1					
2					
3					
4					
5					
6	IN THE SUPERIOR COURT OF THE STATE OF ARIZONA				
7	IN AND FOR THE COUNTY OF MADICODA				
8					
9	IN RE THE GENERAL ADITIDICATION	W-1 (Salt) W-2 (Verde)			
10	OF ALL RIGHTS TO USE WATER IN	W-3 (Upper Gila)			
11	SOURCE	W-4 (San Pedro) Consolidated			
12		Contested Case No. W1 11 605			
13		Confested Case No. W1-11-005			
14		ORDER QUANTIFYING FEDERAL RESERVED WATER RIGHTS FOR			
15		FORT HUACHUCA			
16					
17	CONTESTED CASE NAME: In re Fort Hu	achuca			
18	HSR INVOLVED: San Pedro River Watersh	ned Hydrographic Survey Report.			
19	DESCRIPTIVE SUMMARY: Determination	on of purpose, quantity, and source of federal			
20	reserved water right for Fort Huachuca.				
21	NUMBER OF PAGES: 67				
22	DATE OF FILING: September 6, 2024				
23					
24					
25					
26					
27					
28		1			
		······································			

1				
2				
3	I.	INTR	ODUCTION	4
4	II.	PROC	EDURAL BACKGROUND	7
5	III.	MILI	FARY PURPOSES FOR A FEDERAL RESERVED WATER RIGHT	9
6		A.	Primary and Secondary Purposes	9
7		B.	Minimum Use	20
8 - 9	IV.	QUA1 RESE	VTIFICATION OF WATER SUBJECT TO A FEDERAL RVED WATER RIGHT	25
10		A.	Ouantifying Current Uses	28
11			1. Background	28
12			2. Current Use	30
13		В.	Long-Term Expansion of Operations	34
14		C.	Short-Term Total Mobilization	44
15	V.	SOUR	CE OF WATER	51
16		A.	Other Water Sources	52
17		B.	Streamflow	55
18			1. Garden Canyon	58
19			2. Huachuca Canyon	59
20		С.	Groundwater	60
21				
22				
23				
24				
25				
26				
27				
28			2	

╢

1		
2	RECORD CITATIONS	
3	References herein to the reporter's transcript of the trial held in Oct. 2016 and Feb. 2017 are	
4	set forth as "Tr. at [Day of Trial]: [Page], [Date] (witness)." The date and witness name are	
5		
6	not included in subsequent "id." citations to the same witness' testimony on the same day of	
7	trial. Exhibits admitted during the trial are referred to as [Exhibit # at page]. References to	
8	the proposed findings of fact submitted by the parties are set forth as [Party FOF #].	
9		
10		
11		
12		
13		
14		
15		
10		
18		
10		
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	. 3	

2

1

The United States claims federal reserved water rights to surface water and 3 groundwater to support the operations and missions of Fort Huachuca. This proceeding 4 adjudicates those claims and the objections to those claims. Under the federal reserved water 5 6 doctrine, the United States implicitly reserved water from sources that "arise on, border, 7 cross, underlie, or are encompassed" within its land withdrawn from the public domain 8 necessary to accomplish the purpose of a federal reservation. Arizona v. Navajo Nation, 599 9 U.S. 555, 561 (2023); see also, United States v. New Mexico, 438 U.S. 696, 698 (1978); 10 11 Winters v. United States, 207 U.S. 564 (1908); Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians v. 12 Coachella Valley Water District, 849 F.3d 1262, 1271 (9th Cir. 2017). The doctrine applies 13 to reservations of land for military bases. In re the General Adjudication of All Rights to Use 14 Water in the Gila River System and Source, 195 Ariz. 411, 417, 989 P.2d 739, 745 (1999). 15 16 cert. denied sub nom. Phelps Dodge Corp. v. U.S. and Salt River Valley Water Users' Assn. 17 v. U.S., 530 U.S. 1250 (2000) ("Gila III").

Fort Huachuca is an important federal military installation that has historically contributed to the national security and continues to provide essential military protection. It is located on 73,142 acres in southeastern Arizona, approximately eight miles north of the international border with Mexico. Tr. at 8:64-65 (Oct. 13, 2016) (Runyon); U.S. SOF 1. It shares its southern and much of its western boundaries with the Coronado National Forest and the Miller Peak Wilderness. The City of Sierra Vista lies to the east of the Fort, and the Town of Huachuca City is located to the north.

27

18

Between 2005 and 2015, Fort Huachuca has had an average effective population of 1 more than 10,000 armed service personnel, active duty dependents, and civilians. U.S. FOF 2 3 443. The Fort provides housing for many of its military personnel stationed at the base along 4 with their dependents. Some of its service members live in the surrounding area. All civilian 5 personnel who work on the base live in the surrounding area. Averaged between 2005 and 6 2014, the Fort used 1,138 acre-feet of water each year on the base to support its military and 7 8 civilian personnel, which translates into approximately 97 gallons per person per day. U.S. 9 FOF 398. Objections have been made to specific uses of water at Fort Huachuca on the 10 grounds that not all of the water has been used for a military purpose and, therefore, the 11 United States is not entitled to a federal reserved water right to provide for those uses. 12

13 The United States claims a federal reserved water right to 7,380 AFA acre-feet 14 annually ("AFA"). The United States primarily quantifies its claim to water in excess to the 15 amount currently used based on the future effective population of Fort Huachuca. The 16 population necessary to the operations and missions of the Fort has fluctuated in the past and 17 18 is expected to fluctuate in the future. The United States expects the population to gradually 19 increase to 14,229 in the future to accomplish the operations and missions of Fort Huachuca 20 with the possibility of a short-term increase of the population by another 49,700 people to 21 respond to a catastrophic event or a Total Mobilization event such as occurred during World 22 23 War II. Objections have been made to the time period that the United States used to calculate 24 its current average population, to assumptions made about the growth of the population, and 25 to the likelihood that an event would occur necessitating the influx of an additional 49,700 26 personnel. 27

Fort Huachuca is located in the foothills of the Huachuca Mountains and within the 1 Sierra Vista Subwatershed. It has three primary sources of water: stream flow from Huachuca 2 3 and Garden Canyons and groundwater. The median annual streamflow from the two canyons 4 in the Huachuca Mountains is 977 acre-feet. Approximately 15,600,000 acre-feet of 5 groundwater are stored beneath the Sierra Vista Subwatershed. Tr. at 9:102 (Oct. 17, 2016) 6 (Runyon); Ex. 341 at 72. An analysis of groundwater storage underlying the land reserved 7 8 for Fort Huachuca to a depth of 1,200 feet determined that several hundred thousand acre-9 feet of water are available to be pumped for use on the Fort. Tr. at 17:128 (Feb. 13, 2017) 10 (Burtell). There appears to be some dispute about whether the United States should be able 11 to reserve rights to both surface water and groundwater, but the primary disagreement among 12 13 the parties focuses on the amounts and process by which the United States' rights could attach 14 to each source. 15 This Order determines only the United States' claims for federal reserved water rights. 16 The implied federal reserved water rights doctrine only reserves that amount of water 17 18 necessary to fulfill the purpose of the reservation, no more. Cappaert v. United States, 426

19 20 21

22

23

of the federal right is the minimum amount necessary to achieve the purpose for which the 24 land for Fort Huachuca was reserved; it is not the maximum amount of water that the United 25 States may use for its military operations. The United States remains able to pursue more 26

27

28

6

U.S. 128, 141 (1976); In re the General Adjudication of All Rights to Use Water in the Gila

River System and Source, 201 Ariz. 307, 312, ¶11 (2001) ("Gila V") (the quantification of a

federal right "must be tailored to the 'minimal need' of the reservation.") The quantification

water for its operations in the same manner as any other public or private appropriator under Arizona law. *United States v. New Mexico*, 438 U.S. at 701.

#### II. Procedural Background

The United States asserted two separate claims for federal reserved water rights. It filed Statement of Claimant ("SOC") 39-10774, last amended in 2002, to claim 7,549 AFA of groundwater to meet the Fort's present and future potable needs. It also filed SOC 39-10775 to assert federal reserved water right to 434 AFA of non-potable water from 101 sources of surface water occurring across the installation. In the Joint Pretrial Statement filed by the parties on September 13, 2016, the United Stated reduced the total amount of its claim from 7,549 AFA to 7,387 AFA. U.S. FOF 2-4. In its Written Closing Statement, the United States further reduced its claims in SOC 39-10774 to 6,952 AFA and in SOC 39-10775 to 428 AFA for a total claim of 7,380 AFA. (U.S. Closing at 2, fn.1)

This case has been divided into two phases. In the first phase, numerous findings of fact and conclusions of law were entered and approved. See Report of the Special Master; 19 Motion for Adoption of Report; and Notice for Filing Objections to the Report, April 4, 2008 20 21 ("Phase 1 Report") approved and modified by Order Granting the Special Master's Motion 22 for Adoption of the April 4, 2008 Report Regarding Fort Huachuca, September 7, 2011 23 ("September 2011 Order"). The parties have offered testimony and submitted evidence and 24 they have made legal arguments in their closing written statement in the second phase of this 25 26 case ("Phase II") about factual and legal issues resolved by the Phase I Report and the 27 September 2011 Order. The factual findings and legal conclusion from Phase I are not at

1	issue and will not be reconsidered as part of this proceeding or addressed in this Order.
2	Similarly, this Order will not reconsider the decisions made in its Order Granting in Part and
3	Denying in Part Motions for Summary Judgment and for Partial Summary Judgment,
4 5	September 1, 2016 ("MSJ Order"), nor will it address issues beyond those specifically
6	designated for determination in Phase II.
7	The Court designated three evidentiary issues for trial in Phase II. See Order
8	Designating Issues for Consideration and Setting Schedule for the Second Phase of this Case,
9	December 19, 2011, at 3-4. The three issues are:
10	1. The scope of water uses encompassed by the term "military purposes."
12	2. Quantification of the federal reserved water rights to fulfill military purposes.
13	3. Sources of water other than groundwater adequate to fulfill military purposes
14	and, if those sources are inadequate, quantification of groundwater to fulfill
15	military purposes.
16	At trial the United States, the claimant, was joined by the Salt Diver Project, the San
18	Carlos Apacha Triba, and the Tente Anacha Triba. Objectant di
19	Minerela Generation (1971) All and Minerela Objectors to this case are Freeport
20	Minerals Corporation ("Freeport"), Liberty Utilities (Bella Vista Water) Corporation
21	("Liberty), City of Sierra Vista, the State of Arizona, the City of Sierra Vista, and Pueblo del
22	Sol Water Company ("Pueblo del Sol"). Trial in this matter concluded after 18 days of
23	testimony from 16 witnesses and the admission of nearly 200 exhibits into evidence.
24	
26	
27	
28	
	δ

1	
2	III. Military Purposes for a Federal Reserved Water Right
3	
4	A. Primary and Secondary Purposes
5	The first issue in this phase of the proceeding that must be resolved involves the types
6 7	of water use that fulfill the military purpose for which land for Fort Huachuca was reserved.
8	The Supreme Court formulated a rule that permits water to be reserved under federal law only
9	for the primary purpose of the reservation and forbids a reservation under federal law for
10	water to meet a secondary purpose of the reservation:
11	Where water is passager to fulfill the years numbers for which a
12	federal reservation was created, it is reasonable to conclude, even in
13	the face of Congress' express deference to state water law in other areas, that the United States intended to reserve the necessary water.
14	Where water is only valuable for a secondary use of the reservation,
16	consistent with its other views, that the United States would acquire
17	water in the same manner as any other public or private appropriator.
18	United States v. New Mexico, 438 U.S. at 701.
19	The State of Arizona contends that the primary use of water for a military purpose
20	does not include the water required for a series of programs and services known as Morale
21	Welfare and Recreation ("MWR") Programs. The Army provides these programs to soldiers
22	wentare and recordation (191 wrec) riograms. The runny provides these programs to solutors,
23	their families, retirees, and in certain circumstances, to the Army Reserve and the National
24	Guard forces. Tr. at 5:19-20 (Oct. 10, 2016) (Boone). The MWR Programs at Fort Huachuca
25	include a shooting range, riding stable, bowling alley, arts and crafts, an annual rodeo, an
∠o 27	annual football training event, and a desert golf course. Tr. at 5:15-18, 20-21 (Oct. 10, 2016)
28	(Boone); Oct. 7, 2016, at 196:21-197:25 (Boone); Tr. at 5:27, 29 (Oct. 10, 2016) (Boone). 9

Each one of these activities receives its water from the Fort's potable water system supplied by its wells pumping groundwater.<sup>1</sup>

3 Colonel Boone, as the Garrison Commander assigned to Fort Huachuca, testified that 4 the MWR Programs offered at the Fort maximize the readiness of the soldiers. Tr. at 5:66-67 5 (Oct. 10, 2016) (Boone). Colonel Boone explained the concept of "readiness" as follows: 6 7 "The simple point of readiness is that an individual soldier and organization is prepared to do 8 their mission. And when we talk about it lately, it's readiness to deploy. And as the Army has 9 been forced to get smaller, we need every soldier to be capable of deploying. And if my job, 10 my job in the case as an operations officer, as an intelligence officer, am I physically ready 11 12 to go, am I mentally ready to go, is my family prepared for me to deploy to Iraq, Afghanistan, 13 or fill in the blank. Is my organization trained or is our equipment ready or is our equipment 14 up to snuff, so - or up to standard and prepared. So that's kind of the total entirety of how we 15 look at readiness." Tr. at 4:198 (Oct. 6, 2016) (Boone). Colonel Boone testified that, as of 16 17 the end of his tenure as Garrison Commander, he had achieved the goal of selecting MWR 18 programs that maximized readiness. Tr. at 5:67 (Oct. 10, 2016) (Boone).

