



PO BOX 201706  
Helena, MT 59620-1706  
(406) 444-6857

## Montana Legislative Services Division

### Legal Services Office

---

**TO:** Water Policy Interim Committee  
**FROM:** Cori Hach, Staff Attorney  
**RE:** Adjudication Benchmarks White Paper  
**DATE:** May 6, 2020

---

#### I. Introduction and Purpose of Paper

The Department of Natural Resources and Conservation (DNRC) and the Water Court have reported to Water Policy Interim Committee (WPIC) that the forecasted completion of examination and reexamination of claims will be delayed given the introduction of about 25,000 exempt-from-filing claims that were filed pursuant to 2017 House Bill 110<sup>1</sup>. Moreover, DNRC has reported that if it were to focus all resources solely on reexamination, it would be theoretically feasible to meet the final 2023 deadline for the reexamination benchmarks codified in Section 85-2-271, MCA. However, focusing solely on this deadline would compromise overall efficiency and further prolong the adjudication.

As an alternative, the Water Court and DNRC jointly submitted the Proposed Benchmark Timetable, attached here as Appendix A, at the March 2020 WPIC meeting. Under this proposal, the examination of exempt claims filed pursuant to HB 110 would occur alongside the remaining reexamination work and review of other unadjudicated claims.

According to the Water Court and DNRC, there would be four main advantages to this consolidated approach: **first**, it would allow DNRC to complete all its work in a given basin at once instead of finishing reexamination and then doubling back to each basin to examine the exempt claims. **Second**, beginning examination of HB 110 claims immediately would save the Water Court from issuing multiple decrees in many basins, which would conserve funding and cut years off the adjudication process by resulting in fewer objection periods, reduced litigation costs, and savings on publication and postage fees due to combined noticing. **Third**, consolidation would avoid creating public frustration that could occur with expensive, confusing, and similar-sounding processes taking place years apart. **Fourth**, it would accelerate the Water Court's ability to begin issuing final decrees.

While the proposed statutory amendments are simple, a certain amount of background understanding is useful to understand the purpose behind each proposed amendment and foster committee discussion. This paper is targeted toward providing the context necessary to understand (1) the current requirements imposed on DNRC and the Water Court by the benchmarks and (2) what statutory changes would be required to facilitate their proposed revised timetable. This background includes an understanding of the:

---

<sup>1</sup> Ch. 338, L. 2017

- Purpose and importance of adjudication
- Stages of adjudication and the role of DNRC and the Water Court in each stage
- Past and present types of DNRC review: verification, examination, and reexamination
- Types of water claims subject to adjudication: timely filed claims, late claims, and exempt claims
- Current status of the benchmarks and relevant history of the Water Court.

## II. Purpose and Importance of Adjudication

The statewide water adjudication is a continuous series of Water Court proceedings intended to resolve any disputes about the amount, ownership, priority, and other attributes of all properly claimed uses of water that were in place prior to July 1, 1973, in the state of Montana. The adjudication is divided into separate proceedings according to the source of supply, with the Water Court issuing an individual decree for each of Montana's 85 hydrologic basins.

Prior to the enactment of the Water Use Act and commencement of the statewide adjudication, smaller-scale efforts to decree water rights claims among users were thwarted by the fact that people who were not notified of and made party to such proceedings could not be bound by the terms of the resulting decree. In other words, such piecemeal determinations lacked widespread enforceability and were vulnerable to repeated reopening and relitigation.

Because finality and enforceability are of paramount importance in the statewide adjudication, a critical element of the process has been providing **notice** of the adjudication and an opportunity to participate through the objection process to every person who claims a water right within each basin. This ensures that when each final decree is eventually issued nobody can come forward and argue that they were excluded from the process and therefore should not be bound by the decree. For this reason, mailing notice to each person who claims a water right in Montana and publishing notice in newspapers has been a major focus and necessary component of the adjudication.

