

**Oklahoma
Comprehensive Water Plan**

Regional Input Meeting #5

Lawton, OK
Sept. 18, 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	
5:10 pm	Plenary Group Discussion of Issue Ratings	Dianna Leggett
6:50 pm	Afternoon Session Adjourned	
7:30 pm	Public Discussion of Issue Ratings	Mike Langston
8:45 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-one citizens participated in the afternoon session, which was witnessed by another 21 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, 38 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>Qn-1. the improvement and expansion of drinking water infrastructure, such as impoundments, distribution systems and aquifer recharge measures</p>	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a high priority because there are concerns about ensuring our infrastructure is sustainable and we may need to develop areas that don't have infrastructure. • New impoundments should only be done where the lake would have long-term viability and long-term benefits that outweigh local costs or losses so this should be a high priority to discuss. • <i>I think it would be a good approach to study recharging our aquifers especially water supplies that are contaminated to help dilute the pollution. Especially terrace and highly permeable aquifers. So this is important to discuss.</i> • <i>We may need to go to a multi-state system on aquifer recharge so this should be discussed.</i>
<p>Qn-2. maintenance of water supply systems, such as dams and pipelines</p>	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a high priority because our infrastructure is aging.
<p>Qn-3. State and federal funding of water storage infrastructure</p>	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a high priority because the SRF [state revolving fund] funding needs to be continued.
<p>Qn-4. the effects of climate change on water supplies</p>	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a low priority. It doesn't need to be discussed further because you can't control or plan for climate. • <i>I agree with what they are saying about climate change but you can plan for very extensive droughts so this should be ranked as high</i>

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>QI-1. State and federal funding of water treatment and protection</p>	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a high priority because there is a need to use state money to leverage funding to continue to get money. • This does need to be a high priority because we need to wean ourselves off federal money.
<p>QI-2. more and better measures to protect drinking water</p>	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a low priority because it is already being done sufficiently now. • This is a priority of the water plan to protect both groundwater and surface water so this should be high. • QL-2 and 3 should be a high priority. • I agree drinking water protection is important but other agencies deal with this and I agree it should be low. • If you leave stuff out of the plan that really needs to be discussed then other interest groups will make the decisions.
<p>QI-3. better technology for treating wastewater</p>	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a low priority because the technology is adequate now. • Right now wastewater cannot be used for drinking water unless it is used downstream so this should be a high priority to allow for reuse. • This should be high because wastewater should be reused and it may take a legal change. • Technology is out there and it is important to discuss. • There should be a change in the laws in order to reuse water within a communities own system so this should be discussed.
<p>QI-4. requirements for providing the public with accurate and timely water quality information</p>	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a low priority because the information is already being provided. • Agree that this is a low priority because you can just give the public information on where the information is located. • <i>This should be a high priority because if you get a large influx of travelers in an area they may not get the information about poor quality water.</i>

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
C-1. measures to encourage conservation through improving water use efficiency and wasting less water	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a high priority because a penny saved is a penny earned.
C-2. measures that encourage the reuse of treated wastewater, gray water, produced water (oil and gas) and storm water run-off	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is high priority because if gray water and wastewater are reused that will protect potable water. • This issue relates back to QL-3. QL-3 is embedded in several other issues.
C-3. improved educational programs about water conservation for all Oklahomans	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is also a high priority. We need to start with our children because conservation will become a way of life for them. • We do need to educate our children and if you start with the next generation they will change and we are planning for the next 50 years so this is high. • <i>I feel as a kid that I should learn how to measure proper chemicals for purifying water and for other uses. We need to educate children about how to deal with chemicals so they don't ruin the water. So this should be a high priority. And it is especially important for kids. Because I've heard kids say that the water they have has affected their health and we should be educated and the generations after us so we can properly balance out water quality and we should not be putting chemicals in water because of the affect on water quality now and in the future.</i>
C-4. incentives to promote water conservation	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a low priority. Who will pay for the incentives? • This is important especially as people move to urban areas and it doesn't have to be money so this should be discussed. • <i>There has to not just be incentives it should include penalties. If you consider penalties as well then it should be rated high.</i> • <i>The OWRB grant program recognizes an increasing block rate when</i>

		<i>awarding grants and it should also consider awarding additional points to water systems that have ordinances enforced against water waste. So this should be discussed in the plan.</i>
C-5. research programs that assess improved methods for water conservation	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a low priority. Rather than implement new research programs if research is developed then that can be addressed later. • This should be a high priority because we can show how to implement new techniques, and if we do that we will have more people using them.

