# Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife's LIMITED LICENSE Application Review Summary Sheet



Note: For proposed groundwater uses, the impacts identified in Section 3.1 and 3.2 are only applicable if OWRD determines there is the potential for substantial interference with surface water per OAR 690-009.

Threatened and/or Endangered Species (Section 4)
Will the proposed use result in a loss of essential habitat of a threatened and/or endangered fish species?
$\square$ YES; see details in Section 4 $\boxtimes$ NO
□ NOT APPLICABLE; threatened and/or endangered fish will not be impacted by the proposed use.
Sensitive Species (Section 5)
Will the proposed use result in a net loss of essential habitat of a sensitive species?
☐ YES; see details in Section 5
□ NOT APPLICABLE; sensitive fish will not be impacted by the proposed use.
Public Interest (Section 6)
Will the proposed use impair or be detrimental to the public interest (in addition to that identified under Division 33)?
☐ YES; see details in Section 6 ☐ NO
Conditions (Section 3 and 6)
ODFW recommends the following conditions, along with any mitigation outlined in Section 7, to overcome impairment or
detrimental impacts to sensitive, threatened, and/or endangered fish species, non-listed fish species, wildlife, or habitat (see
REVIEW SHEET for additional information):
Section 3.1 Identification of Biologically Necessary Flows
□ "Mitigation Plan" [A] □ "Mitigation" [A] □ "Measurement Device" [A] □ "Bypass Plan" [B] □ "Bypass Flow" [B]
Section 3.2 Biological Flow Availability
☐ "Maintain Flow" [A] ☐ "Mitigation Plan" [A] ☐ "Mitigation" [A] ☐ "Measurement Device" [A]  Section 3.3 Fish Passage and Screening
☐ "Passage" [A] ☐ "Maintain Passage" [A] ☐ "Screen" [B] ☐ "Future Protection" [B]
Section 3.4 Other Ecological Functions
□ "Wetland" [A] □ "Riparian Plan" [A] □ "Riparian" [A] □ "In-water Work" type months here [A] □ "Fish Stocking" [A]
☐ Site-specific condition(s), including, but not limited to, any identified in Section 6: type here
☐ Comments: Based on ODFW's observation and discussion with the local watermaster, flow from Butter Creek rarely
reaches the Umatilla River, therefore, the proposed reduction is considered inconsequential at this time. Per OAR 690-
350-0120 (3)(a), the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) verifies that there is currently no minimum
perennial stream flow or instream water right for the protection of aquatic and fish life established for the source
stream identified in the Madison Ranches limited license application 1926. Therefore, the applicant does not need to
provide a copy of a minimum perennial stream flow or instream water right as an attachment to the application.
However, ODFW recommends the following conditions be applied to the associated permit to protect and enhance
Oregon's fish and wildlife and their habitats: In supporting this license, ODFW retains the prerogative to pursue a future
instream water right for Butter Creek, and the license shall be subordinate to any such right.

Mitigation (Section 7)

Is ODFW recommending mitigation in addition to any conditions identified?

YES; see recommended Mitigation Obligation in Section 7

YES; contact ODFW if the applicant is interested in pursuing mitigation

Applicant's Name: Jake Madison, Madison Ranches Inc

Limited License #: LL-1989

 $\boxtimes$  NO

# Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife's LIMITED LICENSE Application Review Sheet



The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) provides the following recommendations to protect and enhance Oregon's fish and wildlife and their habitats for use and enjoyment by present and future generations. Mitigation recommendations are consistent with the goals and standards in ODFW's OAR 635-415 (Fish and Wildlife Habitat Mitigation Policy) and other applicable law. The information is requested by the Oregon Department of Water Resources (OWRD) for the purposes of consultation pursuant to OAR 690-33 (Additional Public Interest Standards for New Appropriations), OAR 690-310 (Water Rights Application Processing), OAR 690-400 (State Water Resources Policy), and OAR 690-410 (Statewide Water Resource Management). ODFW recommendations herein are to be utilized in coordination with the Oregon Department of Environmental Quality's (ODEQ) recommendations regarding impacts to aquatic life due to impaired water quality.

