



ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY COUNCIL

PO BOX 201704
HELENA, MONTANA 59620-1704
(406) 444-3742

GOVERNOR BRIAN SCHWEITZER
DESIGNATED REPRESENTATIVE
MIKE VOLESKY

HOUSE MEMBERS
DEBBY BARRETT
NORMA BIXBY
SUE DICKENSON
CHRISTOPHER HARRIS
WALTER MCNUTT
JIM PETERSON

SENATE MEMBERS
LANE LARSON
GREG LIND
DANIEL MCGEE
JIM SHOCKLEY
ROBERT STORY
MICHAEL WHEAT

PUBLIC MEMBERS
BRIAN CEBULL
KRIS KOK
BUZZ MATTELIN
DOUGLAS MCRAE

COUNCIL STAFF
KRISTA LEE EVANS, Research Analyst
JOE KOLMAN, Research Analyst
CYNTHIA PETERSON, Secretary
TODD EVERTS, Legislative Environmental Analyst

STUDY SUBCOMMITTEE MINUTES

Thursday, March 16, 2006
State Capitol, Room 137

Please Note: These are outlined minutes with audio recording. These minutes provide abbreviated information about committee discussion, public testimony, action taken, and other activities.

COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT

SEN. ROBERT STORY
REP. WALTER MCNUTT, CHAIR
REP. SUE DICKENSON, VICE CHAIR
MR. BUZZ MATTELIN

STAFF PRESENT

KRISTA LEE EVANS, Research Analyst
LEANNE KURTZ, Research Analyst
DIANE MCDUFFIE, Secretary

ATTACHMENTS

Agenda ([Attachment 1](#))
Roll Call ([Attachment 2](#))
Visitor's List

COMMITTEE ACTION

- ▶ Recommended the HJR 10 working group provide recommendations by the May 18th meeting.

- ▶ Recommended changing the \$40,000 appropriation in LC8989 to a biennial appropriation
- ▶ Recommended circulating bill LC7777 for further comments and delay action until the next meeting
- ▶ Recommended finalizing the Contract Timber Harvest Proposed Bill and present it to the full EQC
- ▶ Recommended EQC continue to update the Water Adjudication Chronology

CALL TO ORDER AND ROLL CALL

Chairman McNutt called the meeting of the Environmental Quality Council Study Subcommittee to order at 8:30 a.m. on Thursday, March 16, 2006. Secretary noted the roll. **(Attachment #2)**

ADMINISTRATIVE MATTERS

Senator Story noted on page 9 of the minutes, the word time should be changed to timber.

MOTION: Senator Story moved the minutes of the January 26, 2006 meeting be approved with the correction noted above. **VOTE:** Motion carried unanimously.

(Tape 1; Side A)

HJR 10 WORK GROUP UPDATE

Leanne Kurtz, LSD, provided a brief update on the HJR 10 fire study work group and as mentioned in her memo to the subcommittee dated February 16, 2006 (**Exhibit 1**), after the statute review has been completed proposed legislation will be drafted and sent to the subcommittee members by May 3, 2006. The final meeting of the work group is April 4, 2006. The work group has also discussed various approaches to address problems associated with the wildland urban interface.

Panel Discussion

Members of the HJR 10 fire study work group and additional participants discussed wildland urban interface, problems that residential development in the interface presents to wildfire suppression agencies, and potential legislative solutions. Ms. Kurtz provided a handout outlining questions for the panelists to address and options for EQC subcommittee discussion. (**Exhibit 2**)

Panelists: Debra Foley, Forest Owners Association; Ted Mead, Chief, DNRC Fire & Aviation Management Bureau; Dave Larsen, Chair, Tri-County Fire Working Group; Steve Larson, Fire Chief, City of Helena; Don Lorenzen, State Farm Insurance; Bob Harrington, State Forester, DNRC; Collin Bangs, developer; and Michael Kakuk, Montana Building Industry.

Bob Harrington, State Forester, DNRC, provided a power point presentation on The Wildland-Urban Interface in Montana. (**Exhibit 3**) Mr. Harrington's presentation provided background

information on wildland urban interface (WUI), DNRC Wildfire suppression costs for FY 1996-2005 and the following legislative options:

- ▶ Planning/Policy (HJR10)
 - State Fire Policy
 - Mandatory but flexible planning regulations
 - Reinforce community Wildfire planning
- ▶ Effective Initial Attack
 - Funding for State and Local Govt. Resources
- ▶ Fuel Reduction
 - Incentives for Home and Landowner's ,
 - Support Active Forest Management on all ownerships

Ted Mead, Chief, DNRC Fire & Aviation Bureau, discussed issues regarding firefighter & public safety, tactics, increased complexity and expectations, increased costs, loss of property and other resources, fire mitigation options, and the National Fire Plan in Montana.

