


1 DAVID A. BROWN, SBN 006827  
DOUGLAS E. BROWN, SBN 010791  
2 BRADLEY J. PALMER SBN 024904  
**BROWN & BROWN LAW OFFICES, P.C.**  
3 Post Office Box 1890  
St. Johns, Arizona 85936  
(928) 337-4225



4 *Attorneys for LCR Claimants*

5 **IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA**

6 **IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF APACHE**

7 IN RE:

8 THE GENERAL ADJUDICATION OF ALL  
9 RIGHTS TO USE WATER IN THE LITTLE  
10 COLORADO RIVER SYSTEM AND  
11 SOURCE

Case No. 6417

LCR CLAIMANTS' COMMENTS TO  
ADWR'S PRELIMINARY  
HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY REPORT  
FOR THE HOPI INDIAN RESERVATION

(Submitted to Arizona Department of Water  
Resources)

13 **CONTESTED CASE NAME/NO.** *In re Hopi Tribe Priority*

14 **DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY** The LCR Claimants submit their Comments to the  
15 Arizona Department of Water Resource's Preliminary  
16 Hydrographic Survey Report for the Hopi Indian  
17 Reservation

18 **STATEMENT OF CLAIMANT NOS.** Attached as Exhibit A

19 **NUMBER OF PAGES** 6 including Exhibit A

20 **DATE OF FILING:** June 30, 2009

21 **Introduction**

22 ADWR completed its Preliminary Hydrographic Survey Report ("HSR") in this  
23 contested matter in December 2008. The Court granted an extension of time in which the  
24  
25  
26

1 parties can file comments to the Preliminary HSR. The LCR Claimants hereby submit  
2 their comments to the Preliminary HSR.

3 The Preliminary HSR includes an analysis of some of the Hopi's claims.  
4 However, many Hopi claims are not included in the analysis. The HSR also excludes  
5 analyses of certain attributes of the Hopi claims "until the legal issues before the Court  
6 and the Special Mater are resolved". [Section 9.3.3] Accordingly, these comments are  
7 cursory in nature and lacking in detail. Nevertheless, the following should be considered  
8 in a completed HSR. This list is not exhaustive.

9 **I. ADWR Should Apply the Court's March 2, 2009 Decision to the HSR.**

10 In an order dated March 2, 2009, the Court granted the Navajo Nation's motion for  
11 partial summary judgment and ruled, "that the Hopi Tribe is precluded from asserting  
12 water right claims in this adjudication to the extent such claims seek the right to water  
13 sources located within the Little Colorado River Basin that neither abut nor traverse Hopi  
14 lands." [March 2, 2009 Minute Entry at 2] This ruling limits the sources from which the  
15 Hopi can satisfy its water claims under the federal reserved water rights doctrine and it  
16 affects the viability of the remainder of their claims.

17 To take the Court's latest ruling into account, the HSR should be changed in at  
18 least the following respects: (1) The "History of Proceedings" Section [§1.2] should  
19 include the March 2009 ruling; (2) ADWR's Recommended Water Right Attributes  
20 [§9.3.2] should be amended in the paragraph about Water Source to reflect that the Court  
21 has ruled that the Hopi have no right to fulfill their water claims from the Little Colorado  
22 River; (3) The "Legal Issues Pending Before the Court and Special Master section  
23 [§9.3.3] should be changed to reflect the Court's March 2009 ruling, and (4) Many other  
24 references throughout the HSR need to be modified to reflect the ruling.

1 **II. ADWR's HSR Should Analyze all of the Hopi Claims.**

2 The Preliminary HSR does not address the following Hopi Claims:

- 3 1. The Hopi Industrial Park claims [§ 1.3]  
4 2. Hopi's state law claims on five ranches [§ 2.3.12]  
5 3. Hopi's claims related to off-reservation tourism [§ 2.9.6]  
6 4. An analysis of Hopi claims under the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo [§9.3.2]

7 The stated reason for these omissions is the Court's November 4, 2004 minute entry in  
8 which the Court told ADWR to limit its Preliminary HSR to the "main reservation  
9 lands." In any event, all of the Hopi claims should be added to the HSR before it is  
10 completed.