# Section 1: Proposed Use

Basin: Umatilla

Stream: <u>Butter Creek</u> Tributary to: <u>Umatilla River</u> TRSQQ: 3.00N-28.00E-31-SE NW (optional)

Proposed period of use (from application, if available): November - August

Requested amount (cfs or AF): 925 gpm; maximum 85% of artificial recharge volume from LL-1926

# **Section 2: Fish Species Present**

A) 🗌 No fish species v	vill be impacted b	y the proposed use	based on parameters a	assessed by ODFW. (	(Skip to Section 6)
------------------------	--------------------	--------------------	-----------------------	---------------------	---------------------

B) \( \text{The following fish species of primary concern are present at the location of the proposed use or will be impacted by the proposed use:

	Listing Status				Life Stage Present		
Species	Sensitive	Threatened	Endangered	Not Listed*	Spawning	Rearing	Migration
Summer steelhead		$\boxtimes$					$\boxtimes$
Redband trout	$\boxtimes$				$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$	$\boxtimes$
type here							
type here							
type here							
type here							
type here							
type here							
type here							

<sup>\*</sup>Impacts to species not listed as sensitive, threatened, and/or endangered are addressed in Section 6.

# **Section 3: Potential Impacts to Fish Species**

Note: Impacts identified below are determined by professional judgment and/or best available science. Recommended mitigation for identified impacts is outlined in Section 7. See Section 8 for recommended "condition" language.

3.1 Identification of Biological	y necessary	y Flows
·	•	

FEB

MAR

type here cfs

type here cfs

MAY

JUN

A)	$\boxtimes$	Is the prop	osed use from g	roundv	vater?					
			e impacts identi	fied in	Section 3.1 and	3.2 are	only applicable	if OWI	RD determines there is the	
		potential f	or substantial in	terfere	nce with surface	e water	per OAR 690-0	09.		
		$\square$ NO								
B)	$\boxtimes$	ODFW has	not identified bi	iologica	illy necessary flo	ows wit	hin the impacte	ed reacl	h.	
-		⊠ "Meas	urement Device'	,			·			
		Howeve	er, based on best	profes	sional judgmen	t, impa	cts to fish from	the pro	pposed reduction in flow are	
		expecte	d to be <b>inconsec</b>	quentia	I or there is ins	ufficien	t information at	t this ti	me to determine if the proposed	
		use will	impair biologica	lly nece	essary flows for	fish. T	herefore, no mi	tigatior	n for a reduction in flow is	
		recomn	nended. ODFW i	recomn	nends the syste	m insta	lled to divert wa	ater inc	clude monitoring equipment, the	
		type de	termined by OW	RD, wh	ich allows wate	r use n	neasurement an	d repo	rting and ensures the permitted	
		amount	is not exceeded	. (Skip	to Section 3.3)					
		$\square$ "Mitiga	tion Plan," "Mit	igation	," and "Measur	ement	Device"			
					•	•	-		ot available entirely or partially fo	
		·	posed use. A fur			_	<del></del>			
	$\square$ ODFW recommends the season of use be restricted to <u>type here</u> if the applicant can show beneficial us								•	
during this time (OAR 690-300-0010(57)(b)) or the proposed use be mitigated prior to issuance of a								· · ·		
		-	osed Final Orde			-				
				the pro	posed use be m	iitigate	d <u>prior to issuar</u>	ice of a	Proposed Final Order. (Skip to	
		Sect	ion 3.3)							
C)		ODFW red	commends the fo	ollowing	g biologically ne	cessar	/ flows to suppo	rt the l	biological needs of fish species:	
•			ODFW recommends the following biologically necessary flows to support the biological needs of fish species:  Instream Water Right certificates and pending applications at the point of impact and/or downstream							
			iologically neces		_		·			
		JAN	type here cfs	APR	type here cfs	JUL	type here cfs	ОСТ	type here cfs	
		FEB	type here cfs	MAY	type here cfs	AUG	type here cfs	NOV	type here cfs	
		MAR	type here cfs	JUN	type here cfs	SEP	type here cfs	DEC	type here cfs	
			_				•			
		Source	e: DOFW Regi		_	ssment				
	based on list BIR here									
			$\Box$ type other	source	<u>here</u>					
D)		"Bypass P	lan" and "Bypas	s Flow	' (for reservoirs	that d	irectly divert fro	om surf	face water)	
•		• •			-		-		ary flows, minus any amount that	
									ervoir during the filling season.	
		JAN 1	ype here cfs A	PR ty	pe here cfs JU	JL ty	pe here cfs O	CT ty	pe here cfs	

D) Comments concerning biologically necessary flows: Based on ODFW's observation and discussion with the local

AUG

SEP

type here cfs

NOV

DEC

watermaster, flow from Butter Creek rarely reaches the Umatilla River, therefore, the proposed reduction is considered inconsequential at this time. Per OAR 690-350-0120 (3)(a), the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) verifies that there is currently no minimum perennial stream flow or instream water right for the protection of aquatic and fish life established for the source stream identified in the Madison Ranches limited license application 1926. Therefore, the applicant does not need to provide a copy of a minimum perennial stream flow or instream water right as an attachment to the application. However, ODFW recommends the following conditions be applied to the associated permit to protect and enhance Oregon's fish and wildlife and their habitats: In supporting this license, ODFW retains the prerogative to pursue a future instream water right for Butter Creek, and the license shall be subordinate to any such right.

