

Water Transaction Checklist for Specific Water Transactions to Increase Tributary Flows

Instructions: The local entity should complete the following checklist as completely as possible when proposing a specific water transaction to the Columbia Basin Water Transactions Program (Columbia Basin WTP). Upon transaction completion, the checklist should be updated to reflect any changes to the transaction and a final version should be submitted to the Columbia Basin WTP.

Name of Transaction: **Beaver Creek, Salmon River above Alturus Lake Creek**
Local Entity Proposing Transaction: **Idaho Department of Water Resources**
Entity Contact Person on Transaction: **Bill Graham, IDWR**
Date Transaction Proposal Submitted to the Columbia Basin WTP: **2004**
Total Amount of Landowner Payment: **240.9 acres X \$20/acre= \$4,818**
Amount of Landowner Payment Requested from the Columbia Basin WTP: **\$4,818**
Principal Objective of the Transaction: **Adding up to 8.77 cfs of flow to Beaver Creek by leasing water rights from DOT L.L.P. water right numbers, 71-2091C, 71-2091D, 71-7008 and 71-7083. Will add 0.8 cfs to the Salmon above Alturus Lake Creek with 71-7009.**

ACCOUNTABILITY CRITERIA

1. Have the following documents been submitted to the Columbia Basin WTP as part of the proposal? If not, when will the document(s) be submitted?

- a. Contract with landowner detailing terms of the water right transaction:

Yes ☒ No ☐

Date Submitted: **1/20/04**

Comments:

- b. Water right certificate(s) included in the transaction.

Yes ☒ No ☐

Date Submitted: **1/20/04**

Comments:

- c. Application(s) submitted to the state water agency for transfer of the water right to instream flow (if applicable). **N/A**

Yes ☐ No ☐

Date Submitted:

Comments: **Water is being provided for instream flow through the IWRB Water Bank.**

- d. Approval order from the state water agency required to affect the transfer and change of use (or explanation as to how the water right will be protected instream without agency approval).

Yes ☒ No ☐

Date Submitted: **1/20/04**

Comments: **Approval is in the form of WRB water lease and rental documents.**

- e. A copy of a completed and signed National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) checklist submitted to Bonneville Power Administration.

Yes ☒ No ☐

Date Submitted: 1/20/04

Comments:

- f. Any other important documents to describe and record the transaction.

Yes ☐ No ☒

Date Submitted:

Comments:

2. What other information may assist the Columbia Basin WTP in evaluating this transaction or similar transactions in the future?

The lease is on an Upper Salmon Basin Watershed Project (USBWP) SHIPUSS high-priority stream for flow enhancement within an ESU.

ADMINISTRATIVE CRITERIA

3. How did the water right holder use the water before the transaction? Is there evidence that water right(s) to be acquired was put to beneficial use during the relevant time period set forth by your state's abandonment statute? **Irrigation. Yes; water rights were recognized in the Basin 71 Partial Decrees completed in 1999. Evidence of recent irrigation was observed during field inspections in 2003.**
4. When was the application for the transfer of the water right to instream flow submitted to the applicable state agency (or other authority)? If the application has not yet been filed, what is the projected application submission date? When is the state agency expected to approve the transfer and finalize the amount of water that will be allocated to instream flow? **Application was made to the Water Board's Water Bank in June 2003.**
5. Who will hold the water right once the water is secured for instream flow? **Idaho Water Resource Board**

HYDROLOGIC CRITERIA

6. What is the name of the stream(s) that will have increased instream flows as a result of the transaction? In what subbasin and watershed HUC is the stream(s) located? Please provide the NPCC Subbasin name and Watershed 5th Field HUC (10 digit) number. **Beaver Creek, Upper Salmon River Basin, HUC 1706020101**
7. What is the reach(es) of river that will benefit? (Please provide the approximate river mile of the upper and lower ends of the instream reach(es) and the Global Positioning System (GPS) coordinates of the existing point(s) of diversion.) **About one mile of**

Beaver Creek upstream from Salmon River confluence. Point of diversion coordinates

X 2435488.9100 Y 1413217.0000

Within Custer County. Note: Upper Salmon River about two miles will also benefit from Beaver Creek to Alturas Lake Creek confluence.

