

**Source Protection Plan for
Johnstown Well Field Co.
Kildare**

January 2005

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ITEM		PAGE
1.	INTRODUCTION	1
2.	OUTLINE OF PROTECTION PLAN	1
3.	EXTENT OF THE GROUNDWATER PROTECTION AREAS	1
3.1	Well Head Protection Area	2
3.2	Inner Source Protection Area	2
3.3	Outer Source Protection Area	2
4.	VULNERABILITY RATINGS	2
5.	LAND USE CONTROL MEASURES	3
5.1	Well Head Protection Area	3
5.2	Inner and Outer Source Protection Areas	3

TABLES

Table 1	Overburden Type and Thickness and Vulnerability Ratings
Table 2	Vulnerability Mapping Guidelines

FIGURES

Figure 1	Location of Wells
Figure 2	Groundwater Protection Zones

APPENDICES

Appendix A	Groundwater Protection Schemes – Geological Survey of Ireland (GSI)
Appendix B	Well Logs

1. INTRODUCTION

K. T. Cullen & Co. Ltd were commissioned by Kildare County Council to produce a source protection plan for the proposed well field in Johnstown Bridge, Co. Kildare.

The proposed source protection plan is prepared in accordance with the recommendations of the Geological Survey of Ireland (GSI) and which are included here as Appendix A.

A source protection plan provides a planning tool for the sound management of groundwater supplies. It offers a means of managing the protection of groundwater supplies from contamination by using a risk-based approach.

2. OUTLINE OF PROTECTION PLAN

The proposed groundwater protection plan for the Johnstown Bridge Well Field will provide guidelines for the planning and licensing authorities in carrying out their functions, and a framework to assist in decision-making on the location, nature and control of developments and activities in order to protect groundwater. Use of the plan will help to ensure that within the planning and licensing processes due regard is taken of the need to maintain the beneficial use of groundwater.

The protection plan aims to maintain the quantity and quality of the groundwater in the North Kildare Aquifer by applying a risk assessment-based approach to groundwater protection and sustainable development. The plan does not set out to limit development but merely to control potentially polluting activities where they could lead to groundwater contamination.

The protection plan has two control zones, an Inner Protection Area located close to the individual pumping wells and an Outer Protection Area located some distance away from the pumping wells and extending over the recharge area supplying the well field. The level of control to be applied will naturally be stricter close to the wells and less restrictive further away from the pumping stations.

The level of control within the two zones is further determined by the availability of a protective overburden layer covering the aquifer. Where the overburden layer is clay rich and thick then the aquifer has a low vulnerability to pollution and so the level of controls applied will be also low. Where the overburden cover is thin or absent then the aquifer has a high or extreme vulnerability and in these circumstances a high degree of control is required.

3. EXTENT OF THE GROUNDWATER PROTECTION AREAS

The Johnstown Bridge Well Field will draw groundwater from the North Kildare Aquifer which underlies this part of the county and in particular from the Calp Formation. The Calp is dominated by dark grey to black low permeability, fine grained and argillaceous limestone and shales. In many places this is not considered a major aquifer, however, higher well yields have been recorded where fracturing has occurred or more permeable strata has been encountered. The planned abstraction will be taken from 7 production wells, which will have a combined output of some 3.75Ml/day.

The location of the pumping wells is shown in Figure 1 and the geological logs from the drilling programme are contained in Appendix B.

3.1 Well Head Protection Area

Each pumping well will be enclosed by a secure fenced off area measuring some 10m x 10m and no potentially polluting activities will be permitted within the well-head protection area.

3.2 Inner Source Protection Area

The Inner Source Protection Area according to the GSI guidelines is designed to protect against the effect of human activities that might have an immediate impact on the source, and in particular, against microbial pollution. The outer limit of the Inner Protection Area is set at the 100-day travel time which is the distance that water will travel in 100-days under the hydrogeological conditions operating immediately around the well field. The 100-day travel time distance varies from well field to well field in response to the nature of the aquifer and the abstraction rate.

At Johnstown Bridge, the Inner Sources Protection Area will cover some 1.4 km² as shown on Figure 2.

3.3 Outer Source Protection Area

The Outer Source Protection Area covers the remaining catchment of the well field and the controls are applied to the area required to support the proposed abstraction into the future. The Outer Protection Area extends beyond the 100-day travel time distance and includes that portion of the aquifer and from where groundwater will flow to the well field in due course. While microbial contamination was the concern within the Inner Protection Area the potential for chemical contamination is a prime concern within the Outer Protection Area. For example, the land use controls within the Outer Protection Area will be directed at preventing nitrate contamination as a result of excessive application of artificial fertilizer.

At Johnstown Bridge the Outer Sources Protection Area will extend southwards away from the well field as indicated in Figure 2 and will cover an area measuring some 10km².

4. VULNERABILITY RATINGS

The drilling programme at Johnstown Bridge together with other geological information have been used to map the vulnerability zones within the Inner Source Protection Areas around the Johnstown Bridge Well Field. The overburden type and thickness at each well head are presented in Table 1 and these have been used to determine the vulnerability of the aquifer in the Inner Source Protection Area based on the GSI Vulnerability Mapping Guidelines given in Table 2.

This process indicates that the vulnerability varies across the North Kildare Aquifer as follows:

09.0 low in the middle of the area

- close to JB 2, JB 20, and JB 21
- 10.0 moderate in the east of the area
- locally at JB 23
- 11.0 high in the south of the area
- close to JB 24 and JB 25

Additional site investigations are required to determine the vulnerability of the North Kildare Aquifer within the Outer Source Protection Area.

5. LAND USE CONTROL MEASURES

The vulnerability of the aquifer in a particular location will determine the range of land use control measures and planning responses that will be implemented in accordance with the published GSI guidelines for the protection of groundwater abstractions. Recommended land use control measures are published as a series of matrices by the GSI with planning responses available for septic tanks, landspreading of organic wastes and landfilling.

5.1 Well Head Protection Area

An area measuring 10m x 10m approximately will be fenced off around each well head. No potentially polluting activities will be permitted within this area.

5.2 Inner and Outer Source Protection Areas

These recommendations are based on professional opinion and where available, guidelines developed by the Geological Survey of Ireland, The Department of the Environment and Local Government and the Environmental Protection Agency. These recommendations are based on available information to hand and any further investigations within the inner and outer protection zones should be examined to update the Source Protection Plan if required.

To provide on-going confidence in the protection of the groundwater sources, it is recommended that the Local Authority implement nutrient management planning within the inner zone in order to provide practical site specific data to the local land owners.

Normal Agricultural Landspreading

Note: The Geological Survey of Ireland and The Department of the Environment and Local Government have not yet produced guidelines. These recommendations are therefore based on our current understanding of the overburden type and thickness.

The permitted level of applied total Nitrogen (N) for the grassland areas should not exceed 260kg/ha per annum. The permitted level of N from animal and other wastes on the same areas should not exceed 170kg/ha per annum.

The permitted upper limit for Phosphorous (P) applications corresponds with a soils P Level of 10mg/l for mineral soils and 30mg/l for peat soils.

Landspreading should not be permitted within the distance from each production well as specified in the table below. Normal agricultural landspreading (to the levels specific in 2 and 3 below) may continue outside these areas subject to ongoing monitoring by implementation of a nutrient management plan.

Borehole Reference	Vulnerability Rating	Distance From The Well
JB2	Low (L)	30m
JB17	High (H)	50m
JB20	Low (L)	30m
JB21	Low (L)	30m
JB23	High (H)	50m
JB24	High (H)	50m
JB25	High (H)	50m

Intensive Landspreading

Note: Summary below. For full details see Groundwater Protection Schemes 1999 (Geological Survey of Ireland, The Department of the Environment and Local Government).

Inner Zone - Not acceptable where vulnerability rating is moderate to low unless no alternative areas are available and detailed evidence is provided. to show that contamination will not take place. Not acceptable where the vulnerability rating is high or extreme.

Outer Zone - Not acceptable where the aquifer vulnerability rating is extreme - high. Elsewhere acceptable subject to a maximum organic nitrogen load not exceeding 170kg/hectare/yr.

Waste Water Systems for Single Houses

Note: Summary below. For full details see Groundwater Protection Schemes 1999 (Geological Survey of Ireland, The Department of the Environment and Local Government).

Wastewater treatment systems to be located a minimum of 60m from any production wells unless otherwise approved.

Elsewhere acceptable where there is a minimum thickness of 2m of unsaturated soil OR the installation of a Puraflow type system or similar (as described in the EPA 2000 Wastewater Treatment Manual). The authority must be satisfied that on the evidence of the groundwater quality of the source and the number of existing houses, the accumulation of significant nitrate and/or microbiological contamination is unlikely. On extreme vulnerability sites a maintenance contract may also be required.

Landfill Sites

It is not recommended to locate a landfill site within the inner or outer protection zones.

Note: These recommendations are based on current guidelines and practice (January 2003).

Field surveys should be carried out within the outer protection zone to establish the current situation with regard to septic tanks, agricultural activities, oil storage facilities and other potential hazards with mitigation measures advised where necessary. Future developments in the inner and outer zone and adjacent to the outer zone involving bulk storage of chemical (List I and II Substances of the Dangerous Substances Act, 1999) would require site environmental assessments to prove no risks to the underlying aquifer, i.e. future development specific site investigations should be carried out.

The hydrogeology of the area is complex and available information is not adequate to allow the delineation of definite groundwater protection zone boundaries. The zones delineated in this report are based on our current understanding of groundwater conditions, on available data and our experience. Additional information obtained in the future may indicate that amendments to the boundaries are necessary.

Appendix I Extract taken from Groundwater Protection Schemes (DELG, EPA, GSI, 1999)

The following text is taken from **Groundwater Protection Schemes**, which was jointly published in 1999 by the Department of Environment and Local Government (DELG), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and Geological Survey of Ireland (GSI). This Appendix gives details on the two main components of Groundwater Protection Schemes – land surface zoning and groundwater protection responses. It is included here so that this can be a stand alone report for the reader. However, it is recommended that for a full overview of the groundwater protection methodology, the publications **Groundwater Protection Responses for On-Site Systems for Single Houses ('septic tanks')**, **Groundwater Protection Responses for Landfills** and **Groundwater Protection Responses for Landspreading of Organic Wastes** should be consulted. These publications are available from the GSI, EPA and Government Publications Office.

Land Surface Zoning

Vulnerability Categories

Vulnerability is a term used to represent the intrinsic geological and hydrogeological characteristics that determine the ease with which groundwater may be contaminated by human activities.

The vulnerability of groundwater depends on: (i) the time of travel of infiltrating water (and contaminants); (ii) the relative quantity of contaminants that can reach the groundwater; and (iii) the contaminant attenuation capacity of the geological materials through which the water and contaminants infiltrate. As all groundwater is hydrologically connected to the land surface, it is the effectiveness of this connection that determines the relative vulnerability to contamination. Groundwater that readily and quickly receives water (and contaminants) from the land surface is considered to be more vulnerable than groundwater that receives water (and contaminants) more slowly and in lower quantities. The travel time, attenuation capacity and quantity of contaminants are a function of the following natural geological and hydrogeological attributes of any area:

- (i) the subsoils that overlie the groundwater;
- (ii) the type of recharge - whether point or diffuse; and
- (iii) the thickness of the unsaturated zone through which the contaminant moves.

In general, little attenuation of contaminants occurs in the bedrock in Ireland because flow is almost wholly via fissures. Consequently, the subsoils (sands, gravels, glacial tills (or boulder clays), peat, lake and alluvial silts and clays), are the single most important natural feature influencing groundwater vulnerability and groundwater contamination prevention. Groundwater is most at risk where the subsoils are absent or thin and, in areas of karstic limestone, where surface streams sink underground at swallow holes.

The geological and hydrogeological characteristics can be examined and mapped, thereby providing a groundwater vulnerability assessment for any area or site. Four groundwater vulnerability categories are used in the scheme – **extreme (E)**, **high (H)**, **moderate (M)** and **low (L)**. The hydrogeological basis for these categories is summarised in Table A.1 and further details can be obtained from the GSI. The ratings are based on pragmatic judgements, experience and available technical and scientific information. However, provided the limitations are appreciated, vulnerability assessments are essential when considering the location of potentially polluting activities. As groundwater is considered to be present everywhere in Ireland, the vulnerability concept is applied to the entire land surface. The ranking of vulnerability does not take into consideration the biologically-active soil zone, as contaminants from point sources are usually discharged below this zone, often at depths of at least 1 m. However, the groundwater protection responses take account of the point of discharge for each activity.

Vulnerability maps are an important part of Groundwater Protection Schemes and are an essential element in the decision-making on the location of potentially polluting activities. Firstly, the vulnerability rating for an area indicates, and is a measure of, the likelihood of contamination. Secondly, the vulnerability map helps to ensure that a Groundwater Protection Scheme is not unnecessarily restrictive on human economic activity. Thirdly, the vulnerability map helps in the choice of preventative measures and enables developments, which have a significant potential to contaminate, to be located in areas of lower vulnerability.

In summary, the entire land surface is divided into four vulnerability categories – extreme (**E**), high (**H**), moderate (**M**) and low (**L**) – based on the geological and hydrogeological factors described above. This subdivision is shown on a groundwater vulnerability map. The map shows the vulnerability of the first groundwater encountered (in either sand/gravel aquifers or in bedrock) to contaminants released at depths of 1–2 m below the ground surface. Where contaminants are released at significantly different depths, there will be a need to determine groundwater vulnerability using site-specific data. The characteristics of individual contaminants are not taken into account.

