

**Oklahoma  
Comprehensive Water Plan**

**Regional Input Meeting #1**

Big Cabin, OK  
August 7, 2008

## MEETING AGENDA

Time	Topic	Speaker/Facilitator
3:00 pm	Afternoon Session Convened	
3:05 pm	Welcome	Ed Crone, Executive Director, Grand Gateway Economic Development Association
3:10 pm	Meeting Purpose and Staff Introductions	Mike Langston, Institute Assistant Director
3:30 pm	Discussant Introductions and Water Facts Discussion	Dianna Leggett, Facilitator
3:45 pm	Small Group Discussions of Issue Ratings	
5:00 pm	Plenary Group Discussion of Issue Ratings	Dianna Leggett
6:30 pm	Afternoon Session Adjourned	
7:00 pm	Evening Session Convened	
7:15 pm	Public Discussion of Issue Ratings	Mike Langston
9:20 pm	Evening Session Adjourned	

The purpose of the Regional Input Meetings is to determine which issues deserve priority attention as we move forward in the water planning process. In this region, 31 citizens were invited to participate in a discussion about the importance of 55 issue categories, which were created by grouping the 2500+ comments obtained from the 42 Local Input Meetings held in 2007. The participants ranked an issue category as highly important if they believed that the issue category should be discussed in the planning workshops that will be held in 2009. Otherwise, they ranked the issue category as having low importance.

Twenty-seven citizens participated in the afternoon session, which was witnessed by another 27 observers. The observers were encouraged to listen carefully to what was being discussed and then given the opportunity to offer their own comments and suggestions during the evening session. Altogether, 32 citizens participated in the evening session.

In the tables that follow, the ratings by the participants of each of the 55 issue categories are presented in the second column. The **bold** (in black) ratings (“H” and “L”) are the ratings given by the discussants in the afternoon session. Where agreement among the discussants was reached, only one rating is presented. If no agreement was reached, then “H/L” is recorded. If the observers differed on the ratings offered in the evening session, then these are recorded in *italics* (blue color).

The rationales for each rating are presented in the third column of each table. Rationales written in **bold** (black color) are those offered by the discussants in the afternoon meeting. Rationales written in *italics* (blue color) are those offered by observers during the evening session.

## QUANTITY (Qn) ISSUE CATEGORY

*(issues associated with the collection, storage, and distribution of water to reliably meet water needs)*

ISSUE CATEGORY	STATE-WIDE PRIORITY	EXPLANATION/RATIONALE
<p><b>Qn-1.</b> Improving drinking water infrastructure (such as building additional impoundments, better transport systems or enhancing recharge) to ensure adequate supplies of water</p>	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>We need to look at this because the plan is for the next 50 years.</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>Qn-2.</b> Improving maintenance of water supply systems including dams and pipelines</p>	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The issue is not timely.</b></li> <li>• <b>Because of the age of the dams, it is a high priority and many legislators are working on it. It needs to be addressed.</b></li> <li>• <b>We should combine this issue with Qn-1; Qn-1 is the single most important issue for the plan.</b></li> <li>• <b>OK should push the federal government to create new storage structures.</b></li> <li>• <i>Dams and water pipes need repair now – they are old.</i></li> <li>• <i>Many of our water supply lakes have exceeded their 50-year life span.</i></li> <li>• <i>When we built our first set of dams, we cherry-picked the best locations for hydropower. We are looking at dredging lakes and not just building new ones. It may be better to maintain the dams that we have rather than build new ones.</i></li> <li>• <i>On average, water districts lose 50% of the water they process because of the age and construction of the pipes.</i></li> <li>• <i>Water supply systems need attention right NOW across the state – we certainly will need to address this over the next 50 years. This issue should not be combined with QN-1. Drinking water infrastructure is not necessarily encompassing of other water supply and maintenance.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Qn-3.</b> Increasing (or continuing) state &amp; federal funding of water storage infrastructure</p>	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>We need funding to make water more available.</b></li> <li>• <i>Everything discussed is going to cost money, so it has to be discussed.</i></li> </ul>

