

Groundwater Transfer Review Summary Form

Transfer/PA # T- 14606 RA

GW Reviewer James Hootsmans Date Review Completed: 4/2/2025

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-14606

Applicant Name: Bruce and Velan Chapin Trust

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

Reviewer(s): James Hootsmans

Date of Review: 4/2/2025

Date Returned to WRSD: 4/3/2025

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 an Additional Point of Appropriation (APOA) to Certificate 85811 to supplement the authorized POA. Certificate 85811 is for agriculture use and supplemental irrigation of 1.9 acres. The maximum rate is 0.024 cubic feet per second (cfs).

The well log for authorized POA on the certificate was not included in the application of G13786 or through certificate stage and not provided on this application. Therefore, the certificate location of the POA was used for this groundwater review. The proposed APOA MARI 64375 is an authorized POA on nearby Permit 16939 also owned by the applicants.

2. Will the proposed POA develop the same aquifer (source) as the existing authorized POA?
☒ Yes ☐ No Comments: Both the authorized POA and the APOA will develop from shallow alluvium. According to the groundwater review by Marc Norton in October 1994, the authorized POA is drilled to a depth of approximately 60 feet below ground surface (bgs) in unconfined alluvium. The proposed APOA is cased to 99 feet bgs and sealed to 19 feet bgs. The casing is perforated from 74 feet to 94 feet bgs. Both of the POA are hydraulically connected to nearby surface water bodies.
3. a) Is the existing authorized POA subject to a water level decline condition?
☐ Yes ☒ No Comments: Certificate 85811 has no existing water level decline conditions.

- 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: N/A
4. a) Is there more than one source developed under the right (e.g., basalt and alluvium)?
☐ Yes ☒ No Comments: Both POA will develop the alluvial aquifer.
- 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: No, the authorized and proposed POAs are similar distances from nearby water rights. The closest water right is Permit 16939, for which the proposed APOA is an authorized POA already.
- 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
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 authorized and proposed POAs are similar distances from nearby surface water sources.
- 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: _____
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: N/A
8. What conditions or other changes in the application are necessary to address any potential issues identified above: N/A
9. Any additional comments: N/A

T14606 Chapin Trust

