

[Type text]

[Type text] 2010-07

**WATER TRANSFER WORKING GROUP PROJECT DESCRIPTION**

APPLICATION NO./COURT CLAIM NO.: <b>Court Claim No. 02223/Water Right Claim 118160</b>		
APPLICANT NAME <b>Dave Blanchard Northland Resources 206 West First St. Cle Elum, WA 98922</b>	CONTACT NAME <b>Dave Blanchard Tom McDonald Lisa Pelly Tim Flynn</b>	TELEPHONE NO. <b>425-417-5311 360-786-5039 509-888-0970 206-780-7730</b>
WATER RIGHT HOLDER'S NAME (if different) n/a <b>Scatter Creek Resources, LLC (formerly Pasco)</b>		EMAIL: <b>dblanchard@SapphireSkies.net</b>

DATE OF APPLICATION: <b>7-15-09</b>	PRIORITY DATE: <b>July 31, 1903</b>
WATER SOURCE: <b>well</b>	CROP:
INSTANTANEOUS QUANTITY: <b>1.01 cfs</b>	ANNUAL QUANTITY: <b>101 AF, 55 AF consumptive use</b>
PERIOD OF USE: <b>Year round</b>	
PLACE OF USE: <b>The NE1/4 SE1/4 SW1/4 of Section 1</b>	PURPOSE OF USE: <b>Domestic use</b>
IRRIGATION METHOD:	

**CONSUMPTIVE USE CALCULATION:**

see below

**NARRATIVE DESCRIPTION OF PROJECT:**

Northland Resources (Northland) has been working with the Department of Ecology to utilize a mitigation water bank for new surface water and groundwater appropriations for its proposed developments in Kittitas County. (see attachment A) Northland will place into the State's Trust Water Rights Program (trust) existing water rights to create the mitigation water bank.

The Scatter Creek Resources, LCC (Pasco) water right, Court Claim No. 02223 is owned by Northland Resources and is one of three water rights currently being placed into the Trust program for the water bank. The water bank is consistent with WAC 173-539A. Northland Resources has requested this water right be placed into trust for instream flow until needed for mitigation.

Court Claim No. 02223 was originally a 1903 water right authorizing diversion for irrigation between May 1 and September 15. The water right was confirmed in the Conditional Final Order issued in Subbasin No. 2 (Easton), dated February 13, 1997 for the irrigation of 49 acres. The Court awarded .98 cfs for irrigation, .02 cfs year round domestic and .01 cfs year round for stockwater.

A Change request on this water right was filed with the Kittitas County Conservancy Board in May 2005. Requested changes included changing the point of diversion from a surface water source to a groundwater source and changing the period and purpose of use from seasonal irrigation to year-round domestic use for the Meadow Springs project, which is one of the pending Northland projects that will exercise a new water right based on mitigation from the water bank.. The change application was recommended for approval by the Conservancy Board on January 5, 2006 and subsequently modified and approved by Ecology on March 24, 2006.

The final approved change, as modified by Ecology, recognized historical water use of 98 afy for irrigation of 34 acres and an additional 3 afy for domestic and stockwater use. Of the 101 afy of total use, Ecology approved a consumptive use of 55 AF for domestic use. The Ecology approval is the final determination of beneficial and

consumptive use that will be used for placing the water right into trust.

2010-07

**WTWG CHECKLIST**

<b>1. Validity</b>	<b><i>Response</i></b>
Is there continued beneficial use history sufficient to ensure that the right has not been relinquished or abandoned?	<b><i>Yes</i></b>
Is it free of any “cloud” or claim on the title of the water right?	<b><i>Yes</i></b>
<b>2. Water Budget Neutrality</b>	
Is the transfer water budget neutral?	<b><i>Yes</i></b>
Is the transfer TWSA (Total Water Supply Available) neutral?	<b><i>Yes</i></b>
Does the transfer of the right result in equal or less consumptive use?	<b><i>Yes</i></b>
Can the transfer be made without detriment or injury to existing rights? (RCW 90.03.380(1))	<b><i>Yes</i></b>
<b>3. Timing and Availability</b>	
Temporary Transfers: If a seasonal transfer, can the transfer be implemented in the time remaining in the season?	<b><i>n/a</i></b>
Permanent Transfers: Is there a map of the fallowed land or discontinued use and can it be confirmed?	<b><i>Yes</i></b>
<b>4. Impairment of instream flow</b>	
Does the transfer cause no adverse change to instream flows?	<b><i>Yes</i></b>
Is all the water accounted for at Parker and Prosser (if applicable)?	<b><i>Yes</i></b>
<b>5. Operational Considerations</b>	
If the transfer relies on space in existing Reclamation storage, is storage capacity available?	<b><i>Yes</i></b>
Can the transfer be “bucketed”, with different rate and timing, without adverse impacts on other users and fish and other aquatic life?	<b><i>Yes</i></b>
Does the transfer have no impermissible impact on Yakima Project operations?	<b><i>Yes</i></b>
<b>6. For Transfers Between Surface Water and Ground Water</b>	
Can the hydrologic impacts of the transfer be accurately evaluated?	<b><i>Yes</i></b>
<b>7. Other considerations</b>	
Is the transfer in agreement with public policy?	<b><i>Yes</i></b>
Is the transfer free of unacceptable secondary effects – economic, environmental, or cultural?	<b><i>Yes</i></b>
Does the transfer not rely on return flow?	<b><i>Yes</i></b>