





REFUND

\$50 ON

EACH APP

TO YOLCHIM

RECEIVED REQ FOR  
STAND & PROTEST

**Oregon Water Resources Department**  
**Water Rights/Adjudication Section**

Water Right Application Number: IS 69958

**Proposed Final Order**

**Summary of Recommendation:** The Department recommends that the attached draft certificate be issued with conditions.

**Application History**

On 6/12/89, the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife submitted an application to the Department for the following instream water right certificate.

Source: CLEAR CR TRIB GRANITE CR

County: Grant

Purpose: Migration, spawning, egg incubation, fry emergence, and juvenile rearing.

The amount of water (in cubic feet per second) requested by month:

JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	D	E	C
30	30	48	48	48	30	15	15/48	48/15	15	15	15		

To be maintained in:

CLEAR CREEK FM MOUTH OF BEAVER CREEK AT RIVER MILE 4.3 (NWNW, SECTION 24, T9S, R35E WM); TO MOUTH OF CLEAR CREEK AT RIVER MILE 0.0 (NENE, SECTION 1, T9S, R35E WM)

The Department mailed the applicant notice of its Initial Review on April 10, 1996. Public notice of the application was provide in the Department's weekly public notice on April 24, 1996. Comments were received for 30 days.

The following supporting data was submitted by the applicant:

- (a) Fish and Wildlife Resources of the John Day Basin, Oregon, and Their Water Requirements; September, 1979.
- (b) Determining Minimum Flow Requirements for Fish, ODFW Report January 20, 1984.
- (c) Developing and Application of Spawning Velocity and Depth Criteria for Oregon Salmonids, Alan K. Smith, Transactions of the American Fisheries Society, April 1973.
- (d) Determining Stream Flows for Fish Life, Oregon State Game



Commission Report, March 1972.

- (e) A letter dated April 5, 1996, stating that the flows requested in this application are the minimum amount necessary to restore, protect and enhance populations and habitats of native wildlife species at self-sustaining levels

In reviewing applications, the Department may consider any relevant sources of information, including the following:

- comments by or consultation with another state agency
- any applicable basin program
- any applicable comprehensive plan or zoning ordinance
- the amount of water available
- the proposed rate of use
- pending senior applications and existing water rights of record
- the Scenic Waterway requirements of ORS 390.835
- applicable statutes, administrative rules, and case law
- any comments received

An assessment with respect to conditions previously imposed on other instream water rights granted for the same source has been completed.

An evaluation of the information received from the local government(s) regarding the compatibility of the proposed instream water use with land use plans and regulations has been completed.

The level of instream flow requested is based on the methods of determining instream flow needs that have been approved by administrative rule of the agency submitting this application.

### Findings of Fact

The basin Basin Program allows the proposed use.

Senior water rights exist on this source or on downstream waters.

The source of water is within or above a State Scenic Waterway.

The source of water is not withdrawn from appropriation by order of the State Engineer or legislatively withdrawn by ORS 538.

The estimated average natural flow for the lower end of the requested reach is as follows (in cubic feet per second):

JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
13.1	15.4	19.1	76.8	194	70.9	13.1	4.1	4	5.57	9.26	12.1

### Conclusions of Law

Under the provisions of ORS 537.153, the Department must

presume that a proposed use will not impair or be detrimental to the public interest if the proposed use is allowed in the applicable basin program established pursuant to ORS 536.300 and 536.340 or given a preference under ORS 536.310(12), if water is available, if the proposed use will not injure other water rights and if the proposed use complied



with rules of the Water Resources Commission.

The proposed use requested in this application is allowed in the basin Basin Plan.

No preference for this use is granted under the provisions of ORS 536.310(12).

The proposed use will not injure other water rights.

The proposed use complies with rules of the Water Resources Commission.

The proposed use complies with the State Agency Agreement for land use.

The proposed instream flows do not fully appropriate this source of water year round. Water is available for additional storage.

Water is not available for the proposed use at the amount requested year round because the unappropriated water available is less than the amounts requested during some months.

For these reasons, the presumption set forth in ORS 537.153, as discussed above, has not been established. The application therefore has been processed without the statutory presumption.

"When instream water rights are set at levels which exceed current unappropriated water available the water right not only protects remaining supplies from future appropriation but establishes a management objective for achieving the amounts of instream flows necessary to support the identified public uses." OAR 690-77-015(2).

"The amount of appropriation for out-of-stream purposes shall not be a factor in determining the amount of an instream water right." "The amount allowed during any time period for the water right shall not exceed the estimated average natural flow ..." (excerpted from OAR 690-77-015 (3) and (4)).

Because the proposed use exceeds the available water, it can not be presumed to be in the public interest. However, under the direction of OAR 690-77-015 (2)(3) and(4), the proposed use is in the public interest up to the limits of the estimated average natural flow.

Oregon law allows certain uses of water to take precedence over other uses in certain circumstances. When proposed uses of water are insufficient for all who desire to use them, preference shall be given to human consumption purposes over all other uses and for livestock consumption over any other use (excerpted from ORS 536.310 (12)).

The Department therefore concludes that

- the proposed use, as limited in the draft certificate, will not result in injury to other water rights,
- the proposed use, as limited in the draft certificate, will not impair or be detrimental to the public interest as provided in ORS 537.170.
- the proposed use, as limited in the draft certificate, will include the following conditions: for purposes of water

distribution, this instream right shall not have priority over human or livestock consumption.


- the flows are to be measured at the lower end of the stream reach to protect necessary flows throughout the reach.
- the stream flows listed below represent the minimum flows necessary to support the public use.

JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
13.1	15.4	19.1	48	48	30	13.1	4.1	4	5.57	9.26	12.1

#### Recommendation

The Department recommends that the attached draft certificate be issued with conditions.

DATED AUGUST 27, 1996

  
Steven P. Applegate  
Administrator  
Water Rights and Adjudications Division

#### Protest Rights

Under the provisions of ORS 537.153(6) or 537.621(7), you have the right to submit a protest against this proposed final order. Your protest *must* be in writing, and must include the following:

- Your name, address, and telephone number;
- A description of your interest in the proposed final order, and, if you claim to represent the public interest, a precise statement of the public interest represented;
- A detailed description of how the action proposed in this proposed final order would impair or be detrimental to your interest;
- A detailed description of how the proposed final order is in error or deficient, and how to correct the alleged error or deficiency;
- Any citation of legal authority to support your protest, if known; and
- If you are not the applicant, the \$200 protest fee required by ORS 536.050.
- Proof of service of the protest upon the applicant.

Your protest must be received in the Water Resources Department no later than October 11, 1996.

After the protest period has ended, the Director will either issue a final order or schedule a contested case hearing. The contested case hearing will be scheduled *only* if a protest has been submitted and if

- upon review of the issues the director finds that there are significant disputes related to the proposed use of water, or
- the applicant requests a contested case hearing within 30 days after the close of the protest period.



DRAFT  
STATE OF OREGON

CERTIFICATE OF WATER RIGHT

THIS CERTIFICATE ISSUED TO

Oregon Water Resources Department  
158 12th Street NE  
Salem, Oregon 97310

The specific limits for the use are listed below along with conditions of use.

Source: CLEAR CR TRIB GRANITE CR

County: Grant

Purpose: Migration, spawning, egg incubation, fry emergence, and juvenile rearing.

To be maintained in:

CLEAR CREEK FM MOUTH OF BEAVER CREEK AT RIVER MILE 4.3 (NWNW, SECTION 24, T9S, R35E WM); TO MOUTH OF CLEAR CREEK AT RIVER MILE 0.0 (NENE, SECTION 1, T9S, R35E WM)

The right is established under Oregon Revised Statutes 537.341.

The date of priority is 6/12/89.

The following conditions apply to the use of water under this certificate:

1. The right is limited to not more than the amounts, in cubic feet per second, during the time periods listed below:

JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
13.1	15.4	19.1	48	48	30	13.1	4.1	4	5.57	9.26	12.1

2. The water right holder shall measure and report the in-stream flow along the reach of the stream or river described in the certificate as may be required by the standards for in-stream water right reporting of the Water Resources Commission.
3. For purposes of water distribution, this instream right shall not have priority over human or livestock consumption.
4. The instream flow allocated pursuant to this water right is not in addition to other instream flows created by a prior water right or designated minimum perennial stream flow.
5. The flows are to be measured at the lower end of the stream reach to protect necessary flows throughout the reach.

Witness the signature of the Water Resources Director affixed this \_\_\_\_ day of \_\_\_\_\_, 19\_\_.

Water Resources Director

Recorded in State Record of Water Right Certificate number \_\_\_\_\_.

IS 69958



COPY CHECK-OFF SHEET FOR PROPOSED FINAL ORDERS

CC: FILE # IS 69958

WATERMASTER # KELLY RISE

REGIONAL MANAGER: KENT SEARLES

ODF&W - County: Grant

DEQ

PARKS

OTHER STATE AGENCY IF NECESSARY:

DIVISION 33 LIST: \_\_\_\_\_ COLUMBIA RIVER INTERTRIBAL FISH COMMISSION; U.S. FISH & WILDLIFE;  
(CHECK ONLY IF APPLICABLE) \_\_\_\_\_ NORTHWEST POWER PLANNING COUNCIL & NATIONAL MARINE FISHERIES

POWER BUILDER UPDATER;

WATER FOR LIFE (TODD HEIDGERKEN)

OTHER ADDRESSES OF PEOPLE WHO PAID THE \$10 FEE:

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

PEOPLE WITH OBJECTIONS, COMMENTS OR REQUESTED COPY W/O \$10 (SEND THE \$10 LETTER):

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

CASEWORKER : CINDY SMITH

**STATE OF OREGON  
WATER RESOURCES DEPARTMENT**

RECEIPT # **7502**

158 12TH ST. N.E.  
SALEM, OR 97310-0210  
378-8455 / 378-8130 (FAX)

INVOICE # \_\_\_\_\_

RECEIVED FROM: Ronald Jackson  
BY: \_\_\_\_\_

APPLICATION	
PERMIT	
TRANSFER	

CASH: ☐ CHECK: # X 24-12 OTHER: (IDENTIFY) ☐

TOTAL REC'D \$ 600.00

**0417 WRD MISC CASH ACCT**

ADJUDICATIONS	\$
PUBLICATIONS / MAPS	\$
OTHER: (IDENTIFY)	\$
OTHER: (IDENTIFY)	\$

**REDUCTION OF EXPENSE**

CASH ACCT. \$

PCA AND OBJECT CLASS

VOUCHER #

**0427 WRD OPERATING ACCT**

0407 MISCELLANEOUS  
0407 COPY & TAPE FEES  
0410 RESEARCH FEES  
0408 MISC REVENUE: (IDENTIFY)  
TC165 DEPOSIT LIAB. (IDENTIFY)

*IS 69958  
IS 69959  
IS 69961*

\$
\$
\$
\$

**WATER RIGHTS:**

0201 SURFACE WATER  
0203 GROUND WATER  
0205 TRANSFER

EXAM FEE
\$
\$
\$
EXAM FEE
\$

0202  
0204  
0206

RECORD FEE
\$
\$
\$
LICENSE FEE
\$
\$

**WELL CONSTRUCTION**

0218 WELL DRILL CONSTRUCTOR  
LANDOWNER'S PERMIT

*0223*

OTHER (IDENTIFY) *Protest PCA 77235*

*\$600.00*

**0437 WELL CONST. START FEE**

0211 WELL CONST START FEE  
0210 MONITORING WELLS

\$
\$

CARD #
CARD #

OTHER (IDENTIFY)

**0539 LOTTERY PROCEEDS**

1302 LOTTERY PROCEEDS

\$

**0467 HYDRO ACTIVITY**

LIC NUMBER

0233 POWER LICENSE FEE (FW/WRD)  
0231 HYDRO LICENSE FEE (FW/WRD)


\$
\$

HRDRO APPLICATION

\$

RECEIPT # **7502**

DATED: 10-11-96 BY: C. Reid

Distribution-White Copy-Customer, Yellow Copy-Fiscal, Blue Copy-File, Buff Copy-Fiscal



BEFORE THE WATER RESOURCES DEPARTMENT OF OREGON  
WATER RIGHTS DIVISION

In the Matter of Instream Water Right	)	
Application IS 69958, Clear Creek,	)	
Grant County,	)	
	)	
Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife	)	PROTEST TO
Applicant.	)	PROPOSED FINAL
	)	ORDER
	)	
Grant County,	)	
Protestant.	)	

---

Protestant, Grant County, a municipal corporation, pursuant to ORS 537.153(6) and OAR 690-77-043, hereby protests the Proposed Final Order for Application IS 69958, Clear Creek, tributary to the Middle Fork of the John Day River in Grant County.

I.

