

Groundwater Transfer Review Summary Form

Transfer/PA # T- 14494

GW Reviewer James Hootsmans Date Review Completed: 11/20/2024

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-14494

Applicant Name: Quiet Meadows Farm

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

Reviewer(s): James Hootsmans

Date of Review: 11/20/2024

Date Reviewed by GW Mgr. and Returned to WRSD: JTI 6/4/25

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: The applicant is proposing one additional Point of Appropriation (POAs) to help supplement the production of the existing POA (LINN 60537) on Groundwater Registrations GR-917. The additional POAs is listed as LINN 4167 on the Location Map included below. LINN 4167 was the original POA on GR-917 on previous transfer T-11752. **Note: The existing POA is also a POA on concurrent application G-19441.**
2. Will the proposed POA develop the same aquifer (source) as the existing authorized POA?
☒ Yes ☐ No Comments: The authorized POA on GR-917 (LINN 60537) is 59 feet deep and produces from the alluvial aquifer. The proposed APOA (LINN 4167) is 26 feet deep and also produces from the alluvial aquifer.
3. a) Is the existing authorized POA subject to a water level decline condition?
☐ Yes ☒ No Comments: No water level conditions decline conditions are attached to Claim GR-917.
- 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: All POAs currently or will be developed in alluvium.
- 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.): _____

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 existing POA (LINN 60537) is also a POA on concurrent application G-19441. Therefore, interference has to be assessed with all the rates from the pending applications and existing claims combined (stacked use). The proposed POA was the original POA on GR-917 prior to Transfer T-11752.

Authorized POA use and rates (LINN 60537): 5.19 CFS Total

App G-19441 – POD 3 – 4.3 CFS

Claim 917 – POD 1 – 0.8912 CFS

The closest ground water right to the POAs is also owned by the applicant. Therefore, the greatest injury would be to themselves. The next closest groundwater right POD is MARI 16091. However, given that the APOA was the original POA when Claim GR-917 was issued, there would not be any increase interference with another ground water right from the original levels.

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 additional POA is similar distance from the North Santiam River than the authorized POA, therefore at its maximum allowed rate of use, no increase in interference is likely to occur.

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: NA

7. What conditions or other changes in the application are necessary to address any potential issues identified above: NA

8. Any additional comments: NA

Location Map**T14494, T11495 and T14496 Quiet Meadow Farms**