# **Groundwater Transfer Review Summary Form**

# Transfer/PA # T- <u>13550</u>

GW Reviewer <u>D. Boschmann</u> Date Review Completed: <u>03/15/2021</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:

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.

W	OREGON VATER RESOURCES DE PARTMENT	725 Sale (503	gon Water Resou Summer Street Ni em, Oregon 97301 3) 986-0900 w.wrd.state.or.us	,	⊠ Wat □ Peri	ter Rig nit An Modifi	ter Review For ht Transfer nendment ication	m:
App	lication: T-1	13550	<u>)</u>			Appli	cant Name: <u>Van De</u>	Stroet
Prop	posed Chang	ges:	□ POA □ USE	⊠ APOA □ POU	$\Box SW \rightarrow \\ \Box OTHE$		$\Box$ RA	
Reviewer(s):Darrick E. BoschmannDate of Review: 03/15/202								5/2021
				Date Reviewed	by GW Mg	r. and I	Returned to WRSD:	<u>JTI 3</u> /17/21
	sfer may be The water v affected by The applica	approvell r the t	oved because: reports provid- ransfer. does not inclu	ed with the appl de water well re	lication do n	ot corre	e whether the propos espond to the water i ion of the well const r proposed to be dev	ights ruction
			i to establish t	ne ground wate	i bouy devel	opeu o	I proposed to be dev	elopeu.
□  1.	Basic descr This app from two w 231.5 acres	iption licati ells ( in th	n of the chang on is related t POD $1 = HA$ e Malheur La	es proposed in t o certificate 952 RN 50789; POI ke Basin. The fe	this transfer: 221 which au 2 = HARN 2 llowing cha	uthoriz 50285 inges a	es groundwater pum ) for primary irrigati re proposed: 156; HARN 52624).	ping on of

2. Will the proposed POA develop the same aquifer (source) as the existing authorized POA?  $\boxtimes$  Yes  $\square$  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 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)?  $\Box$  Yes  $\boxtimes$  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?

No Comments: T Yes

The proposed APOAs currently serve as authorized POAs on additional water rights held by the applicant. The changes proposed here will redistribute pumping between all wells authorized under certificate 95221 and these other water rights. The nearest authorized POA under different ownership is over a mile away, and at this distance any impacts should be minimal.

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?

 $\Box$  Yes  $\boxtimes$  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?

 $\Box$  Yes  $\boxtimes$  No Comments: There are no perennial surface water sources in the vicinity of the authorized or proposed wells.

b) If yes, at its maximu	m allowed rate of use	, what is the expected	1 change in degree of
interference with any $\mathbf{s}$	urface water sources	resulting from the p	roposed 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?

 $\Box$  Yes  $\Box$  No Comments:

- 7. What conditions or other changes in the application are necessary to address any potential issues identified above: <u>none.</u>
- 8. Any additional comments: <u>The application includes several versions of Table 1. The Table 1</u> received and stamped November 16 2020 is used for this review.