1

2

The United States called Dr. Richard Fafara to testify about the MWR Programs. Dr. Fafara is a management analyst in the Army's Operations Directorate who has completed post-doctorate work focused on program evaluation, survey methodologies, and sociology. Tr. at 5:181-85 (Oct. 10, 2016) (Fafara); Ex. 55, at 1-2. Dr. Fafara's work involves analysis

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> The golf course uses potable water for purposes such as consumption and bathrooms. It 26 does not use potable water for irrigation. Non-potable water used for irrigation is discussed 27 separately below. The discussion of water uses for MWR Programs excludes the use of non-potable water for irrigation. 28

of the Army's MWR and family support programs, including gathering data and participating 1 in studies related to the Army's MWR Programs and the efficacy of the programs to advance 2 3 military readiness and contribute to retention of the soldiers. Tr. at 5:190 (Oct. 10, 2016) 4 (Fafara). He testified that the MWR Programs are designed and offered to assure that the 5 soldiers are committed to and ready to carry out the Army's mission. Tr. at 5:197 (Oct. 10, 6 2016) (Fafara). Dr. Fafara pointed to two Army studies, "Morale, Welfare, and Recreation 7 8 Programs and Mission" and "Groundbreaking Study Confirms Army Morale, Welfare, and 9 Recreation Programs Linked to Soldier Readiness and Retention," that demonstrated a direct 10 link between the usage of MWR Programs and soldier readiness and retention. Tr. at 5:194-11 96 (Oct. 10, 2016) (Fafara); see also Ex. 55, at 3-4. In light of these studies and others, Dr. 12 13 Fafara opined that there "is a pretty impressive and significant body of research that expands 14 [sic] decades that demonstrates, using social science research and statistics, that the programs 15 really do have an effect on readiness and retention." Tr. at 6:66-67 (Oct. 11, 2016) (Fafara). 16 The State of Arizona began its argument to defeat a right to water necessary for the 17 18 MWR Programs by asserting that the purpose of the military is to fight and win the nation's 19 wars and the military purpose of Fort Huachuca is to train soldiers to operate unmanned aerial 20 systems. It urged the denial of federal reserved water rights for the challenged uses because 21 those uses are not necessary to accomplish its defined purpose of the reservation. While the 22 23 State of Arizona's characterization of the purposes of the United States armed forces, in 24 general, and Fort Huachuca, in particular, are undoubtedly true, those are not controlling with 25 respect to the determination of the federal reserved water right for Fort Huachuca. 26 27 28 11

In the proceedings prior to trial, the Court determined that the primary purpose for the 1 withdrawal and reservation of the land for the Fort was to provide for local and national 2 3 security. See Phase I Report; September 2011; MSJ Order at 5. The Court provided a more 4 nuanced explanation that the primary of military uses of water at the Fort are "not static and 5 include water rights required to satisfy contemporary, direct, indirect and quasi-municipal 6 7 needs that arise in conducting military and military-related functions important to local and 8 national security." September 2011 Order at 2. Accordingly, the purpose of Fort Huachuca 9 for which federal water rights may be found is not narrowly limited to only those uses directly 10 and exclusive focused on fighting and winning wars and training required to operate 11 Military uses include military and military-related functions unmanned aerial systems. 12 13 important to local and national security.

The State of Arizona next proposed an alternative definition of the primary purpose 15 drawn from a line of cases concerning the United States' immunity from damages for injuries 16 suffered by members of the armed forces. Feres v. United States, 340 U.S. 135 (1950). 17 18 Pursuant to the Feres doctrine, a suit against the United States arising from an injury suffered 19 by a member of the armed service is barred if the injury occurred during the course of an 20 activity incident to military service. Based on a case in which a court determined that the 21 Feres doctrine did not bar a claim for damages against the United States, the State of Arizona 22 23 argues that MWR Programs are not activities incident to miliary service and, consequently, 24 the United States cannot reserve water for their operation. 25

In support of its position, the State of Arizona cites *Regan v. Starcraft Marine, LLC*, 524 F.3d 627 (5<sup>th</sup> Cir. 2008). *Regan* considered whether the United States was immune from

28

a suit for injuries suffered by a soldier participating in a MWR boating program. The Regan
Court, after observing that the line of cases controlling determinations of activities incident
to military service are inconsistent and that the Feres doctrine requires fact-specific analysis
of a number of factors, summarized its view of the relevant decisions:
The people universal point of the secology of the fill of the secology of the secology of the second s
the further from uniquely military functions an activity may be, and
is the [immunity] bar.
<i>Id.</i> at 645.
In Regan, the injury occurred off-base. Here, all activities, by definition, occur on
base because the United States has limited its claim to water to be used on base. The Regan
Court ultimately concluded that the recreational boating activity was not a uniquely military
function. It did not establish a bright-line rule regarding the extent to which MWR Programs
constitute an integral component of military readiness. A subsequent case, also decided by
the Fifth Circuit Court of Appeals, found that paintball game held on a "fun day" on a military
base was a military function and, therefore, the United States was immune from suit.
Chandler v. United States, 713 F. App'x 251 (5th Cir. 2017).
The courts, in the context of cases involving personal injuries suffered in MWR
Programs, have recognized that MWR Programs can improve the performance of the military
mission. See, e.g., Hass v. United States, 518 F.2d 1138, 1141(4th Cir. 1975) ("Recreational
activity provided by the military can reinforce both morale and health and thus serve the
overall military purpose."). The Ninth Circuit Court of Appeals held that recreational
canoeing was incident to military service. Bon v. United States, 802 F.2d 1092 (9th
Cir.1986); see also, Costo v. United States, 248 F.3d 863, 867 (9th Cir. 2001) (MWR rafting

program was an activity incident to military service); Pringle v. United States, 208 F.3d 1220 1 ) (10<sup>th</sup> Cir., 2000) (fight at a recreational night club on base was incident to military service); 2 3 Keisel v. Buckeye Donkey Ball, Inc., 311 F. Supp. 370 (E.D.Va. 1970) (donkey riding during 4 a ballgame sponsored by the Special Services division of a naval air station was incident to 5 military service). The decision in Regan cannot be read as establishing the black letter law 6 urged by the State of Arizona that the activities provided by MWR Programs, such as the 7 8 annual rodeo, are not incident to military service. The relevant analysis here, however, does 9 not involve the factual and legal factors that affect the extent of the federal government's 10 sovereign immunity under the Feres doctrine. As stated above, the relevant test is whether 11 the contested use is a contemporary, direct, indirect and quasi-municipal use that arises in 12 13 conducting military and military-related functions important to local and national security.

The State of Arizona moved beyond redefining the primary purpose of the reservation 15 to argue that the challenged water uses constitute secondary uses that cannot be supplied by 16 17 federal reserved water rights. State of Arizona Closing at 6. In United States v. New Mexico, 18 the source of the primary-secondary purpose rule, the Court held that Congress intended to 19 reserve water to conserve the water flows and to furnish a continuous supply of timber. It 20 considered the government's proposed purposes of its claimed federal reserved water rights 21 to "maintain a minimum instream flow for aesthetic, environmental, recreational, and 'fish' 22 23 purposes" and rejected them as secondary to the Congressional primary purposes and 24 inconsistent with the overall goal of "enhancing the quantity of water that would be available 25 to the settler of the arid West." 438 U.S. at 704, 713. 26

27

28

14

1	The Idaho Supreme Court applied this primary-secondary test and the New Mexico
2	reasoning in United States v. State of Idaho, 23 P.3d 117 (2001). It evaluated the United
3	States' claims for federal reserved water rights to the Snake River for islands located in the
4 5	river that had been withdrawn from the public domain. The court found that the purpose of
6	the island reservation was to create a sanctuary for migratory birds to protect them from
7	hunters and trappers. It determined that this primary purpose did not include an implied
8	reservation of any water: "Without water there would be no island, but there would be a
9 10	sanctuary as defined by the Migratory Bird Conservation Act." 23 P.3d at 126. The court
11	characterized and rejected the United States' claims for federal reserved rights to water to
12	support the island riparian habitat, maintain open water around the islands, and provide
13	isolation from predators as secondary purposes. Like the New Mexico Court, the Idaho
14	Supreme Court concluded that the purposes advanced by the United States were inconsistent
15 16	with the primary purpose and with Congressional intentions with respect to management of
17	the river water:
18	If the Court were to adopt the position of the United States, the Court
19	would have to find that the water intended to be stored and regulated by colossal federal projects for the past 98 years would now be
20	subordinated to the need to preserve water for the islands. The historical context of the designations and the language of the
21	reservations rebuts the position of the United States
22	of the dust bowl years, intended to give preference to waterfowl or
24	any other migratory bird, over people.
25	1d. at 128.
26	In the general adjudication of the Big Horn River System, the Supreme Court of
27	Wyoming applied the primary-secondary purpose test to evaluate the purposes for reservation
28	15
11	

of the land for the tribes of the Wind River Reservation. In re Gen. Adjudication of All Rts. 1 to Use Water in the Big Horn River Sys., 753 P.2d 76 (Wyo. 1988), aff'd sub nom. Wyoming 2 3 v. United States, 492 U.S. 406 (1989). The United States sought federal reserved water rights 4 for domestic, agricultural, livestock, mining, fisheries, and wildlife purposes. Using the New 5 Mexico terminology, the Big Horn Court concluded that agriculture was the primary purpose 6 of the reservation and livestock, mining, fisheries, and wildlife purposes were secondary 7 8 purposes. Unlike the decisions in New Mexico and State of Idaho, the Big Horn Court did 9 not find and did not reject the secondary purposes as being inconsistent with the primary 10 purpose. Instead, the court rejected the secondary purposes because it found that those uses 11 were not intended at all based upon the language of the governing treaty and the evidence 12 13 introduced at trial. Notably it did approve federal reserved water rights for municipal, 14 domestic, and commercial uses because "[d]omestic and related use has traditionally been 15 subsumed in agricultural reserved rights. Id. at 99. 16

As demonstrated by the cases discussed above, as well as other decisions such as 17 18 United States v. Adair, 723 F.2d 1394 (9th Cir. 1983) and Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla 19 Indians v. Coachella Valley Water Dist., 849 F.3d 1262 (9th Cir. 2017) that have used the 20 primary-secondary test as a guideline, the courts broadly define the primary purpose. In New 21 Mexico the primary purpose was generally defined as "securing favorable conditions of water 22 23 flows," and furnishing "a continuous supply of timber." In Big Horn, the primary purpose 24 was agriculture which the court construed to incorporated domestic, municipal, and 25 commercial uses. A primary purpose is not so narrowly defined as envisaged by the State of 26 Arizona. It does not impose an obligation on the courts to minutely examine specific uses 27

28

within a general category of a water use, such as a military use, and characterize those uses as primary or secondary uses. The New Mexico Court did not identify certain species of trees in its definition of approved water rights. The Big Horn Court did not establish an agricultural water right by reference to permitted and disallowed crops. The Court is not required in this case to delve into specific water uses on the Fort to parse whether water for a military purpose can be used for drinking while in training, in the barracks, or in an office but 8 not at the Fort's bowling alley or shooting range.

9 The State of Arizona relied upon the testimony of Major General Michael T. McGuire, 10 the Adjutant General for the State of Arizona and Director of the Arizona Department of 11 Emergency and Military Affairs, to establish that the water for MWR Programs are secondary 12 13 purposes of the reservation. Major General McGuire stated that the MWR Programs fall 14 within a budgetary category he called "mission enhancement," which includes items such as 15 gym equipment, as opposed to another category that covers expenses incurred by the military 16 as "mission essential," such as boom operator training and ground fuel. Tr. at 16:50-52 (Feb. 17 18 9, 2017) (McGuire). He further testified that base operating and overhead costs, equipment 19 for soldiers, specialized training gear and equipment specific to an installation are mission 20 essential costs. Tr. at 16:51-52 (Feb. 9, 2017) (McGuire). He appeared to consider the MWR 21 Program that provides childcare necessary to fulfill the military mission. Id. at 57. According 22 23 to Major General Maguire's testimony, the military distinguishes between mission 24 enhancement and mission essential items to prioritize military expenses. Tr. at 16:54 - 55 25 (Feb. 9, 2017) (McGuire). 26

27

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

In the context of ascertaining water rights, the assignment of different budgetary 1 priorities to a military use does not differentiate a primary purpose from a secondary purpose 2 3 of a reservation. In New Mexico and State of Idaho, the secondary uses were determined to 4 be affirmatively inconsistent with the primary purpose of the reservation. There is no 5 evidence that operations which are mission enhancements are inconsistent with the military 6 purpose for which the land was reserved. In Big Horn, the secondary uses, e.g., mining and 7 8 fisheries, were uses distinct from the primary agricultural use and not supported by the 9 language of the controlling documents. Using the State of Arizona's nomenclature, mission 10 enhancement activities and mission essential activities put the water to the same uses such as 11 drinking, cleaning, personal hygiene, and preparing foods. There is no distinct category of 12 13 water applicable to a mission enhancement activity that supports the characterization of a 14 MWR Program as a secondary use. 15

Based on empirical and methodologically sound studies and the testimony of Dr. Fafara and Colonel Boone, the MWR Programs that rely on potable water to meet the needs for uses such as drinking, personal hygiene, and food preparation, contribute to the readiness and retention of Army soldiers. These MWR Programs are consistent with the primarily purpose of the reservation of Fort Huachuca to conduct military and military-related functions and do not constitute a secondary purpose.

Freeport raises objections to another type of use for which the United States asserts
federal water rights. The United States filed Statement of Claimant 39-10775 to claim water
rights to 435 AFA from surface water sources. U.S. Closing at 30. Originally filed as a
claim under state law, the United States amended the Statement of Claimant to change the

28

legal basis to a claim under federal law. U.S. SOF 4. In its Closing Statement, the United States informed the Court that: "It is unknown, however, precisely how the 435 AFA was calculated." United States Closing at 30. It reported that none of the sources are gauged thereby preventing the collection of data to accurately quantify the surface water sources. *Id.* It speculates that the quantity of 435 AFA is the sum of all surface water sources on the Fort Huachuca base investigated by Arizona Department of Water Resources ("ADWR"), which included 122.5 AFA for the springs in Garden and Huachuca Canyons.

The United States claims the surface water in a number of springs and ponds for wildlife or game management purposes. Ex.1319 (13-19 of 68). It contends the game and wildlife management fulfills a military purposes because it facilitates hunting which is part of the Fort's MWR Programs. U.S. FOF 365; U.S. Closing at 14. As Freeport points out in its Closing Statement, the United States presented very little evidence about hunting at trial. Colonel Boone did not make the link between hunting and MWR Program. When asked on direct examination "[w]hy do you allow hunting on Fort Huachuca," Colonel Boone focused on the value of managing animal populations, not on any readiness or retention considerations. Freeport FOF 74. In its proposed Statement of Facts, the United States simply makes the general statement that "[t]o hunt game and wildlife, they must have water." U.S. SOF 184. Based on the evidence offered, game and wildlife management is intended precisely as Colonel Boone described and not as a MWR Program.

