SALT RIVER PROJECT COMMENTS ON THE HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY REPORT FOR INDIAN LANDS IN THE LITTLE COLORADO RIVER SYSTEM

June 30, 2000

CONTENTS

I. Comments on Overall Scope of the HSR. 2
A. Separate HSRs by Reservation 2
B. Additional Information to be Added to the HSRs 3
C. Claims Based on State Law 4

II. Comments On Assumptions Identified By The Special Master 5
A. Federal Law Claims 5
1. Issue 5
2. Recommendation 7
B. Allotments 7
1. Issue 7
2. Recommendation 8
C. State Law Claims 8
1. Issue 8
2. Recommendation 9
D. Other Indian Lands 10
1. Issue 10
2. Recommendation 11

III. General Comments on the HSR 11
A. Chapter 1: Introduction and Background 11
1. Applications (p. 1, line 9) 11
2. PIA Evaluations (p. 5, lines 7-9) 11
3. Scope of the HSR (pp. 6, 7) 12
B. Chapter 2: Navajo Indian Reservation 12
1. Reservation Dates (pp. 13, 14) 12
2. History (pp. 13-17) 14
3. Water Resources (pp.18-24) 14
4. Current Water Uses (pp. 25-30) 14
5. Claims (pp. 31-47) 17
6. Non-reservation Lands (pp. 46, 47) 21
C. Chapter 3: Hopi Indian Reservation 22
1. History (pp. 51-55) 22
2. Current Water Uses (pp. 58, 59) 22
3. Claims 22
4. Hopi New Lands 25
D. Chapter 4: Zuni Indian Reservation 26
1. Physical Description (pp. 64, 65) 26
2. History (pp. 66, 67) 26
3. Current Uses (p. 71) 26
4. Zuni Claims (pp. 72-74) 27
5. State Law Claims (pp. 75, 76) 27

CONTENTS CONTINUED

E. Chapter 5: San Juan Southern Paiute Lands 27
1. Physical Description (pp. 77, 78) 27
2. History (pp. 79, 80) 28
3. Claims 28
F. Chapter 6: Unusual Circumstances 28
1. Allotments (pp. 91-101) 28
G. Appendices 28

IV. Specific Comments and Questions 29

TABLES

Table 1. Additional Acts of Congress, Executive Orders, Proclamations and Secretarial Orders 13

Table 2. Comparison of 1986 USDA report and claims for irrigation on the Navajo Reservation. 16

APPENDICES

Appendix 1: Previous State Filings on Navajo Lands

Appendix 2: Previous State Filings on Hopi Lands

Appendix 3: Previous State Filings on Zuni Lands

SALT RIVER PROJECT COMMENTS ON THE HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY REPORT FOR INDIAN LANDS IN THE LITTLE COLORADO RIVER SYSTEM

JUNE 30, 2000

The Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District, referred to herein as the Salt River Project or SRP, submits the following comments on the Indian Lands Hydrographic Survey Report (HSR). SRP has substantial interest in this preliminary HSR and subsequent proceedings. Following receipt of comments and any changes in the preliminary HSR, the Arizona Department of Water Resources (Department) will publish a final HSR, which will trigger the formal objection process. The intent of SRP's comments is to suggest changes that are needed before final publication. These changes will enhance understanding of the HSR, minimize objections, and reduce the need to introduce evidence at subsequent hearings, thereby expediting the resolution of these claims.

In general, SRP concurs with the Department's approach for all procedures that are not specifically addressed below in Section I (Overall Scope), Section II (Assumptions), Section III (General Comments), and Section IV (Specific Comments and Questions). However, SRP reserves the right to comment on or object to additional items if further review results in the identification of other problems or concerns.

SRP002918

I. Comments on Overall Scope of the HSR.

The Salt River Project recommends three fundamental changes to the Hydrographic Survey Report for Indian Lands in the Little Colorado River System. First, rather than a single report for all Indian lands in the basin, three separate reports (Hopi, Navajo/San Juan Southern Paiute, and Zuni) would be more appropriate.[1] Second, the scope of each Indian HSR should be expanded to include additional relevant information such as the amount of surface water and underground water available to meet specific Indian claims. Third, the Department should set forth its recommendation on all water right claims and uses based on state law. These recommendations are discussed further below.

A. Separate HSRs by Reservation

There are several reasons that separate Indian HSRs are preferred over a single Indian Lands document:

1. The Department will have a more manageable workload. Given the suggestions below and comments by other parties, revision of the preliminary HSR for all of the Indian lands will require a significant amount of work. Moreover, additional time will be required to evaluate the water rights on the substantial acquisitions of land by the Hopi and Zuni Tribes since 1994. The workload can be distributed over a number of years by doing separate Indian HSRs.
2. The process will be more manageable by the Court and the parties. Large numbers of objections will be filed on the claims for each Tribe. Deciding threshold legal issues and having evidentiary hearings will take a long time for the claims for each Tribe. Because the Court and the parties have insufficient resources to litigate all of the Indian claims simultaneously, each Tribe's claims will have to be done sequentially. Thus, it makes sense to do a series of HSRs.
3. Using the sequential HSR process, the HSR and objections for the set of Indian claims tried last will be relatively current. Moreover, the later Indian HSRs and objections can incorporate the relevant results from earlier Indian HSRs.

[1]As provided in the preliminary HSR (p. 111) the claims on behalf of the Fort Apache Indian Reservation should be addressed in a separate HSR for that reservation, to be prepared as part of the Gila River Adjudication.

SRP suggests that the Indian HSRs be completed in the following sequence:

1. Hopi
2. Navajo and San Juan Southern Paiute
3. Zuni

There are several reasons to proceed in this sequence. These reasons are discussed below.

First, the average date of reservation for the three principal Tribes occurred in this order. Determination of the more senior claims first will assist in the evaluation of water available for subsequent reservations.

Second, extensive work on the state law claims and filings for newly-acquired Hopi Lands presumably has been done by the Tribe as part of the property purchases. That effort will facilitate the Department's review and evaluation of those claims and filings.

Third, consideration of the Hopi claims is less complex than for the other Indian claims because there is less interaction between those claims and other parties. For the majority of the Hopi claims, the water sources and claimed uses are relatively isolated from other water users.

B. Additional Information to be Added to the HSRs

Pretrial Order No. 2 provides:

1. DWR shall prepare an HSR for Indian Lands. Contents of this HSR will include:

a. Background information on the boundaries and origins of Indian lands;

b. General information as to water resources, geology, soils, minerals, timber, range land, recreation, topography, climate, and population;

c. Legal documents applying to Indian lands;

d. Current ownerships, leases, water contracts, federal water projects, state filings;

e. Information describing surface water and groundwater available to Indian lands;

f. Past and current water uses on Indian lands.

DWR will not include descriptions or opinions of the feasibility, profitability or practicability of future uses of water for irrigation or other uses. What DWR includes in a. through f. above, however, will serve as the basis for evaluating claims of future uses. Further, DWR may be directed during the adjudication process to examine the data, assumptions or methods forming the basis of claims or objections to claims regarding future uses of water on Indian lands. (Order, pp. 1, 2).

The Department provided some of this information in the preliminary HSR.[2] However, additional, more specific information is needed to "serve as a basis for evaluating claims of future uses." For example, more detailed information on hydrology, soils, climate and topography is needed for the specific areas claimed for future irrigation uses on each of the reservations. Similarly, additional specific information on hydrology, geology, minerals, recreation and population can serve as a basis for evaluating the non-irrigation claims. A similar level of analysis has been conducted by the Department for the Gila River Indian Reservation in the preliminary HSR for that reservation published in April 1999.

As provided in Pretrial Order No. 2, the Department should place particular emphasis on the water resources available to meet the Indian claims. The importance of this information is underscored by the Arizona Supreme Court's recent decision on Issues 4 and 5, wherein it was decided that federal reserved rights to groundwater may exist where other supplies of water are insufficient to meet the needs and purposes of the reservation. *See* 989 P.2d 739 (Ariz. 1999). Thus, for each major Indian claim, the Department should provide its analysis of the amount of water available to satisfy that claim from sources other than groundwater, as well as the amount of groundwater which is available.[3] For unappropriated surface water supplies available at the time of the creation of the reservation, it is especially important that DWR provide information on the seasonal and annual flow variation at each diversion location in order for the parties and the court to fully evaluate those claims.

C. Claims Based on State Law

The adjudication statutes were amended in 1995. One of the pertinent changes is that the Department shall propose "water right attributes for each individual water right claim or use as prescribed by this article." A.R.S. §45-256.B. Thus, the Department must recommend priority date, water quantity, and other attributes of each water right claim and water use based on state law, which is identified during the investigation.

---

[2]Specific comments on boundaries, legal documents, state filings and historical water uses are contained in Section III of these comments.

[3]This analysis may not be necessary for small Indian claims such as those for livestock or domestic use.

The provisions for DWR's recommendations in A.R.S. §45-256.B do not apply to aspects of the adjudication for which the Department is not requested to provide technical assistance by the court or the Master. *See* A.R.S. §45-256.A. As discussed in the Section I.B. of these comments, the Little Colorado River Adjudication Court has directed that "DWR will not include descriptions or opinions of the feasibility, profitability or practicability of future water for irrigation or other uses [claimed for Indian lands]." Pretrial Order No. 2 at 2. Therefore, the Department does not need to recommend water right attributes for these claimed future uses.

II. Comments On Assumptions Identified By The Special Master

The Special Master's memorandum to claimants dated September 23, 1994 ("Memorandum") identifies five assumptions regarding the content of the HSR on which comments are invited. These "simplifying assumptions" are intended to "focus the objection process" and "to simplify the litigation as much as possible." Memorandum at 2. The Salt River Project supports the objectives of these assumptions. However, several of the assumptions are flawed and will actually result in greater numbers of objections and more complex litigation. Issues regarding these assumptions and the Salt River Project's recommendations are discussed below.

A. Federal Law Claims

1. Issue

The assumption that reserved water rights claims must be supported by PIA and/or other standards is valid. Memorandum at 3. However, the assumption that objections should only be made to the "total figures for each water use category claimed for each reservation" and that the litigation will be confined to these totals is not valid. Although it probably will be "unnecessary to litigate the details" of many of the small claims, the details of some of the larger claims for specific existing and future uses form the foundation for the totals in each water use category. It is these details that provide the basis of the claim and thus the focus of any objections and litigation.

One of the important "details" is the location of a particular claimed water use within the exterior boundaries of a reservation. The dates for the establishment of each part of a reservation vary. *See* HSR at 13, 14. In turn, these dates are important in assessing how much

unappropriated water was available at the time that a particular portion of the reservation was established and the priority date to be assigned to any federal reserved rights that may be established. *See* Winters v. United States, 207 U.S. 564, 577 (1908); Cappaert v. United States, 426 U.S. 128, 138 (1976); United States v. New Mexico, 438 U.S. 696, 698 (1978). The location of individual existing and future water uses also may be important relative to the purposes of the particular reservation. Water is only reserved for the primary purposes of the specific reservation of land. New Mexico at 702. And, like dates of establishment, the primary purposes often vary from one reservation of land to another.

Location is also important because PIA claims depend on demonstrating that a particular tract of land is arable, has an adequate water supply, and is feasible to irrigate from both an engineering and economic standpoint. *See* Arizona v. California, 373 U.S. 546 (1963); Special Master's Report in Arizona v. California ("Arizona v. California II Master's Report") (February 22, 1982); In re General Adjudication of All Rights to Use Water in the Big Horn River System ("Big Horn I"), 753 P. 2d 76 (Wyo. 1988); New Mexico v. Lewis, 1993 WL 375216 (N.M. App.). Moreover, whether the reservation is appurtenant to the source of water claimed is a location issue that may be subject to objection. For example, the Hopi Tribe claims over 50,000 acre-feet per year from the mainstem of the Little Colorado River although the Hopi Reservation is not appurtenant to that water source. *See* Claim No. 39-91443, p. 12.