#### 3.2 Biological Flow Availability

)	Ba	sed on parameters assessed by ODFW, are the recommended biologically necessary flows (identified in Section
	3.1	, Question B) available within the impacted reach during the period of impact?
		YES; "Maintain Flow" and "Measurement Device"
		A further reduction in flow from the proposed use will <u>not</u> impair biologically necessary flows for fish as long as
		the recommended flows remain satisfied real time within and downstream of the point of impact. ODFW
		recommends the system installed to divert water include monitoring equipment, the type determined by OWRD,
		which allows water use measurement and reporting and ensures the permitted amount is not exceeded.
		NO; "Mitigation Plan," "Mitigation," and "Measurement Device"
		The proposed use will impair biologically necessary flows for fish entirely or partially during the period of
		impact.
		☐ Water is only available to support biologically necessary flows within the impacted reach during
		type months here. ODFW recommends the season of use be restricted to coincide with this period if the
		applicant can show beneficial use during this time (OAR 690-300-0010(57)(b)) or the proposed use be
		mitigated <u>prior to issuance of a Proposed Final Order</u> for any use outside of this period.
		$\ \square$ Water is not available to support biologically necessary flows within the impacted reach year-round. ODFW
		recommends the proposed use be mitigated prior to issuance of a Proposed Final Order.
		UNKNOWN; "Mitigation Plan," "Mitigation," and "Measurement Device"
		There is insufficient information on instream flow availability (e.g., no Water Availability Basin or gage) to
		determine if the proposed use will impair biologically necessary flows for fish. Therefore, ODFW assumes
		impairment and recommends the proposed use be mitigated <u>prior to issuance of a Proposed Final Order</u> unless
		the applicant provides sufficient evidence to ODFW that the biologically necessary flows are available and can be
		maintained within the impacted reach.
		NOT APPLICABLE; "Measurement Device"
		ODFW has determined that impacts to fish habitat from the proposed reduction in flow are expected to be
		inconsequential or de Minimis based on parameters assessed. Therefore, ODFW does not recommend
		mitigation for a reduction in flow at this time. However, ODFW recommends the system installed to divert water
		include monitoring equipment, the type determined by OWRD, which allows water use measurement and
		reporting and ensures the permitted amount is not exceeded.

B) Comments concerning availability of biologically necessary flows: type here

#### 3.3 Fish Passage and Screening

A) Would the proposed use potentially create or maintain an artificial obstruction<sup>1</sup> to fish passage for native migratory

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> "Artificial obstruction" means any dam, diversion, dike, berm, levee, tide or flood gate, road, culvert or other human-made device placed in the waters of this state that precludes or prevents the migration of native migratory fish.

Limited License #: LL-1989 Applicant's Name: Jake Madison, Madison Ranches Inc fish currently or historically present at the point of diversion per ORS 509.585? ☐ YES; "Passage"  $\boxtimes$  NO ☐ NO; "Maintain Passage" Based on available information, the proposed use does not appear to involve instream structures that would create or maintain an artificial obstruction. However, if the applicant creates or maintains an artificial obstruction to fish passage for the proposed use, the applicant will need to address Oregon's fish passage laws prior to diversion of water. B) Would fish species benefit from fish screening per ORS 498.306? ☐ YES; "Screen"  $\boxtimes$  NO ☐ "Future Protection" Fish screening will not currently benefit fish species but may be beneficial in the future if conditions within the watershed change. Please describe current conditions within the watershed: type here C) Comments concerning fish passage or screening: type here **3.4 Other Ecological Functions** A) Are there other impacts to ecological functions important to fish during the period of impact? YES; A "condition" will be identified below or mitigation will be recommended in Section 7.4. ☐ The proposed project may impair or be detrimental to the public interest through impairment of a wetland providing fish habitat. "Wetland" Development of the proposed project may disturb the riparian area that provides habitat to fish. "Riparian" and "Riparian Plan" ☐ To have the least impact on fish and habitat resources, ODFW recommends any in-water work related to construction, development, or maintenance of the proposed use be conducted during the preferred work period of type here "In-water Work" ☐ The permittee shall not stock fish in the reservoir without a fish transport permit approved by ODFW. "Fish Stocking" ☐ Other impacts to fish: type here  $\bowtie$  NO B) Other comments concerning ecological functions important to fish: type here Section 4: ODFW Findings Regarding Threatened and/or Endangered Fish Species (under OWRD's Division 33 Statewide Rules) □ NOT APPLICABLE; threatened and/or endangered fish will not be impacted by the proposed use. **Skip to Section 5.** 