11 In order to satisfy the "comprehensive requirement" of the McCarran Amendment,  
12 an adjudication must include the "whole community of claims." *United States v. District  
13 Court of Eagle County*, 401 U.S. 520, 525 (1971). Not only does the federal  
14 comprehensiveness requirement necessitate an analysis of all claims, a concern for  
15 efficient use of resources also weighs in favor of including all Hopi claims in the HSR.  
16 All of the above claims will have to be decided in this adjudication and requiring ADWR  
17 to prepare an additional HSR later that addresses these claims would cause a wasteful  
18 duplication of effort. In addition, when these claims are raised in this adjudication, if the  
19 Court and the parties need hydrographic data, the adjudication will be further stalled  
20 while ADWR prepares this data. It would be more efficient to ask ADWR to analyze all  
21 of the Hopi claims now, before any evidentiary determinations are made.

22 **III. The HSR Needs Additional Information**

23 In several places, the HSR lacks information. This information should be  
24 completed before the HSR becomes final. Some of the additional information that is  
25 needed includes:  
26

- 1 1. Additional information promised by the Hopi and the United States  
2 regarding the claimed quantities and impoundment facilities for stock  
watering. [§ 2.3.9]
- 3 2. Information from the Hopi and the United States to clarify how much water  
4 from impoundments is needed for stock watering and how much is needed  
5 for other uses of the impoundments. [§ 2.8.4 (“Neither the Hopi nor the  
6 United States claim a separate quantity of water for livestock, but instead  
7 include livestock among the purposes for which impoundments, springs and  
8 wells are used.”)]
- 9 3. Additional information promised by the Hopi regarding future  
stockwatering claims. [§ 2.9.4]
- 10 4. The amount of acreage of usable rangeland in the Moenkopi Area [§ 6.1.2]
- 11 5. The carrying capacity of rangeland in the Moenkopi Area [§ 6.1.2]
6. Revised storage estimates for impoundments with degraded or eroded  
berms or siltation. [§ 7.2.2]
7. Flow data for the springs claimed in the Hopi SOC [§ 8.4.3]
8. Any information in any Amended Claims should be considered prior to the  
issuance of a final HSR.

12 **IV. The HSR Should Reflect Current Information.**

13 The HSR includes several comments regarding the Mojave Generating Station  
14 (MGS) as being one of the bases of the Hopi claim. The new HSR should reflect the fact  
15 that MGS was recently decommissioned and will be torn down. *Arizona Republic*. June  
16 11, 2009. Furthermore, the HSR should reflect lack of viability of the claim for Heavy  
17 Industrial water use in light of the statement in §8.3.3 that “both projects were  
18 abandoned, lacking a sustainable water supply.”

20 **V. HSR Should Not Include ADWR’s Analysis of Legal Issues.**

21 In the HSR, ADWR makes several analyses of legal issues. For example, see  
22 §9.3.1. Such analysis is not within the purview of the Department’s responsibilities and  
23 should be deleted.  
24  
25  
26

1 **Conclusion**

2 The LCR claimants respectfully request that the above-listed issues be considered  
3 and included in the HSR before it is finalized and presented to the Court.

4 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 30th day of June, 2009.


5 BROWN & BROWN LAW OFFICES, P.C.

6  
7  
8  
9 David A. Brown  
Douglas E. Brown  
Bradley J. Palmer  
10 Post Office Box 1890  
11 St. Johns, Arizona 85936  
12

13 ORIGINAL of the foregoing mailed/faxed this  
14 30th day of June, 2009, to:

15 Arizona Department of Water Resources  
16 Adjudications Section  
3550 N. Central  
Phoenix, AZ 85012

17 COPIES of the foregoing mailed this  
18 30<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2009, to  
19 those parties who appear on the  
20 Court-Approved Mailing List for  
Case No. 6417.

