

# Groundwater Transfer Review Summary Form

Transfer/PA # T- 13666

GW Reviewer J. Hackett Date Review Completed: April 18, 2022

## 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-13666

Applicant Name: Bartholomew Family Trust / Douglas Lee

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

Reviewer(s): J. Hackett

Date of Review: April 18, 2022

Date Reviewed by GW Mgr. and Returned to WRSD: JTI 5/13/22

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 the following changes to water right permit G-12723. 1) change an 8.9 acre portion of the authorized POU, 2) add an APOA (POA 3 / WASC 52641) to serve 8.4 acres of the To Lands using a 0.038 cfs portion of the authorized rate, and 3) add an APOA (POA 2 / WASC 52703) to serve 0.5 acres of the To Lands and the 19.0 acres of existing authorized lands using the remaining 0.087 cfs of the authorized rate.
2. Will the proposed POA develop the same aquifer (source) as the existing authorized POA?  
 Yes     No    Comments: The authorized POA (WASC 3023) was 480 feet deep and was open to water-bearing zones in the Priest Rapids and Frenchman Springs aquifers of the Columbia River Basalt Group (CRBG) aquifer system. The well was formally abandoned in 2019 (WASC 52704) as part of Mosier Well Replacement Project. The project was designed to identify and repair or replace wells that commingled aquifers in the CRBG aquifer system.

WASC 3023 was replaced with Proposed POA 2 (WASC 52703). WASC 52703 is 640 feet deep and produces from water-bearing zones in the Frenchman Springs aquifer. Proposed POA 3 (WASC 52641) is 510 feet deep and is open to a single water-bearing zone in the Frenchman Springs aquifer. Both proposed POAs produce from the same aquifer as the authorized POA.

- 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: Proposed POAs will interfere with the same group of groundwater users as the authorized POA, so interference should not increase.  
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: Proposed POAs will interfere with the same surface water sources as the authorized POA, so interference should not increase.  
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: \_\_\_\_\_

Well Location Map

T-13666 Bartholomew Trust / Lee

1:10,000 scale