In addition, claims for existing and future water uses in the same category may be subject to different objections. For example, some historically irrigated lands that have been continuously irrigated may be entitled to a presumption that they are PIA. *See* Big Horn I. On the other hand, non-arable, discontinued, or never developed "existing use" claims may not be PIA. Id.

There are other reasons that the individual components of the claim in a particular water use category may be the focus of specific objections. These reasons include:

- Partial overlaps and differences between claims filed by the Tribes and the United States on their behalf (see Sections III.B.5, III.C.3 and III.E.3 of these comments).
- Concern by particular entities over claims to specific sources of water. For example, the Navajos and Hopis have competing claims to water in washes that cross the Hopi Reservation and to water from the N aquifer. Another example is competing claims to the mainstem of the Little Colorado River by non-Indians, Tribes and the United States.

2. Recommendation

In addition to providing more information relevant to the claims as discussed in Section I.B. of these comments, the Salt River Project recommends that the HSR be modified by adding a second volume to the HSR in the form of an appendix that contains the actual claims and amendments that have been filed by or on behalf of the Tribes.[4] All maps that were submitted with those claims should be reproduced and included in the new appendix. The claims contain detailed information on the water source, location, amount of water and other important attributes of each "existing" and future water use that comprises the total figures for each water use category. To the extent that an objection needs to be directed to a specific element of the claim, this appendix would facilitate that objection.

Most importantly, the Special Master should not direct that "objections to the final HSR be made to only the total figures for each water use category claimed for each reservation." Memorandum at 3. Limiting the content or scope of the objections would result in two types of objections — very general, or long and complex. In either case, the litigation will not be simplified because the disclosure and discovery process will have to be initially devoted to simply clarifying the objections. Instead, the objection booklet that accompanies the final claims should encourage objections to be directed to particular elements of a claim and to be as clear and specific as possible.

B. Allotments

1. Issue

The Special Master states his intent to "require that any objection to the amount of water or priority date for any allotment must be presented as an objection to the total amount or priority date claimed by the Tribe or the United States on its behalf." Memorandum at 4. This approach has the same problems discussed in Section I.A of these comments. Namely, it is the details that provide the basis of the claim and thus the focus of any objections and litigation.

[4]This approach would also eliminate the need for Appendices B and E in the preliminary HSR. The United States amended its claims on November 22, 1994. The amended claims are much less detailed than the original claims. Additional information from the United States will be needed in order for the Department to proceed. However, it appears that many of the major claims in the amended filings are the same as the original claims filed in 1985.

Another assumption with respect to allotments appears to be that all of the allotted lands are located on the reservation. Memorandum at 4; HSR at 98. However, a substantial number of allotments exist outside of the exterior boundaries of the reservation in the following areas:

Township	Range	Section(s)
19N	28E	3, 4, 10[5]
20N	18E	12, 14
20N	19E	12, 18, 20, 24
20N	20E	30
20N	28E	30, 32-34[2]
21N	28E	14, 22, 23, 27, 28, 34
21N	29E	18

2. Recommendation

Again, the Salt River Project believes that limiting the scope and content of objections would complicate or delay litigation rather than simplifying and expediting the process. Also, the Master and DWR should clarify their intentions with respect to off-reservation allotments. The Salt River Project recommends broadening the assumption that water claimed for allotments is deemed to be included in the claims for each reservation by expanding the assumption to include off-reservation allotments. The final HSR and the Special Master's objection booklet accompanying that document should clarify that water for off-reservation allotments is assumed to be encompassed within the claims for each reservation.

C. State Law Claims

1. Issue

The Salt River Project supports the assumption that all claims related to water uses on Indian lands, including those that assert water rights based on state law, should be reported in the final HSR. Memorandum at 3. However, as discussed below and in Section I.C. of these comments, these claims need to be matched to existing uses where possible and the Department must recommend water right attributes for each claim and water use. Later sections of these

[5]Allotments in these sections are located within the Navajo New Lands.

comments identify numerous state law filings that pertain to Indian lands in addition to those identified in Appendices C and G of the HSR.

DWR should also report the filings and pertinent information therein on the more than 250 registered wells on Indian lands, which are on file with DWR ("55s"). These filings, like applicable surface water filings, constitute reliable evidence of the water use associated with the well, and should be evaluated by DWR as part of the determination of water rights. Well registrations and notices of intent to drill contain important information regarding the filing date, depth, capacity and other data pertinent to these points of diversion.

The Salt River Project expects the Tribes or the United States on their behalf to accept the Master's invitation to assert some claims based on state law. Memorandum at 3. State law claims for Navajo New Lands, Navajo Fee Lands and Zuni Heaven, as well as for Hopi and Zuni acquired lands, may have earlier priority dates than could be asserted under federal law. Another reason to include these claims and filings in the HSR on Indian lands is that water available under these rights may be available to meet the "needs" of the reservation in some situations and thereby reduce the necessity for reserved rights. Moreover, as discussed in Section II.A of these comments, depending on the outcome of certain legal issues such as primary/secondary purposes of the reservations or minimum needs of the reservation, some existing and future water uses on the reservations might have to rely on state law in order to become valid water rights. Yet another reason to include all claims and filings that relate to Indian lands is to ensure that this phase of the adjudication disposes of each of these assertions of water rights. Adjudication of the claims related to Indian lands will involve granting at least a portion of some claims, dismissing or consolidating overlapping claims, canceling state rights where reserved rights are awarded instead, and dismissing or relying on prior filings. In any event, none of these claims or filings should remain to be litigated in a later, separate proceeding.

2. Recommendation

DWR should review the additional claims and filings that pertain to Indian lands that are described in Sections III.C.3 and III.D.4 of these comments to verify that they indeed pertain to Indian lands and identify any others that may apply to those lands. All of these filings plus any others that are identified by the United States or Tribes during the comment period should be

incorporated into the final HSR. Finally, DWR should recommend water right attributes for each claim and existing water uses based on state law.

D. Other Indian Lands

1. Issue

The Special Master's memorandum lists six categories of statements of claimant. Memorandum at 2. The sixth category is listed as follows:

> "*(6) statements of claimant associated with lands owned by the tribes that are not located on the reservation, new lands, or fee lands.*"

Id. However, the text of the memorandum only refers to "five categories" and this sixth category is omitted from any discussion. Memorandum at 2, 5. For example, the HSR briefly mentions "Navajo Nation Non-reservation Lands" and the filings associated with these lands. HSR at 46, 47 and Appendix C. However, it is not clear how these lands differ from other Navajo Fee Lands.

For purposes of categorizing Indian lands and water rights, the following types of lands have legal distinctions:

1. On-Reservation Trust Lands
2. On-Reservation Allotments
3. Off-Reservation Trust Lands
4. Off-Reservation Allotments
5. Fee Lands
6. State and Federal Leased or Permitted Lands

Rather than focusing on the type of claims, it is more useful to focus on the type of land. All claims, filings, and water uses (whether based on state or federal law) should be reported for each type of Indian land.

Although state and federal lands that are leased by or permitted to the Tribes are not "Indian land" *per se*, at least some of the water rights on these leased lands are likely to be owned by the

Tribes and the Tribes have a significant interest in the remaining water rights.[6] Therefore, the claims, filings, and uses on these state and federal lands should be adjudicated at the same time as the other Indian land.

2. Recommendation

The Salt River Project suggests that the final HSR and the Special Master's objection booklet clarify how claimed water rights for various types of Indian lands will be treated in the adjudication. In particular, as discussed in Sections I.C and II.C of these comments, the Salt River Project recommends that all claims, filings, and uses based on state law be treated just like other state law-based water rights. Specifically, these statements of claimant, prior filings, and water uses should continue to be reported in the HSR. In addition, DWR should attempt to verify claims and filings, match them to existing water uses, and recommend water right attributes for each individual claim and use.

III. General Comments on the HSR

A. Chapter 1: Introduction and Background

1. Applications (p. 1, line 9)

Based on the Master's previous ruling concerning the Silver Creek HSR, applications to appropriate will not be finalized in the adjudication. Memorandum Decision, Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law for Group 1 Cases Involving Stockponds, Stockwatering, and Wildlife Uses, Civil No. 6417-033-9005 (Consolidated), at 59-62 (4/20/94). The phrase "instream flow applications" should be deleted from the list of water rights that are expected to be finalized as part of the adjudication.

2. PIA Evaluations (p. 5, lines 7-9)

PIA evaluations involve extensive technical studies of economics and water supply in addition to "field investigations and engineering analyses." See Arizona v. California II Master's

[6]On state land, a Tribe may own the water right if: 1) the point of diversion is on patented land acquired by the Tribe or on land owned by the United States; or 2) if the water right was perfected before the land was transferred to the state. *See* A.R.S. § 37-321.01.A. On federal land, the Special Master ruled that water rights on leased federal land will be adjudicated in the name of the lessee or permittee unless the United States filed an objection on ownership. *See* Master's April 20, 1994 decision on Group 1 Cases.

Report, Big Horn I, New Mexico v. Lewis. The sentence should be reworded to read: "These evaluations require extensive field investigations and water supply, engineering and economic analyses, and litigation of the issue typically involves lengthy evidence and expert witness testimony."

3. Scope of the HSR (pp. 6, 7)

As discussed in Sections I. B and II.A of these comments, the HSR summarizes the claims but does not provide enough background information and does not adequately "catalog" the specifics of each claim as directed by the Court's April 18, 1994 order. In terms of the specifics of each claim, the Salt River Project suggests that an adequate catalog can be provided with the addition of an appendix in a second volume of the HSR that reproduces the actual claims that have been filed. That appendix can be referenced in this section of the HSR as well as in the claims section of the chapters on each reservation.

B. Chapter 2: Navajo Indian Reservation

1. Reservation Dates (pp. 13, 14)

The map provided in Figure 2-2 (p. 14) does not provide enough detail to enable claimants to file proper objections regarding priority dates. For the final HSR, the delineation of the base grid, where available, will be necessary for claimants to interpret the Treaty, Executive Order, or Act of Congress establishing each portion of the Reservation in relation to the claims. A more detailed map would be helpful in eliminating unnecessary objections. Moreover, since many of the claims are in UTM coordinates, the map should also identify those coordinates.

Although a complete analysis was not possible because of the scale of Figure 2-2, there appear to be some discrepancies between the boundaries and dates reflected in Figure 2-2 and the Act of Congress or Executive Order establishing each area of the Reservation. The Salt River Project suggests re-examining Figure 2-2 for the following areas:

> Area H — As currently shown, the western and southern boundaries do not appear to correctly reflect Executive Order # 1699 dated November 9, 1907.

Area J — The Executive Order dated May 7, 1917 was modified on January 19, 1918. The correct boundaries, including this modification, do not appear to be reflected in Figure 2-2.[7]

Area K — As currently shown, the boundaries appear to be incorrect for the central and southern portions of the area. The correct boundaries are described in the Congressional Act dated May 23, 1930.[8]

Area L — Recognizing that this area is not within the Little Colorado River watershed, it should be noted that this area was established as the Canyon De Chelly National Monument and not classified as Indian lands.

Area P — The east and west sections of this area may not correctly reflect the Act of Congress dated June 14, 1934.

There are a number of other Acts of Congress, Executive Orders, Proclamations, and Secretarial Orders that have not been discussed or mapped in the preliminary HSR. These are identified in Table 1 and should be incorporated into the final HSR. The Navajo New Lands and Fee Lands should also be included on any larger scale map prepared for the final HSR.