(Tape 1; Side B)

Ms. Kurtz provided a handout on Sampling of Legislative Treatment of Wildfire Mitigation in the Wildland-Urban Interface Utah, Oregon, Arizona, California. **(Exhibit 4)** Ms. Kurtz provided a brief summary of each states' statutory responses to wildfire mitigation in the wildland-urban interface. In conclusion, the approaches each state has taken to address wildland fire mitigation and suppression differ in their degrees of restriction, the sanctions used to achieve compliance, and in how standards are developed and implemented.

Dave Larsen, Chair, Tri-County Fire Working Group, discussed the sources of money available to mitigate fire in the wildland urban interface and the problems in obtaining those funds. The Tri-County Fire working group serves the people of Lewis and Clark, Broadwater and Jefferson Counties. The working group started competing for grants in 1999 and over the past six years successfully obtained grants from DES, DNRC and BLM. Mr. Larsen said at some point the group may want to send a letter regarding legislative options.

Debra Foley, Forest Owners Association, provided a power point presentation on some issues and problems associated with wildland urban interface and a handout on Wildfire in Montana: Potential hazard reduction and economic effects of a strategic treatment program. **(Exhibit 5)**.

Major points discussed were:

- ▶ Forest conditions
- ▶ Massive fuels
- ▶ No forest fuels reduction requirements for new subdivisions

- ▶ Responsibility for forest management should be applied to all ownerships, public and private

Suggestions/Solutions:

- ▶ Prevention
- ▶ Education
- ▶ Incentives

Steven Larsen, Fire Chief, City of Helena, stated that whatever solutions examined need to be broad enough to cover all different types of wildland urban interface. Mr. Larsen agreed there are tools in place and grant resources available. However, more needs to be done in prevention.

Don Lorenzen, State Farm Insurance, provided the following proposals:

- ▶ suggest legislators work through the insurance commissioner to offer credits or debits for complying or noncomplying with fire mitigation efforts
- ▶ approach homeowners in wildfire threatened areas to seek mitigation services and offer information and provide referrals
- ▶ suggest his company change guidelines to require homeowners associations to participate in a community wildfire protection plan (CWPP)

Collin Bangs, developer, addressed the following problems associated with residential development in wildland urban interface:

- ▶ permit process is difficult and unpredictable
- ▶ lack of zoning in WUI areas
- ▶ problems with access
- ▶ water problems
- ▶ wildlife habitat
- ▶ wildfire danger

Michael Kakuk, Montana Building Industry, stated that local governments have plenty of authority. What is lacking is clarity on how the different statutes work together. MBIA is seeking clarity on the existing authority and how that can best be structured to regulate growth or development and expanding the work group to include local governments.

Rep. Dickenson asked in what way are land owners in WUI being penalized.

Ms. Foley said she was referring to the idea that land owners in WUI be assessed as an individual group. By identifying the WUI it may be interpreted that they should pay more. Identifying the WUI is difficult and it is a landscape issue that affects everyone and the whole community benefits

Rep. Dickenson asked if there are requirements within the city limits on the sort of homes that can be built that are surrounded by trees.

Mr. Larsen stated that the City of Helena is working on creating some requirements but currently there are not any.

Sen. Story asked if state law or insurance commissioner rules make it difficult for an insurance company to offer credits or debits on insurance premiums.

Mr. Lorenzen said to his knowledge, there is nothing to say that insurance companies can't do that.

Sen. Story said he is not in favor of developing new legislation on this issue. He also said he is more interested in Mr. Kakuk's discussion on uniformity.

Mr. Kakuk said that MBIA is committed to continuing to work on this issue over the interim to ensure effective and efficient fire protection consistently and predictably.

Rep. Dickenson asked if the deadline is extended, would that be sufficient time for the working group to provide legislation.

Ms. Kurtz said she thinks it is possible. The work group has a meeting scheduled for May 4th and at that time would have a better idea of whether or not they will have recommendations for the subcommittee to consider at the July meeting.

Rep. Dickenson said she would be interested in allowing the subcommittee's schedule to be flexible and see what the work group decides at their May meeting.

Chairman McNutt expressed concern regarding the public comment period due to time constraints for the remainder of the interim.

