

# Groundwater Transfer Review Summary Form

Transfer/PA # T- 14411

GW Reviewer Phillip I. Marcy Date Review Completed: 04/15/2024

## 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-14411

Applicant Name: Gary Johnston/Airport Lane Trust

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

Reviewer(s): Phillip I. Marcy

Date of Review: 04/15/2024

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 change the authorized point of appropriation (POA) to a new well (BAKE 52975 / "POA 2"). The authorized POA well cannot be positively correlated to a well log report.
  2. Will the proposed POA develop the same aquifer (source) as the existing authorized POA?  
☒ Yes    ☐ No    Comments: The authorized POA cannot be positively tied to a well log report, however the owner states that the well is no deeper than 60 feet (personal communication with CWRE, 03/15/2024). This is more than likely to be true, as older wells in the Baker Valley are typically developed into shallow alluvium due to the high piezometric surface and high transmissivity of the unconfined shallow gravels present here. Further information provided by East Region Well Inspector Jon SanFilippo (03/18/2024) suggests that the existing well does not meet well construction standards, is no longer used, and will likely be abandoned.
  3. a) Is there more than one source developed under the right (e.g., basalt and alluvium)?  
☐ Yes    ☒ No There is only one authorized POA well.  
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: The location of the proposed POA is only about 40 feet from the existing, authorized POA location and is therefore not expected to result in any substantive changes in interference with neighboring rights.
- 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: NA
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 POA well is significantly closer to any surface water source and is likely to produce from a somewhat deeper interval than the authorized POA well, thus potentially reducing the degree of in-season interference with nearby surface waters.
- 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: NA ☐ Minimal ☐ Significant  
Stream: NA ☐ 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: NA
7. What conditions or other changes in the application are necessary to address any potential issues identified above: NA
8. Any additional comments: \_\_\_\_\_

