Policy Issue. Please add your own issues and rank						
accordingly. (* Denotes statutorily assigned to EQC).	Bean	Pomnichowski	Murphy	Hamlett **	McChesney	Average
CBM water use (HB575)	2	2	5	1	7	3.4
Water Right Enforcement (HB39)	1	5	1	9	9	5.0
DNRC Rules (permitting; other issues)*	5	7	8	4	2	5.2
Closed Basin Permitting (SB93; SB94)	9	4	2	5	8	5.6
General Permitting (HB40)	4	7	8	8	1	5.6
Ground Water Investigation Oversight (HB52)	11	1	2	3	11	5.6
Water-related subdivision issues (SB17)	7	3	7	9	3	5.8
Municipal Water Use (HB379; SB149)	3	7	6	9	6	6.2
State Water Plan Oversight (SB303)*	12	6	8	2	4	6.4
DEQ Rules (septic mixing zones; other issues)*	6	7	8	9	5	7.0
Adjudication Oversight*	8	7	3	9	12	7.8
Water Marketing	10	7	8	6	10	8.2
Implementation of Phosphorus Ban (SB200)	14	7	8	7	14	10.0
Nutrient Work Group Oversight (SB95)*	13	7	8	9	13	10.0

** Exempt wells also ranked 2		
NOTE: Sens. Barrett and Wanzenried repsonses attached. Not ncluded in average.		

specifics on my choices.

From: Sebby Barrett SD36

Water Policy Issue Priority Worksheet

This worksheet is intended to help WPIC members prioritize issues for study during the 2009-10 interim-The issues listed include some addressed by the 2008-09 WPIC as well as issues that came up during the 2009 session. Please add other issues and rank them accordingly. The WPIC report, the handbooks on water quality and water rights, and the list of 2009 legislation may provide ideas for study topics. Based on the priorities, staff will devise a work plan that will allow WPIC members to decide the amount of time and resources devoted to each issue.

		Ranking in	
	Policy Issue, Please add your own issues and rank accordingly. (*		
	Denglés statuté elly assigned la EQC)	Priority	
	2011 2 - 97 1011 10 7 7 1111 11 9 7 1 1111		
	Closed Basin Permitting (SB93; SB94)		
	General Permitting (HB40)		
	Adjudication Oversight* Water Right Enforcement (HB39)		•
	Water Marketing	2	
	DNRC Rules (permitting; other issues)*		
	DEQ Rules (septic mixing zones; other issues)*		
·	Water-related subdivision issues (SB17)		
	Ground Water Investigation Oversight (HB52)		
	State Water Plan Oversight (SB303)*	-	
	CBM water use (HB575)	<u> </u>	
	Implementation of Phosphorus Ban (SB200)		
	Nutrient Work Group Oversight (SB95)*		
	Municipal Water Use (HB379; SB149)		
		 	
		ļ	
	Navigable stream issues	1	
	(testing: title us recreation)		
			1
Protecting	Senior Water Rights	2	
J	(water leasings marketing)		
	Using MT. WATER CENTER FOR	3	
	studies & tescistich		
		 	
	WAC to send letter to DNRC stressing	4	
	importance of replacing John Tubbs		
·	with a person knowledgeste of my, water		
	laine and option		
		 	
		DEC	LIVEN
		 NE L	JEITEL
•			

JUN 0 8 2009

Kolman, Joe

From: Dave Wanzenried [daveew@gmail.com]

Sent: Saturday, June 13, 2009 9:31 AM

To: Kolman, Joe; McNutt, Walter; Everts, Todd; Chas Vincent

Subject: Priority worksheet

Good morning, Mr. Kolman.

Here are my priorities from the worksheet you provided in our packets. All of my priorities (and, yes, there are m,ore rankings than there were choices on your list) assume the maximum amount of coordination with EQC, so as to develop a coordinated, complementary work plan.

Following my rankings, I have provided a narrative concerning a broader look at water issues.

Administrative:

- 1. General permitting implementation oversight (HB 40), particularly "substantial credible evidence" criteria
- 2. Phosphorous Ban implementation oversight
- 3. Monitor SB 507 implementation, specifically issue DNRC list of meandering streams
- 4. Consumptive use rule implementation oversight
- 5. Ownership record update data base interface
- 6. Closed basin permitting

Water use:

- 1. Exempt wells
- 2. Water marketing examine initiatives in other states to develop tools in addition to the in-stream flow option
- 3. Coalbed methane water use
- 4. Ground water study oversight (HB 52)
- 5. Water plan oversight (SB 303)

I also recommend that the Committee devote time to developing a longer-term perspective than one interim. For example, planning and rulemaking may not always fit neatly into a two-year period. Expenditures for planning must continue beyond one biennium and should be regarded as investments. It should also try to develop guiding principles about studies and rulemaking to ensure senior water rights are safeguarded. Further, to the greatest extent possible, other legislators and the public need a distilled version of our proceedings and major findings as we go along.

There are long-term trends and initiatives that Montana should be cognizant of, most particularly the consequences of reduced stream flows, increased in-state demands for water and designs by other states (Missouri River Basin and Columbia River Basin) and the federal government (Bonneville Power Administration) for our water. We may want to consider having several hearings and invite those with a broad or specific perspective to testify.

Finally, the Committee's work and work products (including drafts) should be available on-line as much as possible. The water rights and adjudication processes seem to be a paper chase - - - I recommend that the Committee work diligently to avoid adding to it.

I apologize for taking liberties with your request for feedback.

Respectfully,

Dave Wanzenried Senate District #49 Missoula

Phone: 406-546-9442