COPY

WATER RIGHTS NEGOTIATIONS MEETING

THE CONFEDERATED SALISH AND KOOTENAI TRIBES

AND

THE MONTANA RESERVED WATER RIGHTS COMPACT COMMISSION

Wednesday, May 3, 2000

9 11 a m

KwaTaqNuk Resort

Polson, Montana

б

Reported by Abigail Dupuis, Certified Court Reporter and Notary Public, Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes, Box 278 Pablo, Montana 59855 (406) 675-2700

1	All Present
2	
3	D Fred Matt, CSKT Negotiating Team Chairman
4	Jamı Hamel, CSKT Negotiating Team
5	Lloyd D. Irvine, CSKT Negotiating Team
6	Ron Trahan, CSKT Negotiating Team
7	S Kevin Howlett, CSKT Negotiating Team
8	Darryl Dupuis, CSKT Negotiating Team
9	Robb Hunter, CSKT Managing Attorney
10	Francis Auld, CSKT Negotiating Team
11	Patrick Pierre, CSKT Negotiating Team
12	Rhonda Swaney, CSKT Negotiating Team
13	Chris Kenney, Federal Negotiating Team Chairman
14	Norbert S Ries, Federal Negotiating Team
15	Richard K Aldrich, Federal Negotiating Team
16	Bernie Burnham, Federal Negotiating Team
17	Chris Tweeten, State Negotiating Team Chairman
18	Tara DuPuy, State Negotiating Team
19	Susan Cottingham, State Negotiating Team
20	Aimee Grmoljez, Legal Counsel for Governor's Office
21	Faye Bergan, Legal Counsel for State Negotiating Team
22	
23	
24	
25	

1	<u>INDEX</u>	
2	Fred Matt (Introduction)	<u></u>
		6
3	Chris Tweeten (Introduction)	6
4	Chris Kenney (Introduction).	7
5	Tony Incashola (Introduction of Elders) .	8
6	Pend d'Oreille Drum Group (Flag Song)	9
7	Chief Cliff Drum Group (Honor Song) .	9
8	Yamncut Drum Group (Honor Song) .	9
9	Tony Incashola (Opening Prayer)	9
LO	Pat Pierre (Personal Comments)	10
11	Matt Michel (Personal Comments) .	14
L2	Felicity McDonald (Personal Comments)	15
L3	Tony Incashola (Interpretation of Comments)	15
L4	Louie Adams (Personal Comments)	17
L5	Tony Incashola (Personal Comments)	17
16	Chris Tweeten (Opening)	18
L7	Chris Kenney (Opening)	26
L8	Fred Matt (Opening)	28
L9	Robb Hunter (Memorandum of Understanding) .	34
20	Rhonda Swaney (Technical Approach)	38
21	Robb Hunter (Legal Approach)	39
22	Fred Matt (Introduction of Elders)	40
23	Rhonda Swaney (Introduction of Technical Team)	40
24	Fred Matt (Introduction of Council Members).	41
5	Susan Cottingham (Technical and Legal Approach)	42

1		
1	Chris Kenney (Technical and Legal Approach)	45
2	Rhonda Swaney (Scope of Negotiations)	48
3	Chris Tweeten (Scope of Negotiations) .	50
4	Chris Kenney (Scope of Negotiations)	51
5	Ron Billstein (Watershed Approach)	51
6	Susan Cottingham (Watershed Approach).	54
7	Chris Kenney (Watershed Approach) .	56
8	Clayton Matt (Technical Issues)	57
9	Dan Decker (Legal Issues)	60
10	Faye Bergan (Technical and Legal Issues)	63
11	Aimee Grmoljez (Legal Issues)	66
12	Susan Cottingham (Technical Issues) .	68
13	Fred Matt (Interim Agreement)	69
14	Chris Tweeten (Agenda)	70
15	Fred Matt (Agenda)	70
16	Chris Kenney (Agenda)	70
17	Fred Matt (Agenda)	72
18	Fred Matt (Next Session Agenda)	74
19	Susan Cottingham (Next Session Agenda) .	75
20	Chris Kenney (Next Session Agenda)	77
21	Fred Matt (Assignments)	79
22	Chris Kenney (Assignments)	79
23	Susan Cottingham (Assignments)	80
24	Rhonda Swaney (Summary)	92
25	Fred Matt (Public Comments).	104
- 1	I	

	II .	
1	Gale Patten (Public Comment)	105
2	Mike Grinde (Public Comment) .	. 106
3	John Campbell (Public Comment)	108
4	Tom Smith (Public Comment)	. 109
5	Vernon Finley (Public Comment)	113
6	Mike Durglo Jr (Public Comment)	116
7	Gary Morigeau (Public Comment)	118
8	Joe Weaselhead (Public Comment)	. 119
9	Stephen Smallsalmon (Public Comment)	. 120
10	Leonard Michel (Public Comment)	. 121
11	Fred Matt (Closing)	123
12	Pat Pierre (Closing Comments) .	124
13	Tony Incashola (Closing Comments).	128
14	Chief Cliff Drum Group (Honor Song) .	130
15	Pend d'Oreille Drum Group (Honor Song)	130
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25	Certificate of Court Reporter.	132

FRED MATT Okay We're going to introduce the players at the table up here, and then we'll have an opening ceremony We brought a drum here today, and we'll have Tony introduce them We will leave it up to Tony to start that out

But, first of all, there again I want to thank everybody for taking the time out of their busy schedules to be here. This is very important and probably a start of a process that I hope that at the end everybody -- I know maybe everybody won't be completely satisfied, but that we get through in some sort of a timely fashion

And I'll talk about that a little bit later
So myself, I'll be the chair today For those of you
that don't know me, my name is Fred Matt I'm the
chairman of the Tribal Council. And then we have to my
right Rhonda Swaney, director of Natural Resources; Jami
Hamel, Vice-Chair, Darryl Dupuis, Robb Hunter, the head
of our Legal Department, Pat Pierre, one of our tribal
elders, Ron Trahan, councilman from St Ignatius, Lloyd
Irvine, councilman from Pablo, and Kevin Howlett And
then to my left is the state team Maybe you could
introduce yourself

CHRIS TWEETEN Thank you, Mr. Chairman My
name is Chris Tweeten, I'm the chairman of the Reserved
Water Rights Compact Commission Seated to my far right

5

is Tara DePuy, who is the Park County Attorney and a member of the Compact Commission

To my immediate right is Susan Cottingham, the staff director for the Compact Commission Seated to my immediate left is Aimee Grmoljez, who is the legal counsel for Governor Marc Racicot And to Aimee's left is Faye Bergan, who is the legal counsel for the Compact Commission for these negotiations

FRED MATT Okay, Chris

CHRIS KENNEY Good morning My name is Chris

Kenney I'm the Chairman of the Flathead Federal

Negotiation Team Not all my team is here today. We had some folks with conflicts But to my left is Mr Bernie

Burnham, with BIA from Portland, who is a former member to the team

To my immediate right is Mr Rich Aldrich, from the Solicitor's Office of the Department of Interior

He's stationed in Billings And to my far right is Mr

Norbert Ries, who is, as I say, a former member to the negotiation team who's with the Bureau of Reclamation

I have some visitors, Mr Steve Pollick from BIA from Billings, who provides a lot of support to our negotiation effort, Mr Darrell Ewing, who is with the Office of Native American Affairs with the Bureau of Reclamation, who also provides technical support to the

staff

And Mr John Dooley, who is the Native American Affairs program manager for the Bureau of Reclamation in Boise, Idaho, and whose administrative responsibilities reach up into this part of Montana

FRED MATT Okay Thanks, Chris Okay So we're going to invite Tony to start out

TONY INCASHOLA Thank you, Mr Chairman This morning what we want to do is establish something that I think we, as tribes, need to establish and let everybody know that there are the confederacy of Salish people and Kootenai tribes on this reservation

We have three drum groups here representing the Salish, the Pend d'Oreille and the Kootenai And they will each sing a song The Salish Drum -- or the Pend d'Oreille Drum will sing the flag song, and then the Kootenai Drum and the Salish Drum will sing honor songs

So first of all, I would like to welcome each and every one of you here to this very important day Welcome to this beautiful valley of ours to discuss a very important issue that is important to all of us, that is part of our lives, our lifeline.

And I hope that as we go into this session and listen to the Honor Songs that we honor our ancestors, all of our ancestors who have provided for us and because

of them we are here today It is not because of modern 2 technology of modern things, material things that we have 3 today It's not because of that that we're here 4 It's because of the belief and the hard work of our ancestors 5 6 that have been here for many, many years And I hope by the end of the day that people all in this room will go 7 away understanding a little bit about each other and 8 knowing the importance of unity, of trust, of respect, of 9 10 the things that were given to us by our ancestors 11 After the drums we will have statements from the various tribal representatives, and then we will 12 continue with the agenda Thank you First we will have 13 14 an Honor song -- or a Flag song, rather 15 (The Pend d'Oreille Drum Group performed a Flag 16 Song) 17 (The Chief Cliff Drum Group performed an Honor Song) 18 19 (The Yamncut Drum Group performed an Honor 20 Song) 21 (Tony Incashola opened the meeting with a 22 prayer.) 23 TONY INCASHOLA The first opening statement 24 I'd like to have Mr Pat Pierre, from the Pend

25

d'Oreille.

PAT PIERRE First of all, I'd like to thank each and every one of you for coming today This is a beginning of something that hopefully will be for the good of all people As you probably have figured out by now, that you are in Indian Country, Pend d'Oreille Country, in the foot of the continental divide into Washington State

It was all Pend d'Oreille Country at one time

And I am a descendent of the Pend d'Oreille people The

rivers that flow throughout Indian Country are not just

rivers, the creeks that come out of the mountains are not

just creeks, they are a life and a lifeline to each and

every individual

To the Indian people the days gone by that up to now we still consider the three elements, the water, the earth and the air, the wind, we call at the wind These three elements are life itself. The Indian people have a continuous prayer, continuous prayer that all the three elements will survive, the air and the water and the earth will continue to be pristine so that we as a people can live and go on in time. It is up to each and every individual, not only in this room, but in this nation to do their part to see that this happens

We Indian people look at the water as a very highly spiritual aspect of life - The water is healing

Whether it's a cold spring out of the mountain, whether it's a creek running down the valleys, or whether it's a river, it is healing

1.0

I have personally witnessed many people healed in the waters, no doctors, no medication, just the water itself. So we look at water as something that's very precious. We don't look at water as just another stream.

We honor the rivers, we honor the creeks, the lakes, because that's how important it is to us as Indian people. And we hopefully pray that all the people throughout this nation, especially in this country here, the Flathead Nation, that you, too, will understand the importance of the water.

The water does not belong to the individual, the individual belongs to the water. The earth does not belong to the individual; the individual belongs to the earth. So we keep that in mind as we go through this time.

We have set a table that each of you could come to talk with us about this water. And our prayer today is that the streams throughout the reservation will not become a battleground, will not be something that we will have to fight for for the rest of time

We, as Indian people, these days are a peaceful

nation However, these negotiations that's going on
beginning today, let us not turn it into litigation. The
individuals that will come to this meeting today need to

understand you are in Indian Country

You are talking about something that this

Indian Nation, this particular Indian Nation owns We have every right to say, yes, this water belongs to this Nation We will protect it to the best of our ability We will stand and say, yes, we will protect this water and the land and the air

We talk about the three elements continuously, but the only way that we're going to come to an agreement is through the forth element, and that fourth element should surround this table, each and every one of us share every day, each and every one of us walk in this element every day

And that's spirituality Spirituality. How do we look at this? How do we conduct ourselves in the presence of one another here? With a good spirit or a bad spirit? How do we come to this table and sit and talk all day long and be at peace when we leave here?

Spirituality needs to be right here in the midst of the people today and the days to come. That fourth element is the most important part. We, as Indian people, live that daily, we walk in it; we sleep in it,

we talk in it

1.5

It is a part of our life, a very important

part Many of us here Indian people still practice our

traditional ways from way back when Back before

Christopher Columbus ever come to this country we had a

way of life that's still alive today

It's still alive And that's spirituality We know how to conduct ourselves on the side of the Great

One We know how to conduct ourselves on the side of all mankind, that we will continue to be a peaceful nation

We have provided the table for you to come and talk with us Let these negotiations be good

This is not given to us. This land was not given to us. This water was not given to us. The air was not given to us. It is there for the people. Let us become good stewards of the land. Let us become good keepers of the land and continue to build upon the land.

We Indian people, we look down the road. We see seven generations coming. We want them seven generations to share the things that we share today. We want those seven generations to know that they can walk upon this land in freedom and not be oppressed by different segments of this world.

We want those seven generations to enjoy a beautiful valley, a beautiful land, pristine streams, air

and earth. We learn to take from the earth and give back to the earth that is life. For everything we take we give back so that we can come and take again

So today, with this statement, I pray that everyone in this building that has come to this meeting will not have any negative thoughts about what's going on here, that we can sit here and be positive in what we do We have the authority to be positive

We have the power to be positive So let's go through this day like that Let us not turn our streams and our lakes into battlegrounds, but let us work together to keep it beautiful Thank you

TONY INCASHOLA Lemlencht Next, from the Kootenaı people, I'd like to ask Mr Matt Michel to come up here and make a statement

MATT MICHEL (Speaker spoke in his native language.)

Today I'm glad I'm here They told me to come They told me I was an elder I'm only 76 years old. I don't think I'm that old And to tell you the truth, when I went to school, I was in the third grade, I was still wearing moccasins See how poor the Indians were back then?

Today we're going to talk about our water rights How come Indian housing ain't going to pay for

our water? It's our water We got to pay so much every month And our land, wherever we build our house, we got to pay \$25 a year for our own land

That's what I can't understand What Pat mentioned about our spiritual, what he said about Columbus when he said he discovered the world, no, thousands and thousands of years ago the Indians were here. It's their land

(Speaker spoke in his native language). Well,
I'm glad what Pat mentioned, that's what set -- (Speaker spoke in his native language) Thank you

TONY INCASHOLA. Next, we have Felicity

McDonald, from the Bitterroot Salish Her nickname, we call her Jim so everybody knows where she's from, the Bitterroot here Her grandparents were down there, was known as Bitterroot Jim, so today she's also known as Bitterroot Jim Sometimes we call her Jungle Jim But Bitterroot Jim, one of our elders

FELICITY MCDONALD. (Speaker spoke in her native language)

TONY INCASHOLA: Did you ever take shorthand in Salish? I'm going to try to catch some of the things.

