## **Groundwater Transfer Review Summary Form**

Transfer/PA # T- <u>14643</u>
GW Reviewer <u>Grayson Fish</u> Date Review Completed: <u>8/26/2025</u>
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 pe 690-380-0100(3).
Summary of GW-SW Transfer Similarity Review:
$\hfill\Box$ 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.

Version: 20210204



## **Ground Water Review Form:**

WATER RESOURCES DEPARTMENT	Oregon Water Resources Department 725 Summer Street NE, Suite A Salem, Oregon 97301-1271 (503) 986-0900 www.wrd.state.or.us		<ul><li>☑ Water Right Transfer</li><li>☐ Permit Amendment</li><li>☐ GR Modification</li><li>☐ Other</li></ul>		
Application: T- <u>14643</u>			Applicant Name: Applicant Name:	Andrey N. & Clavdia Kaya	
Proposed Chang	ges: 🗵 POA	□ APOA ⊠ POU	□ SW→GW □ OTHER	⊠ RA	
Reviewer(s): <u>C</u>	<u> Grayson Fish</u>			Date of Review: <u>8/26/2025</u> rned to WRSD: <u>8/26/2025</u>	
	provided in the apapproved because:	plication is in	sufficient to evaluate	e whether the proposed	
	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	_				
4 acres of g 864 to two proposed To Well B.  Well A (Ma) Will the pro  Yes 864) and prom sand a Willamette	roundwater use asswells located appro O POAs are existin  ARI 620) is an auth Oposed POA develor No Comments Oposed TO POA Wend gravel below a to	ociated with Coximately 1 ming well Well And orized POA for the same aquest Well A (MARI thick sequence total depth of	Certificate 64094 from the current (MARI 620) and year or Certificate 98446. The current (Source) as the state of the authorized February (Source) and the control of the fine-grained sed ~175 feet for FROM	existing authorized POA?  FROM POA Well 1 (MARI oth wells produce water iments, including the tages of sand and gravel.	
	•	•	*	s FROM POA Well 1.	
2. a) Is the exi	a) Is the existing authorized POA subject to a water level decline condition?				
		•	e level, most recent s on has been exceede	spring-high water level, and do N/A	

Page 1 of 3 Version: 20210204

3.	<ul> <li>a) Is there more than one source developed under the right (e.g., basalt and alluvium)?</li> <li>☐ Yes ⋈ No Comments:</li> </ul>
	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.): $\underline{N/A}$
4.	a) Will this proposed change, at its maximum allowed rate of use, likely result in an increase in interference with <b>another ground water right</b> ?
	Yes No Comments: The proposed change will move groundwater use closer to several groundwater POAs north of the currently authorized FROM POA. The closest wells are MARI 65211, an authorized POA for groundwater Certificate 17155 located ~500 feet southwest of Well B, and a POA authorized under Permit G-17693 located ~1,000 feet to the southeast of Well A. The reduction in distance between the proposed TO POAs when compared to the authorized FROM POA is likely to result in an increase in interference with other groundwater rights in the area.
	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: This transfer would allow an additional 0.05 cfs to be pumped from the proposed TO POAs. Well A (MARI 620) is currently authorized to pump at a maximum rate of 0.71 cfs under Certificate 98446. Considering the relatively small increase in authorized pumping rate proposed by this transfer, it is unlikely that another groundwater right would not receive water to which it is legally entitled.
5.	a) Will this proposed change, at its maximum allowed rate of use, likely result in an increase in interference with <b>another surface water source</b> ?
	Yes No Comments: The locations of the TO POAs (~1,400 feet) are closer to Hoch Reservoir than the currently authorized FROM POA (~7,200 feet). Hoch Reservoir is fed by Ryan Creek to the north. This reduction in intervening distance between the TO POAs and Hoch Reservoir compared to the authorized FROM POA is likely to result in an increase in interference with that surface water source.
	b) If yes, at its maximum allowed rate of use, what is the expected change in degree of interference with any <b>surface water sources</b> resulting from the proposed change?
	Stream: Hoch Reservoir  Minimal Significant
	Stream:
6.	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
7.	What conditions or other changes in the application are necessary to address any potential issues identified above:
8.	Any additional comments:

Page 2 of 3 Version: 20210204

T-14643 T4S R1W Sec. 19/30

