## **Groundwater Transfer Review Summary Form**

Transfer/PA # T- <u>13426</u>						
GW Reviewer <u>Aurora C Bouchier</u> Date Review Completed: <u>6/24/2020</u>						
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:						
$\Box$ 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 pe 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						

Version: 20200605



WARRE	WRD S	725 Sale (503	gon Water Resor Summer Street N m, Oregon 97301 ) 986-0900 v.wrd.state.or.us				
App	olication: T- <u>1.</u>	3426	$\tilde{\underline{0}}$		App	olicant Name: <u>Stephen Koch</u>	
Prop	posed Change	es:	□ POA □ USE	□ APOA ⊠ POU	□ SW→GW □ OTHER	$\square$ RA	
Rev	iewer(s): A	uror	a C Bouchier			Date of Review: <u>6/24/2020</u>	
				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 specifics are as follows:						
	Permit G-15950 authorizes Well 1 (CLAC 12500), Well 2 (CLAC 12469), Well 3 (CLAC 61795) and Well 4 (proposed) for a maximum rate of 1.67 cfs to irrigate 93.7 acres. This transfer amends the location of Well 1 by approximately 60 feet. This brings the meets and bounds into agreement with the location of the well in Certificates 51320, 52594, 68116 and 94707, which are involved in a recent transfer (T-13425, currently under review). This transfer also amends the location of Well 2 by approximately 190 feet. This brings the meets and bounds into agreement with the location of the well in Certificates 51320, 52594, 68116 and 94707, which are also involved in a recent transfer (T-13425, currently under review). Changes to the POU include moving 14.1 acres to a new location. The remaining						

operations. The specifics are as follows: Permit G-15950 authorizes Well 1 (CLAC 1250 61795) and Well 4 (proposed) for a maximum r transfer amends the location of Well 1 by appro bounds into agreement with the location of the 94707, which are involved in a recent transfer ( transfer also amends the location of Well 2 by a meets and bounds into agreement with the locat 68116 and 94707, which are also involved in a review). Changes to the POU include moving 1 79.6 acres remain in place. 2. Will the proposed POA develop the same aquifer (source) as the existing authorized POA? X Yes  $\square$  No Comments: 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.): Version: 20200605  $\square$  Yes  $\square$  No Comments:  $\underline{NA}$ 

issues identified above: \_\_\_\_\_

8. Any additional comments:\_\_\_\_\_

Gro	ound Water Review Form	Transfer Application: T-13426					
4.	a) Will this proposed change, at its maximum allowed rate of use, likely result in an increase in interference with <b>another ground water right</b> ?						
	Yes □ No Comments: An additional transfer (T-13425, currently under review, which requests having Wells 1, 2, 3 and 4 all authorized under Certificates 51320, 52594, 68116 and 94707 in addition to some changes in POU) involves the same Wells 1-4. These Certificates are 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.	<ul> <li>a) Will this proposed change, at its maximum allowed rate of use, likely result in an incre in interference with another surface water source?</li> <li>☐ Yes ☒ No Comments:</li> </ul>						
	b) If yes, at its maximum allowed rate of use, what is interference with any <b>surface water sources</b> resulting	1 0					
	Stream: Minimal  Stream: Minimal  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?						

7. What conditions or other changes in the application are necessary to address any potential

Page 2 of 4 Last Revised: 1/17/2018

## **Well Location Map**

