



Oregon Water Resources Department
725 Summer Street NE, Suite A
Salem, Oregon 97301-1271
(503) 986-0900
www.wrd.state.or.us

Ground Water Review Form:

- ☐ Water Right Transfer
☐ Permit Amendment
☐ GR Modification
☐ Other

Application: T-11151

Applicant Name: Kregger Farming Enterprises

Proposed Changes: ☐ POA ☒ APOA ☐ SW→GW ☐ RA
☐ USE ☐ POU ☐ OTHER

Reviewer(s): Marc A. Norton

Date of Review: July 11, 2013

The information provided in the application is insufficient to evaluate whether the proposed transfer may be approved because:

- ☐ The water well reports provided with the application do not correspond to the water rights affected by the transfer.
- ☐ The application does not include water well reports or a description of the well construction details sufficient to establish the ground water body developed or proposed to be developed.
- ☐ Other _____

-
1. Basic description of the changes proposed in this transfer: The applicant proposes to add two additional wells for a total of 3 POAs.
 2. Will the proposed POA develop the same aquifer (source) as the existing authorized POA?
☒ Yes ☐ No Comments: The transfer should be conditioned to limit the new wells to the alluvial aquifer overlying the Columbia River Basalts.
 3. a) Is there more than one source developed under the right (e.g., basalt and alluvium)?
☐ Yes ☒ No _____
b) If yes, estimate the portion of the right supplied by each of the sources and describe any limitations that will need to be placed on the proposed change (rate, duty, etc.): _____
 4. a) Will this proposed change, at its maximum allowed rate of use, likely result in an increase in interference with **another ground water right**?
☒ Yes ☐ No Comments: The proposed location for POA 2 will be located about 700 feet from an existing domestic well. The proposed new well will increase interference with the existing well. Interference will decrease at POA 1 because less water will be pumped from this well. Interference at the proposed location for POA 3 should be minimal. In an earlier review, there was concern about an approved new well location under a different application to the north of POA 2. The well was constructed about 1600 feet north and should not be a problem.
b) If yes, would this proposed change, at its maximum allowed rate of use, likely result in another groundwater right not receiving the water to which it is legally entitled?

☒ Yes ☐ No If yes, explain: The amount of interference from proposed location for POA 2 could exceed 80 feet at the nearby domestic well after 90 days of pumping. This would greatly reduce the discharge rate at the existing well. See drawdown graph.

5. a) Will this proposed change, at its maximum allowed rate of use, likely result in an increase in interference with **another surface water source**?

☐ Yes ☒ No Comments: _____

b) If yes, at its maximum allowed rate of use, what is the expected change in degree of interference with any **surface water sources** resulting from the proposed change?

Stream: _____

☐ Minimal ☐ Significant

Stream: _____

☐ Minimal ☐ Significant

Provide context for minimal/significant impact: _____

6. What conditions or other changes in the application are necessary to address any potential issues identified above: The additional wells shall only develop water from the alluvial aquifer overlying the Columbia River Basalts.
7. Any additional comments: Recommendation – Move POA 2 north and east or west to get as far from the domestic well as possible. Or, condition the transfer such that the discharge at POA 2 is limited if there is substantial interference with the domestic well.

Theis Drawdown and Recovery at r = 700 ft From Pumping Well



