

Groundwater Transfer Review Summary Form

Transfer/PA # T- LL-1981 Forbearance Mitigation Review

GW Reviewer Grayson Fish Date Review Completed: 1/28/2026

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-1981, Forbearance Evaluation Applicant Name: Newsun Cascade Development

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

Reviewer(s): Grayson Fish

Date of Review: 1/28/2026

Date Reviewed and Returned to WRSD: 1/28/2026

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: This is a forbearance mitigation review for Limited License application LL-1981. The Applicant proposes forgo irrigating 121.008 acres under Certificate 80626 to mitigate for proposed construction/road maintenance, general construction, dust control, soil management, fire suppression, re-seeding and re-vegetation uses with a maximum requested rate of 1.51 cfs and 22.4 AF/year. Water would be pumped from LAKE 341 which is an authorized POA under Certificate 80626.

Note: The acreage proposed for forbearance is being transferred under T-14354 and the final order approving that transfer was issued 8/14/2025. The mitigation proposal states that if the transfer final order is issued approving the transfer prior to the end of the limited license, water will not be pumped at the new point of appropriation until the limited license is completed or canceled. At the time of this mitigation review, the POA proposed under T-14354 does not appear to have been constructed.

This mitigation reviews both scenarios:

1. Forbearing 121.008 acres from Certificate 80626 and use from LAKE 341 as originally proposed.
2. Forbearing 121.008 acres transferred approximately 4.5 miles to the northwest under T-14354 and use from a proposed well located in the center of the NW corner of Section 28 T25S/R12E

2. Will the proposed POA develop the same aquifer (source) as the existing authorized POA?
☒ Yes ☐ No Comments: Groundwater in the Fort Rock Valley-Christmas Valley area (Fort Rock Classified Area) is identified as a single groundwater system. Groundwater is found in both a shallower predominantly basin-fill sediment unit and a deeper predominantly volcanic rocks and sediments unit below. The predominantly basin fill sediment unit and the predominantly volcanic rocks and sediment unit both readily yield groundwater, and the two units are hydraulically connected.
Miller (1986) describes the groundwater source as the main groundwater reservoir. That reservoir includes groundwater in different geologic units. The reservoir has three characteristics. First, the "natural" groundwater level changes less than 1.5 feet annually, indicating the system is highly modulated. Second, the 1980s potentiometric surface was approximately 4292 feet elevation amsl basin-wide with Silver Lake an exception. Third, the reservoir consists of numerous water producing zones in several formations, all having an essentially common potentiometric level, and all being very transmissive in general.
The authorized wells in both scenarios produce groundwater from water bearing zones within the predominantly basin-fill sediment and/or the underlying predominantly volcanic rocks and sediment unit of the main groundwater reservoir. The proposed well will also produce groundwater from water bearing zones within the main groundwater reservoir.
3. a) Is the existing authorized POA subject to a water level decline condition?
☐ Yes ☒ No Comments: Neither Certificate 80626 nor T-14354 are subject to 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: _____
4. a) Is there more than one source developed under the right (e.g., basalt and alluvium)?
☐ Yes ☒ No Comments: Authorized wells in both scenarios and the proposed well would source water from the main groundwater reservoir of the Fort Rock Basin.
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.): _____
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: Neither scenario considered is likely to result in another groundwater right not receiving the water to which it is legally entitled due to the highly transmissive nature of the source aquifer.
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: _____
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 scenario is expected to result in an increase in interference with Paulina Marsh.

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: _____
8. What conditions or other changes in the application are necessary to address any potential issues identified above: _____
9. Any additional comments: _____

LL-1981 Mitigation Review Map