Freeport argues that the United States is not entitled to a federal reserved water right for game and wildlife management because this use is a secondary and not a primary purpose of the reservation. In both the *New Mexico* and the *State of Idaho* decisions, the courts rejected

the United States' claims for federal water rights, brought decades after the initial reservation, 1 2 for environmental purposes because no intent existed at the time of the reservation to elevate 3 the environment generally and fish and waterfowl specifically over the agricultural and 4 domestic water needs of the people in the area. The same reasoning applies in this case. The 5 intent of the reservation of Fort Huachuca was for military use and the available, accessible 6 water was to be used for military and military-related purposes. Camp Huachuca was first 7 8 established at the base of the Huachuca Mountains in March 1877, at the mouth of Huachuca 9 Canyon, due in part to the availability of good water for the soldiers and their horses. No 10 intent existed to reserve significant amounts of water for wildlife that would have 11 subordinated the interests of the military personnel and livestock. The primary purpose was 12 13 to support military personnel and their livestock; it was not to preserve the environment and 14 protect wildlife. The Court finds that wildlife and game management/ hunting are secondary 15 purposes for which water must be obtained under state law. No federal reserved water right 16 will attach to claims asserted in SOC 39-10775 for game and wildlife management. 17

18

19

28

# B. Minimum Use

As its second argument to foreclose a federal right to water to support the MWR Programs supplied by potable groundwater, the State of Arizona claimed that the United States did not provide evidence at trial of the minimum quantity of water required to meet Fort Huachuca's military purpose. It argued that the minimum amount of water must be an amount less than the amount pumped because no reduction is made for the MWR Programs. Under controlling law, the amount of water subject to a federal reserved water right must be quantified as the least amount necessary to accomplish the federal purpose. *Cappaert v.*  1

United States, 426 U.S. at 141. The minimal needs standard found in Cappaert requires that the Court examine the Fort's MWR Programs on a more granular level to determine whether the water use associated with the Fort's MWR Programs represents the minimal amount of water necessary. Each of the MWR Programs to which the State of Arizona objects will be addressed.

Fort Huachuca runs a Sportsman Center that maintains gun, archery, and paintball ranges for personal use by active duty members and their dependents, military retirees, and in certain circumstances, members of the National Guard and the U.S. Army Reserve (collectively DOD ID card holders). Colonel Boone testified that "many military members shoot, many members own weapons or bows, so we needed to provide a safe place for them." Tr. at 5:17-18 (Oct. 10, 2016) (Boone). Water is provided at the Sportsman Center and in surrounding area for drinking and restrooms. Tr. at 10:118-119 (Oct. 18, 2016) (Mulhearn). The Fort operates a 12-lane bowling alley, which also has a dinner and party room. Tr. at 5:27-29 (Oct. 10, 2016) (Boone). A Craft Center offers a variety of MWR Programs that provide a summer camp for dependent children, and embroidery, pottery, and painting activities for DOD ID card holders. Tr. at 5:15, 16, 20 (Oct. 10, 2016) (Boone). Each program requires water to meet the participant's personal uses such as restrooms and drinking. Id. at 18, 105. The people who live and work on the base or live off the base but work on the base require water for daily personal use. Supplying water to them at the 24 Sportsman Center, the bowling alley or the Crafts Center rather than in their homes, barracks, 25 offices or other workplaces has little effect the amount of water claimed. These programs 26

27

have a negligible impact on the amount of water that would otherwise be required to operate
 Fort Huachuca in the absence of the MWR Programs.

3

The State of Arizona objected to the operation of the golf course. Potable water for 4 which the federal government seeks a reserved water right is used at the golf course, like at 5 the MWR Programs discussed in the preceding paragraph, to provide for bathrooms and 6 drinking water. Tr. at 5:25 (Oct. 10, 2016) (Boone). The material quantities of water used 7 8 to irrigate the golf course, as opposed to the insignificant amounts to provide for the personal 9 needs of the golfers, are provided by effluent. The Fort generates effluent from its treatment 10 of sewage generated on the base from water originally pumped as groundwater. Tr. at 5:85 11 (Oct. 10, 2016) (Boone); Tr. at 11:166-67 (Oct. 19, 2016) (Runyon); Tr. at 3:159 (Oct. 5, 12 13 2016) (Borer). Determining the minimum amount of water needed to irrigate the golf course 14 is a moot point. The United States does not seek a federal reserved water right to groundwater 15 or surface water to irrigate the golf course. No federal reserved water right will attach to any 16 water to irrigate the golf course. 17

18 The State of Arizona additionally objected to two MWR Programs that are annual 19 events held at Fort Huachuca. State of Arizona Closing at 9, 11. The Fort hosts the University 20 of Arizona Wildcats football team to a dinner with the soldiers. Tr. at 5:41-45 (Oct. 10, 2016) 21 (Boone). Water use by guests at a dinner are insignificant. The Fort also holds a rodeo once 22 23 a year at the Wren Arena in conjunction with a local riding club. Tr. at 5:39-46, 168-172 24 (Oct. 10, 2016) (Boone). Water use at the Fort's annual rodeo at Wren Arena is for personal 25 uses by the participants, some dust control, and for the livestock that are brought on to the 26

- 27
- 28

post for the event. Tr. at 3:136-137 (Oct. 6, 2016) (Borer). Again, the amounts of water used
 for this MWR Program are negligible.

3 The State of Arizona also objected to three facilities, only one of which can be 4 considered to be a part of a MWR Program. The first facility is the Buffalo Corral Riding 5 Stables which boards 50 to 60 horses kept on Fort Huachuca, for B Troop, B Troop, 4th 6 7 Cavalry, "is a ceremonial troop that supports parades and changes of command and things 8 like that, purely ceremonial. The Buffalo Corral is also open to DOD ID card holders who 9 can use the "is a recreational unit for soldiers and their families - and folks that have MWR 10 benefits to be able to go out and do 24 personal riding." Tr. at 4:20-23 (Oct. 7, 2016) (Borer). 11 12 The horses are also available for trail rides, and it also provides a place for soldiers to board 13 their private horses. Tr. at 5:18 (Oct. 10, 2016) (Boone). The two other facilities provide 14 temporary lodging for soldiers and can also be used by DOD ID card holders when space is 15 avaiable. Tr. at 3:125-128, 135 (Oct. 6, 2016) (Borer). The two facilities are a hotel and a 16 site providing a place for 56 recreational vehicles (RVs) to park and access water and 17 18 electricity. Tr. at 5:21-23 (Oct. 10, 2016) (Boone). Each facility provides water for 19 consumption, bathing, and bathrooms. None of these three facilities includes any water 20intensive uses. 21

The low water use associated with the MWR Programs and facilities to which the State of Arizona has lodged objections is reflected in the total annual potable water use on the base. The Fort's per capita water use rate is among the lowest in Arizona. Tr. at 10:15 (Feb. 8, 2017) (Burtell). The potable water used by the Fort from its groundwater pumping operations to operate its MWR Programs and the lodging facilities satisfies the minimal need standard.

28

Freeport raised the minimum use requirement in its opposition to the United States' 1 claims for surface water for firefighting, land navigation training, and recreation. Freeport 2 3 contends that the United States failed to prove at trial that a precise quantity of water from a 4 specific source was the minimum amount needed to fulfill its stated purpose. Freeport 5 Closing at 13. The United States, as the claimant, bears the burden of demonstrating the 6 specific quantity of water sufficient to fulfill the purposes of the reservation of Fort Huachuca. 7 8 Arizona v. California, 460 U.S. 605, 620 (1983); Gila V, 201 Ariz. at 312 ¶14 (2001). It must 9 present evidence that allows the Court to base its decision on a solid factual record and craft 10 a decree with sufficient precision so that when the United States acts to protect or enforce 12 those rights, an appropriately tailored remedy can be formulated.

13 The United States did not offer any data into evidence at trial as to the amount of 14 surface water needed for recreational use. It offered the bare representation that "Fort 15 Huachuca has hiking trails and picnic areas in Huachuca and Garden Canyons, and a picnic 16 area next to the pond where the Lakeside Officer's Club used to be, which is used for parties, 17 18 organization day events, etc." Tr. at 5:36-37, 173-174 (Oct. 10, 2016) (Boone).

With respect to uses of surface water for firefighting, the United States did not call 20 any witness who had personal knowledge about any specific quantity of water used from a 21 surface water source to suppress a fire. Oct. 17 Trans. 112:8-15 (Mulhern); Oct. 18 Trans. 22 23 79:25-80:611 (Mulhern). It did offer testimony that the Forest Service will carry water 24 buckets under its aircraft that it can dip into the Fort's surface water sources for use in its 25 firefighting mission. U.S. SOF 342. This statement provides no information about source 26

27

28

11

19

or quantity. It did not present evidence as to the quantities used, or the quantification of any
amount needed to fulfill its stated purposes.

2 3

The United States also claimed surface water for land navigation training with its 4 assertion that "some surface water sources on Fort Huachuca are used in the Fort's land 5 navigation courses." U.S. SOF 363. Colonel Boone testified that Tinker Pond is the pond on 6 Fort Huachuca that is used during land navigation courses. Tr. at 5:148 (Oct. 10, 2016) 7 8 (Boone). He offered his opinion that that, based on his experience with the surface water 9 supplies at Fort Huachuca, Tinker Pond probably only contains water during the monsoon 10 season, and is dry throughout the rest of the year. Tr. at 5:150 (Oct. 10, 2016) (Boone). Fort 11 Huachuca, however, does not cancel the land navigation course when Tinker Pond is dry. Tr. 12 13 at 5:150 (Oct. 10, 2016) (Boone). Colonel Boone explained that soldiers can use Tinker Pond 14 as a reference point regardless of whether it contains water. Id. The Court finds that water 15 from Tinker Pond is not necessary to meet the primary purposes of the reservation because it 16 is claimed for game management and not for land navigation purposes. The United States 17 18 has not satisfied its burden of proof to establish a quantity of water from surface water sources 19 sufficient to establish a federal reserved water right to those sources. No federal reserved 20 water rights shall attach to those claims set forth in Statement of Claimant 39-10775. This 21 decision does not preclude the United States to asserting those claims under state law. 22

23

24

# IV. Quantification of Water Subject to a Federal Reserved Water Right

The amount of water necessary to accomplish the military purposes of Fort Huachuca requiring potable water primarily depends upon the number of people necessary to accomplish the direct, indirect, and quasi-municipal needs that arise in conducting military

and military-related functions important to local and national security. The United States claimed 6,952 AFA for potable uses based on calculations of the amount of water needed by its actual or expected population to accomplish the military purposes of the Ft. Huachuca during three time periods.

The first calculation relies on data obtained from current water uses on Fort Huachuca. The second calculation assumes a future expansion of operations with a corresponding increase in a demand for water. The determination has already been made that the federal reservation of water for military uses is "not static and includes water rights required to satisfy contemporary, direct, indirect and quasi-municipal needs that arise in conducting military and military-related functions important to local and national security." September 2011 Order at 2. The third calculation anticipates a substantial increase personnel to respond to a national emergency or a total mobilization of the United States' armed forces to fight a war that will cause a short-term increased demand for water during the total mobilization time period. 

The United States called Joel Degner, a Water Resource Engineer, who holds a
Bachelor of Science in hydrological science, to explain each calculation. He testified that he
used the same methodology to calculate the water needs for each of the three time periods.
Mr. Degner determined that the amount of water necessary to accomplish the military
purposes of the Fort Huachuca could be quantified by multiplying the Effective Population<sup>2</sup>

 <sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> As discussed below, the Fort's Effective Population is the Fort's population adjusted to
 reflect that a portion of the population lives and works on-base, another portion works on base but
 does not live on base, and yet another component of the population works part-time on the base but
 does not live on the base.

1	of the For	t by water use in gallons p	per capita per day for	each of the relevant t	ime periods.	
2	See Table 1. The parties disputing the United States' claim do not contest its basic					
3	methodology to determine Fort Huachuca's current and future water needs Calculations					
4	presented	hy Freeport were also has	ad an an analysis of th	o Effectivo De milatio	14. 1. 1	
5	presented	by Precipit were also base		e Effective Populatio	n multiplied	
6	by a gallo	ns per capita per day amou	unt. Tr. at 15:104 (Feb	o. 8, 2017) (Burtell);	Tr. at 8:140-	
7	142 (Oct.	13, 2016) (Runyon). The	United States' method	ology to calculate the	e quantity of	
8	water clair	med is a reasonable meth	odology for determin	ing Fort Huachuca's	current and	
9	future wat	erneeds				
10						
11		Fort Huach	uica Consumptive Wat	er Need	_ (	
12						
13		Categories of Population	No. of Personnel	Water Need (AFA)		
14			Current			
15		Effective Population	10,447	1,138		
		Ex	pansion (Long-Term)			
16		Effective Population	11,229	1,222		
10		Mission Expansion (BRAC or other growth)	3,000	326		
10		Total Expansion	14,229	1,548		
17		Total N	Appilization (Short-Ter	(		
20		Two Infantry Divisions	38,000	4,132		
21		Additional Students	11 700	1 272	-	
22	: - -		10,700	1,272		
23		l otal Mobilization	49,700	5,404		
24		Tot	al Future Water Needs			
25		Expansion	14,229	1,548		
26		Total Mobilization	49,700	5,404		
27		Total Future Need	63,929	6,952		
28	Table	21				
			.27			

3

25

26

27

28

#### A. Quantifying Current Uses

#### 1. Background

4 The current amount of water used by the Fort exceeds its historical use. The United 5 States called Scott Miltenberger, a professional historian who holds a doctorate in American 6 History, to testify about the Fort's historical military functions, water use, and associated 7 populations. Ex. 229. During the first four decades of its operation, Fort operations required 8 9 about 20 AFA. Over the succeeding years, water use increased as the Fort's population grew. 10In the years leading up to the United States' engagement in World War II, the Fort's 11 population grew from about 1,300 in 1940 to more than 5,000 as the Army expanded the 12 facilities so the Fort could serve as a training center and constructed Libby Army Airfield. 13 14 Ex. 231 at 39:7-9 and 82:1-23 and fn. 219 (Miltenberger); Tr. at 14:124-125 (Feb. 7, 2017) 15 (Burtell). A great deal of time and effort was spent by the parties to fix the maximum 16 population of the base for a very short period of time during World War II. Considering all 17 the evidence on the maximum population of Fort Huachuca during World War II, the Court 18 19 finds that the precise number cannot be determined, but the population likely ranged between 20 25,000 and 40,000 personnel. U.S. SOF 54. Following World War II, demobilization and 21 de-population occurred quickly at Fort Huachuca. By June 1946, Fort Huachuca had a 22 caretaker staff of only 125 personnel (with a full population of 400, dependents included). 23 Ex. 231 at 84:31-32, 85: 11-13 (Miltenberger). 24

With the outbreak of the Korean War, Fort Huachuca became a training site for aviation units with a population of about 10,300 people for the 1951-1952 period. After the war, the population quickly dropped to about 100 people. Tr. at 1:150 (Oct. 3, 2016)

