

MARVIN J. SONOSKY (1909-1997)
ARTHUR LAZARUS, JR. (1926-2019)
REID PEYTON CHAMBERS
HARRY R. SACHSE (1934-2024)
WILLIAM R. PERRY (RET.)
LLOYD B. MILLER
DOUGLAS B. L. ENDRESON
MARY J. PAVEL
DAVID C. MIELKE
COLIN C. HAMPSON
RICHARD D. MONKMAN (AK)*
VANESSA L. RAY-HODGE
FRANK S. HOLLEMAN
REBECCA A. PATTERSON (AK)*
NATHANIEL H. AMDUR-CLARK
RYAN C. RUSCHE (MT)*
WHITNEY A. LEONARD (AK)*
K. AMANDA SAUNDERS (AK)*
STEVEN C. WILFONG (CA)*
CHLOE E. COTTON (AK)*
CASSIDY R. GUERRO (CA)*
ANNE R. DELONG
NOAH I. STAR (AK)*
ROSALIND Q. CUNEO (AK)*
JOHN K. CRAWFORD
NOAH S. GOLDENBERG (OR)*

OF COUNSEL
ANNE D. NOTO
MYRA M. MUNSON (AK)*
JAMES E. GLAZE*
GARY F. BROWNELL (NM)*
DONALD J. SIMON
MATTHEW S. JAFFE
MATTHEW L. MURDOCK
EMILY J. SOLI (NM)*
VANESSA B. WILLARD (CO)*

SAMANTHA STONE – POLICY ADVISOR

*NOT ADMITTED IN D.C.

Bureau of Reclamation
Attn: BCOO-1000
P.O. Box 6170
Boulder City, NV 89006

Re: Comments of the Hualapai Indian Tribe to Draft Environmental Impact Statement on Post-2026 Operational Guidelines and Strategies for Lake Powell and Lake Mead

As water rights attorneys for the Hualapai Tribe, we submit the following comments for the Tribe on the Draft Environmental Impact Statement of the Interior Department's Bureau of Reclamation on Post-2026 Operational Guidelines and Strategies for Lake Powell and Lake Mead (DEIS), published in the Federal Register on January 16, 2026.

**SONOSKY, CHAMBERS, SACHSE,
ENDRESON & PERRY, LLP**

1425 K STREET, N.W., SUITE 600
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005
TEL (202) 682-0240 | FAX (202) 682-0249
WWW.SONOSKY.COM
LAW OFFICES

ANCHORAGE, AK OFFICE
510 L STREET, SUITE 310
ANCHORAGE, AK 99501
(907) 258-6377
FAX (907) 272-8332

JUNEAU, AK OFFICE
302 GOLD STREET, SUITE 201
JUNEAU, AK 99801
(907) 586-5880
FAX (907) 586-5883

SAN DIEGO, CA OFFICE
145 WILLOW STREET, SUITE 200
BONITA, CA 91902
(619) 267-1306
FAX (619) 267-1388

February 27, 2026

BY OVERNIGHT DELIVERY

ALBUQUERQUE, NM OFFICE
500 MARQUETTE AVE., N.W., SUITE 660
ALBUQUERQUE, NM 87102
(505) 247-0147
FAX (505) 843-6912

PORTLAND, OR OFFICE
9900 S.W. WILSHIRE STREET, SUITE 240
PORTLAND, OR 97225
(503) 206-7624
FAX (971) 373.8253

1. **Basic Water Sources, Uses and Present and Future Water Needs on Hualapai Reservation.**

The Hualapai Reservation encompasses approximately one million acres in northwestern Arizona. All lands on the Reservation are tribal trust lands; there are no allotments or fee inholdings. The Colorado River forms the northern boundary of the Reservation through a 108-mile portion of the Grand Canyon. The entire Reservation is downstream from Lake Powell and upstream from Lake Mead.

The Reservation is arid and has no significant surface water streams other than the Colorado River. It has very limited groundwater resources, on which the Tribe currently depends for all its water needs. The Tribe's principal residential community at Peach Springs, Arizona presently relies exclusively on three groundwater wells near the Reservation's southern boundary. Those wells were installed in 1975, so the piping for the well system is over 50 years old and has failed in the recent past, leaving the Peach Springs community without water for several days. One of the wells has also suffered episodes of dangerous E-coli and coliform contamination. When that well is out of service because of contamination, the Tribe is unable to supply sufficient water to Peach Springs and has been forced to implement strict mandatory conservation measures. Because this groundwater is currently the only source of water for residential needs on the Reservation, the Tribe is very vulnerable to any short-term interruptions in supply from these wells, and also to the long-term decline in the water levels in the aquifer from which the wells are supplied.