Table A.1 Vulnerability Mapping Guidelines

Vulnerability Rating	Hydrogeological Conditions				
	Subsoil Permeability (Type) and Thickness			Unsaturated Zone	Karst Features
	high permeability (sand/gravel)	moderate permeability (e.g. sandy subsoil)	low permeability (e.g. clayey subsoil, clay, peat)	(sand/gravel aquifers only)	(<30 m radius)
Extreme (E)	0–3.0 m	0–3.0 m	0–3.0 m	0–3.0 m	–
High (H)	>3.0 m	3.0–10.0 m	3.0–5.0 m	>3.0 m	N/A
Moderate (M)	N/A	>10.0 m	5.0–10.0	N/A	N/A
Low (L)	N/A	N/A	>10.0 m	N/A	N/A
Notes: i) N/A = not applicable. ii) Precise permeability values cannot be given at present. iii) Release point of contaminants is assumed to be 1-2 m below ground surface.					

Source Protection Zones

Groundwater sources, particularly public, group scheme and industrial supplies, are of critical importance in many regions. Consequently, the objective of source protection zones is to provide protection by placing tighter controls on activities within all or part of the zone of contribution (ZOC) of the source.

There are two main elements to source protection land surface zoning:

Areas surrounding individual groundwater sources; these are termed source protection areas (SPAs).

Division of the SPAs on the basis of the vulnerability of the underlying groundwater to contamination.

These elements are integrated to give the source protection zones.

Delineation of Source Protection Areas

Two source protection areas are recommended for delineation:

Inner Protection Area (SI);

Outer Protection Area (SO), encompassing the remainder of the source catchment area or ZOC.

In delineating the inner (SI) and outer (SO) protection areas, there are two broad approaches: first, using arbitrary fixed radii, which do not incorporate hydrogeological considerations; and secondly, a scientific approach using hydrogeological information and analysis, in particular the hydrogeological characteristics of the aquifer, the direction of groundwater flow, the pumping rate and the recharge.

Where the hydrogeological information is poor and/or where time and resources are limited, the simple zonation approach using the arbitrary fixed radius method is a good first step that requires little technical expertise. However, it can both over- and under-protect. It usually over-protects on the downgradient side of the source and may under-protect on the upgradient side, particularly in karst areas. It is particularly inappropriate in the case of springs where there is no part of the downgradient side in the ZOC. Also, the lack of a scientific basis reduces its defensibility as a method.

There are several hydrogeological methods for delineating SPAs. They vary in complexity, cost and the level of data and hydrogeological analysis required. Four methods, in order of increasing technical sophistication, are used by the GSI:

- (i) calculated fixed radius;
- (ii) analytical methods;
- (iii) hydrogeological mapping; and
- (iv) numerical modelling.

Each method has limitations. Even with relatively good hydrogeological data, the heterogeneity of Irish aquifers will generally prevent the delineation of definitive SPA boundaries. Consequently, the boundaries must be seen as a guide for decision-making, which can be re-appraised in the light of new knowledge or changed circumstances.

Inner Protection Area (SI)

This area is designed to protect against the effects of human activities that might have an immediate effect on the source and, in particular, against microbial pollution. The area is defined by a 100-day time of travel (ToT) from any point below the water table to the source. (The ToT varies significantly between regulatory agencies in different countries. The 100-day limit is chosen for Ireland as a relatively conservative limit to allow for the heterogeneous nature of Irish aquifers and to reduce the risk of pollution from bacteria and viruses, which in some circumstances can live longer than 50 days in groundwater.) In karst areas, it will not usually be feasible to delineate 100-day ToT boundaries, as there are large variations in permeability, high flow velocities and a low level of predictability. In these areas, the total catchment area of the source will frequently be classed as SI.

If it is necessary to use the arbitrary fixed radius method, a distance of 300 m is normally used. A semi-circular area is used for springs. The distance may be increased for sources in karst aquifers and reduced in granular aquifers and around low yielding sources.


Outer Protection Area (SO)

This area covers the remainder of the ZOC (or complete catchment area) of the groundwater source. It is defined as the area needed to support an abstraction from long-term groundwater recharge i.e. the proportion of effective rainfall that infiltrates to the water table. The abstraction rate used in delineating the zone will depend on the views and recommendations of the source owner. A factor of safety can be taken into account whereby the maximum daily abstraction rate is increased (typically by 50%) to allow for possible future increases in abstraction and for expansion of the ZOC in dry periods. In order to take account of the heterogeneity of many Irish aquifers and possible errors in estimating the groundwater flow direction, a variation in the flow direction (typically $\pm 10-20^\circ$) is frequently included as a safety margin in delineating the ZOC.

A conceptual model of the ZOC and the 100-day ToT boundary is given in Fig. A.1.

If the arbitrary fixed radius method is used, a distance of 1000 m is recommended with, in some instances, variations in karst aquifers and around springs and low-yielding wells.

The boundaries of the SPAs are based on the horizontal flow of water to the source and, in the case particularly of the Inner Protection Area, on the time of travel in the aquifer. Consequently, the vertical movement of a water particle or contaminant from the land surface to the water table is not taken into account. This vertical movement is a critical factor in contaminant attenuation, contaminant flow velocities and in dictating the likelihood of contamination. It can be taken into account by mapping the groundwater vulnerability to contamination.



Delineation of Source Protection Zones

The matrix in Table A.2 gives the result of integrating the two elements of land surface zoning (SPAs and vulnerability categories) – a possible total of eight source protection zones. In practice, the source protection zones are obtained by superimposing the vulnerability map on the source protection area map. Each zone is represented by a code e.g. SO/H, which represents an Outer Source Protection area where the groundwater is highly vulnerable to contamination. The recommended map scale is 1:10,560 (or 1:10,000 if available), though a smaller scale may be appropriate for large springs.

All of the hydrogeological settings represented by the zones may not be present around each groundwater source. The integration of the SPAs and the vulnerability ratings is illustrated in Fig. A.2.

Table A.2 Matrix of Source Protection Zones

VULNERABILITY RATING	SOURCE PROTECTION	
	<i>Inner (SI)</i>	<i>Outer (SO)</i>
Extreme (E)	SI/E	SO/E
High (H)	SI/H	SO/H
Moderate (M)	SI/M	SO/M
Low (L)	SI/L	SO/L

Resource Protection Zones

For any region, the area outside the SPAs can be subdivided, based on the value of the resource and the hydrogeological characteristics, into eight aquifer categories:

Regionally Important (R) Aquifers

- (i) Karstified aquifers (**Rk**)
- (ii) Fissured bedrock aquifers (**Rf**)
- (iii) Extensive sand/gravel aquifers (**Rg**)

Locally Important (L) Aquifers

- (i) Sand/gravel (**Lg**)
- (ii) Bedrock which is Generally Moderately Productive (**Lm**)




Fig. A.2 Delineation of Source Protection Zones Around a Public Supply Well from the Integration of the Source Protection Area Map and the Vulnerability Map

(iii) Bedrock which is Moderately Productive only in Local Zones (**LI**)

Poor (P) Aquifers

- (i) Bedrock which is Generally Unproductive except for Local Zones (**PI**)
- (ii) Bedrock which is Generally Unproductive (**Pu**)

These aquifer categories are shown on an aquifer map, which can be used not only as an element of a Groundwater Protection Scheme but also for groundwater development purposes.

The matrix in Table A.3 gives the result of integrating the two regional elements of land surface zoning (vulnerability categories and resource protection areas) – a possible total of 24 resource protection zones. In practice this is achieved by superimposing the vulnerability map on the aquifer map. Each zone is represented by a code e.g. **Rf/M**, which represents areas of regionally important fissured aquifers where the groundwater is moderately vulnerable to contamination. In land surface zoning for groundwater protection purposes, regionally important sand/gravel (**Rg**) and fissured aquifers (**Rf**) are zoned together, as are locally important sand/gravel (**Lg**) and bedrock which is moderately productive (**Lm**). All of the hydrogeological settings represented by the zones may not be present in each local authority area.

Flexibility, Limitations and Uncertainty

The land surface zoning is only as good as the information which is used in its compilation (geological mapping, hydrogeological assessment, etc.) and these are subject to revision as new information is produced. Therefore a scheme must be flexible and allow for regular revision.

Uncertainty is an inherent element in drawing geological boundaries and there is a degree of generalisation because of the map scales used. Therefore the scheme is not intended to give sufficient information for site-specific decisions. Also, where site specific data received by a regulatory body in the future are at variance with the maps, this does not undermine a scheme, but rather provides an opportunity to improve it.

Groundwater Protection Responses

Introduction

The location and management of potentially polluting activities in each groundwater protection zone is by means of a **groundwater protection response matrix** for each activity or group of activities. The level of response depends on the different elements of risk: the vulnerability, the value of the groundwater (with sources being more valuable than resources and regionally important aquifers more valuable than locally important and so on) and the contaminant loading. By consulting a **Response Matrix**, it can be seen: (a) whether such a development is likely to be acceptable on that site; (b) what kind of further investigations may be necessary to reach a final decision; and (c) what planning or licensing conditions may be necessary for that development. The groundwater protection responses are a means of ensuring that good environmental practices are followed.

Table A.3 Matrix of Groundwater Resource Protection Zones

VULNERABILITY RATING	RESOURCE PROTECTION ZONES					
	Regionally Important Aquifers (R)		Locally Important Aquifers (L)		Poor Aquifers (P)	
	Rk	Rf/Rg	Lm/Lg	LI	PI	Pu
Extreme (E)	Rk/E	Rf/E	Lm/E	LI/E	PI/E	Pu/E
High (H)	Rk/H	Rf/H	Lm/H	LI/H	PI/H	Pu/H
Moderate (M)	Rk/M	Rf/M	Lm/M	LI/M	PI/M	Pu/M
Low (L)	Rk/L	Rf/L	Lm/L	LI/L	PI/L	Pu/L

Four levels of response (**R**) to the risk of a potentially polluting activity are proposed:

R1 Acceptable subject to normal good practice.

R2^{a,b,c,...} Acceptable in principle, subject to conditions in note a,b,c, etc. (The number and content of the notes may vary depending on the zone and the activity).

R3^{m,n,o,...} Not acceptable in principle; some exceptions may be allowed subject to the conditions in note m,n,o, etc.

R4 Not acceptable.

Integration of Groundwater Protection Zones and Response

The integration of the groundwater protection zones and the groundwater protection responses is the final stage in the production of a Groundwater Protection Scheme. The approach is illustrated for a hypothetical potentially polluting activity in the matrix in Table A.4.

The matrix encompasses both the geological/hydrogeological and the contaminant loading aspects of risk assessment. In general, the arrows (→↓) indicate directions of decreasing risk, with ↓ showing the decreasing likelihood of contamination and → showing the direction of decreasing consequence. The contaminant loading aspect of risk is indicated by the activity type in the table title.

The response to the risk of groundwater contamination is given by the response category allocated to each zone and by the site investigations and/or controls and/or protective measures described in notes a, b, c, d, m, n and o.

It is advisable to map existing hazards in the higher risk areas, particularly in zones of contribution of significant water supply sources. This would involve conducting a survey of the area and preparing an inventory of hazards. This may be followed by further site inspections, monitoring and a requirement for operational modifications, mitigation measures and perhaps even closure, as deemed necessary. New potential sources of contamination can be controlled at the planning or licensing stage, with monitoring required in some instances. In all cases the control measures and response category depend on the potential contaminant loading, the groundwater vulnerability and the groundwater value.

In considering a scheme, it is essential to remember that: (a) a scheme is intended to provide guidelines to assist decision-making on the location and nature of developments and activities with a view to ensuring the protection of groundwater; and (b) delineation of the groundwater protection zones is dependent on the data available and site specific data may be required to clarify requirements in some instances. It is intended that the statutory authorities should apply a scheme in decision-making on the basis that the best available data are being used. The onus is then on a developer to provide new information which would enable the zonation to be altered and improved and, in certain circumstances, the planning or regulatory response to be changed.

Table A.4 Groundwater Protection Response Matrix for a Hypothetical Activity

VULNERABILITY RATING	SOURCE PROTECTION		RESOURCE PROTECTION						
			Regionally Imp.		Locally Imp.		Poor Aquifers		
	<i>Inner</i>	<i>Outer</i>	<i>Rk</i>	<i>Rf/Rg</i>	<i>Lm/Lg</i>	<i>Ll</i>	<i>Pl</i>	<i>Pu</i>	
<i>Extreme (E)</i>	R4	R4	R4	R4	R3 ^m	R2 ^d	R2 ^c	R2 ^b	↓ ↓ ↓ ↓
<i>High (H)</i>	R4	R4	R4	R3 ^m	R3 ⁿ	R2 ^c	R2 ^b	R2 ^a	
<i>Moderate (M)</i>	R4	R3 ^m	R3 ^m	R2 ^d	R2 ^c	R2 ^b	R2 ^a	R1	
<i>Low (L)</i>	R3 ^m	R3 ^o	R2 ^d	R2 ^c	R2 ^b	R2 ^a	R1	R1	
→ → → → → → → → →									

(Arrows (→ ↓) indicate directions of decreasing risk)

Use of a Scheme


The use of a scheme is dependent on the availability of the groundwater protection responses for different activities. Currently, responses have been developed for three potentially polluting activities: IPC-licensable landspreading of organic wastes (primarily piggeries and poultry waste), domestic wastewater treatment systems, and landfills. Additional responses for other potentially polluting activities will be developed in the future.

