

Groundwater Transfer Review Summary Form

Transfer/PA # T- 13503

GW Reviewer D. Boschmann Date Review Completed: 09/29/2020

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-13503

Applicant Name: Denise Kryger

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

Reviewer(s): Darrick E. Boschmann

Date of Review: 09/29/2020

Date Reviewed by GW Mgr. and Returned to WRSD: JTI 10/2/20

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: _____

This application is related to permit G-15301 which authorizes groundwater pumping from three wells (*POD 1 = HARN 1043; *POD 2 = HARN 1044**; POD 3 = no well log) in the Malheur Lake Basin for commercial use (hot spring resort) at a year round rate of 1.00 cfs, being 0.44 cfs from POD 1, and 0.28 cfs each from POD 2 and POD 3. The following changes are proposed:

1. Correct the record to reflect the accurate locations of POD 1 (HARN 1043) and POD 2 (HARN 1044).

2. Add 3 APOAs (HARN 51901; HARN 52601; HARN 52548)

*The application indicates that HARN 1043 and HARN 1044 are not currently the authorized wells and proposes to change the authorized PODs to these wells. However, the original groundwater review dated 4/19/2002 (G-15732) reviews these two wells as the proposed POD 1 and POD 2 at that time, and so Department records indicate these wells are already the currently authorized POD 1 and POD 2 under this permit. The well locations for these wells provided on application G-15732 and those provided on the current application are inconsistent – either the original well locations provided on application G-15732 were incorrect, or the well locations provided on the current application are incorrect, or there is some kind of mix-up about which well correlates to which well log at this site. The hand written metes and bounds included with the application map for G-15732 are not consistent with those in WRIS. Neither the metes and bounds provided on the G-15732 application map nor those in WRIS are consistent with the locations marked on the G-15732 application map relative to the tax lot boundaries. Those provided in the current application are closer to those marked on the original application map, and are assumed here to be the more accurate locations.

**HARN 1044 is an old (pre-1930) dug well and may not meet well construction standards. Route to WCC for review.

2. Will the proposed POA develop the same aquifer (source) as the existing authorized POA?

Yes No Comments: Available data indicates a predominantly

volcanic/tuffaceous sedimentary rock unit occurs beneath a predominantly basin fill sediment unit. Reports for the Malheur Lake Basin indicate groundwater occurs in both the basin fill and underlying rocks. The groundwater is likely hydraulically connected, making a single groundwater system occurring in different geologic units. Leonard (1970) found that near the edges of the valley there is likely good interconnection between individual water-bearing beds in the valley fill and those in the adjacent and underlying tertiary rocks.

In general, groundwater in the Harney Basin flows from several upland recharge areas to a common discharge area near Malheur and Harney Lakes, with some apparent discharge to the Malheur Basin through one or more areas along the eastern margin. While the rocks and sediments making up the aquifer system in the Harney Basin do constitute a single groundwater flow system, sub-watersheds within the basin contribute recharge to different parts of the system depending on groundwater flow-paths from recharge to discharge areas. In general, within these sub-watersheds water within the aquifer system is sourced from a common recharge area, and can therefore be considered a single 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 ground water right**?
 Yes No Comments: The proposed wells are located in very close proximity to the currently authorized POD locations.
- 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: There are no perennial surface water sources in the vicinity of the proposed or authorized wells.
- 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: none.
8. Any additional comments: HARN 1044 is an old (pre-1930) dug well and may not meet well construction standards. Route to WCC for review.

