

# Groundwater Transfer Review Summary Form

Transfer/PA # T- 14001

GW Reviewer Gabriela Ferreira / Dennis Orlowski Date Review Completed: April 4, 2023

## 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-14001

Applicant Name: Carol and Leonard Wilke

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

Reviewer(s): Gabriela Ferreira / Dennis Orlowski

Date of Review: April 4, 2023

Date Reviewed by GW Mgr. and Returned to WRSD: JTI 6/3/25

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: Applicant proposes to add one well as APOA on 15.0 acres of claim GR-1658. GR-1658 currently has 1 authorized POA, CLAC 13048 (Well 1), a dug well completed to a depth of 14 feet below land surface (bls). The location of CLAC 13048 was described in the original claim application as 1,650 feet south and 480 feet east from the northwest corner of Section 9; the application provides an updated location of 1,585 feet south and 495 feet east from the northwest corner of Section 9. The re-described location is approximately 70 feet north of the original location and does not significantly impact potential interference with other groundwater users or surface water. The proposed APOA (Well 2) would be constructed to a total depth of 100 feet and sealed to a depth of 40 feet bls.
  2. Will the proposed POA develop the same aquifer (source) as the existing authorized POA?  
☒ Yes ☐ No Comments: Both Well 1 and Well 2 develop shallow alluvial deposits of the Willamette aquifer within the Canby alluvial fan (Gannett and Caldwell, 1998).
  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.): N/A

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 nearest groundwater user was identified as Claim GR-3996, withdrawing from CLAC 13049. Well 1 is approximately 870 feet northwest of CLAC 13049, whereas the proposed APOA Well 2 would be located approximately 730 feet northwest of CLAC 13049. The reduced distance will likely cause an increase in interference with CLAC 13049, which also produces from the shallow alluvium of the Molalla River.
- 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: Because of the unconfined and highly transmissive nature of the aquifer tapped by the subject wells, the proposed change is unlikely to cause CLAC 13049 or similarly located wells to not receive the water to which they are legally entitled.
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 Well 2 is ~740 feet south of the Molalla River, whereas the authorized POA Well 1 (CLAC 13048) is ~620 feet south of the Molalla River. The increased intervening distance is not likely to result in increased interference with the Molalla River.
- 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: Not applicable.
7. What conditions or other changes in the application are necessary to address any potential issues identified above: None
8. Any additional comments: None

References:

Gannett, M.W. and Caldwell, R., 1998, Geologic framework of the Willamette Lowland aquifer system, Oregon and Washington, Professional Paper 1424-A, 32 p: U. S. Geological Survey, Reston, VA.