Groundwater Transfer Review Summary Form

Transfer/PA # T- _**14870**_

GW Reviewer _**J. Hootsmans**_ **Date Review Completed:** _**9/29/2026**_

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-14870 Applicant Name: City of Boardman

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

Reviewer(s): J. Hootsmans Date of Review: 9/29/2026

Date Returned to WRSD: 9/29/2026

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 proposed to transfer the authorized point of appropriation (POA) on **Certificate 34275** from unused well No. 1-64 (MORR 745) to a new well (Kunze Well, PROP 879) that will be constructed along Kunze Road within the city limits.

   Certificate 34275 limits the maximum rate of 1.50 cubic feet per second (cfs) for municipal use.

2. Will the proposed POA develop the same aquifer (source) as the existing authorized POA?
   ☒ Yes ☐ No Comments: The authorized POA is open to multiple water-bearing zones of the Columbia River Basalt Group (CRBG) to a max depth of 585 feet below ground surface (bgs). The proposed POA will target water-bearing zones in the CRBG between 400 and 600 feet below land surface.

3. a) Is the existing authorized POA subject to a water level decline condition?
   ☐ Yes ☒ No Comments: **Permit G2664 (Certificate 34275)** has a priority date of 5/20/1964 and is not subject to a water level decline condition.

   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: Both the proposed POA and authorized POA would produce water from water-bearing zones in the CRBG at depths up to 600 feet bls.

   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 proposed POA will target water bearing zones between 400 and 600 feet bls, which are also developed by the authorized POA. Known wells that obtain water from these water-bearing zones in the vicinity of the POAs are closer to the authorized POA than to the proposed POA. The proposed POA is not appreciably closer to any wells that obtain water from these water-bearing zones than the authorized POA, so the proposed change is not expected to result in an increase in interference with another groundwater right.

   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: The proposed POA is farther away from perennial surface water sources than the authorized POA.

   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: The following conditions should be applied:

   Groundwater production in each well shall be limited to a single aquifer in the Columbia River Basalt Group. Each well shall be continuously cased and continuously sealed to within 100 feet of the bottom of the open borehole. A larger open interval may be approved by the Department if the permittee can demonstrate to the Department's satisfaction, using packer tests or other suitable methods, that the hydraulic heads of water-bearing zones in the proposed open interval are equivalent or that the open interval is part of a continuous zone of interconnected porous materials.

9. Any additional comments: N/A

T-14870
City of Boardman