21  
22 By 

**LCR CLAIMANTS REPRESENTED BY  
BROWN & BROWN LAW OFFICES, P.C.**

1. Town of Eagar 39-84465, 39-84466, 39-84467, 39-84468, 39-84469, 39-84470, 39-84471
2. City of Holbrook 39-82029, 39-82078, 39-82079, 39-82080, 39-82081, 39-85030
3. City of Show Low 39-84279, 39-84280, 39-84281, 39-84282, 39-84283, 39-84284, 39-84285
4. Town of Springerville 39-84149
5. Town of Snowflake 39-83792, 39-84000
6. Town of Taylor 39-80823
7. City of Winslow 39-84979, 39-84980
8. Navapache Hospital District 39-80557
9. Forest Lakes Domestic Water Improvement District 39-93509, *et al.*
10. Silver Creek Irrigation District 39-88816
11. Show Low/Pinetop-Woodland Irrigation Company 39-83105, 39-83786, 39-83787, *et al.*
12. Lakeside Irrigation Company 39-84141
13. Round Valley Water Users Association (now Pioneer Irrigation Company) 39-89112
14. Lyman Water Company 39-89196
15. Bar T Bar Ranch, Inc. 39-87546, 39-87520, 39-87524, *et al.*
16. Flying M Ranch 39-88420, 39-88441, 39-88474, *et al.*
17. Aztec Land & Cattle Company, Ltd.; Aztec Land Company, LLC 39-63081, 39-63082, 39-81038, 39-81039, 39-81040, 39-81055, 39-81057, 39-81059, 39-81060, 39-81061, 39-81062, 39-81063, 39-81095, 39-81101, 39-81102, 39-81103, 39-81108, 39-81109, 39-81110, 39-81111, 39-81112, 39-81113, 39-81114, 39-81115, 39-81116, 39-81200, 39-81265, 39-91626, 39-91627, 39-91629, 39-91630, *et al.*

**BROWN & BROWN LAW OFFICES, P.C.**

A PROFESSIONAL CORPORATION  
OF ATTORNEYS

POST OFFICE BOX 1890  
128 EAST COMMERCIAL  
ST. JOHNS, ARIZONA 85936  
(928) 337-4225  
(928) 337-4547 FAX

DAVID A. BROWN  
DOUGLAS E. BROWN  
F. MORGAN BROWN  
JOHN C. HOLMAN  
BRADLEY J. PALMER

**FAX TRANSMITTAL**

**TO: ADWR Legal Services – 602-771-8683**


**FROM: David A. Brown**

**RE: LCR Claimants' Comments to ADWR's  
Preliminary HSR for the Hopi Indian  
Reservation**

**DATE: June 30, 2009**

**NO. OF PAGES: 7 (INCLUDING COVER)**

**MESSAGE:**



**IF YOU DO NOT RECEIVE ALL PAGES, PLEASE CALL 928-337-4225**

THE INFORMATION CONTAINED IN THIS FACSIMILE MESSAGE IS ATTORNEY PRIVILEGED AND CONFIDENTIAL INFORMATION INTENDED ONLY FOR THE USE OF THE INDIVIDUAL NAMED ABOVE. IF THE READER OF THIS MESSAGE IS NOT THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, OR THE EMPLOYEE OR AGENT RESPONSIBLE TO DELIVER IT TO THE INTENDED RECIPIENT, YOU ARE HEREBY NOTIFIED THAT ANY DISSEMINATION, DISTRIBUTION OR COPYING OF THIS COMMUNICATION IS STRICTLY PROHIBITED. IF YOU HAVE RECEIVED THIS COMMUNICATION IN ERROR, PLEASE IMMEDIATELY NOTIFY US BY TELEPHONE AND RETURN THE ORIGINAL MESSAGE TO US AT THE FOLLOWING ADDRESS VIA THE U.S. POSTAL SERVICE. THANK YOU.

1 DAVID A. BROWN, SBN 006827  
DOUGLAS E. BROWN, SBN 010791  
2 BRADLEY J. PALMER SBN 024904  
BROWN & BROWN LAW OFFICES, P.C.  
Post Office Box 1890  
3 St. Johns, Arizona 85936  
(928) 337-4225

4 *Attorneys for LCR Claimants*

5 **IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA**

6 **IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF APACHE**

7 **IN RE:**

Case No. 6417

8 THE GENERAL ADJUDICATION OF ALL  
9 RIGHTS TO USE WATER IN THE LITTLE  
10 COLORADO RIVER SYSTEM AND  
SOURCE

LCR CLAIMANTS' COMMENTS TO  
ADWR'S PRELIMINARY  
HYDROGRAPHIC SURVEY REPORT  
FOR THE HOPI INDIAN RESERVATION

(Submitted to Arizona Department of Water  
Resources)

11  
12  
13  
14 **CONTESTED CASE NAME/NO.**

*In re Hopi Tribe Priority*

15 **DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY**

The LCR Claimants submit their Comments to the  
Arizona Department of Water Resource's Preliminary  
Hydrographic Survey Report for the Hopi Indian  
Reservation

16  
17 **STATEMENT OF CLAIMANT NOS.**

Attached as Exhibit A

18  
19 **NUMBER OF PAGES**

6 including Exhibit A

20 **DATE OF FILING:**

June 30, 2009

21 **Introduction**

22 ADWR completed its Preliminary Hydrographic Survey Report ("HSR") in this  
23 contested matter in December 2008. The Court granted an extension of time in which the  
24  
25  
26

1 parties can file comments to the Preliminary HSR. The LCR Claimants hereby submit  
2 their comments to the Preliminary HSR.

