


**BEFORE THE DEPARTMENT OF  
NATURAL RESOURCES AND CONSERVATION  
OF THE STATE OF MONTANA**

\* \* \* \* \*

APPLICATION TO CHANGE WATER RIGHT NO. 40S 30069034 BY the City of Glasgow	) ) )	<b>PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION TO GRANT CHANGE</b>
---	-------------	--

\* \* \* \* \*

On May 29, 2014, the City of Glasgow (Applicant) submitted Application to Change Water Right No. 40S 30069034 to change Beneficial Water Use Permit No. 40S 31725-00 to the Glasgow Regional Office of the Department of Natural Resources and Conservation (Department or DNRC). The Department published receipt of the Application on its website. The Department sent the Applicant a deficiency letter under §85-2-302, Montana Code Annotated (MCA), dated June 27, 2014. The Applicant responded with information dated September 8, 2014. The Application was determined to be correct and complete as of September 12, 2014. An Environmental Assessment for this Application was completed on September 22, 2014.



## INFORMATION

The Department considered the following information submitted by the Applicant.

### Application as filed:

- Form 606
- Temporary Change Addendum
- Supplemental information attachments
- Maps showing:
  - Historic place of use and proposed additional place of use
  - Proposed pipeline routes and households served in additional place of use
  - Engineering map of pipeline size for distribution network
  - Point of diversion and conveyance pipeline to water treatment plant
- Compact Disc (CD)
  - Sewage treatment plant records
  - DPRWA Phase 3 design report
  - Maps
  - Water treatment plant intake records

### Information Received after Application Filed:

- Deficiency Response dated September 8, 2014

### Information within the Department's Possession/Knowledge

- Existing water right file
- Environmental Assessment dated September 22, 2014.

The Department has fully reviewed and considered the Environmental Assessment and evidence and argument submitted with this Application and **preliminarily determines** pursuant to the Montana Water Use Act (Title 85, chapter 2, parts 3 and 4, MCA) as follows.

## WATER RIGHTS TO BE CHANGED

### FINDINGS OF FACT

1. The City of Glasgow seeks to add an additional place of use to the following water right:

<b>WR Number</b>	<b>Purpose</b>	<b>Flow Rate (GPM)</b>	<b>Volume (AF)</b>	<b>Period of Use</b>	<b>Point of Diversion</b>	<b>Priority Date</b>
40S 31725-00	Municipal	2,552	1,715	January 1- December 31	NWSENW Section 26, T27N, R41E, Valley County	2/13/1981

The Places of Use for Provisional Permit 40S 31725-00 are as follows:

E2SE Section 2, T28N, R39E, Valley County

S2 Section 1, T28N, R39E, Valley County

E2 Section 11, T28N, R39E, Valley County

Section 12, T28N, R39E, Valley County

N2N2NW Section 13, T28N, R39E, Valley County

W2 Section 7, T28N, R40E, Valley County

SWSESW Section 6, T28N, R40E, Valley County

2. Provisional Permit 40S 31725-00 is a water right for municipal use of surface water from the Missouri River. The City of Glasgow also has multiple Statements of Claim which are for municipal use of groundwater. The surface water and groundwater rights are associated to each other in that they share the same places of use; however, the municipal system has only used surface water diverted under Provisional Permit 40S 31725-00 since the treatment plant was completed in 1988. Groundwater quality in the Glasgow area is poor, requiring treatment for dissolved solids. Once the City received a Provisional Permit for surface water the groundwater treatment plant was decommissioned and replaced with a surface water treatment plant. During a phone conversation on October 15, 2014, Robert Kompel, the Director of Public Works for the City of Glasgow, confirmed that the groundwater wells are not directly hooked up to the municipal water system. The groundwater wells are not approved for use by the Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ), nor are they required to be maintained as a back-up for the

municipal system by DEQ. Additionally, if surface water and groundwater were to be pumped at the same time, there would be issues of cross-contamination in the system.

3. Since Provisional Permit 40S 31725-00 is the only right being used for Glasgow's municipal system, it is the only right being changed. Measurement records provided by the Applicant are measurements of surface water used in their municipal system. Groundwater Certificate 40O 5934-00 was mentioned in the application; water is used under this certificate to keep Home Run Pond, a children's trout pond, full and is not connected to any part of the municipal system, and therefore not relevant to this change.

## **CHANGE PROPOSAL**

### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

4. The proposed change is for a temporary change in the place of use for the municipal water system of the City of Glasgow. The proposed change will add additional places of use to the existing system. The intent of this change is to assist the Dry Prairie Rural Water Authority (DPRWA) by providing water to a portion of their customers until the DPRWA mainline is completed and water can be delivered from the treatment plant in Wolf Point. The temporary expanded place of use for the City of Glasgow municipal water system will include the following locations to the south and west of the Milk River:

T29N, R39E

Sections 29-32

T28N, R39E

Sections 3-36

T28N, R40E

Sections 7\*, 8\*, 19, 20, 30, 31

\*These sections are located just east of Glasgow to the north of the Milk River

5. The Applicant is requesting the temporary change be authorized for 10 years; DPRWA is facing some unknown variables such as funding cycles and time frame for construction of the necessary pipelines in order to make their system operational for this phase of the Dry Prairie system.

6. The new water use will be the same as the existing water use, including the pattern of the use. The only element of the water right to be changed is the place of use. A total of 50 households within the additional place of use will be provided with water under this change.

### **§85-2-402, MCA, CRITERIA**

#### **GENERAL CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

7. An applicant in a change proceeding must affirmatively prove all of the criteria in §85-2-402, MCA. Under this Preliminary Determination, the relevant change criteria in §85-2-402(2), MCA, are:

(2) Except as provided in subsections (4) through (6), (15), and (16) and, if applicable, subject to subsection (17), the department shall approve a change in appropriation right if the appropriator proves by a preponderance of evidence that the following criteria are met:

(a) The proposed change in appropriation right will not adversely affect the use of the existing water rights of other persons or other perfected or planned uses or developments for which a permit or certificate has been issued or for which a state water reservation has been issued under part 3.

(b) Except for a change in appropriation right for instream flow to protect, maintain, or enhance streamflows to benefit the fishery resource pursuant to [85-2-436](#) or a temporary change in appropriation right authorization to maintain or enhance streamflows to benefit the fishery resource pursuant to [85-2-408](#) or a change in appropriation right to instream flow to protect, maintain, or enhance streamflows pursuant to [85-2-320](#), the proposed means of diversion, construction, and operation of the appropriation works are adequate.

(c) The proposed use of water is a beneficial use.

(d) Except for a change in appropriation right for instream flow to protect, maintain, or enhance streamflows to benefit the fishery resource pursuant to [85-2-436](#) or a temporary change in appropriation right authorization pursuant to [85-2-408](#) or a change in appropriation right to instream flow to protect, maintain, or enhance streamflows pursuant to [85-2-320](#), the applicant has a possessory interest, or the written consent of the person with the possessory interest, in the property where the water is to be put to beneficial use or, if the proposed change involves a point of diversion, conveyance, or place of use on national forest system lands, the applicant has any written special use authorization required by federal law to occupy, use, or traverse national forest system lands for the purpose of diversion, impoundment, storage, transportation, withdrawal, use, or distribution of water.