This is what it looks like, anyway First of all, she said that she is more comfortable in speaking in her own language because you can express yourself a lot better

that way

She said when she was young she remembers a petition going around, carried by Sam Resurrection, trying to protect the water, our water rights way back then Elders have always said that some day we would be fighting over water

And it has come to that today The Creator

gave us that water The Creator gave us our resources to

care for Water belongs to those caretakers Water is

used in very various ways and is very important Without

water we would have no berries

Without water we would have no medicine
Without water we would not survive Today, our waters
are polluted Life for our animals depend on the water
that we have Why do we have to fight for our water? It
was given to us

It was reserved for us to protect for our people We people have been here a long time before anyone. Our fish is disappearing because of pollution Lands are posted, preventing people from fishing Water is a very important resource to us, to all of us.

When we elders pass on, our children will have to continue our way of life I hope that fighting over water is not one of them I have a lot of -- the home here of the people, this is our land, this is our home

This is all we have left And she says thank you for listening

I have one more gentleman who has asked to say a few words He is also from the Bitterroot Salish people, and many of you know him Mr Louie Adams

day Remember greed has no room here, because what you're talking about is not only your lifeblood and not only my lifeblood, but the lifeblood of all of us, of everyone. Let's also remember the fish, the deer and elk, the define creatures, all the little animals out there that need this water

Remember the trees, the grass, the flowers

Like Felicity said, the medicines that we use. Let's

remember all of these things Lemlencht And, also, I'm

glad that my ancestors, the Salish, looked down the road

thousands of generations. That's the way I look at it

We want to prepare for thousands of generations down the

road

TONY INCASHOLA Okay That concludes And
I'd just like personally to thank my elders for their
input and their statements As a younger person growing
up here in this valley, I have nothing but praise for our
elders I stand before you because of those elders

The language that I retain, the culture that I

hold, the pride that I have is because of my elders. And my survival depends a lot on those elders. As we continue this process I hope we can put aside our personal views and think about those seven generations yet to come.

Your children, your grandchildren, what are we going to leave them? I hope we can leave them something a lot better than we received from our ancestors. We try to improve every time. What we got from our ancestors was very beautiful. We need to maintain that and improve that for future generations. Thank you

FRED MATT Okay At this time I would like to ask somebody from the State to have an opening statement, time for you, and then the federal team. And then I will finish up

CHRIS TWEETEN Thank you, Mr Chairman.

Again, for the record, my name is Chris Tweeten. I'm the chairman of the Reserved Water Rights Compact

Commission

First of all, we want to thank the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes for hosting this meeting and for making the arrangements to set this room up in a way that accommodates the needs of the parties and also the needs of the public

I think that gets our relationship off on a

very positive footing, and we very much appreciate that I'd like to, Mr Chairman, if I may, take a few minutes and provide some general background information for the other parties and for the members of the public about who we are and who we represent in these negotiations

The Reserved Water Rights Compact Commission is an agency of the state of Montana that was created by the Montana legislature in 1979 specifically for the purpose of sitting across the table from the Indian tribes and federal agencies in Montana in trying to negotiate settlements of the tribal and federal water rights claims in the state of Montana

This was done in the context of a statewide water adjudication program that was created in 1979, the objective of which is to quantify all of the water rights that exist in Montana. In turn, this was a response to a mandate that was in the 1972 Constitution that was adopted by the people of Montana that required, among other things, that there be a centralized record of all the water rights in Montana.

Previously, the water rights records had been decentralized, and that has caused a significant amount of trouble in terms of trying to figure out who is entitled to use water in the state of Montana and in resolving conflicting claims over water in Montana

So we're part and parcel of a larger program in Montana that's designed to create a catalog of all the water rights in existence in the state of Montana. For the past 20 years we've negotiated nine separate compacts with federal agencies and Indian tribes, and we're presently in negotiation with the Blackfeet Tribe, with the Assimiboine and Gros Venture Tribes in Ft. Belknap, and with the Tribes here at the Flathead Reservation

We're also in negotiation with the Forest

Service and the Fish and Wildlife Service over various

federal claims for water. So we have a very full plate
in terms of the work that's before the Commission The

Commission consists of nine members

Four of them are legislators appointed by the legislative leadership, four of them are citizens of the state of Montana who are not legislators who are appointed by the governor, and one is appointed by the Attorney General

The membership of the Compact Commission consists of a very wide variety of representatives of the people in Montana. We have people involved in agriculture, we have attorneys, we have one schoolteacher

So we have representation from a variety of different areas of expertise among the people of the

state of Montana The legislature, in 1979, chose to try to negotiate these claims rather than to litigate them because they understood the drawbacks of litigation over federal reserved water rights. They understood that litigated outcomes out of disputes over federal reserved water rights are generally not very satisfactory and they are very expensive and time consuming

You end up with a quantity of water on a priority date, but with no idea how that water's going to be administered. And ordinarily that's a recipe for further litigation between the parties, all of which consumes a tremendous amount of time and other resources, including mine.

The legislature felt that -- I think wisely -trying to reach negotiated settlements would allow for
finding practical solutions to these conflicts over water
rights that would not only provide a date and a quantity
of water with respect to the federal and tribal claims,
but would also provide some means of integrating those
federal and tribal claims into the water use system that
exists across the state of Montana in a way that
minimizes the possibility for conflicts and litigation in
the future

And we're very optimistic that with a lot of hard work and after what we think will be a fairly

time-consuming negotiating process we will be able to come up with a settlement out of here at the Flathead 2 Reservation that will accomplish those objections, that 4 is, that we will provide an agreement as to the quantity of water that the Tribe has the right to use, while at 5 6 the same time coming to some understanding about how that 7 water right is to be integrated with the existing water rights that exist under state law in this area in a 8 9 manner that's going to minimize the possibility that the parties are going to have to continue to litigate over 10 these issues in the future as they have in the past 11 12

3

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Our process for negotiating is very much built around public participation We recognize that under state law we represent the water users and other citizens of the state of Montana who are not affiliated with the Tribe in this area, and as a practical matter we understand that no negotiated settlement is likely to be approved by the Montana legislature if it does not adequately address the interests of the non-Indian water using community in the valleys that encompass the reservation

That's simply a fact of life that we have to deal with and, as a result, we are very much committed to the idea that we want to conduct public meetings in this area to hear the concerns of the non-Indian water using

community and to take those into consideration as we formulate our negotiating positions.

Our intention is to come to Flathead to conduct as many public meetings as we need to conduct in order to make sure that everyone who has use with respect to these issues has been heard and that we've had an opportunity to take their use into consideration in formulating our negotiating positions

So I want to make it clear to the non-Indian water users and other members of the public who are here today that the public comment period that's on the agenda for today's meeting is not your only opportunity to communicate your views to the Compact Commission

Our staff is always available to talk to you one on one. And, as I said, we are committed to the idea that we will be back on more than one occasion to meet with the public to hear their concerns and to try to achieve a comfort level between us and them as to our ability to represent their interests in these negotiations

We also have a memorandum of understanding with the other agencies in state government that have an interest in these proceedings. We understand it's important for us to make sure that the views of the Department of Natural Resources and Conservation, the

Attorney General's Office, the Department of Fish,
Wildlife and Parks, and the Governor's Office are taken
into consideration in formulating our positions

And we have a formal memorandum of agreement with those agencies and of which we undertake the obligation to keep them informed as to the process and progress of the negotiations, to solicit their input on the issues, and to formulate positions that we think are going to be acceptable to those other agencies, as well.

And I think that's a matter that should be of some comfort to the Tribe and the United States, because we understand that those other agencies in state government are going to have some influence over whether the legislature will approve a negotiated compact.

And we can give you our assurance that those views will be taken into consideration up front and that those agencies will not be coming in and opposing any negotiated compact that we've reached on the grounds that they didn't know what was going on and they weren't aware of the issues that we were negotiating

So I hope that's a matter that's of some comfort to the other parties with whom we're negotiating. Mr Chairman, we're looking forward to productive negotiations We understand the history of the litigation that's gone on in this area over water

rights, and we're very much committed to the idea that we can bring that litigation to a close and come up with a compact that not only addresses the needs of the Tribe with respect to water, but also takes into consideration and addresses the needs of the other water users in the area so that we can put a stop to this litigation and actually allow the Tribe and the non-Indian water users to live together in harmony

We are very much looking forward to the opportunity to negotiate that agreement with you Thank you, Mr Chairman

FRED MATT Thanks, Chris

CHRIS TWEETEN Excuse me One other point I'd like to make for the members of the audience, there is a sign-up sheet that is being passed around. And the purpose of that sign-up sheet is to formulate a mailing list.

If you want to be kept informed as to when the next meetings are going to be held and receive other mailings that might be sent out, please put your name and address on that sign-up sheet as it goes around so we can make sure that we include you on the mailing list and make sure you receive that information. Thank you, Mr Chairman

FRED MATT Okay And at this time the only

comment I would make is that, again, we're going to continue to communicate to the Governor, that as we did when he met with us a few weeks ago, that we intend to pressure him to put the resources, make them available so that we can go through this process

And we will continue to We'll probably sound like a broken record, but I think it's really important that we do this to keep these negotiations going And you'll probably hear that more and more today, also.

Chris And they made it easy for me I think they realize how spacey I can get sometimes, so both parties on each side, their first name is Chris So, Chris

CHRIS KENNEY It's purely coincidental, I assure you Thank you, Mr. Chairman Myself and my colleagues, we're gratified and honored to be here We've been working with the Flathead Nation over a number of years, and we're pleased to see water rights issues involved today when we can begin to talk about resolution to those issues

I have just a couple of opening comments and some contacts. I think it's important for me to say the United States is mindful and cognizant of all of its responsibilities to quantify water in the west and all the different contexts to which that resides.

But we're more than cognizant of our historical

and sacred responsibilities to the Tribes in terms of the treaty relationship we have and the other agreements that we've had over time. And we take that responsibility very seriously and it was because of that reason a number of years ago, starting as far back as the Regan. Administration, and every administration since then, and Congress has also made it clear that it's been the federal government's position that we are looking for negotiated settlements if that's at all possible

And so over the years the Department of
Interior, under the Secretary, has established a
structure to put teams in place to engage the tribes, to
engage the states, to try to find mutually beneficial
settlements that would help the tribes to continue to
provide water for their future evolution of their
homelands and to fulfill the needs that the tribes have
in the future

That's what we're here for, and that's what we are intending to do
Those teams are under the direction of the Deputy Secretary, Dave Hayes, who came into the department at one time as the counsel of the Secretary who traditionally oversaw and administered the Water Rights Program

And when he became Deputy Secretary he just sort of kept that along with him and we didn't really

_

complain too much We thought it was sort of nice to have the deputy secretary's interests on our side We've had a number of settlements over the years

Over the last 20 years the United States has negotiated over 15 to 16 water rights settlements. We think that we have found an opportunity to reach a mutual settlement to the benefit of all parties. Just like the Montana Compact Commission, we do also see advantages to a negotiated settlement when we believe that the Tribes believe that they have received the benefits and the resources they need for their own homeland

And we think that's a possibility, because
we've seen that success story in other contexts. So we
are hopeful and we're looking forward to it. Our team is
here expressly for the purpose of resolving the Flathead
Nation Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes' reserved
water rights claims

That's what we hope to do. That's what we're focused on And so we believe that this is a start of a long and, we expect, fruitful process, that we will end up where we think we need to be Thank you

FRED MATT: Thanks, Chris. I'd just like to make a few comments and then, actually, I'd like to read this prepared statement into the record. But as you can see, for those of you that are here, how important water

is to our people and to all of the people on the reservation

And to our people, as many have talked about this morning, again there's a common theme that we share, and that's our water is very sacred to our people and have been. And we recognize that, and that's why we're here today. And I also think that it just may be a coincidence, but maybe not that we're setting at the south bay of one of the most beautiful lakes in the country.

And we're proud of that I think we work really hard as a tribe to make sure that that water is pure and that water is in the best condition that we can possibly leave it, not only for those of us who are here today, but for our children and our children's children to come

But we not only go just right here within the reservation boundaries, but we are concerned -- as will be talked about today -- in our aboriginal territory, which is head waters in our aboriginal territory. We are concerned about the quality of water and what comes down through the streams

To this day you can still -- in a lot of cases, some people may debate that, but you can still take a dip of water throughout the reservation in our streams and

drink it For those who drifted through this part of the country a hundred years ago probably never thought they'd ever see the day that we were concerned about purity, the

We've been through -- this country's been through a lot of different -- they've been through the gold rush days, they've been through the fuel rush days, gas is running out, gold has run out, all those different times, and I feel we're just at the brink of the water rush days.

quality of water, and now the quantity of what's there

And I just think, personally in my heart, and what has been said many times this morning by many others, that the only way we're going to get through this is if we work together, that obviously we take this seriously and we work together to make sure that our interests and our concerns are met

And that's not going to be easy We know that. And we're going to have to give and take I think we all know that But I think -- I really have a good feeling in my heart that we can do that. So with that, I would just like to read this into the record.

There again, I'm honored to be here today amongst my colleagues to represent you, to speak on behalf of the Salish and Kootenai Tribes And I do think this is a historic occasion On behalf of the Flathead

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

1.4

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Nation, we welcome all of you who are here today, the visitors, to commence with these negotiations for something that's very important as water

We are gathered here to quantify water rights on behalf of the Tribes, the United States and the state of Montana And I must remind our visitors here today that the Salish and Kootenai people have lived here as what has been said for thousands of years

And this very reservation was part of our homeland, and is our homeland today, and will remain for This reservation was established in the rest of time 1855 by the Hell Gate Treaty. And with that treaty we reserved this land as our homeland, and along with the land the water necessary to maintain ourselves and the resources in it or on it

And we, by our tradition and culture, approach these discussions again, which may have been said, and I know I said, with our children in mind. I'm just here for a short time and we're just here for a short time But we want to make sure that what we do today is something that will benefit generations to come

It is our intent to protect the right to a healthy and adequate lifestyle with the water necessary to fulfill the needs for our future and in all honesty review the water as our most important resource, as has

been said many times here

1.0

I don't think it's an accident that it's been said that water is our blood, lifeblood. Water is the lifeblood of the earth and the resources are created -- put upon to sustain our lives. None of us can live without it. We give thanks daily to our Creator for the gift of life and accept the responsibility to maintain water resources on this reservation that are necessary to sustain our lives.

And while the term negotiation to many of our tribal people mean that we may give up something, yet at the same time presents an opportunity for us to amicably resolve the issue of quantification. And I think it behooves us all to meet as nations and governments and to work towards solving the issues before us today regarding something so sacred as water

And, finally, the Confederated Salish and
Kootenai Tribes of the Flathead Nation look forward to
our future negotiations, as I mentioned And, lastly, we
look at litigation as the last alternative to resolve
these issues of quantifying our water. The Tribes are
committed to prepare to work long and hard to reach a
negotiated water rights compact

And with that, again, I want to thank everybody And I'm glad Chris and Chris stated their

name. We have a recorder here today, Abby, and she made sure that -- because there is a record being developed that we want to get your names as you make a comment

We have set out some ground rules, but these ground rules are just so that we can kind of get through the day in some sort of a timely manner and that we have the opportunity for everybody to be heard and to comment

We're going to go through an agenda that we prepared, and at the end of the day we're going to open up the floor for comments from the audience And there again, it has been said it doesn't stop here today. Your comments are welcome and written and the State will leave an address where you can send your comments to, as well as the federal, as well as the Tribe.

