

Groundwater Transfer Review Summary Form

Transfer/PA # T- 14836

GW Reviewer Darrick E. Boschmann Date Review Completed: 04/02/2026

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-14836

Applicant Name: Casey

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

Reviewer(s): Darrick E. Boschmann

Date of Review: 04/02/2026

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 34027 which authorizes groundwater pumping from one well (POD 1 = NLOG 58053*) for supplemental irrigation of 140.3 acres in the Malheur Lake Basin. The following changes are proposed:

1. Add three APOA (HARN 52158; HARN 1814; HARN 53233).
2. Rearrange the POU.

*There is no well log for the authorized well under certificate 34027, so GWIS site NLOG 58053 was created to represent the authorized well. Information in the file indicates the well was drilled to 140 feet with 114 feet of steel casing.

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

Yes No Comments: _____

The area immediately underlying the proposed wells is mapped as Qal (alluvium), which is underlain by QTs (sedimentary deposits; lacustrine, fluvial, and aeolian sedimentary rocks, interstratified tuff, ashy diatomite, and unconsolidated clay, sand, silt, and gravel), and Tst (semiconsolidated lacustrine tuffaceous sandstone and siltstone, ash and ashy diatomite, conglomerate and minor fanglomerate, boulder bearing slope wash, vitric-crystal and vitric-lithic tuff, pumice lapilli tuff, and tuff breccia), which are in turn underlain by Taf (basalt, basaltic-andesite, andesite lava flows and breccias and interbedded tuffaceous sedimentary rocks and tuff) (Walker and Reppening, 1965).

Based on the well logs and information from the file for the authorized well it is likely that all wells produce groundwater from Qal, QTs, and possibly Tst, which together constitute the basin filling deposits in this area.

2. 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: _____

3. 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.): _____

4. 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 are located up to ~0.75 miles from the authorized well. This will result in an incremental increase in interference with wells in the direction of 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: _____

The nearest authorized wells to the proposed wells are located over 1 mile to the northwest. 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 this area.

5. 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 APOA are located further from perennial surface water sources than the currently authorized well.

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: _____

6. 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: _____

7. What conditions or other changes in the application are necessary to address any potential issues identified above: none.

8. Any additional comments: none.

