

**Oklahoma  
Comprehensive Water Plan**

**Regional Input Meeting #6**

Enid, OK  
Sept. 25, 2008

## Meeting Agenda

Time	Topic	Speaker/Facilitator
3:05 pm	Afternoon Session Convened	
3:15 pm	Meeting Purpose and Staff Introductions	Mike Langston, Institute Assistant Director
3:30 pm	Discussant Introductions and Water Facts Discussion	Dianna Leggett, Facilitator
3:50 pm	Small Group Discussions of Issue Ratings	
5:05 pm	Plenary Group Discussion of Issue Ratings	Dianna Leggett
6:35 pm	Afternoon Session Adjourned	
7:20 pm	Public Discussion of Issue Ratings	Mike Langston
8:05 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, 34 citizens were invited to participate in a discussion about the importance of 54 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.

Thirty-two citizens participated in the afternoon session, which was witnessed by another nine 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, 23 citizens participated in the evening session.

In the tables that follow, the ratings by the participants of each of the 54 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.

During the RIM, we also obtained several comments that express concerns, facts, or preferences for water resource management, rather than whether the issue should be discussed at the next level. We included these non-prioritization comments in a table at the end of this report.

## QUANTITY (QN) ISSUE CATEGORY

(ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH THE COLLECTION, STORAGE, AND DISTRIBUTION OF WATER TO RELIABLY MEET WATER NEEDS)

THE PLAN SHOULD CONSIDER...	STATE-WIDE PRIORITY	EXPLANATION/RATIONALE
<p><b>Qn-1.</b> the improvement and expansion of drinking water infrastructure, such as impoundments, distribution systems and aquifer recharge measures</p>	H/L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The group was split. On the low side it is already being done and addressed at different levels.</li> <li>• Others felt it is important to discuss especially when looking at the next 50 years. As populations increase we may need to look at the infrastructure across the state.</li> <li>• This should be high because we could rehabilitate some of the flood control dams to use them as a supply.</li> <li>• <i>In light of the present financial situation, funding of these items (QN-1, QN-2 and QI-1) will be more difficult. Also, without settling the Indian situation, funding could be impossible.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>Qn-2.</b> maintenance of water supply systems, such as dams and pipelines</p>	H/L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Some felt it should always be maintained if you build you need maintain it so was important to discuss.</li> <li>• Others felt that it was already being done so there didn't need to be discussion about this issue.</li> <li>• This is somewhat related to QN-3 because of funding. Maintenance is not adequate and problems with water supply systems have to be addressed, as well as flood control dams because the funding is inadequate and piecemeal. So this should be rated high.</li> <li>• This should be rated high. The flood control dams need to be repaired and municipalities could be at risk. Part of the problem is when you build a dam many think that it will never wear out and this does need to be a high issue. Pipelines as well need to be looked at because they are getting old as well.</li> </ul>
<p><b>Qn-3.</b> State and federal funding of water storage infrastructure</p>	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Funding always needs to be address especially when it comes to water needs.</li> </ul>

**Qn-4.** the effects of climate change on water supplies

L

- This is low because we don't know enough about it and it is unpredictable. If you take care of some of the other issues you can get through the dry times and the wet times.

## QUALITY (QL) ISSUE CATEGORY

(ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH WATER AND WASTEWATER COLLECTION AND TREATMENT, AS WELL AS SOURCE PROTECTION)

THE PLAN SHOULD CONSIDER...	STATE-WIDE PRIORITY	EXPLANATION/RATIONALE
<p><b>QI-1.</b> State and federal funding of water treatment and protection</p>	<p><b>H</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On the high side we felt this was an unfunded mandate. It is being regulated but the regulations are unfunded and need to be reviewed.</li> <li>• This is a state plan, how do we get the federal government to give us money for our state plan.</li> <li>• Many of the mandates are federal and the state plan needs to draw from the federal government. So this should be high to address this issue.</li> <li>• We do need to look at where funds come from and if it comes from the federal government we should look at it.</li> </ul>
<p><b>QI-2.</b> more and better measures to protect drinking water</p>	<p><b>H/L</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We already do this so this is a low priority.</li> <li>• I think this should be high as there should be more protection (security) of treatment plants to prevent contamination of our drinking water plants.</li> <li>• This was originally discussed more in a regulatory way and that is why it was rated low.</li> <li>• If you look at protecting the watershed then this issue should be rated high. In many cases if you look at working with watershed landowners then you can clean up the water and avoid having to build treatment plants. It is working across the state already – Tulsa is doing it in the Eucha-Spavinaw area. We need to think outside the box and this discussion needs to happen</li> <li>• This should be a high priority. We really need to protect our water supply and with changes in industry we must protect our water source. Contamination happens over time and water quality should continually be monitored.</li> </ul>

