

Groundwater Transfer Review Summary Form

Transfer/PA # T- 14654 RA

GW Reviewer Stacey Garrison Date Review Completed: 9/19/2025

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-14654 Applicant Name: Rockyford Yamhill 2, LLC/Julie A Coles, Trustee

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

Reviewer(s): Stacey Garrison

Date of Review: 9/19/2025

Date Returned to WRSD: 9/19/2025

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: Applicant proposes to add 14 APOAs to **Permit G-18733**, APOAs 1-14/Wells 3-16 (**PROP 659-672**) and move 11.1 acres of the 125.7 ac POU. **Permit G-18733** authorizes POA 1/Well 1 (**YAMH 58006**) and POA 2/Well 2 (**PROP 61883**) to irrigate 125.7 ac and maintain a pond with priority date 9/10/2019. **Permit G-18733** authorizes a maximum duty of 1 acre foot per each acre irrigated during the irrigation season of each year, a maximum rate of 0.166 cfs for irrigation of 125.7 ac with irrigation by drip irrigation or by an equally efficient method, and a maximum rate of 0.01 cfs for pond maintenance of Pool/Pond 2 under **permit R-15488**.
2. Will the proposed POA develop the same aquifer (source) as the existing authorized POA?
 Yes No Comments: The authorized POAs, Well 1 (**YAMH 58006**) and Well 2 (**PROP 61883**), develop a Tertiary Marine Volcanic and Sedimentary (TMVS) aquifer, likely the upper portion of the fractured bedrock Yamhill Formation that interfingers with the Tillamook Volcanics (Wells et al., 1995). APOAs 1-14/Wells 3-16 (**PROP 659-672**) are anticipated to develop the same TMVS bedrock aquifer.
3. a) Is the existing authorized POA subject to a water level decline condition?
 Yes No Comments: Permit Specific Condition 3 Static Water Level Measurement, which includes measurement and reporting provisions with water level 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: Well 1 (YAMH 58006) reference level is 45.87 ft bls, most recent spring-high water level is 55.67 ft bls. An applicable permit decline condition has not been exceeded. Well 2 (PROP 61883) has not yet been constructed and a reference level has not been established.

4. a) Is there more than one source developed under the right (e.g., basalt and alluvium)?
 Yes No Comments: only the bedrock source is developed

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: Nine of the APOAs (PROP 669, PROP 662, PROP 668, PROP 663, PROP 666, PROP 667, PROP 670, PROP 671, PROP 672) are closer to YAMH 54957, an exempt domestic well, than either of the authorized APOAs.

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: It is not likely that the proposed change at its maximum allowed rate of use will result in YAMH 54957 not receiving the water to which it is legally entitled.

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: All of the APOAs are closer to Puddy Gulch Creek than the authorized POAs. All but one of the APOAs (PROP 664) are closer to the unnamed tributary to Puddy Gulch Creek) than the authorized POAs. Two of the APOAs (PROP 660 and PROP 661) are closer to Hutchcroft Creek than the authorized POAs.

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: SW 1, trib Puddy Gulch Creek Minimal Significant

Stream: SW 2, Puddy Gulch Creek Minimal Significant

Stream: SW 3, trib N. Yamhill River Minimal Significant

Stream: SW 4, Hutchcroft Creek Minimal Significant

Provide context for minimal/significant impact: All but two of the APOAs (APOA 2/PROP 660, APOA 3/PROP 661) are further from SW 4 (Hutchcroft Creek) than the authorized POAs; the relative change in distance is minimal. All but one (APOA 8/PROP 664) of the APOAs are closer to SW 1 (unnamed tributary to Puddy Gulch Creek) than the authorized POAs are, and all of the APOAs are closer to SW 2 (Puddy Gulch Creek) than the authorized POAs. None of the APOAs are closer to SW 3 (unnamed tributary to the North Yamhill River) than the authorized POAs. Seven of the 14 APOAs are anticipated to have pumping impacts shift from the North Yamhill River upstream of where SW 2 flows into the North Yamhill River to SW 2 upstream of the confluence of SW 2 with the North Yamhill River. The increase in interference is therefore anticipated to be Significant for SW 1 and SW 2 for the seven APOAs that are located within the sub-drainage associated with

SW 2. The APOAs within the drainage for SW 2 are: **APOA 5/PROP 663, APOA 8/PROP 666, APOA 9/PROP 667, APOA 10/PROP 668, APOA 12/PROP 670, APOA 13/PROP 671, and APOA 14/PROP 672.** The pumping impacts of the other seven APOAs remain within the drainage for the North Yamhill River, and therefore the pumping impacts of these APOAs are anticipated to resemble the impacts of the authorized POAs without significant change; these seven APOAs are APOA 1/PROP 659, APOA 2/PROP 660, APOA 3/PROP 661, APOA 4/PROP 662, APOA 6/PROP 664, APOA 7/PROP 665, and APOA 11/PROP 669.

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: Permit G-18733 issued from originating application G-18862 and includes the special conditions listed below, which were included in accordance with OAR 690-502-0040(7); these special conditions as well as the Permit Specific Conditions (Water Use Measurement, Recording, and Reporting and the Static Water Level Measurement) should be applied to all APOAs authorized under originating application G-18862.
- a. Maximum duty of 1 acre foot per each acre irrigated during the irrigation season of each year
 - b. Maximum rate of 0.166 cfs for irrigation of 125.7 ac
 - c. Irrigation by drip irrigation or by an equally efficient method

The reference level for any APOAs under this permit should be based on the reference level set in the existing, authorized POA, POA 1/YAMH 58006; this recommendation is consistent with the existing permit condition language in Permit G-18733 and intended to avoid enlargement under the criteria of OAR 690-380-0100 (2)(d).

To avoid a Significant change in degree of interference with SW 1 (unnamed tributary to Puddy Gulch Creek) and SW 2 (Puddy Gulch Creek) in item 6 above, the applicant may remove the seven APOAs with the Significant change in degree of interference without the need for an additional Groundwater Review. The seven APOAs that should be removed to avoid the Significant change in degree of interference are: **APOA 5/PROP 663, APOA 8/PROP 666, APOA 9/PROP 667, APOA 10/PROP 668, APOA 12/PROP 670, APOA 13/PROP 671, and APOA 14/PROP 672.**

9. Any additional comments: _____

References

Transfer File: T-14654, Permit G-18733

Conlon, T.D., Wozniak, K.C., Woodcock, D., Herrera, N.B., Fisher, B.J., Morgan, D.S., Lee, K.K., and Hinkle, S.R., 2005, Ground-water hydrology of the Willamette Basin, Oregon, Scientific Investigations Report 2005-5168: U. S. Geological Survey, Reston, VA.

Wells, R.E., Snively, P.D., Jr., Macleod, N.S., Kelly, M.M., and Parker, M.J., Fenton, J., and Felger, T., 1995, Geologic map of the Tillamook Highlands, northwest Oregon Coast Range—A digital database: U. S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 95-670, <http://pubs.usgs.gov/of/1995/of95-670/>.

Map

