### PUBLIC INTEREST REVIEW FOR GROUNDWATER APPLICATIONS

101		Water	Rights Se	ction				Dat	e <u>Februa</u>	ry 10, 20	14	- 2
FROM	1:	Grour	ndwater Se	ction		Marc	Norton			1.2.2	-	-
					1.1	Revi	ewer's Name					
SUBJ	ECT:	Appli	cation G	17738		Su	persedes re	eview of				
						-				Date of Re	eview(s)	
PUBL DAR 6 welfare to deter the pre	<b><u>SPO-310-1</u></b> <b>590-310-1</b> <i>e, safety a</i> rmine who sumption	EREST 30 (1) 7 nd healt ether the criteria.	PRESUN The Departm th as describ presumption This revien RMATIO	APTION ment shall p bed in ORS on is estab w is based N: A	; GROUN presume that S 537.525. E lished. OAR l upon avail	DWATE at a propose Department 690-310- lable infor Name:	<u>R</u> ed groundw t staff review 140 allows rmation and Madison R	ater use will w ground wat the proposed d agency poli Canches – Jac	ensure the pres er applications use be modific icies in place a	servation of under OA ed or cond at the time County:	of the pub AR 690-3 itioned to e of evalu Umatill	olic 10-140 o meet nation
A1.	Applica	unt(s) see	ek(s) <u>22.3</u>	cfs fro	om <u>7</u>	well(	(s) in the asin Qu	Morrow (W	Vells & Land)	& Umatill	a (Land)	_ Basi
A2. A3.	Propose Well an	ed use <u>I</u> d aquife	rrigation [8 er data ( <b>atta</b>	461acs (P) ch and nu	& 787.6acs	<u>s (S)]</u> for existin	Se g wells; ma	asonality: ark proposed	wells as such	<u>rear -roun</u> under lo	d gid):	U <sup>T</sup>
Well	Logic	i i	Applicant's Well #	Propo	sed Aquifer*	ifer* Proposed Lo Rate(cfs) (T/R-		Location (T/R-S OO	-(1) Loc $225$	ation, mete	es and bou	nds, e.g
1	Propos	ed	1	San	d & Gravel	22.3		04N/25E-01 S	ESW 1	30' N 1330	Efr SW	cor S 1
2	Propos	ed	2	San	d & Gravel	22	3	04N/25E-01 S	W SE	20' N 2500	EfrSWc	or S 1
3	Propos	ed	3	San	d & Gravel	22	.3	04N/25E-01 N	W SE 1	500' N. 2660	)' E fr SW o	or S 1
4	Propos	ed	4	San	d & Gravel	22	.3	04N/25E-01 S	W NE 2	878' N. 3120	)' E fr SW o	or S 1
5	Propos	ed	5	San	d & Gravel	22	.3	04N/25E-12 N	W NE 7	40' S. 1860'	W fr NE co	or S 12
	Propos	ed	6	San	d & Gravel	22	.3	04N/25E-12 N	W NE I	50' S. 1780'	W fr NE co	or S 12
6		ed	7	San	d & Gravel	22	.3	04N/25E-01 N	IE SE 2	500' N, 100	'W fr SE c	or S 1
6 7	Propos			1.12	1.1		1	2.1				
6 7 Alluvi	Propose ium, CRB,	Bedrock			1 1	0.1	Casing	Liner	Perforations	Well	Draw	
6 7 Alluvi	Propose ium, CRB, Well	Bedrock			Well	Seal		A ALLEY &		TT OIL	Down	Test
6 7 Alluvi Well	Propose ium, CRB, Well Elev	Bedrock First Water	SWL	SWL	Well	Seal	Intervals	Intervals	Or Screens	Yield	L'DOWII	Туре
6 7 Alluvi Well	Propose ium, CRB, Well Elev ft msl	Bedrock First Water ft bls	SWL ft bls	SWL Date	Well Depth (ft)	Seal Interval (ft)	Intervals (ft)	Intervals (ft)	Or Screens	Yield (gnm)	(ft)	
6 7 Alluvi Well	Propose ium, CRB, Well Elev ft msl 321	Bedrock First Water ft bls	SWL ft bls	SWL Date	Well Depth (ft) 80	Seal Interval (ft) 0 - 18	Intervals (ft) 0-40	Intervals (ft)	Or Screens (ft) 40 - 80	Yield (gpm)	(ft)	