(e) If the change in appropriation right involves salvaged water, the proposed water-saving methods will salvage at least the amount of water asserted by the applicant.

The Department has jurisdiction to approve a change if the appropriator proves the applicable criteria in § 85-2-402, MCA. The requirements of Montana's change statute have been litigated

and upheld in Matter of Application for Change of Appropriation Water Rights Nos. 101960-41S and 101967-41S by Royston (1991), 249 Mont. 425, 816 P.2d 1054, and the applicant has the burden of proof at all stages before the Department and courts. Hohenlohe v. DNRC, 2010 MT 203, ¶ 75; Town of Manhattan v. DNRC, Cause No. DV-09-872C, Montana Eighteenth Judicial District Court, *Order Re Petition for Judicial Review*, (2011) Pg. 8, *aff'd on other grounds*, Town of Manhattan v. DNRC, 2012 MT 81.

8. The burden of proof in a change proceeding by a preponderance of evidence is “more probably than not.” Hohenlohe ¶¶ 33, 35.

9. In a change proceeding and in accordance with well-settled western water law, other appropriators have a vested right to have the stream conditions maintained substantially as they existed at the time of their appropriations. Spokane Ranch & Water Co. v. Beatty (1908), 37 Mont. 342, 96 P. 727; ); McDonald v. State (1986), 220 Mont. 519, 722 P.2d 598 (existing water right is the pattern of historic use; beneficial use is the basis measure and the limit); Hohenlohe ¶ 43; Robert E. Beck, 2 Waters and Water Rights § 14.04(c)(1) (1991 edition); W. Hutchins, Selected Problems in the Law of Water Rights in the West 378 (1942); *In the Matter of Application to Change Appropriation Water Right No.41F-31227 by T-L Irrigation Company* (DNRC Final Order 1991)(senior appropriator cannot change pattern of use to detriment of junior); see also Farmers Reservoir and Irr. Co. v. City of Golden, 44 P.3d 241, 245 (Colo. 2002)(“We [Colorado Supreme Court] have stated time and again that the need for security and predictability in the prior appropriation system dictates that holders of vested water rights are entitled to the continuation of stream conditions as they existed at the time they first made their appropriation). This right to protect stream conditions substantially as they existed at the time of appropriations was recognized in the Act in §85-2-401, MCA. An applicant must prove that all other appropriators can continue to reasonably exercise their water rights under changes in the stream conditions attributable to the proposed change; otherwise, the change cannot be approved. Montana’s change statute reads in part to this issue:

85-2-402. (2) ... the department shall approve a change in appropriation right if the appropriator proves by a preponderance of evidence that the following criteria are met:

(a) *The proposed change in appropriation right will not adversely affect the use of the existing water rights of other persons* or other perfected or planned uses or developments for which a permit or certificate has been issued or for which a state water reservation has been issued under part 3.

....

(13) A change in appropriation right contrary to the provisions of this section is invalid. An officer, agent, agency, or employee of the state may not knowingly permit, aid, or assist in any manner an unauthorized change in appropriation right. A person or corporation may not, directly or indirectly, personally or through an agent, officer, or employee, attempt to change an appropriation right except in accordance with this section

(italics added).

10. Montana's change statute simply codifies western water law.<sup>1</sup> One commentator describes the general requirements in change proceedings as follows:

Perhaps the most common issue in a reallocation [change] dispute is whether other appropriators will be injured because of an increase in the consumptive use of water. Consumptive use has been defined as "diversions less returns, the difference being the amount of water physically removed (depleted) from the stream through evapotranspiration by irrigated crops or consumed by industrial processes, manufacturing, power generation or municipal use." "Irrigation consumptive use is the amount of consumptive use supplied by irrigation water applied in addition to the natural precipitation which is effectively available to the plant."

An appropriator may not increase, through reallocation [change] or otherwise, the actual historic consumptive use of water to the injury of other appropriators. In general, any act that increases the quantity of water taken from and not returned to the source of supply constitutes an increase in historic consumptive use. As a limitation on the right of reallocation, historic consumptive use is an application of the principle that appropriators

---

<sup>1</sup> Although Montana has not codified the law in the detail, Wyoming has, and the two states' requirements are virtually the same. Wyo. Stat. § 41-3-104 states:

When an owner of a water right wishes to change a water right ... he shall file a petition requesting permission to make such a change .... The change ... may be allowed provided that the quantity of water transferred ... shall not exceed the amount of water historically diverted under the existing use, nor increase the historic rate of diversion under the existing use, nor increase the historic amount consumptively used under the existing use, nor decrease the historic amount of return flow, nor in any manner injure other existing lawful appropriators.

Colorado follows a similar analysis under its requirement that a "change of water right, ... shall be approved if such change, ... will not injuriously affect the owner of or persons entitled to use water under a vested water right or a decreed conditional water right." §37-92-305(3)(a), C.R.S. E.g., Application for Water Rights in Rio Grande County, 53 P.3d 1165, 1170 (Colo. 2002).

have a vested right to the continuation of stream conditions as they existed at the time of their initial appropriation.

Historic consumptive use varies greatly with the circumstances of use.

Robert E. Beck, 2 Water and Water Rights at § 14.04(c)(1)(b), pp. 14-50, 51 (1991 edition) (italics added).

In Pueblo West Metropolitan District v. Southeastern Colorado Water Conservancy District (Colo. 1986), 717 P.2d 955, 959, the court held:

[O]nce an appropriator exercises his or her privilege to change a water right ... the appropriator runs a real risk of requantification of the water right based on actual historical consumptive use. In such a change proceeding a junior water right ... which had been strictly administered throughout its existence would, in all probability, be reduced to a lesser quantity because of the relatively limited actual historic use of the right.

See also 1 Wells A. Hutchins, Water Rights and Laws in the Nineteen Western States (1971), at p. 624 (changes in exercise of appropriative rights do not contemplate or countenance any increase in the quantity of water diverted under the original exercise of the right; in no event would an increase in the appropriated water supply be authorized by virtue of a change in point of diversion, place of use, or purpose of use of water); A. Dan Tarlock, Law of Water Rights and Water Resources (2007), at § 5:78 (“A water holder can only transfer the amount that he has historically put to beneficial use.... A water holder may only transfer the amount of water consumed. The increment diverted but not consumed must be left in the stream to protect junior appropriators. Consumption is a function of the evapotranspiration of the appropriator’s crops. Carriage losses are usually added to the amount consumed by the crops.”); § 37-92-301(5), C.R.S. (in proceedings for a reallocation [change], it is appropriate to consider abandonment of the water right); Wyo. Stat. Ann. § 41-3-104.

