

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
DISTRICT OF NEW MEXICO

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,  
and  
STATE OF NEW MEXICO, ex rel.  
STATE ENGINEER,  
Plaintiffs,

and

NO. CV 01-72 BB/WDS

ZUNI INDIAN TRIBE and  
NAVAJO NATION,  
Plaintiffs-in-Intervention,

vs.

ZUNI RIVER BASIN  
ADJUDICATION

STATE OF NEW MEXICO COMMISSIONER  
OF PUBLIC LANDS  
and  
A & R PRODUCTIONS, et. al.,  
Defendants.

Subfile No.: ZRB-3-0047

SUBFILE ANSWER

**NOW ENTERING COURT** is William G. Stripp, Attorney at Law, on behalf of the Paul Davis Survivor's Trust dated July 28, 2003, who answers the complaint as follows:

1. Defendant objects to the description of water rights contained in the proposed Consent Order offered by the United States and the State of New Mexico concerning Subfile Number **ZRB-3-0047**.

2. The objection to the description of the water rights described by the proposed Consent Order for Subfile Number **ZRB-3-0047** is made because the offers of 0.7 acre feet per annum for well number 7C-1-W02, and 0.70 acre feet per annum for well

number 7C-1-W03, do not accurately reflect either historical beneficial use or future needs. The two wells service one full section (640 acres). Well 7C-1-W02, which has a priority date of 8/22/1988, has historically been used for both livestock watering and agricultural purposes. The offer of 0.7 acre feet is insufficient. Defendants would accept 5.0 acre feet. Well 7C-1-W03, which has a priority date of 9/23/2003, has historically been used for livestock watering and agricultural purposes. The offer of 0.7 acre feet is insufficient. Defendants would accept 3.0 acre feet.

3. Defendants made a good faith effort to resolve their disagreement with the Consent Order proposed by the United States and the State by meeting with representatives of the Plaintiffs. While Defendants believe that the current offer presented in the Consent Order is unacceptable, Defendants are willing to continue negotiations in an attempt to resolve the parties' differences.

4. Defendants understand that by making this claim and filing this document they are not waiving their right to later raise in an Amended Answer, any jurisdictional or affirmative defenses they may have.

5. Defense counsel is using a slightly modified version of the Subfile Answer form presented with the Notice That the Consultation Period Has Ended rather than a customized pleading, because it appears that is what the Court wants.

Date: October 8, 2010

Respectfully submitted,  
---signed electronically-----  
**WILLIAM G. STRIPP**  
**ATTORNEY AT LAW**  
**P.O. BOX 159**  
**RAMAH, NEW MEXICO 87321**  
**Telephone: (505) 783-4138**  
**Facsimile: (505) 783-4139**

**Certificate of Service**

I HEREBY CERTIFY that on October 8, 2010, I filed the foregoing electronically through the CM/ECF system, which caused counsel and parties pro se who have entered an appearance to be served by electronic means. ---signed electronically---