



725 Summer Street NE, Suite A
Salem, Oregon 97301-1266
(503) 986-0900

Groundwater Review Allocation of Conserved Water CW 147

Applicant Name: Seiji Estate

Date of Initial Review: _____

Reviewer(s): Orlowski

Date of Finalization/Use Review: 6/27/2025

Initial Review Date by GW Manager: _____

Finalization/Use Review Date by GW Manager: 6/27/2025

☐ N/A Proposed Changes: ☐ POA ☐ APOA ☐ USE ☒ POU

The information provided in the application is insufficient to evaluate whether the proposed allocation of conserved water may be approved because:

- ☐ The water well report(s) provided with the application do not correspond to the water right(s) affected by the conserved water application.
- ☐ 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. The application (Part 4) proposes to utilize a new POA for the new use of conserved water. ☐ Yes ☒ No ☐ Unknown
2. Is the new POA within the boundaries described under the Proposed Use (Part 4)?
☒ Yes ☐ No ☐ Unknown
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.):

4. Will the proposed POA develop the same aquifer (source) as the existing authorized POA?

☒ Yes ☐ No Comments: Certificate 28615 authorizes the irrigation of 2.0 acres (maximum pumping rate 0.03 cfs) at a location within the Chehalem Mountains Groundwater Limited Area (GWLA). The single authorized POA for certificate 28615 is WASH 13286, which obtains groundwater from the Columbia River Basalt Group (CRBG) aquifer system. Proposed new POA is WASH 77267, which is located approximately 950 feet due north of WASH 13286, and also obtains groundwater from the CRBG aquifer system.

- 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 final re-allocation to WASH 13286 is 0.0217 cfs (~10 gpm), with a maximum annual duty of 1.806 acre-feet. Given the very small pumping rate and relative scarcity of nearby wells, it is unlikely that the proposed change will result in interference with another groundwater 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: _____

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: Similar to 4a response.

- 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: N/A

6. What conditions or other changes in the application are necessary to address any potential issues identified above: None

7. Any additional comments: None