6 7 Alluvi Well 1 2	Propose ium, CRB, Well Elev ft msl 321 319	Bedrock First Water ft bls	SWL ft bls	SWL Date	Well Depth (ft) 80 80	Seal Interval (ft) 0-18 0-18	$ \begin{array}{r} \text{Intervals}\\ (ft)\\ 0-40\\ 0-40 \end{array} $	Intervals (ft)	Or Screens (ft) 40 - 80 40 - 80	Yield (gpm)	(ft)	
6 7 Alluvi Well 1 2 3	Proposs ium, CRB, Well Elev ft msl 321 319 321	Bedrock First Water ft bls	SWL ft bls	SWL Date	Well           Depth           (ft)           80           80           80	Seal Interval (ft) 0-18 0-18 0-18	$\begin{array}{c} \text{Intervals} \\ \text{(ft)} \\ \hline 0 - 40 \\ \hline 0 - 40 \\ \hline 0 - 40 \end{array}$	Intervals (ft)	Or Screens (ft) 40 - 80 40 - 80 40 - 80	Yield (gpm)	(ft)	
6 7 Alluvi Well 1 2 3 4	Propose ium, CRB, Well Elev ft msl 321 319 321 315	Bedrock First Water ft bls	SWL ft bls	SWL Date	Well           Depth           (ft)           80           80           80           80           80	Seal Interval (ft) 0-18 0-18 0-18 0-18	$ \begin{array}{c} \text{Intervals} \\ \text{(ft)} \\ 0 - 40 \\ 0 - 40 \\ 0 - 40 \\ 0 - 40 \\ 0 - 40 \end{array} $	Intervals (ft)	Or Screens (ft) 40 - 80 40 - 80 40 - 80 40 - 80	Yield (gpm)	(ft)	
6 7 Alluvi Well 1 2 3 4 5	Propose ium, CRB, Well Elev ft msl 321 319 321 315 325	Bedrock First Water ft bls	SWL ft bls	SWL Date	Well           Depth           (ft)           80           80           80           80           80           80           80	Seal Interval (ft) 0-18 0-18 0-18 0-18 0-18	$\begin{array}{c} \text{Intervals} \\ \text{(ft)} \\ \hline 0 - 40 \\ \hline \end{array}$	Intervals (ft)	Or Screens (ft) 40 - 80 40 - 80 40 - 80 40 - 80 40 - 80	Yield (gpm)	(ft)	
6 7 Alluvi Well 1 2 3 4 5 6	Propose ium, CRB, Well Elev ft msl 321 319 321 315 325 325 325	Bedrock First Water ft bls	SWL ft bls	SWL Date	Well           Depth           (ft)           80           80           80           80           80           80           80           80           80           80	Seal Interval (ft) 0-18 0-18 0-18 0-18 0-18 0-18 0-18	$ \begin{array}{c} \text{Intervals} \\ \text{(ft)} \\ 0 - 40 \\ 0 - 40 \\ 0 - 40 \\ 0 - 40 \\ 0 - 40 \\ 0 - 40 \\ \end{array} $	Intervals (ft)	Or Screens (ft) 40 - 80 40 - 80 40 - 80 40 - 80 40 - 80 40 - 80	Yield (gpm)	(ft)	
6 7 Alluvi Well 1 2 3 4 5 6 7	Propose ium, CRB, Well Elev ft msl 321 319 321 315 325 325 325 331	Bedrock First Water ft bls	SWL ft bls	SWL Date	Well           Depth           (ft)           80           80           80           80           80           80           80           80           80           80           80           80           80           80	Seal Interval (ft) 0-18 0-18 0-18 0-18 0-18 0-18 0-18	$\begin{array}{c} \text{Litervals} \\ \text{(ft)} \\ 0 - 40 \\ 0 - 40 \\ 0 - 40 \\ 0 - 40 \\ 0 - 40 \\ 0 - 40 \\ 0 - 40 \\ 0 - 40 \\ \end{array}$	Intervals (ft)	Or Screens (ft) 40 - 80 40 - 80 40 - 80 40 - 80 40 - 80 40 - 80 40 - 80	Yield (gpm)	(ft)	