This is not being videoed. The lens cover is on the camera, but it's being taped so we can make sure we have three different ways of making sure the record is being established. So with that, I would like to just go right into the agenda. Most everybody, the agenda was handed out. So if you don't have one, it's in the back, on the back table.

And again, part of what I believe that I'm so proud of being up here with this group of ladies and gentlemen. And they're really the working horses that

I'm involved with every day So as we go through the agenda, I'm going to call on them to help me identify some of the things that's on here So with that, I'm going to ask Robb Hunter to go through the memorandum of understanding for the audience Robb

1.

1.0

ROBB HUNTER Thank you, Mr Chair For the record, my name is Robb Hunter I'm the managing attorney for the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes What I want to discuss with the parties here is that as we go through negotiations and the negotiation process, a while back the parties thought it was wise to set out certain ways of doing business while we're in negotiations

And, therefore, back in October of 1998, the parties entered into a memorandum of understanding, which is designed to set out protocols under which the parties will operate during negotiation sessions. And these protocols do not go to issues of substance, but merely go to procedural and process aspects of negotiation sessions

And what I'd like to do today is go through these particular elements of the MOU with the parties and have discussions as to the details of that process in order to reach understandings between the parties so that we don't have misunderstandings in these negotiations

today, as well as in the future

This MOU was entered into by the state of Montana, the United States of America and the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes The first element of that MOU is that the parties will hold negotiation sessions on a rotating basis in Pablo, in Helena and in Missoula.

And at each of these locations the chair of the negotiation session will be rotated. And the assumption is that at the particular location the party from that location will chair the meeting. And so Fred is chairing the meeting today. When it goes to Helena the assumption is that Chris will chair the meeting, and in Missoula. Chris Kenney will chair the meeting.

If at any time you think we need more detail into these elements I would ask that input be given. The second element of the MOU is that negotiations are open to the general public and that they will be recorded Now we've had some ideas as to what recording entails, and we do have a verbatim transcript being generated today. But we may in the future realize that that is not necessary to capture the essence of what we agreed to

Negotiations will be closed and held in executive sessions whenever the parties agree that there is a need to protect confidential or privileged

unformation to the extent that such closure is consistent with state, federal and tribal law. The chair, whoever that may be in negotiation sessions, has the authority to restrict the nonparty attendees in such a fashion as to facilitate the negotiation process consistent with state, tribal and federal law

Element number three in the MOU provides that no statements or positions taken by the parties is admissible in any subsequent trial or proceeding pertaining to the protection, establishment, quantification, or administration of the Tribes' reserved aboriginal or appropriative water rights regardless of whether that statement or position constitutes an offer to compromise under State or Federal Rules of Civil Procedure

However, the parties, if in fact this does go to trial or other proceeding are not prohibited from entering into evidence any data that is generated or evidence that is produced in order to facilitate that party's position during that trial or procedure

Element number four in the MOU states that the parties will agree that all press releases or other statements or discussions with the press regarding these negotiations shall be jointly made between the Commission, the Tribes, and the feds claim it was a

mutual mistake that they were left out of this provision

Any press contact outside of these conditions will be reported by the party who has contact with the press to the other parties immediately. When appropriate, the Commission, the Tribes and the federal government will appoint subcommittees to analyze technical or other designated issues and make recommendations back to the negotiating parties at a negotiations session.

The parties to these negotiations are limited to the Tribes, the federal government and the state. The parties acknowledge that the attendance and full input by the public is crucial for a compact to be reached on water rights on the Flathead Reservation. Public comments will be received during each negotiations session and will be a part of the agenda for each session

Each party will be tasked with the responsibility to gather input for those constituents they represent. However, the agenda and anything that goes on the agenda will be agreed to in advance by the parties before that session is taken. And that is the gist of the MOU. There are details to be worked out, and I believe that the chairs might have discussed some of

these details earlier today.

FRED MATT Thank you, Robb Rhonda, do you want to start on the technical aspects of it, and then, Robb, you can explain the legal approach

RHONDA SWANEY Thank you, Mr Chairman The technical and legal teams may be appointed under item number six as just read by Robb -- or excuse me -- number five And generally those subcommittees are directed to work on specific issues. For example, the memorandum of understanding that Robb just went through was assigned to the legal committee a couple of years ago

We intend that this procedure will be followed in each negotiation session. In terms of the technical group that may be asked to work, I would like to introduce those folks. These are the tribal technical team members. Bill Foust, Seth Makepeace, Diane Cline, Clayton Matt, Ron Billstein

And those are the folks that are here today
that are on the technical team. Tom Bateridge Excuse
me He wasn't sitting in his chair and I didn't see
him Some of the tasks that might be assigned to a
technical committee would be, an example, to look at the
hydrology of the reservation, come to agreement as to how
much water is here and can be appropriated

Another example might be agreement on how to

verify those claims, how to be filed. Another topic might be how to come to agreement on any number of things that require compliance. And we intend to -- we worked long and hard for many years to begin to collect data. We're fully prepared to go ahead as soon as possible and look forward to contributing the technical expertise necessary to come to a compact agreement.

ROBB HUNTER Each of the parties have legal resources available to analyze those particular issues that might be developed or might come to an issue as far as the technical approach is concerned. For the Tribes on legal assistance, are myself, Robb Hunter, Mr. Dan Decker, former managing attorney for the Tribes and now private practice, and Mr. John Carter, who is part of the Legal Department for the Tribes

We view our assistance to the process as crucial in actually weighing the legal issues that will develop and make sure for all of the parties and make sure that the rights, as far as the parties are concerned, are protected. We're available to all of the parties at any time to look at the legal issues and to try to come to agreement as to those issues as they may be

And, of course, the legal issues go all the way from the recent Supreme Court -- Montana Supreme Court

decisions regarding water rights on this reservation and the administration of those rights to some of the technical issues that Rhonda just identified

FRED MATT: Okay Thanks, Robb And, also, when we did the introductions we mentioned elders that are on the team And Francis wasn't sitting at the table at the time, but I want to introduce Francis Auld He's really not my elder, but he is an integral part of the team

As you can see, we really hold a high regard for our elders and different people that add significantly an element to these negotiations. And in the back of the room is Ig Couture and Joe Cullooyah. At this time, I think we will just take a short break and let everybody -- I know Barry Baker is starting to fall asleep. So I think we will just take a short break and you can get a cup of coffee.

(A break was taken from 10 37 a m to 11 00 a m)

FRED MATT. Before we continue, Rhonda asked to introduce some of the elders in the back. We didn't know they were back there. So go ahead, Rhonda

RHONDA SWANEY I would like to apologize to the several members of the technical team who are the most important members of the technical team. I'm not

used to this public forum any longer and, consequently,
I'm a little nervous So I'd like to apologize and take
the opportunity to introduce them

2.0

The folks who serve the Tribal Council and advise on cultural matters include the Culture

Preservation Office, Marcia Cross, Germaine White And we have a number of distinguished elders who are part of the elders committee that advise us, as well

Stephen Smallsalmon, John Stanislaw, Joe
Cullooyah, Ig Couture. And both Ig and John are also
part of the negotiation team Louise Michel, Mary Eneas,
Helen Charlo Thank you. Noel Pichette, Mike Durglo,
Alice Camel, Jim McDonald, Margaret Finley, Janie
Wabaunsee, John Peter Paul, and Louie Adams. Thank you

FRED MATT Did you notice that John's still raising cane? Rhonda thinks she's nervous Also, too, I forgot the other members of the Council that's here today Carole Lankford Oh, Maggie We weren't sure She's from over the west side No Okay

And also, there again, the state and the federal team, interrupt me or -- I know as we get through this if you have comments or topics that we're covering, I want to give you some time. So just before we broke we had Rhonda and Robb go through the MOU and the technical team and stuff. So do you have any comments at this

time?

SUSAN COTTINGHAM Mr Chairman, thank you I think we just wanted to augment a little bit about what Robb and Rhonda said in terms of how the State deals with its technical and legal work, and also to just maybe review a little bit about how we have done it in past negotiations

Not to say that's how we'll do it here, but just to give some thoughts to folks on how to proceed We have a twelve-person staff, legal, a couple of attorneys, hydrologists, soil scientists, we use geographic information systems very extensively We have a couple of computer folks that work for us.

And all those folks do technical and legal advice to the Commission and also in past negotiations have worked with other technical and legal staffs from the federal government and from the Tribe to put together some joint technical work. For instance, up in the Milk River, I don't think -- up in the Milk River we have set up a joint legal team and a joint technical team.

The legal team does a lot of the drafting of the actual compact together and then brings it back to the parties when they have issues that they're struggling with. The technical teams, for example, have spent a number of years putting together a hydro water model that

__

models all the water used in the Milk River Basin and comes up with various scenarios for what would happen if the Tribe uses its full water claim and what impacts there are to downstream users and so on and so forth

We spend a lot of time working with the local water users to try to understand how things are working on the ground, and then they come back to the negotiating teams and sort of report what they found and a lot of our meetings, for instance, up there end up being reports from the various technical groups

And we have found that that's worked really well because then all the parties are working from the same information. I think it's our hope that we can begin to set up something like that here, see if our GIS systems are compatible, you know, look at how our computers are set up so that we can begin to see how we can exchange some data and so on

I think one of the things I would hope we could come to an understanding about as we move forward is how those technical teams can relate to each other informally on the phone without having to go through the formal negotiating teams and yet knowing that once they come to some resolution they would be coming back formally to the parties to make some recommendations

So I think as we move through the day we'd like

to talk a little bit about how we might have our staff-to-staff contact I know on some of the other negotiations, we've worked very closely with the Bureau of Reclamation They've had some good technical folks helping us in the Crow negotiations, and I think it's been very productive

So just to augment that, we think that given the fact that all of the official negotiators, Tribal Council and others are very busy with lots of business, it's very helpful to be able to move forward if we can have some informal contacts between the staffs to get a lot of the ground work done

So I just wanted to add to that Oh, yeah, thanks We do have a couple more staff members here that weren't introduced We're as nervous as you are, I suppose. Stan Jones is our hydrologist, and he's working on our Forest Service negotiations and he has got a lot of background in instream flow methodology

And so he's going to be our hydrologist Ariel
Anderson is our soil scientist, and he has begun looking
at the soils information up here on the Flathead
Reservation The person who is going to be our technical
team leader is a woman named Sonya Hogeland She
couldn't be here today

She had a long vacation planned many months

ago But she's going to be heading up our technical team. She's our computer specialist She's a real whiz at the GIS, and I think you will find her very easy to work with.

And she'll maybe be working with Abby and others to see if we can keep minutes or, you know, the tasks list and things like that, helping the logistics and how that moves along. Faye Bergan, who is here, is going to be the legal counsel for this negotiation. And then we have Bill Bryman, who's our ag engineer, will also be working on this, as well

So sorry they couldn't all be here today. But we have a series of four public meetings up on the Milk River in 10 days and they're desperately getting ready for that, as well So we've got a lot going on Thank you, Mr Chairman

FRED MATT. And that was Susan Did you get that? And on these mikes, I think the best way -- you can't crowd them If you're just about a foot away, I think it works the best So go ahead, Chris.

CHRIS KENNEY Thank you Just a couple of comments I had some questions during the break about the structure and process, so this is probably timely One of the things that should be said is with regard to the Flathead Nation's water rights claims, I mean the

l

Bureau of Indian Affairs is really the focused agency

They're the ones over the years that have pulled together the resources, have done the studies and pursued that in concert with the Department of Justice When the Department puts together a negotiation team, in addition to the chair that the Secretary puts in place, then you're going to have other folks that are formal members of the team

Those formal members are there for two

purposes There's either policy considerations because

Reclamation facilities are maybe impacted by a potential

settlement or Fish and Wildlife has a native species

concern, or what we look at as a team, one of the

considerations is what are the issues in addition to the

water that are going to have to be dealt with in the

process of settling

So you'll see a representative from each of these agencies that are impacted. If the Forest Service becomes an issue, then we will ask the Forest Service to at least provide an agile member because we don't want to have to explain to them after two or three years of negotiation what's going on because they haven't been party to it

So we're cognizant of trying to, as Mr. Tweeten mentioned coordination with his fellow agencies, we try

to do that from time to time, if that's okay And so that's the basis of the team. And because of that I, as chair, have access to any of the technical expertise that the federal government that the Department of Interior can bring to bear, assuming, of course, that I can get access to this resource in the first place

Which with the downsizing this year we've lost more and more resources. So as these teams are put together and we identify the need -- we've already brought modeling folks together with the Tribes and working on modeling issues and things like that. So those resources will be available to us as we identify the need.

With regard to legal resources, I didn't mention earlier, but one of the important things about the establishment of the team is it's not only the Secretary of Interior that establishes it but he also does it in coordination and conjunction with the attorney general

We always have a member of the Department of

Justice on our team Dave Harder couldn't be here today,

and Dave Harder is intimately familiar with the claims

and the issues on the Flathead Reservation So in

addition, we've got Rich Aldrich, have a solicitor who is

appointed to this team to support the legal

determinations as far as any negotiated settlement

So we think we have the resources in terms of people and expertise so when those teams get put together, except for the fact that everybody works 80-hour weeks, we will probably be able to get everything done.

FRED MATT Okay, thank you, Chris At this time, again, Rhonda was going to cover item six

RHONDA SWANEY Item six is scope of negotiations. What we wanted to do here was just give you a general overview of the things we plan to talk about in negotiations in the coming months. As many of you know, and hopefully if you don't know you soon will, the Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes have what's called a Stevens Treaty

It was a treaty of Hell Gate negotiated by

Governor Isaac Stevens in 1855 and ratified by Congress
in 1859 That negotiated treaty followed the template
used by Governor Stevens in the negotiation of several
other treaties in the northwest. That template
recognized the special relationship the Indian people
have with fish and wildlife for subsistence and other
purposes.

Consequently, the treaty reserved the rights to the Tribes for hunting and fishing on the reservation and

in usual and accustomed places Those usual and accustomed places were everywhere the Tribes traveled Interpreting the treaty, the courts have said -- these kinds of treaties, the courts have said that in addition to a guaranteed right to those resources we have implied the right to the resources and support, such as water for fish, water to support wildlife habitat.