INTRODUCTION

The protestant's address and telephone number are:

Grant County Court  
P.O. Box 220  
Canyon City, Oregon 97820  
(541) 575-0059

Protestant's attorney in this matter is:

Ronald S. Yockim  
Attorney At Law  
P.O. Box 2456  
548 SE Jackson, Suite 7  
Roseburg, Oregon 97470  
(541) 957-5900

The protestant's interest in the Proposed Final Order is based upon Grant County having identified irrigation, domestic, livestock, ground water recharge, fire protection, fish life, wildlife, pollution abatement, and recreation as uses of Clear

**RECEIVED**

OCT 11 1996

WATER RESOURCES DEPT.  
SALEM, OREGON

Creek that are in the public interest and are also identified in the John Day Basin Plan as being in the public interest (See OAR 690). It is Grant County's interest to conserve the highest use of the water for all purposes including irrigation, domestic use, municipal water supply, recreation, fish and wildlife, navigation, and road construction, maintenance, and reconstruction.

Protestant represents its own interest as well as the public interest in the filing of this protest. The specific public interest that protestant represents is the use of this water for the highest public benefit, which in this case involves a balancing of public interests including water for irrigation, domestic use, municipal water supply recreation, fish and wildlife, navigation, and road construction, maintenance, and reconstruction. In addition, the applicant represents the public interest in insuring that the Director is following the law as established by the Legislature and as adopted in the Grant County Comprehensive Plan.

Grant County also brings this protest to exercise the agreement with the Water Resources Department wherein it was stipulated that the Water Resources Department would consult with the County prior to proceeding further with the instream applications (See Jan. 3, 1992 Letter OWRD to Ronald S. Yockim)

## II.

### ISSUES

1. The Proposed Final Order is in error or deficient in the following particulars:

**RECEIVED**

**OCT 11 1996**

**WATER RESOURCES DEPT.  
SALEM, OREGON**



A. Neither the instream application nor the Water Resources Department's ("Department") file provide sufficient technical data or information to support the flow rates requested. The record not only lacks substantial evidence, it also lacks the information required by OAR 690-77-020 and ORS 537.336.

OAR 690-770-020(3)(g) requires an application to include at a minimum "a description of the technical data and methods used to determine the requested amounts;" (emphasis added).

In this case the file does not contain any "technical data", or any factual data, that supports the proposed instream flows.

B. In reviewing the documentation in the Water Resources Department's files, we are unable to find any "water availability" analysis.

This is a critical omission in that the "water availability" analysis provides information that is essential for determining the proper public interest balance between out-of-stream and instream needs.

The requirement to conduct the "water availability" analysis for instream water rights is found in OAR 690-77-029(1)(b), wherein it is specified that as part of the initial review of the application, the Department is to determine the extent to which water is available from the proposed source during the times and in the amounts requested.

While a specific water availability process is not

**RECEIVED**

OCT 11 1996

WATER RESOURCES DEPT.  
SALEM, OREGON

defined in the instream water right rules (OAR 690-77), we find a number of references that indicate the Department was to examine the water availability by determining the amount of "unappropriated water available."<sup>1</sup> In addition, a requirement to determine the amount of unappropriated water can also be implied from the provisions relative to the ability to set instream flow levels that exceed current unappropriated water available (See OAR 690-77-015(2)).

It is our opinion that these references indicate an intent that the water availability is to be calculated in part by reference to the amount of out-of-stream appropriations.

Further support for the position that "water availability" must include an examination of out-of-stream appropriations is found in the administrative rules relating to out-of-stream appropriations (OAR 690-300). While these rules address the out-of-stream permitting process, they are arguably applicable to the instream rights as well, as a result of Senate Bill 674.

The 1995 Legislature in enacting Senate Bill 674 (§19), added the requirement that the instream water rights are to be processed in accordance with the provisions for obtaining a permit to appropriate water as provided under ORS 537.140 to 537.250. Among these provisions, is the requirement to

---

<sup>1</sup>. "Unappropriated Water Available: means water that exceeds the quantities required to meet existing water rights of record, minimum streamflows and instream water rights and for known and yet to be quantified Native American treaty rights." OAR 690-77-010(29)

**RECEIVED**

OCT 11 1996

WATER RESOURCES DEPT.  
SALEM, OREGON



determine whether water is available (ORS 537.153(2)).

"In reviewing the application under subsection (1) of this section, the department shall presume that a proposed use will not impair or be detrimental to the public interest if the proposed use is allowed in the applicable basins program . . . or given a preference under ORS 536.310(12), if water is available, . . ."

(emphasis added).

The rules implementing ORS 537.153(2) specify that the term "water is available" is defined as:

(a) (A) The requested source is not over-appropriated under OAR 690-400-100 and 690-410-070 during any period of the proposed use; or . . .

(b) For surface water applications received before July 17, 1992, the provisions of subsection (a) of this section shall apply except that the determination of whether a requested source is over-appropriated under OAR 690-400-010 and 690-410-070 shall be based upon whether the quantity of water available during a specified period is not sufficient to meet the expected demands for all water rights at least 50 percent of the time during that period."

OAR 690-300-010(58) (emphasis added)

Since the instream applications are to be processed in the same manner as out-of-stream applications, we believe they must be accompanied by the "water availability" analysis described in subsection (b) above.

We note that although the Proposed Final Order does contain a reference relative to the "amount of water available", this reference is misleading in that it implies a water availability analysis was performed, when in fact it was not. The "amount of water available" data presented in the "Initial Reviews" is in fact the "Estimated Average Natural

RECEIVED

OCT 11 1996

WATER RESOURCES DEPT.  
SALEM, OREGON

Flow."

The "Estimated Average Natural Flow" calculations incorporated into the Proposed Final Order are not only legally insufficient, reliance upon these calculations alone deprives the public of the opportunity to fully consider and comment on the proposed action.

A complete water availability analysis must be conducted and the public afforded an opportunity to review the results. The water availability analysis will provide the public a benchmark upon which to review whether the request is in the public interest and whether it is for the minimum amount necessary as required by Senate Bill 674.

- C. The administrative file lacks information as to whether the amount of water requested is in fact the "minimum quantity of water necessary" as required by Senate Bill 674.

In enacting Senate Bill 674, the Legislature modified the instream water right law to limit the amount of water that could be requested for instream flows to the minimum amount necessary.

"In-stream flow means the minimum quantity of water necessary to support the public use requested by an agency."

(ORS 537.332(2)).

Notwithstanding the "minimum quantity" restrictions, we are unable to find in the files any indication that findings have been made as to whether the requested flows are in fact

**RECEIVED**

OCT 11 1996

WATER RESOURCES DEPT.  
SALEM, OREGON



minimums.

This is an essential element of an instream filing and is particularly suspect in this case for the instream applications were filed at a time when the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife's ("ODF&W") policy was to seek optimum flows.

We note that the ODF&W administrative rules in place at the time the instream applications were submitted state that it is the policy of the Fish and Wildlife Commission to apply for instream water rights to provide optimum benefits. (OAR 635-400-005). Furthermore, the regulations specify that the instream flow requirement is to be no less than the highest instream flow or water surface elevation required by any of the fish and wildlife species during the specified period (OAR 635-400-015(8)).

While the applications do not state on their face that they seek the optimum or highest flow, both regulations would lead to the presumption that the ODF&W did not apply for the minimum quantity as required by Senate Bill 674. Support for this conclusion is found in the application wherein the amount of flow requested exceeds the "estimated average natural flow" at the 50% exceedence.

In addition, ODF&W regulations also specify that if an instream request is for greater than 70% or less than 30% of the naturally occurring stream flows for any given time period it is to be evaluated for appropriateness in relation to

**RECEIVED**

OCT 11 1996

WATER RESOURCES DEPT.  
SALEM, OREGON

naturally occurring stream flows. The appropriateness review would be essential information to both the Department and the public in considering whether the application is in the public interest. Unfortunately, none of the Department's files contain references as to whether this essential evaluation has in fact occurred.

- D. The Proposed Final Order also fails to disclose whether the various local governments and landowners have been contacted relative to this application.

We note that under the existing regulations, the instream applicants are to provide, as part of the application, a copy of any letters they have issued that notify the affected local government of the intent to file the instream water right application (OAR 690-77-020940(j)). The application did not include letters from ODF&W to the Grant County Court.

In addition, under OAR 690-77-019(1), each application for an instream water right is to comply with ORS 537.140, wherein each application for a water right permit is to include the name and mailing address of any owner of the land upon which the source of the water supply is located. In this case, there has been no statement as to land ownership.

The requirement to notify affected governments and landowners insures the public interest issues are fully analyzed by both the agencies and public. In the absence of these elements, the application is in fact incomplete and

**RECEIVED**

OCT 11 1996

WATER RESOURCES DEPT.  
SALEM, OREGON



should be returned (OAR 690-77-027(1)). Returning the applications will allow the public, county and applicant to resolve a number of the public interest questions raised by the applications.

E. The Proposed Final Order allocates all of the natural stream flow during the months of January, February, March, July, August, September, October, November and December for instream purposes. This allocation is detrimental to the public interest since it does not allow any water for other beneficial uses such as road construction, reconstruction and maintenance (ORS 537.040); storage of surface water (ORS 537.143); or otherwise consider a balance of all purposes, including irrigation, domestic use, municipal water supply, power development, public recreation, protection of commercial and game fishing and wildlife, fire protection, mining, industrial purposes, navigation, scenic attractions or any other beneficial use which may have a special value to the public (ORS 537.170(8)(a)).

F. The Proposed Final Order does not leave any water during the months of January, February, March, July, August, September, October, November, and December for uses covered in ORS 537.022 (wetland enhancement, stream restoration, off-channel reservoirs, livestock and wildlife watering, storm water management, etc). Since these projects are subject to

**RECEIVED**

OCT 11 1996

WATER RESOURCES DEPT.  
SALEM, OREGON

regulation if any injury to a water right with an earlier priority occurs (ORS 537.032), they will be limited in their effectiveness if the instream water right is granted in a manner that allocates all of the natural flow to instream. These projects are in the public interest and will be detrimentally affected if the Proposed Final Order is not modified.

G. The Proposed Final Order is not in the public interest in that it allocates all of the natural flow during January, February, March, July, August, September, October, November, and December to instream values and leaves no water available for the uses described in ORS 537.143, including road construction and maintenance, general construction and forestland or rangeland management. Since these limited license activities are prohibited if they cause injury to any other water right, the granting of all of the natural flow will nullify the ability to exercise the provisions of this statute. The public interest will be detrimentally affected unless the final order is conditioned to exempt these uses from the instream flow.

2. The Proposed Final Order can be modified to correct the alleged errors and deficiencies by issuing the final order with the following:

- a. providing that for the purposes of water distribution, this instream right shall not have priority over road

**RECEIVED**

OCT 11 1996

WATER RESOURCES DEPT.  
SALEM, OREGON




- construction, reconstruction or maintenance, human consumption, domestic expanded, livestock, and the uses described in ORS 537.040, ORS 537.143, and ORS 537.022;
- b. limiting the amount of instream flows to less than the natural flow of the stream in a manner that balances the public uses and allows for the activities covered by ORS 537.022, ORS 537.040, ORS 537.143, and ORS 537.170(8);

III.  
LEGAL AUTHORITIES

The protestant relies upon the following citations for legal authority supporting the protest:

1. ORS 537; ORS 536; ORS 183, ORS 197.180
2. John Day River Basin Program plan;
3. Grant County Comprehensive Plan;
4. OAR 635-100-130; OAR 635-415-030.
5. The requirement that any Water Resources Department decision be based upon substantial evidence and rationale, substantial reason, and be rational, are found in Armstrong v. Asten-Hill, 90 Or App 200, 205-207 (1988); Furnish v. Mantavilla Lumber Co., 124 Or App 622, 625 (1993); Stalder v. Bd of Medical Examiners, 37 Or App 853, 858 (1978); Reynolds v. Children's Services Div., 280 Or 431, 434 (1977).

Respectfully submitted this 10th day of October, 1996.

  
Ronald S. Yockim  
Attorney for Protestant

RECEIVED

OCT 11 1996

WATER RESOURCES DEPT.  
SALEM, OREGON

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on the 10<sup>th</sup> day of October, 1996  
I served a true and accurate copy of the foregoing Protest to the  
Proposed Final Order on the applicant by mailing said copy by first  
class mail, postage prepaid, by depositing said copy in the United  
States Post Office in Roseburg, Oregon, addressed as set forth  
below:

Oregon Department of Fish & Wildlife  
2501 SW First Avenue  
P.O. Box 59  
Portland, Oregon 97207

Barbara Griffin

RECEIVED

OCT 11 1996

WATER RESOURCES DEPT.  
SALEM, OREGON

**STATE OF OREGON  
WATER RESOURCES DEPARTMENT**

RECEIPT # **7536**

158 12TH ST. N.E.  
SALEM, OR 97310-0210  
378-8455 / 378-8130 (FAX)

INVOICE # \_\_\_\_\_

RECEIVED FROM: Waterwatch of  
BY: OR INC.

APPLICATION	
PERMIT	
TRANSFER	

CASH: ☐ CHECK: # 2412 OTHER: (IDENTIFY) ☐

TOTAL REC'D \$ 400.