## **Overarching Question 1:**

Will the proposed use result in a loss of essential habitat of a threatened and/or endangered fish species? Note: For impacts to non-essential habitat for threatened and/or endangered species under Habitat Categories 3-6, skip to Section 6.

 $\square$  YES; Based on parameters assessed, ODFW has found impairment of biologically necessary flows or the assumption of impairment due to insufficient information on instream flow availability (Section 3.2, Question A), the need for

fish passage or screening (Section 3.3), or impacts to ecological functions (Section 3.4) essential to threatened and/or endangered fish species during the period of impact.

☑ NO; Based on parameters assessed, ODFW finds the use will either not impair biologically necessary flows (Section). 3.2, Question A) and ecological functions essential to threatened and/or endangered fish species (Section 3.4) or the proposed reduction in flow is expected to be inconsequential or de Minimis (Section 3.1, Question A; Section 3.2, Question A).

#### **Overarching Question 2:**

Can the use be conditioned to result in no loss of essential habitat of a threatened and/or endangered fish

species?
<ul> <li>☐ YES; ODFW recommends the conditions recommended in Section 3 to compensate for any potential impact from the proposed use.</li> <li>☐ ODFW recommends the applicant submit, to the application caseworker at WRD, a Mitigation Proposal that</li> </ul>
fulfills the Mitigation Obligation consistent with the goals and standards of OAR 635-415-0025 (ODFW Habitat Mitigation Recommendations) outlined in Section 7, and other conditions recommended from Sections 3, to compensate for any potential impact from the proposed use.
☐ In addition, ODFW recommends the following site-specific condition(s): <a href="type-here">type-here</a> ☐ NO; ODFW found the proposed use will impact irreplaceable, essential habitat for a threatened and/or endangered fish species, population, or a unique assemblage of species that is limited on either a physiographic province or site-specific basis (i.e., Category 1 Habitat). ODFW recommends avoidance of the impact through alternatives to the proposed use or no authorization of the proposed use if impacts cannot be avoided. Otherwise, the proposed use would harm the species.
Comments: type here
Section 5: ODFW Findings Regarding Sensitive Fish Species (under OWRD's Division 33
Statewide Rules)
Sensitive species will not be impaired by the proposed use. <b>Skip to Section 6.</b>

### **Overarching Question 1:**

Will the proposed use result in a net loss of essential habitat of a sensitive fish species?

Note: For impacts to non-essential habitat for sensitive species under Habitat Categories 3-6, skip to Section 6.

- $\square$  YES; Based on parameters assessed, ODFW has found impairment of biologically necessary flows or the assumption of impairment due to insufficient information on instream flow availability (Section 3.2, Question A), the need for fish passage or screening (Section 3.3), or impacts to ecological functions (Section 3.4) essential to sensitive fish species during the period of impact.
- NO; Based on parameters assessed, ODFW finds the use will either **not impair** biologically necessary flows (Section 3.2, Question A) and ecological functions essential to sensitive fish species (Section 3.4) or the proposed reduction in flow is expected to be inconsequential or de Minimis (Section 3.1, Question A; Section 3.2, Question A).

#### **Overarching Question 2:**

Can the use be conditioned to result in no net loss of essential habitat of a sensitive fish species?

