American Indian Water Rights

Overview

Pueblos and tribal reservations are located within most of the larger stream systems in New Mexico. Each has claims to rights to use the water in its stream. In New Mexico, Indian rights are significant because of their early priority dates, because of the large amounts of water rights claimed, or both. In some instances, such claims have the potential to displace a significant number of junior water rights.

Adjudications involve all water rights in a stream system and may be conducted in state or federal court. In 1952, Congress passed the McCarran Amendment, which waives federal sovereign immunity so that the federal government’s and the Pueblos’ water rights could be determined in state as well as federal court. That concept was not fully understood in the late 1960s, so many of the cases for tributaries to the Rio Grande were filed in federal court.

Pueblo and Tribal water rights belong to the Pueblo or Tribe, rather than individuals, and are adjudicated to that governmental entity. Since the water rights are addressed according to the watershed and the state in which they are located, Pueblos and Tribes may have to pursue their water rights in more than one adjudication. Pueblo and Tribal water rights are determined and described under federal law. They may assert aboriginal and federal reserved water rights claims that are not subject to rules of beneficial use, forfeiture or abandonment, and state law claims, which are subject to the same rules as non-Indian rights. Some Pueblos and Tribes also claim storage rights and contract water rights. Common law theories or doctrines pertaining to Indians continue to be judicially refined and to evolve so that discussing the nature and extent of “Indian water rights” is a complex topic.

Water Distribution

The term “prior appropriation” describes a water management system where, in times of shortage, water is allocated first, and in full, to the entity or person who has the water right with the oldest priority date and then to rights with successively junior priorities until the supply

“Native-American water rights in the region are being slowly determined through negotiation and litigation. This process must be continued and accelerated in order to provide security and certainty to Indian and non-Indian users alike.”

Albert E. Utton, Natural Resources Journal, Vol. 34, Fall 1994

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Stream System (Case Name)</th>
<th>Pueblo/Tribe/Nation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Chama (Aragon)           | Jicarilla Apache Nation  
                           | Ohkay Ow ingeh         |
| Jemez (Abousleman)       | Pueblo of Jemez      
                           | Pueblo of Santa Ana    
                           | Pueblo of Zia          |
| Nambé-Tesuque-Pojoaque (Aamotd) | Pueblo of Nambé  
                           | Pueblo of Pojoaque     
                           | Pueblo de San Ildefonso 
                           | Pueblo of Tesuque       |
| Pecos (Lewis)            | Mescalero Apache Nation |
| San Juan                 | Jicarilla Apache Nation  
                           | Navajo Nation          
                           | Ute Mountain Ute Nation |
| San Jose (Kerr McGee)    | Navajo Nation        
                           | Pueblo of Acoma        
                           | Pueblo of Laguna       |
| Santa Cruz/Truchas (Abbott) | Ohkay Ow ingeh      
                           | Santa Clara Pueblo     |
| Taos (Abeyta)            | Taos Pueblo          |
| Zuni (A&R Productions)   | Zuni Indian Tribe    
                           | Navajo Nation          |
runs out. Shortages may be brought on by variable weather, increased population, early snow melt, over-appropriation, and increased demands per capita. This water management system is commonly applied across the West, as well as in New Mexico.

Basis for Water Rights

In New Mexico, as in most of the West, all non-Indian water rights are determined and described under state law. The priority of a state law water right is based on when the water is put to beneficial use and the quantity is based on how much is put to beneficial use. To preserve a water right under state law, the beneficial use must be continuous, thus giving rise to the maxim, “use it or lose it.”

In contrast, Tribes’ and Pueblos’ water rights are determined and described under federal law. This rule was developed in 1908 by the U.S. Supreme Court in the case, *Winters v. U.S.*, involving non-Indian irrigators and Gros Ventre and Assiniboine Indians on the Fort Belknap Reservation over water in the Milk River of Montana. The U.S. Supreme Court decided that when Congress establishes a reservation, it implicitly reserves water in an amount sufficient to meet the purpose of the reservation, now and into the future, and that the right will have a priority as of the date of the reservation. Federal Tribal rights are referred to as “federal reserve rights.” Pueblos may be entitled to aboriginal rights that were recognized under Spanish and Mexican law and preserved when New Mexico came into the United States under the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo in 1848.

Priority

A Tribal reserved water right priority is as of the date when the lands were set aside by the federal government. Pueblo water rights on grant lands have a “immemorial, aboriginal, or first priority” because the lands a) have been occupied and the water used since before Europeans entered the territory, b) were recognized by prior sovereigns, c) came into the United States protected by the Treaty of Guadalupe Hidalgo, and d) were never relinquished to the federal government. Pueblos and Tribes typically have the earliest dates in a water system.