**0417 WRD MISC CASH ACCT**

ADJUDICATIONS	\$
PUBLICATIONS / MAPS	\$
OTHER: (IDENTIFY)	\$
OTHER: (IDENTIFY)	\$

**RECEIVED  
OVER THE COUNTER**

**REDUCTION OF EXPENSE**

CASH ACCT.	\$
------------	----

PCA AND OBJECT CLASS

VOUCHER #

**0427 WRD OPERATING ACCT**

0407 MISCELLANEOUS	70648, 69958, 69959, 69961, 70643, 70644	\$
0410 COPY & TAPE FEES	70649, 70650	\$
0410 RESEARCH FEES		\$
0408 MISC REVENUE: (IDENTIFY)		\$
TC165 DEPOSIT LIAB. (IDENTIFY)		\$

**WATER RIGHTS:**

0201 SURFACE WATER	EXAM FEE	0202	RECORD FEE
0203 GROUND WATER	\$	0204	\$
0205 TRANSFER	\$	0206	\$
0218 WELL CONSTRUCTION	EXAM FEE	0219	LICENSE FEE
0218 WELL DRILL CONSTRUCTOR	\$	0220	\$
LANDOWNER'S PERMIT			

0234 OTHER (IDENTIFY) PCA 77235 Request for Starting \$400.

**0437 WELL CONST. START FEE**

0211 WELL CONST START FEE	\$	CARD #	
0210 MONITORING WELLS	\$	CARD #	
OTHER (IDENTIFY)			

**0539 LOTTERY PROCEEDS**

1302 LOTTERY PROCEEDS	\$
-----------------------	----

**0467 HYDRO ACTIVITY**

0233 POWER LICENSE FEE (FW/WRD)	LIC NUMBER	\$
0231 HYDRO LICENSE FEE (FW/WRD)		\$
HRDRO APPLICATION		\$

RECEIPT # **7536**

DATED: 10-11-96 BY: D. Bushnell

Distribution-White Copy-Customer, Yellow Copy-Fiscal, Blue Copy-File, Buff Copy-Fiscal



RECEIVED

OCT - 9 1996

**RONALD S. YOCKIM**  
Attorney at Law

WATER RESOURCES DEPT.  
SALEM, OREGON

548 S.E. Jackson  
Suite #7  
P.O. Box 2456  
Roseburg, Oregon 97470

(541) 957-5900  
FAX (541) 957-5923

October 8, 1996

Martha Pagel  
Water Resources Department  
Commerce Building  
158 12th Street NE  
Salem, Oregon 97310-0210

Re: Instream Water Rights  
Our File No. 91186

Dear Ms. Pagel:

On behalf of the Grant County Court, we request standing for the purposes of participating in any contested case proceeding on the proposed final order or for judicial review of a final order in the following instream water rights:

✓IS 69958	✓IS 69959	✓IS 69961	✓IS 70643
✓IS 70644	✓IS 70647	IS 70648	✓IS 70649
✓IS 70650	✓IS 70304	✓IS 70303	✓IS 70305
✓IS 70306	✓IS 70307	✓IS 70308	✓IS 70309
✓IS 71463	✓IS 71464	✓IS 71454	

This request is made pursuant to ORS 537.153(5) and is accompanied by our check in the amount of \$ 950.00 (\$50 x 19 = \$950.00).

Please add our name as a party to any written materials relative to this matter.

Sincerely,

  
Ronald S. Yockim

RSY/bg

cc. Grant County Court  
Michael Mattick  
ODF&W

13



# Water Watch

R I V E R S N E E D W A T E R

Delivered via messenger

October 11, 1996

Water Rights Section  
Water Resources Department  
158 12th Street NE  
Salem, OR 97310

**RE: Request for Standing, Instream Water Rights, John Day River Basin**

70648 NF John Day  
69958 Clear Creek  
69959 Bull Run Creek  
69961 Granite Boulder Creek  
70643 MF Canyon Creek  
70644 EF Canyon Creek  
70649 Crane Creek  
70650 Trail Creek

RECEIVED  
OCT 11 1996  
WATER RESOURCES DEPT.  
SALEM, OREGON

Dear Water Rights Section:

Pursuant to ORS 537.153(5) and OAR 690-310-160(3) WaterWatch and Oregon Trout file this Request for Standing along with the required fee of \$50 per application for applications 70648, 69958, 69959, 69961, 70643, 70644, 70649, and 70650.



**Elements for Request for Standing as required by OAR 690-310-160(3)**

**a. Name, address, telephone number of requester**

WaterWatch of Oregon  
213 SW Ash, Suite 208  
Portland, OR 97204  
(503) 295-4039  
contacts: Kimberley Priestley, Karen Russell

Oregon Trout  
117 NW Front  
Portland, OR 97204  
(503) 222-9091  
contact: Jim Myron

RECEIVED  
OCT 11 1996  
WATER RESOURCES DEPT.  
SALEM, OREGON

**b. Statement of support of the Proposed Final Order**

WaterWatch and Oregon Trout support the proposed issuance of these instream water rights.

**c. How WaterWatch and Oregon Trout would be harmed if the Proposed Final Orders are modified**

WaterWatch of Oregon is a nonprofit organization dedicated to promoting water policies for Oregon that provide the quality and quantity of water necessary to support fish, wildlife, recreation, biological diversity, ecological values, public health and a sound economy. Oregon Trout is a nonprofit organization dedicated to promoting and restoring wild native fish habitat.

In requesting standing for the aforementioned instream water right applications, WaterWatch and Oregon Trout are representing the general public interest in the water resources and associated fish and wildlife resources of this state, as well as the specific interest of WaterWatch and Oregon Trout members. WaterWatch and Oregon have members throughout the Pacific Northwest, including the John Day River basin specifically, who use and enjoy the watershed. All of WaterWatch's and Oregon Trout's members, board members and staff benefit from knowing that such a resource exists even if they have not visited the watershed.

If the PFOs are modified to either deny the applications, decrease the flows proposed, or otherwise alter the rights to the detriment of the resource, WaterWatch's and Oregon Trout's interest would be harmed because denial and/or lower flows pose a risk to the fish species they are intended to benefit, including federally petitioned steelhead, bull trout (warranted but precluded under the federal ESA), state sensitive redband trout, west slope cutthroat, and pacific lamprey, and chinook salmon. It would also impair a number of other public interest values including, but not limited to, wildlife, scenic waterway values and water quality.



1. If the PFOs are modified to either decrease proposed flows and/or deny the applications, WaterWatch's interests will be harmed because flows vital to the survival of aquatic species, including state sensitive fish (redband trout, pacific lamprey, and west slope cutthroat), federal petitioned steelhead, bull trout (warranted but precluded), and chinook will be compromised.

ODFW has requested these flows to provide for the minimum amount necessary for the survival of state sensitive fish (redband trout, pacific lamprey, and west slope cutthroat), federal petitioned steelhead, bull trout (warranted but precluded), and chinook salmon. WaterWatch supports the flows requested by ODFW. If the Department modifies the PFOs to either deny the applications or propose flows lower than those requested by ODFW, the survival of all of these species will be jeopardized.

This is not only a violation of the public interest but could result in a violation of the state and federal Endangered Species Acts for listed fish (as well as petitioned fish if listed). Under the state act the Department is required to consult with ODFW to ensure that any action taken by the Department is consistent with ODFW programs to conserve the species, or, if no plan is in place, that the action will not "reduce the likelihood of the survival or recovery" of the state listed species. ORS 496.182(2). The flows requested by ODFW are in the amounts ODFW has determined are necessary for the survival of these fish. To comply with the intention and mandates of the State Endangered Species Act, the Department should issue the instream water rights at the amounts requested.

Under the federal Act, there is a prohibition against "taking" of endangered species. 16 USCA § 1538(a)(1)(B). Issuing the instream water rights at the amounts requested by ODFW is obviously within the Department's authority. To do such is consistent with the intent and mandates of the Federal ESA, which may soon come into play if steelhead are listed. To the contrary, to deny or lower the instream water rights could result in a taking, for it would deny these fish the flows determined by ODFW as necessary for survival.

Again, if the Department modifies the PFOs to either deny the applications or propose flows lower than those requested by ODFW, the survival of all of these species will be jeopardized and WaterWatch's and Oregon Trout's interests, including ensuring the viability of these fish, will be impaired.

2. If the PFOs are modified, WaterWatch's and Oregon Trout's interests will be harmed because we will have been precluded from fully evaluating the actions of the Department. Thus, WaterWatch and Oregon Trout, by filing this standing statement, reserve the right to raise the following concerns in any contested case hearing or judicial review if any PFO is modified:

**a. The condition of use proposed in the PFO exempting human consumption and livestock use will impair WaterWatch's and Oregon Trout's interest in ensuring that the purposes of the instream water rights are fulfilled.**

The PFOs contain a condition that subordinates the instream water right to human consumption and livestock uses in perpetuity. Individual exceptions will directly lessen the amount of water available instream to satisfy the purposes of the instream water right. Since the flows represented by the instream water right are those ODFW has determined are needed for fish, even the slightest diminishment of these flows will have adverse effects on the fishery

RECEIVED

OCT 11 1996

WATER RESOURCES  
SALEM, OREGON



resource. Moreover, the cumulative effects that will result from this exception could eventually lead to the total negation of the instream water right.

The Department has cited to ORS 536.310(12) as authority for allowing this condition. This section of the statute states that:

When proposed uses of water are in mutually exclusive conflict or when available supplies of water are insufficient for all who desire to use them, preference shall be given to human consumption purposed over all other uses and for livestock consumption, over any other use....

ORS 536.310(12)(emphasis added).

While this statute does provide for a preference for human consumption and livestock, this preference has a specific statutory application.<sup>1</sup> The statute governs situations where there is a conflict between competing applications at the time the permitting decision is taking place. This statute does not address situations of conflict at some nebulous future date. Thus, while the Department may rely on this statute to subordinate the instream water right to the applications pending at the time of the instream water rights adoption, the Department's reliance on this section to attach this open-ended exception is in error.

If the statute were to mandate the open-ended subordination of new rights to human consumption and livestock uses, then equity demands that this condition be placed on every new permit or certificate issued, whether instream or out-of-stream. The statute does not differentiate between instream and out-of-stream water rights.<sup>2</sup> Rather, it specifically states that "preference shall be given to human consumption purposes over all other uses and for livestock consumption, over any other use...." ORS 536.310(12) (*emphasis added*). Thus, if the Department finds that the law requires it to subordinate instream water rights to human consumption and livestock uses, the Department must subordinate all water rights, including agriculture, industry, municipal and mining to human consumption and livestock use. To fail to do this would not only be inequitable, but it would prove the Department insincere in their intent to protect human consumption and livestock above all else.

WaterWatch and Oregon Trout acknowledge that under the law, the Director may include any condition she considers necessary; however, **it must be consistent with the intent** of ORS 537.332 to 537.360 (Instream Water Right Statutes). ORS 537.343. An instream water right is a water right held by the Department in trust for the benefit of the people of the State of Oregon to maintain water in-stream for public use. ORS 537.332(3). "Public benefit" means a benefit that accrues to the public at large rather than to a person, a small groups of persons

---

<sup>1</sup> In addition, this policy is one of the "purposes and policies to be considered in formulating the state water resources program" under ORS 536.300(2). ORS 536.310 (*emphasis added*). The statute referred to, ORS 536.300(2), is the law specifically guiding the formulation of basin plans.

<sup>2</sup> Under the law, "public uses" (recreation; conservation, maintenance and enhancement of aquatic and fish life, wildlife, fish and wildlife habitat and any other ecological values; pollution abatement; navigation) are legal beneficial uses. ORS 537.334(1). Instream water rights enjoy the same legal protections as consumptive water rights.



or to a private enterprise. ORS 537.332(3). To subordinate an instream water right to human consumption and/or livestock uses would specifically benefit a person, or a small group of persons rather than the public at large. This is not consistent with the intent of the instream water right act. Thus, this type of conditioning is not allowed under the Instream Water Right Act.

Moreover, this proposed condition is contrary to the public interest in protecting the resource. The Commission's statewide policies recognize the importance of maintaining streamflows and place high priority on protecting streamflows. OAR 690-410-030(1). This policy directs the state to take action to restore flows in critical areas such as this system. Id. The public uses of the Illinois river system have been impaired. Adoption of this instream water rights without conditions is just one small step towards restoring this system.

Furthermore, this open-ended exception cannot be attached given the mandates of the state Scenic Waterway Act and the Federal Wild and Scenic Rivers Act. Both the state and federal scenic designations carry with them reserved rights that must be protected against impairment or substantial interference. *See Section I.c. above.* No diminishment of these flows are allowed from surface rights unless the new uses meet a very narrow exception under the state Scenic Waterway Act.<sup>3</sup> The federal Wild and Scenic Rivers Act mandates even greater protections by defining impairment as any reduction in streamflows beyond the flows needed to preserve the "free-flowing condition" of designated rivers for their "outstandingly remarkable scenic, recreational, geologic, fish and wildlife, historic, cultural, or other similar values." 16 USC § 1271.