Table 1. Additional Acts of Congress, Executive Orders, Proclamations and Secretarial Orders.

Date	Type	Date	Type	Date	Type
May 29, 1908	Act	May 29, 1928	Act	Jun. 22, 1936	Act
Mar. 20,1909	Proclamation	Mar. 4, 1929	Act	Aug. 9, 1937	Act
Mar. 14, 1912	Proclamation	May 14, 1930	Act	May 9, 1938	Act
Jan. 12, 1915	Secretarial Order	Apr. 22, 1932	Act	Mar. 18, 1940	Act
Aug. 11, 1916	Act	Feb. 17, 1933	Act	Jul. 10, 1940	Act
Jun. 30, 1919	Act	Mar. 2, 1934	Act	May 29, 1944	Act
Feb. 14, 1920	Act	Jun. 19, 1934	Act	Jul. 22, 1958	Act
Dec. 1, 1922	Executive Order	May 9, 1935	Act	Jul. 12, 1960	Act
Mar. 3, 1925	Act	Feb. 11, 1936	Act	Aug. 28, 1965	Act

[7]A portion of this area was added to the Reservation by two separate actions. The Congressional Act dated May 23, 1930 added additional lands to the Reservation, including some of the lands already set aside by these two previous Executive Orders. DWR should note the overlap or at least identify the land as being reserved on the earlier date.

[8]See footnote 7.

Some of the changes mentioned above will result in changes to the exterior boundaries of the Navajo Reservation in Figure 2-2. These corrections should also be reflected in Figures 1-1 (p. 2), 2-1 (p. 12), 2-6 (p. 27), 3-1 (p. 49), 3-2 (p. 52) and 3-3 (p. 59), with particular attention to areas H and K.

2. *History (pp. 13-17)*

Additional historical information on the reservations would improve the HSR. The history of land use and irrigation development on each area prior to becoming part of the Navajo and Hopi Reservations should be included. For example, Mormons settled in the Tuba City/Moenkopi area in the 1870s and began farming prior to federal withdrawal and acquisition in 1900. Water uses were also initiated on New Lands and Fee Lands before their acquisition.

3. *Water Resources (pp.18-24)*

Additional information on the water resources available to meet Indian claims should be provided in the final HSR. As discussed in Section I.B and II.A of these comments, the water available at specific claim locations can serve as a basis for evaluating or objecting to claims. For surface water supplies, water available at the claimed location at the time of the creation of the reservation must be determined by adjusting current flows to reflect upstream development since the date of reservation.

4. *Current Water Uses (pp. 25-30)*

As discussed in Section II.A of these comments, if acreage within a developed irrigation project is currently or has recently been in production, it may be subject to different standards than claims for future uses. In contrast, a much more detailed analysis must be completed for lands never put into production within a developed irrigation project or where irrigation has been discontinued. The first step in this process would be to identify actual existing uses. The 1986 USDA report (USDA) used to develop Table 2-1 (p. 26) is a start, but aerial reconnaissance coupled with field verification would be more reliable. At a minimum, a comparison of the irrigation projects reported in the USDA report and the irrigation claims for current or developed irrigation on the Navajo Reservation should be completed for the final HSR. Aerial reconnaissance could then be pursued for claimed current irrigation projects that cannot be

readily matched to the USDA report or that are not referenced in the study. Table 2 makes this comparison for those irrigation projects that can be readily matched to the claims.

In addition to the comparison of claimed information with the 1986 USDA data discussed above, a comparison of claimed existing irrigation use with 1994 irrigated acres should be provided. In order to be useful, this comparison will need to be on a project-by-project basis and DWR will have to do an independent investigation or obtain more specific information from the BIA. For example, the Delmar 1994 data (p. 28) is only a 1-page list of irrigation projects within the Western Navajo Agency and acres farmed. Most of the projects have different names than in the claims or the USDA report so a comparison cannot be made easily. Furthermore, the information reported for the Fort Defiance Agency (cited as "Martin, 1994") consists of a "personal telephone interview" (pp. 28, 118) without any corresponding documentation.[9] This type of information is of such a general nature that it cannot be relied upon with certainty. DWR should independently verify currently irrigated acreage or qualify the irrigated acreage values for the Fort Defiance Agency with phrases such as "reportedly."

DWR states it was unable to obtain current water use information on the Navajo Nation New Lands or Fee Lands (p. 30). At a minimum, recent aerial photography should be reviewed for these areas to determine the extent of irrigation and stockpond uses.

It appears DWR has misinterpreted the water statistics for the Black Mesa Mining Complex which it received from the Peabody Coal Company in 1994. The Salt River Project suggests the following language to replace the second paragraph on page 29:

> PWCC water statistics indicate 3,703.6 acre-feet of wellfield pumpage in 1993. The average annual wellfield pumpage from 1969 through 1993 was 3,474.6 acre-feet. The use of water from sediment ponds was reported from 1988 through 1993, with an average annual use of 286.9 acre-feet. The total water use for the Black Mesa Mining Complex was 3,939.9 acre-feet in 1993. For more information on Peabody Western Coal Company's operations and water use, see Section 6.4 of Chapter 6.

[9]DWR makes the assumption that the acreage reported from this "telephone interview" is all in the Little Colorado River watershed in Arizona. This may be erroneous because the Fort Defiance Agency extends into New Mexico and a portion lies outside of the Little Colorado River watershed.

Table 2. Comparison of 1986 USDA report and claims for irrigation on the Navajo Reservation.

Irrigation Project	1986 USDA Report		39-91441	39-91442
	original acres	currently farmed	current or recent acres	developed acres
Beaver Farm*	64	0	60	60
Begashibito*	200	0	86**	86
Birdsprings	300	10	35	35
Black Falls*	1,600	0	not claimed	not claimed
Cameron	60	15	60	60
Coldfields*	never developed	never developed	210	210
Cornfields	565	65	480	480
Fort Defiance	208	unknown	159	159
Fort Wingate School*	100	0	not claimed	not claimed
Granado Cornfields	2,210	100	845	845
Houck	361	61	236	236
Jedditto-Navajo and Hopi	144	40	144	not claimed
Kinlichee	269	25	215	215
Klagetoh	400	64	300	300
Klethla	320	150	not claimed	625
Lokasacod*	110	0	69	69
Lower Moenkopi	160	25	90	90
Moenave-Vanzee	163	50	145	145
Moenkopi-Tuba City/Reservoir Canyon	950	175	1,400	1,400
Natoni*	236	8	101	101
Natural Bridge	1,000	unknown	41	41
North Leupp*	95	0	100	100
Oak Springs	50	26	42	42
Red Lake	1,102	724	771	771
Shonto*	102	0	102	102
Todelto Park*	650	36	not claimed	not claimed
Tsaile	500	100	not claimed	not claimed

*Apparently these projects were not reported in Table 2-1 of the HSR because there was no acreage irrigated at the time of the study. DWR should set forth all available information for review by the claimants. Thus, the comparison in the final HSR should include all irrigation projects analyzed in the USDA report.
**Claimed as Upper Begashibito.

5. Claims (pp. 31-47)

a. State Law Claims

Tables 2-8 (p. 44), 2-9 (p. 45) and 2-10 (p. 46) report the state law filings identified by DWR for Navajo Nation Trust Lands, New Lands and Fee Lands. Attachment 1 contains a list of previous filings on Navajo lands generated by comparing DWR's list of active surface water filings (CD dated 6/28/99) with SRP's GIS coverage of Indian lands. Appendix C in the HSR contains nearly all of these filings. The differences may be due to inholdings or errors in one of the data sources. SRP recommends that the Department confirm which state filings apply to Navajo lands. Likewise, DWR should confirm that the statements of claim listed in the preliminary HSR are a complete set for Navajo lands.

As discussed in Sections I.C, II.C and II.D of these comments, once a complete list of state law claims and filings are identified for Navajo lands, those need to be matched to existing uses where possible and the Department must recommend water right attributes for each water claim and use.

b. Federal Law Claims

As discussed in Sections I.B and II.A of these comments, objections and litigation will be facilitated if the HSR contains more detail on the claims. Some of this detail can be provided by adding an appendix that contains the actual statements of claimant including all attachments.

The Salt River Project also recommends that the text of the HSR be expanded to describe the overlap and differences between the claims by the Navajo Nation and the United States on its behalf.[10] This clarification should reduce the number of unnecessary objections resulting from duplication between claims and focus some objections on the significant differences between claims by and on behalf of a particular tribe. The overlaps and differences between claims by the United States and Tribes are summarized in the following paragraphs.[11] Additional overlaps with the claims filed by the Hopi Tribe are identified in Section III.C.3 of these comments.

[10]This section is based on the original claims filed by the United States. To the extent that the amended claims filed by the United States in 1994 differ from the original claims, the overlaps and differences will vary from those outlined in these comments.

[11]Unless otherwise noted, the United States and Navajo claims are for identical locations.

Current Irrigation — Surface Water
The Navajo Nation and United States each claim 17 current irrigation sites totaling 6,269 acres. The source of water is from various creeks and washes throughout the reservation. The difference in the amount of water claimed is due to the difference in the claimed water duty. The United States water duty averages about 4.3 acre-feet per acre and the Nation's averages about 5.0 acre-feet per acre.

Future Irrigation — Surface Water
The largest portion of the Navajo claim for future irrigation using surface water is for 206,000 acre-feet from the Little Colorado River to irrigate 64,480 acres at Leupp. This claim is exactly the same as the claim by the United States on behalf of both the Navajo Nation and the Hopi Tribe.

Irrigation Storage — Surface Water
Navajo claims for current use exceed U.S. claims by 875 acre-feet due to a difference in evaporation for Red Lake Reservoir. However, the U.S. claims 3 acre-feet for Buell Park Dam that is not claimed by the Nation. Navajo claims for future use are in agreement with U.S. claims including the largest claim for 22,600 acre-feet of annual evaporation for the proposed Leupp Reservoir.

The U.S. claims a one-time filling for future reservoirs of 330,000 acre-feet. The corresponding Navajo claim is for 317,813 acre-feet.

Current Irrigation — Ground Water
Navajo and U.S. claims for current irrigation uses from ground water are in agreement for 2,734 acre-feet to irrigate 634 acres. These claims overlap Hopi claims for 1,130 acre-feet in the Moenave/Vanzee and Willow Springs/Littlefield units.

Future Irrigation — Ground Water
The U.S. claims 512 separate locations for future ground water use on the Navajo and Hopi Reservations. The Navajo ground water claims are grouped into five areas: East Leupp, West Leupp, East Tuba, West Tuba, and Lower Shonto. Most of these claims are along Moenkopi Wash and in the Leupp area. It is difficult to separate Navajo and Hopi claims in the Moenkopi Wash area due to the land ownership dispute resulting from the 1934 Act. The U.S. claims 34,601 acres and 106,825 acre-feet for lands in the western part of the Hopi and Navajo Reservations. It appears that the claim by the Navajo Nation roughly corresponds to the U.S. claim for future wells on Navajo lands.

Municipal — Ground Water
Navajo and U.S. claims for current municipal use are generally in agreement with the exception of some rounding differences.

The U.S. claims for future municipal use cannot be readily compared to Navajo and Hopi claims since U.S. claims are not separated by Tribe. The U.S. total claim for future uses exceeds total Tribal claims for future uses by 2,275 acre-feet.