Summary of Permeability Data and Analyses for Subsoils Mapped as Till, and Overlain by Fontstown Series Soils

Description of unit location:	Undulating to flat. Mostly in the southern half of the county. Strong correlation between fontstown soil type and tillage areas.
Why is this a single K unit?	Occupies 22% of county, largely southern and western parts.
1. General Permeability Indicators and Region Characteristics	
Rock type	Limestone
Depth to bedrock	Generally >3m
Subsoil type	Till
Soil type	Fontstown is the main type. Mylerstown, Mortartstown and Kilpatrick groundwater gley series are included where they are mapped in low-lying Fontstown areas. 28 samples
Vegetation and land use	Pasture and tillage
Artificial drainage density	Few drains
Natural drainage density	Low
Topography and altitude	Undulating-flat topography. 60-150m OD.
Ave. effective rainfall (mm)	The mean ppt is 750-875mm per annum

2. Summary of Particle Size Analysis and Field Descriptions of Subsoil Samples.

NB Particle distributions adjusted to discount particles greater than 20mm. Graphs only depict samples taken from 1) a known depth exceeding 1.5m in boreholes or 1m in exposures, AND 2) locations not at permeability boundaries.



3. Data from Permeability Tests.

T' tests: # Results	# Tests T<1	# Tests T>50	Variable head # Results	Range Values	Typical value	Pump tests # Results	Range Values	Typical value	Lab tests # Results	Range Values	Typical value
min/25mm			tests (m/sec):			(m/sec):			(m/sec):		

4. Summary and Analysis

Criteria	Comments	Implications of each criterion for assessment of subsoil permeability	
Quaternary / subsoil origin	Limestone Till	>>>	M-L
Particle size data	Wide variation	>>>	M-L
Field description data	Generally silty subsoils	>>>	M
Soil type	Well - excessively drained soil	>>>	M
Artificial drainage density	Generally very low density, but higher density occurs in localised areas.	>>>	M
Natural drainage density	Generally low	>>>	M
Permeability test data	-	>>>	-
Rock type	Limestone (occasionally shaley limestone)	>>>	L-M
Land use	Tillage & Pasture	>>>	M
Overall conclusion		>>>	Moderate


5. COMMENTS: Subsoil permeability indicators are variable, but the soil maps indicate that the area is generally excessively well drained, and field descriptions were mainly silty or sandy subsoils, on balance, a moderate permeability has been assigned. It is likely that the very frequency sand and gravel units mapped on the margins of this unit, are in fact interspersed within it. This would help to increase the overall subsoil permeability.

Summary of Permeability Data and Analyses for Subsoils Mapped as Till, and Overlain by Elton Series Soils

Description of unit location:	Undulating-flat. Mostly east & north of county. 25% of county.
Why is this a single K unit?	Occupies 25% of the county & largely eastern and northern parts of county.
1. General Permeability Indicators and Region Characteristics	
Rock type	Carrighill, Ballysteen and Calp Formations.
Depth to bedrock	Wide variety of depth to bedrock
Subsoil type	Limestone till, some admixture of shale/granites closer to the wicklow border. Undifferentiated till in the north.
Soil type	Dominantly Elton series. Dunnstown (groundwater gley) is included as the Elton and Dunnstown are associated, with Dunnstown occupying the lower-lying areas. A small pocket of the mortarstown series is also included as it occurs within the Elton series. Fourteen samples were used for Particle Size Analysis.
Vegetation and land use	Pasture/stud farms are found on this soil type.
Artificial drainage density	Low on the elton, some artificial drainage on the dunnstown, particularly around Martinstown.
Natural drainage density	Low
Topography and altitude	Undulating - flat; normally <150m
Ave. effective rainfall (mm)	Precipitation is variable (750-<1000mm)

2. Summary of Particle Size Analysis and Field Descriptions of Subsoil Samples.

NB Particle distributions adjusted to discount particles greater than 20mm. Graphs only depict samples taken from 1) a known depth exceeding 1.5m in boreholes or 1m in exposures, AND 2) locations not at permeability boundaries.



3. Data from Permeability Tests.

T' tests: # Results min/25mm	# Tests T<1	# Tests T>50	Variable head tests (m/sec):	# Results	Range Values	Typical value	Pump tests # Results (m/sec):	# Results	Range Values	Typical value	Lab tests # Results (m/sec):	# Results	Range Values	Typical value
---------------------------------	-------------	--------------	------------------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------	----------------------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------	---------------------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------

4. Summary and Analysis

Criteria	Comments	Implications of each criterion for assessment of subsoil permeability	
Quaternary / subsoil origin	Limestone till	>>>	M-L
Particle size data	A wide variation	>>>	M
Field description data	Generally silty subsoils	>>>	M
Soil type	Well - excessively drained soil	>>>	M-L
Artificial drainage density	Generally very low density, but higher density occurs in localised areas.	>>>	M
Natural drainage density	Generally low	>>>	M
Permeability test data	-	>>>	-
Rock type	Generally muddy limestones	>>>	L-M
Land use	Tillage and pasture	>>>	M
Overall conclusion		>>>	M


5. COMMENTS: Subsoil permeability indicators are variable, but the soil maps indicate that the area is generally excessively well drained, and field descriptions were mainly silty or sandy subsoils, on balance, a moderate permeability has been assigned. It is likely that the very frequency sand and gravel units mapped on the margins of this unit, are in fact interspersed within it. This would help to increase the overall subsoil permeability.

Summary of Permeability Data and Analyses for Subsoils Mapped as Till, and Overlain by Kennycourt Series Soils

Description of unit location:	Rolling. 4% of county, eastern part bordering wicklow and dublin.
Why is this a single K unit?	Occupies the lower slopes of the Wicklow mountains.
1. General Permeability Indicators and Region Characteristics	
Rock type	Greywackes & shales
Depth to bedrock	Generally 3-5m
Subsoil type	Limestone till
Soil type	Kennycourt - stony loam, well drained. Six samples.
Vegetation and land use	Pasture
Artificial drainage density	low
Natural drainage density	low
Topography and altitude	150-240 m OD, rolling, 4 degree slopes.
Ave. effective rainfall (mm)	875-1000mm ppt.

2. Summary of Particle Size Analysis and Field Descriptions of Subsoil Samples.

NB Particle distributions adjusted to discount particles greater than 20mm. Graphs only depict samples taken from 1) a known depth exceeding 1.5m in boreholes or 1m in exposures, AND 2) locations not at permeability boundaries.



3. Data from Permeability Tests.

T' tests: # Results min/25mm	# Tests T<1	# Tests T>50	Variable head tests (m/sec):	# Results	Range Values	Typical value	Pump tests # Results (m/sec):	Range Values	Typical value	Lab tests # Results (m/sec):	Range Values	Typical value
---------------------------------	-------------	--------------	------------------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------	----------------------------------	--------------	---------------	---------------------------------	--------------	---------------

4. Summary and Analysis

Criteria	Comments	Implications of each criterion for assessment of subsoil permeability	
Quaternary / subsoil origin	Limestone Till	>>>	M-L
Particle size data	Two samples of variable clay fraction.	>>>	H-M
Field description data	Generally silty subsoils	>>>	H-M
Soil type	Well-excessively well drained	>>>	M
Artificial drainage density	No artifical drainage	>>>	M
Natural drainage density	Low	>>>	M
Permeability test data	-	>>>	-
Rock type	Shales	>>>	L-M
Land use	Pasture	>>>	M
Overall conclusion		>>>	M


5. COMMENTS: Subsoil permeability indicators are variable, but the soil maps indicate that the area is generally well well drained, and field descriptions were mainly silty subsoils, on balance, a moderate permeability has been assigned. It is likely that the very frequency sand and gravel units mapped on the margins of this unit, are in fact interspersed within it. This would help to increase the overall subsoil permeability.

Summary of Permeability Data and Analyses for Subsoils Mapped as Till, and Overlain by Straffan Complex

Description of unit location:	Flat - undulating, occupying large areas of North Kildare.
Why is this a single K unit?	Occupies 13% of the county largely north Kildare
1. General Permeability Indicators and Region Characteristics	
Rock type	Calp limestone
Depth to bedrock	Generally 3-5 & 5-10m
Subsoil type	Undifferentiated till
Soil type	Straffan complex comprises 6 soil series mostly gley soils. Thirteen samples were used in the analysis.
Vegetation and land use	Generally pasture, some tillage and some rushy areas.
Artificial drainage density	Considerable areas have undergone artificial drainage, comprising deepening of water courses and installing of closed field drains.
Natural drainage density	High
Topography and altitude	Flat - undulating; 60-90m OD
Ave. effective rainfall (mm)	precipitation is approximately 750mm

2. Summary of Particle Size Analysis and Field Descriptions of Subsoil Samples.

NB Particle distributions adjusted to discount particles greater than 20mm. Graphs only depict samples taken from 1) a known depth exceeding 1.5m in boreholes or 1m in exposures, AND 2) locations not at permeability boundaries.



3. Data from Permeability Tests.

T' tests: # Results	# Tests T<1	# Tests T>50	Variable head # Results	Range Values	Typical value	Pump tests # Results	Range Values	Typical value	Lab tests # Results	Range Values	Typical value
min/25mm			tests (m/sec):			(m/sec):			(m/sec):		

4. Summary and Analysis

Criteria	Comments	Implications of each criterion for assessment of subsoil permeability	
Quaternary / subsoil origin	Undifferentiated till	>>>	L-M
Particle size data	Wide variation	>>>	L-M
Field description data	Generally clayey subsoils	>>>	L
Soil type	Mostly gleys, clay loams comprises 70% of complex	>>>	L
Artificial drainage density	High	>>>	L-M
Natural drainage density	High	>>>	L-M
Permeability test data		>>>	
Rock type	Muddy Limestone (Calp Limestone)	>>>	L-M
Land use	Generally pasture	>>>	M
Overall conclusion		>>>	L

5. COMMENTS: Subsoil permeability indicators are variable, but the soil maps indicate that the area is generally poorly drained and field descriptions were mainly clayey subsoils, on balance, a Low permeability has been assigned.

Summary of Permeability Data and Analyses for Subsoils Mapped as Till, and Overlain by Allenwood Complex


Description of unit location:	The allenwood complex occupies the margins of the peat/bogs (allen + banagher (reclaimed peat)) in the northern part of the county. It comprises the mylerstown gw gley and peaty gleys. Occupies 1% of county.
Why is this a single K unit?	Occupying the areas between the Fontstown/Elton soil series and the Banagher/Allen peat series.

1. General Permeability Indicators and Region Characteristics

Rock type	BN boston hill fmn - nodular muddy lst&shale
Depth to bedrock	Generally greater than 10m
Subsoil type	Undifferentiated till (clayey gravel/gravelly clay)
Soil type	Allenwood complex comprises the mylerstown groundwater gley & peaty gleys, thus a mixture of peaty soils and grey-brown podzolics. Three samples analysed.
Vegetation and land use	Rushes where it is not managed and pasture where it has undergone drainage.
Artificial drainage density	High
Natural drainage density	High
Topography and altitude	Flat.
Ave. effective rainfall (mm)	750-875mm of precipitation.

2. Summary of Particle Size Analysis and Field Descriptions of Subsoil Samples.

NB Particle distributions adjusted to discount particles greater than 20mm. Graphs only depict samples taken from 1) a known depth exceeding 1.5m in boreholes or 1m in exposures, AND 2) locations not at permeability boundaries.



3. Data from Permeability Tests.

T' tests: # Results # Tests T<1 # Tests T>50	Variable head # Results Range Values Typical value	Pump tests # Results Range Values Typical value	Lab tests # Results Range Values Typical value
min/25mm	tests (m/sec):	(m/sec):	(m/sec):

4. Summary and Analysis

Criteria	Comments	Implications of each criterion for assessment of subsoil permeability	
Quaternary / subsoil origin	Undifferentiated till	>>>	L-M
Particle size data	A variation from silty to clayey soils.	>>>	L-M
Field description data	A variation from silty to clayey subsoils.	>>>	L-M
Soil type	Loam-peaty loam-Peat	>>>	L-M
Artificial drainage density	High water table, big deep drains along perimeters and internal closed field drains	>>>	L-M
Natural drainage density	High water table, margins of peat bogs.	>>>	L-M
Permeability test data	-	>>>	none
Rock type	Muddy limestone	>>>	L-M
Land use	Where it has been drained there is rough pasture used for sheep grazing.	>>>	L-M
Overall conclusion		>>>	M

5. COMMENTS: Subsoil permeability indicators are inconclusive, on balance in order to be conservative it is given a moderate permeability.

Summary of Permeability Data and Analyses for Subsoils Mapped as Till, and Overlain by


Description of unit location:	Occupies the flood plain alongside the River Liffey. Liffey regosol
Why is this a single K unit?	Occupies the flood plain alongside the River Liffey.

1. General Permeability Indicators and Region Characteristics

Rock type	Predominantly Limestone.
Depth to bedrock	Generally greater than 10m
Subsoil type	Limestone and undifferentiated till.
Soil type	Liffey regosol - alluvium - loam-silty-clay loam. Three samples
Vegetation and land use	Predominantly pasture
Artificial drainage density	Low
Natural drainage density	Low
Topography and altitude	Generally 60m OD.
Ave. effective rainfall (mm)	750-875 precipitation.

