

## Watermaster Review Form for Short-Term

## Instream Lease Application Pursuant to OAR 690-077-0077(3)(h)

	ase Agreement #: L- volving Certificate(s) #: 75836
W	atermaster/Field Staff Review. By signature below, staff verifies that:
1.	Does the lease agreement meet the requirements of OAR 690-077-0077(3)(e) to suspend the original use? Yes No If no, please explain:
2.	Is the proposed instream use for a:  ☐ Point ☐ Reach
3.	Is there an existing instream water right established pursuant to ORS 537.341 or 537.346? (A right applied for by ODFW, DEQ, or OP&RD or a converted minimum flow right.)  Yes No
	If yes, is the right proposed to be leased senior to the existing instream right?  ☐ Yes ☐ No
	If no, do you have any information on how the lease will serve a public use? OAR90-077-0077(3)(d). Please explain: fish habitat and conservation
4.	Does the lease agreement meet the requirements of OAR 690-077-0077(7) to avoid injury to other water rights due to:  a. Return flows  ☐ Yes ☐ No  Please explain: return flows factor needs to be incorporated. see proposed conditions section
	<ul> <li>b. Other losses</li> <li></li></ul>
5.	Does the lease agreement meet the requirements of OAR 690-077-0077(7) to avoid enlargement?  Yes No Please explain: if the return flows and other losses are applied.
6.	For split season use instream leasing, does the lease agreement meet the measuring and reporting requirements of OAR 690-077-0079(4)?  Yes No N/A, not a split season use instream lease Please explain:
7.	Proposed conditions to the instream use: ( <u>Describe</u> . if any)

If the applicant had run maximum rate, they would not hit the maximum duty. In addition, it appears some of the lands are in the river bed and areas not irrigated, therefore abandoned. I would request additional information (affidavit, photos, crop report, etc). Looking the photos and reviewing the area

this is questionable.

Assuming we go with the maximum acres, I would propose 0.48 cfs from April 1<sup>st</sup> - September 30<sup>th</sup>. The rate is lower then usual. It is my opinion, the return flow to the system are going to be lower except for the fact that we are in a river system with basalt layer and the lands are on the river. This means any water that is left returns to the system, but probably is unmeasureable in the John River system. Therefore, I am reducing the recommended return flow to 33%, I don't have any information to base this figure on outside, knowing some will return to the John Day River. I normally apply a 1% loss factor in the John Day and recommend that continues with this lease. The amount of water we are dealing with is insignificant inregards to amount in the river. For the benefit of the resource, I feel we should lease into the John Day River and to McDonald Ferry gaging station in the John Day River.

I also propose that the monthly rates on the lease be removed in section 2.2.

Vernon L. Church	Date: <u>September 14, 2005</u>
Printed Name	
Signature	