Consequently, we're going to be talking in negotiation sessions about our off-reservation and on-reservation water rights. We're going to talk about consumptive and nonconsumptive uses. Consumptive uses are certainly those that are used in the water consuming it, like agriculture, domestic water use, commercial, municipal industrial uses.

And nonconsumptive uses are uses or rights to water so the water is not consumed. An example of those are instream flows. Another example is water for hydro power development or hydro power use. Also recreation is a nonconsumptive use. And we plan to talk about all of these

We plan to talk about surface water and ground water We plan to talk about water rights administration Mr. Tweeten's already mentioned that We agree we need to talk about that And, finally, we feel compelled to address settlement contributions to be

4 5

made by all the parties So those are an example of the kinds of things we plan to discuss in upcoming sessions

FRED MATT Okay Again, thank you, Rhonda
Watershed approach Ron Okay. Either that or you can
sit at the table and use the mike And, again, state
your name.

RON BILLSTEIN Okay. Thank you, Mr Chairman. I'm Ron Billstein.

FRED MATT Ron, excuse me Thank you, Jamı, for keeping me on task Before you do, there again, does the State have any response to the comments Rhonda had to make?

CHRIS TWEETEN Mr Chairman, thanks for the opportunity to comment Our charge as the commission is quite broad and we will obviously be prepared to address and discuss whatever issues the other parties want to bring to the table

The interests that we ordinarily try to protect are those of the non-Indian water users and there are extensive, as you know, existing uses in the area that we think are going to be a major concern in these negotiations and something we need to discuss

We are certainly prepared to discuss contributions to settlement, but the extent to which the State is obligated to make contributions to settlement

depends on the extent to which we receive protections for those things that are of concern to us that we bring to the table

And that's traditionally the way our contributions and obligations have been viewed in other negotiations, and we expect that's the way they will be viewed here, as well

FRED MATT Thanks, Chris

CHRIS KENNEY I think the only thing I would offer beyond what Rhonda has already said -- because I think she represented it well -- was the United States has the same interest and understanding what we believe our agreements were with the Tribe when we entered those treaties and we want to pursue all of those purposes and rights that we think the Tribe has

I think we're in substantial agreement with the Tribe in that regard. With regard to federal contributions to settlements we take what we consider those in terms of equitable concerns and whatever we think will be of benefit to facilitate, make the settlement work for everybody's benefit

FRED MATT. Okay Thanks Okay, Ron

RON BILLSTEIN My name is Ron Billstein I'm

a technical consultant to the Tribes for these

settlements And I'd like to talk a bit about what we

call watershed approach And I've been fortunate to work with all the parties here on a number of other settlements

Some have been fairly successful, fairly streamlined Others have taken a good long period of time to get accomplished and some are still moving ahead. And I'd like to think that we've learned a lot during the course of these processes

And one of the questions that you ask is, you know, how do you start a settlement? How do you get this thing going? How do you get focused? How do you begin the process? And I'd like to talk a little bit about that

Of course, there are some global technical issues that go across all kinds of watershed boundaries on any reservation. That deals with hydrology, both surface and ground water, climate zones, water requirements, soils, and those sorts of things.

Those will have to be done on an overall reservation-wide basis. But by and large, those can be accomplished fairly readily and at the front end. But we've found the best step then to take is to get into an individual watershed-by-watershed analysis because each watershed has its own unique problems and issues

And we find it's beneficial to concentrate on

those particular watersheds and ultimately reach an agreement in principle on a watershed and then ultimately come in later and integrate them all into an overall settlement document

We were introduced with respect to the tribal technical teams and legal teams and the state technical and legal teams, as well as the federal side, and there are a lot of resources there—But, believe me, when we get into the heart of these settlements you're going to find that those resources are going to be stretched in a lot of ways

And you're not going to be able to study everything concurrently. So that's another reason to start to look at a watershed-by-watershed analysis. Because we have limited resources, both legal and technical, it's a way of trying to optimize those resources to get some kind of an output with respect to an analysis.

And the other part is with respect to the non-Indian interests. I've been in a lot of settlements in Arizona, in New Mexico, all the way up here. And the non-Indian parties are going to be stretched, as well You would like to concentrate in that area of the reservation or in that watershed that most affects you, that holds the greatest amount of your interest.

a

It's going to be very demanding on you on both a time-driven basis, as well as a cost basis, to try to cover everything throughout this settlement. So, again, by doing kind of a watershed specific analysis we think that this is a way to insure greater participation by the vast majority of the non-Indian interests

So we would like the state and federal teams to consider this idea that, sure, there are certain global technical issues and legal issues that we have to address at the front end, but then that we concentrate on evaluating and establishing a settlement agreement and principles on the major watersheds on the reservation, starting with, say, the Jocko Watershed, and then go over into the Little Bitterroot Camas areas, and then finally over into the Mission area

There may be some subsets of that, like the main stem of the Flathead or the Flathead Lake area, but it's a suggestion that we would like to bring up for discussion at this time because they think that this would expedite the settlements in the best way possible

FRED MATT Thanks, Ron Susan

SUSAN COTTINGHAM Mr Chairman, thank you,

Ron We have worked with Ron on other settlements and so

we're familiar with how a number of these have worked

And I think we're very amenable to a watershed approach

I think as Ron said, there are going to be certain global issues that are going to stretch across all of the watersheds. And, certainly, I don't think we would come to a final agreement on a particular watershed until we looked at the big picture and saw how everything integrated

But we've used that approach in other negotiations. When we were working with the Crow, Faye instituted sort of an agreement that we would start and do all of our technical work, including looking at the state claims examination process, which I think Rhonda mentioned in Pryor Creek.

And what that did was we were able to work closely with the tribal folks and federal folks and show them exactly how that process worked. We looked at hydrology, we looked at our soils, and what agreements and disagreements we had

And then we all came to a comfort level about, you know, where our data worked and where it didn't work. So I think those kinds of things are helpful. Up on Ft. Belknap we have a separate working group on People's Creek, which is not on the main stem of the Milk, and that's working very well.

And, in fact, we are actually doing something a little bit new up there. It's a small watershed. But

we're actually working with the water users and the Montana Water Court to see if we can get their understanding of exactly what their water rights are going to end up being and get some stipulations there so that everybody knows what the playing field is

So I think the approach is worthwhile. Like I said, I think there will still be global issues and I think everybody will want to take a look at how all the watersheds work together and what give and take we've had on either one—But I don't see that that's a problem.

I think the point that Ron made that everybody's resources is stretched pretty thin, including the folks out there on the ground, and it sort of makes sense to try to get a handle on it. And, of course, the watershed is the best way to do it. So, Faye, any other thoughts on that? Thank you

CHRIS KENNEY I want to -- in full disclosure,
I don't like splitting negotiations up for the reasons
that Susan suggested because segmentation of negotiations
leads to mischief sometimes However, I say that because
I believe strongly that watershed basis in this
negotiation is highly desirable for a couple of reasons

Number one, I think the complexity of the Flathead's negotiations far exceeds anything else that we've seen in the state of Montana and I think to try to

get our arms around it all at once would be challenging at best and almost insane at worst

1.9

And the other reason I think it's a good idea and I support it is because I think the watersheds on the reservation tend to lend themselves to segmentation.

With the caveat and one of the reasons I start with such a strong statement is that I am concerned and I endorse. Susan's point that at some point you stop and you bring everything together because it's all a piece of a whole and I want to make sure we don't lose sight of that.

So I guess the other reason I think it's a good idea is it gives us an opportunity to pursue and engage our technical people in particular sooner rather than later because I think we can talk about the Jocko or the Camas Bitterroot, I think we can engage people relatively early in that process because they are more management So I would agree with what both of you guys said

FRED MATT Okay Thanks, Chris This next item on the agenda, I'm going to ask Clayton Matt and Dan Decker to go over the technical and legal issues Clayton, you can either -- well, yeah, why don't you just sit I'll just leave

CLAYTON MATT We had spent some time talking about the -- amongst the team and with the federal representatives -- lots of options that we can identify,

and I think some of them have been identified here this morning

I think everything that we've done on the agenda up until now sort of sets the stage for our beliefs and our understandings about what negotiation means to us. And I think we set some ground rules. Now comes the time to begin to talk a little bit about what

technical and legal work we can start on

Some informal discussions we had in setting the agenda, I know some things came out from the State staff, and I would expect you'll have some input to offer. And I guess I would expect to hear some of the same things here today, and I won't try to share those.

I will let you deal with those and bring those out. And I'm only going to deal with the one technical item we talked about internally and if there are other technical items we will try to tackle I guess we'll expect to hear that from you, as well. There may be -- I'm certain there are at least a couple of legal questions that are going to come out of this. And when I'm done, Dan Decker is going to address a little bit of the legal question on the one item and I think introduce another item.

One of the global issues I think we've got to deal with to begin with, and I think regardless of the

positions we ultimately take on water rights on the reservation, regardless of the positions that we've settled on, the claim verification process seems like something that needs to be done

And I think we're aware in observing the negotiations throughout the state of Montana that you have had with other tribal governments. That seems to be something that's already begun. In many ways it makes sense to us, as well. I know that there are some technical issues we need to work out

We probably won't get them all worked out here today. I assume a technical team could sit down and give a talk about the approaches to accomplishing that So the one item I wanted to get on the table right now is that.

And certainly as a threshold to that there are some legal questions, and I think there may end up ultimately being some legal analysis associated with that, as well—So while we could begin to work on a whole litany of technical issues, I think our engineering expert under the firm MCHAM Ron Billstein laid out a few of the issues to you and I heard some mention of some of the other work that's being done—I heard that maybe you've already begun to look at some soils here on the reservation.

Of course, there's hydrology and then go on and on from there But where do we begin And that claim verification seems to be at least one of the early needs we have and we're throwing that on the table to begin with and to see where we go

And, of course, as you finish up here today, I guess that will in part depend on the amount of work we get assigned here and will partly depend on what the negotiation schedule is going to entail. So that's all I had for now, and I will turn it over to Dan.

DAN DECKER I'm going to pick up where Clayton left off on claim verification. It's important to us as much from a legal standpoint as a technical standpoint because it's been -- we've heard from the state team repeated statements about the interest of protecting existing non-Indian water users on the Flathead Indian Reservation.

And from that aspect it's very important to these negotiations that those claims that you seek to protect, that there is a verification of those claims and the validity of the claims that have been made by the non-Indian water users that you do want to protect.

And we know that there is a stance that the state has to play and the Compact Commission has to play with the state water courts in the process of verifying

those claims But we would hope that that would be a process that could begin soon.

Also, we note that one of the first things that will need to be discussed -- it's more a technical aspect. Clayton did mention it -- is working with and recognizing the extent of the water resource, the hydrology that is before the parties. From there, then I will move quickly. I won't talk a whole lot about it

But one of the items certainly I think that if all of the parties at the table are not aware today that I will mention briefly is that when the governor was here sometime ago he invited the Tribes to participate in discussions for an interim administration plan, due to the recent Montana Supreme Court decision, which subsequently upheld a previous Supreme Court decision which basically stated that the State did not have permitting authority on this Indian reservation until or at which time the Tribes' water rights had been measured and quantified, and after that point, that possibly the state would have some administration authority

We recognize up front that our interpretation of that decision is slightly different than the State's However, the State certainly recognizes that they do not have the surface water permitting authority.

There was a proposal made to the Tribes And

the Tribes -- there's been an exchange of letters with the governor. We wanted that discussion on administration discussed in this forum. The governor countered saying that due to state statute it needed to be negotiated with the NRC

We countered, basically saying that the statute was permissive and we still felt this forum was the most appropriate forum. The governor then countered proposing a special negotiating committee that would work directly with his office.

And the Tribes have since countered very recently that from our perspective that's not acceptable because the State statute forces the Tribes to take a step back because the State statute indicates that in order to reach an interim agreement under the authority of that statute that the State would have to have exclusive permitting authority over non-Indian water users.

And obviously on this reservation it's our perspective that it's very reasonable to assume that non-Indian water users might at some stage of the game need to get water permits from the Tribe. However, with all of that said, the point being that it's the Tribes' position that rather than doing an interim discussion on administration that we will just take up administration

.

in the course of these discussions Thank you

FRED MATT Okay And, there again, Chris, do you have any comments or discussion on those?

FAYE BERGAN Thank you, Mr Chairman My name is Faye Bergan I'm legal counsel for the Compact Commission, and my chairman wanted me to respond concerning claims examinations and some of the other issues you've raised and what our role is in terms of existing state-based water rights and what we have done in the past to try to gather the types of information that we were discussing here

The Compact Commission -- I think we should clarify for everybody's benefit that the Compact Commission does not adjudicate state-based water rights. That is a role for the Montana Water Court—And how we have approached the issue, what is the nature and extent of the state-based water rights and how they would be incorporated in the compact for those protections of state-based water users has varied slightly from compact to compact

We, as far as the claims examination process, the claims examination process is done by the Department of the Natural Resources and Conservation under the normal procedure. They examine the water right claims for state-based water uses and furnish the Water Court

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

with that information on the claims examination

Then it is the Water Court that uses the normal adjudication process to review those claims and to consider the claims examination information. The claims examination information is a very useful piece of information for the parties to have

If the DNRC Regional Office conducts the claims examination they use area photographs, water resources surveys, they examine on-the-ground aspects of irrigation We have in the past approached this a couple of claims different ways

And as Susan mentioned, on the Crow Reservation we selected a test basin so the tribe could see how the claims examination works The DNRC went in and did the claims examination and furnished that information to the tribe for their review

The claims examination is done by the DNRC It's a water court document In that particular instance we went into the Water Court and asked for an order to both allow the DNRC to come in and do these claims examinations and to instruct the DNRC to prioritize the claims examination in that particular basin.

The Water Court has been very good to work with, has in all instances done as we've requested in terms of claims examination and got the process started as soon as it could The claims examination process on Parker went quite well and the tribe -- the Tribe's involvement there was to furnish DNRC the information about what land was on trust -- what land was in trust and what land was fee

And they reviewed the DNRC's information. We made it available to the tribes so that if they wanted to furnish DNRC with any information or studies they had they could do so. It would be public information. DNRC would use that information just like it used any other piece of information in examining claims.

They chose not to do that in that instance, but that would be an avenue to examine here. We do not determine individual water rights claims, as I said, but that is an important aspect of review of settlement to see if practical solutions will work on the ground for all the parties

For technical information we do extensive background information for negotiations and to the extent where we have been able to do that technical work jointly with the tribes and the federal government it really expedites the process because we end up with a product everybody can agree is the technical background for these discussions so we're not fighting over whose technical report to use as well as what to do about the problems.

