Groundwater Transfer Review Summary Form

Transfer/PA # T- _14611_

GW Reviewer _J. Hootsmans_ Date Review Completed: _5/27/2025_

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-14611 Applicant Name: Kuenzi Turf and Nursery

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

Reviewer(s): James Hootsmans Date of Review: 5/27/2025

Date Returned to WRSD: 5/28/2025

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: This proposed transfer pertains to two certificates, 27110 and 96313. The proposed changes on Certificate 27110 are the addition of two new groundwater Points of Appropriation (POA) whereas the proposed changes for Certificate 96313 are the addition of one new groundwater POA.

   This proposed transfer intends to irrigation pumping to APOAs (existing wells) as follows:

   - Certificate 27110:
     - Authorized POA: MARI 6130 (Well 2)
     - Proposed APOAs: MARI 3055 (Proposed Well 1) and MARI 69522 (Proposed Well 3)
   - Certificate 96313:
     - Authorized POA: MARI 3055 (Well 1) and MARI 6130 (Well 2)
     - Proposed APOAs: MARI 69522 (Proposed Well 3)

2. Will the proposed POA develop the same aquifer (source) as the existing authorized POA?
   ☒ Yes ☐ No Comments: Both the authorized POA and the APOA will develop from shallow alluvium. The authorized POA is drilled to a depth of approximately 140 feet below ground surface (bgs) in alluvium. The proposed POA are drilled to depths of 119 feet bgs (Well 1) and 150 feet bgs (Well 3).

3. a) Is the existing authorized POA subject to a water level decline condition?
☐ Yes ☒ No Comments: Certificates 27110 and 96313 do not have any 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: The existing POA (MARI 6130) and the proposed additional POA (MARI 3055 and MARI 69522) are all completed in the shallow alluvial aquifer (sand and gravels).

4. a) Is there more than one source developed under the right (e.g., basalt and alluvium)?
☐ Yes ☒ No Comments: Both the authorized POA and the proposed POA all develop the alluvial groundwater source.

   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: All POAs indicated on this application are similar distances to other groundwater POAs.

   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: Both authorized From-POAs are nearer to the Pudding River than both proposed To-POAs, and thus the proposed change will likely not result in an increase in stream interference.

   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

T14611 Kuenzi Turf and Nursery