



## WATERMASTER APPLICATION REVIEW

Application #:

Applicant's Name:

- 1) Would the proposed allocation have the potential for injury to existing rights?  
 Yes    No
  
- 2) If the proposed allocation will cause injury, can it be conditioned to avoid injury?  
 Yes    No   If Yes, please list conditions:
  
- 3) Have you spoken with persons from other state agencies about this application?  
 Yes    No   If yes, whom and why?
  
- 4) Please select the appropriate measurement, recording and reporting condition for this application.  
 **Small** < 0.1 CFS, < 9.2 AF  
 **Medium** > 0.1 CFS but < 0.25 CFS, > 9.2 AF but < 100 AF  
 **Large** > 0.25 CFS, > 100 AF  
 Require a staff gage if source is runoff or if the reservoir is located in-channel.  
 Require an in-line flow restrictor.
  
- 5) Please provide any additional information or conditions that you believe are necessary for this application.

Watermaster Name:

Watermaster Signature:

Date:

WRD Caseworker:

Ph: 503-986-0900/ Fax: 503-986-0901

Dear Caseworker,

There appears to be a glitch in the watermaster review form regarding opportunities for comment box. The following are my comments that should be included with this application review.

- 1) The applicant is applying for 27cfs on 702,277.9 acres. The applicant needs to provide a rate per acre and duty per acre. The reason being is 27cfs at 1/60 cfs/acre equates to 1,620 acres under a typical water right. It would be impossible for 27cfs to be monitored through several different points of diversion over 702,277 acres with no rate or duty limitation. I am not aware of any irrigation right in the state that allows for a rate at the POD with no rate per acre or duty limitation.
- 2) It is unmanageable to continue layering new water right applications with other deficient water rights from the same source. A plan will need created to identify which water rights are being used and where so that layering from the same source, or other deficient rights, does not continue to occur. Only one water right on a field at a time until the source, identified by order of priority date, is unavailable. This is usual and accustomed in most water rights through the state.
- 3) The total maximum request of 13,097.1 AF must have been calculated using the rate of 27cfs multiplied by the number of days between March 1-November 1. I could not recreate the requested amount and do not understand how this total quantity would be accounted for through typical metering at the POD system. An advanced on-farm metering and reporting system will be required by the Watermaster if this application moves forward.
- 4) Does the MCWC have legal authority to deliver water outside of its boundaries? The MCWC was founded as an arm of the Columbia Improvement District and East Improvement District to manage its mitigated water rights. It would seem reasonable it has authority under these boundaries. I do not understand how it could have authority to apply for water rights on parties not associated with the Columbia Improvement District or East Improvement District. The list of impacted landowners is lengthy, both inside and outside of the EID/CID boundaries. Have impacted landowners been contacted and agreeable to these impacts on their property?
- 5) I did not consider the cover letter as part of this review. The cover letter appears to be requesting changes to existing permits and there is no guarantee any or all of the existing permit conditions will be continued or granted. This is being reviewed as a new water right application and should stand alone in its review process. It seems that the cover letter is anticipating an outcome/conditions that haven't been determined yet. These will need discussed at a future date upon the completion of all State agency and public comment review.

Sincerely,

Greg Silbernagel - Watermaster, District 5  
Oregon Water Resources Department  
116 SE Dorion Ave.  
Pendleton, OR 97801  
(541) 969-1677