



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-12436

Applicant Name: Sester Farms Inc. / Ted Sester

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

Reviewer(s): Phillip I. Marcy

Date of Review: 04/20/2017

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 wishes to add two wells to the current right (certificate 30659), while removing the authorized existing POA well (CLAC 4699). One APOA well exists (CLAC 55502), while the other has yet to be drilled. The addition of the yet undrilled well is proposed to supply redundancy to the onsite water supply.
 2. Will the proposed POA develop the same aquifer (source) as the existing authorized POA?
 - Yes No Comments: Both the existing POA well and the completed APOA well appear to produce from sands and gravels within the Springwater Formation (Madin, 2004), and penetrate into the upper portion of the Troutdale Formation. Some local wells encounter basalt at depths greater than 800', beneath hundreds of feet of fine-grained alluvium. To be considered as the same source, the APOA well (well 3 on application) must not be completed to a depth greater than 600'.
 3. a) Is there more than one source developed under the right (e.g., basalt and alluvium)?
 - Yes No Existing wells develop from alluvium.
 - 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.): NA
 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: Proposed changes to certificate 30659 do not move potential pumping impacts significantly closer to any other right.
 - 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: NA

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: Proposed changes to certificate 30659 do not move potential pumping impacts significantly closer to any surface water source.

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: Noyer Creek Minimal Significant

Stream: N. Fork Deep Creek Minimal Significant

Provide context for minimal/significant impact: Both proposed APOA locations are within 500 feet of the authorized POA location.

6. What conditions or other changes in the application are necessary to address any potential issues identified above: NA

7. Any additional comments: NA