<p><b>Qn-4.</b> Considering the effects of climate change on water supplies</p>	<p>L</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>Climate will become important over the next 50 years but it is not necessary to discuss this in the plan</b></li><li>• <i>This needs to be looked at in the plan though it may not be that important to discuss; the technical side should address this in demand projections</i></li><li>• <i>We have population growth, climate change, general water supplies, technological change, and environmental concerns that will affect planning. Plan details will include this information.</i></li></ul>
---	----------	--

## QUALITY (QI) ISSUE CATEGORY

*(issues associated with water wastewater collection and treatment, as well as source protection)*

ISSUE CATEGORY	STATE-WIDE PRIORITY	EXPLANATION/RATIONALE
<p><b>QI-1.</b> Increasing (or maintaining) state &amp; federal funding available for water treatment/protection</p>	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We can't do anything without money.</li> <li>• The issue definition should include water users. Therefore, the first source of funding should be local.</li> <li>• We should think more about infrastructure in the issue definition because treatment is more local.</li> <li>• All sources of funding should be looked at.</li> </ul>
<p><b>QI-2.</b> Improving drinking water treatment/protection</p>	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• To sustain the system, we need to do keep improving it.</li> <li>• Public health is a major issue and needs to be addressed in the plan.</li> </ul>
<p><b>QI-3.</b> Developing better technology for treating wastewater</p>	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is one of the things we want the plan to do for us over the next 50 years.</li> </ul>
<p><b>QI-4.</b> Providing the public with accurate and timely water quality information</p>	L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There needs to be a mechanism to do this but it may be outside the scope of the plan and thus not as important.</li> <li>• <i>There are mechanisms already in place to take care of this.</i></li> </ul>

## WATER TRANSFER AND SALE (T) ISSUE CATEGORY

*(issues associated with the inter-basin transfer of water in OK as well as sales of water outside of OK)*

ISSUE CATEGORY	STATE-WIDE PRIORITY	EXPLANATION/RATIONALE
<p><b>T-1.</b> Water sales or transfers within the state</p>	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>This issue needs to be discussed.</b></li> <li>• <i>It is important because we need to balance supply and demand.</i></li> <li>• <i>We must discuss the sale and transfer of water.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>T-2.</b> Water sales or transfers outside of the state</p>	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>These are key components of the water planning process. We need to look at future needs beyond 50 years before we sell water out of state.</b></li> <li>• <b>If we were selling water to people upstream, then we would be concerned about water quality coming back into the state.</b></li> <li>• <i>Because Texas has more representatives at the federal level, something is going to happen.</i></li> <li>• <i>But they don't have more Senators!</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>T-3.</b> Issues regarding the economic impact of sales or transfers on the state or the basin of origin</p>	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>This issue is important because it affects our state's economy and should be addressed in the state plan.</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>T-4.</b> Issues about who controls the water and land if water is sold or transferred</p>	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The language may need to be more clear. Water rights are important as is concern about infringement on water rights.</b></li> </ul>

## APPROPRIATED WATER USE (UA) ISSUE CATEGORY

*(issues associated with the uses of water, including conjunctive management (of surface and ground water) and minimum stream flow (to protect aquatic life))*