11. Accordingly, the DNRC in administrative rulings has held that a water right in a change proceeding is defined by actual beneficial use, not the amount claimed or even decreed. *E.g., In the Matter of Application for Change Authorization No. G(W)028708-411 by Hedrich/Straugh/Ringer*, (DNRC Final Order 1991); *In the Matter of Application for Change Authorization No. G(W)008323-g76L by Starkel/Koester*, (DNRC Final Order (1992)); *In the Matter of Application for Beneficial Water User Permit No 20736-S41H by the City of Bozeman*

and *In the Matter of the Application to Sever or Sell Appropriation Water Right 20737-S41H*, Proposal for Decision and Memorandum at pgs. 8-22, adopted by Final Order (January 9, 1985); see McDonald, *supra* (beneficial use is the measure, limit and basis, irrespective of greater quantity attempted to be appropriated); Quigley v. McIntosh, 110 Mont. 495, 103 P.2d 1067 (amount of water right is actual historic use); Town of Manhattan v. DNRC, Cause No. DV-09-872C, Montana Eighteenth Judicial District Court, *Order Re Petition for Judicial Review*, (2011) Pgs. 11-12 (proof of historic use is required even when the right has been decreed because the decreed flow rate or volume establishes the maximum appropriation that may be diverted, and may exceed the historical pattern of use, amount diverted or amount consumed through actual use, *citing McDonald*).

12. The Montana Supreme Court recently explained:

An appropriator historically has been entitled to the greatest quantity of water he can put to use. Sayre v. Johnson, 33 Mont. 15, 18, 81 P. 389, 390 (1905). The requirement that the use be both beneficial and reasonable, however, proscribes this tenet. In re Adjudication of Existing Rights to the Use of All Water, 2002 MT 216, ¶ 56, 311 Mont. 327, 55 P.3d 396; see also § 85-2-311(1)(d), MCA. This limitation springs from a fundamental tenet of western water law—that an appropriator has a right only to that amount of water historically put to beneficial use—developed in concert with the rationale that each subsequent appropriator “is entitled to have the water flow in the same manner as when he located,” and the appropriator may insist that prior appropriators do not affect adversely his rights. Spokane Ranch & Water Co. v. Beatty, 37 Mont. 342, 351, 96 P. 727, 731 (1908)....

We do not dispute this interrelationship between historic consumptive use, return flow, and the amount of water to which an appropriator is entitled as limited by his past beneficial use.

Hohenlohe v. DNRC, 2010 MT 203, ¶¶ 43, 45; see also Town of Manhattan v. DNRC, Cause No. DV-09-872C, Montana Eighteenth Judicial District Court, *Order Re Petition for Judicial Review*, (2011) Pg. 9.

13. The extent of the historic beneficial use must be determined in a change case. *E.g.*, McDonald; Hohenlohe ¶ 43; Application for Water Rights in Rio Grande County, 53 P.3d 1165, 1170 (Colo. 2002); Santa Fe Trail Ranches Property Owners Ass'n v. Simpson, 990 P.2d 46, 55 -57 (Colo., 1999); City of Bozeman (DNRC), *supra* (“the doctrine of historic use gives effect to

the implied limitations read into every decreed right that an appropriator has no right to waste water or to otherwise expand his appropriation to the detriment of juniors.”) As a point of clarification, a claim filed for an existing water right in accordance with Mont. Code Ann. § 85-2-221 constitutes *prima facie* proof of the claim only for the purposes of the adjudication pursuant to Title 85, Chapter 2, Part 2. The claim does not constitute *prima facie* evidence of historical use for the purposes of a change in appropriation proceeding before the Department under § 85-2-402, MCA. Importantly, irrigation water right claims are also not decreed with a volume and are, thus, limited by the Water Court to their “historic beneficial use.” §85-2-234, MCA. Town of Manhattan v. DNRC, Cause No. DV-09-872C, Montana Eighteenth Judicial District Court, *Order Re Petition for Judicial Review*, (2011) Pg. 11 (proof of historic use is required even where a water right is decreed).

14. The Department is within its authority to put a volume on a change authorization even where there is no volume on the Statement of Claim. The placement of a volume on the change authorization is not an “adjudication” of the water right. Hohenlohe ¶¶ 30-31.

15. Consumptive use of water may not increase when an existing water right is changed. Town of Manhattan v. DNRC, Cause No. DV-09-872C, Montana Eighteenth Judicial District Court, *Order Re Petition for Judicial Review*, (2011) Pg. 9; *In the Matter of Application to Change a Water Right No. 40M 30005660 by Harry Taylor II and Jacqueline R. Taylor*, (DNRC Final Order 2005); *In the Matter of Application to Change a Water Right No. 40A 30005100 by Berg Ranch Co./Richard Berg*, DNRC Proposal For Decision adopted by Final Order (2005); *In the Matter of Application to Change a Water Right No. 41I 30002512 by Brewer Land Co, LLC*, DNRC Proposal For Decision adopted by Final Order (2003) . An increase in consumptive use constitutes a new appropriation. Town of Manhattan v. DNRC, Cause No. DV-09-872C, Montana Eighteenth Judicial District Court, *Order Re Petition for Judicial Review*, (2011) Pg. 9 (*citing Featherman v. Hennessy*, (1911) 43 Mont. 310, 316-17).

In a change proceeding, the *consumptive* use of the historical right has to be determined:

In a reallocation [change] proceeding, both the actual historic consumptive use and the expected consumptive use resulting from the reallocation [change] are estimated. Engineers usually make these estimates.

With respect to a reallocation [change], the engineer conducts an investigation to determine the historic diversions and the historic consumptive use of the water subject to reallocation [change]. This investigation involves an examination of historic use over a period that may range from 10 years to several decades, depending on the value of the water right being reallocated [changed].

....

When reallocating [changing] an irrigation water right, the quantity and timing of historic consumptive use must be determined in light of the crops that were irrigated, the relative priority of the right, and the amount of natural rainfall available to and consumed by the growing crop.

....

Expected consumptive use after a reallocation [change] may not exceed historic *consumptive* use if, as would typically be the case, other appropriators would be harmed. Accordingly, if an increase in consumptive use is expected, the quantity or flow of reallocated [changed] water is decreased so that actual historic consumptive use is not increased.

2 Water and Water Rights at § 14.04(c)(1); see also, Basin Elec. Power Co-op. v. State Bd. of Control, 578 P.2d 557, 564 -566 (Wyo,1978) (a water right holder may not effect a change of use transferring more water than he had historically consumptively used; regardless of the lack of injury to other appropriators, the amount of water historically diverted under the existing use, the historic rate of diversion under the existing use, the historic amount consumptively used under the existing use, and the historic amount of return flow must be considered.). The Department can request consumptive use information from an applicant. Hohenlohe ¶¶ 51, 68-69.

16. Denial of a change in appropriation in whole or part does not affect the exercise of the underlying right(s). The water right holder can continue to exercise the underlying right, unchanged as it has historically. The Department's change process only addresses the water right holder's ability to make a different use of that existing right. E.g., Town of Manhattan v. DNRC, Cause No. DV-09-872C, Montana Eighteenth Judicial District Court, *Order Re Petition for Judicial Review*, (2011) Pg. 8; *In the Matter of Application to Change Appropriation Water Right No.41F-31227 by T-L Irrigation Company* (DNRC Final Order 1991).