<b>QI-3.</b> better technology for treating wastewater	L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This always changes and fluctuates with technology so we don't need to discuss this right now.</li></ul>
<b>QI-4.</b> requirements for providing the public with accurate and timely water quality information	L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• A lot of this is already being done and regulated so it does not need to be discussed.</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)*

THE PLAN SHOULD CONSIDER...	STATE-WIDE PRIORITY	EXPLANATION/RATIONALE
<p><b>C-1.</b> measures to encourage conservation through improving water use efficiency and wasting less water</p>	<p>H/L</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a high priority because we need to conserve what we have. There is a difference between conservation and efficiency and if we get more efficient that takes care of conservation.</li> <li>• In most cases the market makes the decision and this doesn't need to be discussed.</li> <li>• It is not economical and this is not a high issue. It doesn't make sense to pump water to other places because of the cost of it.</li> <li>• We already have regulations on the amounts of how much water can be used so this does need to be discussed.</li> <li>• Conservation could come into play when you have to supply more water as a municipality and have to build more lines, that is going to be expensive and I think this should be a high priority.</li> <li>• You have opportunity to conserve in urban areas mainly and this should be left to the cities to regulate. The more effective the cities are then the lower their treatment costs are for both sewage and drinking water.</li> </ul>
<p><b>C-2.</b> measures that encourage the reuse of treated wastewater, gray water, produced water (oil and gas) and storm water run-off</p>	<p>H/L</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is not regulated but it is permitted. There should not be more regulation but it should be allocated.</li> <li>• You should not mandate the use of water as this is also market driven.</li> <li>• As you have to increase the cost of treating wastewater then the use of gray water becomes more plausible. I agree this is a low priority.</li> <li>• If you are developing a plan for the state you need to include a plan for efficiency and conservation.</li> <li>• The efficiency side yes but conservation probably not.</li> </ul>

<p><b>C-3.</b> improved educational programs about water conservation for all Oklahomans</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Education is never wasted and this should be encouraged and this is a high priority.</li> </ul>
<p><b>C-4.</b> incentives to promote water conservation</p>	<p>L</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a low priority as it will fluctuate with the market.</li> <li>• Education is great but I don't think you provide incentives for conservation so this should be a low priority.</li> <li>• This should be high because there are incentives that can have a low economic impact on the state. Other states are encouraging it and Arkansas estimates by using different technologies you could save over 5.5 billion gallons of water. With all of our commodities going up and the costs of treating water increasing if we adapt these newer principles then savings could be instituted. It is more economic to reduce use then to recycle water. If you are looking at a comprehensive program and if we are going to have to transport water, for example to this region, the less water you use the less it will cost.</li> </ul>
<p><b>C-5.</b> research programs that assess improved methods for water conservation</p>	<p>L</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Research is handled by agencies and researchers and this shouldn't be done by the legislature.</li> </ul>

## APPROPRIATED WATER USES (AP) ISSUE CATEGORY

(ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH USES OF WATER, INCLUDING CONJUNCTIVE MANAGEMENT (OF SURFACE AND GROUND WATER) AND MINIMUM STREAM FLOWS (TO PROTECT AQUATIC LIFE))

THE PLAN SHOULD CONSIDER...	STATE-WIDE PRIORITY	EXPLANATION/RATIONALE
<p><b>UA-1.</b> changes in water law regarding groundwater and surface water use</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The science of groundwater and surface water need to be honored. It is a very contentious issue. If you own the water rights under your property you don't want someone to come in tell you how to use it.</li> <li>• This should maybe be a low priority because we already have water and maybe it should not be discussed in the plan.</li> <li>• There is concern that because the issue says allocation decisions it will change water law.</li> <li>• Do we want further regulations or do we want to change the current systems. If you discuss this it could lead to change.</li> <li>• There are already current owners of groundwater and if someone wants it then they should buy it.</li> </ul>
<p><b>UA-2.</b> the interaction between ground and surface water in allocation decisions</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Groundwater and surface water are connected and you have to honor the science when making decisions.</li> </ul>
<p><b>UA-3.</b> prioritizing water uses during shortages</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Better to discuss now when we have plenty of water. We recently had drought so better to plan now. We have had low lake levels but this cannot be helped. To enforce an allocation system it needs to be written down beforehand and there needs to be an implementation plan.</li> </ul>
<p><b>UA-4.</b> the water quality and quantity needs of ecosystems in allocation decisions</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Put it in perspective – ecosystems vs. human life. Because we talked about it so much it should be high even though some thought it should be low. This issue enjoys a great deal of public support so a lot of people think this should be high.</li> </ul>