Ms. Evans explained that there are two meetings scheduled for this subcommittee. If the deadline is extended the subcommittee may have to give the public comment period. If the work group provided recommendations at the July meeting there would not be an opportunity for the subcommittee to meet again to make a final decision.

Ms. Kurtz suggested the work group continue to work on a recommendation for the May 18th meeting. If the work group can not provide a recommendation by the May 18th meeting and if the group wants to continue they can take future recommendations to the Local Government Subcommittee.

APPROPRIATIONS 101

Barbara Smith, Associate Fiscal Analyst, LFD, discussed her report on Budgeting Basics. (**Exhibit 6**) Ms. Smith gave a detailed explanation of the appropriations process from analysis to implementation. Her report included information on subcommittee role and structure, HB 2, constructing and acting on the budget, appropriations, statewide present law adjustments, new proposals, and decision packages.

(Tape 2; Side B)

MONTANA UNIVERSITY SYSTEM AND COMMON SCHOOLS

Krista Evans, LSD, explained that at the last meeting the subcommittee requested information from the Office of the Commissioner of Higher Education (OCHE) and the Office of Public Instruction (OPI) on issues related to the administrative assessments from Montana trust lands. Both offices provided memos outlining their thoughts on this issue. (Exhibits 7 and 8)

Leslie Taylor, Legal Counsel for Montana State University (MSU), referred to the memo from Commissioner Stearns dated March 8, 2006 on Comparison of Common Schools and University Trusts . (**Exhibit 7**). Her memo provides a comparison of the legal language that establishes each type of trust and distribution of trust proceeds as it relates to the appropriation to the Montana University System. Ms. Taylor explained that in the Enabling Act there are separate sections that address the common school trusts vs. the university trust and those sections have different language in them. What each of the different language means has not been determined in any court cases, so for the most part, is up to interpretation. She also explained the distribution of trust income is not co-mingled with the appropriation to the Montana University System and is instead distributed directly to the beneficiary institution. Each of the beneficiary institutions has pledged its trust income to the repayment of bonds issued for the construction of campus buildings or acquisition of major equipment. If there are any proceeds left over they are used for operations of the revenue producing facilities.

Krathy Bramer, OPI, School Trust Lands staffer, said there is an existing Attorney General's opinion, an affirmation of that opinion, and a letter of counsel, all of which affirm the current DNRC practice of deducting reasonable costs of managing the trusts on behalf of the beneficiaries. Attached to Ms. Bramer's memo (**Exhibit 8**) is a chart prepared by Roger Lloyd from the Legislative Fiscal Division, (**Exhibit 9**) that shows how the state trust lands revenue flows through OPI to become part of the Base Aid that is then distributed to schools. Ms. Bramer explained that the FY 2006 estimate of distributable revenue available for Base Aid is shown in the chart as \$56.85 million. This revenue flows through the Guarantee Account and offsets the total state direct aid appropriation to K-12 public schools. The annual payment from the trusts represents generally less than 10 percent of the total Base Aid distributed to schools. Revenues from trust land timber harvests for the first 18 million board feet in a year are also directed to the Guarantee Account. However, revenue generated above 18 million board feet in the same year

are distributed to schools on a roughly per-student basis for the purpose of education technology and services in addition to Base Aid payments.

Rep. Dickenson asked for clarification on OPI's position.

Ms. Bramer said that OPI does not have a problem with the way the current assessment is being done.

Sen. Story asked if the university system has administrative fees supported by general fund instead of the trust can that legally be supported.

Ms. Taylor said it is legally defensible because the Enabling Act specifically refers to payment to the public schools after deduction of all expenses incident to the lands and a recent supreme court decision determined that there was no violation of the Constitution by distribution of the land grant proceeds as part of the appropriation, since the appropriation was larger than the distribution. Ms. Taylor also said both Attorney General's opinions, Forest Anderson and Robert Woodahl deal specifically with common schools Enabling Act sections 10 and 11 and not the university system.

Mr. Mattelin asked if there is a benefit for a student at a university that has more trust lands than at a university that doesn't have trust lands or is it equalized.

Craig Roloff, Vice-president, Administration and Finance, MSU-Bozeman, said all the campuses keep separate funds for separate purposes. The Regents equalize funding for campuses based on what they believe is equitable with the general education funds but not with other funds. Bozeman receives more land grant money than Missoula but it's not equalized. Missoula receives more football ticket money than Bozeman and it's not equalized. Over time each campus accommodates their set of operations based on the various sources and amounts of revenues they receive for the other programs.