The open-ended exception for human consumption and livestock proposed by the Department would result in impairment of the state and federal scenic designations and the reserved rights that flow from these designations and therefore is contrary to the mandates of these acts and cannot be attached to this permit. The state Scenic Waterway Act does not allow for diversions of water in or above the designated reach unless there is a finding of necessity and the use meets the extremely limited exceptions in the Act. The state Scenic Waterway Act allows for exceptions for human consumption and livestock only "upon a finding of necessity" for and only if a number of findings are made by the Department, including but not limited to, findings that the applicant cannot reasonably obtain water from any other source; that, if for human consumption, denial of the water right would result in loss of reasonable expectations for use of property; and, if for livestock use, the applicant has excluded livestock from the stream and its adjacent riparian zone. ORS 390.835(5). Moreover, exceptions cannot be in excess of a combined cumulative total of one percent of the average daily flow or one cubic foot per second, except in rare instances. ORS 390.835(7). Thus, if the Department were to allow an exception for human consumption and livestock use, then this exception must abide by the

---

<sup>3</sup> The exception allowed under the Scenic Waterway Act is only allowed upon a finding that such diversion is necessary to uses designated in ORS 536.310(12) and in a manner consistent with the policies set forth in the Instream Water Right Act. Both aspects of this must be met. ORS 390.835(1). Thus, even though human consumption and livestock are given preference over all other uses in ORS 536.310, these uses cannot be allowed unless the free flowing character of the scenic waterway is maintained in quantities necessary for recreation, fish and wildlife uses.



mandates of the Scenic Waterway Act.<sup>4</sup>

**b. The flows proposed in the PFO that are less than those requested by ODFW will impair WaterWatch's and Oregon Trout's interest in ensuring that flows for optimizing habitat are protected.**

For some of these applications, ODFW's requested flows exceed the Department's estimated average natural flow for some months. For these months, the Department has proposed to limit the flows requested by ODFW to the estimated average natural flow.

The Department's rules mandate that instream water rights cannot be granted for amounts greater than the estimated average natural flow, except where periodic flows that exceed the natural flow or level are significant for the public use applied for. OAR 690-77-015(4). An example of such an exception would be high flow events that allow for fish passage or migration over obstacles. *Id.* It appears that the Department has limited all the instream water right applications to the estimated average natural flow without determining whether the periodic flows that exceed the natural flow are "significant" for the public use applied for.

The flows requested by ODFW are necessary for the requested beneficial use of fish life. These flows are needed for migration, spawning, egg incubation, fry emergence and juvenile rearing and for fish passage and habitat maintenance. Given that ODFW's flow requests are to provide for the various lifecycles of fish which are already on the brink of extinction, periodic flows are necessary for fulfillment of the purpose of this instream water right. There should be no reduction in the requested flows. The Department's rules specifically state "an example of such an exception would be high flow events that allow for fish passage or migration over obstacles." OAR 690-77-015(4). This is exactly the type of event ODFW's instream water right application includes. In sum, the agency has the information to find that the higher flows are significant. The instream water rights should be granted at the amounts requested by ODFW.

For the months that ODFW's flow requests were higher than the estimated average natural flow, the Department limited the instream water right because "water is not available for the proposed use." This limitation, and the reasoning behind it, is a clear indication that this system cannot sustain any further water withdrawals. Given this, no further appropriations can

---

<sup>4</sup> In cases of instream water rights not in or above scenic waterways, the Department should, at the very least, put a cap on the amount that can be exempted for human consumption or livestock for any single stream. Without such a cap, instream water rights will be undercut bit by bit until there are insufficient flows left to fulfill the senior instream water rights. Instream water rights are legally protected rights. To allow such a diminution of such a vested water right at some point in the future is inconsistent with the underlying premise of the prior appropriation doctrine--first in time, first in right.

In addition, if the Department allows this exception, the exception should be limited to human consumption where (1) measurement and reporting are mandatory, (2) the applicant has demonstrated that no other alternative supply exists, and (3) the permit is subject to periodic review to ensure that there is still no alternative water source. The exception should be limited to livestock where (1) watering is off stream and (2) the cows are prevented from entering the riparian zone and stream bed.



take place in this system during the months where the instream water right is limited. The Department should ensure that this basin is closed to any further allocation in order to ensure against any further overallocation of the resource. The Department should either institute closure of the basin classification or withdrawal of the resource from further appropriation. Moreover, in cases where streamflows are not being met, the Department should take steps to ensure metering and reporting of all water uses through designations of serious water management areas.

**c. The measurement and reporting condition proposed in the PFO will impair the WaterWatch's and Oregon Trout's interest in ensuring that the instream water right is fulfilled throughout the reach.**

The Department has proposed a condition of use mandating measurement at the lower end of the stream reach to protect necessary flows throughout the reach. To ensure that flows are being protected throughout the reach, measurement must take place at both the upper and lower ends of the stream reach.


In any given stream reach, there are a number of ways water enters the stream whether it be tributaries, runoff, or groundwater seepage. If, for instance, there was a major inputting factor near the lower end of the reach where the measuring device was located this could artificially inflate the amount of water in the stream upstream from that spot. Thus, to ensure that the instream water rights are protected throughout their reach, there should be measuring devices at both the upper and lower end of the reach.


### Conclusion


The proposed instream water rights will protect flows needed for fish life. Adoption of these and other instream flows is critical to the health of Oregon's watersheds and must be a high priority for Oregon if the state is to develop solutions to the resource crises that threatens to destroy the livability of Oregon. Instream water rights not only help to achieve a more equitable allocation of water between instream and out of stream uses, they also establish management objectives for Oregon's rivers.

RECEIVED  
OCT 11 1996  
WATCH RESOURCES DEPT.  
SALEM, OREGON

Sincerely,

  
Kimberley Priestley  
WaterWatch--Legal/Policy Analyst

  
Karen Russell  
WaterWatch--Assistant Director

  
Jim Myron  
Oregon Trout--Conservation Director



RECEIPT # 7350

STATE OF OREGON  
WATER RESOURCES DEPARTMENT158 12TH ST. N.E.  
SALEM, OR 97310-0210  
378-8455 / 378-8130 (FAX)

INVOICE # \_\_\_\_\_

RECEIVED FROM: <u>Ronald S. Yockim</u>	APPLICATION
BY: _____	PERMIT
	TRANSFER

CASH: ☐ CHECK: # 24-62 ☒ OTHER: (IDENTIFY) \_\_\_\_\_TOTAL REC'D \$ 950.**0417 WRD MISC CASH ACCT**

ADJUDICATIONS

\$

PUBLICATIONS / MAPS

\$

OTHER: (IDENTIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

\$

OTHER: (IDENTIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

\$

**REDUCTION OF EXPENSE**

CASH ACCT.

\$

PCA AND OBJECT CLASS

VOUCHER #

**0427 WRD OPERATING ACCT**files 69958-59MISCELLANEOUS 699610407 COPY & TAPE FEES 70643-44 71463-64

\$

0410 RESEARCH FEES 70647-50 71454

\$

0408 MISC REVENUE: (IDENTIFY) 70303-09

\$

TC165 DEPOSIT LIAB. (IDENTIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

\$

WATER RIGHTS:

EXAM FEE

RECORD FEE

0201 SURFACE WATER

\$

0202

\$

0203 GROUND WATER

\$

0204

\$

0205 TRANSFER

\$

0206

\$

WELL CONSTRUCTION

EXAM FEE

LICENSE FEE

0218 WELL DRILL CONSTRUCTOR

\$

0219

\$

LANDOWNER'S PERMIT

0220

\$

0223

OTHER

(IDENTIFY)

Protest #950.-**0437 WELL CONST. START FEE**

0211 WELL CONST START FEE

\$

CARD #

0210 MONITORING WELLS

\$

CARD #

OTHER (IDENTIFY) \_\_\_\_\_

**0539 LOTTERY PROCEEDS**

1302 LOTTERY PROCEEDS

\$

**0467 HYDRO ACTIVITY**

LIC NUMBER

0233 POWER LICENSE FEE (FW/WRD)

\$

0231 HYDRO LICENSE FEE (FW/WRD)

\$

HRDRO APPLICATION

\$

RECEIPT # 7350

DATED: 10-9-96 BY: D. Bushnell

Distribution-White Copy-Customer, Yellow Copy-Fiscal, Blue Copy-File, Buff Copy-Fiscal



TO:

FISCAL SECTION

DATE:

FROM:

Rusk  
Authorized Examiner .....

SUBJECT: Request for transfer of fees or refund check .

Please transfer \$ \_\_\_\_\_ Receipt \_\_\_\_\_ from file  
\_\_\_\_\_ to file \_\_\_\_\_ for:  
\_\_\_\_\_ Examination fee  
\_\_\_\_\_ Permit Recording Fee

Please refund \$ 50<sup>00</sup> to Russ V. CHAM  
file 69958, receipt 2850. These funds are  
refunded due to:

- \_\_\_\_\_ Application rejected
- \_\_\_\_\_ Application withdrawn
- ☒ Excess fees collected for application/PON
- \_\_\_\_\_ Payment of PON
- \_\_\_\_\_ Protest Filing Fees
- \_\_\_\_\_ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

*OK Dwight Ford*

*777 m 5 7  
027*

November 13, 1996

WATER  
RESOURCES  
DEPARTMENT

RONALD S YOCKIM  
548 SE JACKSON  
SUITE # 7  
PO BOX 2456  
ROSEBURG, OR 97470

REFERENCE: REFUND, APPLICATION FILES - ISWR 70303, 70304, 69958,  
69959, 69960, 69961, AND 70648

Enclosed is a check, no. 4288909, in the amount of \$500.00. This  
is a refund of unearned fees paid for the above referenced  
applications.

If you need further assistance please contact the Water Rights  
Section at the address listed below or phone (503) 378-3739.

Sincerely,



Russell W. Klassen  
Senior Water Rights Examiner



Commerce Building  
158 12th Street NE  
Salem, OR 97310-0210  
(503) 378-3739  
FAX (503) 378-8130

AUG -1 1991

WATER RESOURCES DEPT.  
Salem, OR 97310

7/6/91

MATTHEW  
NOT COPY

69958  
Kreag  
cc: Young  
WRC



United States  
Department of  
Agriculture

Forest  
Service

Wallowa-Whitman  
National Forest

P. O. Box 907  
Baker City, OR 97814

Reply to 2540

Date July 29, 1991

Mr. William H. Young  
Oregon Water Resources Department  
3850 Portland Road NE  
Salem, OR 97310

Dear Mr. Young:

Enclosed is a summary of the impacts of 40 ODFW instream water right applications and certificates on Forest programs associated with non-reserved acquired lands managed by the Wallowa-Whitman National Forest. Thirteen applications are currently open for public comment. Also enclosed is a request for relief from these impacts. Our main concern is the limitation of new filings to livestock and domestic purposes.

We request that the Department, the Water Resources Commission, and the Department of Fish and Wildlife review this information and discuss it with Tim Bliss, Water Rights Program Coordinator, Wallowa-Whitman NF (503-523-6391, ext. 387) and Mike Lohrey, Regional Water Rights Program Coordinator (503-326-5927).

The policy of this Region of the Forest Service is to support the State's instream water right acquisition program in order to protect stream-dependent flora and fauna. Yet, the Wallowa-Whitman NF also has the obligation to notify the State of potential impacts to other Forest programs and outputs identified in our Forest Plan.

*for William K. Richmond*  
R. M. RICHMOND  
Forest Supervisor

Enclosure

cc: Mike Lohrey, R-6 Division of Range and Watershed  
Water Resources Commission through Water Resources Department  
cc's continued on next page







cc's continued:

Al Mirati  
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife  
2501 SW First Avenue  
Portland, OR 97207

Jim Lauman  
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife  
107 Twentieth Street  
La Grande, OR 97850

V. Kent Searles, Regional Manager  
Oregon Water Resources Department  
Baker County Courthouse  
1995 3rd Street  
Baker City, OR 97814

District Rangers

John Austin, Forest Engineer

Bruce Kaufman, Forest Timber Mgt. Officer



POTENTIAL IMPACTS OF STATE OF OREGON INSTREAM WATER RIGHTS  
ON WALLOWA-WHITMAN NATIONAL FOREST PROGRAMS

Prepared by Timothy M. Bliss  
Water Rights Program Coordinator  
Wallowa-Whitman National Forest  
July 29, 1991

INTRODUCTION

The policy of the Pacific Northwest Region of the USDA Forest Service is to support the State of Oregon's instream water right acquisition program. This document describes the impacts this policy may have on Forest Plan outputs and requests that the State review and consider modifying restrictions associated with instream water rights.

This document is divided into the following sections:

ACRONYMS  
CONSULTATIONS  
SUMMARY OF THE IMPACTS OF ODFW IWRs ON FOREST PROGRAMS  
REQUESTED ACTIONS  
ODFW IWRs FILED JUNE/JULY 1991  
ODFW IWRs PREDATING JUNE 1991

ACRONYMS: The following acronyms are used in this document.