In addition to facilitating the orderly administration of water rights within Montana, there are two reasons that are often cited for the importance of completing the statewide adjudication. **First**, many Montanans express a concern that neighboring states and Canada may attempt to claim more than their "fair share" of transboundary water resources if Montana cannot prove the extent of its historical use.<sup>2</sup>

**Second**, the federal McCarran Amendment, which waives sovereign immunity to adjudicate federal and tribal claims in state court, applies only if there exists a comprehensive state system establishing a single continuous proceeding for adjudication of water rights.<sup>3</sup> During the 1980s, a handful of lawsuits that the United States had filed in federal court prior to the commencement of

---

<sup>2</sup> See DNRC website: "Downstream states are demanding water in increasing amounts. Montana cannot defend its water use from other states' demands or calls on water until it has completed the adjudication of all of the water rights in Montana, and knows how much of our water is currently being claimed and used. Issuing water rights decrees for every basin in Montana will help the state establish its historic usage. In the event of downstream calls for water from other states or Canada , Montana water users are better protected with these decrees in place." <http://dnrc.mt.gov/divisions/water/adjudication/what-is-adjudication-hb22-information>

<sup>3</sup> Colo. River Water Conservation Dist. v. United States, 424 U.S. 800, 819, 96 S. Ct. 1236, 1247 (1976); State ex rel. Greely v. Confederated Salish & Kootenai Tribes, 219 Mont. 76, 84, 712 P.2d 754, 759 (1985).

Montana's statewide adjudication were stayed pending the conclusion of the state court proceedings,<sup>4</sup> with the idea that the federal courts would remain available as an alternate forum if the state adjudication is not completed or does not satisfy the procedural requirements of the McCarran Amendment.<sup>5</sup> Since that time, the Reserved Water Rights Compact Commission (RWRCC), which was established in 1979, has concluded seven tribal agreements and 12 settlements with federal agencies, all of which have been passed by the state legislature. Approval of these settlements by the Water Court and integration of these claims into final decrees is a major part of the completion of adjudication.

### III. Stages of Adjudication

In 1973, after ratification of the new constitution, the Legislature passed the Water Use Act<sup>6</sup>. This legislation established a central repository for water right records and required prospective water users to apply for a permit before putting water to use. It also recognized that the many "existing rights" that had been appropriated from the territorial days through June 30, 1973, would need to be adjudicated. To accomplish this, the 1979 Legislature passed Senate Bill 76<sup>7</sup>, which divided Montana into four water divisions, created the Water Court, and established the adjudication process roughly as it stands today. The ultimate goal of the adjudication is for a final decree to be issued for each of Montana's river basins. To reach this point, the process progresses through several stages:

#### A. Filing

After the passage of Senate Bill 76, the Montana Supreme Court issued an order directing every person claiming a pre-1973 water right to file their claim with the DNRC by April 30, 1982. About 219,000 claims were filed by the deadline, and about 4,500 additional "late" claims were filed under an extension to 1996 that was created by a subsequent legislature<sup>8</sup>. It is important to note that stockwater and domestic claims for groundwater or instream use were exempted from this process, though such claims could be filed voluntarily. The present-day consequences of this exemption are discussed in greater detail in **Section V**, below.

#### B. Verification or Examination

The DNRC is responsible for reviewing the filings, gathering information, and reporting data, facts, and issues pertaining to the elements of each claim to the Water Court. Originally known as "verification", this process is now referred to as "examination". A brief discussion about the difference between the two will provide context for the discussion of statutory amendments to facilitate the proposed revised benchmarks timeline.

##### 1. *Examination*

On July 15, 1987, the Montana Supreme Court adopted Water Right Claim Examination Rules (Examination Rules). Amended in 1991 and again in 2006, the Examination Rules are nearly 100 pages long and contain detailed requirements for DNRC staff to follow when gathering, examining, and

---

<sup>4</sup> N. Cheyenne Tribe of N. Cheyenne Indian Reservation v. Adsit, 721 F.2d 1187, 1189 (9th Cir. 1983).

<sup>5</sup> Arizona v. San Carlos Apache Tribe, 463 U.S. 545, 570 n.21, 103 S. Ct. 3201, 3215 (1983).

<sup>6</sup> Title 85, chapter 2, MCA.

<sup>7</sup> Ch. 697, L. 1979.

<sup>8</sup> Ch. 629, L. 1993.

reporting data, facts, and issues pertaining to claimed water rights. The DNRC's duties under the Examination Rules include:

- reviewing each claim to determine whether it is clear, complete, understandable, and consistent;
- examining the claim against the available factual records and resources including maps, aerial photographs, public notices, courthouse records, etc.;
- identifying issues and questions and in certain cases conducting a field inspection to attempt to resolve questions; and
- inputting the information gathered into the centralized records system and reporting to the Water Court.