Domestic — Ground Water
The Navajo Nation's claim for present domestic water use is 301 acre-feet, which includes 2.4 acre-feet for evaporation losses. Although U.S. and Navajo claim totals closely correspond, the Navajos list 33 additional claim sites. Water use claim per well differs slightly, with the U.S. claiming 0.45 acre-feet per well and the Tribe 0.4212 acre-feet.

The U.S. has made a combined claim for both Tribes of 33 acre-feet for future domestic use. The Navajo Nation claims 33 acre-feet for future use.

Current Recreation — Surface Water
The Navajos claimed all impoundments greater than 15 acre-feet in size as recreational lakes, although in some cases they might be used for livestock. All of the Navajo claims for evaporation are slightly greater than the amount claimed by the United States. This suggests that a larger estimated surface area and/or a higher evaporation rate was used by the Navajos.

Future Recreation — Surface Water
Navajo evaporation claims for future recreation uses exceed U.S. claims for three of the claim sites. The U.S. claims 53 acre-feet for a lake in Coal Mine Canyon, which the Tribe does not claim.

The U.S., Navajo Nation, and Hopi Tribe are each claiming water from Willow Springs: the Navajos claim 66 acre-feet, the Hopis and U.S. each claim 49 acre-feet.

The U.S. claims a one-time initial filling for recreation lakes of 1,082 acre-feet. The Navajos do not make a claim for the initial filling of recreation lakes.

Stockwater Wells (Livestock Consumption)
There are eight wells that the Navajos claim under current stockwatering consumption which are not included in the U.S. claim. The total acre-feet in both sets of claims corresponds since there is a slight difference in the acre-feet claimed per well. The Navajos have made a claim for future stockwatering use of 50 acre-feet, which the U.S. has not included.

Stockwater Wells (Evaporation)
Navajo claims for current stockwatering evaporation are 3 acre-feet less than the U.S. claim. The U.S. has not listed any future additional evaporation loss. The Navajo claim for future use may include an amount for evaporation.

Stockponds (Consumption)
Navajo claims for livestock consumption from existing stockponds are in agreement with U.S. claims. The U.S. does not list any claims for future livestock consumption from stockponds but the Tribe claims 50 acre-feet.

Stockponds (Evaporation)
Navajo claims for evaporation from existing stockponds are in agreement with U.S. claims. However, the Navajos claim 500 additional acre-feet for future stockpond evaporation and the U.S. does not claim any.

Industrial
Navajo claims for current industrial uses exceed the U.S. claims on their behalf by 600 acre-feet due to the Navajo's claim for existing construction uses. The largest Navajo future claim is 32,000 acre-feet for two coal-fired power plants. The Navajo claims correspond to the U.S. claims except 1,000 acre-feet of additional use is claimed by the Navajos for miscellaneous use and future construction. The U.S. and Navajo claims largely overlap with Hopi claims (See Section II.C.3).

Mining — Ground Water
The U.S. is claiming an additional 516 acre-feet of current ground water use for mining than the Navajos due to the U.S. claim for Peabody Well #9, which the Navajos exclude. The U.S. future use claim includes 1,300 acre-feet for dust control, domestic use and construction, and 6,820 acre-feet for slurrying. It appears that this is a joint claim on behalf of both Tribes. The Navajos claim 11,065 acre-feet for future mining use but do not specify the source of water. The U.S. and Navajo mining claims partially overlap with the Hopi mining claims (See Section II.C.3).

Mining — Surface Water
The U.S. claim for surface water for existing mining use is 2,109 acre-feet greater than the Navajo's. The claim locations agree, but the estimated evaporation from each site differs widely. The U.S. doesn't separate Hopi and Navajo claims for future use.

New Lands — Irrigation
Neither the U.S. nor the Navajos claim any current use of surface water on New Lands. The U.S. claims 410 acre-feet for future irrigation. The Navajo surface water and ground water claims for future irrigation are combined. Future surface water sources include the Puerco River and its tributaries.

Included within the U.S. claims for future use of ground water is 666 acre-feet for family plots by the year 1990. U.S. claims for surface and ground water exceed Navajo claims by 6,249 acre-feet.

New Lands — Domestic/Municipal
The U.S. and Navajo claims for current domestic and municipal use are similar although there are several claims made by each that the other does not list. Both parties claim 72 acre-feet of "present domestic use" and approximately 888 acre-feet for "additional municipal water use by the year 1990." The primary difference between claims is the amount claimed for future (post-1990) municipal use, the U.S. claims 898 acre-feet more than the Navajos.

New Lands — Recreation
The Navajos make no claim for existing or future recreational uses of water. The U.S. makes no claim for existing use but claims 15 acre-feet for two locations of future use.

New Lands — Stockwater/Ground Water
The U.S. claims existing stockwater use for livestock consumption of 382 acre-feet plus approximately 1 acre-foot for evaporation. The U.S. projects no future increases for stockwater consumption or evaporation. Navajo claims are somewhat unclear. In Table 11, they claim 37 acre-feet for current stock use including some wells that are also used for domestic purposes. However, in another section of their claim, they list 34 acre-feet as their present livestock well use. No distinction is made in the Navajo claims between consumption or evaporation uses.

New Lands — Stockponds
The Navajo claim for current livestock consumption and evaporation exceeds the U.S. claims by 54 acre-feet. Differences are due to larger claims for corresponding sites and additional sites not listed in the U.S. claim. The U.S. did not make a claim for future stockpond use; the Navajos claim 115 acre-feet.

New Lands — Industrial
Both the U.S. and Navajo claims list 15 acre-feet for existing uses. Navajo claims for future uses include claims for sand and gravel operations, construction, and miscellaneous industrial purposes. The U.S. lists the sand and gravel claim under mining uses. The difference in claims stems from Navajo claims of 100 acre-feet for construction and 100 acre-feet for miscellaneous uses, which the U.S. does not include.

New Lands — Mining
The U.S. and Tribe each claim 45 acre-feet for future sand and gravel operations. The U.S. claims an additional 20 acre-feet for dust control and other mining water uses.

Fee Lands
The Navajos claim water for two ranches held in fee, the Bar N Ranch and Chambers Ranch. The Navajos claim 73 acre-feet for present livestock well use and for consumption and evaporation for stockponds. The U.S. makes no claim for Indian fee lands.

6. Non-reservation Lands (pp. 46, 47)

As discussed in Section II.D of these comments, the intent of the Special Master and DWR with respect to the treatment of water right claims for these lands should be specified in the final HSR. The Salt River Project recommends that the claimed water rights for these lands be handled in the same manner as all other Indian lands.

C. Chapter 3: Hopi Indian Reservation

1. History (pp. 51-55)

Additional background on the Hopi Industrial Park would improve this section of the HSR. Information on past and current water use, if any, and the circumstances surrounding Hopi acquisition of the land would assist in evaluation of this portion of the claim. It is important to note that these lands are held in trust but are not part of the Hopi Reservation.

2. Current Water Uses (pp. 58, 59)

As noted in the HSR, the 1992 data that DWR relied upon for current agricultural use within the Hopi Reservation has marginal value, at best. The Natural Resource Information System data is a computer-generated form with a few handwritten numbers on it that appear to be in draft form. There are three sections (Tribally Owned, Individually Owned, and Government Owned) for entries related to "Land Use — Irrigated," but only the Individually Owned section has an entry in that row. DWR has based its statement, "The NRIS report shows that in 1992 a total of 140 acres were being irrigated on the Hopi Reservation" (p. 58) on that entry. This statement appears to be based on data of very questionable reliability and should be rewritten to reflect the quality of the information. Similarly, the "HPL Cropland Estimates, 1992 Season" (p. 58) is actually entitled HPL Cropland Rental Estimates 1992 Season, which indicates that the figures are only for rental tracts of land.

The Salt River Project suggests that DWR pursue aerial reconnaissance coupled with field verification as a more reliable means for determining current irrigation uses. As stated earlier in these comments, current or recent irrigation uses may be examined differently than future claims under the PIA standard. Identifying current uses will help to eliminate unnecessary objections.

3. Claims

As with claims for Navajo lands, there are numerous overlaps and differences between claims of the United States, Navajo Nation, and Hopi Tribe.[12] These differences and overlaps are discussed in the paragraphs below and Section II.B.5 of these comments.

[12]Again, this section is based on the original claims filed by the United States. To the extent that the amended claims filed by the United States in 1994 differ from the original claims, the overlaps and differences will vary from those outlined in these comments.

Current Irrigation — Surface Water
The U.S. claims about 6,317 acres of land for irrigation on the Hopi Reservation District 6 lands and Hopi Partitioned lands. The Tribe claims an additional 1,490 acres in Begashibito Wash and Pasture Canyon in the Moenkopi 1934 Act area. U.S. and Hopi claims are similar with the exception of the four tracts of additional land claimed by the Tribe. The water duty used by the U.S. and Hopi on agreed-upon claims averages about 1.0 acre-foot per acre.

Future Irrigation — Surface Water
The Hopi Tribe claims 45,790 acre-feet to irrigate 13,710 acres of Hopi land within the Leupp project. Thus, the Hopi claim is a partial duplication of the Navajo and United States claims.

The United States and Hopis both claim future irrigation on tributaries for 4,370 acres in the same six projects. The net water requirements of both claims are 15,125 acre-feet but the Hopis claim an additional 4,549 acre-feet for a diversion requirement to offset evaporation losses.

Irrigation Storage — Surface Water
Hopi claims for current irrigation storage exceed U.S. claims by 157 acre-feet due to a larger claim (54 vs. 29 af) for Lower Reservoir and additional claims for Upper and Middle Reservoir at Pasture Canyon. Hopi future claims agree with the U.S. claims. The Hopis have claimed 4,810 acre-feet for their portion of the Leupp Reservoir evaporation, which overlaps with the U.S. and Navajo claims for that reservoir.

The U.S. claims a one-time filling for future reservoirs of 330,000 acre-feet for both Tribes, the Navajos claim 317,813 acre-feet, and the Hopis claim 31,000 acre-feet plus 59,640 acre-feet for their portion of the Leupp Project. Again, the Hopi Leupp Reservoir claims overlap U.S. and Navajo claims for that proposed reservoir.

Current Irrigation — Ground Water
The U.S. and Hopi claims correspond with each other. The Hopi Tribe claims 1,130 acre-feet for lands in the Moenave/Vanzee and Willow Springs/Littlefield units, which the Navajos also claim.

Future Irrigation — Ground Water
The Hopis claim 15,780 acre-feet to irrigate 5,260 acres on District 6 and Hopi Partitioned lands and a general unquantified claim for lands in the Moenkopi Wash area. With the exception of the unquantified Moenkopi portion of the claim, this amount appears to roughly correspond to the U.S. claim for wells on Hopi land.

Municipal — Ground Water
The Hopi claim locations for current municipal use agree with the U.S. claims, with the exception of an additional U.S. claim (4 af) for Second Mesa. Tribal claims, however, are 917 acre-feet greater than U.S. claims for these sites. The

Hopi claim is based on 1984 population estimates and a 200 gpcd water requirement. The basis for the U.S. claim is not known.

The U.S. claims for future municipal use cannot be readily compared to Hopi claims since U.S. claims are not separated by Tribe. The U.S. total future claim exceeds total Tribal claims by 2,275 acre-feet.

Domestic — Ground Water
The U.S. claims 1.12 acre-feet of current domestic use for Hopi water haulers. The Hopi Tribe has claimed 22 acre-feet for current domestic use based on a population of 100 multiplied by a water requirement of 200 gpcd.

The U.S. has made a combined claim for both Tribes of 33 acre-feet for future domestic use. The Hopi Tribe alone claims over 68 acre-feet for future use.