Water availability is even worse elsewhere on the Reservation. There is a small groundwater well on the east side of the Reservation that provides water to ranchers and wildlife in that area, but this water is not potable for human consumption. And there are two wells at West Water, which is located on a dirt road that runs between Peach Springs and the Tribe's principal economic enterprise at Grand Canyon West on the western rim of the Grand Canyon—a distance of 60 miles. The West Water wells, which are 35 miles from Grand Canyon West, previously provided all of the water for the Tribe's Grand Canyon West development. But several years ago, the water table in those wells suddenly dropped because of the current long-term drought and both wells failed. Since then, the Tribe has been forced to curtail some of its operations at Grand Canyon West because of a lack of water, and has resorted to pumping groundwater near Peach Springs and hauling it by truck to the West Water site, from which the water is then pumped to Grand Canyon West. This patchwork system is insecure and very expensive, but it is the only way the Tribe can continue any operations at Grand Canyon West.

Grand Canyon West is the centerpiece of the Tribe's economy, and is vitally important to the economic wellbeing of the Hualapai Tribe. The Hualapai Reservation does not have the natural

resources to permit commercial agriculture, timber or mineral development. But the Reservation's virtually unique location on the Grand Canyon gives the Tribe a strong basis to create a self-sustaining tourism-based economy.

Prior to the pandemic, Grand Canyon West employed more than 1,500 workers (more than 550 of whom were not tribal members). At that point, the Hualapai Tribe was the second largest employer in Mohave County, Arizona, and Grand Canyon West hosted over 1 million visitors a year. Although operations at Grand Canyon West declined during the pandemic years, they are now slowly returning to pre-pandemic capacity. But Grand Canyon West, like Peach Springs, requires a secure source of water in order to operate and the Tribe's current reliance on its declining groundwater resources is not sustainable. Water from the Colorado River is vitally necessary to securing the basic domestic needs of the Tribe's on-Reservation population and to sustaining its on-Reservation economy, particularly at Grand Canyon West.

2. Hualapai Water Rights Settlement Act.

In the Hualapai Tribe Water Rights Settlement Act of 2022, Pub. L. No. 117-349, 136 Stat. 6225 (2023), Congress approved a full and final settlement of all of the Hualapai Tribe's federally reserved water rights claims for its Reservation and trust lands, including the Tribe's rights to water from the Colorado River. The Act quantifies the Tribes' Colorado River water rights as 4,000 acre-feet a year (afy) of Central Arizona Project (CAP) water. Within the CAP, this entire water allocation has a non-Indian agricultural (NIA) priority. The Act provides that 1,115 acre-feet a year of the CAP water will be firmed (half by the United States and half by the State of Arizona) to municipal and industrial (M&I) priority status—the highest priority within the CAP—but only until 2108. Like Hualapai, several other tribal water settlements in Arizona provide tribes with quantities of the Central Arizona Project NIA water, which is the lowest priority water in the CAP system, the first block of water cut when shortages are declared to the CAP system.

This NIA water was set aside by Congress in 2004 for future tribal water settlements by the Arizona Water Settlements Act (AWSA). At the time ASWA was enacted, the general expectation of Congress, the State of Arizona, and tribal and non-Indian water users was that Colorado River shortages would occur relatively rarely and that tribes could “bank” NIA water they did not use in wet years that could be withdrawn from the “bank” for use in dry years when shortages would occur. This general expectation still prevailed in 2012 when the framework for the Hualapai water settlement was negotiated between the Tribe, the Interior Department, the State of Arizona, and major water users and providers in the State, chiefly the Salt River Project (SRP) and Central Arizona Water Conservancy District (CAWCD). A statute ratifying the Hualapai settlement was introduced in Congress in 2014 but not enacted by Congress until 2022.

In the past decade, the unprecedented drought in the Southwest—which had initially been seen as part of the cyclical pattern of wetter and drier periods observed throughout the prior century—has become recognized as a more permanent, structural phenomenon. Deep shortages in Colorado River flows in the past several years have led the Interior Department to impose significant reductions in water deliveries in the Lower Basin in order to preserve long term system operations. It bears emphasis that neither the Hualapai Tribe nor the State of Arizona anticipated any such shortages when the Arizona Water Settlements Act was passed in 2004 nor when the framework of the Hualapai settlement was agreed to in 2012.

