

Groundwater Transfer Review Summary Form

Transfer/PA # T- 14509

GW Reviewer James Hootsmans Date Review Completed: 12/3/2024

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-14509

Applicant Name: Lone Oak Hop Farms LLC

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

Reviewer(s): James Hootsmans

Date of Review: 12/3/2024

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 proposes to change to new POA for irrigation of 84.8 acres (maximum annual volume of 80 af/year) under Certificate 97981. The POA specific rate will be 1.06 cfs for the 84.8 acres. According to the applicant, the authorized POA (MARI 2584) has collapsed and needs to be replaced.

As per Final Order for previous transfer T-13705 involving the authorized POA (MARI 2584), Certificate 57771 was cancelled, and Certificate 97981 was issued as a remaining right for 97.2 acres of POU at a maximum rate of 1.22 cfs

2. Will the proposed POA develop the same aquifer (source) as the existing authorized POA?
☒ Yes ☐ No Comments: The authorized From-POA (MARI 2584) and the proposed To-POA (MARI 71233) both utilize the sands and gravels of the alluvial Willamette aquifer (Woodward et al 1998).
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 Certificate 97891.
- 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: All POAs utilize the sands and gravels of the alluvial Willamette 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: The proposed To-POA (MARI 71233) is similar distance to other groundwater rights than the authorized POA (MARI 2584), therefore at its maximum allowed rate of use, no increase in interference is likely to occur. The POAs are approximately 50 feet apart.
- 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: The proposed To-POA (MARI 71233) is similar distance to surface water bodies than the authorized POA (MARI 2584), therefore at its maximum allowed rate of use, no increase in interference is likely to occur. The POAs are approximately 50 feet apart.
- 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: NA

T14509 Lone Oak Hop Farms LLC