ISSUE CATEGORY	STATE-WIDE PRIORITY	EXPLANATION/RATIONALE
<p><b>UA-1.</b> Ground water as private property</p>	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This may be one of the biggest issues facing the water board. There is concern that control of water could end up in a monopoly.</li> <li>• Agriculture is strong in OK because of the groundwater rights they have for irrigation, especially in the western part of the state.</li> </ul>
<p><b>UA-2.</b> Consideration of the interaction between ground and surface water in allocation decisions</p>	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This has to be part of the plan. They affect each other but yet are regulated differently.</li> <li>• Surface water is state water and groundwater is a private property right. So trying to tie stream water and groundwater together is a mistake, but it needs to be discussed.</li> </ul>
<p><b>UA-3.</b> Developing a list of water use priorities to guide decisions during drought (e.g., which uses should be shut off first during drought)</p>	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This should be done regionally, by municipality, or by a supplier. It may not be able to be done statewide.</li> <li>• Having a state agency tell a local area how to handle the issue of priorities is probably beyond what they should do.</li> <li>• All other state agencies have to write a document that says how they will address the plan. This does not just affect the Water Board.</li> <li>• <i>Existing law does not have a list of priorities. Therefore, UA-3, and UA-8 – UA-15 require a complete upheaval of the State's current water rights system. These questions are not appropriate unless a position has first been adopted that the State will establish priorities.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>UA-4.</b> Considering the water quality and quantity needs of ecosystems as part of allocation decisions</p>	H/L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some thought it was already addressed by other agencies and others felt it should be part of the water plan. We shouldn't ignore this issue but we don't want to go to extremes either.</li> <li>• This affects recreation such as hunting and fishing. Even though there are regulations that protect some species, many species that don't need protection now but may need it in 50 years.</li> <li>• <i>Wetlands in many parts of the state are important as filtration mechanisms.</i></li> <li>• <i>Healthy ecosystems mean better water quality.</i></li> <li>• <i>Florida has been through this; they would tell us it should be ranked high.</i></li> <li>• <i>The Water Board should have their fingers in all water issues.</i></li> <li>• <i>Determination of environmental flows is necessary to maintain healthy freshwater ecosystems. Environmental flow prescriptions would help protect resources (fish &amp; wildlife) used by many Oklahomans, including those who hunt, fish and participate in other outdoor recreational activities such as hiking, camping, swimming, wildlife viewing, photography, and boating. Protecting freshwater ecosystems also would help recover federally-listed species and help prevent the need to list additional aquatic or aquatic-dependent species.</i></li> </ul>

<p><b>UA-5.</b> Permitting of water uses</p>	<p>H/L</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>That is the purpose of the water plan. In this region permitting is done by the GRDA, but in other regions, it is done by the OWRB. The tribes may also have some role in this.</b></li> <li>• <i>There has to be a central control of permitting, like the Water Board.</i></li> <li>• <i>Permitting of water to outside the area of origin should allow local citizens to have some say in the permitting process.</i></li> <li>• <i>The permitting system is different in the GRDA area than the rest of the state. Permitting should be consistent across the state no matter which agency does it.</i></li> <li>• <i>There is already a permitting process in place. This may need to be reworded (updated). I am unsure about the rational of ranking it high.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>UA-6.</b> Considering the need of adequate amounts of water to further economic development when making allocation decisions</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>If we could sell water a bottle at a time, we could all be wealthy.</b></li> <li>• <b>Everything below this issue category should be high because of the purpose of the plan and the planning horizon. Water use in general is important even though some issues are more important than others.</b></li> <li>• <b>All water use issues should be ranked high. Look at supply and demand.</b></li> <li>• <i>In considering water needs, we have to consider water quality as well.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>UA-7.</b> Considering the effect of population change on water needs in allocation decisions</p>	<p>L/H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>People move to where the water is.</b></li> <li>• <i>Since population drives demand, population forecasts should be considered.</i></li> <li>• <i>Only 8% of the water used is for public supply.</i></li> <li>• <i>Water for agricultural use is tied to population growth in the area; people need food.</i></li> <li>• <i>Potable water for human consumption is what is important.</i></li> <li>• <i>Water allocation is based on population projection, which cities estimate is growing more there than in rural areas. But if more and more water is diverted to cities, rural areas will have a hard time meeting their demands.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>UA-8.</b> Considering the water needs of recreation and tourism in allocation decisions</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>This is a state priority even though it is also very important in this region.</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>UA-9.</b> Considering the water needs of agriculture and agriculture industry in allocation decisions</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>This is important for all agriculture uses across the state, especially for poultry in this region.</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>UA-10.</b> Considering the water needs of oil and gas production, including refining and exploration in allocation decisions</p>	<p>L/H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>We had questions about the water needs of oil and gas.</b></li> <li>• <i>Water is very important to the drilling, completion and production of oil and gas. We are in about 72 counties across the state and our industry as a whole is a benefit to the state as we pay a gross production tax to the state and paid over one billion dollars to help fund the state's budget. There are new technologies that require more water in the southeast part of the state. The oil and gas industry as a whole feels this should be a high priority. The high priority rating should be assigned to all industrial uses across the state.</i></li> <li>• <i>One of the things discussed was where the water came from and if they would use permitted</i></li> </ul>