IWR = Instream Water Right granted by OWRD  
MA = Management Area from WWNF Forest Plan  
ODFW = Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife  
OWRD = Oregon Water Resources Department  
WRC = Water Resources Commission  
WWNF = Wallowa-Whitman National Forest

CONSULTATIONS: The following information was provided by Mike Mattick (OWRD), who coordinates the processing of ODFW IWRs.

1. As of mid-July the only significant protest of the IWRs was made by Douglas County. The County wants to preserve the practice of obtaining water for road construction and maintenance through limited licences. The Forest Service has submitted no comments on this topic.
2. The WRC and OWRD have been reviewing, setting policy for, and approving ODFW's IWRs throughout this year with few restrictions, and likely will continue to do so. The only limitation being placed on the IWRs is a reservation of up to 1 percent of low flow for livestock and domestic purposes, if these uses are not harmful to the beneficial uses being protected.

SUMMARY OF THE IMPACTS OF ODFW IWRs ON FOREST PROGRAMS:

The WWNF is concerned about consumptive water needs on 301,000 acres of acquired lands in the State of Oregon where the WWNF has obtained few water rights under State law and can not claim federal reserved rights, and where the



WRC has limited opportunities for new appropriations to livestock and domestic purposes. Most of these lands are located in the Grande Ronde, Powder and Burnt River drainages. At this time the WWNF has only one water right on these lands for road construction, maintenance and dust abatement, has only 6 livestock water developments with wildlife as a secondary use, and has no water rights for fire protection, irrigation of seed tree orchards, and wildlife as a single user in closed livestock allotments.

The "Impacts" section of each IWR (summarized in other sections of this document) indicates the acreage of upstream acquired lands affected by the IWR. Potential impacts of these IWRs on Forest programs are listed below.

(1) Non-point pollution from roads and wildfires may increase if water is not available for road reconstruction, maintenance, and dust abatement, and for firefighting. The potential impacts from water use may be much lower than the potential impacts of sedimentation on aquatic organisms.

(2) Harvest of diseased and mature timber may be delayed, and access to roadless areas scheduled for timber management may be limited, due to lack of water for road construction, maintenance and dust abatement. There may be a significant increase in harvest costs for acquired lands which may affect the economies of timber-dependent communities. Most of ODFW's IWRs are located in Forest Plan MAs 1, 3, 14 and 18 where more intensive timber management is planned.

(3) Seed tree orchards may need to be irrigated. The following seed orchards are located on acquired lands. The Paddy Flat orchard is the only one that is presently affected by instream water rights (Certificate 59530) and is the only one where water for irrigation is needed in the near future. The other orchards may be affected by future filings in the Powder and Burnt River drainages.

<u>ORCHARD</u>	<u>STREAM</u>	<u>LOCATION</u>
Paddy Flat	Little Eagle Creek	T7S R44E Sec 11 N2 SE
Forshey	Forshey Cr/Goose Cr	T7S R44E Sec 31 NW SE
Black Mountain	Powder River tributary	T10S R38E Sec 36 SE SE
		T10S R39E Sec 31 SW SW
		T11S R38E Sec 1 NE NE
		T11S R39E Sec 6 NW NW
Yellow Pine	Middle Fork Burnt River	T12S R36E Sec 17 SW NE

(4) Availability of surface water may not coincide with timing of water needs for Forest activities. Post-IWR filings may allow water use only during specific seasons or years of plenty. Water set aside for appropriation under the WRCs "1 percent of low flow rule" may be fully appropriated many years before it is needed (and can be legally filed for) for road construction to access timber in a roadless areas or for other purposes.

(5) Budget needs for State filing fees, well and reservoir construction, monitoring of water use, water rental, purchase of water rights, alternative methods of maintaining road surfaces, and so forth may be considerable. Funds may not be available for 2 or more years through the Federal budget process.

Another impact is the Diack court order that is preventing the WWNF from obtaining new surface water rights in the Grande Ronde River drainage upstream from the Washington border, while at the same time allowing the State to file.

Sometime in the future ODFW may obtain IWRs for other streams in the upper Powder River drainage and for streams in the Burnt River drainage. These filings may affect consumptive water use on portions of 100,000 acres of acquired timberlands in those drainages that are not affected by the current filings.

REQUESTED RELIEF: The Wallowa-Whitman NF requests that the OWRD, ODFW & WRC:

1. Consider the potential impacts of non-availability of water for essential WWNF programs, including road construction and maintenance for access to timber harvest and recreation sites, and dust abatement for water quality compliance. Discuss these impacts with Forest and Region personnel.
2. Consider adding other beneficial uses to the reservation of 1% of low flow for surface water appropriation, including:
  - a. Road construction, maintenance and dust abatement
  - b. Fire protection
  - c. Wildlife
  - d. Irrigation of seed tree orchards
3. Consider that 1% of low flow may be too small of an allowance for streams with no or few significant diversions on the National Forest, where water needs for WWNF management can not be met with the 1% limitation, and where there would be little if any impact on fish populations.
4. Clarify whether wintertime storage and wells will still be legal methods of appropriation for beneficial uses not permitted in the 1% reservation of low flow, and/or in addition to the 1% reservation, so long as there is no impact on beneficial uses protected by the IWRs.
5. Indicate the method of appropriation allowed for each beneficial use, whether a permanent water right or a limited license.
6. Notify Tim Bliss, WWNF, and Mike Lohrey, USFS Regional Office, of all decisions made by the WRC, OWRD and ODFW regarding these and related issues.

ODFW IWRs FILED JUNE/JULY 1991: The list is ordered by river basin and subbasin. Comments on impacts are provided for each IRW.

1. GRANDE RONDE RIVER, subbasin above Wallowa River

Meadow Creek

Application No & Priority Date: 71677, 6-7-91.

Reach: from Waucup Cr to Bear Cr.

High Flow/Low Flow: 26 cfs/10 cfs.

Impacts: will limit or prevent new applications on 4100 acres of upstream acquired lands (MA 14), and for non-reserved water uses on reserved lands.



Meadow Creek      Application No & Priority Date: 71676, 6-7-91.  
Reach: from Bear Cr to mouth.  
High Flow/Low Flow: 68 cfs/27 cfs.  
Impacts: will limit or prevent new applications on  
          11,100 acres of upstream acquired lands  
          (mostly MAs 3 & 14, some MAs 1 & 3A), and for  
          non-reserved water uses on reserved lands.

Bear Creek      Application No & Priority Date: 71667, 6-7-91.  
Reach: from headwater springs in Sec 21, T4S, R34E  
          to mouth.  
High Flow/Low Flow: 17 cfs/7 cfs.  
Impacts: will limit or prevent new applications on 900  
          acres of upstream acquired lands (MA 14), and  
          for non-reserved water uses on reserved  
          lands.

Burnt Corral Cr      Application No & Priority Date: 71668, 6-7-91.  
Reach: from East Burnt Corral Cr to mouth.  
High Flow/Low Flow: 12 cfs/5 cfs.  
Impacts: will limit or prevent new applications on  
          3200 acres of upstream acquired lands (mostly  
          MA 3, some MA 14), and for non-reserved water  
          uses on reserved lands.

Marley Creek      Application No & Priority Date: 71679, 6-7-91.  
Reach: from Swan Cr to mouth.  
High Flow/Low Flow: 17 cfs/7 cfs.  
Impacts: will limit or prevent new applications on  
          4300 acres of upstream acquired lands (mostly  
          MA 3, some MA 1), and for non-reserved water  
          uses on reserved lands.

McCoy Creek      Application No & Priority Date: 71678, 6-7-91.  
Reach: from Syrup Cr to mouth.  
High Flow/Low Flow: 34 cfs/13 cfs.  
Impacts: will limit or prevent new applications on  
          3600 acres of upstream acquired lands (MAs 3  
          & 14), and for non-reserved water uses on  
          reserved lands.

Dark Canyon Cr      Application No & Priority Date: 71660, 6-7-91.  
Reach: from headwaters in SW Sec 14, T2S, R35E to  
          mouth.  
High Flow/Low Flow: 34 cfs/13 cfs.  
Impacts: will limit or prevent new applications on  
          2200 acres of upstream acquired lands (MA 3),  
          and for non-reserved water uses on reserved  
          lands.

Spring Creek      Application No & Priority Date: 71671, 6-7-91.  
Reach: from headwaters in NW Sec 2, T2S, R35E to mouth.  
High Flow/Low Flow: 26 cfs/10 cfs.  
Impacts: will limit or prevent new applications on  
          10,300 acres of upstream acquired lands  
          (MA 3), and for non-reserved water uses on  
          reserved lands.

Pelican Creek

Application No & Priority Date: 71674, 6-7-91.

Reach: from unnamed tributary in SW Sec 4, T2S, R36E to mouth.

High Flow/Low Flow: 17 cfs/7 cfs.

Impacts: will limit or prevent new applications on 9900 acres of upstream acquired lands (mostly MA 3, some MA 3A), and for non-reserved water uses on reserved lands.

Willow Creek

Application No & Priority Date: 71734, 7-1-91.

Reach: from Coon Cr to S Fk Willow Cr.

High Flow/Low Flow: 10 cfs/4 cfs.

Impacts: will limit or prevent new applications on 150 acres of upstream acquired lands (MA 3), and for non-reserved water uses on reserved lands.

Willow Creek

Application No & Priority Date: 71669, 6-7-91.

Reach: from South Fork Willow Cr to mouth.

High Flow/Low Flow: 34 cfs/13 cfs.

Impacts: will limit or prevent new applications on 500 acres of upstream acquired lands (MA 3), and for non-reserved water uses on reserved lands.

Catherine Creek

Application No & Priority Date: 71732, 7-1-91.

Reach: from N Fk/S Fk confluence to gage 13320000 (Sec 2, T5S, R40E).

High Flow/Low Flow: 100 cfs/30 cfs.

Impacts: will limit or prevent new applications on abt 8400 acres of upstream acquired lands (MAs 1 & 3), and for non-reserved water uses on reserved lands.

Lit Catherine Cr

Application No & Priority Date: 71681, 6-7-91.

Reach: from headwaters in SE Sec 25, T5S, R41E to mouth.

High Flow/Low Flow: 34 cfs/13 cfs.

Impacts: will limit or prevent new applications on 1400 acres of upstream acquired lands (MAs 1 & 3), and for non-reserved water uses on reserved lands.

ODFW IWRs PREDATING JUNE 1991: The list is ordered by river basin and subbasin. Comments on impacts are provided for each IRW.

1. GRANDE RONDE RIVER, subbasin above Wallowa River

Limber Jim Creek

Application No & Priority Date: 70867, 11-8-90.

Reach: from Marion Cr to mouth.

High Flow/Low Flow: 34 cfs/13 cfs.

Impacts: will limit or prevent new applications on 4000 acres of upstream acquired lands (mostly MA 3, some MA 1), and for non-reserved water uses on reserved lands.



Sheep Creek	<p>Application No &amp; Priority Date: 70861, 11-8-90.          Reach: from East Sheep Cr to mouth.          High Flow/Low Flow: 42 cfs/13 cfs.          Impacts: will limit or prevent new applications on          2400 acres of upstream acquired lands (mostly          MA 3, some MA 1), and for non-reserved water          uses on reserved lands.</p>
Fly Creek	<p>Application No &amp; Priority Date: 70868, 11-8-90.          Reach: from Little Fly Cr to mouth.          High Flow/Low Flow: 34 cfs/13 cfs.          Impacts: will limit or prevent new applications on          9400 acres of upstream acquired lands (mostly          MA 3, some MAs 1 &amp; 3A), and for non-reserved          water uses on reserved lands.</p>
Beaver Creek	<p>Application No &amp; Priority Date: 70872, 11-8-90.          Reach: from Beatty Cr to mouth.          High Flow/Low Flow: 68 cfs/27 cfs.          Impacts: will limit or prevent new applications on          5100 acres of upstream acquired lands (MAs 3          &amp; 1), and for non-reserved water uses on          reserved lands.</p>
Five Points Creek	<p>Application No &amp; Priority Date: 70873, 11-8-90.          Reach: from Middle Fork to mouth.          High Flow/Low Flow: 42 cfs/13 cfs.          Impacts: will limit or prevent new applications on          20,500 ac. of upstream acquired lands (mostly          MA 3, some MAs 1 &amp; 3A), and for non-reserved          water uses on reserved lands.</p>
Grande Ronde Riv	<p>Application No &amp; Priority Date: 59539, 11-3-83.          Point: at gage 13319000 nr LaGrande, Sec 36, T2S, R37E.          High Flow/Low Flow: 300 cfs/30 cfs.          Impacts: will limit or prevent new applications on abt          95,000 acres of upstream acquired lands          (mostly MAs 3 &amp; 14, some MAs 1 &amp; 3A), and for          non-reserved water uses on reserved lands.</p>
N Fk Catherine Cr	<p>Application No &amp; Priority Date: 70865, 11-8-90.          Reach: from unnamed tributary at river mile 10.2 in          SWSW Sec 9, T4S, R42E to mouth.          High Flow/Low Flow: 85 cfs/34 cfs.          Impacts: will limit or prevent new applications on          1000 acres of upstream acquired lands (mostly          MA 1, some MA 3), and for non-reserved water          uses on reserved lands.</p>
S Fk Catherine Cr	<p>Application No &amp; Priority Date: 70862, 11-8-90.          Reach: from Collins Cr to mouth.          High Flow/Low Flow: 50 cfs/20 cfs.          Impacts: will limit or prevent new applications on          1700 acres of upstream acquired lands (mostly          MA 1, some MA 3), and for non-reserved water          uses on reserved lands.</p>

Catherine Creek

Certificate No & Priority Date: 59537, 11-3-83.  
Reach: from gage 13320000 (Sec 2, T5S, R40E) to Swackhammer diversion at Union.  
High Flow/Low Flow: 200 cfs/30 cfs.  
Impacts: will limit or prevent new applications on abt 8400 acres of upstream acquired lands (MA 1 & 3), and for non-reserved water uses on reserved lands.