YES; ODFW recommends the conditions and mitigation recommended in Sections 3, 4, and 7 to compensate for any

Limited License #: LL-1989 Applicant's Name: Jake Madison, Madison Ranches Inc potential impact from the proposed use. ODFW recommends the applicant submit, to the application caseworker at WRD, a Mitigation Proposal that fulfills the Mitigation Obligation consistent with the goals and standards of OAR 635-415-0025 (ODFW Habitat Mitigation Recommendations) outlined in Section 7, and other conditions recommended from Sections 3 and 4, to compensate for any potential impact from the proposed use. ☐ In addition, ODFW recommends the following site-specific condition(s): type here □ NO; ODFW found the proposed use will impact irreplaceable, essential habitat for a sensitive fish species, population, or a unique assemblage of species that is limited on either a physiographic province or site-specific basis (i.e., Category 1 Habitat). ODFW recommends avoidance of the impact through alternatives to the proposed use or no authorization of the proposed use if impacts cannot be avoided. Otherwise, the proposed use would harm the species. Comments: type here Section 6: ODFW's Public Interest Findings (under OWRD's Division 310) Note: Comment on fish or wildlife species not already discussed in Sections 4 or 5 and impacts to non-essential habitat of STE fish. **Overarching Question 1:** Will the proposed use impair or be detrimental to the public interest?  $\square$  YES; In addition to those previously identified in Sections 4 and 5, the proposed use will impair or be detrimental to the following public interest(s) under ORS 537.170(8): identify beneficial use(s) and how they are impaired or detrimentally affected ☑ NO; Impairment or detriment to public interests, in addition to those previously identified in Sections 4 and 5, will be inconsequential from the proposed use or has not been assessed at this time. Skip to Section 7. **Overarching Question 2:** Can the proposed use be conditioned to overcome the impairment or detriment to the public interest? ☐ YES; ☐ The same conditions and mitigation as outlined in Sections 3, 4, and 7 apply. ☐ ODFW recommends the following site-specific condition(s): type here NO; ODFW found the proposed use will impact irreplaceable, essential habitat for a fish or wildlife species, population, or a unique assemblage of species that is limited on either a physiographic province or site-specific basis (i.e., Category 1 Habitat). ODFW recommends avoidance of the impact through alternatives to the proposed use or no authorization of the proposed use if impacts cannot be avoided. Otherwise, the proposed use would harm the species.

Comments: type here

# Section 7: ODFW's Recommended Mitigation Obligation

NOT APPLICABLE; ODFW is not recommending mitigation. (Sign and STOP here)

<b>ODFW Representative's Sig</b>	nature:	Date: <u>9-4-24</u>
Name: <u>Danette Faucera</u>	Phone: (971) 280-3773	Email: danette.l.faurcera@odfw.oregon.gov
Mitigation Obligation		
those essential to support t impact habitat, so the prop- are naturally adapted. Thes further reduction in flow or wildlife, and/or their habita	he biological needs of fish, wildli osed use may diminish physical h se changes will negatively affect t alteration of habitat from the pr t without appropriate mitigation	each are or are assumed to be entirely or partially below fe, or habitats and/or the proposed use will otherwise nabitat and alter the flow regime to which fish and wildlife their distribution, productivity, and abundance. Therefore, a roposed water use would impair or be detrimental to fish, a. ODFW recommends the applicant contact the caseworker wing recommended Mitigation Obligation, if questions arise.
Choose One:		
A) Water is not available recommends the promitigation and/or concutside this period we listed fish species, or further information cas required under OA often complicated, times	posed use be mitigated <u>prior to inditions</u> , a further reduction in floil ill impair or be detrimental to se wildlife. If the applicant is interestoncerning appropriate condition at 690-33, to compensate for any me consuming, and expensive, a	ry flows at the POD and/or downstream year-round. ODFW issuance of a Proposed Final Order. Without appropriate ow or alteration of habitat from the proposed water use insitive, threatened, and/or endangered fish species, non-ested in pursuing mitigation, please contact ODFW for its and a Mitigation Obligation consistent with OAR 635-415, by potential impact from the proposed use. Mitigation is and may include, but is not limited to, actions such as chasing or transferring an existing water right.
here. ODFW recomm mitigated prior to iss mitigation and/or con outside this period w listed fish species, or further information of as required under OA often complicated, ti	nends the season of use be restri- uance of a Proposed Final Order nditions, a further reduction in fle ill impair or be detrimental to se wildlife. If the applicant is intere- concerning appropriate condition of R 690-33, to compensate for any me consuming, and expensive, and	try flows at the POD and/or downstream during type months cted to coincide with this period or the proposed use be for any use outside of this period. Without appropriate ow or alteration of habitat from the proposed water use insitive, threatened, and/or endangered fish species, non-ested in pursuing mitigation, please contact ODFW for its and a Mitigation Obligation consistent with OAR 635-415, by potential impact from the proposed use. Mitigation is and may include, but is not limited to, actions such as chasing or transferring an existing water right.
determine if the prop proposed use be miti evidence to ODFW th reach. Without appro the proposed water to endangered fish spec please contact ODFW consistent with OAR	posed use will impair biologically gated prior to issuance of a Properat the biologically necessary flow opriate mitigation and/or conditions outside this period may impacies, non-listed fish species, or will for further information concern 635-415, as required under OAR	ilability (e.g., no Water Availability Basin or gage) to necessary flows for fish. Therefore, ODFW recommends the losed Final Order unless the applicant provides sufficient was are available and can be maintained within the impacted ions, a further reduction in flow or alteration of habitat from ir or be detrimental to sensitive, threatened, and/or Idlife. If the applicant is interested in pursuing mitigation, sing appropriate conditions and a Mitigation Obligation 690-33, to compensate for any potential impact from the consuming, and expensive, and may include, but is not

