WATER RESOURCES DEPARTMENT MEMO

April 7, 20 15

TO:	Application G	17997	
FROM:	Mike	Zwart	Groundwater Section

SUBJECT: Scenic Waterway Interference Evaluation

YES NO NO

The source of appropriation is within or above a Scenic Waterway

YES

✓ NO

Use the Scenic Waterway condition (condition 7J)

Per ORS 390.835, the Groundwater Section is able to calculate groundwater interference with surface water that contributes to a Scenic Waterway. The calculated interference distribution is provided below.

Per ORS 390.835, the Groundwater Section is unable to calculate groundwater 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 flows necessary to maintain the free-flowing character of a scenic waterway.

DISTRIBUTION OF INTERFERENCE

Calculate interference as the monthly fraction of the annual consumptive use and fill in the table below. If interference cannot be calculated, per criteria in 390.839, do not fill in the table but check the "unable" option above, thus informing the Water Rights Section that the Department is unable to make a Preponderance of Evidence finding.

Exercise of this permit is calculated to reduce monthly flows in the ______ Scenic Waterway by the following amounts, expressed as a proportion of the annual consumptive use pumped from the well.

Monthly Fraction of Annual Consumptive Use

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

PUBLIC INTEREST REVIEW FOR GROUNDWATER APPLICATIONS

TODL		LILL	I REVIEW	TOR	ORCOTAL									
TO:		Wate	er Rights Sec	tion		Date April 7, 2015								
FROM	[:	Grou	indwater Sec	tion		Michael Zwart								
						Reviewer's Name								
SUBJE	ECT:	Appl	ication G-	17997		Supersedes review of								
										Date of R	eview(s)			
PUBL OAR 6 welfare to deter the press A. GE A1.	IC INTI 90-310-1 , safety au mine who sumption NERAL Applica	ERES 30 (1) and hea ether th criteria INF(nt(s) so Lost V	T PRESUM The Department th as described the presumption a. This review DRMATION eek(s) 2.05 alley Creek /	PTION ent shall f ed in OR is estab is based N: A 	resume that <i>s 537.525.</i> I blished. OAF d upon avai Applicant's l om <u>one</u> Creek	DWATE at a propos Departmen R 690-310- lable infor Name:	R ded groundwit t staff review 140 allows to rmation and Wilks Rand (s) in the pasin Qu	ater use will w ground wat the proposed 1 agency poli <u>ch Oregon L</u> <u>Malheur</u> nad Map: <u>C</u>	ensure the preserved applications use be modified icies in place a imited	servation under OA ed or cond at the tim County:	of the put AR 690-3 litioned to e of eval <u>Malheu</u>	blic 10-140 o meet uation. r Basin		
12	Dropose	d use	Irrig	tion 12	3 agros	Sea	onality	March 1 to	October 31					
A3	Well on	d aquit	for data (attac	h and m	mbor loge	Seasonanty: <u>March 1 to October 51</u>								
AJ.	w cli ali	u aqui	iei uala (allac	n anu m	initial logs	IUI CAISUI	ig weils, ma	ii k proposed	wells as such	unuer io	giu).			
Wall	Logic		Applicant's	Dropo	and Aquifar*	Prop	osed	Location	Loc	ation, met	es and bou	inds, e.g		
wen	Logic	1	Well #	гюро	sed Aquiler	Rate	e(cfs)	(T/R-S QQ	-Q) 225	0' N, 1200	E fr NW	cor S 36		
1	Propos	ed	Rye Valley	_	Basalt	2.	05	15S/40E-4 NI	E-NE 1	20' S, 1050	W fr NE e	cor S 4		
2														
3														
5				-										
* Alluvi	um, CRB,	Bedroc	k									-		
Well	Well Elev ft msl	First Wate ft bls	r SWL ft bls	SWL Date	Well Depth (ft)	Seal Interval (ft)	Casing Intervals (ft)	Liner Intervals (ft)	Perforations Or Screens (ft)	Well Yield (gpm)	Draw Down (ft)	Test Type		

Well	Elev ft msl	Water ft bls	SWL ft bls	SWL Date	Depth (ft)	Interval (ft)	Intervals (ft)	Intervals (ft)	Or Screens (ft)	Yield (gpm)	Down (ft)	Test Type
1	3962				800	0-200	0-200		unknown			

Use data from application for proposed wells.