		<p><i>water or if they got from some other source.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Maybe the water plan should look at how to help industries develop new technologies to develop better use practices.</i></li> <li>• <i>Oil and gas industry is very important in large areas of the state. We must take a long-term, broad-minded approach – as for all water use issues.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>UA-11.</b> Considering the water needs of mining in allocation decisions</p>	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>This is already addressed by the OK Department of Mines.</b></li> <li>• <i>We [aggregates] produce 85 million tons of rock, sand and gravel for building purposes and food and medication. It represents the foundation of the construction industry of OK; its economic impact is \$1.2 billion. The amount of water used is small and much of the water is reused. This industry needs access to water and society needs the products. The facts regarding the industry need to be known.</i></li> <li>• <i>This is a comprehensive water plan so it should consider all the major users of water in the state. Even if it is not a big use, it is not up to us to decide that it should be overlooked. All the uses rated low should be rated high.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>UA-12.</b> Considering the water needs of navigation in allocation decisions</p>	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Too much water or too little water has affected navigation and is very important to the whole state.</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>UA-13.</b> Considering the water needs of hydropower in allocation decisions</p>	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>This helps keep energy costs low even though it may be a small part of OK use.</b></li> <li>• <i>This may be a low use of water but it is important to consider because we need to look at all uses.</i></li> <li>• <i>When generators are running, one million gallons of water runs through them every 11 seconds. The state was no help to us at Lake Eufaula because it was a federal issue rather than a state issue. There is a trade-off between cheap electricity and the water level behind these hydropower dams.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>UA-14.</b> Considering the water needs of industry in allocation decisions</p>	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>We wouldn't be here without industry.</b></li> <li>• <i>Needs to be a wise use of water because some industries are water intensive; conservation needs to be part of the plan.</i></li> <li>• <i>In this region, we don't have a problem with water to an industry. Our problem is water out from industry – we can't handle the wastewater.</i></li> <li>• <i>That would make conservation more important; if you can't treat it then you are wasting it.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>UA-15.</b> Considering the water needs of municipalities in allocation decisions</p>	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>What municipalities need is important.</b></li> </ul>

## WATER CONSERVATION AND REUSE (C) ISSUE CATEGORY

*(issues associated with water conservation, such as increased water use efficiency, reduced wasting of water, use of marginal waters, and reuse of gray water)*

ISSUE CATEGORY	STATE-WIDE PRIORITY	EXPLANATION/RATIONALE
<b>C-1.</b> Reducing water use by changing use practices or not wasting water	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan should not necessarily address changing use practices; however, not wasting water is a high priority and should be separate from the first part of the issue.</li> <li>• Conservation technology should be addressed more to industry and ag uses because they are bigger users.</li> <li>• Education &amp; research will take care of these issues over time, so no need to consider.</li> </ul>
<b>C-2.</b> Reusing water including treated wastewater, gray water, produced waters (oil and gas) and storm water runoff	H/L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Reusing water is important and should be addressed.</li> <li>• Education and research will take care of these issues over time.</li> </ul>
<b>C-3.</b> Education to students and adults specifically about conservation	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This may occur but is not necessarily a high focus.</li> <li>• <i>This should be a high priority because the more you know, the more you will spread the word - which will increase conservation and quality issues.</i></li> <li>• <i>It has to be both within structured education in the schools but also out to the general public through water bills and county fairs.</i></li> <li>• <i>Many feel that education is already out there; but as an educator, I see it as the same information that we had as kids – and nothing changed. So the more you know about it, the quicker you will deal with the problem and address it.</i></li> <li>• <i>Increased education – not just about conservation, but also how the water gets to your house and how the water is cleaned – will help people understand and will allow for better infrastructure.</i></li> </ul>
<b>C-4.</b> Incentives specifically targeted to promote water conservation	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If conservation was part of the plan, then the specifics will come out over time. These don't need to be in the plan <i>per se</i>.</li> <li>• <i>There are already mechanisms to encourage conservation through loans and grants programs.</i></li> <li>• <i>There should be tax breaks for advanced environmental controls such as lagoons at CAFOs and methane gas generation. This should be a high priority.</i></li> </ul>
<b>C-5.</b> Research specifically about conservation, such as developing new technologies to decrease use	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If conservation is part of the plan, then research on new technologies needs to be part of the plan – especially for industry and agriculture.</li> <li>• <i>You shouldn't call out just industry and ag because some municipalities also lose water. The plan needs to look at all users for conservation technologies.</i></li> <li>• <i>Long-term thinking should absolutely include research: government funded/partnership funding/research incentives, etc.</i></li> </ul>