limited to, actions such as replacing the proposed amount of water through purchasing or transferring an existing water right.

- D) 

  Mitigation is not an option. ODFW recommends avoidance of the impact through alternatives to the proposed use or no authorization of the proposed use if impacts cannot be avoided.
- E) Based on ODFW's knowledge of applicable Subbasin Plans, Recovery Plans, Regional Restoration Plans, or other documents, the proposed use appears inconsistent with the Northwest Power and Conservation Council's Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program<sup>2</sup>, impairs essential habitat, or is otherwise detrimental to the protection and/or recovery of sensitive, threatened, and/or endangered fish species, non-listed fish species, or wildlife. Therefore, ODFW recommends the applicant submit, to the application caseworker at WRD, a Mitigation Proposal that fulfills the Mitigation Obligation (consistent with the goals and standards of OAR 635-415-0025; ODFW Habitat Mitigation Recommendations) as outlined in this section(s), as well as other conditions recommended in Sections 3-6. ODFW recommends the Proposal include an assessment of options using the following actions listed in order of priority:
  - (1) avoiding the impact altogether,
  - (2) minimizing the impact by limiting the degree or magnitude of the action,
  - (3) rectifying the impact by repairing, rehabilitating, or restoring the affected environment,
  - (4) reducing or eliminating the impact over time by preservation and maintenance operations during the life of the development action and by monitoring and taking appropriate corrective measures, and
  - (5) compensating for the impact by replacing or providing comparable substitute resources or environments. Because the mitigation is site- and species-specific, ODFW recommends written approval of the Proposal by

### 7.1 Identification of Habitat Category

Habitat Category<sup>3</sup> for the Primary Species of Concern During the Period of Impact:

ODFW prior to issuance of a Proposed Final Order (see Section 9).

Month	Primary Species of Concern	Habitat Category
January	type here	type here
February	type here	type here
March	type here	type here
April	type here	type here
May	type here	type here
June	type here	type here

Month	Primary Species of Concern	Habitat Category
July	type here	type here
August	type here	type here
September	type here	type here
October	type here	type here
November	type here	type here
December	type here	type here

#### 7.2 Flow Mitigation

	If the applicant chooses to pursue water use during type here, when biologically necessary flows are not met or water is not available, ODFW recommends the applicant provide water-for-water mitigation that is <b>legally protected</b> and maintained as an instream water right for the life of the permit and subsequent certificate, as outlined below.   In lieu of mitigation, the applicant may provide evidence that the biologically necessary flows are available and can be maintained within the impacted reach.
	ODFW recommends WRD's "Normal Mitigation," including any site-specific options addressed below.
A)	Water Quantity: type here (equals amount requested)

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Water Resources Department's document number 94-2

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> see ODFW Habitat Mitigation Policy, OAR 635-415-0025

	Limited License #: LL-1989 Applicant's Name: Jake Madison, Madison Ranches Inc
	□ plus a net benefit (for Habitat Category 2)
B)	Months: <u>type here</u>
C)	Location of Mitigation (based on the Habitat Category):  at or above the point of impact  at or above the point of impact is preferred, but may occur within the watershed/home range of the impacted population(s)  within a high priority reach <sup>4</sup> within the watershed/home range of the impacted species or population  within the watershed/home range of the impacted population(s)
	☐ benefitting the impacted population(s) and/or higher priority species: <u>list species here</u>
D)	Additional comments: type here
<u>7.3</u>	B Habitat Restoration Mitigation
	es the Mitigation Goal also allow a habitat restoration project as a mitigation option (i.e., impacts to Habitat tegories $3-6$ )?
	YES; In lieu of providing "water-for water", ODFW's Habitat Mitigation Policy allows the applicant the option of providing mitigation through a habitat restoration project that recreates similar habitat structure and function to that existing prior to the development action. If the applicant is interested in pursuing this option, please contact ODFW for further information.  NO; Skip to Part 4, if applicable.
<u>7.4</u>	1 Other Ecological Functions Mitigation
	Not applicable
	ODFW recommends the applicant provide the following mitigation, including, but not limited to, mitigation for "Other Impacts to Ecological Functions" or impacts to wildlife.  Note: Copy and paste the template below for each habitat type in need of replacement.
A)	Habitat Structure and Function in Need of Replacement: type here
B)	Describe the habitat quantity and quality to be replaced: type here
•	Months:  □ In Perpetuity □ Other: type here
D)	Location of Mitigation:  ☐ at or above the point of impact ☐ at or above the point of impact is preferred, but may occur within the watershed/home range of the impacted population(s) ☐ within a high priority reach <sup>5</sup> within the home range of the impacted species or population