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>UA-1. changes in water law regarding groundwater and surface water use</p>	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The law needs to be looked at. Need to look closer at groundwater allocations. Discussion needs to happen before changes are made. Groundwater rights should stay the same. UA-1 and UA-2 are linked. • We need to know what we have in order to allocate water. So one of the highest priorities of the plan should be to know what water we have and how it is connected.
<p>UA-2. the interaction between ground and surface water in allocation decisions</p>	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We need to be careful about changing our water laws. We want Oklahoma to come to some agreement on this. If we don't agree among ourselves then it will end up in litigation. Technical studies must be completed in order to have this discussion. • There needs to be some link recognized between groundwater and surface waters especially in karst systems and this should be a high priority.
<p>UA-3. prioritizing water uses during shortages</p>	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is important so municipalities and rural water districts can implement restrictions. High priority for local areas but a low priority for the state. • We don't want the state to tell us how to do it, it should be regulated locally. But it should be discussed in the state plan to allow for the local entities to regulate it. • I think local could be more regional than just local and I agree it needs to be discussed.
<p>UA-4. the water quality and quantity needs of ecosystems in allocation decisions</p>	H/L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is not as important as some of the other issues. We do need to protect the ecosystems. It is not an allocation system it is a conservation system. When you protect the ecosystem you protect our water.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This would be high for the state but low for a region because western Okla. has lots of droughts. • There needs to be other things to bring more water to an area such as wetlands. • I feel this is very important because the ecosystem is plants and animals and this variety is advantageous to the state and we need to maintain our ecosystem. Because we are talking about quality and quantity in the plan. • The issues here are already being discussed by other agencies so I think this should be low in the plan. • We need to weed some of these issues out and I think this issue should be low because there are other issues more important. • <i>I think this should be discussed because the ecosystem as it is defined in its entirety, land, water, air, is all a part of the whole and you can't just take one part out. Everyone uses it and it is not just the trees in the creek.</i> • <i>This should be rank high because all of the wetlands and ecosystems are part of the filtration system for all of the water that flows through them, but they should be monitored because they could become saturated with pollutants.</i> • <i>Ecosystems – when understood in its full extent and definition it must be considered high. It must always be considered high when you look at it as an allocation factor, as a use issue, as a conservation issue, etc., etc.</i>
<p>UA-5. the need of adequate amounts of water to further economic development in allocation decisions</p>	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If we don't have economic development we won't keep our kids in Oklahoma. UA-5 and UA-6 are connected. So this is a high priority. It is critical for use and planning. • I agree this should be high but it must done on a sustainable growth basis. • It is high because economic development should be compatible and sustainable with the environment. We need planning policy and enforcement.
<p>UA-6. the effect of population change on water needs in allocation decisions</p>	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Tied to UA-5.