## 2. *Verification*

From 1982 until the 1987 adoption of the Examination Rules, DNRC's process for reviewing claim filings was called verification. DNRC utilized the verification process for approximately 98,000 claims contained in about 45 basins. Although similar to examination, verification lacked the same rigor on certain elements. For example, during verification very little time was spent on locating actual points of diversion and confirming correct legal descriptions; standardization of source names and ditch names was a low priority; most major elements of storage reservoirs were not documented and many assumptions were made; and the period of diversion was not standardized among claims of the same type or often even identified.<sup>9</sup> Eventually this lack of standardization led to litigation alleging that the verification process would not produce sufficiently accurate decrees. As part of the settlement of the litigation, the decision was made to "reexamine" certain verified claims, discussed in greater detail in **Section IV**, below.

### C. Temporary Preliminary Decree or Preliminary Decree

Once DNRC has completed its examination or reexamination (or, prior to 1987, verification) of the claims in a given water basin, DNRC provides a Summary Report to the Water Court. The Water Court uses the information in the Summary Report to produce a preliminary decree for that basin. This decree is intended to include all the claims in the basin or, if the basin contains Indian or federal water rights reservation claims that have not yet been settled through a water compact or negotiation, all the claims in the basin except those unsettled Indian or federal claims.

### D. Notice and Objection

After the preliminary decree is issued, the Water Court is required to provide notice of its availability to every person who claimed a water right in the basin. The Water Court also publishes notice in the newspapers in the basin. As discussed above, this notice is an extremely important part of the process, since without proper notice there is a risk that the final decree will be jurisdictionally defective and unenforceable.

The day after a decree is issued, the time period for filing objections begins. The objection period lasts 180 days unless a request to extend that time is granted. Claimants are instructed to review

---

<sup>9</sup> Reexamination Guidebook Updated March 2019, p 22.

the decree to identify any errors in the decree's description of their water rights and notify the Water Court. This is also the time to review any water claims that might injuriously affect their water rights and object if appropriate. After the close of the objection and counterobjection periods, the objection list is published. At this time, parties who are not a claimant or objector can file a Notice of Intent to Appear in the proceedings.

E. Litigation

A Water Master is assigned to each basin and is responsible for adjudication of objections in the basin by consolidating claims into cases. Claims that receive issue remarks but not objections are also consolidated into cases. For each consolidated case, the Water Masters order and conduct conferences and if necessary order field investigations, accept or reject settlement agreements, and conduct hearings. After the objections are settled or after a hearing if necessary, the Master will either recommend (1) that changes be made to the water right claim, or (2) that the water right claim should remain unchanged. This recommendation is issued in the form of a Master's Report, which is adopted by the Water Judge and incorporated into the Water Court's final decree, if there are no objections, or as modified following rulings on objections.

**IV. History of the Benchmarks: House Bill 22 and Senate Bill 57**

A. House Bill 22

After proceeding at variable funding levels for decades, by the early 2000s there were still 57,000 claims remaining that had not yet been examined by DNRC. In response, the Legislature passed House Bill 22 in 2005<sup>10</sup>. HB 22 developed a funding source for the adjudication by imposing a fee on every water user in the state<sup>11</sup> and also established statutory deadlines for completion of the examination process. These deadlines, codified in Section 85-2-271, MCA, imposed incremental benchmarks for examining the 57,000 claims that had never before been reviewed by the DNRC, with a final deadline of June 30, 2015. The DNRC successfully met the final benchmark from HB 22 by completing examination in 2015.

B. The Current Landscape: Senate Bill 57:

By the time the initial examination was nearing completion, lingering questions remained regarding whether it would be necessary to reexamine claims that had been subject to the DNRC's verification process prior to the adoption of the Examination Rules. In 2012, a committee of Water Court and DNRC staff was formed to address the issue. Generally, the committee agreed that a complete reexamination should not be undertaken. However, the committee recommended that certain elements or issues that had not previously been subject to consistent or meticulous scrutiny<sup>12</sup> should be reviewed by DNRC to eliminate potential problems for water users. The committee concluded that the reexamination should include all claims in decrees issued prior to March 28, 1997, that are not a final decree, not just claims that were subject to the verification process.

---

<sup>10</sup> Ch. 288, L. 2005.

<sup>11</sup> In 2007, this fee was repealed and the funding replaced with a general fund appropriation. See Ch. 319, L. 2007.

<sup>12</sup> Specifically, these were: (1) decree exceeded; (2) filed and use rights predating district court decrees; (3) over-filed notices of appropriation; (4) claims with multiple uses; and (5) standardization and identification of point of diversion, source, and ditch name.