(Miltenberger); Ex. 231 at 55:6-56. In 1954, the Army selected Fort Huachuca to serve as 1 the Army's electronic proving ground because the physical aspects of the landscape provide 2 3 an area free of electronic interference. Ex. 231 at 55:6-56: Tr. at 1:86 (Miltenberger); Ex. 4 382. According to Dr. Miltenberger, when Fort Huachuca assumed the role as a training and 5 testing ground for the latest in electronics technology it was transformed into a large, 6 permanent highly technical facility for operations and training of American military 7 8 personnel." Ex. 231 at 70:11-12 (Miltenberger). Over the next few years, the Army 9 rehabilitated existing structures, built hundreds of new houses, barracks, and other quarters 10 on post, and constructed technical buildings, testing buildings and laboratories, a Field House 11 (recreational facility), shop facilities, and extension of utilities and work on roads. Ex. 231 at 12 13 87:8-90:2 (Miltenberger). During this period, increased numbers of military family members 14 resided at the Fort. Tr. at 1:152 (Oct. 3, 2016) (Miltenberger). From 1954 to 1968, Fort 15 Huachuca's population expanded rapidly to over 7,000 in 1955; 11,000 in 1958; over 13,000 16 in 1960; a slight dip to about 11,000 in 1962 and 12,000 in 1963, and then a rise to about 17 18 13,000 again in 1965; 16,000 in 1967; and, 19,000 in 1968. Ex. 231 at 87:22-24, 95, Table 19 "Fort Huachuca Population Statistics, 1951-1989," and Summary Table (Miltenberger). 20 Through the 1970s and early 1980s, Fort Huachuca continued to add or reorganize units and 21 missions, related to communications, electronics, military intelligence, and other 22 23 responsibilities reaching a population ranging between about 15,000 to 18,000. Tr. at 1:152 24 (Oct. 3, 2016) (Miltenberger). During that time, the Fort's water use expanded from about 25 1,371 AFA in 1956, to about 3,300 AFA in the 1970s. Ex. 231, Summary Table 26 (Miltenberger); Ex. 20 at 3 (Burtell). 27

28

Between 1982 and 1993, the Fort continued to pump about 3,000 AFA, ranging from 1 a low of 2,469 AFA in 1987 to a high of 3,207 AFA in 1989. Ex. 20 at Table 6 (51 of 247). 2 3 Beginning in the early 1990s, Fort Huachuca was involved in the mobilization of troops for 4 Operations Desert Shield and Desert Storm, including the post's 11th Signal Brigade, the 5 Arizona National Guard's 2220th Transportation Company, and other Reserve and National 6 Guard units. Ex. 231 at 64:31-65:6 (Miltenberger). In 1993, the Fort pumped 3,029 AFA. 7 8 9 2. **Current Use** 10 11 The United States marks the terrorist attacks on September 11, 2001, as the start of the 12 current era of the Fort's history. As explained by Dr. Miltenberger: "The evolution of Ft. 13 Huachuca's mission profile since the 1990s left it uniquely situated for the new challenges of 14 the 21st Century - most clearly manifested in the military operations that followed in the wake 15 16 of the terrorist attacks of September 11, 2001." Ex. 231 at 66:14-17 (Miltenberger); Tr. at 17 1:144-145, 153-154 (Oct. 3, 2016) (Miltenberger). 18

The growth over the past decades has resulted in the construction of additional 19 barracks, headquarters buildings, physical training fields, dining facilities, parking lots and 20 21 affiliated infrastructure. Tr. at 3:146-148 (Oct. 6, 2016) (Borer). As of 2015, there were 22 about 1,050 single family homes and 18 barracks facilities with approximately 4,800 barracks 23 rooms. Tr. at 3:125-128, 135 (Oct. 6, 2016) (Borer). Currently, only active-duty military 24 personnel and their families live in single family housing on Fort Huachuca. Tr. at 3:148 25 26 (Oct. 6, 2016) (Borer); Tr. at 5:108-112 (Oct. 10, 2016) (Boone). The base also provides 27 buildings and for: (1) two elementary schools, the middle school, and the satellite college 28

campuses; (2) the playgrounds and public picnic areas; (3) the medical clinic, dental clinic, 1 and wellness center; (4) the post exchange; (5) the grocery store; (6) the commissary; (7) the 2 3 gas stations and their associated convenience stores; (8) a separate, freestanding convenience 4 store; (9) two banks; (10) two fitness centers; (11) the post office; (12) the thrift store; (13) 5 two places of worship; and (14) the cemetery. Groundwater is used at Fort Huachuca by the 6 people living and working on the base for washing, bathing, cleaning, consuming, and 7 8 cooking. Tr. at 147:8-18, (Oct. 19, 2016) (Higgins). The base has a swimming pool used 9 for military training, fitness, and recreation. It also has a hydrant system that transports water 10for firefighting and minor fire suppression. Tr. at 4:152-153 (Oct. 7, 2016) (Boone). Water 11 is used to wash aircraft. Tr. at 4:153 (Oct. 7, 2016) (Boone). 12 13 Mr. Tom Borer, the former Deputy Garrison Commander of Fort Huachuca, described 14 the day-to-day operations and maintenance of the Fort infrastructure including water use. Tr. 15 at 3:105 (Oct. 6, 2016) (Borer). The Fort Huachuca Garrison is akin to a city manager's 16 office, with a Department of Public Works that includes engineering, housing, human 17 18 resources, and emergency services. Ex. 231 at 96:13-15 (Miltenberger); Tr. at 3:113-136 19 (Oct. 6, 2016) (Borer); Tr. at 4:98 (Oct. 7, 2016) (Boone). Mr. Borer testified that numerous 20 water conservation and mitigation efforts have been implemented on base. Tr. at 3:154 (Oct. 21 6, 2016) (Borer). It has installed low flow dishwashers, toilets that use 1.28 gallons per flush, 22 23 low-flow shower heads, waterless urinals, replaced swamp coolers with air conditioners and 24 reduced outdoor water use. Tr. at 3:154, 165 (Oct. 5, 2016) (Borer); Tr. at 4:23, 174 (Oct. 6, 25

27

26

28

31

2016) (Boone); Tr. at 12:26 (Oct. 20, 2016) (Higgins). The Fort does not allow the residents

of individual houses on the base to have grass and has eliminated irrigated gardening plots.

Tr. at 3:154-155 (Oct. 5, 2016) (Borer). Artificial turf has replaced grass in the physical training fields and soccer fields. Tr. at 3:161-162 (Oct. 5, 2016) (Borer). The barracks, schools, and facility headquarters use xeriscaping rather than grass. Id. at 3:158 (Oct. 5, 2016) (Borer). Mr. Borer explained that "[t]he areas that have grass, it's natural grass. The only water it sees that-to my knowledge- is rainwater .... " Tr. at 3:159 (Oct. 5, 2016) (Borer). The Brown Parade Field is the only area irrigated by pumped groundwater. Tr. at 4:19, 30 (Oct. 6, 2016) (Borer).

Christopher Higgins, the Water Compliance Program Manager for Fort Huachuca, further testified that the Fort prioritizes leaks, and thus any water leak in the potable water system is quickly identified and fixed. Tr. at 12:27 (Oct. 20, 2016) (Higgins). As part of its conservation efforts, the Fort modernized its Barnes Field House pool to prevent unnecessary water use by recirculating water that spills into the gutters surrounding the surface area of the pool and closed its Grierson Pool due to leakage problems that were occurring at the pool. Tr. at 8:113-14 (Oct. 13, 2016) (Runyon); Ex. 21 341 at pdfp. 273. The Fort also operates an educational program known as Water Wise consumer awareness to encourage its population to actively conserve water. Tr. at 12:26-31 (Oct. 20, 2016) (Higgins). 

Fort Huachuca's annual groundwater pumping in the current years, which is the sole 1 2 source of potable water used on the base, is substantially lower than its historic pumping. Tr. 3 at 12:69 (Oct. 20, 2016) (Higgins); Ex.177; Ex.20, Table 6 (51 of 247). Mr. Higgins testified 4 that beginning in the early 2000s the amount of water pumped declined until 2012 when Fort 5 Huachuca pumped 6 Groundwater Pumped (acre-feet annually) 7 approximately 986 AFA. Tr. at Acre-Feet Pumped Annually 1600 8 1400 12:20 (Oct. 20, 2016) (Higgins). 1200 9 1000 See figure 1. In the succeeding 800 10 600 400 years, groundwater pumping has 11 200 0 12 gradually increased from the 2004 2006 2008 2010 2012 2014 2016 2018 Year 13 2012 low. Tr. at 12:19-20 (Oct. 14 Figure 1. Amount of groundwater pumped each year 2005-2016. 20, 2016) (Higgins). See also Sources: Tr. at 11:182-83 (Oct. 19, 2016) (Higgins); Ex. 115; Tr. at 15 12:4-13 (Oct. 20, 2016) (Higgins); Exhibits 115-124, at Part I; Exh. Ex. 177; Tr. at 12:20 (Oct. 20, 3022. 16 2016) (Higgins); Tr. at 13:109-17 18 10 (Feb. 6, 2017) (Degner); Tr. at 15:107 (Feb. 8, 2017) (Burtell); Ex. 124, at Part I. In 2016, 19 Fort Huachuca pumped approximately 1,117 AFA for its population of 10,447. Tr. at 14:137 20 (Feb. 7, 2017) (Burtell); Ex.3022. Tr. Ex.3022; Joint Pretrial Statement. 21 No party disputes the groundwater well data provided by the United States that 22 23 quantifies the amount of water pumped and used each year at Fort Huachuca. Liberty 24 explicitly recognized that "[t]he amount of water used by Fort Huachuca in recent years is 25 particularly well-established." Liberty Closing at 6. The United States calculated that the 26 average amount of groundwater pumped by the Fort for the period 2005 to 2014 was 1,138 27 28 33

AFA. Ex. 25 at A-6, Table 5 (Degner); Ex. 3022, Ex.115-124, 175, and 3022; Tr.11:180-184 (Oct.19, 2016) (Higgins); Tr. at 12:4-13 (Oct. 20, 2016) (Higgins).

No disputes, except those related to water use for the MWR Programs discussed above, exist regarding the quantification of Fort Huachuca's current use of groundwater. Freeport acknowledged that "Fort Huachuca's most recent pumping data represents the Fort's true minimal need because conservation measures have continued to affect the amount of groundwater withdrawals even in recent years." Freeport Closing at 26. *See also* Liberty Closing at 2. Thus, the United States is entitled to a federal reserved water right equal to no less than 1,138 AFA.

11

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

# 12

# 13

18

# **B.** Long-Term Expansion of Operations

The United States seeks federal reserved water rights to an additional amount of water to provide for future expansion. It contemplates a future use of 1,548 AFA for a future Effective Population of 14,229. Freeport and Liberty argue that long-term future use should be capped at 1,300 AFA.

The United States' claim for future use is based on a calculation of the daily use factor,
the gallons per capita per day, multiplied by the expected long-term population of the Fort.
The United States based its gallons per capita per day figure based on current use. Because
the Fort must provide water for people who work on the base but do not live on the base, an
accurate computation of the relevant population first requires a determination of the Fort's
Effective Population.

26

The United States called Donald Stadelman, an expert demographer, who holds a Ph.D. in economics to testify about the population at the Fort. Tr. at 15:13 (Feb. 6, 2017)

34.

(Stadelman); Ex. 3021. Dr. Stadelman defined the relevant population as "all military 1 members stationed at the post who reside either on-post or off-post, their dependents who 2 3 live on-post, the direct fulltime civilian employee and contractors who work on-post, and 4 half, the total number of part-time civilian and contractors assumed to work half-time on-5 post." Tr. at 13:22-23 (Feb. 6, 2017) (Stadelman); Ex. 370, at 2. This designated population 6 7 is intended to encompass all of the people who are typically present on the Fort during the 8 work week and exclude those who neither work nor live on the Fort (e.g., the dependents of 9 soldiers who do not live on the Fort). Tr. at 13:23-24 (Feb. 6, 2017) (Stadelman). The relevant 10 demographic group can be grouped into eight categories: (1) 1,684 active duty military 11 residing on the Fort; (2) 1,237 active duty military residing outside the Fort; (3) 2,843 military 12 13 students; (4) 2,940 military dependents who live on the Fort; (5) 3,008 civilians who are 14 employed by an Army agency on the Fort; (6) 4,171 contractors who are employed by an 15 Army agency on the Fort; (7) personnel employed by national security organizations; and (8) 16 524 personnel from other agencies and companies. Tr. at 13:29-33 (Feb. 6, 2017) 1718 (Stadelman); Ex. 370, at A-1.

19 Dr. Stadelman's calculation of the Fort's population began with the data obtained from 20the Fort's annual census. Tr. at 13:25 (Feb. 6, 7 2017) (Stadelman). He also conducted an 21 independent survey of the Fort's population to ascertain the percentage of the Fort's civilian 22 23 employees and contractors who were employed by more than one of the Fort's tenant 24 organizations. Tr. at 13:25-26 (Feb. 6, 2017) (Stadelman); Ex. 479. The Fort's annual census 25 necessitated this additional step because the census counted each employee in each mission, 26 so a simple summation of all contractors and employees in the missions could have resulted 27

28

in one or more people being counted more than once. Tr. at 13:25-26 (Feb. 6, 2017) 1 (Stadelman). Dr. Stadelman conducted his survey via e-mail using contact information 2 3 provided by the Fort and received a 52% response rate, which is considered a good response 4 rate. Tr. at 13:26 (Feb. 6, 2017) (Stadelman); Ex. 479. Dr. Stadelman's survey found that 5 approximately five percent of civilian and contractor employees work on two missions. As 6 a result, Dr. Stadelman applied a "correction factor" to the census population to account for 7 8 the double-counting issue. Tr. at 23 at 13:26-29 (Feb. 6, 2017) (Stadelman); Ex. 351, § 3.3 9 (pp. 4-5). He also reduced the number of part-time employees and contractors by half because 10 they were not present on the Fort for the entire work week. Id. Based on the data, survey 11 results, and adjustments, Dr. Stadelman determined that the population for 2005 and 2014 12 13 was, on average, 16,497. Tr. at 13:29-33 (Feb. 6, 2017) (Stadelman); Ex. 370, atA-1.

14 Mr. Degner used Dr. Stadelman's calculations and then further reduced the population 15 count to account for individuals who live off-Fort but work on-Fort because that population 16 only used water on the Fort for approximately one-third of the day. Tr. at 13:104-05 (Feb. 6, 17 18 2017) (Degner). He described his process as developing a formula that calculates "a third of 19 a commuter and adds that to the resident population to get to kind of a water use unit or an 20 effective population for the per capita use rate." Tr. at 13:104 (Feb. 6, 2017) (Degner). Mr. 21 Degner's methodology is not disputed by the parties. Tr. at 14:119-20 (Feb. 7, 2017) 22 23 (Burtell).

