Water Right Conditions Tracking Slip Groundwater/Hydrology Section FILE ## G-16257 ROUTED TO: Water Rights TOWNSHIP/ RANGE-SECTION: 235 32E-18 CONDITIONS ATTACHED? []yes [/ no **INSTRUCTIONS:** REMARKS OR FURTHER Reviewer: Michael Zunt

-

<u>PUBI</u>	LIC IN	ΓERE	<u>ST REV</u>	IEW FOI	R GROU	ND W	AT]	ER API	PLICATI	ONS	5			
TO:		Wate	r Rights S	ection					Dat	e	August	<u>18 , 200</u> 4	4	
FROM	[:	Grou	nd Water/	Hydrology	Section _	Mic	hael	Zwart						
SUBJI	ECT:	Appl	ication G-	16257		Re	uper	r's Name sedes re	view of		N/A	Date of Re	view(s)	
PUBL OAR 6 welfare to deter the pres	IC INT 90-310-1 s, safety au rmine whe sumption NERAL	ERES' 30 (1) ( <i>nd heal</i> ether th criteria	<u>F PRESU</u> The Depart th as descr e presumpt . This revie DRMATI(	MPTION ment shall p ibed in ORS ion is establ ew is based ON: A	GROUN presume than 537.525. ished. OAI upon avail upon icant's	DWAT at a propo Departme R 690-310 ilable inf Name:	ER osed ont sta )-140 orma Ste	groundwa aff review ) allows th ation and eve Rick	ater use will y ground wat he proposed agency pol	<i>ensui</i> er apj use b <b>icies</b> i	the press plications of modified in place at Co	ervation under OA or condi t <b>the time</b> ounty: <b>H</b>	of the pul R 690-31 tioned to of evalu	blic 10-140 meet 1 <b>ation</b> .
A1	Applica	nt(s) se	ek(s) 4.0	cfs fro	m three	e we	11(s)	in the	Malheur I	ake				Basin
	]	Poison	Creek Slo	010 H 0	<u></u>	<u>sut</u>	basi	n Ou	ad Map: P	oison	Creek Sl	ough		_ Dusin,
A2. A3.	Propose Well an	ed use:	Irr er data (att	igation, 333 tach and nu	3.0 ac (P) Imber logs	Se for exist	ason: ing v	ality: vells; ma	<u>March 31</u> rk proposed	<u>to O</u> l well	ctober 31 s as such	under log	gid):	
Well	Logi	id	Applicant Well #	t's Pr A	oposed auifer*	Propo Rate(	osed cfs)	(T	Location /R-S OO-O)		Location 2250' N	n, metes N, 1200' E	and boun fr NW co	ds, e.g. r S 36
1	HARN	50927	1	Al	luvium	4.	)	235/3	2E-18 NW-	NE	3520'	E, 50' S f	r NW cor	S 18
2	HARN	573	2	Al	luvium	4.0	)	238/32	2E-18 NW-N	W	300' E	E, 410' S f	r NW cor	S 18
3	Propo	sed	3		luvium	4.0	)	238/3	<u>2E-18 NE-N</u>	W	2420' 1	E, 410' S I	r NW coi	· S 18
5									÷					
* Alluvi	um, CRB,	Bedroc	k					<u>.</u>						
Well	Well Elev ft msl	First Wate ft bls	r SWL ft bls	SWL Date	Well Depth (ft)	Seal Interval (ft)	I	Casing ntervals (ft)	Liner Intervals (ft)	Per Or	forations Screens (ft)	Well Yield (gpm)	Draw Down (ft)	Test Type
1	4134	28	15	2/13/04	246	0-20	0	-31	0-60 146-159	60- 159	120 -245	100	0	В
2	4139	?	20	2/26/63	170±	?*	0	-160	?	Nor	ne	1000	?	
3	4137		-		4-500	0-200	0	-200+						
<u> </u>			_				_							
Use data	from app	lication	for proposed	d wells.										J
A4. (HARM are gra	Comme 572). S vel pack	ents: <u>W</u> ee atta ed. *T	<u>'ell #1 has</u> ched trans he seal wa	<u>been deepe</u> fer review s not descri	ned (HAR memo (T-9 bed on eit	N 50934) 9692) for her well	and addi og, t	repaired tional wo out is rep	d (HARN 51 ell construct orted to hav	<u>(023).</u> tion in ve bee	Well #2   nformatio en put in j	nas also ł n. Both place prie	oeen repa existing or to 199	<u>tired</u> wells 4.
A5. 🛛	Provisi manage (Not all Comme	ions of ment of basin r nts:	the <u>Malhe</u> f ground wa rules contai	<b>ur Lake</b> ater hydrauli n such prov	ically conn isions.)	ected to s	urfac	Basin ru e water	iles relative t	o the <b>are</b>	developm not, activ	ent, class ated by th	ification is applic	and/or ation.

