

Groundwater Transfer Review Summary Form

Transfer/PA # T- 13496

GW Reviewer M. Thoma

Date Review Completed: 09/15/2020

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-13496

Applicant Name: Deborah Ann Wallace

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

Reviewer(s): M. Thoma

Date of Review: 09/15/2020

Date Reviewed by GW Mgr. and Returned to WRSD: JTI 9/16/2020

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 applicant proposes to add several APOAs, change the POU, and diminish part of the right from Primary Irrigation to Supplemental Irrigation on the original underlying certificate Cert. 91588. The original certificate is for Primary irrigation of 311.5 acres from one POA (“Well #1” – see table) at a rate of 1.35 cfs. The transfer proposes to move the POU of 125 acres and change the POA on those 125 acres from Well #1 to Wells #3, #4, #5, and #6 (see table below). These acres are also proposed to be diminished to Supplemental Irrigation. The applicant also proposes to change the POU for 44.9 acres and add an APOA (Well #2) in addition to the original POA (Well #1). Finally, the applicant proposes to add an APOA (Well #2) to the remaining 141.6 acres which are not being moved. The result will be 186.5 of the original 311.5 acres (60%) being irrigated from two POAs (Well #1 and Well #2) instead of one (Well #1) and 125 of the original 311.5 acres (40%) being now irrigated from four POAs (Wells #3, #4, #5, #6). The transfer will thus result in the rate changing from 1.35 cfs from one well (Well #1) to 0.81 cfs being appropriated from Well #1 and Well #2 and 0.54 cfs being appropriated from Wells #3, #4, #5, and #6.

POA Number	Well Log ID	Total Depth	Max. Rate after Transfer
Well #1	KLAM0014690	405	0.81
Well #2	KLAM0051848	581	0.81
Well #3	KLAM0014946	1370	0.54
Well #4	KLAM0014941	695	0.54
Well #5	KLAM0057323 (d)	1475	0.54
Well #6	PROPOSED	820	0.54

2. Will the proposed POA develop the same aquifer (source) as the existing authorized POA?
 Yes No Comments: All of the wells proposed on the application are producing from a mixed-volcanic aquifer system that underlies much of the Lost River Subbasin. This system is composed of a thick (100's of feet) sequence of interbedded clastic volcanic sediments and crystalline volcanic flows. The two units are divided into separate units by Sherrod and Pickthorn (1992) where flows or sediments dominate but may also be indistinguishable when members are thin. In the vicinity of the proposed transfer, these units are interbedded (based on driller's logs) and likely in hydraulic connection with each other and so are considered a single groundwater source.

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 groundwater right**?
 Yes No Comments: The proposed change would move a portion of the appropriation under the original certificate (from Well #1) as much as 1.9 miles (to Well #6) from the original POA and closer to several existing groundwater rights, which will increase interference with those rights.
 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: The nearest surface water sources are several miles from either the original POA or the proposed POAs and so any change in interference will be insignificant and cannot be definitively quantified.
 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. 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: _____

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

8. Any additional comments: _____