By correcting for the commuter population present on the Fort consuming water for
 only approximately one-third of the day, Mr. Degner was able to reach an "effective on-post
 population" that could be used to calculate the average per-person water use at the Fort. Tr.

28

at 13: 104-05 (Feb. 6, 2017) (Degner); Ex. 25, at A-1, A-6. 5 268. Of the total average 1 workday population of 16,497 for the Fort between 2005 and 2014, a total of 9,030 were 2 3 commuters who did not reside on the Fort. Tr. at 13:29-33 (Feb. 6, 2017) (Stadelman); Ex. 4 370, at A-2; Tr. at 13:106-07 (Feb. 6, 2017) (Degner); Ex. 25, 8 at A-6. 9 269. Therefore, to 5 reach the "effective on-post population," Mr. Degner multiplied the commuter population of 6 9,030 by the correction factor of 0.33 (which yields 2,980) and added the corrected commuter 7 8 population to the on-post population of 7,467. Tr. at 13:104-07 (Feb. 6, 2017) (Degner); Ex. 9 25, at A-6. This calculation results in a total "Effective Population" of 10,447 based on the 10 data during the ten years preceding Mr. Degner's calculations. Tr. at 13:104-107 (Feb. 6, 11 2017) (Degner); Ex. 25, at A-6. 15 b. 12

13 Calculating the Effective Population figure enabled Mr. Degner to determine the per 14 capita water use at the Fort. He divided the total volume of water pumped from the Fort's 15 eight production wells by the Effective Population. Tr. at 13:106-07 (Feb. 6, 2017) (Degner). 16 During the ten-year period preceding Mr. Degner's analysis, 2005 to 2014, the average on-17 18 post groundwater use was 1,138 AFA. Tr. at 13:106-07 (Feb. 6, 2017) (Degner). After 19 converting this figure from acre-feet per year to gallons per day, the result is "97 gallons per 20 capita per day for the Fort's effective population from 2005 to 2014." Id. at 13:107, 110-11. 21

A dispute exists between the parties regarding the appropriate number of years of data that should be used to calculate the average gallons per capita per day figure. The United States used ten years of data while Freeport calculated the average water use based on a fiveyear record. The five-year period of record, 2010-2014, results in an average gallon per capita per day of 95. Freeport reasoned that a five-year period was more appropriate because it

captured the years in which all of the conservation measures were fully operational and 1 eliminated higher-use years. A review of the record shows that the per capita use in 2007, a 2 3 year excluded from Freeport's data, equaled the per capita use 2014. Tr. at 15:104-05 (Feb. 4 8, 2017) (Burtell); Ex. 20, at pdfp. 51 (Table 6). Mr. Degner explained that it was appropriate 5 to use the prior ten years of population and groundwater production data to calculate the 6 gallons per capita per day figure, as opposed to a shorter time period such as five years. Tr. 7 8 at 13:109 (Feb. 6, 2017) (Degner). A longer period of record lessens the impact that a single 9 year of particularly unusual weather, use, or non-use has on the result. Id. at 13: 109-10. 10 Accordingly, the ten-year lookback period averaging 97 gallons per capita per day is a 11 reasonable basis on which to calculate future use. 12

13 The United States contends that its Effective Population will increase in the future by 14 an additional 729 and that the population at the Fort will also increase by another 3,000 15 personnel due to expansions in its assigned missions. Currently, Fort Huachuca's missions 16 focus on what the Army refers to as Command, Control, Communications, Computers and 17 18 Intelligence (C4I). It trains virtually every military intelligence soldier in the Army. U.S. 19 Closing at 28. Fort Huachuca's extensive and technologically advanced missions now involve 20 testing of electronic equipment, military intelligence training, Unmanned Aerial Systems 21 (UAS) training and operations, and support to the Army's communications networks. The 22 23 Fort's unmanned aerial systems activities and related mission have continued to experience 24 growth. Tr. at 3:145 (Oct. 5, 2016) (Borer). The Gray Eagle, an aerial system, recently had a 25 threefold increase in its mission that is expected to continue into the near future. Tr. at 4:141-26 27

38

42 (Oct. 6, 2016) (Boone). The Fort's student population has increased due to the Gray Eagle's
 mission activities. *Id.* at 4:142-43.

3

4

5

6

 $\overline{7}$ 

8

9

10

General McGuire also testified that there is "huge growth opportunity down at Fort Huachuca in the unmanned aerial systems area .... " Tr. at 16:73-74 (Feb. 9, 2017) (McGuire). Lieutenant General Ashley testified that the Fort's missions for testing devices for use in electronic warfare are "something that's going to be a growth area for us, because we're going to be investing more of that in the Fort structure in the future, and this [Fort Huachuca] is a great place to do it." Tr. at 7:131-32 (Oct. 12, 2016) (Ashley).

The State of Arizona challenges the assumption that a change in mission translates into a change in water use. It contends that the Fort has experienced a 67 percent decrease in water use during the same time period in which missions at the Fort have increased. State of Arizona Closing at 32. The State of Arizona's observation highlights the fact that the Fort used much greater amounts of water per person and demonstrates the importance of tying anticipated future use to an estimated future population and a use measured by the current 97 gallons per capita per day.

19 Historic precedent exists for the Fort's population increasing by several thousand or 20 more as a result of new missions relocating to the Fort. The relocation of the Electronic 21 Proving Ground to the Fort in 1954 increased the Fort's population by 7,000. Tr. at 2:36 22 23 (Oct. 4, 2016) (Miltenberger). The Electronic Proving Ground continues to be in operation. 24 Tr. at 2:34-35 (Oct. 4, 2016) (Miltenberger). Subsequently, the Army relocated the 11th 25 Signal Group from Fort Lewis, Washington to the Fort thereby increasing the Fort population 26 by 5,000 people. Tr. at 2:38-40 (Oct. 4, 2016) (Miltenberger); Ex.231 at 59. In 1967, the 27

Army relocated its Strategic Communications Command ("STRATCOM") to the Fort. Tr. at 2:40-42 (Oct. 4, 2016) (Miltenberger); Ex. 231, at 60. The arrival of STRATCOM brought 6,000 new troops to arrive at the Fort. Tr. at 2:41-42 (Oct. 4, 2016) 14 (Miltenberger); Ex. 391. In the early 1990s, the Army relocated its Intelligence School to the Fort. Tr. at 2:42 (Oct. 4, 2016) (Miltenberger).

Making an arguing similar to that raised by the State of Arizona, Freeport argues that historic data should not be used because it was "inflated by inefficient delivery systems and a lack of conservation measures." Freeport Closing at 29. Freeport is correct that the determination of future use in this case should not assume that historic infrastructure and conservation measures or lack thereof will be reinstated in the future. The United States, however, does not quantify its likely future use based on either historic infrastructure or conservation practices. It calculates the future quantity as a function of population that is multiplied by the 97 gallons per capita per day amount that was derived from groundwater pumping with modern infrastructure and conservation measures. 

Liberty and Freeport assert that 1,300 AFA, less than a 20 percent increase over the average use in the previous decade, is the minimum amount necessary to fulfill the Fort's foreseeable future uses accounting for increases in population and mission fluctuations. Freeport Closing at 29, Liberty Closing at 2. Liberty and Freeport contend that future use should be based on the Fort's estimate in its 2012 Community Water System Five-Year Update filed with Arizona Department of Water Resources. The 2012 Five-Year Update includes at Section F a "projected system population and projected demand" that sets forth the projected population and water use at the Fort for the years 2015, 2020, and 2030. Tr. at 

12:16-18 (Oct. 20, 2016) (Higgins); Ex.2 126, § F. Mr. Higgins, who prepared the form, 1 2 predicted that the same amount, approximately 1,032 AFA, for the same population would 3 be used in 2015, 2020, and 2030. Mr. Higgins testified that he completed the form based on 4 uses reported in recent years. Tr. at 12:71 (Oct. 20, 2016) (Higgins). He explained that the 5 prediction assumes no future changes in mission or change in population. Id. Mr. Higgins 6 testified that he had no basis to actually know whether the Fort's population would be 7 8 consistent, noting that "I'm not privy to knowing huge mission changes, meaning equates to 9 huge population shifts up or down," and therefore he "did not project any changes in mission 10 on the -you know, I don't have access to that." Id. at 12:17-18. 11

Colonel Boone testified that given the Fort's unique geography, restricted military 12 13 airspace and types of missions, it could grow to support additional missions through another 14 round of Base Realignment and Closure (BRAC). U.S. FOF 416-420; Tr. at 4:180-81 (Oct. 15 6, 2016) (Boone). The Army uses the BRAC procedure to "adjust military forces, military 16 missions, and consolidate things" by reducing infrastructure and related expenditures. Id. at 17 18 4:180. In the most recent BRAC process, the Department of the Army issued a report ranking 19 all Army installations in order of "military value" based upon, among other factors, the 20 installation's available physical space to grow. Tr. at 4:183-84 (Oct. 6, 2016) (Boone); Ex. 21 10. In this analysis, the Department of the Army ranked the Fort as 21 out of 97 installations 22 23 in terms of military value. Tr. at 4:184-85 (Oct. 6, 2016) (Boone); Ex. 10, at 23 53 (pdf p. 24 63); Tr. at 7:141 (Oct. 12, 2016) (Ashley). Colonel Boone explained that this ranking 25 signifies that the Fort is viewed by the Army as possessing high military value. Tr. at 5:60-26 61 (Oct. 10, 2016) (Boone); Ex. 2, at pdfp. 15. That value is due, in part, to the unique 27

attributes of the Fort's restricted airspace which has caused units to be transferred to the Fort from "other Army installations to Fort Huachuca to train, because they can't do - they can't fly enough or do enough training tasks where they're located." Tr. at 4:141 (Oct. 6, 2016) (Boone).

In the past, the Fort has received new missions and population increases as a result of 6 7 the BRAC process. Tr. at 2:42-43 (Oct. 4, 2016) (Miltenberger); Tr. at 7:141-42 6 (Oct. 12, 8 2016) (Ashley). When a mission is relocated as a result of the BRAC process, it generally is 9 a long-term relocation. Tr. at 7:177-78 (Oct. 12, 2016) (Ashley). By testifying that an 10 installation where he was previously stationed received a population increase of up to 5,000 11 individuals as a result of BRAC, Colonel Boone confirmed that increases resulting from the 12 13 BRAC process can be significant. Tr. at 4:181-82 (Oct. 6, 2016) (Boone); Ex. 9, at C-12 14 (pdfp. 12). Lieutenant General Ashley stated that in his opinion that a BRAC could cause the 15 Fort's population to grow by a "few hundred or even a few thousand more personnel." Tr. at 16 7:145-146 (Oct. 12, 2016) (Ashley). It is reasonable to conclude the Fort's current missions 17 18 will continue and could grow in the future and, as a result acquire additional personnel and 19 increase the minimum amount of water required to support the Fort.

Liberty contends that 1,300 AFA will suffice even if the Fort's population were to increase as the United States forecasts. Liberty points to the 2009 Effective Population of 17,804 to argue that changes in population do not necessarily result in changes in water use because the 2009 groundwater use was not more than 1,800 AFA as would be expected but was less than 1,300 AFA. Liberty Closing at 10-11. While Liberty's point is well-taken with respect to 2009, the observation simply reinforces the need to calculate future water

28

20

1

2

3

4

5

rights using an extended record of water use rather than a limited period of data or a single
 data point.

3 The third argument that Liberty and Freeport make in support of a 1,300 AFA 4 quantification draws from a 2007 groundwater model designed to assess the environmental 5 impact of the Fort's groundwater pumping through 2030. The Fort's hydrologist at the time, 6 Thomas Runyon, took the lead in selecting the assumed future groundwater pumping figure, 7 8 which was 1,300 AF per year. Tr. at 8:91-92 (Oct. 13, 2016) (Runyon); Tr. at 9:165-66 (Oct. 9 17, 2016) (Mulhern). Mr. Runyon explained that, in selecting the 1,300 AFA figure, he did 10 not coordinate with the Fort's military planners to determine the potential for future 11 population increases at the Fort, but instead "simply looked back at a ten-year period and 12 13 looked at the average pumping that occurred in that ten-year period, and we made an 14 assumption that we'll use that for moving forward in time." Tr. at 8:91-92 (Oct. 13, 2016) 15 (Runyon). 16

Like the form filed with ADWR, the input into the groundwater model was based 17 18 entirely on a short-term evaluation of immediate past use and an assumption of no future 19 change. Through the efforts of Dr. Miltenberger, it is clear that numerous external events 20 have affected the missions, operation and population of Fort Huachuca throughout the past 21 century. The past does not support an assumption of a static future. The experienced, senior 22 23 Army officers who testified about the future of Fort Huachuca made no assumptions that the 24 Fort's operations and missions would not change. To the contrary, they expected that 25 missions would change, and the population based at the Fort, a valuable base in the military 26 hierarchy, would grow by several thousand in the future operations of Fort Huachuca. The 27

28

United States has presented sufficient evidence to demonstrate that it is reasonably likely that its Effective Population will increase by approximately 3,700 or 36 percent in the future. Accordingly, it is appropriate that United States should be decreed federal reserved water rights to 1,548 AFA for military and military-related purposes for Fort Huachuca. **C. Short-Term Total Mobilization** 

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

#### 8 The United States claims a federal reserved water right to an additional 5,404 AFA of 9 groundwater to provide for a short-term Total Mobilization caused by a potential future 10 11 calamitous event. In support of this claim, the United States called as a witness David Koch, 12 the Director of the Directorate for Plans, Training, Mobilization and Security (DPTMS) at 13 Fort Huachuca. He defined Mobilization as "the process by which a portion or all of the 14 armed forces are brought to a state of readiness for entry into war, or other national 15 16 emergency, by activating all or part of the reserve components and assembling, organizing, 17 and preparing personnel for deployment or sustaining base support." Tr. at 6:155 (Oct. 11, 18 2016) (Koch). The short-term Total Mobilization envisioned by the Army would consist of 19 an influx of 38,000 personnel in an infantry division that could involve three to five Infantry 20 21 Brigade Combat Teams. This scenario also includes an increased student and support 22 personnel populations that would generate a short-term Effective Population of 49,700 that 23 would be in addition to the existing Fort population. The United States calculates that the 24 Total Mobilization population will require 5,404 AFA in addition to the 1,548 AFA need to 25 26 support the existing population at the time of the Total Mobilization. Joint Pretrial Statement 27 p. 10. The United States contends that as Fort Huachuca trains virtually every military 28

intelligence Soldier in the Army, it stands to reason that in the case of a Total Mobilization such as World War II, the Fort's training mission would increase substantially. U.S. Closing at 32.