Current Recreation — Surface Water
The Hopi claim is greater than the U.S. claim for three of the locations and less than the U.S. for one location (Lake Maho). Overall, the Hopi claim is 4 acre-feet greater than the United States claim for these sites. There is an addition error in the Hopi claim; the total should be 70 acre-feet, not 80 acre-feet.

Future Recreation — Surface Water
Hopi claims are in agreement with U.S. claims.

The U.S., Navajo Nation, and Hopi Tribe claims each include water from Willow Springs; the Navajos claim 66 acre-feet, the Hopis and U.S. claim 49 acre-feet.

The U.S. claims a one-time initial filling for recreation lakes of 1,082 acre-feet. The Hopi claim of 404 acre-feet for initial filling of recreation lakes overlaps part of the U.S. claim.

Stockwater Wells (Livestock Consumption)
Hopi claims for current stockwatering consumption are in agreement with U.S. claims. There is some discrepancy in the Hopi claims for future uses in this category. The Hopi summary of claims (Table 7) shows a total of 118 acre-feet, which corresponds to the U.S. claim; however, the Hopi supporting tables indicate a future use of 187 acre-feet. It appears that the detailed Hopi claim for future uses includes current uses of 95 acre-feet, so that the net future claim would be 92 acre-feet. The U.S. claim lists two well sites with no current use and 1.6 acre-feet of future use, for which the Tribe does not have a specific corresponding claim.

Stockwater Wells (Evaporation)
Hopi claims for current stockwatering evaporation are substantially greater (484 acre-feet) than U.S. claims. The Hopi claims for future uses are in agreement with the U.S. claims.

Stockponds (Consumption)
Hopi claims for livestock consumption from existing stockponds are in agreement with U.S. claims. There is some discrepancy in Hopi claims for future stockponds. The Hopi summary of claims (Table 7) shows a claim of 97 acre-feet, which is close to the U.S. claim; however, the supporting tables indicate a

future use of 71 acre-feet. There are several claims for future stockponds made by the U.S. with no corresponding claim by the Hopis.

Stockponds (Evaporation)
Hopi claims for evaporation from existing stockponds are in agreement with U.S. claims. Again, there is disagreement between the Hopi summary (Table 7) and the supporting detailed list of claims in Appendix 1. Table 7 shows future evaporation of 79 acre-feet, which corresponds to the U.S. claim. Hopi Appendix 1 does not show any claim for additional future use.

Industrial
The U.S. has not identified any current industrial water claims for the Hopis and the Tribe has included current uses in their municipal claims. Hopi future claims are in agreement with U.S. claims with the exception that the Hopis claim 30 acre-feet more for the Winslow Industrial Park. Hopi claims duplicate several of the U.S. and Navajo claims including 16,000 acre-feet for one of the power plants, 120 acre-feet for a feed lot and beef processing plant, and 460 acre-feet for potato operations and vegetable processing. The dual claim for agricultural processing facilities is based on facilities for the proposed Leupp irrigation project. The proposed power plant claimed by both Tribes is located somewhere along the Hopi-Navajo boundary.

Mining — Ground Water
The Hopis claim 2,325 acre-feet, which is one-half of the water that is currently being pumped by Peabody Coal. This is a partial duplication of the 4,649 acre-feet the U.S. and Navajos are claiming for the same use. The Hopi claims for future mining and slurry correspond to the amount in the U.S. claim although the Tribe claims an additional 5,000 acre-feet for development of oil and gas and other minerals besides coal. In addition, the Tribe claims 21,000 acre-feet for other mining and industrial uses.

Mining — Surface Water
The U.S. does not make claims for existing mining surface water use for the Hopis. The U.S. claim for future use is not divided between the Tribes. The Hopi Tribe has not made claims for current or future surface water mining use.

4. Hopi New Lands

The Hopi Tribe has acquired a number of ranches since the preliminary HSR was published in 1994. As discussed in Sections I.C, II.C and II.D of these comments, the state law claims and filings for these lands need to be incorporated into the HSR and the Department must recommend water right attributes for each water claim and use. As noted in Section II.D, claims or uses on state or federal land leased by the Tribes also should be addressed along with the other

Indian claims. One of the major issues to resolve on leased lands will be the ownership of water rights on these lands. See A.R.S. §§ 37-321.01 and 45-151.

In order to provide perspective on the magnitude of this effort, Attachment 2 contains a listing of previous state law filings on Hopi Ranches prepared by comparing DWR's database with SRP's GIS coverage. As can be seen from the list, a large number of filings have been made on these lands. Of course, Attachment 2 does not include the similar number of adjudication claims or the claims and filings for federal lands with grazing permits held by the Hopi Tribe.

D. Chapter 4: Zuni Indian Reservation

1. Physical Description (pp. 64, 65)

The description and map of the Zuni lands should be revised to reflect that most of two more sections of land are in the Zuni Reservation (land in Sections 26 and 27, Township 14 North, Range 26 East). In addition, over the past few years, the Zuni Tribe has acquired substantial amounts of land located north and east of the Reservation. These fee and leased lands should also be described and shown on a map.

2. History (pp. 66, 67)

The HSR should provide information on the history of land and water usage prior to acquisition by the United States and Zuni Tribe. Appendix G of the HSR lists a number of state law water right filings that claim priority dates as early as 1870. In order to provide background information on the claims for current and future water uses on the reservation, DWR should research and report the land and water use history of the area since the late 1800s. This portion of Chapter 4 would parallel the "History of Irrigation Development" sections of the Navajo and Hopi chapters of the HSR.

3. Current Uses (p. 71)

The majority of the Statements of Claimant filed on behalf of the Zuni Tribe are for stockpond uses. DWR should be able to determine existing stockpond uses using aerial photography. The Salt River Project suggests coordinating a site visit with the Zuni Tribe in order to determine other current uses, if any, occurring on the Zuni Reservation.

4. Zuni Claims (pp. 72-74)

The Department should clarify the status of the claims with the United States and the Zuni Tribe. Although the claimant name on the form is "Pueblo of Zuni," the claims are signed by Herbert Becker, an attorney for the United States at that time. Based on the 1994 amended claims filed by the United States, it appears that the original claims were filed by the United States on behalf of the Zuni Tribe.

5. State Law Claims (pp. 75, 76)

The Statements of Claimant and state law filings by the previous landowners and by or on behalf of the Zuni Tribe should be verified by DWR, matched to existing uses where possible, and recommended attributes for each water right or use should be included in the HSR. This approach is the same as that used by DWR for non-Indian HSRs.

There are many claims under state law for water uses on Zuni lands within the Little Colorado River watershed that have not been evaluated or reported in the preliminary HSR.

In order to provide perspective on the magnitude of this effort, Attachment 3 contains a listing of previous state law filings on Zuni Ranches prepared by comparing DWR's database with SRP's GIS coverage. As can be seen from the list, a large number of filings have been made on these lands. Of course, Attachment 3 does not include the similar number of adjudication claims.

The state law claims and filings associated with Reservation lands should be separated from the documents associated with Zuni fee lands. Separation of claims and filings for water uses on lands of different legal status will facilitate the adjudication and administration of these water rights.

E. Chapter 5: San Juan Southern Paiute Lands

1. Physical Description (pp. 77, 78)

The HSR should indicate the data source for the boundaries of the San Juan Southern Paiute lands shown in Figure 5-1.

2. History (pp. 79, 80)

The history of reservation lands should focus on the area shown on Figure 5-1 (p. 78). The Secretarial Order of October 16, 1907, and subsequent changes in the San Juan Southern Paiute Reservation, does not refer to the land associated with this claim, but pertains only to the Paiute strip located in Utah along the Arizona border. The discussion of Paiute strip lands should be removed from the HSR or clarified to clearly distinguish those lands from the area involved in the adjudication.

3. Claims

The claims filed by and on behalf of the San Juan Southern Paiute Tribe overlap the claims previously filed by and on behalf of the Navajo Nation. The overlap and any discrepancies in the claims should be reported in the HSR.

F. Chapter 6: Unusual Circumstances

1. Allotments (pp. 91-101)

DWR's discussion of case law should include additional cases, including recent decisions in Walton III [752 F.2d 397 (1985)]; Big Horn I [753 P.2d 76 (Wyo. 1988)]; and Big Horn II [803 P.2d 61 (Wyo. 1990)].

Figure 6-1 (p. 98) appears to contain some errors in depicting allotments. As discussed in Section I.B, some off-reservation allotments are not shown at all. The location of other allotments does not agree with the 1966 BIA maps of allotments (e.g., no allotments exist in Section 24, T19N, R28E; Section 19, T20N, R28E; T20N, R27E; or Section 25, 26 or 34, T21N, R29E).

G. Appendices

In Tables C-9 through C-11, it appears that DWR did not check Yavapai County for notices of appropriation. Instead, DWR apparently relied on the fact that some notices were transcribed into Coconino County. DWR should research the early Yavapai County records to see if any additional notices of appropriation apply to Indian lands.

IV. Specific Comments and Questions

Page	Line	Comments
8	First ¶	The area figures in this paragraph should be modified taking into account any exterior boundary changes as a result of comments.
21	4, 23	The flow values for the perennial reaches of Moenkopi Wash (2.6 cfs) and Black Creek (1.45 cfs) should be specified as either the minimum, average, or median annual flow.
26	Table 2-1	DWR should include all irrigation projects included in the USDA report regardless of the current number of acres irrigated.
27	Fig. 2-6	What was the data source for the irrigated lands? The text on page 25 implies that the data source is the USDA report but there are 29 projects on Figure 2-6, but only; 18 are listed on Table 2-1.
38	4	The text indicates that SOC No. 39-91441 was amended February 4, 1993. This amendment could not be located. It does appear that the United States requested a portion of the claim be replaced due to a line transposition error on December 18, 1985. If this is the amendment to 39-91441, the date should be corrected. Otherwise, more information on the 1993 amendment should be included in the HSR and the amendment should be placed in DWR's files.
51	21	The 1882 "order" (not "treaty") set aside lands.
72	2, 3, 12	DWR should confirm with the Zuni Tribe and the United States which party to reference as filing the statements of claimant on April 7, 1992. Although the claim forms state that the claimant is the "Pueblo of Zuni," the forms are signed by Herbert Becker who represents the United States.
73, 74	Table 4-1	Based on the claims, the priority date on Table 4-1 should read "reserved," not "time immemorial." The total number of claims should read "17," not "18."
77	14	"Hamblin Washing" should read "Hamblin Wash."
107	8	Replace "3,867" with "3,543."