Upon the committee's recommendation, the Water Court issued a statewide order (2012 Order) requiring the DNRC to reexamine all claims in Temporary Preliminary Decrees and Preliminary Decrees issued prior to March 28, 1997, for the elements that had not previously been subject to consistent scrutiny -- about 90,000 previously decreed claims. The objectives were to correct water right elements that may cause water distribution problems and make claims consistent across the state.

The 2012 Order was put into law by Senate Bill 57 in 2015<sup>13</sup>. SB 57 provided for funding for the reexamination and amended Section 85-2-271, MCA, to its current form by replacing the examination benchmarks with new benchmarks for reexamination by the DNRC with a final completion date of June 30, 2023. The chart below shows the benchmarks language before and after SB 57, with emphasis added. Note that in their current form the benchmarks direct DNRC to complete *reexamination*, not examination. Further, the statute is limited to *verified* claims.

85-2-271 Benchmarks under HB 22		85-2-271 Benchmarks under SB 57
(b) The cumulative benchmarks are as follows:		(b) The benchmarks are as follows:
<b>Date</b>	<b>Total Number of Claims Examined</b>	(i) the department shall <b>reexamine</b> 10,000 <b>verified</b> claims by June 30, 2017;
December 31, 2006	8,000	(ii) the department shall <b>reexamine</b> 30,000 <b>verified</b> claims by June 30, 2019;
December 31, 2008	19,000	(iii) the department shall <b>reexamine</b> 60,000 <b>verified</b> claims by June 30, 2021; and
December 31, 2010	31,000	(iv) the department shall <b>reexamine</b> 90,000 <b>verified</b> claims by June 30, 2023.
December 31, 2012	44,000	
December 31, 2015	57,000	

## V. HB 110 -- The Goalpost Is Moved Again

At the time that SB 57 was passed, completion of reexamination was thought of as a symbolic "finish line" after which DNRC's role in the adjudication would be mostly wrapped up and subsequently limited to its support function during the litigation phase. This changed with the 2017 passage of House Bill 110, which established a June 30, 2019, deadline for filing exempt claims. By the time the deadline arrived, over 25,000 claims had been filed, and all of them will need to be examined by DNRC prior to issuance of final decrees.

If DNRC were to focus solely on meeting the reexamination benchmarks, it would likely be able to complete that process by 2023 with its current staffing levels. However, given the flood of HB 110 claims, DNRC and the Water Court are now questioning whether directing resources solely toward reexamination is the prudent course. A bit of background is helpful to understand why.

### A. What Is an Exempt Claim?

<sup>13</sup> Ch. 269, L. 2015.

As noted in **Section III.A** above, in recognition of the fact that many domestic and stockwater claims had very low consumptive volume compared to other uses like irrigation and municipal use and were therefore unlikely to result in enforcement disputes, the DNRC exempted such claims from the original statewide filing requirement. According to some commentators, the Department actively discouraged people from filing exempt claims, evidently daunted by the number of claims it needed to examine and concerned about a flood of small applications.<sup>14</sup>

B. SB 355 and HB 110

As the adjudication proceeded over the decades, concern arose that claimants who had declined to file their exempt water rights might eventually be disadvantaged by that choice. Although failure to file an exempt claim did not result in forfeiture of the right, it did result in a potentially negative consequence: an unfiled claim would be subordinated to all timely filed rights, groundwater certificates, and permits. In 2013, Senate Bill 355 was enacted to create a process for claimants to file exempt rights in the general adjudication<sup>15</sup>. This was followed up by HB 110 in 2017, which imposed a final deadline in order to create a "date certain" by which all exempt claims would need to be filed to avoid losing their priority date. The advantage of this approach was eliminating the uncertainty and potential disruption from allowing exempt claims to trickle in gradually and unpredictably. The disadvantage was a flood of filings requiring examination -- over 25,000 claims.

None of the claims received under HB 110 have been previously reviewed by DNRC, so they will need to be examined pursuant to the Examination Rules. DNRC anticipates that the amount of time required to process each exempt claim may be less than for other types of claims, because domestic and stockwater claims tend to be less complex and for smaller volumes than many of the types of claims that were filed under SB 76. However, the sheer magnitude of claims will require extensive time and resources.

