

# Groundwater Transfer Review Summary Form

Transfer/PA # T- 14196

GW Reviewer Darrick E. Boschmann Date Review Completed: 11/21/2023

## 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-14196

Applicant Name: John Giorgi

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

Reviewer(s): Darrick E. Boschmann

Date of Review: 11/21/2023

Date Reviewed by GW Mgr. and Returned to WRSD: \_\_\_\_\_

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 certificate 93438 which authorizes groundwater pumping from one well (POD 1 = CROO 52449) for primary irrigation of 237.0 acres in the Deschutes Basin (Crooked River Basin). The following changes are proposed:

1. Add on APOA (Well #2 = not constructed)

Note that the location for Well #2 provided on the application Table 1 is not the same location provided and depicted on the application map. For the purposes of this review it is assumed that the location for Well #2 provided and depicted on the application map is the intended location.

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

☒ Yes   ☐ No   Comments: \_\_\_\_\_

The proposed APOA is located approximately 1,600 feet to the southeast of the currently authorized well and proposes a very similar well construction as that of the currently authorized well. The currently authorized well produces groundwater from water bearing zones within the Columbia River Basalt Group (CRBG), and as proposed the proposed APOA should also produce groundwater from water bearing zones within CRBG.

For this finding to remain valid the proposed well will need to be cased and sealed to produce groundwater from the same water bearing zones within the CRBG as the currently authorized well and to avoid commingling of separate aquifers within the CRBG.

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 nearest authorized POD is located over 1 mile to the northeast of the proposed APOA. The proposed APOA is located somewhat further away from this POD than the currently authorized well.

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 proposed APOA is located somewhat further away from perennial reaches of surface water than the currently authorized 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: \_\_\_\_\_ ☐ 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: \_\_\_\_\_

---

The proposed well will need to be constructed to avoid commingling between any groundwater occurring in the formations overlying the CRBG and water bearing zones within the CRBG. Additionally, the proposed well will need to be cased and sealed to produce groundwater from the same water bearing zones within the CRBG as the currently authorized well and to avoid commingling of separate aquifers within the CRBG.

---