2. GRANDE RONDE RIVER, Wallowa River subbasin

Hurricane Creek

Application No & Priority Date: 70692, 9-24-90.  
Reach: from Dunn Cr to mouth.  
High Flow/Low Flow: 60 cfs/25 cfs.  
Impacts: will limit or prevent new applications on 3600 acres of upstream acquired lands (MA 4), and for non-reserved water uses on reserved lands.

Bear Creek

Certificate No & Priority Date: 59808, 11-3-83.  
Point: from gage 13330500 (Sec 34, T1N, R42E) to mouth.  
High Flow/Low Flow: 40 cfs/20 cfs.  
Impacts: will limit or prevent new applications on 1600 acres of upstream acquired lands (mostly MAs 1 & 3, some MA 6), and for non-reserved water uses on reserved lands.

3. GRANDE RONDE RIVER, subbasin below Wallowa River

Chesnimnus Creek

Application No & Priority Date: 70584, 8-30-90.  
Reach: from Peavine Cr to Crow Cr.  
High Flow/Low Flow: 60 cfs/23 cfs.  
Impacts: will limit or prevent new applications on 5700 acres of upstream acquired lands (MA 1), and for non-reserved water uses on reserved lands.

Joseph Creek

Application No & Priority Date: 70583, 8-30-90.  
Reach: from Peavine Cr to Crow Cr.  
High Flow/Low Flow: 85 cfs/34 cfs.  
Impacts: will limit or prevent new applications on 7700 acres of upstream acquired lands (MA 1), and for non-reserved water uses on reserved lands.

Joseph Creek

Application No & Priority Date: 70780, 10-18-90.  
Reach: from Cougar Cr to stateline.  
High Flow/Low Flow: 120 cfs/47 cfs.  
Impacts: will limit or prevent new applications on 8700 acres of upstream acquired lands (MA 1), and for non-reserved water uses on reserved lands.



4. IMNAHA RIVER

Little Sheep Cr      Certificate No & Priority Date: 59813, 11-3-83.  
Point: at mouth.  
High Flow/Low Flow: 20 cfs/10 cfs.  
Impacts: will limit or prevent new applications on  
1400 acres of upstream acquired lands (MA 3),  
and for non-reserved water uses on reserved  
lands.

Big Sheep Creek      Certificate No & Priority Date: 59809, 11-3-83.  
Reach: from Little Sheep Creek to mouth.  
High Flow/Low Flow: 55 cfs/25 cfs.  
Impacts: will limit or prevent new applications on  
1900 acres of upstream acquired lands (MAs 1  
& 3), and for non-reserved water uses on  
reserved lands.

Imnaha River      Certificate No & Priority Date: 59812, 5-9-61.  
Point: at gage 13319000, Sec 16, T1N, R48E.  
High Flow/Low Flow: 85 cfs.  
Impacts: will limit or prevent new applications on  
3300 acres of upstream acquired lands (mostly  
MAs 1 & 3, some MAs 10 & 11), and for  
non-reserved water uses on reserved lands.

5. PINE CREEK, subbasin of Power Basin

East Pine Creek      Application No & Priority Date: 70870, 11-8-90.  
Reach: from Beecher Cr to mouth.  
High Flow/Low Flow: 16 cfs/6 cfs.  
Impacts: will limit or prevent new applications on  
1200 acres of upstream acquired lands (mostly  
MA 3, some MA), and for non-reserved water  
uses on reserved lands.

North Pine Creek      Certificate No & Priority Date: 59534, 6-26-70  
Point: at mouth.  
High Flow/Low Flow: 45 cfs/20 cfs.  
Impacts: will limit or prevent new applications on 400  
acres of upstream acquired lands (MA 10), and  
for non-reserved water uses on reserved  
lands.

Pine Creek      Certificate No & Priority Date: 59542, 6-26-70  
Point: at State Engineer's Gage 13-2901.9 at stream  
mile 1.9.  
High Flow/Low Flow: 100 cfs/40 cfs.  
Impacts: will limit or prevent new applications on  
1700 acres of upstream acquired lands (mostly  
MAs 3 & 10, some MA 1), and for non-reserved  
water uses on reserved lands.

6. POWDER RIVER

E Fk Eagle Creek      Certificate No & Priority Date: 59530, 6-26-70  
Point: at mouth.  
High Flow/Low Flow: 45 cfs/23 cfs.  
Impacts: will limit or prevent new applications on 80  
          acres of upstream acquired land (MA 3A), and  
          for non-reserved water uses on reserved  
          lands.

Eagle Creek      Certificate No & Priority Date: 59531, 6-26-70  
Point: at stream mile 10.9 at State Engineer's Gage  
          13-2882 (SE Sec 7, T8S, R45E).  
High Flow/Low Flow: 80 cfs/50 cfs.  
Impacts: will limit or prevent new applications on  
          7000 acres of upstream acquired land (mostly  
          MAS 1 & 3, some MA 3A), and for non-reserved  
          water uses on reserved lands.

7. NORTH FORK JOHN DAY RIVER

N Fk John Day R      Application No & Priority Date: 70648, 9-11-90.  
Reach: from Trail Cr to Texas Bar Cr.  
High Flow/Low Flow: 300 cfs/150 cfs.  
Impacts: will limit or prevent new applications on 900  
          acres of upstream acquired land (MA 18), and  
          for non-reserved water uses on reserved  
          lands.

Granite Creek      Certificate No & Priority Date: 59784, 11-3-83.  
Reach: from Clear Creek to mouth.  
High Flow/Low Flow: 71 cfs/30 cfs.  
Impacts: will limit or prevent new applications on 900  
          acres of upstream acquired lands (MA 18), and  
          for non-reserved water uses on reserved  
          lands.

Bull Run Creek      Application No & Priority Date: 69959, 6-12-89.  
Reach: from Boundary Cr to mouth.  
High Flow/Low Flow: 22 cfs/4 cfs.  
Impacts: will limit or prevent new applications on 500  
          acres of upstream acquired lands (MA 18), and  
          for non-reserved water uses on reserved  
          lands.

Clear Creek      Application No & Priority Date: 69958, 6-12-89.  
Reach: from Beaver Cr to mouth.  
High Flow/Low Flow: 48 cfs/15 cfs.  
Impacts: will limit or prevent new applications on 400  
          acres of upstream acquired lands (MA 18), and  
          for non-reserved water uses on reserved  
          lands.



8. UMATILLA RIVER

Meacham Creek

Application No & Priority Date: 70489, 7-16-90.

Reach: from headwaters in Sec 34, T1S, R35E to North  
Fork Meacham Creek.

High Flow/Low Flow: 102 cfs/40 cfs.

Impacts: will limit or prevent new applications on 200  
acres of upstream acquired lands (MA 3A), and  
for non-reserved water uses on reserved  
lands.

April 10, 1996

Director  
Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife  
2501 SW First Ave  
PO Box 59  
Portland OR 97207

WATER  
RESOURCES  
DEPARTMENT

Reference: Instream water rights in the John Day Basin,  
Files 69949, 69951, 69958, 69959, 69961, 69963,  
70589, 70590, 70640-70647, 70649-70655

Dear Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife:

This document, called an "Initial Review", is to inform you of the potential limitations to your proposed instream water right and to describe some of your options. Based on the information you have supplied, the Water Resources Department has made several determinations:

The referenced applications are complete and not defective.

The proposed use is not prohibited by law;

The instream use is allowed under OAR 506, the John Day Basin Program;

**1. Application 69949**

Priority date: 6/12/89

REYNOLDS CR TRIB JOHN DAY R  
GRANT COUNTY

REYNOLDS CREEK FM MOUTH OF N FK REYNOLDS CREEK AT RIVER  
MILE 5.0 (NESE, SECTION 20, T13S, R35E WM); TO MOUTH OF REYNOLDS  
CREEK AT RIVER MILE 0.0 (NESW, SECTION 26, T13S, R34E WM)

**a. The amount of water requested for instream use:**

JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
15	15	18	18	18	15	12/5	5/12	12/5	5	5	12

**b. The estimated average natural flow:**

JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
11.6	11.7	15.9	32.3	47.8	28.2	13.2	7.62	8.18	10.4	12.2	11.5

**c. Allowable water use:**

JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
11.6	11.7	15.9	18	18	15	12/5	5/7.62	8.18/5	5	5	11.5



Commerce Building  
158 12th Street NE  
Salem, OR 97310-0210  
(503) 378-3739  
FAX (503) 378-8130



## 4. Application 69959

Priority date: 6/12/89

BULL RUN CR TRIB GRANITE CR  
GRANT COUNTY

BULL RUN CREEK FM MOUTH OF BOUNDARY CREEK AT RIVER MILE 3.0  
(NENE, SECTION 14, T9S, R35.5E WM); TO MOUTH OF BULL RUN  
CREEK AT RIVER MILE 0.0 (NESW, SECTION 4, T9S, R35.5E WM)

## a. The amount of water requested for instream use:

JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
15	15	22	22	22	6	4	4/22	22/15	6	6	6

## b. The estimated average natural flow:

JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
7.1	8.9	11.4	43.7	92.8	37.9	6.38	2.31	2.04	2.95	4.09	6.39

## c. Allowable water use:

JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
7.1	8.9	11.4	22	22	6	4	2.31	2.04	2.95	4.09	6

## 5. Application 69961

Priority date: 6/12/89

GRANITE BOULDER CR TRIB M FK JOHN DAY R  
GRANT COUNTY

GRANITE BOULDER CREEK FM MOUTH OF PORKY CREEK AT RIVER MILE 3.5  
(SWNE, SECTION 28, T10S, R34E WM); TO MOUTH OF GRANITE BOULDER  
CREEK AT RIVER MILE 0.0 (SENE, SECTION 6, T11S, R34E WM)

## a. The amount of water requested for instream use:

JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
12	12	15	15	15	13	7/3	3	3	3	3	7

## b. The estimated average natural flow:

JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
4.4	4.7	8.31	20.5	33.4	26	4.82	3.38	3.01	3.49	4.25	3.99

## c. Allowable water use:

JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
4.4	4.7	8.31	15	15	13	4.82/3	3	3	3	3	3.99

## 8. Application 70590

Priority date: 8/30/90

W FK MILL CR TRIB MILL CR  
CROOK COUNTYWEST FORK MILL CREEK FROM HARVEY CREEK RIVER MILE 1.5 (NENW,  
SECTION 8, T13S, R18E); TO THE MOUTH RIVER MILE 0.0 (NWSW,  
SECTION 16, T13S, R18E)

## a. The amount of water requested for instream use:

JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
8	8/12	20	20	20	12	8	8	8	8	8	8

## b. The estimated average natural flow:

JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
1.98	4.69	5.94	6.49	3.65	0.96	0.17	0.06	0.04	0.06	0.28	1.12

## c. Allowable water use:

JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
1.98	4.69	5.94	6.49	3.65	0.96	0.17	0.06	0.04	0.06	0.28	1.12

## 9. Application 70640

Priority date: 9/11/90

JOHN DAY R TRIB COLUMBIA R  
GRANT COUNTYJOHN DAY RIVER FROM SNOW CREEK, RIVER MILE 283.0 (NENE,  
SECTION 20, T15S, R35E); TO RAIL CREEK, RIVER MILE 275.8 (NWNE,  
SECTION 24, T14S, R34E)

## a. The amount of water requested for instream use:

JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
34	34	40	40	40	34	34	34/40	40	40	34	34

## b. The estimated average natural flow:

JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
9.92	8.95	10.5	19.4	36.2	28.4	16.6	9.2	9.57	11.5	11.9	10.3

## c. Allowable water use:

JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
9.92	8.95	10.5	19.4	36.2	28.4	16.6	9.2	9.57	11.5	11.9	10.3



## 12. Application 70643

Priority date: 9/11/90

M FK CANYON CR TRIB CANYON CR  
GRANT COUNTY

MIDDLE FORK CANYON CREEK FROM THE HEADWATERS RIVER MILE 8.0  
(NENE, SECTION 9, T15S, R33E); TO THE MOUTH (NESW, SECTION 2,  
T16S, R32E)

