

# Groundwater Transfer Review Summary Form

Transfer/PA # T- 13966

GW Reviewer Joe Kemper Date Review Completed: 8/23/2022

## 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-13966

Applicant Name: Samuel Stafford

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

Reviewer(s): Joe Kemper

Date of Review: 8/23/2022

Date Reviewed by GW Mgr. and Returned to WRSD: JTI 11/7/22

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 move 0.5 cfs from CROO 50577 under certificate 96129 to JEFF 50730. The applicant also proposes to change the place of use and character of use from industrial/manufacturing to nursery.
2. Will the proposed POA develop the same aquifer (source) as the existing authorized POA?  
☐ Yes ☒ No Comments: The two wells are located more than 15 miles apart. CROO 50577 produces water from Quaternary aged (and potentially late Tertiary) unconsolidated sands and gravels that directly overlie the John Day Formation (Ferns and McClaughry, 2006). This alluvial aquifer appears to be largely separate from the regional aquifer system hosted in the Deschutes Formation. JEFF 50730 produces water from a coarse alluvial deposit deep within a package of volcanics (presumably the Deschutes Formation). These are separate are different geologic units, aquifers, and have separate recharge-discharge flowpaths. CROO 50577 and JEFF 50730 do not develop the same source.
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: There are several adjacent tax lots that are presumed to have domestic water supply wells within 2000-2500 feet from JEFF 50730. The proposed transfer will likely result some in well-to-well interference with those wells.
- 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: The expected well-to-well interference is unlikely to reach a magnitude that would be considered injury.
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: CROO 50577 is closer (~1 mile) to the Crooked River than JEFF 50730 (~2 miles). Stream depletion is expected to decrease from the proposed change.
- 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: Crooked River   ☐ 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: NA
7. What conditions or other changes in the application are necessary to address any potential issues identified above: \_\_\_\_\_
8. Any additional comments: \_\_\_\_\_

## References

Barlow, P.M., and Leake, S.A., 2012, Streamflow depletion by wells—Understanding and managing the effects of groundwater pumping on streamflow: U.S. Geological Survey Circular 1376, 84 p.

Ferns, M.L., and McClaughry, J.D., 2006, Preliminary geologic map of the Prineville 7.5' quadrangle, Crook County, Oregon: Oregon Department of Geology and Mineral Industries, Open-File Report O-06-22, scale 1:24,000

Gannett, M.W., Lite, Jr., K.E., Morgan, D.S., and Collins, C.A., 2001, Ground-water hydrology of the upper Deschutes Basin, Oregon: U.S. Geological Survey Water-Resources Investigations Report 00-4162, 74 p.

Map of Proposed POA Changes