3 The Preliminary HSR includes an analysis of some of the Hopi's claims.  
4 However, many Hopi claims are not included in the analysis. The HSR also excludes  
5 analyses of certain attributes of the Hopi claims "until the legal issues before the Court  
6 and the Special Mater are resolved". [Section 9.3.3] Accordingly, these comments are  
7 cursory in nature and lacking in detail. Nevertheless, the following should be considered  
8 in a completed HSR. This list is not exhaustive.

9 **I. ADWR Should Apply the Court's March 2, 2009 Decision to the HSR.**

10 In an order dated March 2, 2009, the Court granted the Navajo Nation's motion for  
11 partial summary judgment and ruled, "that the Hopi Tribe is precluded from asserting  
12 water right claims in this adjudication to the extent such claims seek the right to water  
13 sources located within the Little Colorado River Basin that neither abut nor traverse Hopi  
14 lands." [March 2, 2009 Minute Entry at 2] This ruling limits the sources from which the  
15 Hopi can satisfy its water claims under the federal reserved water rights doctrine and it  
16 affects the viability of the remainder of their claims.

17 To take the Court's latest ruling into account, the HSR should be changed in at  
18 least the following respects: (1) The "History of Proceedings" Section [§1.2] should  
19 include the March 2009 ruling; (2) ADWR's Recommended Water Right Attributes  
20 [§9.3.2] should be amended in the paragraph about Water Source to reflect that the Court  
21 has ruled that the Hopi have no right to fulfill their water claims from the Little Colorado  
22 River; (3) The "Legal Issues Pending Before the Court and Special Master section  
23 [§9.3.3] should be changed to reflect the Court's March 2009 ruling, and (4) Many other  
24 references throughout the HSR need to be modified to reflect the ruling.

1 **II. ADWR's HSR Should Analyze all of the Hopi Claims.**

2 The Preliminary HSR does not address the following Hopi Claims:

- 3 1. The Hopi Industrial Park claims [§ 1.3]  
4 2. Hopi's state law claims on five ranches [§ 2.3.12]  
5 3. Hopi's claims related to off-reservation tourism [§ 2.9.6]  
6 4. An analysis of Hopi claims under the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo [§9.3.2]

7 The stated reason for these omissions is the Court's November 4, 2004 minute entry in  
8 which the Court told ADWR to limit its Preliminary HSR to the "main reservation  
9 lands." In any event, all of the Hopi claims should be added to the HSR before it is  
10 completed.

11 In order to satisfy the "comprehensive requirement" of the McCarran Amendment,  
12 an adjudication must include the "whole community of claims." *United States v. District*  
13 *Court of Eagle County*, 401 U.S. 520, 525 (1971). Not only does the federal  
14 comprehensiveness requirement necessitate an analysis of all claims, a concern for  
15 efficient use of resources also weighs in favor of including all Hopi claims in the HSR.  
16 All of the above claims will have to be decided in this adjudication and requiring ADWR  
17 to prepare an additional HSR later that addresses these claims would cause a wasteful  
18 duplication of effort. In addition, when these claims are raised in this adjudication, if the  
19 Court and the parties need hydrographic data, the adjudication will be further stalled  
20 while ADWR prepares this data. It would be more efficient to ask ADWR to analyze all  
21 of the Hopi claims now, before any evidentiary determinations are made.