Sharing information really greatly speeds up the process also so the parties are not reinventing the wheel when somebody else has already done the work. And that's true for the federal government, for the Compact Commission and for the Tribes

1.7

In other negotiations where information was freely shared, technical information was freely shared, it really expedited the process. As far as technical work we are very interested in getting started or continuing our work on the soils for the Flathead

We have an extraordinary soil scientist on staff, and it's an important background piece of information that takes quite a bit of time to collect. And to the extent that we can share information on soils. I think that we would be going a long way to getting this process started, from our perspective anyway.

I'm representing Governor Racicot. And I just wanted to respond briefly to the legal last point. I know that I'm representing Governor Racicot in this government-to-government meeting here today and his most recent letter -- which he has not seen the Tribes' response because I received it this morning myself and he's on travel arriving back in Bozeman this afternoon.

I can just express that I know he will be

disappointed that an interim agreement is not looking to be possible at this time for the fact that we were hoping to possibly help pave the way for the compact to flow more smoothly in the sense that a final compact may take years and it's foreseeable that there may be some legal hurdles to be challenged in the next few years

And so I guess that would be the extent of my comment. And I have received a letter from the Tribe, which I will convey to the governor at my earliest convenience. If by chance there is a different response after this meeting and it would be possible to look at any further conversations on an interim agreement, of course, we would be happy to do so. Thank you

FRED MATT Thank you.

CHRIS TWEETEN. Mr Chairman, I think that's all we have on this point

FRED MATT Okay Chris, do you have anything?

CHRIS KENNEY Yeah, I do But I don't know that it's exactly on this point, but it certainly goes as the next discussion matter in the agenda. So I don't know if that's appropriate or if there's other folks or other things to be said about either technical or legal issues. So before I say anything I guess I want to make sure I haven't jumped outside the agenda

1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | |

SUSAN COTTINGHAM We're ready to move on Let me just clarify a couple things. I think we said before our technical staff is pretty heavily loaded with some other work, but I think there are some things we could do to get started informally. We mentioned some soils information

Andy has been working on gathering some SES data and if the Tribe has digitized any of the data they have and is willing to share it with us or that we could take a look at, you know, I think it would be one way to sort of take a look and see how our GIS systems are compatible or incompatible.

It might be one way to sort of test how we might exchange some data. And I think in talking to Stan Jones we probably could also just have some informal conversations with your water resources folks on what hydrologic data is out there, what's been done. And I'll be honest with you

We have not done any hydrologic modeling up here on this reservation. But I suspect there has been some done. We're familiar with various different kinds of water models, and Stan could certainly talk to Seth or whoever your hydrologist is that's going to be working on it and see if we can sort of put together what's out there and see if we could agree on how to proceed

So I think there are some specific things that we could do to get started on the purely technical aspect of it, and then perhaps at some point in the next couple months the attorneys could have some discussions and the negotiators could have some discussions about how we might proceed on getting us more information on the claims examination process, as well, since we realize that's going to be of concern

FRED MATT Yeah, I was just -- it's probably going to take a little time to go through item number nine, so I was prepared to just make a suggestion that we break for lunch and then do that afterwards But also I'd like to respond a little bit

As I said earlier, I'm disappointed that the governor is disappointed. You don't have to put that in the paper. Make me look good. But there again, as I mentioned earlier, you know, one of the reasons why I say that is, you know, I believe that when he was here we asked him point-blank whether he would dedicate the resources to get this done.

And I think an interim agreement, in my mind, would just stall the process. I mean you talked about stalling the process. I personally think that that would. The more we roll up our sleeves and just get through this the better for I think all of us that live

here, and that if -- you know, there are a lot of unknowns that we all have

So the more we roll up our sleeves and work through it the better I think we will be So I hope the governor is not offended for me saying that I'm disappointed that he's disappointed So anyway. So with that --

CHRIS TWEETEN. Mr Chairman, excuse me As you know, I have other business back in Helena that's going to cause me to have to leave here at one o'clock And I'm wondering if it might be possible to at least embark on hearing some of the public comment before we take a break for lunch so that I can partake in that before I have to leave

FRED MATT Fine with me I particularly don't have a problem with that

CHRIS TWEETEN Chris, how do you feel about that?

CHRIS KENNEY No, I don't know that I have a problem with that I wanted to go back to my point I wanted to make earlier And that is, from what I've heard this morning it seems to me that we need to have a discussion, and I think your staff and us can do that later

So I'm not concerned about time so much, but I

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

do think I would like to have some kind of discussion today on technical teams and self-working groups and so forth, because I would like to have a discussion about the time lines of the State because it's not clear to me exactly what the State thinks they need to do to better prepare themselves in the valley

You've already made the statement that you need to come up and have public meetings and things like that, and it seems to me that that has to be done before other things can happen because you have to be informed then it's not clear to me what the process will be

We've put technical teams together to make sure that all three parties have some procedure set up so that we know -- that I have enough time to find the right technical people I need to have So I think we need to have that discussion today, as well

The issues are important, obviously, and what we take first and what we take second should be somewhat informed by folks that sit down and understand those And so before the day's out I think we need to things make sure that at the very least we put some kind of apparatus and structure together so that if we pursue all the things we talked about today we don't have to sort of go through a chaotic exercise trying to find the right people at the right time, coordinating the right people

to talk to each other and know what their mandates are

So I haven't heard that at this point, and that was going to be my point is I would like to enter into that discussion at some point. I understand that you have to leave, and I understand that it would be very helpful for you to hear at least some of the public comments, so I don't have any objection to that

FRED MATT Yeah, and there again, Chris, that is what I thought we were going to go through in the next part of the agenda

KEVIN HOWLETT Can we caucus before we break away from the agenda?

FRED MATT Sure.

KEVIN HOWLETT I mean I understand his needing to go, but I think we set that agenda for a reason and we should talk about it.

FRED MATT Okay Well, we're going to take a break and caucus, so give us five minutes

(A break was taken from 11.47 a m to 11 50 a.m)

FRED MATT Okay. I just want to thank Kevin for -- you know, there's a very good reason why all of us are here at the table, so if at any time in the process any one of the teams feel a little bit uncomfortable about maybe things we're doing we said upfront that we

were going to stop and discuss those kinds of things

And we -- what I'd like to comment on, by way of a short discussion that we had, for Chris, I appreciate the fact that you want to be here to hear some of the comments, but there again, I was reminded that, you know, this agenda has been approved and set well in advance of this meeting.

And I don't want to sit here and debate whether it's important that you be back in Helena for something else or be here. We kind of talked a little bit about it. But we set this meeting agenda well in advance, and we told the audience and those that are here that there will be time for comments.

And it was the consensus of the time to stick with the agenda. There will be a record. If you want to hear the comments it will be on record. And I just hope you understand

MR TWEETEN Mr Chairman, as chairman of this negotiating session it's your call as to how the agenda is followed, and I understand that's your prerogative And while I'm disappointed that you haven't receipted my request, I certainly understand that it's your authority to make that decision and we'll make the best of it

FRED MATT And there again, I would just offer this up for the team in general, the feds and the state,

as we talk about dates and time frames, we're willing to set aside the time, the necessary time and put that as a high priority

When we set dates and times I intend to make sure that they're followed and I will be there. I think the team feels the same way. So at this time I think what I'd like to do is break for lunch, and then after lunch we will go to item nine.

And we've got a couple of other items on the agenda, nine and ten, and then open the floor for public comment. So we will reconvene this meeting at one o'clock.

(A lunch break was taken from 11 53 a m to 1 10 p m.)

FRED MATT We're down to item number nine on the agenda And as you can see, what's there is, you know, there's some decisions I think we need to talk about And then again, I asked Rhonda maybe if -- maybe she quasi volunteered because she heard me kind of mumbling over how I was going to accomplish this

So she's agreed to summarize what happened or what we've talked about so far And I appreciate that And then we will talk about the agenda maybe for the next meeting a little bit, some thoughts or ideas that you may have.

But I guess the first thing that I'd like to ask the team is, from the state and the feds, if they think that four times a year is too aggressive. I know I've heard Susan at least come out -- I think your office said that maybe we might look at once a year. But I'm kind of hoping we will -- do you have any thoughts?

SUSAN COTTINGHAM I don't know that I've said once a year, and I think that would be not aggressive enough. So I think initially what we were discussing at lunch is I know you as a team and with your technical folks have done a lot of thinking about the scope of negotiations and what issues we want to raise

And to be quite honest, although I think there are a lot of issues that are similar in a lot of these compact negotiation, we realize that each one of them is very unique and there is going to be a unique set of issues up here as well

And we have not had the time so step back and take a look at those, to meet with some of the local folks to find out what's on their minds. So I think one of the things we do want to do over the next six months is set up some informal meetings, set up some public meetings, come up and talk to you guys, talk to the folks from the project, talk to the folks from the municipalities or wherever and see what issues are unique

up here, what things are on people's minds

So that's something that we're ready and able to do and will probably do probably sometime by the fall. Four times a year in the context of an aggressive negotiation is not too aggressive at all, and I think we could certainly look at a time frame like that

That's basically I think pretty much what we've been doing with our current negotiation with Ft Belknap, although there is a lot more technical work in between with the staffs and so on and so forth. So I think that would probably be fine

Like I said, I think we're going to need some time to get started. I think there are some technical aspects that we could probably commit to doing today, at least on a parallel track to start getting the staffs familiar with each other and what their work is

I guess I was going to ask Faye to talk a little bit about the claims examination again. But let me just simply say for purposes of this point is we would be willing to initiate a conversation with the water judge about how we might get started on the claims examination and see if he would be willing, because I think that's something that's going to benefit everybody and it seems to be something that you guys are real interested in getting started on

And I think that's something we could initiate pretty quickly So, no, I don't think, you know, obviously, it depends on if we're saying we meet again in four months and we're prepared to talk about X, we may not be able to be prepared technically to talk about X, but we can certainly get everybody together and see how our technical teams are going and move forward

FRED MATT Yeah, that's what -- I failed to mention that, you know, when I say four times a year that's for the negotiating team. But I was assuming that the technical people may, you know, meet more than that to get some of the technical details maybe lined out and worked on. So, Chris, do you have any thoughts on that?

CHRIS KENNEY Yeah, it's usually sort of a function of time in between in which you accomplish when you meet. I think four times a year is a nice target. I would definitely not want less than three times a year. I'm not quite sure how much more focus on -- I think we need to have some kind of discussions as a negotiation group to set the agenda for some technical folks.

I don't think we're going to have the time or

-- I need to do some consultation with my folks and sort

of set some agendas up and find out where the resources

are, because I think we need to have sort of an in-depth

discussion about how to put the soils people together,

who does that, and if that's the first thing we want to

I'm not clear in my own mind about the prioritization The claims stuff, I mean I see the value in all of it. So I think probably we need to have --well, let me just ask the question. I don't see the Compact Commission getting all of their scoping work and laying that ground work in the next three months, if we were going to meet on a quarterly basis

I mean I think you could you could, but it doesn't sound realistic to me, given what I know what else is going on But I would argue that we ought to meet in not less than -- not more than three months to sit down in a working session just to lay all this stuff out and have all the technical people there and chart some of that stuff out so that we can send them off with instructions, because I don't want any technical teams working unless they have clear instructions from this group and they know exactly what they're supposed to be doing and what they're supposed to bring back to the group.

My vice is I don't want technical teams doing ex parte negotiations unless we understand that that's what they're doing for reasons that we understand So until we establish that protocol I will be waiting to see

how this will play out So I would think we want to meet earlier rather than later to sort of set that agenda up

FRED MATT Okay And then I think in part of the -- as I looked over Rhonda's shoulder, part of the summary was she took some notes on some of the things that I think we -- what I had heard that we were kind of throwing out there as things that need to be done as claims verification, hydrology and the soils

I think you kind of said you have some people that could work on that But with that, so I guess the decision on the time frame we'll try to look at at least four times in this upcoming year

CHRIS KENNEY And, you know, within the next two or three meetings we will begin to see how the rhythm is going to work and how the timing will work. I don't think this will be a problem for us. I think it will begin to dictate its own time frame

FRED MATT Okay So with that, Rhonda, do you want to maybe go through the summary you have? What Rhonda just shared with me is maybe something that we ought to think about. Do you think we could look at making some assignments before three months?

CHRIS KENNEY Well, I'm thinking about that now, and I guess --

FRED MATT I personally think that we could

probably do that It may not be an aggressive assignment, but we at least we could be working on things

CHRIS KENNEY We could do some phone call coordination We could get some folks to sit down and talk and get to know each other and they could talk in generalities

And then I would be prepared to support that kind of activity But I guess I am -- I want to look people in the eye when I tell them what I want them to do And I can simply send instructions to do that, but I think we can do that if we just make sure we make some phone calls and talk back and forth I think that's possible

FRED MATT: Okay

SUSAN COTTINGHAM. So let me clarify then The suggestion would be that we take the next three or four months, the Commission starts doing some of its own work in terms of scoping. But again, I mean Chris has pointed out, it's not going to happen anytime real soon. Getting geared up for the public meetings and stuff is a lot of work, and it would probably be fall before we'd be doing some of that.

But in the meantime, in the interim, to gear up for maybe perhaps more of a working session on how we

start off technically, we would have folks have some informal conversations about what's out there, how we might want to get started, and maybe even try to put an agenda together for like a technical working session for the next negotiating session

Does that -- you know, because I understand

Chris's concerns. I think it's hard to send folks off

and say, hey, talk about hydrology without much

guidance But I do think we need to have some more staff

time to figure out, you know, how they might suggest the

negotiators kick this off

CHRIS KENNEY And how large a scope? If we're talking about a subbasin approach, would it be appropriate to focus people on some things that we know we have information that could be discussed and shared, I think for instance, focus on maybe a smaller watershed that's not quite so involved as the Mission, say, take a look at that Camas Bitterroot or take a look at Jocko?

FRED MATT Jocko, yeah, I think that's a good approach I think we talked about it, and I think the Jocko would be one of the areas I think we could look at and start from

CHRIS KENNEY I'm sorry I apologize

FRED MATT That's all right Oh, what I

mentioned was I think I agree, yeah, the Jocko maybe

would be a good area that we agree on

CHRIS KENNEY There has been some suggestion that Camas would be simpler, but Dan Decker doesn't think so.

SUSAN COTTINGHAM Well, again, I think without us having some time to do the scoping about what the watersheds are and which ones might be simpler or which ones might be more complicated, I think some might be better for hydrology, some might for soils. Without doing that, I don't want to commit to saying let's start here

So maybe over the next few months the technical folks and whoever can sort of try to put together a work plan and a long-term time frame for how we might start divvying some of that up and we can talk about it at the next negotiating session

I'm just feeling a little bit at a disadvantage because we haven't had the time to say, okay, here, we know these are the issues in the Jocko, and here are the issues in whatever. And again, I still think a lot of them are going to be more global issues than watershed based.