APPENDIX 1:
PREVIOUS STATE FILINGS ON NAVAJO LANDS

FILING	CERTIFICATE	APPLICANT	LOCATION
33-32623	32623	BABBITT RANCHES INC	NAVAJO
33-35910	35910	JEFFERS, J.C.	NAVAJO
33-40830	40830	GANNON, R.C.	NAVAJO
36-101932		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	NAVAJO
36-1376		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-1382		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	NAVAJO FEE LANDS
36-1419		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-1429		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-1430		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-1431		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	NAVAJO FEE LANDS
36-1432		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-1473		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-1476		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-1478		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-1479		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-1481		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-1482		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-1490		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	NAVAJO
36-18452		MCCARRELL, M.M.	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-18457		MCDONALD, M.M.	NAVAJO
36-18460		MCDONALD, M.M.	NAVAJO
36-18461		MCDONALD, M.M.	NAVAJO
36-42686		PYEATT, R.	NAVAJO
36-46858		MC LEAN, M.M.	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-66477		ROBERTS, L.W.	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-66478		ROBERTS, L.W.	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-66479		ROBERTS, L.W.	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-66480		ROBERTS, L.W.	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-66481		ROBERTS, L.W.	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-66482		ROBERTS, L.W.	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-66483		ROBERTS, L.W.	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-66484		ROBERTS, L.W.	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-66485		ROBERTS, L.W.	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-66486		ROBERTS, L.W.	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-66487		ROBERTS, L.W.	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-66488		ROBERTS, L.W.	NAVAJO NEW LANDS

APPENDIX 1:
PREVIOUS STATE FILINGS ON NAVAJO LANDS

FILING	CERTIFICATE	APPLICANT	LOCATION
36-66489		ROBERTS, L.W.	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-69020		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-69021		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-69024		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-69025		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-69026		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-69027		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-69028		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-69033		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-69035		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-69036		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-69037		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-69042		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-69043		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-69045		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-69046		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-69048		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-69049		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-69050		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-69051		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-69052		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-69053		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-69054		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-69055		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-69058		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-69059		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-69060		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-69061		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-69081		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-69082		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-69083		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-69084		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-69085		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-69086		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-69090		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-69092		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS

APPENDIX 1:
PREVIOUS STATE FILINGS ON NAVAJO LANDS

FILING	CERTIFICATE	APPLICANT	LOCATION
36-69094		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-69095		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-69096		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-69098		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
36-70516		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
38-18455		MC DONALD, M.M.	NAVAJO
38-69117		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
38-69118		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
38-69119		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
38-69120		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
38-69121		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
38-69122		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
38-69123		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
38-69128		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
38-69130		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
38-69131		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
38-69133		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
38-69134		DOUBLE SPUR RANCHES	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
38-88000		ROBERTS, L.W.	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
38-88001		ROBERTS R & ROBERT J	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
38-88002		ROBERTS, L.W.	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
38-88003		ROBERTS, L.W.	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
38-88004		ROBERTS, L.W.	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
38-88005		ROBERTS, L.W.	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
38-88006		ROBERTS, L.W.	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
38-88007		ROBERTS, L.W.	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
38-88008		ROBERTS, L.W.	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
38-88009		ROBERTS, L.W.	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
38-91320		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
38-91325		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	NAVAJO FEE LANDS
38-91375		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
38-91378		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
38-91379		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
38-91380		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	NAVAJO NEW LANDS
38-91387		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	NAVAJO
3R-317	257	CAMPBELL, D.W.	NAVAJO

APPENDIX 1:
PREVIOUS STATE FILINGS ON NAVAJO LANDS

FILING	CERTIFICATE	APPLICANT	LOCATION
4A-4237	2860	FOLGER, R.E.	NAVAJO
4A-4805	3930	CAMERON TRADING CO	NAVAJO
4A-874	257	CAMPBELL, D.W.	NAVAJO

APPENDIX 2:
PREVIOUS STATE FILINGS ON HOPI LANDS

FILING	CERTIFICATE	APPLICANT	LOCATION
33-16	144	BABBITT BROTHERS TRADING CO	AJA RANCH
33-32622	32622	BABBITT RANCHES INC	HART RANCH
33-32624	32624	NA PROPERTIES INC	HART RANCH
33-32625	32625	BABBITT RANCHES	HART RANCH
33-32626	32626	BABBITT RANCHES INC	HART RANCH
33-32627	32627	BABBITT RANCHES INC	HART RANCH
33-32628	32628	BABBITT RANCHES INC	HART RANCH
33-32629	32629	BABBITT RANCHES INC	HART RANCH
33-32630	32630	BABBITT RANCHES INC	HART RANCH
33-32631	32631	BABBITT RANCHES INC	HART RANCH
33-32632	32632	BABBITT RANCHES INC	HART RANCH
33-32633	32633	BABBITT RANCHES INC	HART RANCH
33-32634	32634	BABBITT RANCHES INC	HART RANCH
33-32635	32635	BABBITT RANCHES INC	HART RANCH
33-32636	32636	BABBITT RANCHES INC	HART RANCH
33-32637	32637	BABBITT RANCHES INC	HART RANCH
33-32638	32638	BABBITT RANCHES INC	HART RANCH
33-32639	32639	BABBITT RANCHES INC	HART RANCH
33-32640	32640	BABBITT RANCHES INC	HART RANCH
33-32641	32641	CULLUM, T.S. ET ALS	HART RANCH
33-32642	32642	BABBITT RANCHES INC	HART RANCH
33-32643	32643	BABBITT RANCHES INC	HART RANCH
33-32644	32644	BABBITT RANCHES INC	HART RANCH
33-32645	32645	BABBITT RANCHES INC	HART RANCH
33-32646	32646	BABBITT RANCHES INC	HART RANCH
33-32647	32647	BABBITT RANCHES INC	HART RANCH
33-32648	32648	BABBITT RANCHES INC	HART RANCH
33-34643	34643	BABBITT RANCHES INC	HART RANCH
33-34644	34644	BABBITT RANCHES INC	HART RANCH
33-46740	46740	NA PROPERTIES, INC.	HART RANCH
33-78405		CLEAR CREEK CATTLE	CLEAR CREEK RA
33-87269	87269	PRINGLE, R.E.	HART RANCH
33-90028		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	AJA RANCH
33-90030		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	AJA RANCH
33-90032		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	AJA RANCH
33-90034		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	AJA RANCH

APPENDIX 2:
PREVIOUS STATE FILINGS ON HOPI LANDS

FILING	CERTIFICATE	APPLICANT	LOCATION
33-90036		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	AJA RANCH
33-90107		COCONINO NATL FOREST	CLEAR CREEK RA
33-90391		MC CAULEY, JOHN & DIXIE	AJA RANCH
33-90520	90520	BINTLIFF, DAVID C	CLEAR CREEK RA
33-90521	90521	BINTLIFF, DAVID C	CLEAR CREEK RA
33-90522	90522	BINTLIFF, DAVID C	CLEAR CREEK RA
33-90523	90523	BINTLIFF, DAVID C	CLEAR CREEK RA
33-90524	90524	BINTLIFF, DAVID C	CLEAR CREEK RA
33-90525	90525	BINTLIFF, DAVID C	CLEAR CREEK RA
33-90526	90526	BINTLIFF, DAVID C	CLEAR CREEK RA
33-90527	90527	BINTLIFF, DAVID C	CLEAR CREEK RA
33-90528	90528	BINTLIFF, DAVID C	CLEAR CREEK RA
33-90529	90529	BINTLIFF, DAVID C	CLEAR CREEK RA
33-90531	90531	BINTLIFF, DAVID C	CLEAR CREEK RA
33-90532	90532	BINTLIFF, DAVID C	CLEAR CREEK RA
33-90533	90533	BINTLIFF, DAVID C	CLEAR CREEK RA
33-90534	90534	BINTLIFF, DAVID C	CLEAR CREEK RA
33-90535	90535	BINTLIFF, DAVID C	CLEAR CREEK RA
33-90536	90536	BINTLIFF, DAVID C	CLEAR CREEK RA
33-90537	90537	BINTLIFF, DAVID C	CLEAR CREEK RA
33-90538	90538	BINTLIFF, DAVID C	CLEAR CREEK RA
33-90539	90539	BINTLIFF, DAVID C	CLEAR CREEK RA
33-90540	90540	BINTLIFF, DAVID C	CLEAR CREEK RA
33-90541	90541	BINTLIFF, DAVID C	CLEAR CREEK RA
33-90542	90542	BINTLIFF, DAVID C	CLEAR CREEK RA
33-90543	90543	BINTLIFF, DAVID C	CLEAR CREEK RA
33-90544	90544	BINTLIFF, DAVID C	CLEAR CREEK RA
33-90545	90545	BINTLIFF, DAVID C	CLEAR CREEK RA
33-90546	90546	BINTLIFF, DAVID C	CLEAR CREEK RA
33-90547	90547	BINTLIFF, DAVID C	CLEAR CREEK RA
33-90548	90548	BINTLIFF, DAVID C	CLEAR CREEK RA
33-90549	90549	BINTLIFF, DAVID C	CLEAR CREEK RA
33-90550	90550	BINTLIFF, DAVID C	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-101550		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-101678		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-101679		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA

APPENDIX 2:
PREVIOUS STATE FILINGS ON HOPI LANDS

FILING	CERTIFICATE	APPLICANT	LOCATION
36-101680		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-101682		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	HART RANCH
36-101683		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	HART RANCH
36-101737		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-101738		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-101739		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-101740		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-102004		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	AJA RANCH
36-104874		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-104875		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-105044		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-105046		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-1166		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	AJA RANCH
36-117		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	26 BAR RANCH
36-11732		O'HACO, M.J.	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-1211		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-1212		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-1213		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-1215		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-1221		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	AJA RANCH
36-1222		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	AJA RANCH
36-1268		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-1269		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-1270		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-1271		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-1272		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-1273		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-1275		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-1276		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-1277		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-1278		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-1279		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-1280		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-1281		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-1282		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	AJA RANCH
36-1283		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	AJA RANCH

APPENDIX 2:
PREVIOUS STATE FILINGS ON HOPI LANDS

FILING	CERTIFICATE	APPLICANT	LOCATION
36-1284		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	AJA RANCH
36-1285		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	AJA RANCH
36-130		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	26 BAR RANCH
36-131		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-132		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	26 BAR RANCH
36-1328		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-1330		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-1331		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-1332		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-1333		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-1334		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-1335		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-1336		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-1337		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-1338		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-1339		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-1344		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-1345		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-1347		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-1348		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-1353		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	AJA RANCH
36-1354		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	AJA RANCH
36-1355		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	AJA RANCH
36-1356		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	AJA RANCH
36-1383		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	HART RANCH
36-1385		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	HART RANCH
36-1393		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-1394		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-1396		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-1437		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	HART RANCH
36-1438		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	HART RANCH
36-1440		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	HART RANCH
36-15350		BUTLER, VINSON T	26 BAR RANCH
36-214		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	26 BAR RANCH
36-21624		CLEAR CREEK CATTLE	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-21625		CLEAR CREEK CATTLE	CLEAR CREEK RA

APPENDIX 2:
PREVIOUS STATE FILINGS ON HOPI LANDS

FILING	CERTIFICATE	APPLICANT	LOCATION
36-21626		CLEAR CREEK CATTLE	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-21627		CLEAR CREEK CATTLE	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-21628		CLEAR CREEK CATTLE	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-21629		CLEAR CREEK CATTLE	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-21630		CLEAR CREEK CATTLE	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-21631		CLEAR CREEK CATTLE	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-23287		O'HACO, M.J.	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-25019		TUCKNESS, D.	26 BAR RANCH
36-25021		TUCKNESS, DOROTHALENE	26 BAR RANCH
36-25022		TUCKNESS, DOROTHALENE	26 BAR RANCH
36-25025		TUCKNESS, DOROTHALENA	26 BAR RANCH
36-26305		AJA CATTLE CO	AJA RANCH
36-26306		AJA CATTLE CO	AJA RANCH
36-26307		AJA CATTLE CO	AJA RANCH
36-26308		AJA CATTLE CO	AJA RANCH
36-26310		AJA CATTLE CO	AJA RANCH
36-26311		AJA CATTLE CO	AJA RANCH
36-26312		AJA CATTLE CO	AJA RANCH
36-26313		AJA CATTLE CO	AJA RANCH
36-26315		AJA CATTLE CO	AJA RANCH
36-27011		INTERNATIONAL SPRINGS	AJA RANCH
36-272		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	26 BAR RANCH
36-32774		WINSLOW, CITY OF	AJA RANCH
36-358		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	AJA RANCH
36-359		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-360		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-361		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
36-362		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	AJA RANCH
36-38383		HEARTZ JR, GEORGE ROBERT	AJA RANCH
36-393		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	HART RANCH
36-394		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	HART RANCH
36-395		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	HART RANCH
36-396		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	HART RANCH
36-401		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	HART RANCH
36-402		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	HART RANCH
36-403		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	HART RANCH