17. The Department may take notice of judicially cognizable facts and generally recognized technical or scientific facts within the Department's specialized knowledge. Admin. R. Mont. (ARM) 36.12.221(4).

## Historic Use:

### FINDINGS OF FACT

18. The City of Glasgow's system capacity was originally designed based on population. The municipal system can divert a maximum flow of 4.68 CFS (2100 GPM). A performance testing report by HDR Engineering in conjunction with Interstate Engineering in 2008 confirms the maximum flow rate of 4.68 CFS. Records provided by the Applicant document that the maximum annual use of water under Provisional Permit 40S 31725-00 occurred in 1989 when 283.01 million gallons of water was treated at the treatment plant. 283.01 million gallons is equivalent to 868.53 Acre-Feet (AF).

19. Measurement records were provided for 12 years out of a 24 year period between 1989 and 2013. The average annual use by the City of Glasgow based on the records provided was 758.72 AF. Average annual discharge under a surface water discharge permit into the Milk River was stated to be 157,927,066 gallons or 484.66 AF. Based on an average annual diverted volume of 758.72 AF and average annual discharge of 484.66 AF, an annual consumptive use rate of 36% was calculated. Maximum historic consumptive use based on a maximum diverted volume of 868.53 AF and consumptive use of 36% would therefore be 312.67 AF.

### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

20. Applicant seeks to change existing water rights represented by its Water Right Claims. The "existing water rights" in this case are those as they existed prior to July 1, 1973, because no changes could have been made to those rights after that date without the Department's approval. §85-2-402(1), MCA; Royston, supra; Town of Manhattan v. DNRC, Cause No. DV-09-872C, Montana Eighteenth Judicial District Court, *Order Re Petition for Judicial Review*, (2011) Pg. 7; cf. General Agriculture Corp. v. Moore (1975), 166 Mont. 510, 534 P.2d 859 (limited exception for perfection). Thus, the focus in a change proceeding is what those rights looked like and how they were exercised prior to July 1, 1973. E.g., Matter of Clark Fork River Drainage Area (1992), 254 Mont. 11, 17, 833 P.2d 1120. An applicant can change only that to which it has a perfected right. E.g., McDonald, supra; Town of Manhattan v. DNRC, Cause No. DV-09-872C, Montana Eighteenth Judicial District Court, *Order Re Petition for Judicial Review*, (2011)

Pg. 9 (the rule that one may change only that to which it has a right is a fundamental tenet of Montana water law and imperative to MWUA change provisions, *citing Featherman v. Hennessy*, (1911) 43 Mont. 310, and *Quigley v. McIntosh*, (1940) 110 Mont. 495); see also In re Application for Water Rights in Rio Grande County 53 P.3d 1165, 1170 (Colo. 2002) (while the enlargement of a water right, as measured by historic use, may be injurious to other rights, it also simply does not constitute a permissible “change” of an existing right); Robert E. Beck, 2 Water and Water Rights at § 16.02(b) at p. 271 (issues of waste and historic use, as well as misuse ... properly be considered by the administrative official or water court when acting on a reallocation application,” (citations omitted)); *In the Matter of Application for Change in Appropriation of Water Right No. 139988-40A, 139989-40A, and 50641-40A by Careless Creek Ranch* (DNRC Final Order 1988)(where there is water at new point of diversion, more often than not purpose of change is to pick up that extra water, application must be made for a new water right to cover the extra water; it cannot be appropriated under the guise of a change in the old right).

21. The Department as fact finder in a change proceeding must have the required information to evaluate historic use of a water right to determine whether the change will result in expansion of the original right, or adversely affect water users. The Department cannot determine whether there will be adverse effect to other appropriators from a different use of water until it knows how the water has been historically used, including the pattern of use. *Town of Manhattan v. DNRC*, Cause No. DV-09-872C, Montana Eighteenth Judicial District Court, *Order Re Petition for Judicial Review*, (2011) Pg.13 (upholding ARM 36.12.1902, reflecting basic water law principles).

22. The requirement that a water user establish the parameters and pattern of use of a water right through evidence of historic use is a fundamental principle of Montana water law that serves to ensure that a change does not expand a water right (i.e. bootstrap a new use with a senior priority date) or adversely affect other water users. Evidence of historic use serves the important function of protecting other water users who have come to rely upon maintaining surface and ground water conditions for their livelihood. *Id.* at Pg. 14.

23. Water Resources Surveys were authorized by the 1939 legislature. 1939 Mont. Laws Ch. 185, § 5. Since their completion, Water Resources Surveys have been invaluable evidence in

water right disputes and have long been relied on by Montana courts. In re Adjudication of Existing Rights to Use of All Water in North End Subbasin of Bitterroot River Drainage Area in Ravalli and Missoula Counties (1999), 295 Mont. 447, 453, 984 P.2d 151, 155 (Water Resources Survey used as evidence in adjudicating of water rights); Wareing v. Schreckendgust (1996), 280 Mont. 196, 213, 930 P.2d 37, 47 (Water Resources Survey used as evidence in a prescriptive ditch easement case); Olsen v. McQueary (1984), 212 Mont. 173, 180, 687 P.2d 712, 716 (judicial notice taken of Water Resources Survey in water right dispute concerning branches of a creek).

24. The Department has adopted a rule providing for the calculation of historic consumptive use where the applicant proves by a preponderance of the evidence that the acreage was historically irrigated. ARM 36.12.1902 (16)

25. If an applicant seeks more than the historic consumptive use as calculated by ARM 36.12.1902 (16), the applicant bears the burden of proof to demonstrate the amount of historic consumptive use by a preponderance of the evidence. The actual historic use of water could be less than the optimum utilization represented by the calculated duty of water in any particular case. E.g., Application for Water Rights in Rio Grande County 53 P.3d 1165 (Colo., 2002) (historical use must be quantified to ensure no enlargement); *In the Matter of Application to Change Water Right No. 41H 1223599 by MGRR #1, LLC.*, DNRC Proposal for Decision adopted by Final Order (2005); Orr v. Arapahoe Water and Sanitation Dist. 753 P.2d 1217, 1223 -1224 (Colo., 1988)(historical use of a water right could very well be less than the duty of water); Weibert v. Rothe Bros., Inc., 200 Colo. 310, 317, 618 P.2d 1367, 1371 - 1372 (Colo. 1980) (historical use could be less than the optimum utilization “duty of water”).

26. While evidence may be provided that a particular parcel was irrigated, the actual amount of water historically diverted and consumed is critical. E.g., In the Matter of Application to Change Water Right No. 41H 1223599 by MGRR #1, LLC., supra. The Department cannot assume that a parcel received the full duty of water or that it received sufficient water to constitute full service irrigation for optimum plant growth. Even when it seems clear that no other rights could be affected solely by a particular change in the location of diversion, it is essential that the change also not enlarge an existing right. Trail's End Ranch, L.L.C. v. Colorado

Div. of Water Resources 91 P.3d 1058, 1063 (Colo., 2004) (citing Application for Water Rights in Rio Grande County, 53 P.3d at 1168 and Empire Lodge Homeowners' Ass'n v. Moyer, 39 P.3d 1139, 1147 (Colo., 2001)).

