Water Right Conditions Tracking Slip	
Groundwater/Hydrology Section FILE # #G-17792 ROUTED TO: Water Rights - Kim TOWNSHIP/ RANGE-SECTION: <u>85/40E-24</u> CONDITIONS ATTACHED?: Myes[] no REMARKS OR FURTHER INSTRUCTIONS:	
Reviewer: Mike Zwart	

• 1

.

#### WATER RESOURCES DEPARTMENT

MEMO

March 27, 20 14

**TO:** Application G-<u>17792</u>

GW: Mike Zwart (Reviewer's Name) FROM:

### **SUBJECT: Scenic Waterway Interference Evaluation**

- YES
   The source of appropriation is within or above a Scenic Waterway
   NO
- YES
   Use the Scenic Waterway condition (Condition 7J)
   NO
- Per ORS 390.835, the Groundwater Section is **able** to calculate ground water interference with surface water that contributes to a Scenic Waterway. The calculated interference is distributed below.
- Per ORS 390.835, the Groundwater Section is **unable** to calculate ground water interference with surface water that contributes to a scenic waterway; **therefore**, **the Department is unable to find that there is a preponderance of evidence that the proposed use will measurably reduce the surface water flows necessary to maintain the free-flowing character of a scenic waterway**.

#### DISTRIBUTION OF INTERFERENCE

Calculate the percentage of consumptive use by month and fill in the table below. If interference cannot be calculated, per criteria in 390.835, do not fill in the table but check the "unable" option above, thus informing Water Rights that the Department is unable to make a Preponderance of Evidence finding.

Exercise of this permit is calculated to reduce monthly flows in \_\_\_\_\_\_ Scenic Waterway by the following amounts expressed as a proportion of the consumptive use by which surface water flow is reduced.

Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec

# PUBLIC INTEREST REVIEW FOR GROUNDWATER APPLICATIONS

.

TO:		Water Rights Section Date March 27, 2014								·			
FROM	И:	Grou	Indwater S	ection		Mike	Zwart						
							ewer's Name	review of					
SUBJ	ECI	App	lication G-	17/92		Suj	perseues				Date of Re	view(s)	
OAR welfar to dete	<b>690-310-1</b> e, safety a ermine who	<b>30</b> (1) <i>nd hea</i> ether th	The Depart lth as descr	<i>ibed in ORS</i> ion is establ	resume that 537.525. D ished. OAR	a propose epartment 690-310-	ed ground staff revie 140 allows	water use will e ew ground wate s the proposed nd agency poli	er applica use be m	ations u odified	under OA l or condi	R 690-3 tioned to	10-140 meet
A. <u>GI</u>	ENERAL	, INFO	ORMATI	<u>ON</u> : A	pplicant's N	lame:	Bert Side	doway		(	County:	Baker	
A1.													
A2. A3.	3. Well and aquifer data (attach and number logs for existing wells; mark proposed wells as such under logid):												
Well	Logi	d	Applicant Well #	's Propos	ed Aquifer*	Prop Rate		Location (T/R-S QQ-			tion, mete ' N. 1200'		
1	BAKE 5	2333	1	H	Basalt	5.2	44	8S/40E-24 NV	V-NE	2250' N, 1200' E fr NW cor S 3 44.86034 N, -117.75472 W			72 W
2	Propos	sed	2	I	Basalt	5.2	44	8S/40E-24 NV	V-NE	44	.86130 N,	-117.755	10 W
4													
5												, m	
* Alluv	ium, CRB,	Bedroo	ck –										
Well	Well Elev ft msl 3358 3358	First Wate ft bls 94	r SWL	SWL Date 2/17/2014	Well Depth (ft) 500* 500	Seal Interval (ft) 0-18 0-18	Casing Intervals (ft) 0-500 0-500	Liner Intervals (ft) None None	Perfora Or Scr (ft) 95-5 95-5	eens ) 00	Well Yield (gpm)	Draw Down (ft)	Test Type
			_										
Use da			For proposed		ntly 225 fee	t deep, bi	ut is propo	osed to be cons	structed	as abo	ve.		
A5. 🕅	A5. A5. Provisions of the <u>Powder</u> Basin rules relative to the development, classification and/or management of ground water hydraulically connected to surface water are, or 44.86034 N, -117.75472 W are not, activated by this application. (Not all basin rules contain such provisions.)												
A6. [	Name o	of admi	nistrative a	rea:				tap(s) an aquife					striction.