Quantification

Under state law, water right quantification for non-Indians is relatively straightforward. The method of quantification depends on the purpose to which the water right is applied and the measure is beneficial use. Non-Indian irrigation rights are measured by the number of irrigated acres, multiplied by the consumptive irrigation requirement assigned to the area, or that amount necessary to grow the crops generally grown in the area. The water must be used for that purpose and must be used through time in order to maintain the water right.

Tribal and Pueblo water rights are quantified differently. The first step in tribal water right quantification for reserved lands involves looking at the purpose for which the reservation was set aside. If the purpose is for agriculture, the “Practicably Irrigable Acreage” (PIA) standard is used. In the *Aamodt* case, the standard applied to grant lands is “historically irrigated acreage” (HIA). Tribes may acquire contract and state law rights as well.

PIA Standard: In the case of agricultural reservations, the U.S. Supreme Court case of *Arizona v. California*, announced in 1963 that tribal water quantification would be based on PIA, not actually irrigated acreage. In accord with *Winters*, the Court adjudicated enough water to irrigate all the practicably irrigable acreage on the affected reservations, in order to serve the current, as well as the future agricultural needs of the Indians. PIA claims have been litigated in New Mexico for the Mescalero Apache
In New Mexico, as across the United States, Indian water rights remain for the most part undefined. These rights are generally believed to have early priority dates for large amounts. Once defined, these rights will be satisfied in priority in times of shortage under the prior appropriation water management system.

actively using the water at the time of quantification and are not subject to the “use it or lose it” rule. They do not get permits from the State Engineer for any federal reserved right. In New Mexico, as across the United States, Indian water rights remain for the most part undefined. These rights are generally believed to have early priority dates for large amounts. Once defined, these rights will be satisfied in priority in times of shortage under the prior appropriation water management system.

Over the last century, non-Indian development burgeoned as the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation developed dams and other government irrigation projects, and states crafted interstate river compacts allocating water between them. Water was captured and rights were allocated and managed without knowledge or consideration of Indian water claims. Consequently, watersheds’ supplies were fully or over-appropriated in filling the demands of non-Indians. Now Indians’ claims are being defined and the complexion of watershed resources, management, and the demands on the resource are changing.

A final quantification of senior tribal water rights is vital, so much so that New Mexico declared the resolution of tribal claims as a critical statewide priority in the State Water Plan of 2003. The emerging nature of the law, the stakes, and the amounts of time, resources, and money required make accomplishing this task very challenging.
Government-to-Government Relations
Tribes, Pueblos, and Nations assert inherent sovereignty and treaty rights as the basis for many of their positions on water policy. Concerns about compromising sovereignty and senior water rights have kept some Tribes away from the negotiating table, but reliance on litigation is inescapably complex, costly, and time consuming. All sides are beginning to emphasize the importance of government-to-government consultations on water issues. For example, both state and Tribal entities support negotiated shortage-sharing agreements as alternatives to priority administration, provided that the Tribal or Pueblo’s senior water rights are recognized. Increasingly, non-Indian governments are employing tribal liaisons to increase communication and cooperation between governments.

Litigation
The State and the Pueblos are actively litigating the claims of the Pueblos of Acoma and Laguna in the State of New Mexico v. Kerr McGee, et.al. (Rio San Jose) adjudication; the claims of the Navajo Nation in the State of New Mexico v. A& R (Zuni River) adjudication; and the claims of the Pueblos of Jemez, Santa Ana, and Zia in the State of New Mexico v. Abousleman (Rio Jemez) adjudication.

Settlement
The 2003 State Water Plan points out the need for the State to commit the necessary funds and resources to settle Indian water rights claims. In 2005–2006, the State entered into three settlement agreements to resolve the water rights claims of one Nation and five Pueblos: the Navajo Nation in the New Mexico v. United States (San Juan River) adjudication; Taos Pueblo in the State of New Mexico v. Abeyta (Rio Honda and Rio Pueblo de Taos) adjudication; and Pojoaque, San Ildefonso, Nambe and Tesuque Pueblos in the adjudication New Mexico v. Aamodt (Rio Nambe, Rio Pojoaque and Rio Tesuque) adjudication. Between 2009 and 2010,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Settlement</th>
<th>Federal Contribution</th>
<th>State Contribution</th>
<th>Local Contribution</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aamodt</td>
<td>$174.3 million</td>
<td>$50 million (45.5M for construction of non-Pueblo part of water system; 4M for non-Pueblo connection fund; 500,000 for mitigation of impacts of Pueblo use on non-Pueblo wells)</td>
<td>County of Santa Fe</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Navajo</td>
<td>984.1 million</td>
<td>$50 million, minus previous State contributions or cost share credit toward Navajo Gallup Project (required)</td>
<td>$7.4 million for construction of County part of water system</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10 million for non-Indian ditch rehabilitation (not-required)</td>
<td>$14 million for additional County connections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taos</td>
<td>124 million</td>
<td>$6.9 million to acquire water rights for non-Pueblo parties</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$12.1 million for Mutual Benefits Projects, which offset surface water reduction from groundwater pumping</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>1,297.4 million</td>
<td>$129 million (rounded) (plus related indexing)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Congress approved these settlements and all three are now being implemented.