<p>UA-7. the water needs of recreation and tourism in allocation decisions</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We need water infrastructure in the southern counties to keep water here and capture some of the development from north Texas, like tourists. This is a high priority, we need more impoundments. • It is really important to discuss because if we don't consider these a high priority we may not get assistance. • All of these are parts of the economic whole and they should be discussed together not separately. But we need to know how much water we have. • This may also help recharge aquifers which could help agriculture as well. • <i>The prospects of benefits of recreation should be accurately compared to current actual benefits of agriculture and other local industries. So I agree this is a high priority.</i>
<p>UA-8. the water needs of agriculture and agriculture industry in allocation decisions</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Ag is our economic development in this part of the state so this must be discussed. • <i>Ag is not the only economic development use of water in this part of the state and there has been some misuse by ag use and this does need to be discussed.</i> • <i>Ag is not the only thing we have so other people that live out in the country need to be included in the discussion because decisions about agriculture can affect other rural people.</i> • <i>It seems unfair to single out agriculture for criticism.</i> • <i>This is a discussion about agriculture use and not whether or not you live in the country.</i> • <i>All of the allocation needs of all the uses need to be discussed.</i>
<p>UA-9. the water needs of oil and gas production, including refining and exploration, in allocation decisions</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Oil and gas is one of our economic engines but we don't want it misused or to make it a pollution problem. It is a high priority.
<p>UA-10. the water needs of mining in allocation decisions</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Economically it is a high priority but it also needs to be conserved. • <i>The mining industry does use water we do reuse some water on site. We supply lots of building materials and it is important that mining be included in the discussion. In this region gypsum mining and aggregate mining happens, as well as sand and gravel mining.</i>

<p>UA-11. the water needs of navigation in allocation decisions</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is high for the state's economy and the eastern region.
<p>UA-12. the water needs of hydropower in allocation decisions</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are a lot of hydropower plants in the state so this is important to discuss.
<p>UA-13. the water needs of industry in allocation decisions</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is important because of the money it brings in to the area and the jobs. • This is a high importance but industry should be required to conserve and safeguard quality and quantity. They also need to pay their fair share.
<p>UA-14. the water needs of municipalities in allocation decisions</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • You have to have water to have industry and drinking water.

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>T-1. water sales or transfers within the State</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is high we need to address it first for the state. There is potential for conservation of capital resources. The needs should be balanced. • I agree these should all be high but we need to know what we have and where it is. • We need to look at how we can pipe water from the east to the west to help out and give an alternative water supply.
<p>T-2. water sales or transfers outside of the State</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Regardless of position it must be discussed as we don't want the feds to make the decisions for us and this should be internal to the state. • There are rights and tribal water rights have to be acknowledged in the plan as well and need to be discussed.
<p>T-3. 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"> • This issue is related to the first two and if we discuss the first two then we need to discuss this one.
<p>T-4. 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"> • This could be tied back to UA-3. Appropriate management is crucial. Allocation has to be defined by dependable yield not average. • We would need to be careful how much control the person who buys the water has over land management and is important to discuss.

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
LH-1. how to reduce the impact of natural or man-made disasters that could affect water supply or infrastructure	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Reduction of the impact has to be high looking from the state prospective on mitigation not prevention. We can't prevent all disasters so we need to plan for mitigating them so this needs to be high. There are threats out there and we need to recognize those. • The plan should merely refer this issue over to the Dept. of Homeland Sec. for Oklahoma; however, it does need to be discussed in the plan. • We really need to look at these issues and we need to really determine what the important ones are.
LH-2. land management practices that affect water quality and quantity	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Mitigates the need to expand water plants or build new ones. Anything about quality and quantity has to be discussed. • There are other people regulating these issues. • I think this should be a high priority because of what has happened during the dust bowl. We changed practices then but we have gotten away from that. Development can cause floods, as seen around Kingfisher and we do need to discuss this. • Urban development is one of the big issues, farming practices have improved but commercial and urban growth needs to be address so this is important to discuss.
LH-3. the infrastructure needs for fire fighting	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a low priority because it just doesn't rise to the same level as some other things and it is being dealt with. Though we do need to know how much water is used for firefighting so the plan can address that. • What the needs of the firefighters are is getting their pipes to standard to help fight firefighters. So I think it does need to be discussed. • We have used over 300,000 gallons in one day to fight a fire so there could be a question of how much water should be allocated for this