## a. The amount of water requested for instream use:

JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
16	16	25	25	25	16	11	11	11	11	11	16

## b. The estimated average natural flow:

JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
2.47	3.1	6.32	15.6	20.4	11.1	2.88	1.32	1.06	1.38	2.05	2.43

## c. Allowable water use:

JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
2.47	3.1	6.32	15.6	20.4	11.1	2.88	1.32	1.06	1.38	2.05	2.43

## 13. Application 70644

Priority date: 9/11/90

E FK CANYON CR TRIB CANYON CR  
GRANT COUNTY

EAST FORK CANYON CREEK FROM MINERS CREEK RIVER MILE 8  
(SWNE, SECTION 7, T15S, R33E)' TO THE MOUTH RIVER MILE 0.0  
(NENE, SECTION 30, T15S, R32E)

## a. The amount of water requested for instream use:

JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
15	15	22	22	22	15	10	10	10	10	10	15

## b. The estimated average natural flow:

JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
4.76	5.83	11.9	29.4	41.9	24.6	6.63	2.55	2.1	2.73	4.11	4.65

## c. Allowable water use:

JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
4.76	5.83	11.9	22	22	15	6.63	2.55	2.1	2.73	4.11	4.65

16. Application 70647

Priority date: 9/11/90

N FK JOHN DAY R TRIB JOHN DAY R  
GRANT COUNTYNORTH FORK JOHN DAY RIVER FROM THE HEADWATERS RIVER MILE  
112.0 (NWNE, SECTION 13, T8WS, R36E); TO TRAIL CREEK RIVER  
MILE 101.0 (NWNE, SECTION 34, T7S, R35.5E)

## a. The amount of water requested for instream use:

JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
58	58	80	80	80	58	40	40/80	80	58	58	58

## b. The estimated average natural flow:

JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
16.7	15.4	15.8	32.7	210	260	72.6	36.3	28.6	28.2	23.5	15.7

## c. Allowable water use:

JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
16.7	15.4	15.8	32.7	80	58	40	36.3	28.6	28.2	23.5	15.7

17. Application 70649

Priority date: 9/11/90

CRANE CR TRIB N FK JOHN DAY R  
GRANT COUNTYCRANE CREEK FROM UNNAMED TRIBUTARY (SNNW, SECTION 18, T8S, R36E);  
TO THE MOUTH RIVER MILE 0.0 (NENE, SECTION 10, T8S, R35E)

## a. The amount of water requested for instream use:

JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
8	8	14	14	14	8	5	5/14	14	14	5	5

## b. The estimated average natural flow:

JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
2.88	3.19	4.25	18.2	45	19.1	3.11	0.97	0.83	1.21	1.81	2.59

## c. Allowable water use:

JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
2.88	3.19	4.25	14	14	8	3.11	0.97	0.83	1.21	1.81	2.59



20. Application 70652

Priority date: 9/11/90

BIG BOULDER CR TRIB M FK JOHN DAY R  
GRANT COUNTYBIG BOULDER CREEK FROM AN UNNAMED TRIBUTARY (NENW, SECTION 1,  
T10S, R33E); TO THE MOUTH (SWSW, SECTION 26, T10S, R33E)

a. The amount of water requested for instream use:

JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
25	25	43	43	43	25	16	16	16	16	16	16

b. The estimated average natural flow:

JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
5.91	7.5	12.8	29.6	43.8	27.6	5.5	3.97	3.73	4.3	5.09	5.24

c. Allowable water use:

JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
5.91	7.5	12.8	29.6	43	25	5.5	3.97	3.73	4.3	5.09	5.24

21. Application 70653

Priority date: 9/11/90

BIG CR TRIB M FK JOHN DAY R  
GRANT COUNTYBIG CREEK FROM POLE CREEK (SENE, SECTION 15, T9S, R33E);  
TO THE MOUTH RIVER MILE 0.0 (SWSW, SECTION 21, T9S, R32E)

a. The amount of water requested for instream use:

JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
15	15/26	26	26	26	15	10	10	10/15	15/10	10	15

b. The estimated average natural flow:

JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
7.76	11.3	19.5	42.3	57	36.4	7.47	4.56	4.27	5.06	5.41	6.52

c. Allowable water use:

JAN	FEB	MAR	APR	MAY	JUN	JUL	AUG	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
7.76	11.3	19.5	26	26	15	7.47	4.56	4.27	5.06	5.41	6.52

Your applications can be moved to the next phase of the water rights application review process.

Please reference the application number when sending any correspondence regarding the conclusions of this initial review. Comments received within the comment period, will be evaluated at the next phase of the process.

At this time, you must decide whether to proceed or to withdraw your applications as described below.

Withdrawal:

If you choose not to proceed, you may withdraw your application. To accomplish this you must notify the Department in writing by April 24, 1996. For your convenience you may use the enclosed "STOP PROCESSING" form.


To Proceed With Your Application:

If you choose to proceed with an application, you do not have to notify the Department. Your applications will automatically be placed on the Department's Public Notice to allow others the opportunity to comment. After the comment period the Department will complete a public interest review and issue a proposed final order.

If you have any questions:

Feel free to call Michael Mattick at (503) 378-8455 ext. 276 or 1 (800) 624-3199 if you have any questions. Please have your application number(s) available if you call.

Sincerely,



Cindy Smith  
Initial Review Team

Regional Manager, Watermaster, Water Availability  
Section

enclosures: Stop Processing Form



June 17, 1996

RECEIVED

JUN 18 1996

WATER RESOURCES DEPT.  
SALEM, OREGON

Water Rights Section  
Water Resources Department  
158 12th Street NE  
Salem, OR 97310

RE: Comments, John Day River Basin Instream Water Rights  
69949, 69951, 69958-59, 69961, 69963, 70589-90, 70640-47, 70649-55

Dear Water Rights Section:

WaterWatch of Oregon strongly supports the flows requested in these Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife instream water right applications for the John Day River Basin. These flows are essential for survival of a number of fishery resources. However, while we fully support the adoption of these instream water right, we have some concerns with the initial reviews as issued.

**a. Exceptions for Human Consumption and Livestock Uses**

The Department is proposing the following condition on all instream water rights: "This instream right shall not have priority over human or livestock consumption." This condition subordinates this instream flow requests to human consumption and livestock uses in perpetuity. Individual exceptions will directly lessen the amount of water available instream to satisfy the purposes of the instream water right. Since the flows represented by the instream water right are those ODFW has determined are needed for fish, even the slightest diminishment of these flows will have adverse effects on the fishery resource. Moreover, the cumulative effects that will result from this exception could eventually lead to the total negation of the instream water right.

The Department has cited to ORS 536.310(12) as authority for allowing this condition. This section of the statute states that:

When proposed uses of water are in mutually exclusive conflict or when available supplies of water are insufficient for all who desire to use them, preference shall be given to human consumption purposed over all other uses and for livestock consumption, over any other use....

ORS 536.310(12)(emphasis added).

While this statute does provide for a preference for human consumption and livestock,



RECEIVED

JUN 18 1996

this preference has a specific statutory application.<sup>1</sup> The statute governs situations where there is a conflict between competing applications at the time the permitting decision is taking place. This statute does not address situations of conflict at some nebulous future date. Thus, while the Department may rely on this statute to subordinate the instream water right to the applications pending at the time of the instream water rights adoption, the Department's reliance on this section to attach this open-ended exception is in error.

If the statute were to mandate the open-ended subordination of instream water rights to human consumption and livestock uses, then equity would demand that this condition be placed on every new permit or certificate issued, whether instream or out-of-stream. The statute does not differentiate between instream and out-of-stream water rights.<sup>2</sup> Rather, it specifically states that "preference shall be given to human consumption purposes over all other uses and for livestock consumption, over any other use...." ORS 536.310(12) (*emphasis added*). Thus, if the Department finds that the law requires it to subordinate instream water rights to human consumption and livestock uses, the Department must subordinate all water rights, including agriculture, industry, municipal and mining to human consumption and livestock use. To fail to do this would not only be inequitable, but it would prove the Department insincere in their intent to protect human consumption and livestock above all else.

We acknowledge that under the law, the Director may include any condition she considers necessary; however, **it must be consistent with the intent** of ORS 537.332 to 537.360 (Instream Water Right Statutes). ORS 537.343. An instream water right is a water right held by the Department in trust for the benefit of the people of the State of Oregon to maintain water in-stream for public use. ORS 537.332(3). "Public benefit" means a benefit that accrues to the public at large rather than to a person, a small groups of persons or to a private enterprise. ORS 537.332(3). To subordinate an instream water right to human consumption and/or livestock uses would specifically benefit a person, or a small group of persons rather than the public at large. This is not consistent with the intent of the instream water right act. Thus, this type of conditioning is not allowed under the Instream Water Right Act.

Moreover, this proposed conditions is contrary to the public interest in protecting the resource. The Commission's statewide policies recognize the importance of maintaining streamflows and place high priority on protecting streamflows. OAR 690-410-030(1). This policy directs the state to take action to restore flows in critical areas such as this system. *Id.* The public uses of the John Day River system have been impaired. Adoption of these instream

---

<sup>1</sup> In addition, this policy is one of the "purposes and polices to be considered in formulating the state water resources program" under ORS 536.300(2). ORS 536.310 (*emphasis added*). The statute referred to, ORS 536.300(2), is the law specifically guiding the formulation of basin plans.

<sup>2</sup> Under the law, "public uses" (recreation; conservation, maintenance and enhancement of aquatic and fish life, wildlife, fish and wildlife habitat and any other ecological values; pollution abatement; navigation) are legal beneficial uses. ORS 537.334(1). Instream water rights enjoy the same legal protections as consumptive water rights.



RECEIVED

JUN 18 1996

water rights without conditions is just one small step towards restoring this system.

WATER RESOURCES DEPT.  
SALEM, OREGON

If the Department is going to attach such a permit condition, the Department should, at the very least, put a cap on the amount that can be exempted for human consumption or livestock for any single stream. Without such a cap, instream water rights will be undercut bit by bit until there are insufficient flows left to fulfill the senior instream water rights. Instream water rights are legally protected rights. To allow such a diminution of such a vested water right at some point in the future is inconsistent with the underlying premise of the prior appropriation doctrine--first in time, first in right.

In addition, if the Department allows this exception, the exception should be limited to human consumption where (1) measurement and reporting are mandatory, (2) the applicant has demonstrated that no other alternative supply exists, and (3) the permit is subject to periodic review to ensure that there is still no alternative water source. The exception should be limited to livestock where (1) watering is off stream and (2) the cows are prevented from entering the riparian zone and stream bed.

**b. The flows proposed are less than those requested by ODFW**

For some months of the year, ODFW's requested flows exceed the Department's estimated average natural flow for these months. For these months the Department proposed issuance of flows at the estimated average natural flow.

The Department's rules mandate that instream water rights cannot be granted for amounts greater than the estimated average natural flow, except where periodic flows that exceed the natural flow or level are significant for the public use applied for. OAR 690-77-015(4). An example of such an exception would be high flow events that allow for fish passage or migration over obstacles. *Id.* It appears that the Department has limited all the instream water right applications to the estimated average natural flow without determining whether the periodic flows that exceed the natural flow are "significant" for the public use applied for.

The flows requested by ODFW are necessary for the requested beneficial use of water - fish life. These flows are needed for migration, spawning, egg incubation, fry emergence and juvenile rearing and for fish passage and habitat maintenance. Given that ODFW's flow requests are to provide for the various life cycles of fish which are already on the brink of extinction, periodic flows are necessary for fulfillment of the purpose of this instream water right. There should be no reduction in the requested flows. In sum, the agency has the information to find that the higher flows are significant. The instream water rights should be granted at the amounts requested by ODFW.


**c. Measurement and reporting**

The Department has proposed a condition of use mandating measurement at the lower end of the stream reach to protect necessary flows throughout the reach. To ensure that flows are being protected throughout the reach, measurement must take place at both the upper and lower ends of the stream reach.

In any given stream reach, there are a number of ways water enters the stream whether it be tributaries, runoff, or groundwater seepage. If, for instance, there was a major inputting factor near the lower end of the reach where the measuring device was located this could artificially inflate the amount of water in the stream upstream from that spot. Thus, to ensure that the instream water rights are protected throughout their reach, there should be measuring devices at both the upper and lower end of the reach.

### Conclusion

The proposed instream water rights will protect flows needed for fish life in and recreational use of river. These fish populations have statewide and even national significance and streamflows are essential for maintenance of these fish. Adoption of this and other instream flows is critical to the health of Oregon's watersheds and must be a high priority for Oregon if the state is to develop solutions to the resource crises that threatens to destroy the livability of Oregon. Instream water rights not only help to achieve a more equitable allocation of water between instream and out of stream uses, they also establish management objectives for Oregon's rivers.

Sincerely,  
  
Kimberley Priestley  
Legal/Policy Analyst

**RECEIVED**

JUN 18 1996

WATER RESOURCES DEPT.  
SALEM, OREGON



Instream Application No.

69958

Certificate No.

