrogeologic units of the Portland Basin have been defined and described by the U.S. Geological Survey in a series of corts published in the 1990s (Swanson et al., 1993, McCarthy and Anderson, 1990). As indicated by the proposed well struction, the applicant's well will produce from the shallow Unconsolidated Sedimentary aquifer (US) and the Troutdale vel aquifer (TG). Locally the US is approximately 80 feet thick and the TG is about 120 feet thick. The applicant's well be open to the entire thickness of the US and the upper 40 feet of the TG. Most of the production in the well will bably come from the US. Wells tapping this aquifer are typically capable of pumping several hundreds to several usands of gallons per minute with a relatively small amount of drawdown. This is probably due to the efficient hydraulic

Application: <u>G-17454</u> continued

Date: June 14, 2011

2

# #	Columbia Slough Columbia River	GW Elev ft msl 10 10	SW Elev ft msl 10 5	Distance (ft) 120 2100	Hydrau Conne YES NO	ected?	Potentia Subst. Int Assum YES	terf
Basis for aquifer hydrau surface water sources, surto be hydraulically conne	Columbia River							
Basis for aquifer hydrau surface water sources, surto be hydraulically conne	Columbia River			2100				
Basis for aquifer hydrau surface water sources, sur to be hydraulically conne								
surface water sources, surto be hydraulically conne						_= +		_
surface water sources, surto be hydraulically conne							一一	_
surface water sources, surto be hydraulically conne							一	_
surface water sources, surto be hydraulically conne								
surface water sources, surto be hydraulically conne					一	T I	Ī	_
surface water sources, surto be hydraulically conne		1					_	_
Water Availability Basis 690-09-040 (4): Evaluat connected and less than that are pertinent to that s Compare the requested ra distributed by well, use for	ion of stream impacts f 1 mile from a surface surface water source, ar ate against the 1% of 80	For <u>each well</u> water source and not lower 19% of the source 19% o	that has be . Limit eva SW source ow for the	en determine luation to ins s to which th pertinent Wa	ed or assumed tream rights e stream und tter Availabil	d to be hydrau and minimum ler evaluation i lity Basin (WA	ulically stream flo is tributary AB). If Q	y. is 1
PSI.								
Well SW Well < 1/4 mile?	Qw > Instream Water 5 cfs? Right ID	Instream Water Right Q	Qw > 1% ISWR?	80% Natural Flow	Qw > 1% of 80% Natural	Interference @ 30 days (%)	Poter for Su Inter Assur	ubs fer
1 1 🗵		(cfs)		(cfs) 267,000	Flow?	0*	Assui	1
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	+			267,000	$+$ \dashv	0*	 	╁
	 		<u> </u>	207,000	 	•	+++	╁
					$+$ \dashv		+ +	╬
	 		<u> </u>		$+$ \dashv		+	┿
	 		- -		+ $+$	-	 	╬
	 		<u> </u>		+ $+$	-	+	╀
	 		- -		\vdash		 	
								<u>_</u>

Date: June 14, 2011

Confined

3

Unconfined

Application: <u>G-17454</u> continued

Well

2

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

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

Aquifer or Proposed Aquifer

alluvium

alluvium

Application: G-17454 continued Date: June 14, 2011	

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.

	 	1 3						
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?

*Modeling in similar circumstances suggests that due to the proximity of the well to Columbia Slough and high aquifer hydraulic conductivity (500-1000 ft/d), impacts will be >25% of the pumping rate after 30 days of pumping. Impacts to the Columbia River will also be > 25% of the pumping rate due to the large (>2000 feet) width of the river. However, because the extracted water will be re-injected into the same aquifer, there will be zero net impact due to pumping, so **PSI is not assumed.**

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												
	uted Wells	_					_			_	_		
Well	SW#	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
	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 Q	as CFS												
	ence CFS												
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Well O	as CFS												
-	ence CFS												
$(\mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{T}\mathbf{c}$	otal Interf.												
(B) = 80	% Nat. Q												
(C) = 1	% Nat. Q												
					,	,	,			, 1	,		,
$(\mathbf{D}) = (A$		√ 21	√ •	√ 0./	√ •	√ 	√ 	√ 	√ 21	√ •	√	√ 	√
$(\mathbf{E}) = (\mathbf{A}$	(A / B) x 100	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%

Version: 08/15/2003

application: <u>G-17454</u>	continued	Date: <u>June 14, 2011</u>
(FS; (D) = highlight the check)		at 80% exceed. as CFS; (C) = 1% of calculated natural flow at 80% exceed. as eater than (C); (E) = total interference divided by 80% flow as percentage.
690-09-040 (5) (b) Rights Section.	The potential to impair or detr	imentally affect the public interest is to be determined by the Wate
under this permit ca	n be regulated if it is found to sub	can be adequately protected from interference, and/or ground water use estantially interfere with surface water: ion(s) as indicated in "Remarks" below;
п. 🗀 тие рег	mit should contain special conditi	ion(s) as indicated in Remarks below,
6. SW / GW Remarks and	d Conditions:	
-		
References Used:		
		lkinson, J.M., 1993, A description of hydrogeologic units in the Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 90-4196, 56 p.
McCarthy, K.A., and Ar Survey Open-File Report		er data for the Portland Basin, Oregon and Washington: U.S. Geologica
	Morgan, D.S., 1996, A description ogical Survey Water-Supply Paper	of the ground-water flow system in the Portland Basin, Oregon and r 2470-A, 58 p.

D1.	Well #:	Logid:
D2.	a.	TELL does not meet current well construction standards based upon: review of the well log; field inspection by report of CWRE other: (specify)
D3.	a.	ZELL construction deficiency: constitutes a health threat under Division 200 rules; commingles water from more than one ground water reservoir; permits the loss of artesian head; permits the de-watering of one or more ground water reservoirs; other: (specify)
D4.	THE W	/ELL construction deficiency is described as follows:
D5.	THE W	 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. [to the Enforcement Section. I recommend withholding issuance of the permit until evidence of well reconstruction with the Department and approved by the Enforcement Section and the Ground Water Section.
THIS	SECTIO	ON TO BE COMPLETED BY ENFORCEMENT PERSONNEL
	_	
D7.	Well co	nstruction deficiency has been corrected by the following actions:
	-	
		, 200
		(Enforcement Section Signature)

Application: <u>G-17454</u> continued

Date: June 14, 2011

6

Well Location Map

