

Groundwater Transfer Review Summary Form

Transfer/PA # T- 14651 (RA)

GW Reviewer J. Hootsmans Date Review Completed: 8/20/2025

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-14651

Applicant Name: Chemeketa Community College

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

Reviewer(s): J. Hootsmans

Date of Review: 8/20/2025

Date Returned to WRSD: 8/20/2025

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 to move the location of the nursery use (greenhouse, place of use) on **Certificate 98253**. The applicant is also proposing one new additional Point of Appropriation (APOA) for the irrigation use on **Certificate 98253**. The proposed POA is identified as PROP 704 on the map provided below.

Certificate 98253 limits the maximum rate of 0.78 cubic feet per second (cfs) for irrigation and 0.03 for nursery operations. The certificate further limits Well 1 to 0.41 cfs, Well 2 to 0.06 cfs and Well 3 from 0.59 cfs.

2. Will the proposed POA develop the same aquifer (source) as the existing authorized POA?
☒ Yes ☐ No Comments: The proposed APOA (PROP 704) is proposed to similar depths as the authorized POAs and is within the same quarter-quarter of the authorized POA or adjacent quarter-quarter. All authorized POAs are within 1800 feet of the proposed POA.
3. a) Is the existing authorized POA subject to a water level decline condition?
☐ Yes ☒ No Comments: Certificate 98253 has no decline conditions.
- 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: N/A

4. a) Is there more than one source developed under the right (e.g., basalt and alluvium)?
☐ Yes ☒ No Comments: Both the proposed APOA and authorized POA produce water from the alluvial 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.): N/A
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 close proximity of the proposed APOA to the authorized POA means that any change in interference with nearby neighboring water rights is likely to be negligible, so long as the combined rate of use from both wells does not exceed that total rate of 0.78 cfs authorized by **Certificate 98253**. However, the close proximity of the proposed APOA to the authorized POA and the similar depths of completion mean the POA and APOA will likely interfere with each other.
- 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: N/A
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: Neither the authorized POA nor the proposed APOA are close to known perennial surface water sources. Therefore, the proposed transfer is unlikely to cause an appreciable change in interference with another surface water source.
- 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: N/A
8. What conditions or other changes in the application are necessary to address any potential issues identified above: N/A
9. Any additional comments: N/A

T14651 Chemeketa Community College