2. Summary of Particle Size Analysis and Field Descriptions of Subsoil Samples.

NB Particle distributions adjusted to discount particles greater than 20mm. Graphs only depict samples taken from 1) a known depth exceeding 1.5m in boreholes or 1m in exposures, AND 2) locations not at permeability boundaries.



3. Data from Permeability Tests.

T' tests: # Results min/25mm	# Tests T<1	# Tests T>50	Variable head tests (m/sec):	# Results	Range Values	Typical value	Pump tests # Results	Range Values	Typical value	Lab tests # Results	Range Values	Typical value
---------------------------------	-------------	--------------	------------------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------	----------------------	--------------	---------------	---------------------	--------------	---------------

4. Summary and Analysis

Criteria	Comments	Implications of each criterion for assessment of subsoil permeability	
Quaternary / subsoil origin	Alluvium	>>>	M
Particle size data	Indicates moderate or high permeability subsoils	>>>	L
Field description data	Variation in the field description.	>>>	L-M
Soil type	Alluvium - well drained - loam	>>>	M
Artificial drainage density	Low	>>>	M
Natural drainage density	Low	>>>	M
Permeability test data	-	>>>	-
Rock type	Limestone	>>>	
Land use	Pasture	>>>	M
Overall conclusion		>>>	M

5. COMMENTS: On balance subsoil indicators suggest that the alluvium alongside the River Liffey is moderately permeable.

Summary of Permeability Data and Analyses for Subsoils Mapped as Till, and Overlain by the Finnerly Complex


Description of unit location:	Occupying portions of the river valleys in the west of the county. Associated with a high water table all yr. Round. Mapped in Laois as Alluvium (subtypes Po & K), mapped in Limerick as the Camogue series
Why is this a single K unit?	Occupying the flood plains in the western part of Kildare, approximately 2.5% of the county.

1. General Permeability Indicators and Region Characteristics

Rock type	Largely clean shelf limestones.
Depth to bedrock	Generally 5-10 and greater than 10m.
Subsoil type	Alluvium.
Soil type	Finnerly complex comprises organic & mineral materials. Four samples were analysed.
Vegetation and land use	Largely restricted to rough summer grazing.
Artificial drainage density	Large open drains and closed field drains are common.
Natural drainage density	High
Topography and altitude	Flat and low-lying.
Ave. effective rainfall (mm)	Approximately 750mm of precipitation.

2. Summary of Particle Size Analysis and Field Descriptions of Subsoil Samples.

NB Particle distributions adjusted to discount particles greater than 20mm. Graphs only depict samples taken from 1) a known depth exceeding 1.5m in boreholes or 1m in exposures, AND 2) locations not at permeability boundaries.



3. Data from Permeability Tests.

T' tests: # Results	# Tests T<1	# Tests T>50	Variable head # Results	Range Values	Typical value	Pump tests # Results	Range Values	Typical value	Lab tests # Results	Range Values	Typical value
min/25mm			tests (m/sec):			(m/sec):			(m/sec):		

4. Summary and Analysis

Criteria	Comments	Implications of each criterion for assessment of subsoil permeability
Quaternary / subsoil origin	Generally alluvium or till.	>>> L-M
Particle size data	Variable with a tendency toward the low permeability end.	>>> L-M
Field description data	Variable, a mixture of sandy and clayey subsoils.	>>> L-M
Soil type	Alluvium and peat	>>> M-L
Artificial drainage density	High	>>> L
Natural drainage density	High	>>> L
Permeability test data		>>> -
Rock type	Limestones.	>>> M-L
Land use	Pasture.	>>> L-M
Overall conclusion		>>> M


5. COMMENTS: On balance subsoil indicators are not conclusive, to be conservative the complex is given a moderate permeability rating. This is a similar rating to that used in Laois for similar deposits.

Summary of Permeability Data and Analyses for Subsoils Mapped as Till, and Overlain by the Garristown Soil Series.

Description of unit location:	Occupy a small area in the very north of kildare adjacent to meath
Why is this a single K unit?	A surface water gley occupying a distinct area in North Kildare.
1. General Permeability Indicators and Region Characteristics	
Rock type	Namurian shales NAM
Depth to bedrock	0-3;3-5m
Subsoil type	Undifferentiated till
Soil type	The Garristown soil series is aheavy textured clay loam of poor structure, and is a surface water gley. Two samples analysed.
Vegetation and land use	Pasture, rushes where there is no artificial drainage.
Artificial drainage density	Drained using closed field drains.
Natural drainage density	Several streams.
Topography and altitude	Rolling
Ave. effective rainfall (mm)	750-875mm of precipitation.

2. Summary of Particle Size Analysis and Field Descriptions of Subsoil Samples.

NB Particle distributions adjusted to discount particles greater than 20mm. Graphs only depict samples taken from 1) a known depth exceeding 1.5m in boreholes or 1m in exposures, AND 2) locations not at permeability boundaries.



3. Data from Permeability Tests.

T' tests: # Results min/25mm	# Tests T<1	# Tests T>50	Variable head tests (m/sec):	# Results	Range Values	Typical value	Pump tests # Results (m/sec):	Range Values	Typical value	Lab tests # Results (m/sec):	Range Values	Typical value
---------------------------------	-------------	--------------	------------------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------	----------------------------------	--------------	---------------	---------------------------------	--------------	---------------

4. Summary and Analysis

Criteria	Comments	Implications of each criterion for assessment of subsoil permeability	
Quaternary / subsoil origin	Dense impermeable undifferentiated till	>>>	L-M
Particle size data	Variable and possibly not representative as there are patches of higher permeability material within the series	>>>	M-L
Field description data	Largely clayey subsoils.	>>>	M-L
Soil type	Clay Loam	>>>	L
Artificial drainage density	Closed field drains on sloping ground	>>>	L
Natural drainage density	High	>>>	L
Permeability test data	-	>>>	-
Rock type	Namurian shales (elsewhere in the country are typically associated with low permeability subsoils)	>>>	L
Land use	Pasture with rushy slopes where no field drains.	>>>	L
Overall conclusion		>>>	L

5. Comments Subsoil permeability indicators suggest low permeability and the soil maps indicate that the area is poorly or imperfectly drained, and field descriptions were mainly clayey subsoils, on balance, a Low permeability has been assigned.

Summary of Permeability Data and Analyses for Subsoils Mapped as Till, and Overlain by Kellistown and Newtown soil series


Description of unit location:	Mapped at the southern tip of kildare, intermingled with the Athy cpx and Newtown groundwater gley
Why is this a single K unit?	Occupies 1.6% of the county, confined to the southern tip of the county.

1. General Permeability Indicators and Region Characteristics

Rock type	Granite
Depth to bedrock	Largely 5-10m
Subsoil type	Limestone till
Soil type	The KELLISTOWN soil series, a sandy loam which is well drained. Six samples were used in the analysis.
Vegetation and land use	Largely tillage and pasture.
Artificial drainage density	Low
Natural drainage density	Low
Topography and altitude	Undulating to rolling; 60-120m OD
Ave. effective rainfall (mm)	750-875mm of precipitation.

2. Summary of Particle Size Analysis and Field Descriptions of Subsoil Samples.

NB Particle distributions adjusted to discount particles greater than 20mm. Graphs only depict samples taken from 1) a known depth exceeding 1.5m in boreholes or 1m in exposures, AND 2) locations not at permeability boundaries.



3. Data from Permeability Tests.

T' tests: # Results min/25mm	# Tests T<1	# Tests T>50	Variable head tests (m/sec):	# Results	Range Values	Typical value	Pump tests # Results (m/sec):	# Results	Range Values	Typical value	Lab tests # Results (m/sec):	# Results	Range Values	Typical value
---------------------------------	-------------	--------------	------------------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------	----------------------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------	---------------------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------

4. Summary and Analysis

Criteria	Comments	Implications of each criterion for assessment of subsoil permeability
Quaternary / subsoil origin	Limestone tills with less than 20% granite/shale admixture.	>>> M
Particle size data	Suggests moderate or high permeability subsoil.	>>> M-H
Field description data	Generally sandy or silty subsoils.	>>> M
Soil type	Generally a well drained sandy loam.	>>> M
Artificial drainage density	Low	>>> M-H
Natural drainage density	Low	>>> M-H
Permeability test data	-	>>> -
Rock type	Granite	>>> M
Land use	Tillage and pasture	>>> M
Overall conclusion		>>> M


5. Comments: Subsoil permeability indicators suggest moderate-high permeability and the soil maps indicate that the area is generally excessively well drained, on balance, a moderate permeability has been assigned. It is likely that the very frequency sand and gravel units mapped on the margins of this unit, are in fact interspersed within it. This would help to increase the overall subsoil permeability.

Summary of Permeability Data and Analyses for Subsoils Mapped as Till, and Overlain by Grange Series Soils

Description of unit location:	Extreme north east of kildare occupying 0.33% of the county.
Why is this a single K unit?	A unique soil type to Kildare, occupying a small area of the county.
1. General Permeability Indicators and Region Characteristics	
Rock type	Calp 1st (CD)
Depth to bedrock	generally <5m and <3m in parts with outcrop
Subsoil type	Limestone till
Soil type	Grange soil series - The 'C' horizon is a gritty to sandy loam with some gravel pockets. One sample taken.
Vegetation and land use	Pasture
Artificial drainage density	Low
Natural drainage density	Low
Topography and altitude	undulating (3-4degs), 70mOD
Ave. effective rainfall (mm)	precipitation approximately 750mm/yr

2. Summary of Particle Size Analysis and Field Descriptions of Subsoil Samples.

NB Particle distributions adjusted to discount particles greater than 20mm. Graphs only depict samples taken from 1) a known depth exceeding 1.5m in boreholes or 1m in exposures, AND 2) locations not at permeability boundaries.



3. Data from Permeability Tests.

T' tests: # Results min/25mm	# Tests T<1	# Tests T>50	Variable head tests (m/sec):	# Results	Range Values	Typical value	Pump tests # Results (m/sec):	# Results	Range Values	Typical value	Lab tests # Results (m/sec):	# Results	Range Values	Typical value
---------------------------------	-------------	--------------	------------------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------	----------------------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------	---------------------------------	-----------	--------------	---------------

4. Summary and Analysis

Criteria	Comments	Implications of each criterion for assessment of subsoil permeability	
Quaternary / subsoil origin	Limestone Till	>>>	L-M
Particle size data	The one sample suggests moderate or high permeability	>>>	M
Field description data	The one sample suggests a silty to clayey subsoil.	>>>	L-M
Soil type	Well drained gritty sandy loam	>>>	M
Artificial drainage density	Low	>>>	M
Natural drainage density	Low	>>>	M
Permeability test data		>>>	
Rock type	Muddy limestone	>>>	L-M
Land use	Pasture	>>>	M
Overall conclusion		>>>	M

5. Comments: Subsoil permeability indicators suggest moderate-high permeability and the soil maps indicate that the area is generally excessively well drained, on balance, a moderate permeability has been assigned.

Summary of Permeability Data and Analyses for Subsoils Mapped as Till, and Overlain by Donaghcrumper Series

Description of unit location:	Extreme north east of kildare occupying 0.35% of the county.										
Why is this a single K unit?	A unique soil type to Kildare, occupying a small area of the county.										
1. General Permeability Indicators and Region Characteristics											
Rock type	Calp (muddy) limestone										
Depth to bedrock	generally <5m and <3m in parts with outcrop										
Subsoil type	Limestone till										
Soil type	Donaghcrumper Series - grey brown podzolic, moderately well drained loam-clay loam. One sample.										
Vegetation and land use	Generally pasture										
Artificial drainage density	Low										
Natural drainage density	Low										
Topography and altitude	Flattish to undulating; 61m OD										
Ave. effective rainfall (mm)	750mm precipitation approximately										
2. Summary of Particle Size Analysis and Field Descriptions of Subsoil Samples.											
NB Particle distributions adjusted to discount particles greater than 20mm. Graphs only depict samples taken from 1) a known depth exceeding 1.5m in boreholes or 1m in exposures, AND 2) locations not at permeability boundaries.											
<div>Summary of particle size data: proportion of clay fraction in each sample</div>				<div>Summary of particle size data: proportion of total fines fraction in each sample</div>				<div>Field description of samples: range in principal subsoil types described using BS5930:1999</div>			
3. Data from Permeability Tests.											
T' tests: # Results # Tests T<1 # Tests T>50 min/25mm			Variable head # Results Range Values Typical value tests (m/sec):			Pump tests # Results Range Values Typical value (m/sec):			Lab tests # Results Range Values Typical value (m/sec):		
4. Summary and Analysis											
Criteria	Comments						Implications of each criterion for assessment of subsoil permeability				
Quaternary / subsoil origin	Limestone Till						>>> L-M				
Particle size data	Only one sample - inconclusive						>>> L-M				
Field description data	Only one sample that suggests clayey subsoil.						>>> L-M				
Soil type	Grey brown podzolic; loam to clay loam that is moderately well drained.						>>> M				
Artificial drainage density	Low						>>> M				
Natural drainage density	Low						>>> M				
Permeability test data	-						>>>				
Rock type	Muddy limestone						>>> L-M				
Land use	Pasture						>>> L-M				
Overall conclusion							>>> M				
5. Comments: Subsoil permeability indicators suggest moderate-low permeability and the soil maps indicate that the area is generally well drained, on balance, a moderate permeability has been assigned.											