#### Requested discharge rate is 10,000 gpm = 22.3 cfs.

A5. **Provisions of the** <u>Umatilla River</u> management of groundwater 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: The wells are located outside of the Ordnance Gravel Critical Groundwater Area.

2

Page

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

- B1. Based upon available data, I have determined that groundwater\* for the proposed use:
  - a. is over appropriated, is not over appropriated, or appropriated to be over appropriated during any period of the proposed use. \* This finding is limited to the groundwater 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 groundwater 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 groundwater rights or to the groundwater resource:
     i. The permit should contain condition #(s) <u>7B Interference, 7P Well Tag, 7T Measuring Tube</u>,
    - Large measuring and reporting with flow meter on each well
    - ii. The permit should be conditioned as indicated in item 2 below.
    - iii. X The permit should contain special condition(s) as indicated in item 3 below;

a. Condition to allow groundwater production from no deeper than \_\_\_\_\_\_ ft. below land surface;

- b. Condition to allow groundwater production from no shallower than \_\_\_\_\_\_ ft. below land surface;
- c. Condition to allow groundwater production only from the groundwater reservoir above the Columbia River Basalts;
- d. Condition to allow production only from a single aquifer in the Columbia River Basalt;
- e. 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**.

B2.

Ground water availability remarks: <u>The proposed wells will develop water from a coarse grained alluvial deposit</u> overlying the Columbia River Basalts. The sands and gravels thin rapidly to the south. Wells 2, 5 and 6 are located about 1000 feet north of the thinning of the alluvial deposit. This will increase drawdowns, reduce yields, and push the cone of depression towards the river. A stream depletion model was run to determine possible impacts to the Columbia River from pumping the wells. The first run was done pumping 10,000 gpm from well 1, the closest well to the river. The second run was done pumping 10,000 gpm from well 7, the well located the farthest from the river. The results are shown on page 7 and 8 of the review.

Special Permit Condition: The permittee shall construct two minimum six-inch diameter observation wells to penetrate the same aquifer as the production wells. The wells shall meet the Department's minimum well construction standards and shall be cased and sealed to the same depth as the production wells. The wells shall be constructed at a location approved by the Department for the purpose of instrumentation with continuous water-level monitoring equipment. The landowner or permittee shall provide access to Department staff to install and maintain the monitoring equipment. The wells shall not be used for any other purpose while the Department is monitoring water levels. The wells shall be completed prior to water use under the terms of any permit issued.

## 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
1-7	Sand and gravels		$\boxtimes$

Basis for aquifer confinement evaluation: <u>Groundwater levels are at the depth where water was encountered in nearby</u> wells.

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 G El ft	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	290	267	5676				
2	1	Columbia River	290	267	7500				
3	1	Columbia River	290	267	6500				
4	1	Columbia River	290	267	6050				
5	1	Columbia River	290	267	8500				
6	1	Columbia River	290	267	8300				
7	1	Columbia River	290	267	7900				
- 0			a a state						
	1		1 2 1	110					

Basis for aquifer hydraulic connection evaluation: All seven well locations are over one mile from the Columbia River.

Water Availability Basin the well(s) are located within: Columbia River

C3a. 690-09-040 (4): Evaluation of stream impacts for <u>each well</u> 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			Saute II						
No.				24						
- and									1	
	N			C. 19						1
	1			Carlos A.						
	200			1- 11					100.01	
							Contraction -			
				The second second						

3

#### Application G-17738

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 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			

Comments: All seven well locations are over one mile from the Columbia River.

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
1. 1.1		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Well Q	as CFS							-					
Interfere	ence CFS					in the second	-			Truly 1			
D' / "													
Well	sw#	Ian	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Iun	Iul	Αυσ	Sen	Oct	Nov	Dec
1	1	Jan 0%	100	0%	mpi Ø	Tridy	0%	0%	0%	- Sep	96	70	96
Well C	as CES	10	N	10	70	10	10	10	10	10	10	10	10
Interfer	ence CES	2.2		-				-					1
2	1	9%	9%	9/0	90	9%	70	%	%	9%	%	%	%
Well C	as CFS	10	~	~	~			-		10			
Interfere	ence CFS	1000						116			18		-
3	1	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	. %	%	%	%	%
Well Q	as CFS	114-											
Interfere	ence CFS	The Is a	12 24 4										
4	1	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Well Q	as CFS	1.2			1. 20.20			5	1 Suthing 1	1			
Interfere	ence CFS	100								- Andrews			
5	1	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Well Q	as CFS	1 -											
Interfere	ence CFS	19.			1.2.20						-	-	
6	1	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Well Q	as CFS				N		1000				-		
Interfere	ence CFS	-							10		Charles 1		
$(\mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{T}_{\mathbf{a}}$	tal Interf												
(R) = 10	% Not O		1						and the second second				
(D) = 80	W N A												
(C) = 1	% Nat. Q	1-11			1	-							1
(D) = (	(A) > (C)	1	1	V.	1	1	V	1	~	V.	-	VC 1	· fair
(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.

Application G-17738

5

Basis for impact evaluation: \_\_\_\_\_\_ Estimated interference with the Columbia River is about 10 to 12 cfs after 120 days of pumping.

C4b.	690-09-040 (5) (b)	The potential to impair or detrimentally affect the public interest is to be determined by the Water	r
	<b>Rights Section.</b>		

- 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>The proposed wells will develop water from a coarse grained alluvial deposit overlying the Columbia River Basalts</u>. The sands and gravels thin rapidly to the south. Wells 2, 5 and 6 are located about 1000 feet north of the thinning of the alluvial deposit. This will increase drawdowns, reduce yields, and push the cone of depression towards the river. A stream depletion model was run to determine possible impacts to the Columbia River from pumping the wells. The first run was done pumping 10,000 gpm from well 1, the closest well to the river. The second run was done pumping 10,000 gpm from the river. The results are shown on page 7 and 8 of the review. The estimated interference is about 10 to 12 cfs after 120 days of pumping.