\_ , \_\_\_\_\_ , \_\_\_\_

\_ , \_

A6. Well(s) # \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_, Name of administrative area: \_\_\_\_\_ Comments:

app no. G 16257

\_, tap(s) an aquifer limited by an administrative restriction.

,

B. <u>GF</u>	ROUI	ND WATER AVAILABILITY CONSIDERATIONS, OAR 690-310-130, 400-010, 410-0070
<b>B</b> 1.	Bas	ared 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.	<ul> <li>will, if properly conditioned, avoid injury to existing ground water rights or to the ground water resource:</li> <li>i. The permit should contain condition #(s);</li> <li>ii. The permit should be conditioned as indicated in item 2 below.</li> <li>iii. The permit should contain special condition(s) as indicated in item 3 below;</li> </ul>
B2.	a.	Condition to allow ground water production from no deeper than ft. below land surface;
	b.	<b>Condition</b> 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):
33.	Gra <u>bet</u> <u>ade</u> 	ound water availability remarks: <u>I am somewhat concerned about the potential for pumping interference</u> ween these wells and the nearby well reviewed under file G-16003. Standard permit condition 7B is likely iguate to address this issue. Based on SOW #169, water levels appear reasonably stable.

## 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	Valley-fill seds. and underlying pumice/tuffaceous seds.	$\boxtimes$	
2	Valley-fill seds. and/or underlying pumice/tuffaceous seds.	$\boxtimes$	
3	Pumice, pos. silicic ash-flow tuff underlying lacustrine seds.	$\boxtimes$	

Basis for aquifer confinement evaluation: <u>SWL is generally above the targeted water-bearing zone in the area. Well</u> #1 describes nearly 40 feet of clay. Well #2 is cased to 160 feet, but it is unknown where the well seal is placed.

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 ASSUME	D Potential for Subst. Interfer. Assumed? YES NO
1	1	Poison Creek Slough	4119	4133	4250		
2	1	Poison Creek Slough	4119	4133	4000		
3	1	Poison Creek Slough	4119±	4133	3500		

Basis for aquifer hydraulic connection evaluation: <u>Surface water sources are not developed in tuffaceous deposits</u> <u>targeted by well #3. Also, the head relationship suggests a poor hydraulic connection, at least locally. The SWL appears</u> to be about 14 to 20 feet below most nearby canals and surface water sources. Water Availability Basin the well(s) are located within: <u>Poison Cr. Sl. > Ninemile Sl. at mouth (31200106)</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?

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?

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-Di	istributed	Wells											
Well	SW#	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Well Q a	as CFS												
Interfere	ence CFS												
Distail	uted Well												
Well	SW#	s Ian	Feb	Mar	Anr	May	Iun	յոլ	Δυσ	Sen	Oct	Nov	Dec
wen	5,7,7	5un %	<u> %</u>	Wiai	<u>%</u>	Wildy %	5un %	5ui %	Mug %	<u>%</u>	%	<b>%</b>	<u>%</u>
Well Q a	as CFS												
Interfere	ence CFS												
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Well Q a	as CFS												
Interfere	ence CFS												
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Well Q a	as CFS												
Interfere	ence CFS												
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Well Q a	as CFS												
Interfere	ence CFS												
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Well Q a	as CFS												
Interfere	nce CFS												
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Well Q a	as CFS												
Interfere	nce CFS												
(A) = Tot	tal Interf.												
(B) = 80	% Nat. Q												
(C) = 1 9	% Nat. Q												