## LAND MANAGEMENT AND HAZARD MITIGATION (LH) ISSUE CATEGORY

*(issues associated with land management practices to protect water resources (e.g., riparian area restoration, soil conservation, and wetlands enhancement) and with measures to reduce damage from natural and man-made hazards, including terrorism)*

ISSUE CATEGORY	STATE-WIDE PRIORITY	EXPLANATION/RATIONALE
<p><b>LH-1.</b> Natural or man-made disasters affecting either water infrastructure or supply</p>	<p>L/H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If reworded as drought or flood only, then high, because it is easier to plan for these but can't necessarily plan for a tornado or hurricanes.</li> <li>• <b>Why just focus on drought and flood (see above)?</b></li> <li>• <i>I disagree with a focus only on drought and flood. All disasters need to be considered; you can plan for natural and man-made disasters. This should be ranked high.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>LH-2.</b> Land management practices that effect water quality and quantity</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Without good land management practices, we are not going to have good water quality. We need to look at it as a system.</b></li> <li>• <i>There is rapid infiltration in this region because of the karst topography. It is particularly important to this part of the state because what is on the surface travels quickly to the groundwater.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>LH-3.</b> Meeting the water needs of fire fighting</p>	<p>L/H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>It is important that they have appropriate water but this is more a local issue and not necessarily one for the water plan.</b></li> <li>• <i>This should be considered a high priority because of wildfires in rural areas.</i></li> <li>• <i>It should be high priority because there are issues about water line sizes. Because of funding requirements against speculative building, this dictates line size. But if Oklahoma set it as a high priority, then federal agencies will take that into consideration.</i></li> <li>• <i>It costs the homeowner more in insurance if there is not a six-inch line.</i></li> </ul>

## WATER MANAGEMENT AGENCIES AND PROCEDURES (AP) ISSUE CATEGORY

*(issues associated with the jurisdictions, authorities, and procedures of water management agencies)*

ISSUE CATEGORY	STATE-WIDE PRIORITY	EXPLANATION/RATIONALE
<p><b>AP-1.</b> Changes to agency jurisdictions/authority (such as limiting, expanding or consolidating duties)</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We should look for efficiency improvements.</li> </ul>
<p><b>AP-2.</b> Changes to the authority of cities, conservation districts, rural water districts and other locally led organizations</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We want to maintain checks and balances.</li> <li>• <i>They should be changed to allow/encourage regional participation in the permitting and administration of water.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>AP-3.</b> Changing the services agencies offer</p>	<p>L</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• More administrative</li> </ul>
<p><b>AP-4.</b> Enforcing current laws and regulations by the appropriate agency</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• If the laws on the books were enforced, we would avoid some of the conflicts. We need more accountability and keep better track of it.</li> <li>• We need more consistent enforcement.</li> <li>• Sometimes federal standards enforcement will shut down small systems (federal standards may be okay for New York City but not for Big Cabin).</li> <li>• <i>Amen</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>AP-5.</b> Effects of federal regulations on state issues</p>	<p>L/H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a question of efficiency; it's important but may be discretionary in planning.</li> <li>• <i>Is this appropriate for the state plan? It is important to the State but maybe not in the scope of the plan.</i></li> <li>• <i>There is a problem with the federal gov't getting involved. Sometimes you have to deal with the federal gov't and the state cannot get involved because of preemption.</i></li> <li>• <i>It should be high because federal regulations can change and make water in Oklahoma unavailable for use.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>AP-6.</b> Effects of current, and suggestions for new state regulations/laws</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We may be able to affect federal regulations through State rules and regulations.</li> </ul>
<p><b>AP-7.</b> Developing or increasing federal and state incentive programs to promote compliance with regulations</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We need to look at equity in incentives.</li> <li>• Fear of a notice of a violation keeps me in line with the regulations.</li> <li>• Regulations are the proper way to ensure compliance.</li> <li>• This may not fit in with the water plan, itself.</li> <li>• EPA (DEQ) is trying to help the systems stay ahead of the game.</li> <li>• This dovetails with financing for infrastructure because the incentives may provide funding for infrastructure.</li> <li>• <i>Enforcement needs to be improved on current rules and regulations.</i></li> </ul>