APPENDIX 2:
PREVIOUS STATE FILINGS ON HOPI LANDS

FILING	CERTIFICATE	APPLICANT	LOCATION
36-404		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	HART RANCH
36-46698		WILTBANK, J.M., JR	26 BAR RANCH
36-5693		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	26 BAR RANCH
36-59843		NA PROPERTIES NC	HART RANCH
36-59844		BABBITT RANCHES	HART RANCH
36-59845		BABBITT RANCHES	HART RANCH
36-59846		BABBITT RANCHES	HART RANCH
36-59847		BABBITT RANCHES	HART RANCH
36-59848		BABBIT RANCHES	HART RANCH
36-741		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	26 BAR RANCH
36-751		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	26 BAR RANCH
36-831		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	26 BAR RANCH
36-833		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	26 BAR RANCH
36-834		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	26 BAR RANCH
36-835		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	26 BAR RANCH
36-836		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	26 BAR RANCH
36-837		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	26 BAR RANCH
36-838		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	26 BAR RANCH
36-839		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	26 BAR RANCH
36-840		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	26 BAR RANCH
36-841		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	26 BAR RANCH
36-861		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	26 BAR RANCH
36-862		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	26 BAR RANCH
38-21636		CLEAR CREEK CATTLE	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-21637		CLEAR CREEK CATTLE CO	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-21638		CLEAR CREEK CATTLE CO	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-21639		CLEAR CREEK CATTLE CO	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-21640		CLEAR CREEK CATTLE CO	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-21641		CLEAR CREEK CATTLE	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-21642		CLEAR CREEK CATTLE	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-21643		CLEAR CREEK CATTLE	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-21644		CLEAR CREEK CATTLE CO	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-21645		CLEAR CREEK CATTLE	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-21646		CLEAR CREEK CATTLE	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-21647		CLEAR CREEK CATTLE	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-21648		CLEAR CREEK CATTLE	CLEAR CREEK RA

APPENDIX 2:
PREVIOUS STATE FILINGS ON HOPI LANDS

FILING	CERTIFICATE	APPLICANT	LOCATION
38-21649		CLEAR CREEK CATTLE	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-21650		CLEAR CREEK CATTLE	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-21651		CLEAR CREEK CATTLE	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-21652		CLEAR CREEK CATTLE	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-21653		CLEAR CREEK CATTLE	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-21654		CLEAR CREEK CATTLE CO	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-21655		CLEAR CREEK CATTLE	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-21656		CLEAR CREEK CATTLE	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-21657		CLEAR CREEK CATTLE	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-21658		CLEAR CREEK CATTLE CO	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-21659		CLEAR CREEK CATTLE CO	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-21660		CLEAR CREEK CATTLE CO	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-23304		O'HACO, M.J.	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-25026		TUCKNESS, DOROTHALEN	26 BAR RANCH
38-25033		TUCKNESS, DOROTHALEN	26 BAR RANCH
38-25034		TUCKNESS, DOROTHALEN	26 BAR RANCH
38-25035		TUCKNESS, DOROTHALEN	26 BAR RANCH
38-25036		TUCKNESS, DOROTHALEN	26 BAR RANCH
38-25037		TUCKNESS, DOROTHALEN	26 BAR RANCH
38-25040		TUCKNESS, DOROTHALEN	26 BAR RANCH
38-25041		TUCKNESS, DOROTHALEN	26 BAR RANCH
38-25042		TUCKNESS, DOROTHALEN	26 BAR RANCH
38-26318		FRED AJA CATTLE CO	AJA RANCH
38-26319		FRED AJA CATTLE CO	AJA RANCH
38-26320		FRED AJA CATTLE CO	AJA RANCH
38-26321		FRED AJA CATTLE CO	AJA RANCH
38-26322		FRED AJA CATTLE CO	AJA RANCH
38-26323		FRED AJA CATTLE CO	AJA RANCH
38-26324		FRED AJA CATTLE CO	AJA RANCH
38-26325		FRED AJA CATTLE CO	AJA RANCH
38-26326		FRED AJA CATTLE CO	AJA RANCH
38-26327		FRED AJA CATTLE CO	AJA RANCH
38-26328		FRED AJA CATTLE CO	AJA RANCH
38-26329		FRED AJA CATTLE CO	AJA RANCH
38-26330		FRED AJA CATTLE CO	AJA RANCH
38-26331		FRED AJA CATTLE CO	AJA RANCH

APPENDIX 2:
PREVIOUS STATE FILINGS ON HOPI LANDS

FILING	CERTIFICATE	APPLICANT	LOCATION
38-26332		FRED AJA CATTLE CO	AJA RANCH
38-26333		FRED AJA CATTLE CO	AJA RANCH
38-26334		FRED AJA CATTLE CO	AJA RANCH
38-26335		FRED AJA CATTLE CO	AJA RANCH
38-26336		FRED AJA CATTLE CO	AJA RANCH
38-26337		FRED AJA CATTLE CO	AJA RANCH
38-26338		FRED AJA CATTLE CO	AJA RANCH
38-26339		FRED AJA CATTLE CO	AJA RANCH
38-26340		FRED AJA CATTLE CO	AJA RANCH
38-26341		FRED AJA CATTLE CO	AJA RANCH
38-26342		FRED AJA CATTLE CO	AJA RANCH
38-26343		FRED AJA CATTLE CO	AJA RANCH
38-26344		FRED AJA CATTLE CO	AJA RANCH
38-26345		FRED AJA CATTLE CO	AJA RANCH
38-27013		RED HILL RANCH CORP	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-61416		NEW MEX & AZ LAND CO	AJA RANCH
38-64243		AZL RESOURCES INC	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-64244		AZL RESOURCES INC	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-64245		AZL RESOURCES INC	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-64246		BINTLIFF, DAVID C.	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-64247		AZL RESOURCES INC	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-64248		AZL RESOURCES INC	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-64249		AZL RESOURCES INC	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-64250		AZL RESOURCES INC	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-64251		AZL RESOURCES INC	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-64252		AZL RESOURCES INC	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-64253		AZL RESOURCES INC	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-64254		AZL RESOURCES INC	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-64255		AZL RESOURCES INC	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-64256		AZL RESOURCES INC	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-64257		AZL RESOURCES INC	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-64258		AZL RESOURCES INC	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-64259		AZL RESOURCES INC	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-64260		AZL RESOURCES INC	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-64261		AZL RESOURCES INC	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-64262		AZL RESOURCES INC	CLEAR CREEK RA

APPENDIX 2:
PREVIOUS STATE FILINGS ON HOPI LANDS

FILING	CERTIFICATE	APPLICANT	LOCATION
38-64263		AZL RESOURCES INC	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-64264		AZL RESOURCES INC	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-64265		BINTLIFF, DAVID C.	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-64267		AZL RESOURCES INC	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-64268		AZL RESOURCES INC	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-64269		AZL RESOURCES INC	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-64270		AZL RESOURCES INC	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-64271		AZL RESOURCES INC.	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-64272		AZL RESOURCES INC	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-64273		AZL RESOURCES INC	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-64274		AZL RESOURCES INC	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-64275		AZL RESOURCES INC	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-64276		BINTLIFF, DAVID C.	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-64277		AZL RESOURCES INC	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-64278		AZL RESOURCES INC	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-64279		AZL RESOURCES INC	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-64280		AZL RESOURCES INC	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-64281		AZL RESOURCES INC	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-65808		BABBITT RANCHES INC	HART RANCH
38-65809		BABBITT RANCHES INC	HART RANCH
38-65810		BABBITT RANCHES INC	HART RANCH
38-65811		BABBITT RANCHES INC	HART RANCH
38-65812		BABBITT RANCHES INC	HART RANCH
38-65813		BABBITT RANCHES INC	HART RANCH
38-65814		BABBITT RANCHES INC	HART RANCH
38-65815		BABBITT RANCHES INC	HART RANCH
38-65816		BABBITT RANCHES INC	HART RANCH
38-65817		BABBITT RANCHES INC	HART RANCH
38-65818		BABBITT RANCHES INC	HART RANCH
38-87868		WINSLOW RANCH	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-87869		WINSLOW RANCH	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-87870		WINSLOW RANCH PRNSHP	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-90457		BINTLIFF, DAVID C	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-90458		BINTLIFF, DAVID C	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-90459		BINTLIFF, DAVID C.	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-90460		BINTLIFF, DAVID C.	CLEAR CREEK RA

APPENDIX 2:
PREVIOUS STATE FILINGS ON HOPI LANDS

FILING	CERTIFICATE	APPLICANT	LOCATION
38-90461		BINTLIFF, DAVID C	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-90462		BINTLIFF, DAVID C	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-90463		BINTLIFF, DAVID C	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-90464		BINTLIFF, DAVID C	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-90465		BINTLIFF, DAVID C	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-90466		BINTLIFF, DAVID C	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-90467		BINTLIFF, DAVID C	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-90468		BINTLIFF, DAVID C	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-90469		BINTLIFF, DAVID C	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-90661		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-90684		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-90685		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-90686		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-90695		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-90696		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-90697		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-90698		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-90699		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-90700		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-90701		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-90702		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-90703		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-90704		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-90705		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-90729		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	AJA RANCH
38-90730		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	AJA RANCH
38-90731		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	AJA RANCH
38-90732		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	AJA RANCH
38-90734		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	AJA RANCH
38-90735		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	AJA RANCH
38-90736		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	AJA RANCH
38-90737		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-90738		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-90744		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-90745		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-90746		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA

APPENDIX 2:
PREVIOUS STATE FILINGS ON HOPI LANDS

FILING	CERTIFICATE	APPLICANT	LOCATION
38-90747		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-90748		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-90781		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	HART RANCH
38-90782		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	HART RANCH
38-90783		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	HART RANCH
38-90784		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	HART RANCH
38-90785		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	HART RANCH
38-90786		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	HART RANCH
38-90787		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	HART RANCH
38-90819		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	HART RANCH
38-91187		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	AJA RANCH
38-91242		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-91247		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	AJA RANCH
38-91282		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-91283		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-91284		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	AJA RANCH
38-91304		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-91305		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-91306		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-91307		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-91310		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-91311		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-91326		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	HART RANCH
38-91329		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-91330		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-91348		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	HART RANCH
38-91350		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	HART RANCH
38-95349		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-95417		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-95499		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
38-95500		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	CLEAR CREEK RA
3R-168	161	CLEAR CREEK CATTLE CO.	CLEAR CREEK RA
3R-201	404	DREHER, B.F.	HART RANCH
3R-2293	3586	AZ GAME & FISH DEPT	AJA RANCH
3R-363	346	FRANCIS CAMPBELL & CO.	CLEAR CREEK RA
3R-365	348	CLEAR CREEK CATTLE	CLEAR CREEK RA

APPENDIX 2:
PREVIOUS STATE FILINGS ON HOPI LANDS

FILING	CERTIFICATE	APPLICANT	LOCATION
4A-3361		WINSLOW, CITY OF	AJA RANCH
4A-3451		XXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXXX	AJA RANCH
4A-584	404	DREHER, B.F.	HART RANCH
BB-64	64	PHELPS, T.	26 BAR RANCH
BB-65	65	WILTBANK, J.H.	26 BAR RANCH
BB-73	73	COLTER, F.T.	26 BAR RANCH
BB-94	94	COLTER, F.T.	26 BAR RANCH

