

Groundwater Transfer Review Summary Form

Transfer/PA # T- 14631

GW Reviewer Phillip I. Marcy Date Review Completed: 07/02/2025

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-14631

Applicant Name: Michael Rysavy/Grande Hot Springs

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

Reviewer(s): Phillip I. Marcy

Date of Review: 07/02/2025

Date Reviewed by GW Mgr. and Returned to WRSD: _____

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 add an appropriation to Certificate 92277 to increase irrigation system flexibility, in addition to adding a character of use for "Recreational" purposes.
 2. Will the proposed POA develop the same aquifer (source) as the existing authorized POA?
☒ Yes ☐ No Comments: The proposed APOA well (UNIO 1425) is significantly deeper than the existing authorized POA (UNIO 51712) and appears to access a second water-bearing zone as reported on the driller's log. However, there is not sufficient evidence to conclude that these water-bearing horizons represent separate and discrete aquifers.
 3. a) Is the existing authorized POA subject to a water level decline condition?
☒ Yes ☐ No Comments: Permit G-16213 requires a single reference level to have been collected after water use has begun. Annual measurements were reported for years 2008-2012 for UNIO 51712.

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: The initial level reported in 2008 was 8.00' BLS, but does not appear representative, with the remainder of measurements falling between 0.08-3.00' BLS. Therefore, the reference level is determined to be the 03/12/2009 measurement of 0.09' BLS. The most recent measurement was on 03/16/2012, with a level of 3.00' BLS.

4. a) Is there more than one source developed under the right (e.g., basalt and alluvium)?
☐ Yes ☒ No Comments: A variety of lithologies are reported on both logs, based upon driller interpretations of drill cuttings. In both wells, water-bearing zones are encountered below 400' and below a horizon of solid rock. Permit G-16213 approves production only from the basalt aquifer system, which both POA and APOA wells appear to encounter.
- 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.): NA
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: Assuming no enlargement of water use occurs, the proximity of these two wells minimizes the likelihood of interference, as the APOA is not significantly closer to any existing right.
- 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: NA
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 APOA well does not shift impacts significantly closer to any surface water source or to any shallower water-bearing zone.
- 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: NA ☐ Minimal ☐ Significant
Stream: NA ☐ 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: NA
8. What conditions or other changes in the application are necessary to address any potential issues identified above: NA
9. Any additional comments: The proposed APOA appears to meet conditions and assumptions in the initial permit and neither enlargement or increased interference to neighboring rights or surface water appear likely.