<p><b>AP-8.</b> Improvement or changes to the current permitting process</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>More substantive.</b></li> <li>• <i>There should be different kinds of permits to protect other uses.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>AP-9.</b> Water Rights</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Though may be outside the scope of planning, this should to be discussed.</b></li> <li>• <i>This should be coupled with AP-12.</i></li> <li>• <i>What about storage rights? If we don't have storage rights, then we don't have any water rights because we can't use the water we have. The heights of dams should be increased to allow for more storage. For example Lake Tenkiller has no storage rights available.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>AP-10.</b> Levying taxes on water sales, transfers, or other actions</p>	<p>L</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Low priority.</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>AP-11.</b> Consolidating water treatment facilities (or other infrastructure) of municipal and/or rural water districts</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Very important. Needs more discussion.</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>AP-12.</b> Tribal claims to both ground and surface water</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Though may be outside the scope of planning, this should be discussed.</b></li> <li>• <i>Tribes have a claim to water in the state. The title to water is a serious issue affecting economic development. The state has got to negotiate with the tribes and they need to do it before the plan is finalized – not after as has been suggested.</i></li> <li>• <i>It is the 800 lb gorilla in the closet.</i></li> <li>• <i>Until this is settled, the rest of this is going to be a problem.</i></li> </ul>

## WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANNING (P) ISSUE CATEGORY

*(issues associated with how planning should be conducted, including scope, public participation procedures, funding, evaluation, and conflict management)*

ISSUE CATEGORY	STATE-WIDE PRIORITY	EXPLANATION/RATIONALE
<b>P-1.</b> Finding ways to balance demand & supply to ensure equity	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Equity can be ambiguous, so eliminate “ensure equity.”</b></li> <li>• <i>All wells should be metered to get accurate information.</i></li> </ul>
<b>P-2.</b> Ways to improve the planning process	L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The process is pretty much identified already; we didn’t want to spend a lot time of thinking about how to improve it.</b></li> </ul>
<b>P-3.</b> Working with other states on both our ground and surface issues of quality and quantity to avoid conflicts	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Regional issues often extend across state boundaries.</b></li> <li>• <i>We should know how much water is leaving OK &amp; look at keeping as much as we can.</i></li> </ul>
<b>P-4.</b> Involving the public in the planning process	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The public is already involved.</b></li> <li>• <i>This should be a high priority; the public needs to be involved.</i></li> <li>• <i>The public needs to be informed about what is happening currently with the process and water in our state in general. This should be a high priority.</i></li> </ul>
<b>P-5.</b> Recognizing water availability, use, and rainfall differences across the state	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>One size does not fit all. We need to look at how to account for differences – especially if there is going to be legislation.</b></li> <li>• <b>We need to recognize that water availability is different across the state.</b></li> <li>• <b>Regional differences should be written into any law changes.</b></li> </ul>
<b>P-6.</b> Identifying research needs during the planning process	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Identifying data gaps is important so the different agencies charged with providing the data can know where to get it. This could replace P-2 because it could take care of this.</b></li> </ul>
<b>P-7.</b> Updating the Comprehensive Water Plan more frequently than every decade	L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The document may need to be tweaked as we learn new things. It should be a living document.</b></li> <li>• <i>As things change, the document may need to be changed – but this should not require an entirely new plan.</i></li> </ul>
<b>P-8.</b> Developing procedures to deal with conflict during and after the planning process	H/L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>High importance if a statewide issue but lower for a regional issue.</b></li> <li>• <b>This is generally a regional/local issue.</b></li> <li>• <i>There needs to be a mechanism to resolve issues at the local level – the state should have preemptive authority under certain criteria, but the locals should be involved.</i></li> <li>• <i>There needs to be equalization between regional and local issues to protect locals from the political power of larger groups.</i></li> <li>• <i>There should be self-policing on a basin basis – GGEDA has been looking at working with all interests in the Grand River Basin, including other states.</i></li> <li>• <i>We need procedures in place.</i></li> </ul>