Sen. Story asked if the decision to use the revenue from the trust for bond services was made by the Regents or the campus.

Mr. Roloff said it was made sometime ago by the Regents.

Sen. Story asked if it is a perpetual obligation of the trust or is there a point in time when it is revisited.

Mr. Roloff said that there are several issues and series that will be retired between 15 and 20 years so that possibility would exist.

MORRILL ACT

Krista Evans, LSD, explained that included in the mailing was the revised bill draft LC8989 (**Exhibit 10**) prepared by Mr. Petesch. The bill exempts the ability to use revenues from Morrill Act land for administrative purposes and includes a statutory appropriation for \$40,000 each fiscal year.

Tom Schultz, Administrator, DNRC, commented that the \$40,000 is a ten year average. He recommended that the amount in statute be changed a biennial appropriation.

Sen. Story asked if DNRC had a timber sale would the \$40,000 appropriation be adequate to cover administration costs.

Mr. Schultz said it may not be. The department would need to forecast in advance of the session and build the cost into the budget request.

Sen. Story asked if the money can be carried forward if only a portion is used in the first biennium.

Ms. Smith said 30 percent can move forward as long as it is consistent with the goals and objective of the agency.

(Tape 3;Side A)

Ms. Smith said that DNRC, could through HB 2, ask for additional one-time-only to cover the timber sale.

Rep. Dickenson asked for clarification regarding the authority to carryforward any unexpended portion of the appropriation in bill draft LC8989.

Ms. Evans explained that if the bill is silent then the amount carried forward is 30 percent. In LC8989 the bill states "any unexpended amount".

Rep. Dickenson asked if anyone would like to comment on putting a cap on the amount carried forward.

Ms. Smith said as the fund balance grows the question would need to be asked does the appropriation grow with it. Any concern about what is growing in the fund would be an issue for the LFD as part of the budget analysis.

With no objections from the subcommittee, the bill will be changed to reflect Mr. Schultz's recommendation that the amount be a biennial appropriation.

Sen. Story asked if there is a reporting mechanism in place for how and when the money is used and is it being used for the purpose it was appropriated.

Ms. Evans explained that the state has the fiduciary responsibility to fund DNRC adequately so the department can meet the fiduciary responsibility to the beneficiaries of the trust. If the appropriation is not statutorily appropriated it is then up to the discretion of future legislators as to how much money DNRC will get to administer those lands.

Ms. Smith explained that there is some structure in the state accounting system to address Sen. Story's concerns. When the appropriation is established it will roll into the state accounting system as a statutory appropriation and organizational units can be set-up to ensure that it is used only for Morrill administration.

Chairman McNutt asked if the department is not anticipating a timber sale in this biennium.

Mr. Schultz stated the department has not looked at this biennium because this is not standard practice yet, but it would be prudent for them to do so, and the department will. If a supplemental is needed it will be built into their budget request.

Ms. Evans discussed two outstanding issues with the Morrill Act that were discussed at the last meeting and does the subcommittee wish to move forward.

- ▶ repayment of the funds that have been taken from Morrill Act over the years
- ▶ repayment to the other trusts that absorbed the administrative costs after 2003-2005

The total amount for 2003, 2004, and 2005 is \$244,899.90.

Mr. Schultz told the subcommittee that the department does not have a general fund appropriation for FY 06 and 07.

Rep. Dickenson asked if the Governor has authority to designate expenditures for FY 06 and 07.

Ms. Smith said in the past the Governor has used his emergency powers. However, she did not think this would be within his purview to grant an appropriation authority because the legislature is the appropriating body of Government.

Ms. Smith said there is the ability to do a program transfer but because of fire season DNRC may not have any excess general fund.

No action was taken on this issue.

DNRC TRUST LANDS ADMINISTRATION - ALTERNATIVE FUNDING SCHEME

Krista Evans, LSD, explained that at the last subcommittee meeting, DNRC suggested a different way of receiving administrative money from the trust and because it was fairly complex, the subcommittee requested that the DNRC proposal be put in a bill draft format. Ms. Evans worked with DNRC to develop the bill (LC7777). ([Exhibit 11](#)) LC7777 eliminates multiple accounts, puts all the administrative money into the Trust Land Administration Account (TAC) up to 15 percent of gross revenues subject to appropriation by the Legislature, includes the exemptions for the Morrill Act, and on page 4, section 4 the term "revenue" is defined.