Appendix IV: Discussion Of the Key Indicators of Domestic and Agricultural Contamination of Groundwater

A.1 Introduction

This appendix is adapted from Daly, 1996.

There has been a tendency in analysing groundwater samples to test for a limited number of constituents. A "full" or "complete" analysis, which includes all the major anions and cations, is generally recommended for routine monitoring and for assessing pollution incidents. This enables (i) a check on the reliability of the analysis (by doing an ionic balance), (ii) a proper assessment of the water chemistry and quality and (iii) a possible indication of the source of contamination. A listing of recommended and optional parameters are given in Table A1. It is also important that the water samples taken for analysis have not been chlorinated - this is a difficulty in some local authority areas where water take-off points prior to chlorination have not been installed.

The following parameters are good contamination indicators: E.coli, nitrate, ammonia, potassium, chloride, iron, manganese and trace organics.

TABLE A1

Recommended Parameters		
Appearance	Calcium (Ca)	Nitrate (NO ₃)*
Sediment	Magnesium (Mg)	Ammonia (NH ₄ and NH ₃)*
pH (lab)	Sodium (Na)	Iron (Fe)*
Electrical Conductivity (EC)*	Potassium (K)*	Manganese (Mn)*
Total Hardness	Chloride (Cl)*	
General coliform	Sulphate (SO ₄)*	
E. coli *	Alkalinity	
Optional Parameters (depending on local circumstances or reasons for sampling)		
Fluoride (F)	Fatty acids *	Zinc (Zn)
Orthophosphate	Trace organics *	Copper (Cu)
Nitrite (NO ₂)*	TOC *	Lead (Pb)
B.O.D.*	Boron (B) *	Other metals
Dissolved Oxygen *	Cadmium (Cd)	
* good indicators of contamination		

A.2 Faecal Bacteria and Viruses

E. coli is the parameter tested as an indicator of the presence of faecal bacteria and perhaps viruses; constituents which pose a significant risk to human health. The most common health problem arising from the presence of faecal bacteria in groundwater is diarrhoea, but typhoid fever, infectious hepatitis and gastrointestinal infections can also occur. Although *E. coli* bacteria are an excellent indicator of pollution, they can come from different sources - septic tank effluent, farmyard waste, landfill sites, birds. The faecal coliform : faecal streptococci ratio has been suggested as a tentative

indicator to distinguish between animal and human waste sources (Henry *et al.*, 1987). However, researchers in Virginia Tech (Reneau, 1996) cautioned against the use of this technique.

Viruses are a particular cause for concern as they survive longer in groundwater than indicator bacteria (Gerba and Bitton, 1984).

The published data on elimination of bacteria and viruses in groundwater has been compiled by Pekdeger and Matthess (1983), who show that in different investigations 99.9% elimination of *E. coli* occurred after 10-15 days. The mean of the evaluated investigations was 25 days. They show that 99.9% elimination of various viruses occurred after 16-120 days, with a mean of 35 days for Polio-, Hepatitis, and Enteroviruses. According to Armon and Kott (1994), pathogenic bacteria can survive for more than ten days under adverse conditions and up to 100 days under favourable conditions; enteroviruses can survive from about 25 days up to 170 days in soils.

Bacteria can move considerable distances in the subsurface, given the right conditions. In a sand and gravel aquifer, coliform bacteria were isolated 100 ft from the source 35 hours after the sewage was introduced (as reported in Hagedorn *et al.*, 1981). They can travel several kilometres in karstic aquifers. In Ireland, research at Sligo RTC involved examining in detail the impact of septic tank systems at three locations with different site conditions (Henry, 1990; summarised in Daly, Thorn and Henry, 1993). Piezometers were installed down-gradient; the distances of the furthest piezometers were 8 m, 10 m and 9.5 m, respectively. Unsurprisingly, high faecal bacteria counts were obtained in the piezometers at the two sites with soakage pits, one with limestone bedrock at a shallow depth where the highest count (max. 14 000 cfu's per 1000 ml) and the second where sand/gravel over limestone was present (max 3 000 cfu's per 100 ml). At the third site, a percolation area was installed at 1.0 m b.g.l; the subsoils between the percolation pipes and the fractured bedrock consisted of 1.5 m sandy loam over 3.5 m of poorly sorted gravel; the water table was 3.5 b.g.l. (So this site would satisfy the water table and depth to rock requirements of S.R.6:1991, and most likely the percolation test requirement.) Yet, the maximum faecal coliform bacteria count was 300 cfus per 100 ml. Faecal streptococci were present in all three piezometers. It is highly likely that wells located 30 m down gradient of the drainage fields would be polluted by faecal bacteria.

As viruses are smaller than bacteria, they are not readily filtered out as effluent moves through the ground. The main means of attenuation is by adsorption on clay particles. Viruses can travel considerable distances underground, depths as great as 67 m and horizontal migrations as far as 400 m have been reported (as reported in US EPA, 1987). The possible presence of viruses in groundwater as a result of pollution by septic tank systems is a matter of concern because of their mobility and the fact that indicator bacteria such as faecal coliforms have been found not to correlate with the presence of viruses in groundwater samples (US EPA, 1987).

The natural environment, in particular the soils and subsoils, can be effective in removing bacteria and viruses by predation, filtration and absorption. There are two high risk situations: (i) where permeable sands and gravels with a shallow water table are present; and (ii) where fractured rock, particularly limestone, is present close to the ground surface. The presence of clayey gravels, tills, and peat will, in many instances, hinder the vertical migration of microbes, although preferential flow paths, such as cracks in clayey materials, can allow rapid movement and bypassing of the subsoil.

A.3 Nitrate

Nitrate is one of the most common contaminants identified in groundwater and increasing concentrations have been recorded in many developed countries. The consumption of nitrate rich water by young children may give rise to a condition known as methaemoglobinaemia (blue baby syndrome). The formation of carcinogenic nitrosamines is also a possible health hazard and epidemiological studies have indicated a positive correlation between nitrate consumption in drinking

water and the incidence of gastric cancer. However, the correlation is not proven according to some experts (Wild and Cameron, 1980). The EC MAC for drinking water is 50mg/l.

The nitrate ion is not adsorbed on clay or organic matter. It is highly mobile and under wet conditions is easily leached out of the rooting zone and through soil and permeable subsoil. As the normal concentrations in uncontaminated groundwater is low (less than 5 mg/l), nitrate can be a good indicator of contamination by fertilisers and waste organic matter.

In the past there has been a tendency in Ireland to assume that the presence of high nitrates in well water indicated an impact by inorganic fertilisers. This assumption has frequently been wrong, as examination of other constituents in the water showed that organic wastes - usually farmyard waste, probably soiled water - were the source. The nitrate concentrations in wells with a low abstraction rate - domestic and farm wells - can readily be influenced by soiled water seeping underground in the vicinity of the farmyard or from the spraying of soiled water on adjoining land. Even septic tank effluent can raise the nitrate levels; if a septic tank system is in the zone of contribution of a well, a four-fold dilution of the nitrogen in the effluent is needed to bring the concentration of nitrate below the EU MAC (as the EU limit is 50 mg/l as NO_3 or 11.3 mg/l as N and assuming that the N concentration in septic tank effluent is 45 mg/l).

The recently produced draft county reports by the EPA on nitrate in groundwater show high levels of nitrate in a significant number of public and group scheme supplies, particularly in south and southern counties and in counties with intensive agriculture, such as Carlow and Louth. This suggests that diffuse sources – landspreading of fertilisers – is having an impact on groundwater.

In assessing regional groundwater quality and, in particular the nitrate levels in groundwater, it is important that:

- (i) conclusions should not be drawn using data only from private wells, which are frequently located near potential point pollution sources and from which only a small quantity of groundwater is abstracted;
- (ii) account should be taken of the complete chemistry of the sample and not just nitrate, as well as the presence of *E. coli*;
- (iii) account should be taken of not only the land-use in the area but also the location of point pollution sources;
- (iv) account should be taken of the regional hydrogeology and the relationship of this to the well itself. For instance, shallow wells generally show higher nitrate concentrations than deeper wells, low permeability sediments can cause denitrification, knowledge on the groundwater flow direction is needed to assess the influence of land-use.

A.4 Ammonia

Ammonia has a low mobility in soil and subsoil and its presence at concentrations greater than 0.1 mg/l in groundwater indicates a nearby waste source and/or vulnerable conditions. The EU MAC is 0.3 mg/l.

A.5 Potassium

Potassium (K) is relatively immobile in soil and subsoil. Consequently the spreading of manure, slurry and inorganic fertilisers is unlikely to significantly increase the potassium concentrations in groundwater. In most areas in Ireland, the background potassium levels in groundwater are less than 3.0 mg/l. Higher concentrations are found occasionally where the rock contains potassium e.g. certain granites and sandstones. The background potassium:sodium ratio in most Irish groundwaters is less than 0.4 and often 0.3. The K:Na ratio of soiled water and other wastes derived from plant organic

matter is considerably greater than 0.4, whereas the ratio in septic tank effluent is less than 0.2. Consequently a K:Na ratio greater than 0.4 can be used to indicate contamination by plant organic matter - usually in farmyards, occasionally landfill sites (from the breakdown of paper). However, a K:Na ratio lower than 0.4 does not indicate that farmyard wastes are **not** the source of contamination (or that a septic tank is the cause), as K is less mobile than Na. (Phosphorus is increasingly a significant pollutant and cause of eutrophication in surface water. It is not a problem in groundwater as it usually is not mobile in soil and subsoil).

A.6 Chloride

The principle source of chloride in uncontaminated groundwater is rainfall and so in any region, depending on the distance from the sea and evapotranspiration, chloride levels in groundwater will be fairly constant. Chloride, like nitrate, is a mobile anion. Also, it is a constituent of organic wastes. Consequently, levels appreciably above background levels (12-15 mg/l in Co. Offaly, for instance) have been taken to indicate contamination by organic wastes such as septic tank systems. While this is probably broadly correct, Sherwood (1991) has pointed out that chloride can also be derived from potassium fertilisers.

A.7 Iron and manganese

Although they are present under natural conditions in groundwater in some areas, they can also be good indicators of contamination by organic wastes. Effluent from the wastes cause deoxygenation in the ground which results in dissolution of iron (Fe) and manganese (Mn) from the soil, subsoil and bedrock into groundwater. With reoxygenation in the well or water supply system the Fe and Mn precipitate. High Mn concentrations can be a good indicator of pollution by silage effluent. However, it can also be caused by other high BOD wastes such as milk, landfill leachate and perhaps soiled water and septic tank effluent.

Box A1 Warning/trigger Levels for Certain Contaminants

As human activities have had some impact on a high proportion of the groundwater in Ireland, there are few areas where the groundwater is in a pristine, completely natural condition. Consequently, most groundwater is contaminated to some degree although it is usually not polluted. In the view of the GSI, assessments of the degree of contamination of groundwater can be beneficial as an addition to examining whether the water is polluted or not. This type of assessment can indicate where appreciable impacts are occurring. It can act as a warning that either the situation could worsen and so needs regular monitoring and careful land-use planning, or that there may be periods when the source is polluted and poses a risk to human health and as a consequence needs regular monitoring. Consequently, thresholds for certain parameters can be used to help indicate situations where additional monitoring and/or source protection studies and/or hazard surveys may be appropriate to identify or prevent more significant water quality problems.

Parameter	Threshold mg/l	EU MAC mg/l
Nitrate	25	50
Potassium	4	12
Chloride	30 (except near sea)	250
Ammonia	0.15	0.3
K/Na ratio	0.3-0.4	
Faecal bacteria	0	0

Box A2 Summary : Assessing a Problem Area

Let us assume that you are examining an area with potential groundwater contamination problems and that you have taken samples in nearby wells. How can the analyses be assessed?

E. coli present ⇒ organic waste source nearby (except in karst areas), usually either a septic tank system or farmyard.

E. coli absent ⇒ either not polluted by organic waste or bacteria have not survived due to attenuation or time of travel to well greater than 100 days.

Nitrate > 25 mg/l ⇒ either inorganic fertiliser or organic waste source; check other parameters.

Ammonia > 0.15 mg/l ⇒ source is nearby organic waste; fertiliser is not an issue.

Potassium (K) > 5.0 mg/l ⇒ source is probably organic waste.

K/Na ratio > 0.4 (0.3, in many areas) ⇒ Farmyard waste rather than septic tank effluent is the source. If < 0.3, no conclusion is possible.

Chloride > 30 mg/l ⇒ organic waste source. However this does not apply in the vicinity of the coast (within 20 km at least).

In conclusion, faecal bacteria, nitrate, ammonia, high K/Na ratio and chloride indicate contamination by organic waste. However, only the high K/Na helps distinguish between septic tank effluent and farmyard wastes. So in many instances, while the analyses can show potential problems, other information is needed to complete the assessment.

A.8 References

- Armon, R. and Kott, Y., 1994. The health dimension of groundwater contamination. In: Zoller, U. (Editor), Groundwater Contamination and Control. Published by Marcel, Dekker, Inc., pp71-86.

