

Groundwater Transfer Review Summary Form

Transfer/PA # T- 14472

GW Reviewer Grayson Fish Date Review Completed: 6/28/2024

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-14472

Applicant Name: Hanley Farm

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

Reviewer(s): Grayson Fish

Date of Review: 6/28/2024

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 add one APOA (SOREC WELL) as an authorized point of appropriation for groundwater Certificates 28663 (primary irrigation) and 28664 (supplemental irrigation).

The application lists WELL 1 (JACK 13504), WELL 2 (JACK 13503), SUMP (JACK 35002) and WELL 3 (JACK 13273) as authorized POA for Cert. 28663. However, WRIS and the paper certificate of Cert. 28663 does not list WELL 3 (JACK 13273) as a valid POA. This is noted as a discrepancy between the application and the relevant water right.

The application lists WELL 1 (JACK 13504), WELL 2 (JACK 13503), SUMP (JACK 35002) and WELL 3 (JACK 13273) as authorized POA for Cert. 28664. However, WRIS and the paper certificate of Cert. 28664 do not list WELL 1 (JACK 13504), WELL 2 (JACK 13503), SUMP (JACK 35002) as a valid POA. Cert. 28664 lists Well 3 (JACK 13273), Well 4 (no log) and Well 5 (abandoned, as noted on application map) as valid POA. This is noted as a discrepancy between the application and the relevant water right.

There is a discrepancy between Tables 1 and Tables 2 of the application. Table 1 lists the township of the authorized and proposed POA as 37 S, this matches the map provided by the applicant. Table 2 lists the township of the POU as 28 S, this does not match the map provided by the applicant. For the purposes of this review, the correct township is assumed to be 37 S and that the township listed on Table 2 is a typo.

2. Will the proposed POA develop the same aquifer (source) as the existing authorized POA?
 Yes No Comments: All authorized POAs and the proposed POA SOREC WELL are located in an area mapped either as Qya (quaternary younger alluvium) or Qafs (Quaternary surficial deposits). These unconsolidated fluvial sediments are placed by the various streams that are present in the Bear Creek Valley. The authorized POA well depths range from 12.5 to 145 feet below land surface. Based on the supplied well log numbers, it appears that bedrock is encountered between 20 to 25 feet below land surface. Given the relatively high reported well yields, it is likely that the alluvial sediments are the dominate source of water.

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 proposed APOA is located within 30 feet of Well 1. The addition of this proposed APOA is not likely to result in a measurable increase in interference with another groundwater right.
 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 within 30 feet of Well 1. The addition of this proposed APOA is not likely to result in a measurable increase in interference with another surface water source.
 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: As noted in section 1, discrepancies in the application and the referenced certificates may need to be addressed.

8. Any additional comments: _____

T-14472