The Hualapai Settlement Act also authorized the appropriation of \$312 million of federal monies for a trust fund the Tribe may use to construct an infrastructure project to pump and deliver up to 3,414 afy of water from the Colorado River to the Reservation, and for other purposes. The project, as currently planned by the Tribe, will divert water from the Colorado River on the Reservation where Diamond Creek enters the River, and then pump that water up to the plateau thousands of feet above the River through a 70-mile pipeline to reach both Peach Springs—the community where virtually all the Tribe’s members reside on the Reservation—and Grand Canyon West.

In addition to the CAP water allocated to the Hualapai Tribe in the 2022 Hualapai Settlement Act, Congress established an Economic Development Fund to enable the Hualapai Tribe to purchase additional Colorado River water rights as part of a separate settlement agreement among the Tribe, the United States and Freeport Minerals Corporation. This settlement agreement was ratified by Congress in the Bill Williams River Water Settlement Act of 2014, Pub. Law 113-223, (sec. 5(d)(1)(A)). Freeport has contributed the money required by that settlement to this Fund. In June 2024, the Hualapai Tribe used a part of the money in that Economic Development Fund to purchase 298 acres of land appurtenant to the Colorado River in the vicinity of Yuma, Arizona, together with a right to divert up to 1,110 afy of water from the Colorado River. The DEIS recognizes this water right as belonging to the Hualapai Tribe. Technical Appendix 18 (TA 18) at p. 6.¹

¹ Erroneously, however, the DEIS states this right has a priority date of February 17, 2006, TA 18, p. 6. That date is incorrect. While the prior owner of the 298-acre tract entered into a “Section 5” contract with the Bureau of Reclamation to divert the 1,110 afy in 2006, the Bureau of Reclamation’s practice is to treat Colorado River water users with Section 5 contracts in Arizona as having a priority date that is co-equal with CAP unless their diversions commenced prior to the authorization of CAP by Congress.

3. **The Department Should Not Curtail Full Deliveries of Any Tribal Water Rights, Including Hualapai's, That Have Been Quantified by Congress or by Final Court Decrees.**

The DEIS considers and analyzes five alternative strategies for managing Colorado River water in times of shortage after 2026, some of which are based on the existing priority system and others of which propose to allocate shortages on a pro rata basis. Although the DEIS contains voluminous information about tribal water rights in the Colorado River Basin and how those rights would be impacted under each of the five alternatives the DEIS considers, the DEIS is fatally flawed because it fails to consider and analyze any option that fully protects from diminution in times of shortage all tribal water rights—like Hualapai's—that have been ratified and confirmed by Acts of Congress and/or final court decisions.

In doing this blinkered analysis, the DEIS simply assumes that there is no possible alternative that would fully protect tribal water rights from curtailment during shortages, and that the Department must therefore simply accept as inevitable the conclusion that some congressionally approved or judicially decreed tribal water rights must be cut in water short years. But of course, this outcome is not inevitable and the Department sets forth no factual basis to support its assumption that this outcome is unavoidable. Instead, the DEIS could and should—indeed must—consider a different available alternative for managing shortages: one that would not impose any shortages on tribal water rights that have been confirmed by Congress and/or by final court decrees.

This defect must be corrected in the final EIS (FEIS) and Record of Decision (ROD). The Final EIS should consider and analyze an alternative that fully protects from diminishment all tribal water rights approved in congressional statutes or judicial decrees—either separately as a Sixth Alternative or in tandem with whatever Alternative the Final EIS and ROD selects as the Preferred Alternative. In other words, the Department should provide an alternative that starts from the premise that congressionally or judicially approved tribal water rights will be prioritized and fully protected from curtailment, and then analyze the impact of doing so on other water users.

The Hualapai Tribe does not itself have sufficient information to assess the consequences of protecting from curtailment the water rights of every other tribe.² The Tribe does submit that,

² As set forth in TA 18, pp. 5-7, of the DEIS, the legislative enactments and judicial decrees quantifying tribal water rights in the Colorado River vary considerably. Several tribes in Arizona and California hold present perfected rights in the *Arizona v. California* decree of the United States Supreme Court. Table TA 18-2; TA 18, pp. 5-6. Other tribes, like Hualapai, have CAP entitlements with varying priorities, including NIA water. Table TA 18-3, TA 18 pp. 6-7.

for several reasons, protecting Hualapai's rights would have minimal impact on other users during the 20-year period after 2026 in which the Department's Decision is expected to operate.