The Pueblos of Jemez, Santa Ana, and Zia were in settlement talks but have returned to litigation. The parties in State of New Mexico v. Abbott for the Santa Cruz/Truchas watersheds are now engaged in settlement talks for Ohkay Owingeh (San Juan Pueblo). In March of 2013, the State and the Jicarilla Apache Nation successfully concluded years of negotiation and collaborative technical work in the State of New Mexico v. Aragon (Rio Chama) adjudication with the entry of a Consent Order recognizing the Nation’s water rights on lands acquired since the entry of the 1998 Jicarilla Apache Nation decree. Finally, the court in the A&R Productions adjudication (Zuni River) granted a stay on December 10, 2013, in the litigation of the Zuni Pueblo sub-proceeding so that the parties can explore entering into settlement talks.

Concerted efforts to obtain funding for implementation of the settlements got started in 2007, both in Congress and in the New Mexico Legislature. The federal contribution will be about $1.3 billion. The state contribution will be about $130 million, to which credits may be applied. The local contributions will total about $93.2 million. The overall cost of the three settlements will be about $1.5 billion.

Federal Funding: In June 2007, Senator Pete Domenici introduced a ten-year funding plan (S. 1643) to raise an estimated $1.37 billion to pay the federal share of implementing the pending settlements. His bill was entitled “Reclamation Water Settlements Fund Act,” which was eventually approved by the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee but lapsed at the end of 2008. Then in 2008 and again in 2009, Senator Bingaman added the Reclamation Water Settlements Fund for the three settlements to the “Omnibus Public Land Management Act.” This omnibus bill became law on March 30, 2009.

If the benchmarks, schedules, and funding obligations are not substantially met, the settlements will fail. Failure means a return to litigation.

The Claims Resolution Act of 2010 approved the Taos Settlement, as well as the Nambé, Pojoaque, San Ildefonso, and Tesuque Settlement. The Act also appropriated and authorized millions to meet the federal obligations for these and the Navajo Nation Settlement.

State Funding: The majority of the State’s share of the funding remains to be appropriated. In 2007, the State made a “down payment” of $10 million to its Indian Water Rights Settlement Fund, to be used for the State’s contribution for three Indian water rights settlements. In 2011, Legislature appropriated $15 million in Severance Tax Bonds to the fund and in 2013, it appropriated $10 million; the total amount of State funding to date is $35 million. The State’s total contribution will be $130 million in un-indexed dollars for the three settlements and will require substantial appropriations for the next several years. The total amount required from the State by the three settlements will require continued annual appropriations of $15 million through 2017.

Congress built benchmarks and timetables into each of the Acts approving the three settlements. If the benchmarks, schedules, and funding obligations are not substantially met, the settlements will fail, which means a return to litigation.

For more information, please see the “Navajo-Gallup Water Supply Project”, the “NPT Pueblos Settlement and the Aamodt Adjudication”, and the “Taos Pueblo Water Rights Settlement” chapters in this edition of Water Matters!

Settlement or Litigation: The Aamodt parties litigated the Pueblos’ claims from 1966 to 2000 without reaching an end. The parties reached a settlement in six years. It took four years for the settlement to wend through Congress. The settlement must be substan-
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State of New Mexico, ex rel. State Engineer v. Aamodt, et al., 66cv6639 (D.N.M.) (Rio Pojoaque; Pueblos of Nambé, Pojoaque, San Ildefonso and Tesuque).
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State of New Mexico, ex rel. State Engineer v. Aragon, et al., 69cv7941 (D.N.M.) (Rio Chama; Ohkay Owingeh aka San Juan Pueblo and Jicarilla Apache Nation).

Latest Update by Darcy Bushnell, Esq. (2013)

Statute resolutions of 2010 have a similar story: today, two Indian Nation settlements have adjudicated water rights; five Pueblos and one Indian Nation have settlements approved by Congress and that are being implemented; one Pueblo is in settlement talks; nine others are in litigation; and seven have not yet started down this path. One way or another, the water rights of Indian peoples whose homelands are located in New Mexico will be determined, and they will have a significant effect on the State and its operations.
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