# Evaluation Request for Plan Review, GWUDI Review, Setback Waivers, & Initial Monitoring Reductions

OHA-DWP

* Items in **bold** are required or form will be returned

## Background Information:

Analysis completed by Hydrogeologist? ☒

**Name of System**: Scapoose
Well Name: Airport Well
Plan Review#: 7-2019
**Requested by**: Pete Farrelly

**PWS ID #**: 00792
**County**: Columbia
Date well log sent to Springfield: 3/6/19
**Entry Point/Source ID**: B/BD
**Surface water w/i 500 ft[1]:** ☐ Yes ☒ No

[1]For all but monitoring reduction requests.

## Nature of Request:

☒ Request for Proposed Well Construction review/suggestions
**Township:** 3N **Range:** 1W **Section:** 7
**Or** **Lat:** _____ **Long:** _____ (☐ Earthtools.org ☐ Terraserver-USA.com ☒ Submitted Plans)
**Or** **Property Address:** _____

☐ Request for As Built Well/Spring Construction for Plan Review (i.e., well construction and aquifer nature)

☐ Request for Construction Setback Waiver (i.e., well construction and aquifer nature) review
- ☐ Septic, sewer, or other fecal contaminant source. Describe: _____
- ☐ Fuel/chemical storage tank and/or associated piping. Describe: _____
- ☐ Other. Describe: _____

**Distance to hazard(s) causing sanitary setback violation within 100 ft:** _____

☐ Request for GWUDI review
**Distance to surface water =** _____

☐ Request for DBP monitoring reduction review
Other well ID#s: _____
Distance to other wells: _____

☐ Request for initial chemical monitoring reduction review
Other well ID#s: _____
Distance to other wells: _____
- ☐ Well under consideration on New Entry Point
- ☐ Well under consideration on Existing Entry Point

---

**For all but Proposed Well Construction Request, provide 1) copy of well log or 2) one of the following and Date Well Completed:**

County Well ID: _____ Well Tag: L_____ Start Card: _____

Date Well Completed: _____

---

**Additional Notes/Comments/Requests:** Colu52612 is 0.2 mi SE. (Gravity sewer lines 400' from new site.)

# Evaluation Results From Regional Hydrogeologist:

**Proposed Well Construction Recommendations:**

Estimated depth to water–bearing zone: ~130 to 170 ft, based on the nearby Miller Rd Wells
Estimated aquifer nature: ☒ Confined ☐ Unconfined
Estimated depth of casing seal: 18 to 30 ft, depending on geologic materials encountered as per Miller Rd Wells

Comments: Proposed construction appears to be reasonable and would meet WRD construction standards if the materials encountered and construction occurs as planned. The City of Scappoose Miller Rd Wells are about a quarter mile away from the proposed drilling site. Based on those well logs, the primary water-bearing zone may be 130 to 170 ft deep. Gravel deposits above that depth may seep very small quantities of water into the borehole. These gravel deposits are overlain by a 15 ft thick silt layer that appears to act as a confining layer. The silt layer appears to be within 13 to 25 ft of the surface so the proposed casing seal depth of 30 ft is reasonable.

---

**As Built Well Construction Evaluation for Plan Review and/or Setback Waiver:**

☐ Well/Spring meets current construction standards.
  ☐ WRD special construction standards, see well log or Comments.
☐ Well/Spring construction does not meet construction standards.
  ☐ Not sealed to appropriate depth. Recommended depth: _____
  ☐ Not appropriate seal materials
  ☐ Open to more than one aquifer
  ☐ Seal info missing or unknown
  ☐ Seal not constructed properly (☐ Insufficient sealant volume ☐ Insufficient annular space)
☐ Susceptible construction, but grandfathered source. Consider for reconstruction if nitrate ≥ 5mg/L or confirmed *E. coli* at source.
☐ Susceptible well construction, **not approved for use**.

Comments: _

**Nature of Aquifer Evaluation:**

Aquifer Nature: ☐ Confined aquifer ☐ Semi-confined aquifer ☐ Unconfined aquifer
Comments:

---

**Construction Setback Waiver Info:**

☐ Facility Profiler review for additional contamination info:
  ☐ Not applicable, Facility Profiler doesn't track releases from this type of contaminant source.
  ☐ Facility Profiler does not indicate a spill or chemical release related to the sanitary setback violation.
  ☐ Facility Profiler indicates that there **is** a spill or chemical release related to the sanitary setback violation.

Comments and/or suggested "alternate measures" that could be considered for a Waiver from Construction Standards Request: _____

---

**GWUDI Review Results:**

☐ New system/source **or** surface water is inside sanitary setback, initiate **monthly source assessment monitoring when source goes into production or as soon as possible.**
- ☐ Fractured bedrock, < 500 ft to surface water
- ☐ Coarse sand, gravel, and boulders, < 200 ft to surface water
- ☐ Sand and gravel, < 100 ft to surface water
- ☐ Sand, < 75 ft to surface water

☐ Pre-existing source, initiate **monthly source assessment monitoring as part of annually generated monthly assessment monitoring list.**
- ☐ Fractured bedrock, < 500 ft to surface water
- ☐ Coarse sand, gravel, and boulders, < 200 ft to surface water
- ☐ Sand and gravel, < 100 ft to surface water
- ☐ Sand, < 75 ft to surface water

☐ Source may be sensitive to GWUDI but approved for use. Source must be included as one of repeat coliform sampling sites, consider for GWUDI if *E. coli* ever confirmed in the source.

☐ Do not need to consider for GWUDI.

Comments:_____

---

**Monitoring Reduction Determination Results:**

☐ Qualifies for initial chemical monitoring reduction as part of existing Wellfield – one round of chemical testing is sufficient.
- ☐ Source is on existing entry point – future monitoring required at entry point.
- ☐ Source is on a separate entry point – future monitoring includes nitrate at all entry points & source monitoring at entry point designated by geologist in comments below.

☐ Qualifies for initial chemical monitoring reduction based on historical data from nearby public water supply well(s) sharing the same aquifer – one round of chemical testing is sufficient. Future monitoring required at entry point.

☐ Qualifies for Common Aquifer designation for DBP monitoring – additional DBP sample sites not required.

☐ Does not qualify for monitoring reduction.

☐ Other: _____

Comments: _____

Reviewed by: Tom Pattee Date: 03/08/2019


Exp 06/01/2019