Page 11 | Version 1.1, updated April 26, 2021

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>4</sup> see ODFW's Aquatic Habitat Priority maps

Applicant's Name: Jake Madison, Madison Ranches Inc

Limited License #: LL-1989

# Section 8: ODFW's Recommended Condition Language

Limited License #: LL-1989

# List A Conditions (to be addressed by applicant prior to issuance of the Proposed Final Order)

#### Bypass Plan (for reservoirs that directly divert from surface water)

<u>Prior to issuance of the Proposed Final Order</u>, the applicant shall submit, to the application caseworker at OWRD, a Bypass Plan which describes the method the permittee shall bypass the recommended flows, as outlined in Section 3.1, C and how the permittee will quantify and document inflow and outflow.

#### **Mitigation Plan**

<u>Prior to issuance of the Proposed Final Order</u>, the applicant shall submit, to the application caseworker at OWRD, a Mitigation Proposal that fulfills the Mitigation Obligation consistent with the goals and standards of OAR 635-415-0025 (ODFW Habitat Mitigation Recommendations), as outlined in Section 7, to compensate for any potential impacts to fish, wildlife, or habitats from the proposed use.

#### Riparian Plan

If development of the point of diversion includes disturbance of the riparian area, the applicant shall be responsible for restoration and enhancement of such riparian area in accordance with the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife's (ODFW) Fish and Wildlife Habitat Mitigation Policy described in OAR 635-415. **Prior to issuance of the Proposed Final Order**, the applicant shall submit, to the application caseworker at OWRD, a Riparian Plan approved in writing by ODFW, unless ODFW provides documentation that a Riparian Plan is not necessary. The applicant is hereby directed to contact ODFW.

#### Wetland

<u>Prior to issuance of the Proposed Final Order</u>, the applicant must submit an offsite determination request to the Oregon Department of State Lands (DSL) to determine the need for a wetland delineation. The offsite determination will identify waters of this state that are subject to regulation and authorization requirements of the Removal-Fill Law (ORS 196.800 to 196.990) that may be needed prior to disturbance or development of the point of diversion.

#### **List B Conditions**

(included in permit and "maintenance" language carried through to certificate)

#### Bypass Flows (for reservoirs that directly divert from surface water)

Per 690-410-0070 (2)(c), the following flows shall be bypassed or passed through the reservoir during the filling season:

- 1) When the biologically necessary flows identified below are not available immediately upstream of the impacted area, the permittee shall pass all live flow downstream at a rate equal to the inflow, minus the amount of mitigation water provided upstream by the permittee, if applicable, and
- 2) When the biologically necessary flows identified below are available immediately upstream of the impacted area, the permittee shall pass flow downstream at a rate **equal to** or greater than the biologically necessary flows.

Once the reservoir has reached the permitted volume, all live flow shall be passed downstream at a rate equal to the inflow.

The permittee shall quantify and document inflow and outflow and maintain the bypass flows for the life of the permit and subsequent certificate per the approved Bypass Plan. The bypass flow data shall be available upon request by the Oregon Water Resources Department, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife, Oregon Department of Environmental Quality, or Oregon Department of Agriculture.

#### {copy table from Section 3.1, Question C}

#### **Fish Stocking**

Per ORS 498.222 and OAR 635-007-0600, all persons transporting fish in Oregon need to have a fish transport permit issued by the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW). The permittee shall not stock fish in the reservoir without a fish transport permit approved by ODFW. As part of the permitting process, the permittee must also screen the inlet and outlet of their pond to insure that fish cannot escape into public waters and/or to keep wild fish from entering the pond.

