

Groundwater Transfer Review Summary Form

Transfer/PA # T- 14772

GW Reviewer Darrick E. Boschmann Date Review Completed: 1/8/2026

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-14772

Applicant Name: Gilmour

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

Reviewer(s): Derrick E. Boschmann

Date of Review: 1/8/2026

Date Reviewed by GW Mgr. and Returned to WRSD: _____

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 application is related to certificate 95518 which authorizes groundwater pumping from two wells (POD 1 = HARN 1489; POD 2 = HARN 52056) for primary irrigation of 38.2 acres in the Malheur Lake Basin. The following changes are proposed:

1. Add one APOA (HARN 50318).
2. Move 7.5 acres of the POU.

Note: On page 6 the application does not indicate that an APOA is proposed, but the table on page 7 indicates this is the case.

2. Will the proposed POA develop the same aquifer (source) as the existing authorized POA?

Yes No Comments: _____

Groundwater in the Harney Basin flows from several upland recharge areas to a common discharge area near Malheur and Harney Lakes, with some apparent discharge to the Malheur Basin through one area along the eastern margin. Groundwater occurs in multiple hydrostratigraphic units, and groundwater within these units is hydraulically connected, making a single groundwater system composed of multiple hydrostratigraphic units (Gingerich and others, 2022). While the rocks and sediments making up the aquifer system in the Harney Basin do constitute a single groundwater flow system, sub-watersheds within the basin contribute recharge to different parts of the system depending on groundwater flow-paths from recharge to discharge areas. In general, within these sub-watersheds water within the aquifer system is sourced from a common recharge area and can therefore be considered a single source.

The currently authorized POA and the proposed POA are all located within ~0.5 miles and are located along groundwater flow paths receiving recharge from a similar source.

3. a) Is the existing authorized POA subject to a water level decline condition?

Yes No Comments: _____

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: _____

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: _____

The proposed APOA is located up to ~0.5 miles from the currently authorized wells. This will result in an incremental increase in interference with existing wells near the proposed APOA.

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: _____

Any increase in interference with existing wells will not meet the standard for substantial or undue interference given the thickness of the aquifer system in the Harney Basin.

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: _____

There are no perennial surface water sources in the vicinity of the authorized or proposed wells.

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: none.

9. Any additional comments: none.