Ms. Evan's memo dated February 24, 2006 identifies issues for the subcommittee to consider and a list of multiple sections of statute being repealed. ([Exhibit 12](#)) Some of the issues raised deal with distributable revenue vs. money that goes into the permanent fund, where revenue received from the trust goes first, and whether or not the 15 percent is taken from all money received or is it a formula being used.

Ms. Evans provided two handouts prepared by Barbara Smith, LFD, that shows Proposed Trust Land Administration Financing FY2004 Revenues, and FY 06 and FY 07 Appropriations ([Exhibit 13](#)) and an Analysis of the 15 percent funding. ([Exhibit 14](#))

Tom Schultz, Administrator, Trust Land Management Division, explained the intent of the bill was to simplify the trust land accounts by eliminating 5 of the 7 accounts. Mr. Schultz discussed each of the issues presented and provided in a memo from DNRC dated February 24, 2006, proposed edits to section 77-1-109 to clarify revenue processing. ([Exhibit 15](#)) Mr. Schultz explained that the TAC account which funds 55 to 60 percent of operations is based on the balance on the permanent fund and nothing to do with distributable revenue and suggested the 15 percent be a calculation across the revenue coming in. The TAC account gives broad discretion as to how the revenues are spent and if additional oversight is needed the department would not be opposed.

Sen. Story asked if the department is over assessing other trusts by not tapping the permanent account and is oil and gas revenue evenly distributed across the trusts.

Mr. Schultz referred to SB 495 enacted by the 2001 Legislature ([Exhibit 16](#)), which resulted in the sale of mineral royalties from the common school trust over 30 years to DNRC for \$138 million. He explained that the department is paying back debt with the non-distributable revenue. Table 2 of the 2005 Annual Report shows how much was paid in debt service ([Exhibit 17](#)).

(Tape 3; Side B)

Sen. Story asked which program assumes the greater cost and are other programs subsidizing the management of forested lands.

Mr. Schultz said that the forest management program bears a larger share of the cost. The timber sale program is partially funded out of the TAC account.

Senator Story asked if 15 percent is enough to cover administrative costs.

Mr. Schultz referred to the analysis prepared by Ms. Smith (Exhibit 13) that shows the budget for FY 06, less the forest improvement account at \$8.4 million, or 11.5 percent. He also referred to Tables 3, 4 and 5 of the Annual Report. (Exhibits [18](#), [19](#), and [20](#))

The subcommittee agreed to circulate the bill draft for further comments and delay action until the next meeting.

STATEWIDE LAND MANAGEMENT ISSUES

Krista Evans, LSD, explained that she and Barbara Smith, LFD, received multiple information requests from legislators addressing various issues associated with state land management. Staff identified issues that raised some questions, thus the reason for the memo sent jointly to members of the EQC and LFC dated February 16, 2006. ([Exhibit 21](#)) It was not the intent of staff to infer or say that anybody was doing anything wrong, more an opportunity for the committees to become more informed.

Barbara Smith, LFD said the Legislative Finance Committee appointed a working group to look at the issues raised. Members of the working group are: Sen. Cooney, Chairman; Sen. Williams; Sen. Laible; and Rep. Ripley. The LFC would also be in favor of an EQC study group.

SURFACE WATER/GROUND WATER UPDATE

Mary Sexton, Director, DNRC provided a power point presentation on the activities of the Surface Water/Ground Water Work Group ([Exhibit 22](#)). Her presentation included information on work group concerns, membership, issues background information, and recommendations.

The four topics the work group addressed are:

1. appropriation of ground water in closed basins
2. augmentation
3. changes to basin closure statutes; and
4. exemptions to permit process

Exemptions to the permit process are still under consideration.

Sen. Story asked if the recommendations for augmentation is for closed basins only.

Director Sexton said augmentation with time will be a statewide issue. In closed basins there would be other specific language particularly mitigating surface water depletions in the affected reach.

Mr. Stults, Administrator, Water Resources Division, explained that the group worked on the flow rate issue and builders and realtors indicated there are certain sprinkler systems and hydrants that require as much as 35 GPM. The more critical element is volume and how many exemptions are being used in a concentrated area .

Rep Dickenson asked how the legislation will be enforced.

Mr. Stults said the legislation is self enforcing because it is for new applications for new water rights. The bigger problem is how to administer existing water rights.

Public Comment

John Youngberg, Montana Farm Bureau representative, agreed there are some areas where there is consensus. The lack of consensus is in regards to the exemptions. MFBF members will not have an opportunity to review the recommendations until June and won't vote until November.