27. “Absent quantification of annual volume historically consumed, no protective condition limiting annual volume delivered can be placed on a Change Authorization, and without such a condition, the evidence of record will not sustain a conclusion of no adverse effect to prior . . . appropriators.” *In the Matter of the Application for Change of Appropriation Water Rights Nos. 101960-41S and 101967-41S by Keith and Alice Royston*, COL No. 8 (1989), *affirmed* (1991), 249 Mont. 425, 428, 816 P.2d 1054, 1057; *In the Matter of the Application of Beneficial Water Use Permit Number 41H 30003523 and the Application for Change No. 41H 30000806 by Montana Golf Enterprises, LLC.*, DNRC Proposal for Decision ( 2003) (proposed decision denied change for lack of evidence of historical use; application subsequently withdrawn); see also Hohenlohe ¶¶ 43, 45; Application for Water Rights in Rio Grande County (2002), supra; *In the Matter of Application to Change Water Right No. 41H 1223599 by MGRR #1, LLC.*, supra.

28. The Department has the authority to consider waste in determining a volume for change in a water right.

*The Department retains the discretion to take into account reasonable or wasteful use and to amend or modify a proposed change of use application according to those determinations. See [Bostwick, 2009 MT 181, ¶ 21, 351 Mont. 26, 208 P.3d 868.](#)*

Hohenlohe ¶ 71.

29. The Department finds that the Applicant has proven by a preponderance of the evidence the historic use of Beneficial Water Use Permit No. 40S 31725-00 of 868.53 AF diverted volume and 4.68 CFS flow rate with a consumptive use of 312.67 acre-feet. (FOF 18, 19)

### **Adverse Effect:**

#### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

30. The proposed change is to add additional places of use to the City of Glasgow’s municipal water right, and will not increase diverted flow rate or volume from that historically

used. The point of diversion is shared by the City of Glasgow and the Montana Aviation Research Company (MARCO). In-line flow meters are installed at the point of diversion, at the pipeline junction at US Hwy 2 where the Glasgow pipeline hooks into the MARCO pipeline, and at the raw water intake at the Glasgow water treatment plant.

31. The Applicant can ensure that their historical diverted flow rate and volume are not exceeded through their monitoring system at the treatment plant which will allow them to identify any potential water use issues before they occur. If projected use appears that it may exceed historical peak use, water use would be restricted so to not exceed the maximum historical diverted volume.

32. The surface water treatment plant for the Glasgow municipal system came online in December 1988. The maximum diverted volume was achieved the following year. At that time, the population of Glasgow was estimated at 3,572 people. The population in Glasgow has decreased since 1989; water use records reflect decreased demand. In 2013, the total diverted volume of the Glasgow municipal system was 638.64 AF, a 26.5% decrease over the maximum historical diverted volume of 868.53 AF.

33. Within the past three years, the peak annual water use was 715 AF, which occurred in 2012. The agreement with DPRWA is that Glasgow will provide up to 75,000 gallons of water per day, which equals 84 AF over the course of the year. Using the recent peak annual use of 715 AF and the agreed upon 75,000 gallons a day, a total annual diverted volume of 799 AF is achieved which is 69.53 AF below the historic maximum annual diverted volume.

34. No senior water users have made call upon Glasgow's surface water right from the Missouri River since the Provisional Permit was issued. The priority date for the water right is February 13, 1981, making it senior to the Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Parks instream flow on the Missouri River. From the time Provisional Permit 40S 31725-00 was first issued, water has been available with a February 13, 1981 priority date, even in drought years.

35. Return flows consist of irrigation water applied which is not consumed and returns underground to its original source or another source of water, and to which other water users are entitled to a continuation of. There are no return flows associated with this change. No changes

will be made to wastewater treatment operations related to this change. Therefore, under the proposed change, the rate and timing of any return flows or surface water discharge is not expected to change based on the proposed change in place of use. The Applicant has proven use of the overall diverted flow and volume and only proposes to change where the water is used.

### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

36. The Applicant bears the affirmative burden of proving that proposed change in appropriation right will not adversely affect the use of the existing water rights of other persons or other perfected or planned uses or developments for which a permit or certificate has been issued or for which a state water reservation. §85-2-402(2)(a), MCA. Royston, *supra*. It is the applicant's burden to produce the required evidence. *In the Matter of Application to Change Water Right No. 41H 1223599 by MGRR #1, LLC.*, (DNRC Final Order 2005).

37. Prior to the enactment of the Water Use Act in 1973, the law was the same in that an adverse effect to another appropriator was not allowed. Holmstrom Land Co., Inc., v. Newlan Creek Water District (1979), 185 Mont. 409, 605 P.2d 1060, *rehearing denied*, (1980), 185 Mont. 409, 605 P.2d 1060, following Lokowich v. Helena (1913), 46 Mont. 575, 129 P. 1063; Thompson v. Harvey (1974), 164 Mont. 133, 519 P.2d 963 (plaintiff could not change his diversion to a point upstream of the defendants because of the injury resulting to the defendants); McIntosh v. Graveley (1972), 159 Mont. 72, 495 P.2d 186 (appropriator was entitled to move his point of diversion downstream, so long as he installed measuring devices to ensure that he took no more than would have been available at his original point of diversion); Head v. Hale (1909), 38 Mont. 302, 100 P. 222 (successors of the appropriator of water appropriated for placer mining purposes cannot so change its use as to deprive lower appropriators of their rights, already acquired, in the use of it for irrigating purposes); Gassert v. Noyes (1896), 18 Mont. 216, 44 P. 959 (after the defendant used his water right for placer mining purposes the water was turned into a gulch, where the plaintiff appropriated it for irrigation purposes; the defendant then changed the place of use of his water right, resulting in the water no longer being returned to the gulch - such change in use was unlawful because it deprived the plaintiff of his subsequent right).

38. The cornerstone of an evaluation of adverse effect to other appropriators is the determination of historic use of water. One cannot determine whether there is adverse effect to another appropriator until one knows what the historic water right is to be changed. It is a fundamental part of Montana and western water law that the extent of a water right is determined by reference to the historic beneficial use of the water right. McDonald; Town of Manhattan v. DNRC, Cause No. DV-09-872C, Montana Eighteenth Judicial District Court, *Order Re Petition for Judicial Review*, (2011) Pg.13; *City of Bozeman* (DNRC), supra; Application for Water Rights in Rio Grande County, 53 P.3d 1165, 1170 (Colo. 2002). The Montana Supreme Court has explained:

An appropriator historically has been entitled to the greatest quantity of water he can put to use. Sayre v. Johnson, 33 Mont. 15, 18, 81 P. 389, 390 (1905). The requirement that the use be both beneficial and reasonable, however, proscribes this tenet. In re Adjudication of Existing Rights to the Use of All Water, 2002 MT 216, ¶ 56, 311 Mont. 327, 55 P.3d 396; see also § 85-2-311(1)(d), MCA. This limitation springs from a fundamental tenet of western water law-that an appropriator has a right only to that amount of water historically put to beneficial use-developed in concert with the rationale that each subsequent appropriator “is entitled to have the water flow in the same manner as when he located,” and the appropriator may insist that prior appropriators do not affect adversely his rights. Spokane Ranch & Water Co. v. Beatty, 37 Mont. 342, 351, 96 P. 727, 731 (1908)....

