

Groundwater Transfer Review Summary Form

Transfer/PA # T- 14323

GW Reviewer Grayson Fish Date Review Completed: 12/20/2023

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-14323

Applicant Name: City of Klamath Falls

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

Reviewer(s): Grayson Fish

Date of Review: 12/20/2023

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: The Applicant proposes to transfer geothermal use associated with **Certificate 24682** (0.25 cfs) and **83012** (0.3342 cfs) from authorized **POA #1 KLAM 10720/KLAM 12021** to a not yet constructed proposed **POA #2**. The applicant states the authorized POA's casing has failed and its allowing for the comingling of shallow cold water with deeper hot water.

2. Will the proposed POA develop the same aquifer (source) as the existing authorized POA?
☒ Yes ☐ No Comments: Construction details are unclear for the authorized **POA #1**, however, the applicant notes that the casing/seal has failed and allows for shallow groundwater (potentially canal leakage) to mix with the deeper geothermal groundwater. The original well log **KLAM 10720** and associated alteration log **KLAM 12021** appear to show only sedimentary rocks down to a depth of 300'.

Proposed construction of **POA #2** submitted along with the transfer application lists a seal of 140'. While it is unclear at this time if that seal depth will be sufficient based on current information, given that the water rights are for geothermal use, it seems clear that the intended outcome is to only access the deeper, hot groundwater.

3. a) Is there more than one source developed under the right (e.g., basalt and alluvium)?
☒ Yes ☐ No As discussed in item 2, the authorized POA comingles shallow cold groundwater and deeper hot water. It would be beneficial to seal off the shallow groundwater as the proposed construction of **POA #2** suggests in order to better serve the intended purpose of the water rights (geothermal heating).
- 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.): N/A. Well should be constructed to isolate deeper, hotter groundwater.
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 applicant's proposal is to construct **POA #2** near the (<100') the currently authorized **POA #1** that is to be decommissioned. Interference with nearby water rights is not expected to 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: N/A
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 applicant's proposal is to construct **POA #2** near the (<100') currently authorized **POA #1** that is to be decommissioned. Interference with nearby surface water sources is not expected to 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: The final well construction of the proposed well must meet minimum well construction standards.

T-14323