A4.	Comments: The proposed construction is estimated. The nearest deep wells are within the Cow Valley Critical
	Groundwater Area to the east. The proposed well is likely to penetrate a Tertiary basalt aguifer at the proposed
	depth.

A6. Well(s) #_

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

Name of administrative area: _____ Comments:

- 2 ---

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) 7N, large measurement and reporting condition.
 - ii. \square 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 <u>200</u> 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>Groundwater levels have rebounded markedly in the adjacent Cow Valley</u> <u>Critical Groundwater Area as a result in changes in irrigation practices and the groundwater control provisions</u> within the critical area. In addition, this area has not experienced much additional groundwater development in recent years. However, any new permits for the use of groundwater in the vicinity of the critical area should include measurement and reporting conditions.

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	Likely Tertiary Basalts underlying basin-fill sediments	\square	

Basis for aquifer confinement evaluation: <u>Basalt aquifers are typically confined and review of well logs within the</u> critical indicates that this is likely to be the case at the proposed well.

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	Lost Valley Creek	3900±	3960	1350		

Basis for aquifer hydraulic connection evaluation: <u>The targeted bedrock/basalt aquifer is likely well below the nearest</u> reach of the creek.

Water Availability Basin the well(s) are located within: <u>31011923</u>, Lost Valley Cr > Willow Cr at mouth.

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?
		[]								

3

Page

Page

4

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?
Commonts:								

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												
Distrib	uted Wells	s											
Well	SW#	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sep	Oct	Nov	Dec
1.00		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Well Q	as CFS												
Interfer	ence CFS												
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Well () as CFS									10.75		-	
Interfer	ence CFS												
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Well C) as CFS												
Interfer	ence CFS												
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Well Q) as CFS												
Interfer	ence CFS												
		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Well () as CFS												
Interfer	ence CFS							-					
1.51		%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%
Well () as CFS							-					
Interfer	ence CFS												
$(\mathbf{A}) = \mathbf{T}\mathbf{c}$	tal Interf.												
(B) = 80	% Nat. Q												
(C) = 1	% Nat. Q												
(D) = ((A) > (C)	1	5	1	V	1	1	1	1	4	1	1	30 ^{31'}
$(\mathbf{E}) = (\mathbf{A}$	/ B) x 100	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%	%

_	
-	
-	
-	
-	
-	
-	
-	
-	
-	
b.	690-09-040 (5) (b) The potential to impair or detrimentally affect the public interest is to be determined by the Wa 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. The permit should contain condition #(s)
	ii. The permit should contain special condition(s) as indicated in "Remarks" below;
SV	V/CW Pemerks and Conditions
_	
	ferences Used: Local well logs; water-level data at nearby wells; review of file G-17102; Geology of the Oregon Part Baker 1° by 2° Quadrangle, by Brooks, et al, 1976 (GMS-7); Hydrogeology of the Ontario Area, Malheur County,
	ferences Used: Local well logs; water-level data at nearby wells; review of file G-17102; Geology of the Oregon Part Baker 1° by 2° Quadrangle, by Brooks, et al, 1976 (GMS-7); Hydrogeology of the Ontario Area, Malheur County, egon, by Gannett, 1990, OWRD Groundwater Report #34; Evaluation of the Cow Valley Critical Groundwater Area
	ferences Used: Local well logs; water-level data at nearby wells; review of file G-17102; Geology of the Oregon Part Baker 1° by 2° Quadrangle, by Brooks, et al, 1976 (GMS-7); Hydrogeology of the Ontario Area, Malheur County, egon, by Gannett, 1990, OWRD Groundwater Report #34; Evaluation of the Cow Valley Critical Groundwater Area alheur County, Oregon, by Hartford, 1988, OWRD Open-File Report #8-01.

Version: 07/26/2013

D. WELL CONSTRUCTION, OAR 690-200

DI.	Well #:	Logid:
D2.	THE WELL does not appear to meet of a. review of the well log; b. field inspection by	current well construction standards based upon:
D3.	THE WELL construction deficiency o	r other comment is described as follows:
D4. 🗌] Route to the Well Construction and C	compliance Section for a review of existing well construction.

Water Availability Tables