4 The Objectors present a series of arguments focusing on the Fort's present status as 5 barriers to future deployment. One such status concerns deployment designations. 6 Installations tasked with deploying units are designated as Power Support Platforms or Power 7 8 Projection Platforms. A military base can be designated as a CONUS Replacement Center 9 ("CRC"), which means that it is more likely to process soldiers for deployment. Tr. at 8:32 10 (October 13, 2016) (Koch). In the past, Fort Huachuca had such deployment designations 11 but it is not currently designated as either. Freeport asserts that the lack of a deployment 12 13 designation decreases the chances that Fort Huachuca would receive troops in a mobilization 14 event. Freeport Closing at 38. The testimony presented at trial is that Fort Huachuca could 15 receive the necessary designations in the future depending on the proximity of the crisis or 16 capacity needed. The Army could also choose to mobilize troops for deployment at Fort 17 18 Huachuca without regard to its current mobilization label. Tr. at 7:190-191 (Oct. 12, 2016) 19 (Ashley); Tr. at 7:13-14, 60-63, 68-70 (Oct. 12, 2016) (Koch): Ex. 2275. Mr. Koch testified 20 that the absence of a particular designator or status would become irrelevant in a Total 21 Mobilization scenario because all available installations would be used for mobilization. Tr. 22 23 at 8:38-41 (Oct. 13, 2016) (Koch). The Objectors makes an argument similar to the one 24 based on the Fort's lack of current of deployment status when it asserts that the Fort lacks 25 sufficient housing to stage a short-term Mobilization. Lieutenant General Ashley 26 acknowledged that the current configuration of the base could not house the expanded 27

28

1

2

3

population. He testified, however, that the requisite housing and infrastructure could be built for 38,000 troops, if necessary. Tr. at 6:150 (Oct. 12, 2016) (Ashley).

3 Freeport and Liberty argue that the claimed water rights should not be decreed because 4 it is unlikely that an event will occur that would cause the population increases advanced by 5 the United States. The United States does not specify any particular future event that could 6 necessitate a short-term Total Mobilization. It did provide general information about 7 8 Lieutenant General Ashley, U.S. Army Deputy Chief of Staff for potential threats. 9 Intelligence and the Commanding General of the U.S. Army Intelligence Center of 10 Excellence and Senior Mission Commander of Fort Huachuca from April 2013 to July 2015, 11 testified about the principal threats facing the nation listing Iran, North Korea, China, Russia, 12 13 and Violent Extremist Organizations such as ISIL or al-Qaeda, which he referred to as the 14 "4+1". Lieutenant General Ashley further noted that the Army must be prepared for total 15 war, such as "major combat operations against a near peer competitor like a China or Russia." 16 Tr. at 7:155-56 (Oct. 12, 2016) (Ashley). He also agreed with an assessment prepared by the 17 18 Chairman of the Joint Chiefs of Staff:

> Today's global security environment is the most unpredictable I have seen in 40 years of service. Since the last National Military Strategy was published in 2011, advantage has begun to erode. We now face multiple, simultaneous security challenges from traditional state actors and transregional networks of sub-state groups - all taking advantage of rapid technological change. Future conflicts will come more rapidly, last longer, and take place on a much more technically challenging battlefield. They will have increasing implications to the U.S. homeland.

<sup>26</sup> Ex. 6 at i (pdf2); U.S. FOF 409-410.

1

2

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

27

28

Lieutenant General Ashley gave as his opinion that there is a low probability that a Total Mobilization would occur. Freeport SOF 192-193. 2

1

3 Freeport also claims that the decreed water rights are not warranted because the Total 4 Mobilization is an intrinsically temporary event. Freeport Closing at 47. The United States 5 acknowledges that the duration of the Total Mobilization is uncertain but references the 6 expansion of Fort Huachuca during World War II which it counted as seven years from 1938 7 8 to 1945. U. S. Closing at 28. Based on the evidence presented, the population began its 9 expansion in late 1940 from approximately 1,300 to 5,500 personnel. Ex. 231 at 39:7-9 and 1082:1-23 and fn. 219 (Miltenberger) US SOF 26. Additional troops moved to Fort Huachuca 11 in 1942 that caused the population to balloon to more than 30,000. U.S. SOF 30-31. The 12 13 number of troops Fort Huachuca declined in 1944 as they were transported to the theaters of 14 war. U.S. SOF 31. Assuming, as the United States does, that mobilization during World War 15 II is analogous to a future total mobilization event, the World War II mobilization 16 demonstrates that population increases at the Fort happens years, not weeks or months, after 17 18 a triggering event. Thus, the time period during which the increased water supply would be 19 needed is more probably shorter than the short-term period presented by the United States. 20 This conclusion is reinforced by Mr. Koch's testimony that all of his hypothetical 21 mobilization scenarios would be short term. In addition, Major General McGuire testified 22 23 that, in his experience, the timeline for emergency situations is measured in weeks or months, 24 not years. Freeport SOF 259-261. Accordingly, the short-term Total Mobilization Event can 25 be appropriately labelled as a temporary event. 26

2 3

The legal question presented by the short-term Total Mobilization is whether such a 1 temporary event that is not likely to occur provides a proper basis for a perpetual federal The United States contends that an event meeting even these reserved water right. 4 assumptions would suffice under the "reasonably feasible" standard set by Gila V. The 5 Arizona Supreme Court created the "reasonably feasible" standard to evaluate whether 6 proposed projects on an Indian Reservation requiring water were achievable from a practical 7 8 standpoint and were economically sound. Gila V, 201 Ariz. at 320, ¶49. As Liberty properly 9 interprets Gila V, an essential condition of the test is that it is likely that a future use will 10 occur. Liberty Closing at 12. A second, equally important, condition built into the test is 11 that the proposed use will be a long-term use. This inherent requirement can be seen in the 12 13 court's approval of the use of master land use plans to quantify water uses and court's 14 instruction that the trial court evaluate established water uses as proof of the likelihood that 15 proven uses will continue in the future. 16

The implicit requirements imposed by the Gila V test to quantify federal reserved 17 18 water rights are consistent with established federal law assumptions that the reserved rights 19 are for permanent uses. In its finding that the government had the power to reserve water 20for use on its land, the Winters Court found that federal reserved water rights applied to 21 permanent or long term uses rather than a temporary uses: "That the government did reserve 22 23 them we have decided, and for a use which would be necessarily continued through years." 24 207 U.S. at 206. The Court cited United States v. Rio Grande Dam & Irrigation Co., 174 25 U.S. 690 (1899) as precedent for its determination that the federal government had the power 26 to reserve a right to water. In Rio Grande Dam & Irrigation, the court 27 found that the

28

federal government's authority to regulate navigable rivers gave it the power to reserve rights 1 to the Rio Grande River to protect the navigability of that watercourse in the interests of all 2 3 people in the United States. 174 U.S. at 707. Again, the Court envisioned a long-term 4 purpose for the water to which it found the United States had the ability to assert a federal 5 reserved water right. In Arizona v. California, supra, the Court approved a federal reserved 6 water right for a present irrigation use that was expected to continue into the future. 7 The 8 conclusion that federal reserved water rights attach to long-term uses and cannot be created 9 for singular events is further reinforced by the decision in United States v. Walker River Irr. 10Dist., 104 F.2d 334 (9th Cir. 1939). In that case, the United States accepted the quantity of 11 water, 26.25 second feet of water, found to be sufficient for irrigation. It also requested that 12 13 the decree enable the federal government to demand as much as 150 second feet from year to 14 year at the commencement of the season. The court rejected the United States' claim for the 15 additional water: "That a decree of this sort would tend greatly to depreciate the value of the 16 water rights of the upstream owners, and to make impossible any intelligent program of 17 18 farming is obvious." Walker River Irr. Dist., 104 F.2d at 340.

The decision that a federal reserved water right must be based on a reasonably probable long-term use is especially applicable in this case where the United States claims a federal right to groundwater. The Arizona Supreme Court found in *Gila III* that federal reserved water rights to groundwater are by nature a preserve intended to continue through years enabling the federal government to protect a reservation from depletion of its underlying aquifer by off-reservation pumpers. The court subsequently reinforced that view of a federal reserved right to groundwater with its statement that the federal reserved water rights doctrine

28

19

"effectively modifies the doctrine of reasonable use, as codified in §45-453, because it restricts an overlying landowner's right to pump groundwater." *Silver v. Pueblo Del Sol Water Co.*, 423 P.3d 348, 353 ¶13 (Ariz. 2018).

The fact pattern in *Pueblo Del Sol Water Co.* highlights the importance of the off 5 repeated restriction that a federal reserved water right reserves only the amount necessary to 6 7 fulfill the purpose of the reservation and "no more". Cappaert, 426 U.S. at 141. In Cappaert, 8 the Court applied this stricture to minimize the impact of a federal reserved water right on 9 adjacent landowners who relied on groundwater for their business. Pueblo del Sol highlights 10 a similar situation in Arizona. In *Pueblo del Sol*, a water company intending to pump 3,440 11 AFA of groundwater to service a new development of commercial buildings and 7,000 12 13 residences, filed an application with ADWR to obtain an adequate water supply designation 14 required by the county. Before ADWR could approve an adequate water supply application, 15 the agency had to find, among other elements, that sufficient groundwater, surface water or 16 effluent of adequate quality would be physically available to satisfy the water needs of the 17 18 proposed use for at least one hundred years. The court interpreted the physically available 19 element as requiring ADWR to evaluate the impact of existing users on the groundwater 20 supply available to the applicant. See A.A.C. R12-15-716(B)(3)(b). Liberty, referencing the 21 rule interpreted in Pueblo del Sol, contends that if the United States' short-term Total 22 23 Mobilization claim were a decreed right, it is not clear how ADWR would treat that right for 24 purposes of determining physical availability. "The worst case is that adequate water supply 25 applicants would have to count the reserved right as an annual use, multiplying the volume 26 by 100 years, which is far more water than the Fort anticipates for a "short term" use that by 27

28

1

2

3

4

its own admission is unlikely to occur at all.' Liberty Closing at 24. Liberty concludes that "locking up groundwater in perpetuity to provide for a scenario that the United States admits is unlikely to ever occur, is inconsistent with the narrow construction required of non-Indian reserved water rights." *Id.* 

Liberty's conclusion is a correct interpretation of the law. A large amount of water 6 for a short-term event that has a low probability of occurrence is the maximum amount of 7 8 water that would be needed by Fort Huachuca to satisfy its purpose. Such a quantification 9 based on an unlikely temporary event would run afoul of the Court's mandate that federal 10 reserved water rights should be quantified as "only that amount of water necessary to fulfill 11 the purpose of the reservation, no more." Cappaert v. United States, 426 U.S. at 141. The 12 13 quantification of federal reserved water rights does not constitute a cap on the amount of 14 water that the Fort can use to meet its needs, it constitutes the floor, i.e., the minimum amount 15 of water needed to fulfill the purposes for which the Fort was reserved. The United States 16 may obtain additional water through a variety of sources to meet future needs, such as 17 18 pumping groundwater under state law or contracting for additional water from surrounding 19 water providers.

20

1

2

3

4

5

21

22

## V. Source of Water

23

The third issue to be decided in this Phase II is the source of water subject to Fort Huachuca's federal reserved water right. The United States claims rights to three primary water sources to fulfill its annual needs: (1) streamflow from Garden Canyon, (2) streamflow from Huachuca Canyon, and (3) groundwater, its current source of water. The courts have

only recently recognized that the Winters doctrine extends to groundwater. See Arizona v. 1 Navajo Nation, 599 U.S. 555, 561 (2023); Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians v. 2 3 Coachella Valley Water Dist., 849 F.3d 1262, 1271 (9th Cir. 2017); Silver v. Pueblo Del Sol 4 Water Co., 244 Ariz. 553, 558 ¶ 13 (2018); Gila III, 195 Ariz. at 420 ¶ 31. Two of these 5 decisions directly addressed the question of whether a federal reserved water right can attach 6 to groundwater: Gila III and Agua Caliente Band of Cahuilla Indians. Gila III concluded 7 8 that a federal reserved water right to groundwater exists when "other water are inadequate to 9 accomplish the purpose of a reservation." 195 Ariz. at 748, ¶31. Agua Caliente Band of 10 Cahuilla Indians found that a "a reservation without an adequate source of surface water must 11 be able to access groundwater." 849 F.3d at 1271. Thus, a federal reserved water right 12 13 attaches to groundwater when adequate sources of other water do not exist to fulfill the 14 purpose of the reservation. A fact-intensive inquiry into the presence of other water on the 15 Fort is required as part of the determination of the appropriate source of the Fort's federal 16 reserved water right. 17

18 19

A.

## Other Water Sources

The State of Arizona argues that the effluent produced by Fort Huachuca should be considered as "other waters" and that the amount of effluent it produced should reduce the amount of groundwater subject to federal reserved water rights. As discussed above, the testimony and evidence the United States introduced at trial established that its claims for federal reserved water rights do not include water for purposes that are currently

52

28

accomplished with effluent, which are irrigating the golf course and recharging the aquifer. U.S. SOF 248, 253.<sup>3</sup>

3 Moving beyond the moot question of whether effluent should be used to offset the golf 4 course irrigation, the more general question is whether recycled groundwater subject to the 5 federal reserved water right should be considered "other water." Colonel Boone testified that 6 7 the Fort's effluent comes from water that was originally pumped as groundwater and was 8 recaptured after use on the Fort. Tr. at 5:85 (Oct. 10, 2016) (Boone). Between 2005 and 2014, 9 the Fort pumped an average of 1,138 AFA and from that water it generated 500 to 700-acre 10feet of effluent, or between 44 percent (500/1138) and 62 percent (700/1138) of an acre-foot 11 12 of effluent for each acre-foot of groundwater pumped. The amount of effluent is derivative 13 of the amount of groundwater pumped. The inevitable impact of the choice to treat a 14 derivative water source as "other water" would be to permanently decrease the initial 15 quantification of a water right determined to be the minimum amount needed to accomplish 16 17 a primary purpose. For example, if 1,138 AFA were determined to be the correct quantity 18 for the Fort, and that amount were offset by the full amount of effluent resulting from the 19 Fort's pumped groundwater that the Fort uses to irrigate the golf course or recharge the 20aquifer, the United States would have a water right to 638 AFA (1138-500) to 438 AFA 21

22

1

- 23
- 24

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>3</sup> Prior to trial, the State of Arizona filed a motion seeking a ruling that the amount of effluent should offset the quantity of groundwater subject to a federal reserved water right. The Court granted the motion finding that the availability of effluent may affect the minimum amount of water needed. 25 It cited the irrigation of the golf course as an example of an appropriate place to consider the amount of available effluent without making any determination about the impact that use of effluent, if any, 26 would have on the quantification of the water right. MSJ Order at 11. Based on testimony and 27 evidence presented at trial, it is now clear that the United States does not seek a federal reserved water right for water to irrigate the golf course currently irrigated by effluent. 28

(1138-700) from which it could generate between 280 (.44 x 638) and 392 (.62 x 438) acre feet of effluent. If the Fort could treat the recycled water to potable standards, it would have only 918 to 711 AFA. (This example assumed that the process of treating effluent to potable water did not further reduce the volume of water). The approach urged by the State of Arizona in this case would reduce the amount of water available to the Fort below its minimum need.