The question of adverse effect under §§ 85-2-402(2) and -408(3), MCA, implicates return flows. A change in the amount of return flow, or to the hydrogeologic pattern of return flow, has the potential to affect adversely downstream water rights. There consequently exists an inextricable link between the “amount historically consumed” and the water that re-enters the stream as return flow...

We do not dispute this interrelationship between historic consumptive use, return flow, and the amount of water to which an appropriator is entitled as limited by his past beneficial use.

Hohenlohe ¶¶ 43-45.

The Colorado Supreme Court has repeatedly addressed this same issue of historic use and adverse effect. E.g., Application for Water Rights in Rio Grande County, 53 P.3d 1165, 1170 (Colo. 2002); Santa Fe Trail Ranches Property Owners Ass'n v. Simpson, 990 P.2d 46, 55

-57 (Colo.,1999); Orr v. Arapahoe Water and Sanitation Dist., 753 P.2d 1217, 1223 (Colo.1988).

The Colorado Supreme Court has consistently explained:

“A classic form of injury involves diminution of the available water supply that a water rights holder would otherwise enjoy at the time and place and in the amount of demand for beneficial use under the holder's decreed water right operating in priority.” Citations omitted) . . .

... it is inherent in the notion of a “change” of water right that the property right itself can only be changed and not enlarged. (citation omitted). The appropriator of native water may not enlarge an appropriation without establishing all of the elements of an independent appropriation, which will necessarily have a later priority date (citation omitted) ...

... diversions are implicitly limited in quantity by historic use at the original decreed point of diversion...

...we have explained this limitation by noting that “over an extended period of time a pattern of historic diversions and use under the decreed right at its place of use will mature and become the measure of the water right for change purposes.” (citation omitted). The right to change a point of diversion is therefore limited in quantity by the historic use at the original point of diversion. (citations omitted) “Thus, a senior appropriator cannot enlarge the historical use of a water right by changing the point of diversion and then diverting from the new location the full amount of water decreed to the original point of diversion, even though the historical use at the original point of diversion might have been less than the decreed rate of diversion.”

FN9. The term “historic use” refers to the “historic consumptive use,” (citations omitted).

Application for Water Rights in Rio Grande County, 53 P.3d at 1169-1170.

39. Consumptive use of water may not increase when an existing water right is changed. E.g., Town of Manhattan v. DNRC, Cause No. DV-09-872C, Montana Eighteenth Judicial District Court, *Order Re Petition for Judicial Review*, (2011) Pg.9; *In the Matter of Application to Change a Water Right No. 40M 30005660 by Harry Taylor II And Jacqueline R. Taylor*, (DNRC Final Order 2005); *In the Matter of Application to Change a Water Right No. 41I 30002512 by Brewer Land Co, LLC*, DNRC Proposal For Decision adopted Final Order (2003). Applicant must provide evidence of historical amount consumed and the amount to be consumed under the

proposed change. *In the Matter of the Application of Beneficial Water Use Permit Number 41H 30003523 and the Application for Change No. 41H 30000806 by Montana Golf Enterprises, LLC.*, (DNRC Proposal for Decision 2003); *In the Matter of Application to Change a Water Right No. 43B 30002710 by USA (Dept. Of Agriculture – Forest Service)* (DNRC Final Order 2005); *In The Matter of Application No. 76H-30009407 to Change Water Right Nos. 76H-108772 and 76H-1-8773 by North Corporation* (DNRC Final Order 2008).

40. It is well settled in Montana and western water law, that once water leaves the control of the appropriator whether through seepage, percolating, surface, or waste waters,” and reaches a water course, it is subject to appropriation. E.g., Rock Creek Ditch & Flume Co. v. Miller (1933), 93 Mont. 248, 17 P.2d 1074, 1077; Newton v. Weiler (1930), 87 Mont. 164, 286 P. 133; Popham v. Holloron (1929), 84 Mont. 442, 275 P. 1099, 1102; Galiger v. McNulty (1927) 80 Mont. 339, 260 P. 401; Head v. Hale (1909), 38 Mont. 302, 100 P. 222; Alder Gulch Con. Min. Co. v. King (1886), 6 Mont. 31, 9 P. 581; Doney, *Montana Water Law Handbook* (1981) [hereinafter Doney] p.22 (if return flows not part of original appropriation then it is available for appropriation by others); see also Hidden Hollow Ranch v. Fields, 2004 MT 153, 321 Mont. 505, 92 P.3d 1185. An intent to capture and reuse return flows must be manifested at the time of the appropriation. E.g., Rock Creek Ditch and Flume, 17 P.2d at 1080; Albert Stone, *Montana Water Law* (1994) p. 84. This is consistent with the cornerstone of the prior appropriation doctrine that beneficial use is the basis, the measure and limit of a water right. E.g., McDonald v. State (1986), 220 Mont. 519, 722 P.2d 598; Toohey v. Campbell (1900), 24 Mont. 13, 60 P. 396. Return flows are not part of a water right and an appropriator is not entitled to return flows in a change in appropriation. Generally, return flow is water that is not consumed or is lost to the system. see also, Doney, p. 21.

The Montana Supreme Court also recently recognized the fundamental nature of return flows to Montana’s water sources in addressing whether the Mitchell Slough was a perennial flowing stream, given the large amount of irrigation return flow which feeds the stream. The Court acknowledged that the Mitchell’s flows are fed by irrigation return flows available for appropriation. Bitterroot River Protective Ass'n, Inc. v. Bitterroot Conservation Dist. 2008 MT 377, ¶¶ 22, 31, 43, 346 Mont. 508, ¶¶ 22, 31,43, 198 P.3d 219, ¶¶ 22, 31,43, *citing Hidden*

Hollow Ranch v. Fields, 2004 MT 153, 321 Mont. 505, 92 P.3d 1185; see discussion in Hohenlohe, supra.

41. The analysis of return flow is a critical component of a change in appropriation and specifically whether a change will cause adverse effect to another appropriator. A change can affect return flow patterns and timing, affecting other water users. E.g., Hohenlohe, supra; *In the Matter of Application to Change Appropriation Water Right No.41F-31227 by T-L Irrigation Company* (DNRC Final Order 1991). An applicant for a change in appropriation must analyze return flows (amount, location, and timing) to prove that the proposed change does not adversely affect other appropriators who may rely on those return flows as part of their water supply to exercise their water rights. E.g., Royston, supra. The level of analysis of return flow will vary depending on the nature of the change application. Hohenlohe ¶¶ 45-46, 55-56.