So, you know, certainly one of the things that we could do at the next negotiating session is just -- one of the things we could do is just make a presentation

5

6

7

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

about how we've gone about our technical work We have a nice power point that shows the GIS stuff and shows you how we look at the water rights

And maybe then the Tribe and feds could talk about some of the resources that they have I know at other reservations there have been lots of studies ongoing, some of which could be shared and some of which But we've sort of tried to scope what's out there so we don't have to reinvent the wheel, and perhaps some folks could take some time and look at what people have

I suspect there will be some tough decisions about what things people are willing to share, and that's going to dictate a lot about how expeditiously we can move forward And in the meantime, you know, like I said, we would offer to talk to the water judge and see if we could get some sort of understanding of whether --I mean what that involves is staff commitments from DNRC if the judge is going to order claims examination to go forward

If we're going to talk about how that process works, it's going to involve some of their time rather than ours But it's a useful process for all of the parties, I think

> FRED MATT Okay.

CHRIS KENNEY I guess I need to catch up.

based on what Susan's comments just were, we wouldn't really anticipate technical people talking to each other until the next time we got together? Did I miss a step?

SUSAN COTTINGHAM Well, I would prefer that the technical people try to maybe put together an agenda for a working session on how we would proceed with technical work rather than -- I think your concern was actually having folks starting to exchange information before we had come up with some guidance for them

CHRIS KENNEY Well, no, I didn't mean to suggest that it would be quite that constrained But we could, say, for instance, have the Tribe make consultation with us to put together a suggested agenda subject matter and send to you guys and figure out how those guys can sit down and at least have some discussions about what they think they know and don't know within the next, say, 30 days to at least start the dialogue and develop the working relationships and exchange phone numbers or whatever they think they need to do

I don't want phone technical teams off doing their own negotiations, but I don't want to wait three months for those folks to engage each other — I can see where that would go — So, Mr. Chairman, maybe we should offer to take it upon ourselves to provide something to

the State, because I think the State is the most resource limited, even though I would like to go on record as saying I'm not flush

But I think that we at least have some committed manpower that we could sort of draw those outlines up at least for the benefit of reacting to something, if that's acceptable.

FRED MATT. I seen Clayton nodding his head

CHRIS KENNEY And I think we could do that in
a relatively short order and anticipate a September

meeting sometime for us, I mean a September negotiation
session It will be right at the end of the year so we
will be broke and can't come

FRED MATT Has anybody got any thoughts on the date for the next meeting?

SUSAN COTTINGHAM I'm sorry Did you have a question?

FRED MATT Any thoughts on the dates for the next meeting?

CHRIS KENNEY I was thinking early September

It's still nice in Montana in early September Well, it

is, as opposed to Washington, D C

SUSAN COTTINGHAM We've got some conflicts in the early part of September, believe it or not, so you might have to stretch your trust in Montana a couple of

weeks, Chris

CHRIS KENNEY It's a great straight-liner, but I'm not going to buy it

FRED MATT. How about the end of August? It's even nicer

FAYE BERGAN Unless we're negotiating on sailboats or something

SUSAN COTTINGHAM Let me try to understand the next meeting would simply be to have a work session on a technical work plan. We're not going to be talking substance, I mean because I don't really want to commit to another session of major substance and a lot of discussions until we've had some time to come out and meet with -- do some public involvement

We're not going to be able to get that done until September, at least So if the negotiating session is simply going to be to get back together and have the technical folks present a work plan and what they've done in their informal discussions, then I'm fine September would be fine.

CHRIS KENNEY That's what I'm talking about SUSAN COTTINGHAM Okay

CHRIS KENNEY And by that time we could have some reports People would tell us what they think they know and they don't know We're not in a position to

make an informed decision at this point

FRED MATT So what do you think, mid-September, the week of the 10th? Is there a particular day that's good?

SUSAN COTTINGHAM Well, let me just say that I know this isn't going to work for you guys because you're Tribal Council, but for Chris's schedule he is committed to being in Helena Monday, Wednesday and Fridays at five o'clock and that's a long-term commitment

And so if we want to do it on Tuesdays and Thursdays that's better, and I think it's obviously better to do it up here, or we could do it in Helena, or we could do something like -- I was trying to avoid the situation we had today, we could start on Tuesday afternoon and continue to Wednesday morning

Because it's not that he's not committed to doing it, he just has something else he has to be in Helena for So I don't know What are people's sense? Do we want to keep on trying to meet up here closer to the action?

FRED MATT Yeah According to the MOU, we're supposed to rotate

SUSAN COTTINGHAM Yeah, and that's fine with us We could host it in Helena next time if you wanted to do that That would be easier Do you want to do

1 that? 2 FRED MATT Let's do that SUSAN COTTINGHAM So in Helena sometime the 3 week of the 11th? 4 Make the call, we will be 5 FRED MATT Yes 6 there 7 FAYE BERGAN: Let's pick a date now 8 SUSAN COTTINGHAM How about Wednesday, the 9 13th? Wednesday, the 13th 10 FRED MATT 0kay Sounds good As long as it 11 isn't Friday, the 13th Okay SUSAN COTTINGHAM Mr Chairman, I wonder if I 12 13 could ask, who should be the contact? I mean I'd like to 14 try to understand Should we be working through the 15 chairman? Is there one person, the attorney, is it the 16 staff director? How should we get the technical people 17 talking to each other? 18 Well, the way we normally do it is FRED MATT 19 all the correspondence would go through the chair, and then we could --20 21 SUSAN COTTINGHAM And would there need to be 22 correspondence on this, or could we -- could somebody 23 initiate a phone call to whoever the federal technical 24 person is going to be and to -- I don't know if it's 25 Rhonda or --

Well, I think --FRED MATT

2

SUSAN COTTINGHAM Do you want us to call you?

3

I mean --

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24

25

FRED MATT · Well, no. I mean I --

SUSAN COTTINGHAM You know, I just want to make sure we get the protocols right here and that the technical staff can start having some exchanges without formal letters.

FRED MATT Well, I guess I look at the rest of Do you concur that -- I mean it would be all the team right with me if you talk to or call the technical I have all the faith in the world that they can staff answer any questions you have So, Kevin

KEVIN HOWLETT Well, I quess my only concern would be that there be an identified person and there would be a record of all of the exchanges or correspondence or whatever I mean we're building a record as we go So if it's Rhonda, that's fine But let's get it centralized

I would prefer that you come to CHRIS KENNEY me for this first time and then we will provide folks to deal with it if the specifics arise, because we have some coordination problems on the federal side because we are so far flung And for the time being just get in touch with me, because it's easier to get in touch with me, run

me down through my office

1.2

FRED MATT. Jami was just whispering in my ear Clayton, he's kind of the one who knows about who should have what correspondence or any information

SUSAN COTTINGHAM And then I'll coordinate our staff work with, you know, the folks, so it will be Clayton, Chris and I, at least initially, and we will address your concerns, Kevin, about keeping a good record Faye was just asking, do you want us to make some initial approaches to the water judge about the claims examination and whether he would be arranged to issuing an order to DNRC, or do you want to wait and talk about that at the next negotiation session and we could do something informally until then?

I guess I'm not -- I know that it's of concern to you guys, and I'm not sure how you want to begin Do you want to just have a discussion about what it is, or do you want us to actually initiate something? Because I will tell you honestly it's probably going to take several years for the claims up in this area.

It's a long process And you don't have to give us a response today, either We can wait on it

But we could sure have some informal discussions with the judge and DNRC, if that would help

FRED MATT Robb, do you want to just address

that?

1.7

ROBB HUNTER I think at this time the Tribes would prefer that we deal with this informally before any formal decisions are made on whether or not to go forward. We would like to have more information on what that entails and time lines As I think you suggested, two years is probably not abnormal for this kind of process But we would like more information before actually saying yes or no

SUSAN COTTINGHAM Okay What if they at least informally talk to DNRC and try to get an understanding of the scope of the claims and how long it might take if we embark on it? Yeah, we could have that as an actual presentation at the next negotiating session about how exactly the process works and how long it takes and try to answer some of your questions. Would that be helpful?

FRED MATT I think so

ROBB HUNTER And I also would suggest that maybe the legal team for the State contact the legal team for the feds and the Tribes and maybe a joint presentation at the next session might be in order

SUSAN COTTINGHAM A joint presentation on?

ROBB HUNTER: On this issue.

SUSAN COTTINGHAM Okay Now who -- Chris, are

we supposed to be working through you on legal team issues if Robb is suggesting that the three -- Faye, Robb, and who would be talking about the claims examination and what we might present at the next meeting?

CHRIS KENNEY I will get in touch with Scott
Miller, who is the negotiation legal counsel, and have
him work with Rich because Rich is familiar with the
Montana procedures And they will get back with you
Scott will be pleased to know he has something to do now

SUSAN COTTINGHAM Okay That's fine

RHONDA SWANEY Fred's asked me to go ahead and summarize some of the things, the high points of today's meeting. So I'm going to attempt to do that. We began with statements from our elders. Pat Pierre. He pointed out that water is our lifeline, our lifeblood, and that water is one of the spiritual elements of our lives.

His prayer is that streams on water on the reservation not become a battleground that we must fight for And he urges all of the parties not to turn quantification into litigation. He would like to see for the next seven generations coming that they can share when they've come what we have today

been here for thousands and thousands of years Felicity
McDonald can remember when Sam Resurrection carried a
petition around to protect tribal water rights, and the
elders predicted that we would fight over water. Without
water we have no life, no berries, no medicine, those
things that are important to us Our very lives

Louie Adams pointed out that this was an historic day, that greed has no place in these discussions, that water is the lifeblood for everyone Tony Incashola urged everyone to put aside personal views and look to what we will leave our next seven generations

Chris Tweeten, in the State's opening statement, thanked the Tribes for hosting the meeting and acknowledged the accommodations made to the public. He gave the history and background to the Water Compact Commission, that it was created by the Montana legislature in 1979 to try to get some limits on water rights to quantify all waters in the state.

And that goes back to a 1972 constitutional mandate to house all water records in one place in the state. So far the Compact Commission has negotiated nine compacts and are currently in negotiations on four more. The makeup of the Commission was also introduced by Chris

And he stressed the state's approach, which should be negotiation rather than litigation, because litigation is expensive, time-consuming and it doesn't involve practical solutions. He stressed to the parties that settlements will not be approved if the interests of all the parties are not addressed, and that the State has a need to conduct public meetings to hear views and take into account in formulating the settlement what all water users' needs are

He pointed out that the Water Compact

Commission has an MOU with other state agencies and that
they keep each other informed and that all the agencies
are committed to bringing litigation to a close so
everyone will be satisfied. He urged everyone who wants
to be on the State's mailing list to sign up on the
sign-up sheet so that information can be passed on to
you.

Chris Kenney, in the opening statement for the federal team, pointed out that the United States is mindful of responsibilities in the west, that they're mindful of their responsibility in relationship with their tribes and also their duty to protect tribal rights

Their position is to come to a mutually beneficial settlement. All water negotiation teams,

federal teams are under the direction of the Deputy

Secretary David Hayes The United States has negotiated

10 to 15 -- 15 to 16 settlements over the last 20 years,

and the team is here expressly to resolve the

Confederated Salish and Kootenai Tribes' water rights

claims

Chairman Matt pointed out how water is

important to our people. It is sacred. He pointed out
how hard the Tribes work to keep the lakes and water

clean for future generations and acknowledged that they
can still drink out of streams and they are clean enough
not to make us sick

We're on the brink of the water rush days The only way to get through is coming to work together. He believes we can get through this because he has a good feeling in his heart, and if we all do we will be successful. The reservation is our homeland. It was established in 1855 by the Hell Gate Treaty

The Tribes not only reserved land but they had to reserve water and other resources necessary in order to sustain the homeland. The Tribes must do what they must to protect generations to come Hopeful that negotiations will give us all an equitable solution and points out that the Tribes and tribal members look forward to future negotiations

and the Tribes are committed to work long and hard towards settlement Robb Hunter, attorney for the Tribes, went through point by point the MOU between the State, the Tribes and the federal government. Point one says that sessions will be held on a rotating basis in Pablo, Helena and Missoula, and be chaired by a member of

the team in perspective cities of the team

Negotiations will be open to the general public. And at least today there are a verbatim transcript prepared. He pointed out that the teams may go into executive sessions if the parties agree and it's consistent with the state, federal and tribal law. He also pointed out that the chair may restrict participants to facilitate the meeting

Point three, negotiation positions can't be used in court. Four, press releases shall be jointly made between the State and Tribes. The feds were left out of that provision. And if consultation with the press occurs, each party must immediately let the other parties know. And it was signed by all three of the parties. And I'm going to skip what I said and what Robb said about the legal team.

Susan Cottingham pointed out how her staff works, that she has twelve staff members, that they have

-- the legal staff has a lot of drafting duties and they report back to the parties
The technical teams do a lot of technical work and report back to the parties
And she gave some examples of things that have been done in other situations

Chris Kenney introduced the team members that were here. He said that the teams are comprised of different people for considerations, and because the issues are different in each situation so they have to have different experts. The feds also have coordination with federal agencies and he, as the chair of the federal team, has access to all of the resources that are brought to bear in negotiations.

He is a representative of the Secretary of
Interior, also works with representatives of the Attorney
General's Office Chris went on to say -- well, I
covered the issues that we hoped to address in
quantification. Those are off- and on-reservation
rights, consumptive and nonconsumptive water uses,
surface and ground water administration, and settlement
contributions

Chris Tweeten went on to say that the Compact Commission has brought authority and can certainly talk about those things the Tribe wants to talk about, but their purpose and intent is to protect non-Indian water

users. And he stated that contributions to settlement will be based on how interests are protected

Ron Billstein addressed everyone to talk about his experience in working on other compacts and recommended a watershed-by-watershed comparison here and in the end those could be integrated into a final document. He recommended that we go in the order of Jocko, Camas and Mission, and pointed out that the area of the lake and river may be necessary

Chris Kenney said that he didn't like splitting things up like that, but in this case would agree to it because of the complexity of the reservation and the watersheds lending themselves to such segregation and because the opportunity provided earlier engagement of technical folks

Clayton Matt identified some of the issues that we believe the teams can begin working on, and the issue he had identified was claims verification. Dan Decker went on to point out that we can begin to work on hydrology, as well, and summarized recent letters the Tribes have exchanged with the governor of Montana

Faye Bergan, from the state, talked about claims examination, as well, and how that works and approaches used in other quantification arenas. She also pointed out the usefulness of working together on

technical information or jointly developing it so that we don't spend time fighting over whose report to use

She's very interested in getting started on soils. Aimee, from the Governor's Office, talked about the governor's disappointment that the Tribes are not interested in an interim agreement. But, because she believes that it will, working as we are on the compact, will take years of negotiation and there will be many legal hurdles to overcome, she stated the Governor's Office remains happy to look at an interim settlement if the Tribes should change their minds

Susan Cottingham pointed out the things that she thought we could get started on: our soils, GIS and computer systems compatibility, and availability of hydrologic data. Chairman Matt said he was disappointed that the governor is disappointed and stated it was his belief that attempting to negotiate an interim agreement would actually stall completion of the compact settlement.