8 Effluent in this case is not reasonably available to the Fort to satisfy its primary 9 The effluent is classified as B plus, which means it cannot be used for potable purpose. 10 purposes. Tr. at 9:98-99 (Runyon) (Oct. 17, 2016); Tr. at 12:64-65 (Oct. 20, 2016) (Higgins). 11 The Fort does not have the capability to treat effluent to the potable standards with its 12 13 wastewater treatment plant. Moreover, effluent is not used for potable purposes anywhere in 14 Arizona. Tr. at 8:121 (Oct. 13, 2016) (Runyon); Tr. at 15:27 (Feb. 8, 2017) (Burtell). 15 Effluent from recycled water to which the decreed right will attach is not "other water." 16

The United States also contends that "other water" for purposes of the *Gila III* analysis 17 18 should not include runoff and rainwater captured on the Fort grounds. Under Arizona law, 19 surface water must flow "in one of the geological or topographical features enumerated by" 20 A.R.S. § 45-141 (A). See Arizona Pub. Serv. Co. v. Long, 160 Ariz. 429, 437, 773 P.2d 988, 21 996 (1989). These features include water that is "flowing in streams, canyons, ravines or other 22 23 natural channels, or in definite underground channels, whether perennial or intermittent, 24 flood, waste or surplus water, and of lakes, ponds, and springs on the surface." A.R.S. § 45-25 14l(A). Diffuse stormwater runoff and captured rainwater are considered "developed" water. 26 i.e., water that is not available without a constructed infrastructure or other artificial 27

28

1

2

3

4

5

6

assistance. *See Fourzan v. Curtis*, 43 Ariz. 140, 144-45, 29 P.2d 722, 724 (1934). Because runoff that has not reached a stream, canyon or other "natural channel" and captured rainwater are not appropriable, neither source of water is among the "other waters" under *Gila III* that must be inadequate before the Fort's reserved water right may extend to groundwater.

1

2

3

4

5

6

#### B. Streamflow

7 The remaining dispute among the parties concerns the streamflow in Garden and Huachuca 8 Canyons. Huachuca Canyon generally runs from the southwestern boundary of Fort Huachuca to the 9 northeast. Tr. at 13:61 (Feb. 2, 2017) (Degner). Garden Canyon originates in the Huachuca 10 Mountains and is generally located within the southern portion of the land and flows to the east. Id. 11 The Coronado National Forest and the Miller Peak Wilderness are located along the southern and 12 much of the western boundaries of Fort Huachuca. At the time that the land for Fort Huachuca was 13 14 reserved, the springs in Huachuca Canyon provided 20 AFA for 280 troops and 170 horses housed 15 at Fort Huachuca. Freeport FOF 16. During the time period when the Fort relied on spring flow in 16 Huachuca Canyon, the water supply from that source was inadequate during dry periods. Tr. at 1:167 17 (Oct. 3, 2016) (Miltenberger); Tr. at 15:164-65 (Feb. 8, 2017) (Burtell). In 1887 and again in 1890, 18 the Army installed check dams in Huachuca Canyon. U.S. SOF 268-269. This additional 19 infrastructure did not create a reliable water source for the population which then numbered between 20 200 and 400 soldiers. Tr. at 2:50-51 (Oct. 4, 2016) (Miltenberger). In 1911, the Army installed a 21 22 collection system in Garden Canyon to deliver an additional water supply for the Fort. Tr. at 1:167, 23 170 (Oct. 3, 2016) (Miltenberger); Tr. at 2:51-52 (Oct. 4, 2016) (Miltenberger); Ex. 231, at 124; Tr. 24 at 3:27 (Oct. 5, 2016) (Miltenberger). Following the addition of Garden Canyon as a water source, 25 the Fort continued to experience water shortages. Tr. at 2:52-53 (Oct. 4, 2016) (Miltenberger). At the 26 time of these shortages, the Fort's population was no more than 1,200. Id. at 2:52-53. 27

28

Dr. Miltenberger testified that, in or around 1930, the Fort constructed a 1,000,000 gallon

1	reservoir and a 900,000 gallon reservoir to increase its storage ca	apacity	beyond that of its existing		
2	250,000 gallons reservoir. Tr. at 3:90-92 (Oct. 16, 2016) (Miltenberger). These reservoirs could				
3	store a total of 6.6 acre-feet of water. The purpose of adding the additional reservoir capacity was to				
4	enable the Fort to store extra surface water during high flow period	ls so tha	It the stored water could be		
5	used in times of drought. Id. at 3:91-92. The reservoirs did not a	lleviate	the shortages. Tr. at 2:47		
6	(Oct. 4, 2016) (Miltenberger). Consequently, the Fort drilled a we	ll. The	Completion Report for the		
7	well confirmed that it was constructed to "augment [] the present s		which for soveral years had		
8	have restricted due to use is line and line with The solution in the	uppry, v	which for several years has		
9	been restricted due to periodic annual shortages." Ir. at 2:54-55 (	Oct. 4,	2016) (Miltenberger); Ex.		
10	377.				
11	In 1966, the USGS examined the streamflow data at the	gating s	station on Garden Canyon		
12	Creek for approximately a four-year period from 1959 to 1963. T	his per	iod included reports of no		
13	flow, except for intermittent runoff due to thunderstorms, from May 29 to September 7, 1961, and				
14	no flow from June 3 to July 27, 1963. Ex. 23. at 4 (Degner); Ex. 29	9 at			
15	2 (PDF 6). Based on the data USGS concluded that Garden				
16	Canyon Creek could supply 30 percent of the pooded water to	Year	Percentage of Water Demand Met		
17	Carlyon creek could supply 50 percent of the needed water to	1971	7.5%		
18	Fort Huachuca. In reliance on this assessment, the United States	1972	4.5%		
19	reinstalled the diversion systems at a cost of $1.700.000^4$ A	1715	Lines destroyed by		
20			11		
			flooding		
21	flood destroyed the pipeline system shortly after installation	1974	flooding 9%		
21	flood destroyed the pipeline system shortly after installation requiring extensive repairs. Tr. at 3:101 (Oct. 5, 2016)	1974 1975 1976	flooding 9% 15% 11%		
21 22	flood destroyed the pipeline system shortly after installation requiring extensive repairs. Tr. at 3:101 (Oct. 5, 2016)	1974 1975 1976	flooding 9% 15% 11%		
<ul><li>21</li><li>22</li><li>23</li></ul>	flood destroyed the pipeline system shortly after installation requiring extensive repairs. Tr. at 3:101 (Oct. 5, 2016) (Miltenberger); Ex. 36, at 4 pdf p. 27; Tr. at 17:84-85 (Feb. <sup>Table</sup>	1974 1975 1976 le 2	flooding 9% 15% 11%		
<ul> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> </ul>	flood destroyed the pipeline system shortly after installation requiring extensive repairs. Tr. at 3:101 (Oct. 5, 2016) (Miltenberger); Ex. 36, at 4 pdf p. 27; Tr. at 17:84-85 (Feb. Table 13, 2017) (Burtell). As shown in Table 2, the new and (Deg	1974 1975 1976 le 2 rce: Tr. a gner)	flooding 9% 15% 11% t 13:86-88 (Feb. 6, 2017)		
<ul> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> <li>25</li> </ul>	flood destroyed the pipeline system shortly after installation requiring extensive repairs. Tr. at 3:101 (Oct. 5, 2016) (Miltenberger); Ex. 36, at 4 pdf p. 27; Tr. at 17:84-85 (Feb. 13, 2017) (Burtell). As shown in Table 2, the new and <sup>Sour</sup> (Deg subsequently replaced diversion system provided a substantially	1974 1975 1976 le 2 rce: Tr. a gner) smalle:	flooding 9% 15% 11% tt 13:86-88 (Feb. 6, 2017) r percentage of the water		
<ol> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> <li>25</li> <li>26</li> </ol>	flood destroyed the pipeline system shortly after installation requiring extensive repairs. Tr. at 3:101 (Oct. 5, 2016) (Miltenberger); Ex. 36, at 4 pdf p. 27; Tr. at 17:84-85 (Feb. 13, 2017) (Burtell). As shown in Table 2, the new and (Deg subsequently replaced diversion system provided a substantially	1974 1975 1976 le 2 rce: Tr. a mer) smalle	flooding 9% 15% 11% at 13:86-88 (Feb. 6, 2017) r percentage of the water		
<ul> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> <li>25</li> <li>26</li> <li>27</li> </ul>	flood destroyed the pipeline system shortly after installation requiring extensive repairs. Tr. at 3:101 (Oct. 5, 2016) (Miltenberger); Ex. 36, at 4 pdf p. 27; Tr. at 17:84-85 (Feb. 13, 2017) (Burtell). As shown in Table 2, the new and <sup>Sour</sup> (Deg subsequently replaced diversion system provided a substantially	1974 1975 1976 le 2 rce: Tr. a gner) smalle:	flooding 9% 15% 11% tt 13:86-88 (Feb. 6, 2017) r percentage of the water		
<ul> <li>21</li> <li>22</li> <li>23</li> <li>24</li> <li>25</li> <li>26</li> <li>27</li> <li>28</li> </ul>	flood destroyed the pipeline system shortly after installation requiring extensive repairs. Tr. at 3:101 (Oct. 5, 2016) (Miltenberger); Ex. 36, at 4 pdf p. 27; Tr. at 17:84-85 (Feb. 13, 2017) (Burtell). As shown in Table 2, the new and Deg subsequently replaced diversion system provided a substantially <sup>4</sup> \$1.7 million in 1969 dollars is \$14.5 million in 2024 infla	1974 1975 1976 le 2 rce: Tr. a gner) smalle	flooding 9% 15% 11% t 13:86-88 (Feb. 6, 2017) r percentage of the water justed dollars.		

needed than anticipated. The Fort's potable water use peaked in 1974 when the Fort used 3,623 acrefeet of water of which 272 acre-feet were provided by the combined Garden and Huachuca Canyon systems. U.S. SOF 325. In 1977, floods again damaged the systems in Garden and Huachuca Canyon requiring months of repairs. Ex. 276 at 50.

5 Mr. Higgins testified that he has seen the surface water collection and distribution system 6 damaged "multiple times" during his tenure at the Fort, "and there is a lot more, as far as historical 7 records are concerned." Tr. at 12:33 (Oct. 20, 2016) (Higgins). A flash flood that occurred in the 8 early 2010s damaged any remaining surface water infrastructure that existed in Garden Canyon 9 beyond repair. Tr. at 10:90-91 (Oct. 18, 2016) (Mulhern); Tr. at 12:33 (Oct. 20, 2016) (Higgins). Mr. 10 11 Higgins confirmed that the surface water infrastructure in both Garden and Huachuca Canyons has 12 been so damaged by various storms that the infrastructure is now unusable. Tr. at 12:31-32 (Oct. 20, 13 2016) (Higgins). He estimated that it would cost "millions and millions" of dollars for the Fort to 14 begin using surface water. Tr. at 12:60 (Oct. 20, 2016) (Higgins). One estimate provided at trial set 15 the cost of renovation at no less than \$20,000,000. Tr. at 15:79-80 (Feb. 8, 2017) (Burtell). Even if 16 the United States were to undertake the cost of yet another attempt to install diversion infrastructure, 17 the history of the repeated, failed efforts means that substantial additional funds would be required 18 19 for extensive repairs or replacement following destructive flood events in the canyons that would 20 prevent the Fort from capturing flood waters until repairs could be undertaken.

In 1983, due to this cycle of unpredictable water flows and foreseeable destruction, the Fort stopped diverting water from the Garden Canyon and Huachuca Canyon system. For more than three decades, the Fort has relied solely on the water from its eight groundwater production wells. Tr. at 1:164 (Oct. 3, 2016) (Miltenberger). Dr. Miltenberger's conclusion, based on his review of the historic report, is that the Fort would suffer periodic water shortages and would lack a reliable water supply if it relied solely on the streamflow from Huachuca and Garden Canyons for its water supply.

28

21

1

2

3

4

1 2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

21

28

#### Tr. at 2:46-47 (Oct. 4, 2016) (Miltenberger); Ex. 231, at 114.

#### 1. Garden Canyon

Discharge from springs, storm runoff, and snow melt runoff into the stream channels of the canyon provides the streamflow found in Garden Canyon. Tr. at 13: 94-95 (Feb. 6, 2017) (Degner). Thomas Runyon, who has a Master of Science in geology and served as the Fort's hydrologist between 2006 and 2011, explained that Garden Canyon streamflow runs through the Fort Huachuca grounds. The base flow for Garden Canyon streamflow is located within the boundaries of Fort Huachuca Tr. at 8:77-78, 85 (Oct. 13, 2016) (Runyon). Streamflow from Garden Canyon outside the Fort Huachuca boundary is ephemeral because it flows only in response to summer monsoon storms. *Id.* at 8:85.

The USGS operates a stream gage in Garden Canyon that has generated flow data from 1959 through 1964 and 1994 through the present. Tr. at 13:74-75 (Feb. 6, 2017) (Degner): Tr. at 8:69, 79 (Oct. 13, 2016) (Runyon). There is perennial flow along several miles of the streambed due to groundwater being discharged into the streambed from various springs but at the gaging station the stream become intermittent. Tr. at 8:70 (Oct. 13, 2016) (Runyon); Tr. at 13:74 (Feb. 6, 2017) (Degner). The median flow in Garden Canyon during this period of record is 858 acre-feet. Tr. at 15:32 (Feb. 8, 2017) (Burtell); Ex.53.

