Groundwater Transfer Review Summary Form

Transfer/PA # T- _14596_

GW Reviewer _J. Hackett_ Date Review Completed: _April 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-14596 Applicant Name: Diego Leon

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

Reviewer(s): J. Hackett Date of Review: April 2, 2025

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: This transfer application proposes adding a APOA to water right certificate 67304.

2. Will the proposed POA develop the same aquifer (source) as the existing authorized POA?
   ☒ Yes ☐ No Comments: Authorized POA, WASC 2855, was drilled to a total depth of 256 feet below land surface (bls) and is open to water-bearing zones (WBZs) in the Pomona Basalt (144-149' bls), Selah interbed (174-194' bls), and Priest Rapids Rosalia Basalt (230-245' bls).

   Proposed APOA (WASC 52968) was drilled to a total depth of 280 feet bls and is open to a WBZ in the Priest Rapids Rosalia Basalt from 239-254' bls.

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: _____

4. a) Is there more than one source developed under the right (e.g., basalt and alluvium)?
   ☐ Yes ☒ No Comments: Both the authorized and proposed POAs develop WBZs in the Columbia River Basalt Group aquifer system.

   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: Authorized and Proposed POAs are constructed similarly and are located similar distances from existing groundwater users, so interference should not increase.

   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: _____

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: Authorized and Proposed POAs are constructed similarly and are located similar distances from nearby surface water sources, so interference should not increase.

   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: _____

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

9. Any additional comments:_____

Well Location Map