The parties then had some discussions on whether or not to change the agenda and proceed to the comment section. It was agreed that they would not; they would continue to follow the agenda After lunch, there was quite a bit of discussions, as we just heard about, the frequency of meetings, it was agreed four times a

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

year I think would be sufficient and that communication by phone can get started

Susan pointed out that they need to conduct public scoping meetings and they won't be able to do that until September Chris suggested that we begin focusing on a smaller watershed, and I think Jocko was agreed upon.

After discussions, it was agreed that an agenda for how we proceed or a technical work plan be presented at the next meeting. That meeting will occur September 13th, which is a Wednesday, in Helena, and will be hosted by the State. What time?

SUSAN COTTINGHAM Do you want nine, is that okay?

RHONDA SWANEY And the meeting will begin at nine Susan will be the contact for all technical matters for the State, Clayton Matt will be the technical contact for the Tribes, Chris Kenney will be the technical contact and the legal contact for the federal team and he will put the legal team in touch with Mr Miller, who will work on legal issues.

CHRIS KENNEY I will put him in touch with your folks.

RHONDA SWANEY: Scott Miller And we will be expecting at the next meeting a report on the technical

-- -

work plan, as well as a joint presentation on claims verification That's all I have Did I miss anything?

SUSAN COTTINGHAM I think we will have you do that at every session. That was pretty good I guess the only thing, just right at the end there, Rhonda, I wasn't sure we had agreement to start on the Jocko I'm just feeling a little bit unclear on about how the watershed thing might work. So maybe we can just explore that before the next session and talk about which one might be the best, how we can do that. I thought that was a great summary

CHRIS KENNEY And what about the straw map of the state, as sort of a beginning agenda on technical stuff and how we would put those folks together?

RHONDA SWANEY: Could you expand?

CHRIS KENNEY Well, the discussion was, how do you get the technical folks to engage each other earlier than waiting for the next session we get together. And I thought one way to do that -- because the State seems to be resource limited -- we could make a suggestion of who would get together and how they would get together and what they would discuss and submit that to them and they could put that together, at least get those folks some sanction to get together and talk about what they think they know and I don't know. Maybe they all know each

other. I don't know all of them

SUSAN COTTINGHAM: And you and the Tribe were going to take a first step?

CHRIS KENNEY And I kind of thought us, the Tribes and feds, would be doing that for them

FRED MATT: Sure

CHRIS KENNEY And one could be sufficient, but something that would give them something to take a look at in terms of protocol, agenda and a time frame At least we could get the technical folks some kind of contact in which to engage each other

RHONDA SWANEY. And that will go back to the parties before given to the technical folks, is that what we're saying?

CHRIS KENNEY Well, I thought we could give it to Susan and her folks and they could let us know if that's going to work, and then we could give direction to the technical folks to set up mutually convenient times and let us know what happens.

FRED MATT Sounds good.

CHRIS KENNEY I mean I've got to find those people. I need a little time to find them

FRED MATT Okay And then before the next meeting we'll get a copy of the minutes out to all the players so that we can review them Abby will do that

SUSAN COTTINGHAM. When you say minutes, Fred, are you talking about the transcript or --

FRED MATT. Well, I think it was decided that a full transcript might not be -- I mean, correct me if I'm wrong, but a full transcript probably won't be necessary. But we will have a short version similar to what Rhonda has just done so well, and we will send it to all the team members and somehow either approve or at least before the next meeting

CHRIS KENNEY I think it's my obligation to review that and either certify it or correct it and send it back to you.

FRED MATT Okay Yeah.

CHRIS KENNEY And I think Chris Tweeten or Susan

SUSAN COTTINGHAM. Yeah, we have not in other negotiations spent a lot of time having the three parties officially approve some minutes. We just do some internal minutes for our own thing. And what we have done in the past is just tape the session and then made copies of the tapes for the other parties.

But we can sure explore it I mean it's just

-- given the fact that we're all resource limited, it's

hard to spend a lot of time working on minutes when we

have a lot of other stuff to work on

FRED MATT Well, the only thing I'm concerned about is we agree on what was said and we said what we said

CHRIS KENNEY: Yeah, that's my concern, too

FRED MATT And Abby has agreed to have that by
the 17th.

CHRIS KENNEY Susan, can we start out that way and if we find it becomes duplicative of --

SUSAN COTTINGHAM So the party that hosts the meeting is to do the minutes?

CHRIS KENNEY Yeah

enough on the plate for the next meeting?

SUSAN COTTINGHAM I guess we can see how it works I hope we don't have a lot of, you know, I didn't really say that, and amend the minutes and amend the minutes. But we'll play it by ear and see how it works FRED MATT Okay Okay Do we think we have

CHRIS KENNEY I think I have more than enough for the next meeting.

FRED MATT Okay That would be more So at this time, most of the audience has been waiting. And I appreciate you sitting in the back and listening to the -- up until what we've done so far. You've been sitting there patiently waiting to make a comment

And, there again, you know, we always want to

have that available for people to comment on the concerns 2 they may have, but I encourage those making comments, again, to state your name And, also, I'd like to see --3 do what you want, but it would be nice if you followed 4 that up in writing Or at least that's my thoughts 5 We will have it on record, but -- and all three б 7 of the agencies here -- the Tribes and feds and the State 8 -- will have addresses to submit comments to. So I'm going to, at this time, unless there is anything else 9 from the team -- yeah, there is not a whole lot of people 10 in the audience, but I just throw this out there 11 If you kind of keep it somewhat -- I hope 12 13 nobody's planning on doing an hour presentation, each one of you, but we will just try to play it by ear 14 want to cut anybody off, but keep it as brief as 15 16 possible So let's open the floor for comments SUSAN COTTINGHAM And there is a microphone 17 FRED MATT And state your name. 18 19 GALE PATTEN I guess somebody's got to be Is this on? 20 first Yeah, it should be 21 FRED MATT I'm Gale Patten. I'm the Sanders GALE PATTEN: 22 23 County Commissioner, but somehow or another I'm still stuck with being a resident of the Little Bitterroot 24 water users over in Hot Springs and Lone Pine. 25

concern and our concern is water storage

The rains and the snows come off the Pacific and the water comes down the creeks and down the rivers and back to the Columbia and back in the Pacific And our problem is storage with the irrigation. And two of our main dams on that part of the irrigation project are off the reservation, the Hubbard and the Little Bitterroot Lake.

And because we're used to this, we have a couple wet years and a dry year and another dryer year and a wet, maybe a little bit of moisture the next year, and then another dry year, we would like to have enough water in storage to skinny through or slip through three dry consecutive years. And our storage is very important to the irrigation project. Thank you

FRED MATT Thank you.

MIKE GRINDE. My name is Mike Grinde I live in Big Arm A little history, kind of like Gale's family, my family is a third generation. I think Gale is like a fourth or fifth that has resided here in this area. Actually, all of the lands that I own were once Indian allotment lands

And I have some concerns I totally respect the Tribes' position on what's been mentioned here in regards to the Hell Gate Treaty of 1855, but I certainly

want this group, especially the people from Washington and so forth, to also keep in mind that the history of this reservation also includes a couple of other major events that basically put nontribal people here on this reservation

The allotment lands that were created in about 1906 and so forth, many of those lands have now transferred into nontribal ownership. The federal government, in about 1910, also homesteaded this reservation. I think it does -- and I think Mr. Kenney was kind of alluding to that earlier -- makes the situation a little bit more complex in what a lot of people have had to deal with on other reservations.

Because, quite frankly, it's also created a population here that's a lot greater than the tribal membership. I think that all of us have to keep in mind here as we work through this process that these two events have created some rights that should be definitely kept in mind to nontribal people.

The federal government doesn't ask nontribal people to come to this reservation and not also allow them to carry certain rights as part of the ownership of the lands that they've acquired They're very factual events, and they're very relevant events to this negotiation

2.0

And I hope that none of you ignore that as you work through your reasoning. In a way, Congress and the presidents of the past have placed all of us on this reservation, and there has to be some respect for that I'm very pleased to hear Mr. Matt express his desires to resolve these issues associated with water rights and do so so it's in the betterment of all tribal and nontribal.

I think that's a very solid sign of cooperation I do have two strong specific concerns though that I think have to be part of this record As a private landowner I firmly believe that ground water rights must remain inherent with surface ownership Otherwise, that land has no value

I also, as a nontribal landowner on this reservation, have some very strong opinions about being subject to tribal policies and regulations in that I don't have any say in tribal government, their regulations or their policies. And I quite frankly look at that as an infringement upon my constitutional rights and bill of rights. Thank you

FRED MATT Okay Anybody else?

JOHN CAMPBELL My name is John Campbell I'm the water and sewer superintendent here for the city of Polson. Polson's been in an extreme crisis We're right

in the middle of this whole thing Probably a lot of you have followed our situation. I've worked with a lot of members, from Clayton Matt clear back to '86 on the Hell Roaring water supply.

My job, since Congress adopted the '86 Safe
Drinking Water Act Amendments and again in '96, has been
extremely challenging trying to keep the constant supply
quality and quantity for the city of Polson Polson,
right now, I think the city serves approximately 5000
people, both tribal members and nontribal members

This facility is one example. And I'm really happy to see this process start. I'm thankful for everybody coming here and taking their time and for Chairman Matt, you know, the statements he made that he would like to make this work for everybody. That's exactly what I've been wanting to hear, and I think that's a great start. And I hope this process goes quickly. We are in dire needs. Thank you.

FRED MATT Thank you Okay, anybody else?

TOM SMITH My name is Tom Smith. I'm a resident of the Charlo area, and I'm a non-Indian water user And I'm speaking primarily so that the State and the feds don't develop the false impression that there is some model or block out there that all of the non-Indian water users or all the non-Indian residents are in

opposition to the Tribal water rights claims or of the minds that living here is the same as living anywhere else in Montana

In the Hell Gate Treaty, the Tribes ceded something like nineteen-twentieths of their aboriginal territory and kept one-twentieth by the terms of the treaty for their exclusive use and benefit. And my understanding is that they retained sovereign rights which weren't exclusively ceded or unilaterally taken by Congress

And water certainly seems to be one of those

So I and many other non-Indian residents of the

reservation regard it as something of a privilege to be

here and a different place than living anywhere else in

the 19/20ths of this ceded aboriginal territory

If non-Indians want to live in a place where the legal parameters of their lives are the same as anywhere else in the United States they can live anywhere else in the nineteen-twentieths. So it's a different situation here

And I think the State and feds need to be aware that there are not an insignificant number of non-Indians here who are not in line with the Joint Board of Control or with some of the other positions that may be expressed here today. And that just needs to be kept in mind I'm

glad to see the spirit of cooperation that appears to be here today.

I think things can be worked out well I think that, on the other hand, it's probably in the interest of the Tribes for the foreseeable future for family farms and ranches to survive because if they're subdivided then there's going to be 10 times as many non-Indians on that land as there are now and 10 times as many competing claims for water and other resources

I think the threat to family farms and ranches though certainly can't be solved by Flathead Irrigation Project or the water rights cases that are being dealt with here. Family farms and ranches have been dwindling in the United States for well over a century. That has been accelerating in the last decade

This, as one of the factors for that, is a pretty small one as things go Things like the so-called Freedom of the Family Farm Act -- or Freedom to Farm Act probably done far more damage to family farms and ranches in this country than any of these other factors

And the hundred-year decline of farm good prices relative to nonfarm good prices also has done far more damage to the survival of family farms and ranches than things like control of the local irrigation projects. So I'd just make those comments.

And I also pose a question to the State.

They've defined their primary role here today in the words of Mr Tweeten, as primarily protecting the interests of non-Indian water users. I just would ask whether that is really the right position for the State to assume or even the legal one

You know, it certainly begs the question of Indian people are citizens of this state as well as non-Indians, and whether the State has a responsibility of representing all citizens. You know, that position certainly brings that question to mind

In my opinion, it's probably illegal, as well as wrong, for the State to define its primary role as simply protecting the interests of non-Indian water users. And I expect that the State would respond to that by saying that, well, the tribal government is the legitimate representative of the tribal members here. And that's true

But that does not free the State from the legal, moral obligation to represent all its citizens. And that may put them in a contradictory position in some ways, but so be it. That's the legacy of the illegal and in some ways wrongful taking of Indian resources in the last century, including the opening of the reservation in 1910, which was alluded to by this gentleman, which was

done in opposition -- over the opposition of tribal members who were almost completely opposed to that

It was done just unilaterally So that history, I don't think, is quite as simple as it was just portrayed to be. And there is not time here to go into more detailed discussion of that But I will leave it at that Thank you

FRED MATT: Thank you Anybody else?

VERNON FINLEY My name is Vernon Finley I'm

a tribal member here I've been absent for most of the

discussion, but I was here for the opening remarks. And

I was kind of troubled as the last speaker was about the

position of the State To come into a negotiation from

an adversarial viewpoint right off the bat, I was kind of

disappointed in that

But one of the things that I wanted -- the point that I wanted to make was for all of the negotiators to look at what is at the core behind the opening remarks, the discussion that started all of this. We heard some of our elders get up and speak and some of their representatives then speak.

And one of the things that struck me the most was the difference in perspective about all of it. From one perspective, the Tribal perspective, what they were saying was it's a very simple matter. It's a matter of

spirituality It's a matter of morality, of ethics It's such a difficult concept to think.

Certainly, let's share the water here That's something that we all should strive to do But how we use it, that's what is the key difference that started out this whole discussion. I heard a group of people say, is it so difficult when water enters your property to let it leave your property at least as pure as when it came in? Is that a difficult concept to grasp?

But it seems the difference in perspective that we have to keep in mind is that from the Tribal perspective it's always based on spirituality, from the dominant culture perspective, it's based on economics Yes, let's do what's moral and, yes, let's do what's right, as long as it doesn't interfere with my ability to make money

That's the basic difference It's okay, as long as I make money, you know If we're talking about who should have the say over the water, for the State to assume that they have some moral or ethical superiority over how to determine keeping the water pure, then let's look at the Burkley Pit, let's look at 75 years of Anaconda Copper running the politics in this state

And look at what they did to the water and look at what they did to the natural resources The water

that is -- the shape that it's in right now that's running through this reservation is as clean as it is because the Tribe took a stand, because the Tribe told the Flathead Valley it's not all right for you to run your sewer lines straight into the river, it's not all right for the people along the lake to go to their cabins and to flush their toilets into the lake; it's not right

And that's why the water is as pure as it is

Now that's the basic things that we're talking about

here The difference in perspective Now one of the

things that I heard from the elders was it has to be for

future generations. It has to be at least as pure as it

is today for future generations.