First, the Hualapai Tribe's Colorado River water entitlements totals 5,110 afy, TA 18 at pp. 6-7, which is a relatively small amount. The major portion of this entitlement—4,000 afy—was specifically approved by Congress as a CAP NIA water allocation when it ratified the Tribe's water rights settlement agreement in 2022. Second, Hualapai's congressional settlement will not become enforceable until Congress fully appropriates the funding authorized in the 2022 Settlement Act and other conditions are met. Third, once the Hualapai settlement does become enforceable, which will likely be several years after 2026, it will then take the Tribe several additional years to finally construct the water delivery infrastructure authorized by Congress in the Settlement Act. Fourth, it will take additional years—perhaps decades—for the Tribe to fully utilize its 5,110 afy Colorado River entitlement on the Reservation. Consequently, at least some Hualapai water will almost certainly be available for conservation in Lake Mead during most if not all of the two decades after 2026 that the Final ROD is expected to operate. Finally, Hualapai is the only tribe in Arizona with a settlement or decree quantifying its water rights upstream of Lake Mead. In that stretch of the Colorado River, there are no other water sources available to the Hualapai Tribe as plausible alternatives to the water rights confirmed in its settlement—which may not be true of every other tribe with an entitlement to Colorado River or CAP NIA water.

Even though Hualapai will not have access to its water rights until the occurrence of the enforceability date of its settlement several years from now, it is critical for the Department in the FEIS not to impair or reduce Hualapai's water rights on an anticipatory basis. The Department intends that the allocation system adopted in the FEIS will apply for a 20-year period—a period during which Hualapai almost certainly will be bringing water to its Reservation to use both to support its population and its on-Reservation economy. Thus, the post-2026 rules to be adopted in the FEIS this year certainly will affect Hualapai in the 20-year period during which the FEIS rules will be in effect. The Department should not adopt an allocation system that reduces Hualapai's access to water even before that access is first realized.

We emphasize that the Hualapai Tribe's quantified CAP water right of 4,000 afy—a right specifically approved by Congress—is a tiny amount of water in the vast Colorado River system, even in a system stressed by drought. From the perspective of the Department's management of the River, this quantity of water hardly rises to the level of a rounding error. But for Hualapai, that small amount of water is the entirety of the future of its Reservation and the future of the Hualapai people. As described in Part I above, the existing groundwater on the Reservation—currently the sole source of water—is insecure and failing, leaving the Reservation population in a constant state of near (and sometimes actual) crisis. And Grand Canyon West, the lynchpin of the Tribe's economy and the principal source of employment for the Tribe's population, is entirely dependent

on this failing groundwater system and on an expensive and burdensome need to truck groundwater long distances to deliver it to Grand Canyon West.

It should also be noted that because of its location directly on the Grand Canyon, Hualapai stands in a privileged position as compared to most users of the Colorado River in Arizona. The Colorado River flows right by the Hualapai Reservation; indeed, it forms the northern boundary of the Reservation for 108 miles. The Colorado River is part of the aboriginal homeland of the Hualapai people. Yet the water from the Colorado River has been and will continue to be pumped hundreds of miles by the CAP system to serve the needs of populations living in central Arizona, while the Hualapai people, who watch the River flow by their homeland every day, have for decades been denied the right to use any of that water. Now that Congress has finally quantified Hualapai's federally reserved water right to use a small but necessary amount of water from the River to sustain their life on the Reservation, that hard-won victory should not be impaired by the Department's administrative action to reduce Hualapai's water right, even in times of shortage. It is all the more improper to reduce Hualapai's right to take water from the River on its own lands in favor of populations who live far distances away.

Failure by the DEIS to even consider full protection of tribal water rights quantified by Congress or final court decrees in times of shortage renders the DEIS legally deficient for several reasons. First, it ignores the well-established trust responsibility of the United States towards these rights—rights to which the United States holds legal title to in trust for the Indian tribes in the Colorado River Basin. Second, tribal water rights unquestionably have a superior legal right to the Colorado River as compared to any non-Indian rights. That was clearly established as long ago as 1908, when the Supreme Court held in the landmark case of *Winters v. United States*, 207 U.S. 564 (1908), that Indian tribes have water rights under federal law that are legally senior to non-Indian uses commenced after the date the tribe's reservation was established (in Hualapai's case, 1883). In *Winters*, the Court held that tribes can use these water rights to satisfy both their present and future needs to create a permanent, self-sustaining homeland for the Tribe and its members. Tribal water rights thus have a priority that, under the *Winters* Supreme Court decision, is senior to all non-Indian water rights in the Colorado River Basin.