<b>UA-5.</b> the need of adequate amounts of water to further economic development in allocation decisions	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is critical for ethanol production and producing wealth. Some industries can use lower quality water.</li> </ul>
<b>UA-6.</b> the effect of population change on water needs in allocation decisions	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is critical to planning. This is what this plan is about. The population will double soon and may continue to do so.</li> </ul>
<b>UA-7.</b> the water needs of recreation and tourism in allocation decisions	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We need to do something with the water before it gets to Texas. But this goes back to prioritization, and recreation and tourism are an industry themselves and there really isn't anyone who speaks for this as there is for agriculture use.</li> </ul>
<b>UA-8.</b> the water needs of agriculture and agriculture industry in allocation decisions	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Ag owns most of the groundwater in the state and the threshold question is will the law be changed. The market place needs to decide how these decisions are made.</li> </ul>
<b>UA-9.</b> the water needs of oil and gas production, including refining and exploration, in allocation decisions	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oil and gas production and refining have different needs of water.</li> <li>• I think combining all these uses is the only way to do it.</li> </ul>
<b>UA-10.</b> the water needs of mining in allocation decisions	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Oil and gas and mining maybe should be included with all other industry.</li> </ul>
<b>UA-11.</b> the water needs of navigation in allocation decisions	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Again all industry should be included together. What does wasting water really mean?</li> </ul>
<b>UA-12.</b> the water needs of hydropower in allocation decisions	H/L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Hydropower is one of the cheapest ways to produce electricity. We don't produce electricity if there isn't water. Also it is regulated federally so may not be much we can do.</li> <li>• We have better uses for our water.</li> <li>• This could be very important to the eastern part of the state but low to our area because we don't have a lot of dams here.</li> </ul>
<b>UA-13.</b> the water needs of industry in allocation decisions	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Again this should be included with all other industrial use.</li> </ul>
<b>UA-14.</b> the water needs of municipalities in allocation decisions	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The municipalities are where most people and business are located. Municipal use is the highest use and so should be discussed.</li> </ul>

## WATER TRANSFERS AND SALES (T) ISSUE CATEGORY

*(ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH THE INTER-BASIN TRANSFER OF WATER IN OKLAHOMA AS WELL AS SALES OF WATER OUTSIDE OKLAHOMA)*

THE PLAN SHOULD CONSIDER...	STATE-WIDE PRIORITY	EXPLANATION/RATIONALE
<p><b>T-1.</b> water sales or transfers within the State</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This should be a high priority. This pretty much speaks for itself. We need to make sure we have water in all corners of the state.</li> </ul>
<p><b>T-2.</b> water sales or transfers outside of the State</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a high priority because when you look at state assets it deserves discussion. Not saying it is a good idea or bad idea but it has to be discussed.</li> <li>• A lot of our water originates outside our state such as Colorado and Kansas and if we say don't sell to Texas could Colorado and Kansas do the same to us. We need to discuss this.</li> </ul>
<p><b>T-3.</b> the economic impact of sales or transfers on the entire State, as well as the basin of origin</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Again this needs discussion. You have to look at the economic impact. All three of these issues are linked and important to discuss.</li> </ul>
<p><b>T-4.</b> how water and land is managed within the basin of origin if water is sold or transferred</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a high priority. If you look at transferring or selling water you have make sure you have adequate quality and quantity. Again this is tied with the first three.</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 THE DAMAGE FROM NATURAL AND MAN-MADE HAZARDS, INCLUDING TERRORISM)*