8. For what term will the transaction secure water for instream flow (e.g., two years, ten years, in perpetuity)? **One year with a good probability on affecting a permanent transaction following the current lease period.**
9. What is the priority date of the water right(s) secured for instream flow? What is the authorized period of use for the water right(s)? Is the water right(s) typically satisfied during this period of use each irrigation season? If not, what is the actual period of use before the water right(s) is restricted? **Water right number 71-2091C priority date 1/31/1964, 71-2091D priority date 1/31/1964, 71-7008 date is 5/4/1970 and 71-7083 (?) priority is 7/13/1982. The authorized period of use is May 1 to October 31. Any significant variation would be due to natural hydrologic conditions. These are the only water rights allowing diversion for irrigation on Beaver Creek. Salmon River water rights 71-7009 0.9 cfs.**
10. What is the proposed period of use of the instream right(s) (e.g., July 1st-September 30th)? **April 15 to October 15.** What is the period during which the benefits of the proposed use is most ecologically significant **May 1 through October 15.**
11. What is the rate in cfs that will be protectable instream? Will the established rate vary throughout the reach(es)? Will the established rate vary during the period of use? If so, describe the amount(s) by which the established rate will vary and the location and/or time of the variance. **The rate protected is 8.77 cfs, which may vary with the natural hydrograph. Instream flow rates in Beaver Creek will be gauged in the upcoming year. The Salmon River right 71-7009 will add ?? cfs to the river.**
12. What is the total quantity of water in acre-feet to be put instream during the term of the transaction? Will the established duty vary throughout the reach(es)? If so, describe the amount(s) by which the established duty will vary and the location of the variance. If the transaction is for more than one year, please give an annual quantity in acre-feet (show calculation). **IDWR standard for this area is 3.0 afa/a for a total of 240.9 acres = 722.7 acre feet per annum.**
13. What percentage increase of the historical base flow will the acquired water provide in the primary reach during the instream period of use? What percentage of the minimum biological flow target will the acquired water provide in the primary reach during the instream period of use? (A range is acceptable.) **Will add about 8.77 CFS to Beaver Creek which would be likely the full flow in the summer. Historical base flow will be estimated over the next year using the MIKE Basin model with a Rainfall/Runoff component. The biological targets of lower Beaver Creek and**

the Salmon River between Smiley and Beaver Creeks will be determined in 2004 by the USGS using PHABSIM.

BIOLOGICAL CRITERIA

14. What are the species name and ESA status (endangered, threatened) of the anadromous fish, specifically Evolutionary Significant Units (ESUs), expected to benefit by the increased flow? What life stages of the fish present will benefit from the increased flows? **Bull trout, ESA Threatened, all life stages; steelhead, ESA Threatened, all life stages; spring chinook salmon, ESA threatened, all life stages would benefit.**
15. What other fish (i.e., Distinct Population Segment) and wildlife species are expected to benefit? How? **Westslope cutthroat and redband trout, species of special concern, all life stages would benefit. Wildlife species including large mammals would benefit.**
- ~~16.~~ (?) How is water quality expected to improve as a result of the transaction **Higher flows will enhance stream habitat quality and should reduce water temperature in the summer.**
17. What is the current condition of the riparian zone and stream channel in the affected reach(es)? Are there other projects planned or in effect to address degraded riparian areas or stream habitat? Include photographs of the affected reach(es), with a listing of the approximate river mile of the site. **Riparian vegetation in the affected reach is fair. Some effects from grazing are evident through the place of use. We will work with the USBWP, the Custer SWCD and the Sawtooth SNRA to implement riparian habitat protection measures.**
18. Do the riparian zone and stream channel have the immediate potential to create additional high quality fish and wildlife habitat with the increase in stream flow? If high quality habitat is not immediately available, what are the other limiting factors (e.g. passage, stream temperature, etc.)? **Yes.**
19. Is the stream reach fenced to create a riparian buffer? If so, what are the set-back distances from the stream? **No.**