Sadly, however, in the five decades immediately following the *Winters* decision, the United States egregiously and repeatedly failed to assert the rights of tribes in court cases against non-Indian water appropriations that were legally junior to the rights of tribes as determined in *Winters*. For over 50 years, the Federal Government ignored the law and provided federal funds for construction of non-Indian water projects in the Colorado River and elsewhere in the West to allow non-Indians to use water to which Tribes had superior legal rights. As the National Water Commission's Final Report succinctly summarized this history of abject neglect in 1973:

During most of this 50-year period [following the decision in *Winters v. United States*, 207 U.S. 564 (1908)], the United States was pursuing a policy of encouraging the settlement of the West and the creation of family-sized farms on its arid lands. In retrospect, it can be seen that this policy was pursued with little or no regard for Indian water rights and the *Winters* doctrine. With the encouragement, or at least the cooperation, of the Secretary of the Interior—the very office entrusted with protection of all Indian rights—many large irrigation projects were constructed on streams that flowed through or bordered Indian Reservations, sometimes above and more often below the Reservations. With few exceptions the projects were planned and built by the Federal Government without any attempt to define, let alone protect, prior rights that Indian tribes have had in the waters used for the projects. . . . In the history of the United States Government’s treatment of Indian tribes, its failure to protect Indian water rights for use on the Reservations it set aside for them is one of the sorrier chapters.³

This shameful history has changed for the better in more recent decades, during which tribes have themselves acted to assert their reserved water rights in court and have negotiated settlement agreements approved by Congress quantifying their *Winters* doctrine reserved rights. Since the 1970s, the United States, as trustee for these rights, has generally participated in this litigation, usually by supporting the water rights claims that the tribes have asserted in court and also by supporting congressional legislation confirming water rights settlements that tribes have negotiated resolving those claims.

However, in order to secure the support in Congress for these tribal water settlements from the Federal Executive Branch, States and non-Indian water users, tribes—including the Hualapai Tribe—have been required to waive all claims against the United States, States and non-Indian water users for past injuries to or encroachment upon the tribes’ legally senior water rights. Specifically, tribes—including Hualapai—have been required to waive all claims against the United States for its abject historical failures to protect their rights in the decades immediately following the *Winters* decision.

These waivers constituted major concessions by the tribes because they have allowed legally junior non-Indian users to continue to use water to which the tribes hold senior legal rights. And by waiving claims against the United States, tribes have absolved the Federal Government from damages for its past failures to protect tribal rights to which the tribes, by law, held a senior legal priority. Because of the historic derelictions of the United States throughout much of the

³ NAT’L WATER COMM’N, WATER POLICIES FOR THE FUTURE – FINAL REPORT TO THE PRESIDENT AND TO THE CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES 474-75 (Washington: Government Printing Office, 1973).

20th century in failing to protect tribal water rights, non-Indians were able to develop long-established water uses that tribes were then forced to recognize in their negotiated water settlements.

For the Secretary now to fail to protect congressionally approved quantifications of tribal water from shortages would impose a fundamental unfairness on the tribes that have entered these settlements in good faith. On the one hand, the tribes remain fully bound by *all* of the waivers they have given to the State and Federal parties in these settlements. But on the other hand, tribes would not receive the full benefit of the bargain they are entitled to in exchange for giving these waivers—a right to take full delivery of the Colorado River water in a quantity that Congress approved as necessary to sustain a permanent livable homeland on their reservations. Instead, pursuant to a Secretarial decision, tribal water confirmed by Congress would be subject to severe reductions. The United States and non-Indian parties would continue to get everything they bargained for in these settlements with Hualapai and other tribes, but the tribes in return would get much less than they bargained for. That result would be a clear miscarriage of justice. As part of the ROD in this matter, the Secretary must ensure that tribes receive the full quantity of water that Congress or a court has determined is necessary to meet the tribes' present and future needs for its Reservation.