THE PLAN SHOULD CONSIDER...	STATE-WIDE PRIORITY	EXPLANATION/RATIONALE
<b>LH-1.</b> how to reduce the impact of natural or man-made disasters that could affect water supply or infrastructure	<b>H/L</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We went high and low. As far as the man-made side there are already other people looking at this. But when looking at natural disasters it should be looked at. Because you need to plan for both flood and drought especially when you think about transferring water across the state.</li> </ul>
<b>LH-2.</b> land management practices that affect water quality and quantity	<b>H</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a high priority. When you look at water statewide you have to look at land management practices and best management practices. When you look at the watershed above a municipality then everyone can come out ahead. We can also work with landowners on irrigation systems and invasive species control.</li> </ul>
<b>LH-3.</b> the infrastructure needs for fire fighting	<b>L</b>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is low priority because it is addressed by other areas and in the statewide plan this isn't as important as other issues, though it is an important issue</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)*

THE PLAN SHOULD CONSIDER...	STATE-WIDE PRIORITY	EXPLANATION/RATIONALE
<b>P-1.</b> ways to balance demand and supply over the long-term	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is what we are here for and this has to be high.</li> </ul>
<b>P-2.</b> ways to improve the current planning process	L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>We are in the process so this should be a low priority for now and focus on the issues and not the process itself.</li> </ul>
<b>P-3.</b> whether and how Oklahoma should work with other states on ground and surface water quality and quantity	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This has to be a high priority because water does not respect political boundaries.</li> </ul>
<b>P-4.</b> how to better involve the public in the planning process	L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is low. Along with P-2 it is already being addressed. If you want the public more involved turn off the water for an hour. Again we shouldn't get bogged down in the process.</li> </ul>
<b>P-5.</b> how to incorporate regional differences in water supply and use	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This has to be a high priority. We need to work together as a state. And you have to have buy in and equity across the state.</li> </ul>
<b>P-6.</b> what research needs to be done during and after the current planning process	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is a low priority. It doesn't need to be decided in the plan. This can be done after the plan.</li> <li>This should be a high priority to make sure we have done the proper research to give us something to base our plan on.</li> </ul>
<b>P-7.</b> treating the water plan as a living document that is reviewed on an ongoing basis	L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is a low priority because we already have the interest in doing the plan and reviewing it.</li> </ul>
<b>P-8.</b> procedures to deal with conflict during and after the planning process	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>This is low priority because there is a process in place for the plan and this can be done after the planning process. There is one already it is called the legislature and if you have done your work then the elected officials will have the buy in.</li> </ul>

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• I look at this as more a process to deal with conflict as people are coming for the water and it should be a high priority so there is a plan to deal with conflict after the plan.</li></ul>
--	--	---

## WATER MANAGEMENT AGENCIES (AP) ISSUE CATEGORY

(ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH THE JURISDICTIONS, AUTHORITIES, AND PROCEDURES OF WATER MANAGEMENT AGENCIES)

THE PLAN SHOULD CONSIDER...	STATE-WIDE PRIORITY	EXPLANATION/RATIONALE
<b>AP-1.</b> changes to State agency jurisdictions, authorities and relationships	H/L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enforcement may take care of this issue but we do need to talk about it. We felt DEQ did not need more control over water.</li> <li>• I think this is a low priority because if you start changing things then everyone will focus on this and not focus on the issues surrounding water because it will become a discussion about what agency does what and that is all anyone will focus on.</li> </ul>
<b>AP-2.</b> changes to local agency authorities and relationships and changes to or development of new local organizations	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other things are more important than this issue and so this is a low issue.</li> <li>• <i>The organizational structures are going to come in hard and we need to work on it in our plan. I'm afraid they will look at watershed management but it should be done on a local level through their conservation districts and increase the roles of the conservation districts because they are the group that can work the best with the landowners. The landowners will generally work better with local people rather than have the state come in and do it.</i></li> </ul>
<b>AP-3.</b> changes in the services agencies offer to the public	L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is not timely but may need to be discussed later in the process.</li> </ul>
<b>AP-4.</b> more consistent enforcement of current laws and regulations	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Enforcement needs to be consistent and this needs to be discussed.</li> </ul>
<b>AP-5.</b> the effects of federal regulations on state regulations and programs	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The plan must conform to federal regulations and so this is a high priority.</li> </ul>