- Daly, D. 1996. Groundwater in Ireland. Course notes for Higher Diploma in Environmental Engineering, UCC.
- Daly, D., Thorn, R. and Henry, H., 1993. Septic tank systems and groundwater in Ireland. Geological Survey Report Series RS 93/1, 30pp.
- Gerba, C.P. and Bitton, G., 1984. Microbial pollutants : their survival and transport pattern to groundwater. In : G.Bitton and C.P. Gerba (Editors), Groundwater Pollution Microbiology, Wiley - Intersciences Publishers, pp 65-88.
- Hagedorn, C., McCoy, E.L. and Rahe, T. M. 1981. The potential for ground water contamination from septic tank effluents. Journal of Environmental Quality, volume 10, no. 1, p1-8.
- Henry, H. (1990). An Evaluation of Septic Tank Effluent Movement in Soil and Groundwater Systems. Ph.D. Thesis. Sligo Regional Technical College. National Council for Education Awards - Dublin.
- Reneau, R.B. 1996. Personal communication. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University.
- Sherwood, M., 1991. Personal communication, Environmental Protection Agency.
- US EPA. 1987. Guidelines for delineation of wellhead protection areas. Office of Ground-water Protection, U.S. Environmental Protection Agency.
- Wild, A. and Cameron, K.C., 1980. Nitrate leaching through soil and environmental considerations with special reference to recent work in the United Kingdom. Soil Nitrogen - Fertilizer or Pollutant, IAEA Publishers, Vienna, pp 289-306.

Location	County	Plot_n	Location	Scheme	details	NGR	Existing	Northings	type	LAB	LAB_REF	date	pH	pH_Rat	Temp(D C)	Temp_Feld (D C)	Dissolved oxygen Tuet	DO_Field (mg/l)	DO_Rat (Tuet)	BOD(mg/l O2)	Conduct (uS/cm)	conduct_Rat_u	Ammonia (mg/l N)	O-Phosphate (mg)	TDM (mg/l N)
Cathedral WS	KD	6	Cathedral WS	Cathedral @ Puntation		S80580	200527	186017	Bare	DUB	3718	112155	7.29	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	718	n/a	<0.05	0.015	6.704
Cathedral WS	KD	6	Cathedral WS	Cathedral @ Puntation		S80580	200527	186017	Bare	DUB	2886	092196	7.12	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	602	n/a	<0.01	0.012	6.603
Cathedral WS	KD	6	Cathedral WS	Cathedral @ Puntation		S80580	200527	186017	Bare	DUB	4592	112056	7.36	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	712	n/a	<0.01	0.015	6.603
Cathedral WS	KD	6	Cathedral WS	Cathedral @ Puntation		S80580	200527	186017	Bare	DUB	4342	110587	7.24	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	652	n/a	0.018	0.018	6.107
Cathedral WS	KD	6	Cathedral WS	Cathedral @ Puntation		S80580	200527	186017	Bare	DUB	686	021158	7.32	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	583	n/a	<0.01	0.0029	6.195
Cathedral WS	KD	6	Cathedral WS	Cathedral @ Puntation		S80580	200527	186017	Bare	DUB	3184	091658	7.51	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	590	n/a	2.589	0.001	9.329
Cathedral WS	KD	6	Cathedral WS	Cathedral @ Puntation		S80580	200527	186017	Bare	DUB	116	011459	7.4	n/a	n/a	9.3	n/a	n/a	9.48	85.3	n/a	<0.01	0.0127	6.49	
Cathedral WS	KD	6	Cathedral WS	Cathedral @ Puntation		S80580	200527	186017	Bare	DUB	3211	101259	7.39	n/a	n/a	10.1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	355	430	0.016	1.3029	2.74
Kiberry Area WS	KD	9	Kiberry Area WS			N62020	260200	200000	Bare	DUB	2014	092196	7.28	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	738	n/a	<0.01	0.009	10.559
Kiberry Area WS	KD	9	Kiberry Area WS			N62020	260200	200000	Bare	DUB	4079	112056	7.24	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	620	n/a	<0.01	0.009	6.254
Kiberry Area WS	KD	9	Kiberry Area WS			N62020	260200	200000	Bare	DUB	4326	110487	7.21	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	750	n/a	<0.01	0.008	10.759
Kiberry Area WS	KD	9	Kiberry Area WS			N62020	260200	200000	Bare	DUB	685	021158	7.25	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	750	n/a	<0.01	0.007	14.407
Kiberry Area WS	KD	9	Kiberry Area WS			N62020	260200	200000	Bare	DUB	3152	090858	7.12	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	742	n/a	<0.01	0.006	10.84
Kiberry Area WS	KD	9	Kiberry Area WS			N62020	260200	200000	Bare	DUB	57	011259	7.29	n/a	n/a	10.9	n/a	n/a	6.97	64	n/a	<0.01	0.009	12.294	
Kiberry Area WS	KD	9	Kiberry Area WS			N62020	260200	200000	Bare	DUB	2775	092059	7.13	n/a	n/a	12.4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	749	535	<0.01	0.005	9.174
Kiberry Area WS	KD	9	Kiberry Area WS			N62020	260200	200000	Bare	DUB	726	020500	7.25	n/a	n/a	10.4	n/a	n/a	8.46	n/a	751	n/a	<0.01	0.01	8.44
Kiberry Area WS	KD	9	Kiberry Area WS			N62020	260200	200000	Bare	DUB	3959	112056	7.482	n/a	n/a	11.7	n/a	n/a	8.34	n/a	653	n/a	0.02	0.0059	4.745
Kiberry Area WS	KD	9	Kiberry Area WS			N62020	260200	200000	Bare	DUB	1487	040401	7.161	n/a	n/a	9	n/a	n/a	7.11	n/a	886	883	<0.01	0.02367	10.801
Monasterwin W/Spring@Hyde	KD	14	Monasterwin W/Spring@Hyde			N642125	264230	212592	Spring	DUB	3167	090858	7.38	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	611	n/a	<0.01	0.009	3.247
Monasterwin W/Spring@Hyde	KD	14	Monasterwin W/Spring@Hyde			N642125	264230	212592	Spring	DUB	92	011259	7.54	n/a	n/a	8.5	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	597	n/a	<0.01	0.011	3.134
Monasterwin W/Spring@Hyde	KD	14	Monasterwin W/Spring@Hyde			N642125	264230	212592	Spring	DUB	3202	101159	7.45	n/a	n/a	11.2	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	614	n/a	<0.01	0.005	3.42
Monasterwin W/Spring@Hyde	KD	14	Monasterwin W/Spring@Hyde			N642125	264230	212592	Spring	DUB	724	020500	7.36	n/a	n/a	9.9	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	651	n/a	<0.01	<0.005	3.11
Monasterwin W/Spring@Hyde	KD	14	Monasterwin W/Spring@Hyde			N642125	264230	212592	Spring	DUB	2811	112100	7.487	n/a	n/a	9.9	n/a	n/a	5.35	n/a	600	n/a	<0.01	0.005	2.26
Monasterwin W/Spring@Hyde	KD	14	Monasterwin W/Spring@Hyde			N642125	264230	212592	Spring	DUB	1487	040401	7.161	n/a	n/a	9.3	n/a	n/a	4.62	n/a	611	723	<0.01	0.00274	2.37
Monasterwin WS (Bt No. 1)@Ballycilly	KD	15	Monasterwin WS (Bt No. 1)@Ballycilly	Ballycilly		N642125	264234	205229	Bare	DUB	3716	112156	7.25	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	804	n/a	<0.005	0.009	6.012
Monasterwin WS (Bt No. 1)@Ballycilly	KD	15	Monasterwin WS (Bt No. 1)@Ballycilly	Ballycilly		N642125	264230	212592	Bare	DUB	3012	092196	7.2	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	637	n/a	<0.01	0.006	6.175
Monasterwin WS (Bt No. 1)@Ballycilly	KD	15	Monasterwin WS (Bt No. 1)@Ballycilly	Ballycilly		N642125	264230	212592	Bare	DUB	4681	111956	7.2	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	607	n/a	<0.01	0.007	6.164
Monasterwin WS (Bt No. 1)@Ballycilly	KD	15	Monasterwin WS (Bt No. 1)@Ballycilly	Ballycilly		S642125	264230	212592	Bare	DUB	3166	090858	7.19	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	759	n/a	<0.01	0.009	6.437
Monasterwin WS (Bt No. 1)@Ballycilly	KD	15	Monasterwin WS (Bt No. 1)@Ballycilly	Ballycilly		S642125	264230	212592	Bare	DUB	91	011259	7.26	n/a	n/a	11.2	n/a	n/a	7.28	67.7	n/a	<0.01	0.009	7.779	
Monasterwin WS (Bt No. 1)@Ballycilly	KD	15	Monasterwin WS (Bt No. 1)@Ballycilly	Ballycilly		S642125	264230	212592	Bare	DUB	9512	112100	7.319	n/a	n/a	10.8	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	880	911	0.009	<0.005	4.977
Monasterwin WS (Bt No. 1)@Ballycilly	KD	15	Monasterwin WS (Bt No. 1)@Ballycilly	Ballycilly		S642125	264230	212592	Bare	DUB	1479	040401	7.161	n/a	n/a	10.7	n/a	n/a	5.36	n/a	911	n/a	<0.01	0.00454	4.752
Churchtown WS	KD	18	Churchtown WS	Churchtown		S64055	264000	195500	Bare	DUB	3015	092196	7.3	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	738	n/a	<0.01	0.016	12.549
Churchtown WS	KD	18	Churchtown WS	Churchtown		S64055	264000	195500	Bare	DUB	4078	111956	7.34	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	696	n/a	<0.01	0.014	6.784
Churchtown WS	KD	18	Churchtown WS	Churchtown		S64055	264000	195500	Bare	DUB	4328	110487	7.32	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	647	n/a	<0.01	0.016	12.147
Churchtown WS	KD	18	Churchtown WS	Churchtown		S64055	264000	195500	Bare	DUB	4714	120857	7.46	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	696	n/a	0.014	0.016	12.76
Churchtown WS	KD	18	Churchtown WS	Churchtown		S64055	264000	195500	Bare	DUB	665	021258	7.37	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	607	n/a	<0.01	0.013	13.136
Churchtown WS	KD	18	Churchtown WS	Churchtown		S64055	264000	195500	Bare	DUB	3163	090858	7.44	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	697	n/a	<0.01	0.0143	10.009
Churchtown WS	KD	18	Churchtown WS	Churchtown		S64055	264000	195500	Bare	DUB	19	011259	7.28	n/a	n/a	10.4	n/a	n/a	6.73	80.5	n/a	<0.01	0.014	10.262	
Churchtown WS	KD	18	Churchtown WS	Churchtown		S64055	264000	195500	Bare	DUB	2774	092059	7.25	n/a	n/a	10.8	n/a	n/a	7.6	n/a	637	n/a	<0.01	0.013	10
Churchtown WS	KD	18	Churchtown WS	Churchtown		S64055	264000	195500	Bare	DUB	727	020500	7.33	n/a	n/a	10.8	n/a	n/a	6.85	n/a	683	n/a	<0.01	0.011	9.99
Churchtown WS	KD	18	Churchtown WS	Churchtown		S64055	264000	195500	Bare	DUB	9808	112100	7.365	n/a	n/a	10	n/a	n/a	8.1	n/a	735	759	<0.01	0.00801	10.554
Churchtown WS	KD	18	Churchtown WS	Churchtown		S64055	264000	195500	Bare	DUB	1466	040401	7.242	n/a	n/a	10.8	n/a	n/a	8.63	n/a	734	753	<0.01	0.00812	10.057
Monasterwin WS (Lughl)	KD	20	Monasterwin WS (Lughl)			N630594	203507	206482	3 No. Springs	DUB	3717	112155	7.27	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	735	n/a	<0.005	0.016	6.243
Monasterwin WS (Lughl)	KD	20	Monasterwin WS (Lughl)			N630594	203507	206482	3 No. Springs	DUB	2013	092196	7.18	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	720	n/a	<0.01	0.01	7.738
Monasterwin WS (Lughl)	KD	20	Monasterwin WS (Lughl)			N630594	203507	206482	3 No. Springs	DUB	4892	111956	7.18	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	747	n/a	<0.01	0.013	6.133
Monasterwin WS (Lughl)	KD	20	Monasterwin WS (Lughl)			N630594	203507	206482	3 No. Springs	DUB	4320	110487	7.17	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	665	n/a	<0.01	0.009	7.72
Monasterwin WS (Lughl)	KD	20	Monasterwin WS (Lughl)			N630594	203507	206482	3 No. Springs	DUB	652	021158	7.21	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	653	n/a	<0.01	0.009	6.327
Monasterwin WS (Lughl)	KD	20	Monasterwin WS (Lughl)			N630594	203507	206482	3 No. Springs	DUB	3165	090858	7.23	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	644	n/a	<0.01	0.011	8.322
Monasterwin WS (Lughl)	KD	20	Monasterwin WS (Lughl)			N630594	203507	206482	3 No. Springs	DUB	90	011259	7.17	n/a	n/a	10.8	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	603	n/a	<0.01	0.011	9.154
Monasterwin WS (Lughl)	KD	20	Monasterwin WS (Lughl)			N630594	203507	206482	3 No. Springs	DUB	2794	092199	7.19	n/a	n/a	11.2	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	659	804	<0.01	0.007	7.696
Monasterwin WS (Lughl)	KD	20	Monasterwin WS (Lughl)			N630594	203507	206482	3 No. Springs	DUB	725	020500	7.22	n/a	n/a	10.9	n/a	n/a	6.83	n/a	701	789	<0.01	0.007	7.41
Monasterwin WS (Lughl)	KD	20	Monasterwin WS (Lughl)			N630594	203507	206482	3 No. Springs	DUB	2012	112100	7.282	n/a	n/a	10.7	n/a	n/a	6.36	n/a	773	880	<0.01	<0.005	8.45
Monasterwin WS (Lughl)	KD	20	Monasterwin WS (Lughl)			N630594	203507	206482	3 No. Springs	DUB	1486	040401	7.075	n/a	n/a	10.8	n/a	n/a	6.58	6.58	763	785	0.02	0.01057	6.188
Newtown / Kibook WS	KD	22	Newtown / Kibook WS			N818394	281850	238447	Bare	DUB	3715	112155	7.31	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	574	n/a	0.014	0.013	0.96
Newtown / Kibook WS	KD	22	Newtown / Kibook WS			N818394	281850	238447	Bare	DUB	2854	092058	7.16	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	634	n/a	0.078	0.009	0.884
Newtown / Kibook WS	KD	22	Newtown / Kibook WS			N818394	281850	238447	Bare	DUB	4101	112156	7.26	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	576	n/a	0.137	0.015	0.862
Newtown / Kibook WS	KD	22	Newtown / Kibook WS			N818394	281850	238447	Bare	DUB	4710	120857	7.23	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a								