That's not negotiable To the dominant cultural perspective it's, let's quantify, let's quantify exactly how much, exactly how much we have the right, how much of the water can we pollute, how much of the water can we put our spray into, how much of the water can we destroy?

Let's quantify that amount. That's a totally different perspective. There were two completely different ways of looking at it. Keeping the water pure, that's a nonnegotiable. If you want to talk about how much water should we use, that's negotiable. If you want

1 2

-

to talk about how to use it and how to keep it pure, that isn't negotiable

It has to be kept pure Now the rest of the negotiations should focus on that It should focus on what is negotiable and what isn't, what's quantifiable and what isn't A number of gallons, that's a quantifiable thing Whether something is pure in the future as it is today, that's not quantifiable.

That's not negotiable And as long as you keep those things in mind, as far as looking at the different perspectives, then I think we've got a lot of room to negotiate here Thank you

FRED MATT Thank you Anybody else? Well, there again, I'd just like to thank everybody. Oops We're out of time I'm sorry

MIKE DURGLO No, I'm not running for council Good afternoon My name is Mike Durglo I'd just like to share a little personal story of my own with you to talk about water. When I was a boy I used to fish in Mission Creek My brother remembers those times. We'd go down almost every day to the creek and fish and bring home sometimes a hundred fish.

And we could drink the water out of Mission

Creek at that time And I remember one time being chased out of the creek A guy, a non-Indian landowner, was

shooting his gun We thought he was shooting at us. I don't know He might have been shooting in the air But it really scared me

And then when I bought a piece of land east of

-- on Ashley Lake a few years ago, I bought into a

lawsuit about water. As far as I know, even today I

don't know if that is settled And from what I

understand the man -- there used to be water on this

acreage, this 20 acres that I bought years ago, and from

what I understand had a secretarial water right

But the non-Indian landowner next to this piece of land decided he was going to shut off that water. And from the stories that I've heard he took a shovel after the guy that owned it and he assaulted this guy. And that's scary. Something that we need to think about, I think, that when we talk about seven generations from now, is the world population is almost doubling every 20 years, maybe less

It's expediential growth And water in the next 20 years will probably be worth more than gold. So, you know, these things, when we come to the table to talk about negotiating water rights and we talk about clean, pure water, and we have -- I believe that we have one of the most beautiful valleys in the U.S

I don't know. I haven't been through the world

that much, but I think we have a paradise here in this valley And if we don't come together and work out something, there's probably going to be more people that are hurt physically

That's a scary thing to think about, our children and our grandchildren fighting about water. And I think -- like Vernon was saying, I think there's enough for everybody if we use it in a good way and if we use it in the right way and we don't hog it, use all the water. I see sprinklers all the time going when it's raining.

We ain't going to be around. Our grandkids will. But I hope that, you know, we can come to some kind of an understanding and we can share the resource in a good way and that it comes to a good ending, I guess Thanks

FRED MATT: Thanks Anybody else?

GARY MORIGEAU My name is Gary Morigeau, and I'm also a tribal member I set my watch here for an hour so I won't -- actually, I won't be long I just

want to emphasize a single point. And that's the point of the approach the State started with in their asserting that they're representing only the non-Indian water users in the valley

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And I think the nontribal member gentleman pointed that out first—But I think it's an important issue—I don't think the State can -- and I would agree—legally take part in this negotiation if they don't represent the entire state population, including Indians, including tribal members from this reservation, including Indians from other reservations

As an Indian from here, when I go off-reservation I take in hunt and fish -- I can hunt and fish in our aboriginal areas I also have to follow the tribal rules and regulations that say I can't hunt except with tribal members. So I can wear two hats. If I have a friend, or even more importantly, my brother's grandchildren -- excuse me He passed away -- I need to show them what they need to learn Some of them are nonmembers, I can't do that, unless I go buy a license I can go out and hunt and fish. I can take them. I need to do that Thank you.

FRED MATT. Thank you, Gary

JOE WEASELHEAD My name is Joe Weaselhead

I'm a tribal member I work for the Water Quality As I

see it here, people are -- the Tribe and nonmembers are arguing about who gets administration of the water in this valley. My views are this. Who works with the water? Who works with the water? I know I do

I'm in water quality. I know my partner over there, he works in Water Quality, and other people in our department, wetlands, riparian lands, lakes. What other nontribal member organization here on the reservation does this to assure the quality of the water everyone drinks, swims in, fishes in? To me, I think the Tribes are doing dang good. That's all I got to say

STEPHEN SMALLSALMON Testing My name is

Stephen Smallsalmon I just got a few words to say You know, the thing that's pretty bothers me is if we, the Indian people and the white people would get together, you know, and live together and understand each other, you know

But here on this reservation we're still fighting amongst each other, you know. And water that I know is -- I remember when I was a small young person yet and my dad used to say it was special, you know, it's a holy water, you know. And I remember when I used to go down to the river we used to even pray before we even got into the water.

And that's how important our water is today

And I'm with the elders And we talk about the rivers, you know, about how they pollute it, you know, with the mines And they still want to put in some more mines What's going to happen later on in this world, you know, now that we have to even buy water from the stores that's bottled? And I hear a lot about the air and the water, you know

1.3

And it's all polluted, you know. So if, you know, the people, the nonmembers here, they should understand us, you know, us Indian people. And maybe we could make a deal with them, you know. But otherwise, you know, there is nothing to negotiate here, you know. This is our place, you know.

So that's all I got to say And I asked the Creator last night I wouldn't get mad So lemlencht.

Lloyd Irvine, I didn't hear you say that

LEONARD MICHEL Good afternoon My name is

Leonard Michel I'm also a tribal member from here. I

think one of the things we haven't touched on -- Vernon

did a little bit -- is economics on the reservation. The

biggest thing we have here for our economics is

recreation

And I think they do more damage to our resources, whether it's timber, our pasture land or anything like that, it's -- you know, our rivers and our

streams and our lakes that's being destroyed because of recreation and the lack of respect for it.

As these three teams get together here in the next few years, I think what they got to look at is put recreation at the back of the whole negotiating team because it's something that's a want, it's not a need. We don't need to recreate, to go out there with our boats and jet skis and what have you and degrade the water

We got to worry about drinking it first So I think it's very important that when the State comes in with their team saying we got to look at recreation, we don't I really feel we have a say so on this because there is a lack of respect. Not on every one of them, but the majority of them

In my own opinion, seeing the reservation the way it's being destroyed, the rivers and creeks and lake, they want more and they want it for nothing. You know, they buy a little recreation permit here and they want it all back. You know, it doesn't work that way. You go to other places in the United States and you have to pay for things.

So when they come to a reservation, whether it's my reservation or the Crow's or the Cheyenne's or the Blackfeet's, you know, they want it for free. They come up with this attitude well it's not the Indian way

1 We
2 an

Well, we're forced into economic times as Indian people and when we demand our fair share of those economics people get their bags up

So it's very important I think to look at the recreationists that they don't need to be out there recreating. There's more important things on that water than recreating. Thank you

FRED MATT Okay Anybody else? Okay There again, I'd like to just thank everybody, especially for those who pretty much hung in here all day to set here This is a beginning of a process that -- there again, I said in my opening remarks that I don't think that maybe everybody will be totally satisfied, but we're going to work real hard to try to accommodate everybody's needs

And one of the things that I'd like to mention in my closing comments, there was something I wanted to mention in my opening comments. But there again, those of us that -- this person I'm going to mention, it's still hard for a lot of us that set up here, a lot of us that have worked and been involved with Mickey Pablo, as most of you know, was a very hard worker, dedicated person

And he'd be right in the thick of things In fact, he would be right here probably doing a bang up Job But anyway, he's here with us in spirit, and I

think most of us feel that Some of things -- and I appreciate Gary, I know he talked about his brother Sometimes we can't help but feel a little bit of emotion, but that's who we are and that's the way we do things

1.3

1.6

We recognize Mickey for all of the hard work
he's done for us as a tribe, and I just hope there is
just a little bit of a glimmer of his intelligence and
his way about him as I try to go forward and work through
this process. So anyway, I want to thank everybody again
for being here, especially the folks who have traveled a
long ways to get here.

I appreciate it Pat Pierre wants to make a closing comment too, and then we have the drum groups going to close us out here today, too.

PAT PIERRE: I'd like to make a comment here, maybe a couple, and I hope that some of you will take what I'm going to say to heart. In the past years this nation, the United States of America, has been totally, totally raped. We have been taking the life source of mother earth up

We have been taking oil, we have been taking gas and we have been taking ore, minerals out of the ground, which are all the life source to mother earth. In my opening comments I said I hope that the lakes and the streams don't become battlegrounds, they don't become

something that we're going to be fighting over.

1.5

Because of this taking from the face of mother earth and the innards of mother earth, we are draining her life source. One day she's going to say, no more, I can't give no more. Self-destruction. I said this 20 years ago. And if we continue to do what we're doing now, if we continue to take and not give back, I predict in 20 years there will be no more to take.

And what will happen when there's no more to take? What will happen to you and to me? What will happen to this nation, a beautiful nation, land of the not-so-free to everybody? And I believe and I want you to listen carefully, because I'm saying this today, that one day we will not have anymore to take

And that's simply because we're not giving back for what we take And every time -- we've been taught as Indian people that when we take something we must give back to mother earth. If we pick a flower we give an offering of a prayer or something. If we pick some roots for food or medicinal purposes we give back so that we can come back and pick some more.

The dominant society out there hasn't done that. They take and they take and they take They make a million dollars and, sure, they've got to have another million dollars. They've got to have two million. After

we make two million, we've got to have three million

now And excuse the language when they say to hell with

the rest of the world, as long as I can get rich

I wanted somebody here to tell me that I'm wrong I don't believe anyone can tell me that I'm wrong, because this is the way the world is out there A while ago Burkley Pit was mentioned That's a good example We'll dig a big hole and make a mountain over here and give it to all the water in the city

We don't care, as long as we can have another million dollars. That's taking and taking and not giving nothing back. They could at least push that mountain back into the hole. I worked in that mine, in those mines, but I didn't work in the pit. And I know what that taking is all about. I've seen it

So I think we need to think about these things, the federal people, the state people, the Indian nations We need to think about these things We need to say, hey, let's slow down here I'm talking about seven generations coming yet up the road But how are we going to see the seven generations if we don't give them something to come to?

If we don't get down to business and say, okay, this is it, we better slow down, we better make sure them seven generations are going to have something to come to,

that's up to us, every one of us individually here in this room, it is our job to protect what we have. It is my job to protect my reservation.

I'm the man that will stand in the middle of the highway and say, no, you can't make a four-lane through the reservation. You have raped mother earth enough. She can't stand no more scars. I'm the man that will do that, because I don't believe that we need to continue to do what's happening out there

I believe that we need to stop and say, now, let's slow down, let's think about these things Earlier I said we have put up a table that you, the State, that you, the government, can come and talk with us Our table You come to my tee pee, a pretty fancy tee pee, but it's my tee pee And walk into my tee pee

But let's slow down Let's think about these things Let's think about what's going on out there We can work hard as a tribal people to protect what we have here, and that's exactly what we're doing I told this team right here we're not going to compromise, we're not going to be manipulated

We are going to stand firm I've been punching this guy all day here, stay firm That's probably why they put me next to him But I believe what I am saying is true. Maybe not today, but down the road you'll see

You're going to say that I heard that old elder say that over in Polson.

Tony.

Let's not fight over what is free, what was given by the Creator for the people's use. This man that spoke up over here, he's going to be a problem all through the negotiation. Every meeting he's going to be sitting there, he's going to be throwing in a monkey wrench every chance he gets.

He's not the only one We have others on this reservation that continuously fight us But we don't get weary, we don't tire of that We are going to stand firm We are going to be here when they're not. And, say, if they don't like it here, we'll help them move

We'll help them go somewhere else so they don't have to put up with a bunch of Indians, where they can claim the water But I want you to just think about what I'm saying This is all I'm going to say I'm going to shut my mouth and wish you all a happy journey home and a safe journey home

FRED MATT Thank you, Pat

PAT PIERRE Tomorrow I got to be in Helena
FRED MATT. Maybe you can ride with them

TONY INCASHOLA Okay, we're going to close with a couple of honor songs again But as these honor

songs are sung I'd like you to also remember these songs
are in honor of those people that have fought so hard,
gave up so much for our lives today, for our resources,
for our children

We also -- the honor songs are for those people who have come here so willingly to try to look for solutions, to work hard for solutions in honor of everyone. These honor songs are for those people. These honor songs are for our elders, who have given us the guidance and the wisdom so that we are where we're at today.

These honor songs are for our ancestors, all of have our ancestors, what they endured to be here so that we're here. And let's stay focused on what we really want. Let's dig deep into our souls and our hearts and ask ourselves why? Why are we here? What are we doing? And I hope that the same answer comes from all of us

And that is for the future generations The hard work that is ahead of us, the majority of us here are not going to see the benefits of those. But hopefully our children and grandchildren will see those benefits.

And hopefully those benefits will be good benefits, that respect will be restored among all people, regardless of where we come from, who we are, and what we

look like That is all connected to what we're doing here, as is the many things that were mentioned here today that are connected to the water.

The life of the different things that depend on water. The Creator has made that balance at the

water. The Creator has made that balance at the beginning of life, and we have offset that balance We need to restore that balance And the only way we can do that is to look ahead for future generations, not necessarily for us here today

We're not going to see the benefit But if we can do our jobs and provide for future generations, then we will see that unity and that respect come back. So these honor songs are for those people, for us here that have stayed here all day to listen, to try to find a glimmer of hope that we will get to a point where we will all be happy

So as these honor songs are sung, think about that Think about your families and your ancestors.

First I want to ask the Kootenai people to sing their song, and then we'll go to the Pend d'Oreille Drum. The Salish Drum was not able to come back. So we're going to close with the two drums

(The Chief Cliff Drum Group performed an Honor Song)

(The Pend d'Oreille Drum Group performed an

```
Honor Song.)
 1
                 (The meeting concluded at 2 55 p m )
 2
 3
 4
 5
 6
 7
 8
 9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```

STATE OF MONTANA) SS COUNTY OF LAKE I, Abigail Dupuis, Certified Court Reporter and Notary Public in and for the County of Lake, State of Montana, do hereby certify that the foregoing pages constitute a full, true and accurate transcript of the proceedings had in the foregoing matter, all done to the best of my skill and ability WITNESS my hand and seal this 23rd day of May, ABIGAIL DUPUIS Notary Public, State of Montana Residing at Pablo, Montana My Commission Expires 08/31/00