**VI. Current State of Benchmarks and Adjudication**

Currently, the benchmarks in Section 85-2-271, MCA, direct DNRC to complete the reexamination process statewide by 2023<sup>16</sup>. DNRC does not have the staff or funding to meet this deadline while simultaneously tackling the HB 110 exempt claims. Moreover, there is very little flexibility since the language in Section 85-2-271, MCA, is limited to "reexamination" of "verified" claims, which would appear to preclude initial *examination* of *exempt* claims. Because DNRC is legally bound to the statutory benchmarks, without legislative action it will need to focus its resources almost exclusively on reexamination. After it has met the 2023 reexamination deadline, it will then shift its focus to examining the HB 110 claims.

A. Outcome Without Legislative Action

---

<sup>14</sup> For example, see the testimony of Jay Bodner during the House Natural Resources Committee hearing for HB 110, January 23, 2017.

<sup>15</sup> Ch. 323, L. 2013.

<sup>16</sup> About 60% of the Water Court's current budget (about \$2.7 million biennially) comes from a water adjudication account filled from the general fund. This portion of the budget is tied to the benchmarks and is set to sunset in 2028.

If DNRC remains obligated to focus solely on the reexamination benchmarks until 2023, it will result in the issuance of more decrees than would otherwise be necessary and an even more drawn out and expensive adjudication process. DNRC and the Water Court agree that it would be more efficient for DNRC to work on reexamination of verified claims and examination of exempt claims concurrently.

Under current procedures, the Water Court issues preliminary and interlocutory decrees on a rolling basis. Bifurcating DNRC's reexamination work from the examination of exempt claims would interfere with this system and significantly delay the Water Court from issuing final decrees. This is because if DNRC provides the Water Court with a Summary Report for a given basin that includes reexamined claims but not exempt claims, the Water Court will need to decide whether to:

(1) delay issuing a preliminary decree for years until it receives the DNRC's Summary Report for both reexamined and exempt claims for that basin; or

(2) issue a preliminary decree with the reexamined claims and then follow up with a supplemental or interlocutory decree with the exempt claims from that basin years later.

The first option would delay the entire adjudication, since the Water Court would be paused in issuing preliminary decrees for some years. The second option would require the issuance of two more decrees in many basins, in turn multiplying the public notice periods<sup>17</sup>, the objection periods, and the opportunities for costly litigation and ultimately delaying the issuance of final decrees. Duplicate decrees would also risk frustrating and confusing members of the public in basins that have already gone through the noticing process multiple times at significant expense.

#### B. Proposed Statutory Revisions

DNRC and the Water Court have jointly submitted the Proposed Benchmark Timetable attached as Appendix A. Under this timetable, DNRC would examine exempt claims concurrently with reexamining verified claims. By consolidating its work in each basin, DNRC would be able to provide the Water Court with a single Summary Report for each basin that included both reexamined claims and exempt claims. The Water Court could then use that information to issue a preliminary or interlocutory decree for each basin that includes the HB 110 exempt claims.

In order to be consistent with the Proposed Benchmark Timetable, the benchmarks would need to be revised in accordance with the timeline set forth in Appendix A. The language would need to be amended to allow for both examination and reexamination of both verified and never-before-reviewed claims. In addition, the notice provisions in Section 85-2-231 should be amended to clarify that exempt claims may be noticed in the same decree as reexamined and other unadjudicated claims.

---

<sup>17</sup> The fiscal note for HB 110 estimated the cost for the issuance of ten supplemental preliminary decrees at nearly \$20,000.