APPENDIX 3:
PREVIOUS STATE FILINGS ON ZUNI LANDS

FILING	CERTIFICATE	APPLICANT	LOCATION
33-89459		BLM - PHOENIX DIST	NORTH RANCH
36-104910		BLM - SAFFORD DIST	NORTH RANCH
36-1064		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	MEADOWS RANCH
36-1113		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	ZUNI HEAVEN LANDS
36-1114		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	ZUNI HEAVEN LANDS
36-1115		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	ZUNI HEAVEN LANDS
36-1116		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	ZUNI HEAVEN LANDS
36-1117		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	ZUNI HEAVEN LANDS
36-1118		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	ZUNI HEAVEN LANDS
36-1119		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	ZUNI HEAVEN LANDS
36-1120		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	ZUNI HEAVEN LANDS
36-1121		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	MEADOWS RANCH
36-1122		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	MEADOWS RANCH
36-1123		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	MEADOWS RANCH
36-1124		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	MEADOWS RANCH
36-1125		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	MEADOWS RANCH
36-1126		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	NORTH RANCH
36-1127		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	NORTH RANCH
36-1132		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	MEADOWS RANCH
36-1133		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	MEADOWS RANCH
36-1141		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	MEADOWS RANCH
36-1143		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	NORTH RANCH
36-1144		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	MEADOWS RANCH
36-1145		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	MEADOWS RANCH
36-1146		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	MEADOWS RANCH
36-1152		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	MEADOWS RANCH
36-1153		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	MEADOWS RANCH
36-1188		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH
36-1189		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	NORTH RANCH
36-1190		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	NORTH RANCH
36-1191		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	NORTH RANCH
36-1193		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	NORTH RANCH
36-1194		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	NORTH RANCH
36-1245		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH
36-1248		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH
36-1249		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH

APPENDIX 3:
PREVIOUS STATE FILINGS ON ZUNI LANDS

FILING	CERTIFICATE	APPLICANT	LOCATION
36-20162		BLM	SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH
36-27958		SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH	ZUNI HEAVEN LANDS
36-27960		SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH	ZUNI HEAVEN LANDS
36-28624		HEAP, H.B.	MEADOWS RANCH
36-28625		HEAP, H.B.	MEADOWS RANCH
36-28626		HEAP, H.B.	MEADOWS RANCH
36-28627		HEAP, H.B.	MEADOWS RANCH
36-28629		HEAP, H.B.	MEADOWS RANCH
36-29377		ISAACSON, C.L.	ZUNI HEAVEN LANDS
36-38355		ELLSWORTH, S.D.	ZUNI HEAVEN LANDS
36-38356		ELLSWORTH, S.D.	ZUNI HEAVEN LANDS
36-38357		ELLSWORTH, S.D.	ZUNI HEAVEN LANDS
36-38358		ELLSWORTH, S.D.	ZUNI HEAVEN LANDS
36-38360		ELLSWORTH, S.D.	ZUNI HEAVEN LANDS
36-38361		ELLSWORTH, S.D.	ZUNI HEAVEN LANDS
38-17288		BLM	NORTH RANCH
38-17931		BLM	ZUNI HEAVEN LANDS
38-17932		BLM	SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH
38-17933		BLM-PHOENIX DISTRICT	SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH
38-17934		BLM-PHOENIX DISTRICT	SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH
38-17935		BLM-PHOENIX DISTRICT	SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH
38-17956		BLM	ZUNI HEAVEN LANDS
38-19326		BLM	SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH
38-19332		BLM-PHOENIX DISTRICT	NORTH RANCH
38-19333		BLM	ZUNI HEAVEN LANDS
38-19334		BLM	ZUNI HEAVEN LANDS
38-27936		SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH	SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH
38-27937		SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH	SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH
38-27938		SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH	SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH
38-27939		SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH	SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH
38-27942		SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH	SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH
38-27944		SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH	SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH
38-27945		SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH	SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH
38-27946		SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH	SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH
38-27947		SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH	SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH
38-27948		SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH	SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH

APPENDIX 3:
PREVIOUS STATE FILINGS ON ZUNI LANDS

FILING	CERTIFICATE	APPLICANT	LOCATION
38-27949		SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH	ZUNI HEAVEN LANDS
38-27950		SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH	SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH
38-27951		SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH	ZUNI HEAVEN LANDS
38-27952		SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH	SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH
38-27953		SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH	SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH
38-27954		SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH	SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH
38-60130		ELLSWORTH, S.D.	ZUNI HEAVEN LANDS
38-60132		ELLSWORTH, S.D.	ZUNI HEAVEN LANDS
38-60133		ELLSWORTH, S.D.	ZUNI HEAVEN LANDS
38-60134		ELLSWORTH, S.D.	ZUNI HEAVEN LANDS
38-80793		LDS CHURCH	NORTH RANCH
38-88023		BLM-PHOENIX DISTRICT	NORTH RANCH
38-88024		BLM-PHOENIX DISTRICT	NORTH RANCH
38-88025		BLM-PHOENIX DISTRICT	NORTH RANCH
38-88026		BLM-PHOENIX DISTRICT	NORTH RANCH
38-88028		BLM-PHOENIX DISTRICT	NORTH RANCH
38-88029		BLM-PHOENIX DISTRICT	NORTH RANCH
38-88030		BLM-PHOENIX DISTRICT	NORTH RANCH
38-88031		BLM-PHOENIX DISTRICT	NORTH RANCH
38-88035		BLM-PHOENIX DISTRICT	NORTH RANCH
38-88047		BLM-PHOENIX DISTRICT	NORTH RANCH
38-88048		BLM-PHOENIX DISTRICT	NORTH RANCH
38-88049		BLM-PHOENIX DISTRICT	NORTH RANCH
38-88050		BLM-PHOENIX DISTRICT	NORTH RANCH
38-88052		BLM-PHOENIX DISTRICT	NORTH RANCH
38-89042		BLM-PHOENIX DISTRICT	NORTH RANCH
38-89864		MEADOWS RANCH LTD	MEADOWS RANCH
38-89865		MEADOWS RANCH LTD	MEADOWS RANCH
38-89866		MEADOWS RANCH LTD	MEADOWS RANCH
38-89867		MEADOWS RANCH LTD	MEADOWS RANCH
38-89868		MEADOWS RANCH LTD	MEADOWS RANCH
38-89869		MEADOWS RANCH LTD	MEADOWS RANCH
38-89870		MEADOWS RANCH LTD	MEADOWS RANCH
38-89871		MEADOWS RANCH LTD	MEADOWS RANCH
38-89873		MEADOWS RANCH LTD	MEADOWS RANCH
38-89874		MEADOWS RANCH LTD	MEADOWS RANCH

APPENDIX 3:
PREVIOUS STATE FILINGS ON ZUNI LANDS

FILING	CERTIFICATE	APPLICANT	LOCATION
38-89875		MEADOWS RANCH LTD	MEADOWS RANCH
38-89892		MEADOWS RANCH LTD	MEADOWS RANCH
38-91167		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	ZUNI HEAVEN LANDS
38-91168		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	ZUNI HEAVEN LANDS
38-91169		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	ZUNI HEAVEN LANDS
38-91170		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	ZUNI HEAVEN LANDS
38-91171		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	ZUNI HEAVEN LANDS
38-91172		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	ZUNI HEAVEN LANDS
38-91173		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	ZUNI HEAVEN LANDS
38-91174		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	MEADOWS RANCH
38-91175		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	MEADOWS RANCH
38-91176		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	MEADOWS RANCH
38-91224		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH
38-91225		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH
38-91226		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH
38-91227		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	NORTH RANCH
38-91228		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	NORTH RANCH
38-91230		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	NORTH RANCH
38-91231		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	NORTH RANCH
38-91267		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH
38-91270		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH
38-91271		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH
38-95418		AZ STATE LAND DEPT	MEADOWS RANCH
3R-1994		ELLSWORTH, S.D.	ZUNI HEAVEN LANDS
3R-2061		PLATT, H.	SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH
3R-2356		PLATT, H.	SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH
3R-271	559	ROGERS, J.W.	SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH
3R-526	708	BIRD, B.K.	NORTH RANCH
3R-586		TUCKER RANCH CORP	NORTH RANCH
3R-590		TUCKER RANCH CORP	NORTH RANCH
4A-2252	1174	JOLLEY, B.	MEADOWS RANCH
4A-725	559	ROGERS, J.W.	SEVEN SPRINGS RANCH
BB-74	74	JARVIS, J.E. *	MEADOWS RANCH
BB-75	75	JOLLEY, J.B. *	MEADOWS RANCH

SALT RIVER PROJECT
POST OFFICE BOX 52025
PHOENIX, ARIZONA
85072-2025
(602) 236-5900

RECEIVED
JUL 03 2000

June 30, 2000

Mr. Don Gross
Adjudications Division
Arizona Department of Water Resources
500 North Third Street
Phoenix, AZ 85004-2124

Re: Salt River Project's Comments on the Hydrographic Survey Report for Indian Lands in the Little Colorado River System

Dear Don:

I have enclosed a copy of the Salt River Project's comments on the Preliminary Hydrographic Survey Report (HSR) for Indian Lands in the Little Colorado River System. The Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District, referred to as the Salt River Project or SRP, has substantial interest in this preliminary HSR and subsequent proceedings.

The intent of SRP's comments is to suggest changes that are needed before final publication. These changes will enhance understanding of the HSR, minimize objections, and reduce the need to introduce evidence at subsequent hearings, thereby expediting the resolution of claims in this and subsequent watersheds.

Sincerely,

David C. Roberts
Manager
Water Rights and Contracts

bcc: Brenda Burman/John Weldon
Fritz Beeson
Craig Sommers

M. Byron Lewis, 002047
John B. Weldon, Jr., 003701
Brenda W. Burman, 017164
Salmon, Lewis & Weldon, P.L.C.
Attorneys at Law
4444 North 32nd Street, Suite 200
Phoenix, Arizona 85018
(602) 801-9060

Attorneys for Salt River Project

IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA

IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF APACHE

IN RE THE GENERAL ADJUDICATION OF ALL RIGHTS TO USE WATER IN THE LITTLE COLORADO RIVER SYSTEM AND SOURCE	Civil No. 6417 SRP's Notice Of Filing Comments with DWR for the Hydrographic Survey Report for Indian Lands

DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY:	SRP's Notice Of Filing Comments with DWR for the Hydrographic Survey Report for Indian Lands
CLAIMANT NUMBERS:	39-82193 through 39-82206 and 39-87393
NUMBER OF PAGES:	2
DATE OF FILING:	Original mailed via overnight delivery On June 30, 2000

SRP's NOTICE OF FILING COMMENTS WITH DWR FOR THE HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY REPORT FOR INDIAN LANDS

The Salt River Project Agricultural Improvement and Power District gives notice that it has filed comments to the Hydrographic Survey Report for Indian Lands in the Little Colorado River

System. These comments were filed with the Arizona Department of Water Resources on June 30, 2000.

RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 30th day of June, 2000.

SALMON, LEWIS & WELDON, P.L.C.

By _____
M. Byron Lewis
John B. Weldon, Jr.
Brenda W. Burman
4444 North 32nd Street, Suite 200
Phoenix, Arizona 85018

Original and one copy of the foregoing
Mailed via overnight mail on June 30, 2000
To the Clerk of the Apache County Superior
Court for filing.

Copies of the foregoing sent via first class mail
on June 30, 2000 to the Honorable Edward
L. Dawson, Gila County Superior Court,
the Honorable Michael C. Nelson,
Apache County Superior Court and
all parties on the Little Colorado River
Adjudication Court-approved mailing list dated
November 16, 1999

_____

Salmon, Lewis & Weldon, P.L.C.
4444 North 32nd Street, Suite 200
Phoenix, Arizona 85018
(602) 801-9060