INNOVATION CRITERIA

20. Name what tool(s) and/or strategies were used in developing this transaction? **This transaction was first discussed in the 2003 as an opportunity to coordinate with the USBR under RPA 149. If this transaction can be implemented on a permanent basis, USBR will not have to design and install diversion works, thereby conserving RPA 149 funds.**
21. Explain what new information has been learned by use of these tool(s) and/or strategies? **As more of these projects are done, word of mouth and public contacts result in more landowners coming forward willing to participate. We**

have a strong possibility of collaborating with the USBR in RPA 149 priority basins.

22. What is:

- a. total cost of the water to be acquired; **\$5,353**
- b. total amount paid to the water right holder from all funding sources; **\$4,818**
- c. amount of landowner payment requested from the Columbia Basin WTP; **\$4,818**
- d. estimated transaction costs related to this transaction and the portion (in \$) of these costs paid by BPA; **\$535**
- e. total cost of the transaction (water cost and transaction costs). **\$5,353**

23. What method was used for determining the value of the water right? **Production value of land to be irrigated.**

24. What incentive(s) motivated the water right holder to enter into the transaction? **Desire to leave water instream for fish.**

MONITORING CRITERIA

25. How will the increases in flow be documented and monitored? **Stream Gauges in Beaver Creek and the Salmon River (the Salmon River gauge is approved, and will be installed this spring).**

26. How will benefits to fish and/or wildlife be documented and monitored? **Photo points will show riparian habitat impacts. Aerial photography and satellite imagery to monitor compliance.**

27. How will increases in water quality be documented and monitored? **Beaver Creek and the Salmon River in that reach are not listed as water quality impaired. However, some water quality data may be collected by the USGS through its Upper Salmon flow characterization studies.**
Please provide key contact information if another agency, program, or individual will be collecting and evaluating the flow, biological and water quality data)

28. Is the anticipated increase in streamflow sufficiently great to alter the physical shape of stream beds and floodplains? If so, have factors such as bank erosion, flooding, and other effects of streamflow change been taken into account for both their positive and negative impacts for fish and wildlife and related water uses? **The floodplains of the Salmon River and Beaver Creek should not be altered. Bank erosion will not be a problem. Natural flows may have a positive effect in reshaping the stream channel in Beaver Creek.**

WATERSHED CONTEXT *(To be provided by a QLE once annually for each subbasin in which they are completing transactions.)*

- ~~29.~~ What does the Northwest Power and Conservation Council's relevant Subbasin Plan state regarding instream flows and water transactions in the watershed? **The NWPPC Subbasin Plan for the Upper Salmon is not yet completed. However this stream is rated as high priority for flow enhancement by the USBWP.**
30. Are there other existing watershed assessments or comprehensive planning efforts under which your water transactions are being implemented? If so, please describe the assessment(s) and/or effort(s). **N/A**
31. Have regulatory instream or minimum flows been set in the watershed or are there other limitations on new appropriations (i.e., has the basin been closed to new appropriations)? **No instream or minimum flows have been established in the Stanley Basin. The IDWR Upper Salmon River Basin Plan will likely include recommendations for new instream flows.**
32. What kind of water resource planning efforts is ongoing in the basin, if any? What is the status of those efforts? Are those efforts attempting to address instream flows? **IDWR's Basin planning efforts are starting this year in the Upper Salmon River Basin.**
33. Are the benefits anticipated from water transactions part of or tied to other habitat improvement projects in the watershed? If so, please describe the relationship and briefly describe the other projects necessary to achieve the habitat goals **The USBWP is doing habitat improvement projects throughout the Upper Salmon River Basin. We will work with the land owners and the USBWP to investigate implementation of habitat protection measures.**