<u>Basin</u>	<u>Reexam</u>	<u>HB110</u>	<u>SB 355</u>	<u>Reexam or Interlocutory</u>	<u>No. of Claims</u>	<u>Total No. of Claims Examined/ Reexamined</u>	<u>Deadline/ Year to send SR to WC</u>	<u>Remaining Claims to Examine/ Reexamine</u>	<u>Regional Office</u>
39E	2,414	186	Done	Reexam	2,600				Billings
40N	1,421	311	Done	Reexam	1,732				
40H	Done	24	2	Interlocutory	26				
40D	2,917	266	Done	Reexam	3,183				
40E	2,972	348	Done	Reexam	3,320				
41K	2,697	268	48	Reexam	3,013				
41I	4,698	1,019	73	Reexam	5,790				
40Q		76	10	Interlocutory	86				
41Q		209	23	Interlocutory	232	19,982	2020	54,364	
41S	5,160	1,099	Done	Reexam	6,259				
43BV	717	488	9	Reexam	1,214				
41U	854	61	Done	Reexam	915				
42A		126	Done	Interlocutory	126				
42M		460	57	Interlocutory	517				
40R		92	19	Interlocutory	111				
42B		38	Done	Interlocutory	38				
43E		27	14	Interlocutory	41				
41L		30	Done	Interlocutory	30	9,251	2021	45,113	
76D	1,413	175	14	Reexam	1,602				
42K	1,441	139	Done	Reexam	1,580				
41E	1,151	321	7	Reexam	1,479				Helena
76M	2,403	331	7	Reexam	2,741				Missoula
40S		226	10	Interlocutory	236				Glasgow
76C	243	38	1	Reexam	282				Kalispell
76N	1,201	119	9	Reexam	1,329				Kalispell
40EJ		293	33	Interlocutory	326				Havre
40F		27	Done	Interlocutory	27				Havre
40L		149	done	Interlocutory	149				Glasgow
39F		174	done	Interlocutory	174	9,925	2022	35,188	Billings
40O		405	14	Interlocutory	419				Glasgow
43BJ	803	56	Done	Reexam	859				Bill/Boze
76HE	1,323	Done	Done	Reexam	1,323				Missoula
40I		12	3	Interlocutory	15				Havre
76G	4,479	698	49	Reexam	5,226				Helena
76GJ		112	done	Interlocutory	112				Missoula
41O		258	22	Interlocutory	280				Havre
76L		454	Done	Interlocutory	454				Kalispell
76LJ		515	Done	Interlocutory	515				Kalispell
41P		128	30	Interlocutory	158				Havre
76J		3	done	Interlocutory	3	9,364	2023	25,824	Kalispell
76E		62	done	Interlocutory	62				Missoula
41F	3,026	359	22	Reexam	3,407				Bozeman
76HB	994	Done	Done	Reexam	994				Missoula
42C		205	83	Interlocutory	288				Billings
76B	96	12	2	Reexam	110				Kalispell
40B		317	50	Interlocutory	367				Lewistown
41B		625	53	Interlocutory	678				Helena
41N		9	done	Interlocutory	9				Havre
76E		62	done	Interlocutory	62				Missoula
43C	1,709	392	44	Reexam	2,145	8,122	2024	17,702	Billings
39G		54	done	Interlocutory	54				Billings
40G		65	done	Interlocutory	65				Havre
41A		789	53	Interlocutory	842				Helena
76I	162	7	5	Reexam	174				Kali/Havre

# Appendix A

43QJ	1,120	355	11	Reexam	1,486				Billings
40J		580	41	Interlocutory	621				Havre
40M		495	13	Interlocutory	508				Glasgow
41D		571	31	Interlocutory	602				Helena
41J		938	286	Interlocutory	1,224				Lewistown
76H		787	74	Interlocutory	861				Missoula
41H		596	done	Interlocutory	596	7,033	2025	10,669	Bozeman
76F		442	6	Interlocutory	448				Missoula
40T		29	Done	Interlocutory	29				Havre
41M		90	16	Interlocutory	106				Havre
41C	1,959	605	20	Reexam	2,584				Bozeman
41G		648	59	Interlocutory	707				Bozeman
76K	562	60	4	Reexam	626				Kalispell
41QJ		537	7	Interlocutory	544				Lewistown
41R		156	17	Interlocutory	173				Havre
43N		13	3	Interlocutory	16				Billings
43O		172	4	Interlocutory	176	5,409	2026	5,260	Billings
40A		833	done	Interlocutory	833				Lewistown
40C		305	done	Interlocutory	305				Lewistown
39FJ		74	done	Interlocutory	74				Billings
43P		194	Done	Interlocutory	194				Billings
43Q		755	27	Interlocutory	782				Billings
40K		64	done	Interlocutory	64				Glasgow
43B		731	done	Interlocutory	731				Bozeman
41T		252	30	Interlocutory	282				Havre
43A		311	done	Interlocutory	311	3,576	2027	1,684	Bozeman
43D		580	140	Interlocutory	720				Billings
42KJ		434	18	Interlocutory	452				Billings
42L		191	3	Interlocutory	194				Billings
38H		19	0	Interlocutory	19				Billings
39H		4	0	Interlocutory	4				Billings
40P		102	11	Interlocutory	113				Glasgow
42I		38	1	Interlocutory	39				Billings
42J		140	3	Interlocutory	143	1,684	2028	0	Billings
<b>Reexam</b>	<b>47,935</b>	<b>HB 110</b>	<b>SB 355</b>	<b>Total</b>	<b>74,346</b>	<b>74,346</b>			
		<b>24,820</b>	<b>1,591</b>	<b>74,346</b>					