Mike Murphy, Montana Water Resources Association representative, also mentioned the lack of consensus in regards to exemptions and that long-term implications with augmentation needs to be addressed in statute. The MWRA members meet in July and that will be the first time for them to discuss the recommendations. .

Mick Seaburg, Work Group member, said the group needs more time to reach an agreement. The Gallatin County Agricultural Irrigation Association strongly support the recommendations.

Jay Bonner, Montana Stock Growers Association, said he would like the group to continue working on the issues. He also expressed concern with the assumption of depletion to surface water. MSGA also has a mid year meeting in June and their final meeting is in December.

Mike McLane, Work Group Facilitator, appearing as a private citizen, provided background information on the Upper Clark Fork River Basin closure and mitigating depletions in closed basins.

Rep. McNutt recommended the work group continue to work on getting a consensus and provide a bill draft to the full EQC in September. If the issues are resolved prior to the May meeting a conference call can be arranged.

(Tape 4; Side B)

CONTRACT TIMBER HARVEST WORK GROUP UPDATE

Krista Evans, LSD, explained that the Draft White Paper for HJR 33 (Exhibit 21) was included in the mailout. Ms. Evans introduced David Groeschl, Forest Management Bureau Chief for Trust Lands, DNRC to provide an update.

Mr. Groeschl provided a handout outlining the current method of selling timber stumpage, contract logging in Washington, a summary of white paper, proposed legislation and potential benefits of contract logging. (Exhibit 22)

Rep. Dickenson asked how this has affected sustainability of the resource in Washington.

Mr. Groeschl said they have repeatedly indicated they get better results by being able to control the harvesting and marketing the materials.

Rep. McNutt asked if the department is obligated to do this to uphold their fiduciary responsibility.

Mr. Groeschl said one of the main reason to bring this legislation forward is to have the opportunity to evaluate this approach on trust lands because of the fiduciary responsibility to maximize the long term revenue to the trust as well as our stewardship responsibility in managing those resources for the long term.

Tom Schultz referred to page 12 of the white paper which states "The DNRC has a constitutional duty to investigate ways to increase returns to the various land trusts they manage." This was written by Dave Jackson and his personal view is that this approach to timber disposal will increase the returns to the trust fund.

Mr. Mattelin asked how many different trusts are represented.

Mr. Schultz said there are 9 trusts that have some portion of forested lands. The accounting per trust that would be required for this would be no different but there would be more accounting for the species and specs being sold.

Mr. Mattelin asked about the risk and if the department could lose money.

Mr. Groeschl said it is important for the department to develop criteria on which sites the contract harvesting would apply. The potential risk is there.

Public Comment

Ellen Engstedt, Montana Wood Products Association representative, said she has members in her association that feel strongly both ways. One thing that may draw support is the cap at 10 percent. The mills are constantly looking for sources and the state has been a good source.

Kathy Bramer, OPI said she sees this as an opportunity not only to potentially generate more revenue for the trust and to improve the competency base and utilize the competency base as well that exists within the trust land management division, but also to increase their ability to address long term goals on land management, improving the forest resource that generates money and meets the land management goals for the state trust.

Tom Schultz commented that Washington has seen an increase in the number of bidders. This may afford more internal local competition.

The subcommittee recommended finalizing the bill and presenting it to the full EQC.

"UPDATED" WATER ADJUDICATION CHRONOLOGY

Krista Evans, LSD, presented the revised Chronology of Montana's Water Adjudication From 1973-2006. ([Exhibit 23](#)) This document provides a chronology of how the adjudication process has evolved and some of the challenges it has faced over the years.

Sen. Story recommended Ms. Evans continue to update the document and provide an electronic copy on the EQC website.

DISCUSSION ON DRAFT FINDINGS/RECOMMENDATIONS

Krista Evans, LSD explained that included in the mailing was the EQC Study Subcommittee Draft Findings and Recommendations worksheet ([Exhibit 24](#)) and a copy of the 2005-2006 EQC Study Subcommittee Final Work Plan ([Exhibit 25](#)). The purpose of these documents is to gather findings and recommendations for each of the primary topics from the work plan and to prepare the subcommittee's draft report which is due in May.

PUBLIC COMMENT

None

OTHER BUSINESS

None

INSTRUCTIONS TO STAFF

Ms. Evans will draft a report and send to subcommittee members for their comments. The report will be updated to reflect comments and be provided at the next meeting.

ADJOURN

Meeting adjourned 5:10