

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-3-0046

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, Pamela Kay Davis, Kristi Davis, Anita Davis Schafer, and Sage Grae Merrill, who answer the complaint as follows:

1. Defendants object 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-3-0046**.

2. The objection to the description of the water rights described by the proposed Consent Order for Subfile Number **ZRB-3-0046** is made because the offers of 0.157

acre feet per annum for well number 7C-1-W08, 1.70 acre feet for per annum for well number 7C-1-W10, and 0.157 acre feet per annum for well number 7C-1-W14, do not accurately reflect either historical beneficial use or future needs. Well 7C-1-W08, which has a priority date of 1/1/1975, has historically been used for both livestock watering and field irrigation. The offer of 0.157 acre feet is insufficient. Defendants would accept 5.0 acre feet. Well 7C-1-W10, which has a priority date of 8/13/1975, has historically been used for livestock watering, field irrigation, and domestic use. The offer of 1.70 is insufficient. Defendants would accept 5.0 acre feet. Well 7C-1-W14, which has a priority date of 1/3/1968, has historically been used for both livestock watering and field irrigation. The offer of 0.157 acre feet is insufficient. Defendants would accept 5.0 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---