



**Oregon Water Resources Department**  
 725 Summer Street NE, Suite A  
 Salem, Oregon 97301-1271  
 (503) 986-0900  
 www.wrd.state.or.us

## Watermaster Review Form: Water Right Transfer

Transfer Application: T-10210

Review Due Date: \_\_\_\_\_

Applicant Name: Russel Ricco, Elmwood Ranch, Inc.

Proposed Changes:  POU  POD  POA  USE  OTHER

Reviewer(s): Eric W. Julsrud

Date of Review: Dec. 15, 2006

1. Do you have information suggesting that the water rights may be subject to forfeiture?  
 Yes  No If "Yes", describe the information and indicate if you intend to file a cancellation affidavit or if you need additional time to determine if a cancellation affidavit should be filed: \_\_\_\_\_
  
2. Is there a history of regulation on the source that serves the right proposed for transfer that has involved the right and downstream water rights?  Yes  No Generally characterize the frequency of any regulation or explain why regulation has not occurred:  
Reynolds Cr. is a creek which has minimal users present and typically ample water to satisfy all users on the system. The regulation file shows the only regulation which has occurred on this creek has been on the "Laurance ditch" which is downstream of this transfer location. The users of this ditch were regulated in 1998 and 2002 due to complaints that water was not being shared with lower users farther down the ditch. No shortages of water between ditches has been reported where regulation by priority was necessary for the Reynolds Creek system.
  
3. Check here if it appears that downstream water rights benefit from return flows resulting from the current use of the right?  If you check the box, generally characterize the locations where the return flows likely occur and list the water rights that benefit most:  
Return flows from the use of this right (25452, 25737) would likely enter the stream in the near vicinity of the place of use. A portion of this return flow would benefit the lower diversion which is involved in a transfer of POD at this time, the Laurance Ditch (T-10209). Some of the return flow would not enter Reynolds creek itself but it would be intercepted by the "Reynolds Slough Ditch" located in SENE Sec. 26 T. 13S R. 34E WM. This ditch would receive the benefit of the majority of the return flow from C-25737. The return flow from C-25452 would most likely provide benefit to the "Reynolds Slough Ditch" and the "Laurance Ditch" which are both downstream of the current historic point of diversion noted in T-10210.
  
4. Are there upstream water rights that would be affected by the proposed change?  
 Yes  No If "Yes", describe how the rights would be affected and list the rights most affected: \_\_\_\_\_

RECEIVED

JAN 08 2007

WATER RESOURCES DEPT.  
 SALEM, OREGON

5. For POD changes and instream transfers, check here if there are channel losses between the old and new PODs or within the proposed instream reach?  If you check the box, describe and, if possible, estimate the losses: Any channel losses that would be present in the stream segment between the authorized point of diversion and the proposed point of diversion (current historic point of diversion) would be immeasurable and insignificant. The distance between the two points of diversion is approximately 600' +/-.
6. Would distribution of water for the right after the proposed change result in regulation of other water rights that would not have occurred if use of the existing right was maximized?  Yes  No If "Yes", explain: \_\_\_\_\_
7. For POU changes, would the original place of use continue to receive water from the same source?  Yes  No  N/A If "Yes", explain: \_\_\_\_\_
8. For POU or USE changes, would use of the existing right at "full face value," result in the diversion of more water than can be used beneficially and without waste?  Yes  No If "Yes", explain: \_\_\_\_\_
9. Are there other issues not identified through the above questions?  Yes  No If "Yes", explain: \_\_\_\_\_
10. What alternatives may be available for addressing any issues identified above: \_\_\_\_\_
11. Have headgate notices been issued for the source that serves the right?  Yes  No
12. What water control and measurement conditions should be included in the transfer:

<b>Measurement Devices</b>	<input type="checkbox"/> Present and should be maintained.	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Should be required prior to diverting water.	<input type="checkbox"/> May be required in the future.
<b>Headgates</b>	<input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Present and should be maintained.	<input type="checkbox"/> Should be required prior to diverting water.	<input type="checkbox"/> May be required in the future.

Signed: *Eva W. [Signature]* 1/2/2007

**RECEIVED**  
**JAN 08 2007**  
 WATER RESOURCES DEPT.  
 SALEM, OREGON