42. The Applicant has proven that the proposed change in appropriation right will not adversely affect the use of the existing water rights of other persons or other perfected or planned uses or developments for which a permit or certificate has been issued or for which a state water reservation has been issued. §85-2-402(2)(b), MCA. (FOF 30-35)

## **Beneficial Use**

### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

43. The Applicant proposes to continue to use 4.68 CFS up to 868.53 AF for municipal purposes, which is a recognized beneficial use (§85-2-102(4)(a), MCA). This amount of water is supported by use measurement records provided by the Applicant. The municipal system can divert a maximum flow of 4.68 CFS. A performance testing report by HDR Engineering in conjunction with Interstate Engineering in 2008 confirms the maximum flow rate of 4.68 CFS. Records provided by the Applicant document that the maximum annual use of water under Provisional Permit 40S 31725-00 occurred in 1989 when 283.01 million gallons of water was treated at the treatment plant. 283.01 million gallons is equivalent to 868.53 AF.

44. The City of Glasgow is proposing to temporarily change the place of use on their existing municipal system in order to provide water to customers of the Dry Prairie Rural Water Authority (DPRWA). This temporary change is being proposed so that the City of Glasgow may

assist DPRWA provide water to a portion of their customers until the DPRWA mainline is completed and water can be delivered from the treatment plant in Wolf Point. A total of 50 homes will be served within the additional place of use under this temporary change.

### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

45. Under the change statute, §85-2-402(2)(c), MCA, an Applicant must prove by a preponderance of the evidence the proposed use is a beneficial use. An appropriator may appropriate water only for a beneficial use. §§85-2-301 and 311(1)(d), MCA.

46. The analysis of the beneficial use criterion is the same for change authorizations under §85-2-402, MCA, and new beneficial permits under §85-2-311, MCA. The amount of water under a water right is limited to the amount of water necessary to sustain the beneficial use. E.g., Bitterroot River Protective Association v. Siebel, *Order on Petition for Judicial Review*, Cause No. BDV-2002-519, Montana First Judicial District Court (2003), *affirmed on other grounds*, 2005 MT 60, 326 Mont. 241, 108 P.3d 518; Worden v. Alexander (1939), 108 Mont. 208, 90 P.2d 160; Allen v. Petrick (1924), 69 Mont. 373, 222 P. 451; Sitz Ranch v. DNRC, DV-10-13390, Montana Fifth Judicial District Court, *Order Affirming DNRC Decision*, (2011) Pg. 3 (citing BRPA v. Siebel, 2005 MT 60, and rejecting applicant's argument that it be allowed to appropriate 800 acre-feet when a typical year would require 200-300 acre-feet); *In the Matter of Application for Beneficial Water Use Permit No. 76H-84577 by Thomas and Janine Stellick*, DNRC Final Order (1995)(permit denied because no evidence in the record that the amount of water needed for fish and wildlife; absence of evidence of waste does not meet the standard of proof); *In the Matter of Application No. 40A-108497 by Alex Matheson*, DNRC Proposal for Decision adopted by Final Order (2000) (application denied as to fishery and recreation use for lack of proof); *In the Matter of Application for Beneficial Water Use Permit No. 76LJ-115-831 by Benjamin and Laura Weidling*, (DNRC Final Order 2003), *aff'd on other grounds*, In the Matter of Application for Beneficial Water Use Permit No. 76LJ-115-83100 by Benjamin and Laura Weidling and No. 76LJ-1158300 by Ramona S. and William N. Nessly, *Order on Motion for Petition for Judicial Review*, Cause No. BDV-2003-100, Montana First Judicial District (2004) (fish and wildlife use denied for lack of proof); *In The Matter of Application For Beneficial Water Use Permit 76LJ 30008762 by Vinnie J & Susan N Nardi*, DNRC Proposal for

Decision adopted by Final Order (2006); Statement of Opinion, *In the Matter of Beneficial Water Use Permit No. 41H-30013678 by Baker Ditch Company* (June 11, 2008)(change authorization denied - no credible evidence provided on which a determination can be made of whether the quantity of water requested is adequate or necessary to sustain the fishery use, or that the size or depth of the ponds is adequate for a fishery); *In the Matter of Application for Beneficial Water Use Permit No. 43C 30007297 by Dee Deaterly*, (DNRC Final Order 2007), *aff'd on other grounds*, Deaterly v. DNRC et al., Cause No. BDV-2007-186, Montana First Judicial District, *Nunc Pro Tunc Order on Petition for Judicial Review* (2008) (permit denied in part because of failure to support quantity of water needed for pond); see also §85-2-312(1) (a), MCA.

The Department may issue a permit for less than the amount of water requested, but may not issue a permit for more water than is requested or than can be beneficially used without waste for the purpose stated in the application. §85-2-312, MCA; see also, McDonald; Toohey. The Department can also consider waste in a change proceeding. Hohenlohe ¶ 71. Waste is defined to include the “application of water to anything but a beneficial use.” §85-2-102(23), MCA. An absence of evidence of waste does not prove the amount requested is for a beneficial use. E.g., Stellick, supra.

47. It is the Applicant’s burden to prove the required criteria. Royston. A failure to meet that affirmative burden does not mean the criterion is met for lack of contrary evidence. E.g., *In the Matter of Application to Change Water Right No. 41H 1223599 by MGRR #1, LLC.*, (DNRC Final Order 2005).

48. Applicant proposes to use water for municipal use which is a recognized beneficial use. §85-2-102(4), MCA. Applicant has proven by a preponderance of the evidence municipal use is a beneficial use and that 868.53 acre-feet of diverted volume and 4.68 CFS flow rate of water requested is the amount needed to sustain the beneficial use. §85-2-402(2)(c), MCA. (FOF 43, 44)

### **Adequate Diversion**

### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

49. Water is diverted from the Missouri River at Nelson Dredge below Fort Peck dam. The POD is shared by Montana Aviation Research Company (MARCO) and the City of Glasgow. Pump Station 1 is the POD and consists of a 36 inch raw water intake leading to an 84 inch diameter concrete wet well. There are four vertical turbine pumps which divert water from the wet well. Two of the pumps have a rated design flow of 1,045 GPM, one is rated at 645 GPM, and the fourth is rated at 400 GPM. The two 1,045 GPM pumps do not run at the same time. The pumps supply water to an 18" concrete mainline which runs 24 miles north to the MARCO treatment plant. Operation of the pump station is coordinated and monitored by both the City of Glasgow and MARCO.

50. The Glasgow tap is located north of the Milk River crossing at the location where the supply pipeline crosses US Hwy 2. The tap is located in an underground valve vault and is composed of an 18" x 18" x 18" tee.

51. Measurement records provided with the application document the maximum historical diverted volume of 868.53 AF and a performance testing report by HDR Engineering in conjunction with Interstate Engineering in 2008 confirms the maximum flow rate of 4.68 CFS.

52. Both the City of Glasgow and MARCO have preset pump times which vary depending on season and demand. The City of Glasgow pumps water at 4.68 CFS during the summer months and 2.94 CFS during winter months.

53. Water will be delivered to DPRWA at the outlet of the City of Glasgow's 1.0 million gallon storage tank. All water will be metered and diverted through an 8" pipe running due east to connect to the existing DPRWA conveyance lines at MT Hwy 24 where it will then be distributed to users in the new service area.

#### CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

54. Pursuant to §85-2-402 (2)(b), MCA, except for a change in appropriation right for instream flow to protect, maintain, or enhance streamflows to benefit the fishery resource pursuant to §85-2-436, MCA, or a temporary change in appropriation right authorization to maintain or enhance streamflows to benefit the fishery resource pursuant to §85-2-408, MCA, or

a change in appropriation right to instream flow to protect, maintain, or enhance streamflows pursuant to §85-2-320,MCA, the Applicant must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that the proposed means of diversion, construction, and operation of the appropriation works are adequate.

55. The adequate means of diversion statutory test merely codifies and encapsulates the common law notion of appropriation to the effect that the means of diversion must be reasonably effective, i.e., must not result in a waste of the resource. *In the Matter of Application for Beneficial Water Use Permit No. 33983s41Q by Hoyt* (DNRC Final Order 1981); §85-2-312(1) (a), MCA; see also, *In the Matter of Application to Change a Water Right No. G129039-76D by Keim/Krueger* (DNRC Final Order 1989)(whether party presently has easement not relevant to determination of adequate means of diversion); *In the Matter of Application for Beneficial Water Use Permit No. 69141-76G by Silver Eagle Mining* (DNRC Final Order 1989) (collection of snowmelt and rain in lined ponds considered adequate means of diversion); *In the Matter for Application to Change a Water Right No. 101960-41S by Royston* (DNRC Final Order 1989)(irrigation system is designed for flow rates of 750 gpm, and maximum usage allowed during non-high water periods, is 144-247 gpm, and the evidence does not show that the system can be operated at the lower flow rates; diversion not adequate), *affirmed*, Matter of Application for Change of Appropriation Water Rights Nos. 101960-41S and 101967-41S by Royston (1991), 249 Mont. 425, 816 P.2d 1054; *In the Matter of Application for Beneficial Water Use Permit No. 41C-11339900 by Three Creeks Ranch of Wyoming LLC* (DNRC Final Order 2002)(information needed to prove that proposed means of diversion, construction, and operation of the appropriation works are adequate varies based upon project complexity; design by licensed engineer adequate); *In the Matter of Application for Beneficial Water Use Permit No. 43B-30002710 by USDA* (DNRC Final Order 2005) (specific ditch segments would be adequate after completion of maintenance and rehabilitation work).

Adequate diversions can include the requirement to bypass flows to senior appropriators. E.g., *In the Matter of Application for Beneficial Water Use Permit No. 61293-40C by Goffena* (DNRC Final Order 1989) (design did not include ability to pass flows, permit denied).

56. Applicant has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that the proposed means of diversion, construction, and operation of the appropriation works are adequate for the proposed beneficial use. §85-2-402 (2)(b), MCA. (FOF 49-53).

### **Possessory Interest**

#### **FINDINGS OF FACT**

57. This application is for instream flow, sale, rental, distribution, or is a municipal use application in which water is supplied to another. It is clear that the ultimate user will not accept the supply without consenting to the use of water. Admin. R. Mont. 36.12.1802. The applicant has possessory interest in the property where the water is to be put to beneficial use or has the written consent of the person having the possessory interest.

#### **CONCLUSIONS OF LAW**

58. Pursuant to §85-2-402(2)(d), MCA, except for a change in appropriation right for instream flow to protect, maintain, or enhance streamflows to benefit the fishery resource pursuant to §85-2-436, MCA, or a temporary change in appropriation right authorization pursuant to §85-2-408, MCA, or a change in appropriation right to instream flow to protect, maintain, or enhance streamflows pursuant to §85-2-320, MCA, the Applicant must prove by a preponderance of the evidence that it has a possessory interest, or the written consent of the person with the possessory interest, in the property where the water is to be put to beneficial use or, if the proposed change involves a point of diversion, conveyance, or place of use on national forest system lands, the applicant has any written special use authorization required by federal law to occupy, use, or traverse national forest system lands for the purpose of diversion, impoundment, storage, transportation, withdrawal, use, or distribution of water.

59. Pursuant to ARM. 36.12.1802:

(1) An applicant or a representative shall sign the application affidavit to affirm the following:

(a) the statements on the application and all information submitted with the application are true and correct; and

(b) except in cases of an instream flow application, or where the application is for sale, rental, distribution, or is a municipal use, or in any other context in which water is being

supplied to another and it is clear that the ultimate user will not accept the supply without consenting to the use of water on the user's place of use, the applicant has possessory interest in the property where the water is to be put to beneficial use or has the written consent of the person having the possessory interest.

(2) If a representative of the applicant signs the application form affidavit, the representative shall state the relationship of the representative to the applicant on the form, such as president of the corporation, and provide documentation that establishes the authority of the representative to sign the application, such as a copy of a power of attorney.

(3) The department may require a copy of the written consent of the person having the possessory interest.

60. The Applicant has proven by a preponderance of the evidence that it has a possessory interest, or the written consent of the person with the possessory interest, in the property where the water is to be put to beneficial use. §85-2-402(2)(d), MCA. (FOF 57)

### **Salvage Water**

This Application does not involve salvage water.

### **PRELIMINARY DETERMINATION**

Subject to the terms and analysis in this Preliminary Determination Order, the Department preliminarily determines that this Application to Change Water Right No. 40S 30069034 should be granted subject to the following.

A temporary change in place of use of up to 10 years is authorized for Provisional Permit 40S 31725-00. The Department determines that the Applicant may continue to divert 4.68 CFS flow up to 868.53 AF diverted volume and 312.67 AF consumed volume from the Missouri River below Fort Peck dam for municipal use with a period of diversion and period of use from January 1- December 31. The entire place of use for the above water right under this change authorization includes the following:

T29N, R39E  
Sections 29-32

T28N, R39E  
S2 Section 1  
E2SE Section 2

Sections 3-36

T28N, R40E

SWSESW Section 6

Sections 7, 8, 19, 20, 30, 31

This Change Authorization will be subject to the following conditions, limitations, or restrictions.

1. Provisional Permits 40S-31725-00, 40O-7276-00, Statements of Claim 40O-28976-00, 40O-28977-00, 40O-28978-00, and Groundwater Certificate 40O-5934-00 are associated. They have overlapping places of use. The water rights for the wells cannot be put to use while this temporary change is in effect.

### **NOTICE**

This Department will provide public notice of this Application and the Department's Preliminary Determination to Grant pursuant to §85-2-307, MCA. The Department will set a deadline for objections to this Application pursuant to §§85-2-307, and -308, MCA. If this Application receives a valid objection, it will proceed to a contested case proceeding pursuant to Title 2 Chapter 4 Part 6, MCA, and §85-2-309, MCA. If this Application receives no valid objection or all valid objections are unconditionally withdrawn, the Department will grant this Application as herein approved. If this Application receives a valid objection(s) and the valid objection(s) are conditionally withdrawn, the Department will consider the proposed condition(s) and grant the Application with such conditions as the Department decides necessary to satisfy the applicable criteria. E.g., §§85-2-310, -312, MCA.

DATED this 31<sup>st</sup> day of October 2014.

*/Original Signed by Denise Biggar/*  
Denise Biggar, Regional Manager  
Glasgow Water Resources Office  
Department of Natural Resources  
and Conservation