References Used: OWRD Stream Depletion Model, Wozniak, 2008 (after Jenkins, 1970 and Hunt, 1999)

6

# D. WELL CONSTRUCTION, OAR 690-200

2.	THE WELL does not appear to m	eet current well construction standards based upon:	
66	a. review of the well log;		
	b. if field inspection by		1111
	d. d other: (specify)		



# Transient Stream Depletion (Jenkins, 1970; Hunt, 1999)

Output for Hunt Stream Depletion, Secondia 9 (c2). Time nump on 100 down

Output for H	unit Strea	in Deple	tion, see	nerio z (a	52):	Time p	ump on =	= 120 day	5			1000
Days	30	60	90	120	150	180	210	240	270	300	330	360
	22.28	22.28	22.28	22.28	22.28	22.28	22.28	22.28	22.28	22.28	22.28	22.28
Qw, cfs	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Jenk SD %	0.275	0.440	0.528	0.585	0.351	0.216	0.151	0.114	0.091	0.074	0.062	0.053
	132-11	State of the	11.77	13.03	1 17121-1-5	A Section	1. 1. 1.	1 18 3	- 1	NE SELLY		
Jen SD cfs	6.120	9.801	0	4	7.810	4.807	3.374	2.549	2.018	1.652	1.386	1.185
	#NUM	#NUM	#NUM	#NUM	#NUM	#NUM	#NUM	#NUM	#NUM	#NUM	#NUM	#NUM
Hunt SD %	1	1		1	1	1 1 -	1	1	1	1-	1	1
	#NUM	#NUM	#NUM	#NUM	#NUM	#NUM	#NUM	#NUM	#NUM	#NUM	#NUM	#NUM
Hunt SD cfs	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	. !	1.1	1	1	1

Parameters:		Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Units
Net steady pumping rate	Qw	10000	10000	10000	gpm
Distance to stream	a	5676	5676	5676	ft
Aquifer hydraulic conductivity	K	1000	1500	2000	ft/day
Aquifer thickness	b	60	60	60	ft
Aquifer transmissivity	Т	60000	90000	120000	ft*ft/day
Aquifer storage coefficient	S	0.2	0.2	0.2	
Stream width	ws	1000	1000	1000	ft
Streambed hydraulic conductivity	Ks	0.25	100	100	ft/day
Streambed thickness	bs	1	1	1	ft
Streambed conductance	sbc	250	100000	100000	ft/day
Stream depletion factor (Jenkins)	sdf	107.38992	71.59328	53.69496	days
Streambed factor (Hunt)	sbf	23.65	6306.666667	4730	

7



8



# Transient Stream Depletion (Jenkins, 1970; Hunt, 1999)

#### Output for Hunt Stream Depletion, Scenerio 2 (s2): Time pump on = 120 days

output tet ti		in Depie							-			
Days	30	60	90	120	150	180	210	240	270	300	330	360
1	22.28	22.28	22.28	22.28	22.28	22.28	22.28	22.28	22.28	22.28	22.28	22.28
Qw, cfs	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2
Jenk SD %	0.128	0.282	0.380	0.447	0.368	0.252	0.185	0.144	0.116	0.096	0.081	0.070
Jen SD cfs	2.861	6.291	8.468	9.963	8.203	5.625	4.133	3.203	2.579	2.136	1.808	1.556
Hunt SD %	#NUM	#NUM	#NUM	#NUM	#NUM	#NUM	#NUM	#NUM	#NUM	#NUM	#NUM !	#NUM
Hunt SD cfs	#NUM !	#NUM !	#NUM !	#NUM	#NUM !	#NUM !	#NUM	#NUM !	#NUM !	#NUM !	#NUM !	#NUM !

Parameters:		Scenario 1	Scenario 2	Scenario 3	Units
Net steady pumping rate	Qw	10000	10000	10000	gpm
Distance to stream	a	7900	7900	7900	ft
Aquifer hydraulic conductivity	К	1000	1500	2000	ft/day
Aquifer thickness	b	60	60	60	ft
Aquifer transmissivity	T	60000	90000	120000	ft*ft/day
Aquifer storage coefficient	S	0.2	0.2	0.2	
Stream width	WS	1000	1000	1000	ft
Streambed hydraulic conductivity	Ks	0.25	100	100	ft/day
Streambed thickness	bs	1	1	1	ft
Streambed conductance	sbc	250	100000	100000	ft/day
Stream depletion factor (Jenkins)	sdf	208.0333333	138.6888889	104.0166667	days
Streambed factor (Hunt)	sbf	32.91666667	8777.77778	6583.333333	