There is historical precedent for the Secretary to take this kind of protective action on behalf of tribes. In 1980, Interior Secretary Cecil Andrus established an allocation of 308,000 acre feet a year of CAP water to certain Arizona Indian tribes and published a decision in the Federal Register providing that the amounts allocated to those tribes would be accorded co-equal priority with all CAP M&I users in Arizona, 45 Fed. Reg. 81265 (December 10, 1980), (copy enclosed). Interior Secretary James Watt reaffirmed Secretary Andrus's allocation with some modifications, mostly with relatively small reductions in the amounts allocated to some tribes. 48 Fed. Reg. 12446 (March 24, 1983) (copy enclosed). This allocation and protection was established by Secretaries Andrus and Watt administratively in the exercise of the Secretary's executive discretion and authority to manage Colorado River operations and withdrawals, even where these allocations were not part of any congressionally or judicially approved quantification of any tribe's *Winters* doctrine reserved water rights as is the case with Hualapai. This history demonstrates the ample authority of the Department to take steps to prioritize and protect tribal water rights, an authority that must be exercised here as well.

By contrast, failure by Secretary Burgum to adopt protections to ensure full delivery of Colorado River water to tribes with congressionally or court approved water rights would subordinate the senior legal priority of tribal water rights under the *Winters* doctrine to legally junior non-Indian uses, which would diminish the tribal water rights that have been specifically approved by Congress or by final court decrees. Such an action would repeat the dismal and

discredited failures of the United States to assert and protect tribal reserved rights in the several decades immediately following *Winters* and would result in a comparable and irreparable subversion of tribal water rights. The Secretary should not allow the United States in the 2020s to repeat the appalling derelictions of its trust responsibility that occurred over a period of several decades in the early and mid-20th century.

4. If the Department Fails to Fully Protect Tribal Water Rights, It Should Adopt the Allocation System Which Least Impairs Hualapai's Water Rights.

To its credit, the Department in the DEIS did analyze the impact of various alternatives that would have less deleterious impacts on the water rights of most Arizona tribes—including Hualapai—than simply mechanically allocating shortages based on a strict regime of legal priorities. Some of these alternatives would instead allocate shortages on a pro rata basis.

The Hualapai Tribe strongly favors the pro rata allocation alternatives because the century-old legal priority system first established in the 1922 Colorado River Compact is deeply flawed and outmoded. Even at the time the 1922 Compact was adopted, it was based on overly optimistic and unrealistic hydrologic projections for the Colorado River that substantially overstated the available water supply in the River. Those 1922 projections are now completely antiquated because of the current long-term drought. Continuing to manage shortages in the next two decades during the present drought based solely on a system of legal priority established more than a century ago would subordinate all water rights in Arizona and Nevada with a priority date of 1968 or later—the year Congress authorized the CAP—to California's right to divert 4.4-million-acre feet a year from the River—about two thirds the average minimal flow in the Lower Basin. Adhering to a strict legal priority alternative would devastate the economies of Arizona and Nevada as well as sharply curtail deliveries of Central Arizona Project water to Arizona tribes—the water on which most tribes in Arizona depend. As a practical matter, this would also eliminate all tribal rights to CAP NIA water in most years. Needless to say, that would devastate the Hualapai Tribe's congressionally approved water rights, and make virtually illusory the benefits which the Tribe is supposed to receive under its water rights settlement. The Secretary's final decision on this matter should protect Hualapai, other Arizona tribes and Arizona itself from such a disastrous result.

Of the alternative pro rata allocation alternatives considered, Hualapai favors the "Enhanced Coordination" model because, of all approaches, it has the least bad outcomes for Hualapai. Unlike the priority-based models, which essentially wipe out Hualapai's CAP NAI supply, the "Enhanced Coordination" model makes comparatively modest cuts of less than 25 percent to Hualapai's 4,000 afy allocation, in scenarios up to total River shortages of 2.3 million acre-feet per year. While this would still impose real limitations on Hualapai's future supply of

the water necessary to support its population and economy, it has the advantage of doing less harm to Hualapai than the other alternatives analyzed by the DEIS.

The Hualapai Tribe appreciates the opportunity to submit these comments.

Respectfully Submitted,

SONOSKY, CHAMBERS, SACHSE,
ENDRESON & PERRY, LLP

Reid Peyton Chambers
Mary J. Pavel
Donald J. Simon

Attorneys for the Hualapai Tribe

Enclosures: 45 Fed. Reg. 81265 (December 10, 1980)
48 Fed. Reg. 12446 (March 24, 1983)