<p><b>AP-6.</b> new state regulations and laws as necessary</p>	<p>L</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is low priority and with proper enforcement this could be taken care of. This may need discussion later.</li> </ul>
<p><b>AP-7.</b> incentive programs to promote compliance with regulations</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This should be worded as “penalties to promote compliance with regulations.”</li> <li>• Ninety-five percent of property in Okla. is in private hands and incentives need to be a part of the process in order to get it to work.</li> <li>• There are no regulations on non-point source pollution so there are no regs to give incentives. So the only way you are going to get private landowners to participate is by giving them incentives so this should be discussed. I agree that if it something regulated then there should be no tax.</li> </ul>
<p><b>AP-8.</b> revisions to the current permitting process to make it more efficient</p>	<p>L</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a low priority as it is working now and everybody needs to have notice.</li> </ul>
<p><b>AP-9.</b> changes in the law regarding the ownership of surface water and groundwater</p>	<p>H/L</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is high and it needs to be discussed but that doesn’t mean it should be changed.</li> <li>• We already have laws in place and so this should be low priority.</li> <li>• The law is already being changed and so this should be discussed.</li> </ul>
<p><b>AP-10.</b> taxes on water sales, transfers and uses</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is high and if there is a tax then the money should go to the OWRB to conduct the research they need to do.</li> <li>• If there is a tax what we discussed was the money should not go into the general fund it should be used for other purposes.</li> <li>• If there is a tax then it should be used for natural resource protection. Some of the money should go to southeast Okla.</li> <li>• We need to figure out how to sell the water that is flowing into the Red River, sell it and put a tax on it to use. It is a resource we can use and this should be discussed.</li> <li>• Maybe this should be revised to say the money goes into water protection or water resource uses and I do think this should be discussed.</li> </ul>

<p><b>AP-11.</b> regionalization of water and wastewater systems</p>	<p>L</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is low and is more a local issue.</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>• This needs to be discussed but it should not cause the plan to get bogged down. There may not be anything we can do about it.</li> <li>• This has to be a high priority; the tribes are the 800 lb gorilla in the closet. The tribes need to be involved in the process.</li> <li>• If it is not included in the discussion then it is like talking around the checkerboard it is all connected. This is important to discuss.</li> <li>• The discussion is already happening and it needs to be discussed.</li> <li>• This should be discussed because not everything discussed will be changed.</li> <li>• I really think this should be a high without the low on it. We have got to get them to the table and we have to take their considerations seriously. We (the state) don't have the same resources as the Tribes and we need to talk to them.</li> <li>• I agree that we need to include the tribes in the discussion because the plan will be nothing if we don't include them.</li> <li>• I am just concerned that the plan could get bogged down and we don't need to stop the plan. If that can be done it would be high.</li> <li>• Tribes contribute millions of dollars to maintenance of county roads and if you include them they can be a big player in financing some of the water issues the state face.</li> <li>• Let's bring the tribes in as a partner and include them.</li> <li>• It is important to include the tribes in the discussion of the planning process because of the treaties and rights they have to Oklahoma water.</li> </ul>

## OTHER COMMENTS OFFERED DURING THE RIM SESSION

ISSUE #	COMMENT
T-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Maybe we should set up a website that would allow for people who have water for sale to advertise it and it would provide an opportunity for people who want to buy water a place to go and find it.</i></li> </ul>
AP-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>This is Oklahoma's opportunity to develop a plan. If we have the Indian tribes help us then we can really be strong because the Tribes can help us with the federal government.</i></li> </ul>
QN-1	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>In southeast Garfield County there are two dams commissioned in the 60s one of those structures is used for water supply for a small town Lucine. We have local assets such as these dams that we can use for water drinking water supply and flood control. You have to get an easement from the landowner and that is up to him if he wants to do this. The federal government supplies the money and then it goes to the local conservation district.</i></li> </ul>
AP-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The Conservation Districts are local people within the jurisdiction of the Tribes and so they are their neighbors and the conservation districts can work more closely with them.</i></li> </ul>
T-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The basin of origin means and should refer only to the local river basin from which the water is being diverted. The Red River and Arkansas River basins are national in scope.</i></li> </ul>
AP-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>The OWRB has in the past worked out compacts with the Choctaw and Chickasaw Nations but the sale was stopped by the legislature. We have got to get something going government to government and settle the issue with the tribes.</i></li> </ul>
AP-12	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>When Oklahoma tried to sell water to Texas a few years ago it was stopped because Texas could not sell bonds for their infrastructure because of the rights of the Tribes. We need to settle this issue before the plan is done.</i></li> </ul>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <i>Many/most issues seem to be discussed as to whose packets the money comes out of and goes into.</i></li> </ul>