Page

## 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.  $\square$  will, if properly conditioned, avoid injury to existing ground water rights or to the ground water resource:
    - i. The permit should contain condition #(s) <u>7N</u>
    - ii.  $\Box$  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: <u>There are no current observation wells nearby that penetrate the same</u> aquifer as the wells here.

Version: 07/26/2013

#### 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
1,2	Fractured basalt (Tb)		

Basis for aquifer confinement evaluation: <u>Basalt aquifers are typically confined.</u>

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 <sup>1</sup>/<sub>4</sub> 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			Potentia Subst. In Assum YES	terfer. ed? NO
1	1	Baldock Slough	3349±	3345	6500		$\boxtimes$			$\boxtimes$
2	1	Baldock Slough	3349±	3345	6300		$\boxtimes$			$\boxtimes$

Basis for aquifer hydraulic connection evaluation: <u>A relatively nearby applicant, with assistance from DOGAMI</u> <u>Regional Geologist Jason McClaughry, provided a report which suggests that hydraulic connection is poor</u> <u>between the local bedrock aquifer and the nearby reach of Baldock Slough. I concur with that conclusion at</u> this location as well.

Water Availability Basin the well(s) are located within: <u>Baldock Sl > Powder R at mouth (30920330).</u>

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?
•										

Version: 07/26/2013

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.

		m 054 400 (						
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: 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-D	istributed	Wells		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·									
Well	SW#	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Well Q	) as CFS												
Interfer	ence CFS												
Distal	uted Well				Carl and the		99 - 1999 - 1992 - 198 199		The Station State	14 205 Page 33	ALC: NOT SALL		San Star
Well	SW#	s Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Well C	as CFS											~~	
	ence CFS												
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Well Q	as CFS												
Interfer	ence CFS												
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	• %	%	%	%
Well Q	as CFS												
Interfer	ence CFS												
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Well Q	Q as CFS												
Interfer	ence CFS												
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
	Q as CFS												
Interfer	ence CFS												
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
the second s	Q as CFS												
Interfer	ence CFS			1964 - 1964 - 1974 - 1975 - 1976			Pacasar State		State of the State of the State	200000 (Barrison - 197			
$(\mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{T}_{0}$	otal Interf.			100 No. 100			1992-1073872238210						
	% Nat. Q												
	% Nat. Q												
				WARDA COLD	No. Contractor			No No SA	104-1004-1044D		Barlie In	1988 - Store	
	$(\mathbf{A}) > (\mathbf{C})$	1	1	~	1	1	V.	×	V	<ul> <li>✓</li> </ul>	4	4	1
$(\mathbf{E}) = (\mathbf{A}$	/ B) x 100	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%

Version: 07/26/2013

,

<b>Basis for</b>		or each month where (A)	is greater than (C); (	(E) = total interference		ow as percentage.
	940 (5) (b) The p s Section.	ootential to impair or	detrimentally affe	ct the public inte	rest is to be deter	mined by the W
under thi	is permit can be rep The permit sho	he surface water source gulated if it is found to build contain condition	b substantially inter #(s)	fere with surface v	vater:	or ground water
ii.	The permit sho	ould contain special co	ondition(s) as indica	ted in "Remarks"	below;	
SW / GW R	emarks and Cond	litions				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
<u></u>		an a				
<u></u>		and the second		NAT		
		······				
		the Oregon Part of t				
	Water Resources	of Baker Valley, Ba				
<u>#6. Ground</u>					wall loog and any	lightian maniary
<u>#6. Ground</u>	y, Baker County,	Oregon, by Lystrom.	Nees and Hampto	on, 1967. Inearby	well logs and app	lication reviews

Page

à

# D. WELL CONSTRUCTION, OAR 690-200

D1.	Well #:	Logid:	
D2.	a. review of the b. field inspectio c. report of CWF	appear to meet current well construction standards base well log; n by	;
D3.	THE WELL construc	tion deficiency or other comment is described as follows	:
D4. [	<b>Route to the Well Co</b>	nstruction and Compliance Section for a review of existi	ng well construction.

# Water Availability Tables