Clighterknee WS	KID	40	Clighterknee WS		N656387	265200	236000	Bore	DUB	1276	0463501	7.262	n/a	10.6		2.87		2.97		n/a	619	646	<0.01	0.046362	2.235
Hare Park (Cumagh Camp)	KID	42	Hare Park (Cumagh Camp)		N770115	277011	211522	Bore	DUB	3046	0827196	6.92	n/a							n/a	798		<0.01	0.018	4.461
Hare Park (Cumagh Camp)	KID	42	Hare Park (Cumagh Camp)	HarePark.Cumagh	N770115	277011	211522	Bore	DUB	4103	1121196	7.24	n/a							n/a	790		<0.01	0.01	4.267
Hare Park (Cumagh Camp)	KID	42	Hare Park (Cumagh Camp)		N770115	277011	211522	Bore	DUB	4366	1165597	7.26	n/a							n/a	806		<0.01	0.008	5.972
Hare Park (Cumagh Camp)	KID	42	Hare Park (Cumagh Camp)		N770115	277011	211522	Bore	DUB	484	0212256	7.26	n/a							n/a	719		<0.01	0.01	4.266
Hare Park (Cumagh Camp)	KID	42	Hare Park (Cumagh Camp)		N770115	277011	211522	Bore	DUB	3164	0809568	7.21	n/a							n/a	707		<0.01	0.022	5.983
Hare Park (Cumagh Camp)	KID	42	Hare Park (Cumagh Camp)		N770115	277011	211522	Bore	DUB	55	0112266	7.375	n/a	10.4				8.33	76.7	n/a	675	n/a	<0.01	0.018115	4.404
Hare Park (Cumagh Camp)	KID	42	Hare Park (Cumagh Camp)		N770115	277011	211522	Bore	DUB	2772	0820589	7.14	n/a	11.1				8.7		n/a	708	876	<0.01	0.015	4.916
Hare Park (Cumagh Camp)	KID	42	Hare Park (Cumagh Camp)		N770115	277011	211522	Bore	DUB	694	0207100	7.21	n/a	10.6				8.9		n/a	736	831	<0.01	0.005	4.43
Hare Park (Cumagh Camp)	KID	42	Hare Park (Cumagh Camp)		N770115	277011	211522	Bore	DUB	1471	0404001	7.266	n/a	10.7	10.7	9.26		9.26		n/a	838	876	0.02	0.011823	5.085
McDonagh (Cumagh Camp)	KID	50	McDonagh (Cumagh Camp)	McDonagh Pump Stn	N768117	276814	211736	Bore	DUB	2047	0827196	7.16	n/a							n/a	744		<0.01	0.127	5.838
McDonagh (Cumagh Camp)	KID	50	McDonagh (Cumagh Camp)	McDonagh Pump Stn	N768117	276814	211736	Bore	DUB	4194	1121256	7.24	n/a							n/a	687		<0.01	0.262	4.855
McDonagh (Cumagh Camp)	KID	50	McDonagh (Cumagh Camp)	McDonagh Pump Stn	N768117	276814	211736	Bore	DUB	4712	1205597	7.63	n/a							n/a	586		0.015	0.012	4.567
McDonagh (Cumagh Camp)	KID	50	McDonagh (Cumagh Camp)	McDonagh Pump Stn	N768117	276814	211736	Bore	DUB	683	0212266	7.76	n/a							n/a	601		<0.01	0.012	4.596
McDonagh (Cumagh Camp)	KID	50	McDonagh (Cumagh Camp)	McDonagh Pump Stn	N768117	276814	211736	Bore	DUB	3150	0808588	7.69	n/a							n/a	624		<0.01	0.0133	5.216
McDonagh (Cumagh Camp)	KID	50	McDonagh (Cumagh Camp)	McDonagh Pump Stn	N768117	276814	211736	Bore	DUB	56	0112266	7.87	n/a	9.8				12.31	113	n/a	597	n/a	<0.01	0.011622	4.825
McDonagh (Cumagh Camp)	KID	50	McDonagh (Cumagh Camp)	McDonagh Pump Stn	N768117	276814	211736	Bore	DUB	2773	0820589	7.61	n/a	10.6	10.6			11.8		n/a	621	730	<0.01	0.011	5.246
McDonagh (Cumagh Camp)	KID	50	McDonagh (Cumagh Camp)	McDonagh Pump Stn	N768117	276814	211736	Bore	DUB	695	0207100	7.76	n/a	10.4	0.4			12.1		n/a	640	720	<0.01	0.01	4.94
McDonagh (Cumagh Camp)	KID	50	McDonagh (Cumagh Camp)	McDonagh Pump Stn	N768117	276814	211736	Bore	DUB	1765	1120202	7.785	n/a	9.3	9.3			11.66		n/a	688	707	<0.01	0.08732	4.875
McDonagh (Cumagh Camp)	KID	50	McDonagh (Cumagh Camp)	McDonagh Pump Stn	N768117	276814	211736	Bore	DUB	1379	0463501	7.666	n/a	10.4				12.22	12.22	n/a	687	717	0.02	0.011622	5.363
Marbletown	KID	72	Marbletown		N773084	277383	266406	DUB	4713	1205597	7.24	n/a								n/a	730		0.023	0.018	10.520
Oxberge Lodge	KID	74	Oxberge Lodge		N755147	275579	214671	DUB	2856	0820588	7.15	n/a								n/a	641		<0.01	0.007	1.412
Monasterewe WS BH No. 1 & Spring)	KID	80	Monasterewe WS BH No. 1 & Spring)	Ballykeilly	N641126	264100	212600	DUB	4301	1104497	7.26	n/a								n/a	707		<0.01	0.007	5.845
Monasterewe WS BH No. 1 & Spring)	KID	80	Monasterewe WS BH No. 1 & Spring)	Ballykeilly	N641126	264100	212600	DUB	651	0211196	7.26	n/a								n/a	689		<0.01	<0.005	5.979
Monasterewe WS(Springs-Bore1+2)	KID	80	Monasterewe WS(Springs-Bore1+2)		56A2125	264220	212602	DUB	3201	1011196	7.22	n/a	11.2	11.2				n/a		n/a	740	854	<0.01	0.006	8.05
Monasterewe WS(Springs-Bore1+2)	KID	80	Monasterewe WS(Springs-Bore1+2)		56A2125	264220	212602	DUB	723	0205600	7.16	n/a	10.9	10.9				5.11		n/a	878	986	<0.01	0.007	7.23

Nitrate (mg/L N)	Nitrate (mg/L NO3)	Nitrite (mg/L N)	alkalinity(mg/L)	Chloride (mg/LCl)	Fluoride (mg/LF)	TOTAL_HARD(mg/L)	Ca_hardness	Ferroc_Coliform	Sulphate (mg/L S)	Sulphide (mg/L S)	Sodium (mg/L Na)	Potassium (mg/L)	Magnesium (mg/L)	Copper (mg/L Cu)
7.34	32.88152	n/a	318	17.38	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	16.2	n/a	7.87	1.93	13.94	n/a
n/a	33.741	n/a	302	17.87	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	12.7	n/a	8.94	1.68	13.1	n/a
n/a	35.121	n/a	316	18.1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	14.12	n/a	7.88	2.17	9.2	n/a
n/a	35.911	n/a	314	18.428	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	16.389	n/a	7.739	0.495	14.916	n/a
n/a	36.311	n/a	289	17	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	11.9	n/a	9.5	1.4	15.2	n/a
n/a	41.311	n/a	272	18.9	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	13.2	n/a	10.4	11.7	13.8	n/a
n/a	42.021	n/a	296	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
n/a	12.121	n/a	155	13.8	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	10.18	n/a	13.87	2.91	8.38	n/a
n/a	45.701	n/a	308	38.83	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	38.28	n/a	12.19	1.61	12.23	n/a
n/a	43.871	n/a	310	35.86	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	40.56	n/a	12.37	2.51	9.72	n/a
n/a	47.841	n/a	284	54.646	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	42.341	n/a	26.498	3.92	15.154	n/a
n/a	63.811	n/a	308	42.8	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	38.7	n/a	15.1	1.7	14.7	n/a
n/a	48.91	n/a	311	35.1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	33.8	n/a	14.8	1.8	14.7	n/a
n/a	54.421	n/a	303	54.8	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	37.5	n/a	15.8	2.3	16.8	n/a
n/a	40.801	n/a	314	35	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	37.1	n/a	15.4	2.07	15.93	n/a
n/a	41.801	n/a	276	33.8	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	30.4	n/a	14.92	1.61	14.24	n/a
n/a	29.871	n/a	241	34.4	n/a	n/a	n/a	<1	31.7	n/a	11.6	<1	14.5	n/a
n/a	47.831	n/a	305	43.1	n/a	n/a	n/a	<1	31	n/a	14.87	0.93	13.86	n/a
n/a	14.381	n/a	303	13.4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	18.7	n/a	8.9	1.3	28.4	n/a
n/a	13.881	n/a	315	18.3	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	25.3	n/a	10.2	1.4	31.2	n/a
n/a	15.141	n/a	334	16.24	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	19.7	n/a	8.47	1.19	27.6	n/a
n/a	13.771	n/a	299	17.4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	20.5	n/a	8.94	1.18	28.8	n/a
n/a	8.861	n/a	240	13.9	n/a	n/a	n/a	<1	19.5	n/a	6.9	<1	26.2	n/a
n/a	14.481	n/a	310	11.88	n/a	n/a	n/a	<1	20.2	n/a	9.3	0.2	28.8	n/a
6.27	27.76336	n/a	320	19.52	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	57.86	n/a	9.36	2.14	31.88	n/a
n/a	36.221	n/a	348	21.28	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	61.05	n/a	7.88	1.71	36.18	n/a
n/a	36.091	n/a	356	21.24	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	64.18	n/a	8.59	1.98	32.95	n/a
n/a	37.371	n/a	341	20.9	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	61.7	n/a	10.4	2.3	31.3	n/a
n/a	34.451	n/a	337	24.8	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	77.6	n/a	11.4	2.9	35.8	n/a
n/a	19.001	n/a	257	19.2	n/a	n/a	n/a	<1	74.3	n/a	8.2	1.4	31.4	n/a
n/a	24.771	n/a	350	14.12	n/a	n/a	n/a	<1	58.9	n/a	10.93	1.96	33.9	n/a
n/a	35.571	n/a	276	33.22	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	24.2	n/a	10.93	1.95	12.4	n/a
n/a	43.311	n/a	288	26.13	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	21.93	n/a	10.97	1.32	13.94	n/a
n/a	53.801	n/a	272	37.488	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	21.872	n/a	11.4	0.731	13.834	n/a
n/a	55.901	n/a	274	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
n/a	58.181	n/a	268	33	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	21.6	n/a	11.3	1.6	13.3	n/a
n/a	57.811	n/a	262	31.9	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	22.8	n/a	14.6	2	14.5	n/a
n/a	48.821	n/a	287	37.2	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	26	n/a	14.3	2.1	16.1	n/a
n/a	44.281	n/a	270	26	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	26.9	n/a	11.76	1.83	16.87	n/a
n/a	44.241	n/a	325	28.4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	21.4	n/a	12.7	1.69	14.6	n/a
n/a	45.721	n/a	263	30.6	n/a	n/a	n/a	<1	21.4	n/a	10.5	<1	15.5	n/a
n/a	44.531	n/a	275	20.83	n/a	n/a	n/a	<1	24.9	n/a	13.49	1.78	14.18	n/a
6.67	29.63476	n/a	373.798	23.45	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	20.94	n/a	11.45	1.89	14.86	n/a
n/a	34.371	n/a	318	26.85	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	25.73	n/a	10.44	1.83	12.84	n/a
n/a	36.071	n/a	318	25.8	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	25.26	n/a	10.97	1.86	9.17	n/a
n/a	34.181	n/a	318	25.721	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	20.232	n/a	10.109	0.775	11.337	n/a
n/a	36.891	n/a	318	32.823	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	22.805	n/a	10.985	1.812	12.985	n/a
n/a	36.891	n/a	302	23.4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	23.5	n/a	13.9	1.7	14.3	n/a
n/a	40.821	n/a	308	24.8	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	21.8	n/a	12.7	2.3	12.2	n/a
n/a	34.101	n/a	291	24.7	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	25.4	n/a	12.72	1.63	15.42	n/a