22 **III. The HSR Needs Additional Information**

23 In several places, the HSR lacks information. This information should be  
24 completed before the HSR becomes final. Some of the additional information that is  
25 needed includes:

- 1 1. Additional information promised by the Hopi and the United States  
2 regarding the claimed quantities and impoundment facilities for stock  
watering. [§ 2.3.9]
- 3 2. Information from the Hopi and the United States to clarify how much water  
4 from impoundments is needed for stock watering and how much is needed  
5 for other uses of the impoundments. [§ 2.8.4 (“Neither the Hopi nor the  
6 United States claim a separate quantity of water for livestock, but instead  
7 include livestock among the purposes for which impoundments, springs and  
8 wells are used.”)]
- 9 3. Additional information promised by the Hopi regarding future  
10 stockwatering claims. [§ 2.9.4]
- 11 4. The amount of acreage of usable rangeland in the Moenkopi Area [§ 6.1.2]
- 12 5. The carrying capacity of rangeland in the Moenkopi Area [§ 6.1.2]
- 13 6. Revised storage estimates for impoundments with degraded or eroded  
14 berms or siltation. [§ 7.2.2]
- 15 7. Flow data for the springs claimed in the Hopi SOC [§ 8.4.3]
- 16 8. Any information in any Amended Claims should be considered prior to the  
17 issuance of a final HSR.

#### 18 **IV. The HSR Should Reflect Current Information.**

19 The HSR includes several comments regarding the Mojave Generating Station  
20 (MGS) as being one of the bases of the Hopi claim. The new HSR should reflect the fact  
21 that MGS was recently decommissioned and will be torn down. *Arizona Republic*. June  
22 11, 2009. Furthermore, the HSR should reflect lack of viability of the claim for Heavy  
23 Industrial water use in light of the statement in §8.3.3 that “both projects were  
24 abandoned, lacking a sustainable water supply.”

#### 25 **V. HSR Should Not Include ADWR’s Analysis of Legal Issues.**

26 In the HSR, ADWR makes several analyses of legal issues. For example, see  
§9.3.1. Such analysis is not within the purview of the Department’s responsibilities and  
should be deleted.

1 **Conclusion**

2 The LCR claimants respectfully request that the above-listed issues be considered  
3 and included in the HSR before it is finalized and presented to the Court.

4 RESPECTFULLY SUBMITTED this 30th day of June, 2009.


5 BROWN & BROWN LAW OFFICES, P.C.  
6

7  
8 \_\_\_\_\_  
9 David A. Brown  
10 Douglas E. Brown  
11 Bradley J. Palmer  
12 Post Office Box 1890  
13 St. Johns, Arizona 85936

14 ORIGINAL of the foregoing mailed/faxed this  
15 30th day of June, 2009, to:

16 Arizona Department of Water Resources  
17 Adjudications Section  
18 3550 N. Central  
19 Phoenix, AZ 85012

20 COPIES of the foregoing mailed this  
21 30<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2009, to  
22 those parties who appear on the  
23 Court-Approved Mailing List for  
24 Case No. 6417.

25  
26 By 

**LCR CLAIMANTS REPRESENTED BY  
BROWN & BROWN LAW OFFICES, P.C.**

1. Town of Eagar 39-84465, 39-84466, 39-84467, 39-84468, 39-84469, 39-84470, 39-84471
2. City of Holbrook 39-82029, 39-82078, 39-82079, 39-82080, 39-82081, 39-85030
3. City of Show Low 39-84279, 39-84280, 39-84281, 39-84282, 39-84283, 39-84284, 39-84285
4. Town of Springerville 39-84149
5. Town of Snowflake 39-83792, 39-84000
6. Town of Taylor 39-80823
7. City of Winslow 39-84979, 39-84980
8. Navapache Hospital District 39-80557
9. Forest Lakes Domestic Water Improvement District 39-93509, *et al.*
10. Silver Creek Irrigation District 39-88816
11. Show Low/Pinetop-Woodland Irrigation Company 39-83105, 39-83786, 39-83787, *et al.*
12. Lakeside Irrigation Company 39-84141
13. Round Valley Water Users Association (now Pioneer Irrigation Company) 39-89112
14. Lyman Water Company 39-89196
15. Bar T Bar Ranch, Inc. 39-87546, 39-87520, 39-87524, *et al.*
16. Flying M Ranch 39-88420, 39-88441, 39-88474, *et al.*
17. Aztec Land & Cattle Company, Ltd.; Aztec Land Company, LLC 39-63081, 39-63082, 39-81038, 39-81039, 39-81040, 39-81055, 39-81057, 39-81059, 39-81060, 39-81061, 39-81062, 39-81063, 39-81095, 39-81101, 39-81102, 39-81103, 39-81108, 39-81109, 39-81110, 39-81111, 39-81112, 39-81113, 39-81114, 39-81115, 39-81116, 39-81200, 39-81265, 39-91626, 39-91627, 39-91629, 39-91630, *et al.*

Exhibit "A"