

# Groundwater Transfer Review Summary Form

Transfer/PA # T- 14248

GW Reviewer Phillip I. Marcy Date Review Completed: 10/30/2023

## 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 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-14248

Applicant Name: David and Kaitlyn Braun

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

Reviewer(s): Phillip I. Marcy

Date of Review: 10/30/2023

Date Returned to WRSD: 9/10/2024

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 proposes to move a portion of the Place of Use (POU) to tax lot 400, and to add "Well A" as an Additional Point of Appropriation (APOA) to the current authorization of "Well B" (LINN 6994).
  2. Will the proposed POA develop the same aquifer (source) as the existing authorized POA?  
☒ Yes ☐ No Comments: The proposed APOA well A is authorized under GR-1927, where a basic description of well construction is given. However, no well log has been correlated with this well and there is no information available concerning productive lithology. Available information reports production from a perforated interval between 70-89' BLS, which is significantly deeper than authorized LINN 6994. Despite these differences in depth, available well log data from nearby wells suggests that within this given range of depths there is little variation in static water level and there is likely to be one interconnected aquifer system within the alluvium.
  3. a) Is there more than one source developed under the right (e.g., basalt and alluvium)?  
☐ Yes ☒ No Based on lithologic information from nearby wells, the current authorization is for production from alluvium.  
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.): NA

4. a) Will this proposed change, at its maximum allowed rate of use, likely result in an increase in interference with **another groundwater right**?  
☒ Yes   ☐ No   Comments: The proposed APOA is 1,190' from the mapped location of Cert. 27688, versus the authorized POA location at a distance of 1,860'.
- 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: Likely pumping rates and aquifer parameters were used to model maximum drawdown after 245 days of use at the proposed location. All but one probable scenario resulted in less than 10 feet of expected drawdown at Cert. 27688 if all pumping were from the proposed APOA, instead of the currently authorized POA.
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 is marginally closer to the South Santiam River, at a distance of 2,740 versus 3,760 under the current authorization.
- 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: South Santiam River   ☒ Minimal   ☐ Significant  
Stream: \_\_\_\_\_   ☐ Minimal   ☐ Significant  
Provide context for minimal/significant impact: Given the low medium to low diffusivity of the aquifer and the size of the surface water body in question, any increase in surface water interference is not considered significant.
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: NA
7. What conditions or other changes in the application are necessary to address any potential issues identified above: \_\_\_\_\_
8. Any additional comments: \_\_\_\_\_