n/a	32.81°	n/a	287	21	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	20	n/a	12.03	1.84	13.07	n/a
n/a	37.42°	n/a	279	23.1	n/a	n/a	n/a	+1	20.7	n/a	9.3	+1	12	n/a
n/a	36.13°	n/a	300	15.96	n/a	n/a	n/a	+1	23.1	n/a	11.88	0.84	12.08	n/a
0.13	0.9784	n/a	210.885	13.89	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	41.3	n/a	7.5	2.51	6.05	n/a
n/a	0.30°	n/a	248	14.4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	70	n/a	7.28	2.74	5.91	n/a
n/a	0.37°	n/a	352	10.51	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	41.38	n/a	8.31	2.41	2.08	n/a
n/a	0.46°	n/a	254	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
n/a	0.13°	n/a	332	18.770	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	100.161	n/a	7.286	2.209	6.794	n/a
n/a	+0.04°	n/a	220	11.8	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	81.7	n/a	9.1	2.8	6.6	n/a
n/a	0.9°	n/a	258	14.8	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	70	n/a	8.3	2.5	7.5	n/a
n/a	0.56°	n/a	245	13.77	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	50.6	n/a	7.67	2.22	6.58	n/a
n/a	0.31°	n/a	352	13.45	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	73.6	n/a	7.82	2.26	6.57	n/a
n/a	0.19°	n/a	244	11.5	n/a	n/a	n/a	+1	82.4	n/a	6.6	1.3	6.6	n/a
n/a	0.63°	n/a	238	9.92	n/a	n/a	n/a	+1	70	n/a	8.87	1.17	6.94	n/a
2.82	12.62976	n/a	302.489	13.69	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	18.87	n/a	10.01	1.45	19.08	n/a
n/a	12.97°	n/a	338	14.7	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	18.6	n/a	11.59	1.51	19.07	n/a
n/a	12.97°	n/a	318	12.84	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	17.9	n/a	10.14	0.52	18.5	n/a
n/a	12.71°	n/a	335	12.511	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	16.887	n/a	8.702	+0.01	18.875	n/a
n/a	12.68°	n/a	332	13.8	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	18.3	n/a	10.6	0.7	19.6	n/a
n/a	13.73°	n/a	319	12.8	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	18	n/a	11.6	0.7	19.6	n/a
n/a	13.73°	n/a	316	12.8	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	18	n/a	11.6	0.7	19.6	n/a
n/a	12.62°	n/a	352	16.4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	20.8	n/a	11.8	0.9	21.4	n/a
n/a	13.12°	n/a	290	15.85	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	19.78	n/a	11.19	0.66	19.85	n/a
n/a	12.62°	n/a	257	16.9	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	19.4	n/a	10.92	0.63	19.69	n/a
n/a	12.21°	n/a	290	12.5	n/a	n/a	n/a	23	17.8	n/a	6.9	+1	14.4	n/a
n/a	13.17°	n/a	318	10.89	n/a	n/a	n/a	10	20.05	n/a	10.36	+1	17.85	n/a
n/a	5.89°	n/a	300	11.4	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	20.7	n/a	8.71	0.93	12.6	n/a
n/a	10.18°	n/a	288	10.55	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	24.49	n/a	10.34	2.14	8.25	n/a
n/a	9.43°	n/a	282	17.708	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	25.367	n/a	14.3	1.097	13.787	n/a
n/a	10.98°	n/a	298	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
n/a	10.23°	n/a	345	13.304	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	24.659	n/a	9.45	0.67	12.625	n/a
n/a	9.30°	n/a	299	10.3	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	22.9	n/a	12.8	2	13.1	n/a
n/a	15.90°	n/a	291	12.8	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	28.6	n/a	11.9	1.1	14	n/a
n/a	8.58°	n/a	288	11.85	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	22.6	n/a	10.7	0.82	13.44	n/a
n/a	10.70°	n/a	265	11.86	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	23.6	n/a	10.53	0.75	12.44	n/a
n/a	8.68°	n/a	285	9.6	n/a	n/a	n/a	+1	21.6	n/a	9.5	+1	11.6	n/a
n/a	9.90°	n/a	272	9.13	n/a	n/a	n/a	+1	24.35	n/a	10.3	+1	11.6	n/a
n/a	19.70°	n/a	322	28.24	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	3.58	n/a	33.92	2.21	13.49	n/a
n/a	19.17°	n/a	352	20.33	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	42.87	n/a	17.39	2.51	11.92	n/a
n/a	17.88°	n/a	352	23.418	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	34.382	n/a	17.901	1.389	14.81	n/a
n/a	19.04°	n/a	338	33	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	27.7	n/a	23.3	2.1	13.6	n/a
n/a	25.20°	n/a	325	27.1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	28.5	n/a	22.6	2.2	12.7	n/a
n/a	19.48°	n/a	322	40.6	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	28.3	n/a	26.6	2.5	13.7	n/a
n/a	21.78°	n/a	335	27.9	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	24.8	n/a	20.1	2.08	13.47	n/a
n/a	19.62°	n/a	341	38.73	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	23.7	n/a	21.53	2.09	12.59	n/a
n/a	22.52°	n/a	330	38.5	n/a	n/a	n/a	+1	30.2	n/a	23.6	0.82	16.65	n/a
n/a	24.97°	n/a	293	18.31	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	5.27	n/a	21.32	1.66	12.96	n/a
n/a	21.43°	n/a	322	11.5	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	19.45	n/a	11.82	0.76	12.7	n/a
n/a	20.37°	n/a	322	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
n/a	20.37°	n/a	320	11.1	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	18.9	n/a	8.2	0.5	16.9	n/a
n/a	23.11°	n/a	344	11	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	19.2	n/a	9.1	1	18	n/a

nda	21.39°	nda	310	14.7	nda	nda	nda	nda	22	nda	0.8	0.8	10.9	nda
nda	23.24°	nda	289	14.14	nda	nda	nda	nda	19.3	nda	0.39	0.58	15.88	nda
nda	21.43°	nda	322	13.37	nda	nda	nda	nda	19.76	nda	0.34	0.58	15.87	nda
nda	21.89°	nda	313	10.9	nda	nda	nda	+1	19.8	nda	7.4	0.5	14.7	nda
nda	23.77°	nda	320	9.72	nda	nda	nda	+1	19.7	nda	0.59	+1	14.85	nda
nda	46.63°	nda	352	nda	nda	nda	nda	nda	nda	nda	nda	nda	nda	nda
nda	0.20°	nda	338	9	nda	nda	nda	nda	9.3	nda	0.24	0.71	9.8	nda
nda	26.90°	nda	330	18.376	nda	nda	nda	nda	46.514	nda	9.133	0.694	28.372	nda
nda	26.48°	nda	328	23.875	nda	nda	nda	nda	52.381	nda	9.576	1.671	28.33	nda
nda	35.60°	nda	332	21.9	nda	nda	nda	nda	75.4	nda	10.36	2.81	32.5	nda
nda	32.61°	nda	308	20.4	nda	nda	nda	nda	83.6	nda	11.07	3.63	30	nda

Calcium (mg/L Ca)	Iron (mg/L Fe)	Manganese (mg/L)
110.53	0.0113	0.0025
113.54	0.236	<0.0005
120.6	0.0023	0.002
127.451	0.367	0.207
117	0.0165	<0.0005
101.8	0.0013	0.009
109	0.0261	<0.0005
82.6	0.0025	0.0105
125.54	0.126	0.0026
147	0.162	0.0058
146.189	<0.001	0.0028
146.1	0.0067	0.0014
140.4	<0.01	0.0021
171.2	0.0115	0.0025
144.1	0.0261	0.0027
140.4	<0.02	0.0042
126.5	<0.05	0.0004
126.6	<0.05	0.0004
103.3	0.0149	<0.0005
121.4	0.0453	0.0025
111.2	0.0027	0.0025
108.8	0.0261	0.0032
96.5	<0.05	0.0046
103.1	0.0068	0.0019
109.29	0.0065	0.0464
127.13	0.0026	0.0149
143.8	0.0061	0.0143
130.1	0.0142	0.0173
162	0.0063	0.0025
130.2	<0.05	0.0029
126	<0.05	0.0021
118.36	0.267	<0.0005
116	0.185	<0.0005
124.626	0.021	<0.0005
109	0.015	0.0017
127.1	0.002	<0.0005
119.1	<0.01	<0.0005
144.7	<0.0005	0.0006
118.6	<0.02	<0.0005
126.2	<0.02	<0.0005
112.6	<0.05	<0.001
107	<0.05	<0.001
109.28	0.0269	0.0001
123.76	0.5	0.0001
124.9	0.0104	<0.0005
126.054	0.076	0.0006
122.3	0.0243	<0.0005
123.3	0.0026	0.0031
161.7	<0.0005	0.001
126.3	0.0022	<0.0005

133.8	<0.02	<0.0005
136.3	<0.05	<0.001
137.2	0.1549	0.0034
95.95	1.952	0.113
124.9	2.246	0.239
94.41	1.403	0.135
nd	4.095	0.194
124.9	4.073	0.197
114.7	2.134	0.147
140.6	3.095	0.211
105.5	1.135	0.1041
121.8	1.9874	0.1286
107.4	1.8931	0.1539
104.85	1.0454	0.2153
98.48	0.144	0.0152
119.2	0.239	0.0197
129.7	0.0223	0.0047
113.823	0.194	0.0138
112.7	0.323	0.006
109.2	0.1	0.0097
109.2	0.1	0.0097
120	0.111	0.0077
111.7	0.0869	0.0153
116.8	<0.02	0.0014
95.1	<0.05	0.0272
98.85	<0.05	0.0032
111	0.201	0.0736
119.1	0.0198	0.0256
110.968	<0.001	0.017
nd	0.024	0.0185
105.1	0.0383	0.0134
108.6	<0.01	0.0153
121.8	0.0267	0.0141
108.1	0.1462	0.1351
110.2	0.0316	0.0414
95.5	<0.05	0.0395
94.75	<0.05	0.0287
145.62	0.283	0.0015
101.2	0.0316	<0.0005
137.181	0.05	0.0011
136.3	0.012	<0.0005
123	0.0271	0.0059
105.3	0.0389	0.001
123.8	<0.02	<0.0005
123.33	<0.02	<0.0005
120	<0.05	<0.001
147.29	0.146	0.0015
128.8	0.105	0.001
nd	0.011	0.0018
121.2	0.0015	<0.0005
117.5	<0.01	<0.0005

140.8	0.0125	0.0000
118.4	<0.02	<0.0005
118.8	<0.02	<0.0005
96	<0.05	<0.001
102.25	<0.05	<0.001
104	0.028	0.0029
108.6	0.039	0.0039
125.433	<0.001	0.0111
121	0.0413	0.0009
100.0	<0.02	0.0155
101.4	<0.02	0.0146



LEGEND

WW20 ● Production Well Location



K.T.Cullen & Co. Ltd.
Hydrogeological & Environmental Consultants



Kildare Co. Co.
Well Locations

Info No. C003054 Date: April 2002

Figure No. 1

LEGEND

- Inner Protection Zone
- Outer Protection Zone
- WW20 ● Production Well Location











Kildare Co. Co.
Source Protection Areas




 K.T. Cullen & Co. Ltd.
Hydrogeological & Environmental Consultants

Job No. C003054 Date: April 2002
Figure No. 2

COUNTY KILDARE GROUNDWATER PROTECTION SCHEME

SOURCE PROTECTION ZONES

VULNERABILITY RATING	SOURCE PROTECTION ZONES	
	Inner (SI)	Outer (SO)
Extreme (E)	 SI/E	 SO/E
High (H)	 SI/H	 SO/H
Moderate (M)	 SI/M	 SO/M
Low (L)	 SI/L	 SO/L

-  Public Supply Well
-  Zone of Contribution of Wells (SO)
-  Inner protection area (SI)
- * K.T. Cullen & Co. Ltd.
- ** GSI Sources

This Source Protection Zone map is designed for general information and strategic planning usage. The boundaries are based on the available evidence and local details have been generalised to fit the map scale. Evaluation of specific sites and circumstances will normally require further and more detailed assessments and will frequently require site investigations to determine the risk to groundwater.

The map is intended for use in conjunction with groundwater protection responses for potentially polluting activities, which lists the degree of acceptability of these activities in each zone and describes the control measures necessary to prevent pollution.

Project Hydrogeologist: Coran Kelly
Project Manager: Vincent Fitzsimons
Digital Map Production: Sheela Smyth & Denise Taylor

The topographic base is reproduced with the permission of the Ordnance Survey of Ireland

KILDARE COUNTY COUNCIL
Comhairle Chontae Chill Dara



Mr. John Linn
Director of Public Services
St. Mary's House, Co. Kildare

DATE	DETAILS	APPROVED	CHANGED
Nov 02	Jet	SS	VF
Nov 02	Jet	BT	CK

GEOLOGICAL SURVEY
OF IRELAND

Géolaíocht Ghraoblaíochta Chéara



Groundwater Division
Beggars Bush, Fingerton Rd.,
Dublin 4