STATE OF OREGON

WATER RESOURCES DEPARTMENT

RECEIVED

JUN 12 1989

Application for Instream Water Right  
by a State Agency

WATER RESOURCES DEPARTMENT  
SALEM, OREGON

There is no fee required for this application.

A. Applicant: Randy Fisher for ODEW  
(Director) (Agency)

Mailing Address: P. O. Box 59  
Portland, OR 97207 229-5407  
City State Zip Phone No.

B. Applicant: David G. Talbot for Division of Parks & Recreation  
(Director) (Agency)

Mailing Address: Vick Bldg., 525 Trade St., #301  
Salem, OR 97310 378-5000  
City State Zip Phone No.

C. Applicant: \_\_\_\_\_ for \_\_\_\_\_  
(Director) (Agency)

Mailing Address: \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_  
City State Zip Phone No.

1. The name of stream or lake of the proposed instream water right is \_\_\_\_\_  
Clear Creek  
a tributary or source (if lake) of Granite Creek

2. The public use(s) this instream water right is based upon include:  
Spawning, rearing and migration of anadromous and resident salmonids,  
including spring chinook, summer steelhead, bull trout and rainbow trout.  
These flows will also provide for recreational fishing, but not drift boating.

Instream Application No. 69958 Certificate No. \_\_\_\_\_

3. The amount of water needed by month and/or year for each category of public use. If more space is needed, use a separate sheet of paper.

List quantities in either cfs, acre-feet, or lake elevation above Mean Sea Level

Use(s)	Jan	Feb	Mar	Apr	May	Jun	Jul	Aug	Sept	Oct	Nov	Dec
Fish & fish habitat	30	30	48	48	48	30	15	15/48	48/15	15	15	15
* fishing	30	30	48	48	48	30	15	15/48	48/15	15	15	15

\* These flows are not in addition to the flows above, but are for a different use.

4. The reach of the stream identified for an instream water right is from the:

upstream end at mouth of Beaver Creek

River Mile (if known) 4.3

within the NW 1/4 of the NW 1/4 of

Section 24 Township 9S Range 35 E W.M.,

County Grant

downstream end at the mouth

River Mile (if known) 0.0

within the NE 1/4 of the NE 1/4 of

Section 1 Township 9S Range 35E W.M.,

County Grant

Lake identified for an instream water right is

within the \_\_\_\_\_ 1/4 of the \_\_\_\_\_ 1/4 of

Section \_\_\_\_\_ Township \_\_\_\_\_ Range \_\_\_\_\_ W.M.,

County \_\_\_\_\_

5. Method(s) used to determine the requested amounts:

The Oregon Method - minimum

\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_



6. When were the following state agencies notified of the intent to file for the instream water right?

Department of Environmental Quality	Date <u>4-24-89</u>
Department of Fish and Wildlife	Date <u>-</u>
Parks and Recreation Division	Date <u>4-24-89</u>

7. If possible, include recommendations for measuring locations or methods:

The instream water right should be for the entire reach, measured at the  
mouth (RM 0.0)

8. If possible, include recommendations for assisting the Water Resources Department (WRD) in measuring and monitoring procedures:

State WRD with cooperation from ODFW.  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

9. If possible, include other recommendations for methods or conditions necessary for managing the water right to protect the public uses (see OAR 690-77-020 (5)(c)):

Attention to water appropriation and enforcement of water rights.  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

Remarks: Segment of John Day Basin map attached.  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

**This application must be accompanied by a basin map with the applicable lake or stream reach identified.**

An instream water right may be allowed for an instream beneficial use of water subject to existing water rights with an effective date prior to the filing date of this application.

This type of beneficial use is for the benefit of the public and a certificate issued confirming an instream water right shall be held in trust by the Water Resources Department for the people of the State of Oregon, pursuant to ORS 537.341.

6/6/89 6/12/89  
Date  
ODFW / Div. of Parks & Rec.  
Agency

Nancy M. MacKHugh John D. Kelly  
Signature  
Chief, NCD ASST Admin  
Title

Instream Application No. 69958 Certificate No. \_\_\_\_\_

This is to certify that I have examined the foregoing application, together with the accompanying maps and data, and return them for:

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_\_\_

In order to retain its priority, this application must be returned to the Water Resources Department with corrections on or before \_\_\_\_\_, 19 \_\_\_\_.

Date: \_\_\_\_\_, 19 \_\_\_\_.

\_\_\_\_\_  
Water Resources Department

\_\_\_\_\_  
Title

This document was first received at the Water Resources Department in Salem, Oregon, on the 12<sup>th</sup> day of JUNE, 19 89, at 1:20 o'clock P. M.

WATER RESOURCES DEPARTMENT  
3850 Portland Road NE  
SALEM, OREGON 97310



Application No. 69958


Permit No.

T4S

45-00' to Baker

41-45' to Baker

11





October 8, 1991

Ronald S. Yockim  
Cegavske, Johnston & Associates, P.C.  
PO Box 218  
Roseburg, Oregon 97407

Re: Instream water right applications 70641 through 70655, 69949,  
69951, 69958 through 69963.

Dear Mr. Yockim,

This letter is to verify receipt of your requests, on behalf of Grant County to enter into discussions regarding the referenced instream water rights applications. Application 69962 was certificated on November 27, 1989. We will contact you when we have completed a natural flow analysis of the remaining streams and are prepared to discuss this information and the other issues raised in your September 25, 1991, correspondence.

Sincerely,



MICHAEL J. MATTICK  
Water Rights Specialist

MJM:

cc: Sen. Gene Timms  
Rep. Mike Nelson  
Grant County Court  
Al Mirati (ODFW)



3850 Portland Rd NE  
Salem, OR 97310  
(503) 378-3739  
FAX (503) 378-8130



CERTIFICATE OF WATER RIGHT

THIS CERTIFICATE ISSUED TO

STATE OF OREGON  
WATER RESOURCES DEPARTMENT  
SALEM, OREGON 97310

confirms the right to use the waters of BIG WALL CREEK, a tributary of the NORTH FORK JOHN DAY RIVER, in the JOHN DAY BASIN to maintain an instream flow for the purpose of ANADROMOUS AND RESIDENT FISH HABITAT AND RECREATIONAL FISHING.

The right is for flows to be maintained in BIG WALL CREEK FROM THE MOUTH OF WILSON CREEK AT RIVER MILE 15, (SW 1/4 SW 1/4, SECTION 25, T 7 S, R 26 E, W.M); TO THE MOUTH OF LITTLE WALL CREEK AT RIVER MILE 4.5, (NE 1/4 NW 1/4, SECTION 31, T 7 S, R 28E, W.M) .

The right is established under Oregon Revised Statutes 537.346.

The date of priority is JUNE 12, 1989.

The right is limited to not more than the amounts during the time periods listed below:

<u>Period</u>	<u>Flows (cubic foot per second)</u>
OCTOBER 1 THRU OCTOBER 31	7
NOVEMBER 1 THRU NOVEMBER 30	15
DECEMBER 1 THRU DECEMBER 31	25
JANUARY 1 THRU FEBRUARY 15	30
FEBRUARY 16 THRU MAY 31	44
JUNE 1 THRU JUNE 30	30
JULY 1 THRU JULY 15	15
JULY 16 THRU SEPTEMBER 30	7

Witness the signature of the Water Resources Director affixed this 27TH day of NOVEMBER, 1989.

*William H. Burg*  
Water Resources Director

Recorded in State Record of Water Right Certificates number 63259.  
IS 69962 BASIN 6 N FK JOHN DAY RIVER & MISC VOLUME 2 DISTRICT 4

# BASIN SUMMARY REPORT

CLEAR CR    TRIBUTARY OF    GRANITE CR

SOURCE > TRIBUTARY	TOTAL DIVERTED	AGRIC.	INDUST.	MUNIC.	DOMEST.	RECREAT.	MISC.	UNKNOWN
CLEAR CR > GRANITE CR	12.01 CFS 0.00 ACF	0.00 0.00	12.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.01 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0
CONGO G > CLEAR CR	0.13 CFS 0.00 ACF	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.13 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0
BEAVER CR > CLEAR CR	0.00 CFS 0.00 ACF	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0
OLIVE CR > BEAVER CR	19.00 CFS 0.00 ACF	0.00 0.00	19.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0
QUARTZ G > OLIVE CR	4.00 CFS 0.00 ACF	0.00 0.00	4.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0
S FK BEAVER CR > BEAVER CR	0.01 CFS 0.20 ACF	0.01 0.20	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0
LIGHTNING CR > CLEAR CR	68.85 CFS 0.00 ACF	22.55 0.00	45.30 0.00	1.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0
DRY CR > LIGHTNING CR	5.00 CFS 0.00 ACF	0.00 0.00	5.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0
SPRING CR > LIGHTNING CR	6.00 CFS 0.00 ACF	0.00 0.00	6.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0
SALMON CR > LIGHTNING CR	25.00 CFS 0.00 ACF	0.00 0.00	25.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0
WOLESY CR > CLEAR CR	2.00 CFS 0.00 ACF	0.00 0.00	2.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0
E FK CLEAR CR > CLEAR CR	23.36 CFS 0.00 ACF	0.36 0.00	23.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0
W FK CLEAR CR > CLEAR CR	27.00 CFS 0.00 ACF	0.00 0.00	27.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0.00 0.00	0



BASIN SUMMARY REPORT 69958

Page 2

CLEAR CR TRIBUTARY OF GRANITE CR

TOTAL DIVERTED  
=====

TOTAL CFS: 192.36  
TOTAL ACF: 0.20

TOTALS BY USE  
=====

	<u>AGRICULTURE</u>	<u>INDUSTRIAL</u>	<u>MUNICIPAL</u>	<u>DOMESTIC</u>	<u>RECREATIONAL</u>	<u>MISCELLANEOUS</u>
(CFS)	22.92	168.30	1.00	0.14	0.00	0.00
(ACF)	0.20	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00

## APPLICATION PROCESSING OUTLINE

Basin: \_\_\_\_\_

Sub-basin: \_\_\_\_\_

Fees paid: Examination fee: \_\_\_\_\_

Recording fees: \_\_\_\_\_

Total: \_\_\_\_\_

Application No. 69958

Permit No. \_\_\_\_\_

RATE AND DUTY \_\_\_\_\_ for irrigation

## 1. Check for minimum information (OAR 690-11-020)

yes	no	
----	----	Name and mailing address of the applicant.
----	----	Source of the water.
----	----	Quantity of water to be appropriated.
----	----	Location of point of diversion to 1/4 1/4 Section.
----	----	Nature and place of use.
----	----	Name and mailing address of all legal owners of the properties involved.
----	----	Signature of the applicant
----	----	Examination fees.

If minimum information not supplied, excepting legal owner information, then return to applicant with letter explaining deficiencies.

yes	no	
----	----	Water Resources Commission classification limits or restrictions -- If yes, note:
----	----	-----
----	----	State Engineer's withdrawals -- If yes, note:
----	----	-----
----	----	Legislative withdrawals -- If yes, note:
----	----	-----
----	----	If policy statement is unclear check with Resources Management Division.
----	----	Scenic Watervay: _____
----	----	on _____ up-stream _____ v/in 1/4 mile
----	----	Notify Parks and Recreation Department
----	----	Out-of-basin diversion
----	----	Need to route to Geology Section due to:
----	----	well within one mile of a stream
----	----	well within restricted surface water area
----	----	wells with request for greater than 5 cfs
----	----	well is for heating &/or cooling
----	----	well constructed by land owner
----	----	well is artesian
----	----	artificial ground water recharge project
----	----	ground water area under study
----	----	Within Irrigation District: _____
----	----	Notify _____ Need excerpt from District
----	----	Legal description of property
----	----	Ownership statement
----	----	Other parties to Notify: _____
----	----	Water Resources Commission review if:
----	----	Request for greater than 5 cfs
----	----	Dam height greater than 10 feet
----	----	Storage of more than 9.2 acre-feet
----	----	Out-of-basin diversion
----	----	within or above a scenic watervay
----	----	conditional uses under basin programs
----	----	requests for larger rate or duty than allowed
----	----	ground water recharge project
----	----	other substantial public interest issues
----	----	requests for review by an agency or person
----	----	Watermaster comment form sent with copy of application and map. _____
----	----	Watermaster comments received _____
----	----	Hydrographic section comments requested _____
----	----	Hydrographic section comments received _____
----	----	O.D.F.W. sent copy of application and map(except groundwater) requesting comment _____
----	----	O.D.F.W. comments received _____
----	----	Report from D.E.Q. received _____
----	----	Publish application information in weekly public notice.
----	----	Notify other owners of development
----	----	PROTESTED
----	----	filed _____
----	----	resolved _____



Application No. <sup>FWS</sup> 69958  
Permit No. ....

6/12/89

Name Dept of Fish & Wildlife/ O S Parks Div., 525  
Address PO Box 59, Port., OR/ Trade St. S.E., Salem, OR

Assigned .....

Address .....

Beginning construction .....

Completion of construction .....

Extended to .....

Complete application of water .....

Extended to .....