 $(\mathbf{D})=\ (\mathbf{A})>(\mathbf{C})$ 

6; (l 1	D) = highlight the checkmark for each month where (A) is greater than (C); (E) = total interference divided by 80% flow as percentage. Basis for impact evaluation: This section does not apply.
-	
-	
-	
-	
-	
-	
-	
	690-09-040 (5) (b) The potential to impair or detrimentally affect the public interest is to be determined by the W Rights Section.
	If properly conditioned, the surface water source(s) can be adequately protected from interference, and/or ground water under this permit can be regulated if it is found to substantially interfere with surface water: i. $\Box$ The permit should contain condition #(s)
	ii. The permit should contain special condition(s) as indicated in "Remarks" below;
	7 / GW Remarks and Conditions <u>The discharge area is likely at a downgradient reach(es) of Poison Creek Slough</u> Nor other surface water sources, and the interference with those sources is also likely to be diffuse. It is not clear the sources is also likely to be more or less "confined" than the sources with more shallow seals. The regional aquifer ultimately discharges to Malheur Lake.
SV and a d oth	/ GW Remarks and Conditions <u>The discharge area is likely at a downgradient reach(es) of Poison Creek Slough</u> <u>l/or other surface water sources, and the interference with those sources is also likely to be diffuse. It is not clear the sep casing and seal, as proposed at Well #3, will result in an aquifer that is likely to be more or less "confined" than er wells with more shallow seals. The regional aquifer ultimately discharges to Malheur Lake.</u>
SW and a d oth	/ GW Remarks and Conditions <u>The discharge area is likely at a downgradient reach(es) of Poison Creek Slough</u> <u>l/or other surface water sources</u> , and the interference with those sources is also likely to be diffuse. It is not clear the <u>eep casing and seal</u> , as proposed at Well #3, will result in an aquifer that is likely to be more or less "confined" than er wells with more shallow seals. The regional aquifer ultimately discharges to Malheur Lake.
SW and a d oth	// GW Remarks and Conditions <u>The discharge area is likely at a downgradient reach(es) of Poison Creek Slough</u> <u>l/or other surface water sources, and the interference with those sources is also likely to be diffuse. It is not clear the eep casing and seal, as proposed at Well #3, will result in an aquifer that is likely to be more or less "confined" than er wells with more shallow seals. The regional aquifer ultimately discharges to Malheur Lake.</u>
SW and a d oth	// GW Remarks and Conditions <u>The discharge area is likely at a downgradient reach(es) of Poison Creek Slough</u> <u>Vor other surface water sources, and the interference with those sources is also likely to be diffuse. It is not clear the eep casing and seal, as proposed at Well #3, will result in an aquifer that is likely to be more or less "confined" than er wells with more shallow seals. The regional aquifer ultimately discharges to Malheur Lake.</u>
SW and a d oth	// GW Remarks and Conditions <u>The discharge area is likely at a downgradient reach(es) of Poison Creek Slough</u> //or other surface water sources, and the interference with those sources is also likely to be diffuse. It is not clear the sep casing and seal, as proposed at Well #3, will result in an aquifer that is likely to be more or less "confined" than er wells with more shallow seals. The regional aquifer ultimately discharges to Malheur Lake.
SW and oth	// GW Remarks and Conditions <u>The discharge area is likely at a downgradient reach(es) of Poison Creek Slough</u> //or other surface water sources, and the interference with those sources is also likely to be diffuse. It is not clear the eep casing and seal, as proposed at Well #3, will result in an aquifer that is likely to be more or less "confined" than er wells with more shallow seals. The regional aquifer ultimately discharges to Malheur Lake.
SW and oth	7/GW Remarks and Conditions <u>The discharge area is likely at a downgradient reach(es) of Poison Creek Slough</u> <u>Vor other surface water sources, and the interference with those sources is also likely to be diffuse. It is not clear the eep casing and seal, as proposed at Well #3, will result in an aquifer that is likely to be more or less "confined" than er wells with more shallow seals. The regional aquifer ultimately discharges to Malheur Lake.</u>
SV and a d oth	// GW Remarks and Conditions <u>The discharge area is likely at a downgradient reach(es) of Poison Creek Slough</u> //or other surface water sources, and the interference with those sources is also likely to be diffuse. It is not clear the eep casing and seal, as proposed at Well #3, will result in an aquifer that is likely to be more or less "confined" than er wells with more shallow seals. The regional aquifer ultimately discharges to Malheur Lake.
