

Groundwater Transfer Review Summary Form

Transfer/PA # T- 13558

GW Reviewer Phillip Marcy Date Review Completed: 01/13/2021

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-13558 Applicant Name: Oregon State University College of Agriculture

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

Reviewer(s): Phillip I. Marcy Date of Review: 01/13/2021

Date Reviewed by GW Mgr. and Returned to WRSD: JTI 2/2/2021

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 proposes to correct the location of the existing authorized well under GR-2993 (no log identified), as well as adding other existing wells to allow operation of the system as a well field. The applicant has contemporaneously submitted GR modifications involving rights GR-2992, GR-2994, and GR-2995 in order to allow use of any and all authorized wells on any and all authorized places of use under these rights.

The application proposes to extend allowable use to a number of wells, including BENT 4675 in addition to the currently authorized POA. This raises an issue based on the fact that BENT 4675 is the currently authorized POA well under GR-2993 as assigned in the GWIS database, matching the specifications in the original document, where it is labeled "Well # 2", as it is also on the well report. Considering these details, this review will proceed considering BENT 4675 as the authorized POA.

2. Will the proposed POA develop the same aquifer (source) as the existing authorized POA?
 Yes No Comments: All existing authorized wells associated with water rights involved in the consolidation of the aforementioned rights produce from shallow alluvium, as will the proposed new well (APOA "Well 3") if constructed as described.

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.): 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: Moving a portion of pumping authorized under GR-2993 to APOA wells closer to nearby GR-400 to the southwest is anticipated to increase interference from this right to a minor extent. However, effects will likely be offset by a share of pumping from rights GR-2994 and GR-2995 (transfers currently under review) being moved to wells currently authorized under this right and GR-2992.

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: See 4a.

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: No proposed APOA is significantly closer to any surface water source than the existing authorized POA well.

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: Owl Creek Minimal Significant

Stream: _____ Minimal Significant

Provide context for minimal/significant impact: None of the proposed APOA locations are significantly closer to Owl Creek than the authorized POA location.

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: None.

8. Any additional comments: _____