The median annual flow statistic is not the result of constant flow. Garden Canyon streamflow is characterized by a great variability in flow marked by floods "characterized by very high peak discharges, actually producing floods that inundate the floodplain" and periods of low or no flow. Tr. at 8:72-73 (Oct. 13, 2016) (Runyon). The periods of drought can last for an extended period of time. In 2002, annual flow was 246 acre-feet, 2003 annual flow, the lowest recorded, was 27 acre-feet, and 2004 had 222 acre-feet of streamflow. Tr. at 15:30-34, 154 (Feb. 8, 2017) (Burtell);

Ex. 53; U.S. FOF 234. Garden Canyon streamflow also exhibits a high degree of seasonal variability. 1 Tr. at 8:74-75 (Oct. 13, 2016) (Runyon). Mr. Degner testified that based on his analysis of the daily 2 3 streamflow data, the daily median flow in June and July is zero. Tr. at 13:75-76 (Feb. 6, 2017) 4 (Degner). No flow days are not limited to the summer months; they can also occur throughout the 5 year. Mr. Degner testified that he examined the historic streamflow data for each day of the year. 6 This daily data provides historical information about that day's minimum, maximum and mean flow. 7 For example, one data set will contain the daily minimum, maximum, and mean for every January 8 1<sup>st</sup> in the recorded history. Mr. Degner reviewed the 365 data sets and testified that most data sets 9 contained a reported minimum amount of water of zero. Tr. at 13:76 (Feb. 6, 2017) (Degner). 10

11 12

#### 2. Huachuca Canyon

13 Huachuca Creek has intermittent streamflow, with the possible exception of the 14 uppermost three-quarters of a mile of stream, meaning that it "dries up most years in the 15 summer." Tr. at 13:62 (Feb. 6, 2017) (Degner); Tr. at 8:80-81 (Oct. 13, 2016) (Runyon). 16 17 Kim Mulhern, who served as the Fort's Chief of the Environmental and Natural Resources 18 Directorate between 2007 and 2013, testified that "I've been up in Huachuca Canyon in May 19 near where the stream gage is, and sometimes the creek is an inch wide .... It's not a significant 20 amount of water. There is very low flow. And there would be no water supply most years in 21 22 - below that gage in May and June." Tr. at 9:111-113, 188-89 (Oct. 17, 2016) (Mulhern). 23 The base flow of Huachuca Canyon also does not extend beyond the boundaries of Fort 24 Huachuca. Tr. at 8:86 (Oct. 13, 2016) (Runyon). Streamflow from Huachuca Canyon 25 between the Fort's borders and the Babocomari River is ephemeral, only flowing in response 26 27 to summer monsoon storms. Id. at 8:85. The median annual flow during the 14-year period

of record for the USGS gage at Huachuca Canyon is 118.8 acre-feet. Tr. at 13:72 (Feb. 6. 2017) (Degner). 2

3 Mr. Degner testified that he examined the 14-year historic streamflow data for Huachuca 4 Canyon for each day of the year as he had done for Garden Canyon. He testified that for the 5 overwhelming majority of days of the year, there was at least one day in the 14-year period of record 6 in which Huachuca Canyon did not have any flow at the USGS gauge. Tr. at 13:67-69 (Feb. 6, 2017) 7 (Degner); Ex. 21, at Fig. 3 (p.5). The record also shows that during some years there is less than 0.1 8 cubic feet per second of flow or 0.2 acre feet per day<sup>5</sup> in Huachuca Canvon for the majority of the 9 10 year. Tr. at 13:65-66 (Feb. 6, 2017) (Degner); Ex. 21, at Fig. 3 (p.5). Notably within the 14-year 11 period of record there were three consecutive years that the flow dropped below 20 percent of the 12 median. In 2003, 2004, and 2005, the total annual flows for Huachuca Canyon were 10.9, 7.2, and 13 21.011 acre-feet, respectively, for a three year total of less than 40 acre-feet. Tr. at 17:71-72 (Feb. 14 13, 2017) (Degner); Tr. at 15:137-38 (Feb. 8, 2017) (Burtell); Ex. 20, at pdf p. 52. In 2003, Huachuca 15 Canyon and Garden Canyon combined produced 38 acre-feet of water as measured at their USGS 16 17 gages. Tr. at 17:81-82 (Feb. 13, 2017) (Burtell). Mr. Degner assessed the flows in Huachuca Canyon 18 as seasonally variable and unreliable. Tr. at 13:69 (Feb. 6, 2017) (Degner).

19 20

27

28

1

# C. Groundwater

21 At the current demand rate of 1,138 AFA, the Fort must supply 95 acre-feet of water 22 each month for its population including the summer months when the streamflow is low or 23 nonexistent. There can be no dispute that the quantity of surface water appurtenant to the 24 land reserved for Fort Huachuca is less than the quantity needed to fulfill the minimum needs 25 26

<sup>5</sup> 1 cfs = 1.983 acre-foot per day

of the reservation and thus, the United States is entitled to a federal reserved water right to groundwater. The remaining question concerns the appropriate method to allocate the federal reserved water rights between groundwater and the Garden Canyon and Huachuca Canyon streamflow.

The United States asserts that its reserved right applies to "all the water sources that 6 Fort Huachuca has at hand, including surface water, springs, and other underground water 7 8 located on or below the reservation, and the groundwater in the regional aquifer." U.S. 9 Closing at 43. Launching from this sweeping proclamation, it contends that no allocation 10 should be made between groundwater and surface water. According to the United States, the 11 federal reserved water right should be decreed without reference to a particular source thereby 12 13 leaving it free to determine from year to year, in its sole discretion, the sources to be used and 14 the amounts to be diverted from each source. U.S. Closing at 41. Federal law requires a 15 federal reserved water right to be defined by its source. In Winters, the reserved land had a 16 large perennial source on one boundary, the Milk River, and several water sources within its 17 18 boundaries, the People Creek, the Big Horn Creek, Lodge Pole Creek, and Clear Creek. The 19 federal reserved water right did not generally attach to all water on the reservation; it attached 20to 5,000 inches from the Milk River. A federal decreed right specifically designates a source 21 or sources of water. See, e.g., Conrad Inv. Co. v. United States, 161 F. at 834 (Birch Creek 22 23 defined as the source of the water to which the right attached); United States v. Ahtanum Irr. 24 Dist., 236 F.2d 321 (9th Cir. 1956); United States v. Walker River Irr. Dist., 104 F.2d 334 25 (9th Cir. 1939); United States v. Orr Water Ditch Co., 309 F. Supp. 2d 1245 (D. Nev. 2004). 26

28

27

1

2

3

4

5

The United States also argues that a federal reserved water right defined by a surface 1 2 water source and a groundwater source imposes Arizona's bifurcated water rights system on 3 a federal right. An adjudicated right referencing the specific sources does not impose 4 Arizona's legal framework governing the establishment, quantification, and retention of 5 appropriative and groundwater rights under state law on a federal right. The decree properly 6 identifies the sources of water to which the federal right attaches, all of which have the same 7 8 priority date, use, place of use, and other characteristics associated with a federal right and 9 do not include elements such as the possibility of loss through forfeiture or abandonment that 10 could apply to a state surface water right. 11 Freeport argues that surface water variability should not cause a source to be 12 13 considered inadequate thereby shifting the entirety of a federal reserved right to groundwater. 14 It states that storage is a practical solution to managing surface water variability. Freeport 15 Closing at 57. Freeport called Richard Burtell, a Registered Geologist with a Master of 16 Science in hydrology and a Bachelor of Science in geology, as a witness. He testified that 17 18 the United States should construct storage dams to impound and store all flow, including 19 flood flows. Another proposal involved diversion dams to divert all streamflow measured 20 at the gages into pipes that would transmit the surface water to steel storage tanks or covered 21 reservoirs. Id. As discussed above, the United States has attempted over a hundred-year 22 23 period to access and store the surface water using a combination of dams and diversion 24 infrastructure. The systems repeatedly failed. Mr. Runyon testified diversion infrastructure 25 must be able to "withstand the potential high flows that can occur in those canyons." Tr. at 26 8:118-19 (Oct. 13, 2016) (Runyon). 27

28

1	Assuming that the infrastructure could be installed and maintained to withstand the
2	flood flows, the amount of storage required by Mr. Burtell's proposal to divert and store the
3	water would be substantial. Currently, the Fort has closed storage tanks that can hold 18.4
4	acre-feet of water or approximately a six-day supply based on an average annual use of 1,138
5	acre-feet. As the United States established at trial, it would have to construct storage for
7	2,059 acre-feet of water to capture the highest flows on record that occurred in October 2000,
8	which is more than 112 times greater than its current storage capacities. Tr. at 18:12-14 (Feb.
9	14, 2017) (Degner). If it were to capture the median amount of streamflow of 976.8
10 11	(858+118.8) acre-feet, the United States would be required to construct and install 53 times
12	more storage than it has at present. To describe the storage requirements in terms of number
13	of tanks, the largest storage tank on Fort Huachuca holds three million gallons or 9.2 acre
14	feet. To store only the median amount would require the construction and installation of 106
15 16	tanks. To provide storage to hold the peak surface flow of October 2000 flow would require
17	224 tanks. Tr. at 18:14 (Feb. 14, 2017) (Degner). If the United States had installed the
18	infrastructure that could have withstood and captured the flood flows and constructed 224
19	storage tanks by 2000, it would have water for 1.8 years (2,059 acre-feet / 1,138 acre-feet of
20   21	average use). Even 224 tanks filled with water, however, would not have provided an
22	adequate water supply for the Fort in the following consecutive years of drought that occurred
23	from 2002 to 2004. Assuming average use, the Fort would have needed 3,414 (1,138 x 3)
24	acre feet of water for those three $^{6}$ vears. The total recorded streamflow amounted to 495
25	dere feet of water for those three years. The total recorded subalifies, amounted to 195
26 27	<sup>6</sup> This proposal also presents timing issues. The amount of the deficit that would be supplied by groundwater could not be calculated until the end of the year in which the groundwater would
28	have been needed.

acre-feet leaving a shortage of 2,919 acre-feet. Even with 224 tanks, the Fort would have
 suffered a deficit of 860 acre-feet or more than 75 percent of a year's supply of water.
 Storage, even 224 three-million-gallon tanks, will not reliably capture all the annual flow of
 the streams and will not reliably fulfill the annual demand for water that the Fort must have
 to accomplish its military mission.<sup>7</sup>

7 Freeport proposes that the decreed right require a conjunctive use of the surface water 8 and groundwater. It proposes that the United States would either be decreed a right to 9 groundwater in an amount quantified by its minimum need reduced by the 976.8 acre-feet, 10 the median combined streamflow. Alternatively, it proposes that the United States be given 11 12 a federal reserved water right to all of the surface flow as measured at the gages, and the 13 reserved right to groundwater would be in an amount equal to the difference between the 14 quantified right and the sum of the annual flows at the USGS gages. Freeport and Liberty 15 articulated the alternative approach in the form of a proposed decree: 16 17 The Government's Annual Right will apply first to the annual 2. surface water discharge from Huachuca Canyon and Garden Canyon 18 that is measured at the Stream Gages. 19 3. In any calendar year in which the two Stream Gages collectively 20 measure less than 1,300 acre feet of stream flow, the Annual Right extends to groundwater to make up the difference. 21 22 Freeport Closing, Appendix A at 1. 23 24 25 <sup>7</sup> The United States also makes legal and factual arguments that it cannot divert and store the 26 streamflow because of federal environmental laws and regulations. Those arguments do not need to 27 be addressed in light of the evidence of the destructive flooding and extended droughts causing the

demonstrated failure of the Fort to divert and use the streamflow. 64

1	The presumption underlying these proposals is that a system can be built to control	
2	and use all the surface water flow. Almost 100 years of history contradicts this assumption.	
3	The United States has attempted on multiple occasions to capture the streamflow only to have	
4	its efforts repeatedly destroyed by floods. At this point, based on the evidence presented,	
6	the decree proposed by the Freeport would result in a futile act that would only result in	
7	requiring the United States to repeatedly incur substantial expense to install and reinstall	
8	infrastructure to capture streamflow that is variable, unreliable, and unlikely to be sufficient	
9	to meet the Fort's needs. <sup>8</sup>	
10		
11	This case presents a unique combination of factors. The perennial and intermittent	
12	reaches of the streamflow are on the reservation land so there do not appear to be either	
13	competing upstream or downstream users. <sup>9</sup> The streamflow is highly variable and unreliable	
14	and the primary purpose requires a steady water supply Huachuca and Garden Canyon	
15		
16	streamflow varies from flood to drought conditions from year to year, month to month, and	
17	even day to day. The Fort's need for water, in contrast, is a constant daily need. Every single	
18 10	day it must meet at least the current minimum demand by Fort personnel for 3.1 acre feet of	
20	water (1,138 AFA /365). Unlike other uses that can tolerate flexibility in flow, the Fort	
21	cannot operate using a water source that provides little to no streamflow for days, weeks or	
22	months. It cannot run its operation that requires in excess of 1,100 AFA relying primarily on	
23	surface water sources that may, in some years, only produce 38 acre-feet in a year as measured	
24	for the second for th	
25	This proposal also appears to present a timing issue. It does not allow the United States to	
26	calculate the amount of groundwater to which it is entitled until the conclusion of the year thereby delaying access to the groundwater.	
27	<sup>9</sup> Notably, no party appears to seek to protect the streamflow from a right that would convey	
28	all of the streamflow to the United States.	
	ο το	

at the gages for Huachuca Canyon and Garden Canyon or approximately three percent of the water needed, and in other years produce over 2,000 acre-feet in a single month and destroy the distribution system. Thus, the physical realities that must be accepted are that the median streamflow is less than annual demand, the variability of the streamflow is great, and the Fort's needs are constant.

In light of these facts and circumstances, two approaches exist. One approach is to 7 8 declare that the surface water is inadequate and identify groundwater as the sole source of the 9 federal reserved water right. This approach would impose the greatest demand on the aquifer 10 and the least demand on the surface water. It is also not consistent with the Gila III decision. 11 Implicit in the Gila III decision is the expectation that surface water, to the extent that it is 12 13 available, will be subject to the federal right and groundwater will be used to fulfill any 14 deficit. The second approach is a different form of conjunctive use than that proposed by 15 Freeport and Liberty. 16

## CONCLUSION

The United States will have a federal reserved water right to 1,548 AFA from the appurtenant groundwater, all of Huachuca Canyon streamflow and all of Garden Canyon streamflow. The decree will state that if the United States were to once again construct the infrastructure and storage allowing it to use the streamflow water, then its federal reserved water right to groundwater, measured on a basis concurrent with its use of the surface water use, would be reduced by that use.

25

17

1

2

3

4

5

6

26 27

1	IT IS ORDERED that the United States will submit a form of decree consistent with	
2	the decisions in this Order by October 15, 2024. The other parties may submit objections to	
3	the form of decree by November 15, 2024.	
4	Dated September 6, 2024	
5	M. C. L. R.	
0	The Honorable Mark H. Brain	
8	Judge, Maricopa County Superior Court	
9		
10		
11		
12		
13	×	
14		
15		
16		
17		
18		
19		
20		
21		
22		
24		
25		
26		
27		
28		
	0/	-