#### **Future Protection**

The permittee may be required in the future to install, maintain, and operate fish screening per ORS 498.306 to prevent harm to fish from the proposed diversion. The Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) may require the water user to install an approved fish screen at the new point of diversion within one year after receiving written notification from ODFW that a fish screen is required. Once installed, the water user shall operate and maintain the fish screen consistent with ODFW's operation and maintenance standards.

Limited License #: LL-1989 Applicant's Name: Jake Madison, Madison Ranches Inc

#### In-Water Work

Any in-water work related to construction, development, or maintenance of the proposed use shall be conducted during the preferred work period of {insert dates identified in Section 3.4} unless an alternate time period is approved by the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife.

#### **Maintain Flow**

The biologically necessary flows shown in the following table shall be maintained real time within and downstream of the point of impact or the use may be regulated until the flows are available.

{copy table from Section 3.1, Question B}

#### **Maintain Passage**

The permittee shall maintain adequate passage of native migratory fish at all times (ORS 509.610) and shall not construct, operate, or maintain any dam or artificial obstruction to fish passage across any waters of the state that are inhabited, or were historically inhabited, by native migratory fish (ORS 509.585).

#### **Measurement Device**

The permittee shall install, maintain, and operate a water use control and/or measuring device, as identified by OWRD. The device shall be installed, functional, and approved by the local Watermaster, <u>prior to diversion of water</u>.

#### Mitigation

The permittee shall comply with terms of the associated Mitigation Plan to compensate for detrimental impacts to fish, wildlife, and/or their habitat. The Mitigation Plan is fully incorporated into the requirements of this permit and may only be altered by written mutual agreement of all parties. The mitigation shall be legally protected and maintained for the life of the permit and subsequent certificate.

#### **Passage**

The permittee shall not construct, operate, or maintain any dam or artificial obstruction to fish passage across any waters of the state that are inhabited, or were historically inhabited, by native migratory fish (ORS 509.585) without obtaining approval for the artificial obstruction from the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW).

The permittee shall submit a proposal for fish passage to ODFW or apply for a fish passage waiver or exemption. Approval of the proposed fish passage facility, waiver, or exemption shall be obtained <u>prior to construction</u> of any in-channel obstruction or <u>prior to diversion of water</u> that may create an artificial obstruction due to low flow. The permittee shall submit proof to ODFW that fish passage has been implemented per the plan, waiver, or exemption <u>prior to diversion of water</u>.

The permittee shall maintain adequate passage of native migratory fish at all times (ORS 509.610) as per the approved plan, waiver, or exemption. The permittee is hereby directed to schedule a consultation with an ODFW Fish Passage Coordinator.

#### Riparian

The permittee shall restore or enhance the riparian area per the approved Riparian Plan <u>prior to diversion of water</u> and maintain the riparian area for the life of the permit and subsequent certificate per the approved Riparian Plan.

#### Screen

The permittee shall install, maintain, and operate fish screening consistent with current Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) standards or submit documentation that ODFW has determined fish screening is not necessary or is exempted. Fish screening is to prevent fish from entering the proposed diversion. The required screen is to be in place, functional, and approved in writing by ODFW **prior to diversion of water**. The water user shall operate and maintain the fish screen consistent with ODFW's operation and maintenance standards. The permittee is hereby directed to schedule a consultation with an ODFW Fish Screening Coordinator.

# Section 9: ODFW's Review of the Mitigation Proposal

Because the mitigation is site- and species-specific, ODFW recommends written approval of the Proposal by ODFW prior to issuance of a Proposed Final Order. ODFW finds the following:

☐ ODFW <b>supports</b> the Mitigation Proposal with the following condition(s):
☐ "Mitigation"
☐ Site-specific condition(s): <u>type here</u>
Additional information:
☐ A Fish Passage Waiver or Exemption has been granted for the proposed POD that fulfills the fish passage requirements for this use.
☐ Comments: type here
☐ ODFW <b>cannot support</b> the Mitigation Proposal because it is not consistent with the criteria in OAR 635-415.
☐ The proposed mitigation is inconsistent with the Northwest Power and Conservation Council's Columbia River Basin Fish and Wildlife Program <sup>5</sup> , impairs essential habitat, or is otherwise detrimental to the protection and/or recovery of sensitive, threatened, and/or endangered fish species, non-listed fish species, or wildlife.
☐ Habitat goals and standards not met: <u>list here and explain why not met</u>
ODFW Representative's Signature:Date: type here
Name: type here Phone: type here Email: type here

Page 15 | Version 1.1, updated April 26, 2021

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>5</sup> Water Resources Department's document number 94-2