SV and oth	// GW Remarks and Conditions <u>The discharge area is likely at a downgradient reach(es) of Poison Creek Slough</u> l/or other surface water sources, and the interference with those sources is also likely to be diffuse. It is not clear the eep casing and seal, as proposed at Well #3, will result in an aquifer that is likely to be more or less "confined" than er wells with more shallow seals. The regional aquifer ultimately discharges to Malheur Lake.
SV and oth	7/ GW Remarks and Conditions <u>The discharge area is likely at a downgradient reach(es) of Poison Creek Slough</u> Vor other surface water sources, and the interference with those sources is also likely to be diffuse. It is not clear the teep casing and seal, as proposed at Well #3, will result in an aquifer that is likely to be more or less "confined" than er wells with more shallow seals. The regional aquifer ultimately discharges to Malheur Lake.
SV and a d oth	7/ GW Remarks and Conditions <u>The discharge area is likely at a downgradient reach(es) of Poison Creek Slough</u> Wor other surface water sources, and the interference with those sources is also likely to be diffuse. It is not clear the teep casing and seal, as proposed at Well #3, will result in an aquifer that is likely to be more or less "confined" than er wells with more shallow seals. The regional aquifer ultimately discharges to Malheur Lake.
SV and a d oth	7/ GW Remarks and Conditions <u>The discharge area is likely at a downgradient reach(es) of Poison Creek Slough</u> Wor other surface water sources, and the interference with those sources is also likely to be diffuse. It is not clear th eep casing and seal, as proposed at Well #3, will result in an aquifer that is likely to be more or less "confined" than er wells with more shallow seals. The regional aquifer ultimately discharges to Malheur Lake.
SV and a d oth	7/ GW Remarks and Conditions <u>The discharge area is likely at a downgradient reach(es) of Poison Creek Slough</u> Vor other surface water sources, and the interference with those sources is also likely to be diffuse. It is not clear th eep casing and seal, as proposed at Well #3, will result in an aquifer that is likely to be more or less "confined" than er wells with more shallow seals. The regional aquifer ultimately discharges to Malheur Lake.
SV and a d oth 	V GW Remarks and Conditions <u>The discharge area is likely at a downgradient reach(es) of Poison Creek Slough</u> Vor other surface water sources, and the interference with those sources is also likely to be diffuse. It is not clear the eep casing and seal, as proposed at Well #3, will result in an aquifer that is likely to be more or less "confined" than er wells with more shallow seals. The regional aquifer ultimately discharges to Malheur Lake.
SW and oth 	V GW Remarks and Conditions <u>The discharge area is likely at a downgradient reach(es) of Poison Creek Slough</u> Vor other surface water sources, and the interference with those sources is also likely to be diffuse. It is not clear the eep casing and seal, as proposed at Well #3, will result in an aquifer that is likely to be more or less "confined" than er wells with more shallow seals. The regional aquifer ultimately discharges to Malheur Lake.

## D. WELL CONSTRUCTION, OAR 690-200

D1. Well #: 2

Logid: \_\_\_\_\_\_ HARN 573/572\_\_\_\_

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.  $\Box$  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: <u>No seal is described on HARN 572, but the log appears</u> to indicate that the well would be sealed in the future. Also, the applicant indicates that the well was sealed prior to purchase of the property. Can a well seal be verified?

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:

(Enforcement Section Signature)

D8. 

Route to Water Rights Section (attach well reconstruction logs to this page).

, 200

Water Resources Department

August 18,2004

MEMO

FROM

TO

Application G- 16254 GW:

SUBJECT Scenic Waterway Interference Evaluation



The source of appropriation is within or above a Scenic Waterway

Yes	
	Use the Scenic Waterway condition (Condition 7J).
No No	

PREPONDERANCE OF EVIDENCE FINDING: (Check box only if statement is true)

2

At this time the Department is unable to find that there is a preponderance of evidence that the proposed use of ground water will measurably reduce the surface water flows necessary to maintain the free-flowing character of a scenic waterway in quantities necessary for recreation, fish and wildlife.

FLOW REDUCTION: (To be filled out only if <u>Preponderance of Evidence</u> box is not checked)

í

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	Мау	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec

