

Groundwater Transfer Review Summary Form

Transfer/PA # T- 13425

GW Reviewer Aurora C Bouchier Date Review Completed: 6/24/2020

Summary of Same Source Review:

The proposed change in point of appropriation is not within the same aquifer as per OAR 690-380-2110(2).

Summary of Injury Review:

The proposed transfer will result in another, existing water right not receiving previously available water to which it is legally entitled or result in significant interference with a surface water source as per 690-380-0100(3).

Summary of GW-SW Transfer Similarity Review:

The proposed SW-GW transfer doesn't meet the definition of "similarly" as per OAR 690-380-2130.

This is only a summary. Documentation is attached and should be read thoroughly to understand the basis for determinations.



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-13425

Applicant Name: Stephen Koch

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

Reviewer(s): Aurora C Bouchier

Date of Review: 6/24/2020

Date Reviewed by GW Mgr. and Returned to WRSD: JTI 6/26/2020

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 application states that they are in the process of coordinating all of their water rights to conform to their current operations. The application also includes a proposed well. There are 4 certificates included in this transfer. The specifics are as follows:

Certificate 51320 authorizes Well 1 (CLAC 12500) for a maximum rate of 0.59 cfs to irrigate 47.4 acres. This transfer proposes adding Well 2 (CLAC 12469), Well 3 (CLAC 61795) and Well 4 (proposed) to the water right. There are no changes to the POU.

Certificate 52594 authorizes Well 2 (CLAC 12469) for a maximum rate of 0.68 cfs to irrigate 54.6 acres. This transfer proposes adding Well 1 (CLAC 12500), Well 3 (CLAC 61795) and Well 4) proposed to the water right. There are no changes to the POU.

Certificate 68116 authorizes a well (CLAC 75482) for a maximum rate of 0.14 cfs to irrigate 11.3 acres. This well is no longer meeting their pumping needs. This transfer proposes changing the authorized POAs to Well 1 (CLAC 12500), Well 2 (CLAC 12469), Well 3 (CLAC 61795) and Well 4 (proposed). Changes to the POU include moving 6.9 acres to a new location. It also proposes moving an additional 2.4 acres which is layered with water from Certificate 94707. The remaining 2.0 acres remain in place.

Certificate 94707 authorizes Well 1 (CLAC 12500) and Well 2 (CLAC 12469) for a maximum rate of 1.3234 cfs for irrigation of 105.8 acres. This transfer proposes adding Well 3 (CLAC 61795) and Well 4 (proposed). Changes to the POU include moving 28.1 acres to a new location. It also proposes moving the 2.4 acres to remain layered with water from Certificate 68116. The remaining 75.3 acres remain in place.

2. Will the proposed POA develop the same aquifer (source) as the existing authorized POA?
 Yes No Comments: The well log for CLAC 75482 indicates the well is likely completed into basin fill sediments.
3. a) Is there more than one source developed under the right (e.g., basalt and alluvium)?
 Yes No NA
- 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: An additional transfer (T-13426, currently under review, correcting location for Wells 1 and 3 and a POU change for Permit G-15950) involves the same Wells 1-4. Permit G-15950 is also owned by Stephen Koch.
- 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: _____
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: NA
6. For SW-GW transfers, will the proposed change in point of diversion affect the surface water source similarly (as per OAR 690-380-2130) to the authorized point of diversion specified in the water use subject to transfer?
 Yes No Comments: NA
7. What conditions or other changes in the application are necessary to address any potential issues identified above: _____
8. Any additional comments: _____

Well Location Map

