

# Groundwater Transfer Review Summary Form

Transfer/PA # T- 14790 RA

GW Reviewer J. Hootsmans Date Review Completed: 3/16/2026

## 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-14790

Applicant Name: Miller Valley, LP

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

Reviewer(s): J. Hootsmans

Date of Review: 3/16/2026

Date Returned to WRSD: 3/16/2026

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: The applicant is proposing an additional Point of Appropriation (APOA) to Certificates (Cert) 98829 and 98830. Each Cert has one authorized POA, either UMAT 5271 (Well 1) or UMAT 5531 (Well 2). The places of use on Certs 98829 and 98830 are connected via irrigation machines. The applicant proposes to add both wells as approved APOAs on both Cert as follows:

Certificate 98829:  
Authorized POA – UMAT 5271  
Proposed APOA – UMAT 5531

Certificate 98830:  
Authorized POA – UMAT 5531  
Proposed APOA – UMAT 5271

2. Will the proposed POA develop the same aquifer (source) as the existing authorized POA?  
 Yes     No    Comments: All authorized POA and proposed APOA produce from water-bearing zones in the Columbia River Basalt aquifer system.

3. a) Is the existing authorized POA subject to a water level decline condition?  
 Yes     No            Comments: Certs 98829 and 98830 have 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: All authorized POA and proposed APOA produce from water-bearing zones in the Columbia River Basalt 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 maximum rates authorized by Certs 98829 and 98830. 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: The authorized POA and proposed POA are similar distances to East Birch Creek and other nearby surface water features. Furthermore, all POA are cased and sealed well below the nearby surface water sources.
- 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

### T14790 Miller Valley RA

