

# Groundwater Transfer Review Summary Form

Transfer/PA # T- 14564

GW Reviewer Phillip I. Marcy Date Review Completed: 01/10/2024

## 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 Water Level Decline Condition Review:

Water levels at the original point(s) of appropriation have exceeded the allowed decline threshold defined by conditions in the originating water right.

## 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-14564

Applicant Name: Edwin and Charlan Heid

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

Reviewer(s): Phillip I. Marcy

Date of Review: 01/10/2024

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 an Additional Point of Appropriation (APOA) to the currently authorized use. Certificate 97920 authorizes four wells (MALH 208, MALH 130, MALH 223, and MALH 216). The certificate breaks POA wells and uses between two ownership groups. The applicant controls two wells (MALH 208 and MALH 130) and 0.59 CFS of the 1.34 CFS total authorization. The applicant wishes to add MALH 131 to their portion of the right to increase system flexibility.
  2. Will the proposed POA develop the same aquifer (source) as the existing authorized POA?  
 Yes     No    Comments: Authorized and proposed POA wells produce from similar depths and lithologies.
  3. a) Is the existing authorized POA subject to a water level decline condition?  
 Yes     No            Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
 b) If yes, for each POA identify the reference level, most recent spring-high water level, and whether an applicable permit decline condition has been exceeded: NA
  4. a) Is there more than one source developed under the right (e.g., basalt and alluvium)?  
 Yes     No    Comments: \_\_\_\_\_  
 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.): \_\_\_\_\_

5. 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 well is 3,058' from the nearest neighboring groundwater right (Cert. 51032), versus authorized POA well MALH 130, which is 3,270' from that right. The largest possible change in impact would occur in the scenario where MALH 208 (POA 1) is no longer pumped and all 0.59 CFS is instead pumped from MALH 130 and MALH 131.
- 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: Though the bulk of pumping for the Heid portion of the groundwater right will be moved closer to the authorized POA location for Certificate 51032, the change in impacts to neighboring rights is not anticipated to be significant provided that no enlargement takes place. Theis drawdown calculations predict between 10-20' of drawdown at the neighboring well after 214 days under the most likely scenarios if all pumping occurs at the proposed APOA well.
6. 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 further from the nearest surface water source (Willow Creek) than either of the currently authorized POA wells.
- 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: \_\_\_\_\_  Minimal  Significant  
Provide context for minimal/significant impact: NA
7. 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
8. What conditions or other changes in the application are necessary to address any potential issues identified above: Due to concern that additional pumping, and therefore enlargement, may occur by addition of the APOA to this established right, if this transfer is approved the following condition is recommended: Before use begins on the APOA well, a totalizing flowmeter shall be installed and maintained on the APOA well MALH 131 and access to the flowmeter shall be granted to OWRD staff upon reasonable notice.
9. Any additional comments: Ongoing declines in the sedimentary aquifer have been noted in this area, though data are limited to a period between 1999-2017 and sporadically reported. The attached hydrograph illustrates the difference in head elevation between the POA and APOA wells on this application and those south of Gum Creek, however the trend of MALH 208 suggests that despite the lower elevation of these well sites and closer proximity to the valley-fill sequence, the same declines may be in effect. Note that there are only two water level measurements on MALH 208, one of which was the driller's reported measurement, thus there exists some level of uncertainty about this trend.