		<p>use.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• <i>Infrastructure needs to be set up to allow for fire protection and this is being implemented by the Dept. of Commerce. They are requiring it in the permits to construct. So this should be a high priority.</i>• <i>I think this is a high priority issue because in the eastern part of the state when there were lots of fires several years ago it severely damaged the ecosystems, this reduced the lands ability to filter water and so impaired water quality.</i>• <i>This should be a high priority because of issues with water supply or fire fighting and if we had better infrastructure we would have saved the state millions of dollars.</i>• <i>This should be a high priority because we need the infrastructure in place to avoid having to pump ponds dry because this takes more time and then it affects your ability to water livestock.</i>• <i>The reason this was rated low was because a lot of improvements have already happened especially since the fires a few years ago.</i>• <i>Originally we thought this was high but this is a water plan and firefighting equipment is approached through other agencies. It is important but it is not appropriate for the water plan to discuss.</i>• <i>Infrastructure is about pipe size and can rural water districts standardize the pipe size to accommodate fire hydrants so this should be discussed.</i>
--	--	--

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
P-1. ways to balance demand and supply over the long-term	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Demand is not something we can control well. It is very important to determine the supply and the demand.
P-2. ways to improve the current planning process	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a lower priority because it doesn't need to be part of the planning process but it does need to be there at the end. • This should be a high priority because we need oversight and peer review of the technical studies as the plan is being developed.
P-3. whether and how Oklahoma should work with other states on ground and surface water quality and quantity	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • States are connected. If we don't address it someone else will, like the feds. We are part of one big water system because the state boundaries are manmade.
P-4. how to better involve the public in the planning process	L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Anyone who has wanted to have input has had an opportunity so this is a lower priority.
P-5. how to incorporate regional differences in water supply and use	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is high, maybe even very high. This is the heart of the matter and we really need to figure out how to balance those needs. • There are different distinct water zones across the state and they is why this should be high • <i>I agree strongly with the group's decision on this issue.</i>
P-6. what research needs to be done during and after the current planning process	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a high priority; we need to make sure at some point the plan is working and should consider what research needs to be done. • Once the plan is place it should be monitored and this may suggest research. This should be discussed. • What kind of research would it be, comprehensive statewide basin studies. • I'm concerned the plan will be completed before the technical studies are done and we can't do a plan without having all the information so

		this should be high.
P-7. treating the water plan as a living document that is reviewed on an ongoing basis	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a high priority. Because as conditions change the plan should change.
P-8. procedures to deal with conflict during and after the planning process	H/L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some think this is a high priority because some processes are needed or should be built into the legal system. • Some thought it was low because they didn't want someone outside their area or territory telling them what to do. • We need to establish a framework during the process to deal with conflict so this should be a high priority.

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
AP-1. changes to State agency jurisdictions, authorities and relationships	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These may not need to be changed but it is important to discuss especially since we are planning for the next 50 years. • I had to deal with four different agencies on a pollution issue and it is very important to discuss this.
AP-2. changes to local agency authorities and relationships and changes to or development of new local organizations	L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is low statewide but could be high regionally. If you take care of AP-1 then it will take care of this by setting the guidelines. • However, this could be high because starting at the top is not always best.
AP-3. changes in the services agencies offer to the public	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a low priority. They seem to be doing okay now with the information they have. If the agencies have more information available then may need to change. • This should be a high priority because we need to discuss putting water studies under OGS and move grants from OWRB for conflict of interest issues. • <i>This should be a high priority because if they have adequate information they should be able to act right away.</i>
AP-4. more consistent enforcement of current laws and regulations	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a high priority. What good are rules if we don't enforce them?
AP-5. the effects of federal regulations on state regulations and programs	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a high priority. It needs to be talked about to ensure the state stays in compliance with federal regulations. This may affect funding

<p>AP-6. new state regulations and laws as necessary</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a hot state issue. There may not need to be any changes but it does need to be discussed.
<p>AP-7. incentive programs to promote compliance with regulations</p>	<p>L/H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Some think it should be low because if you enforce the laws it will take care of it. Some think it should be high to ensure quality and quantity and incentives don't always mean money. • The plan should reflect the general trend of encouraging education and incentives and aid from governmental agencies and the last thing would be regulations. This is important to discuss. • This should be a high issue to provide incentives for water quality and this should be done through incentives and not regulations. • The government is implementing a carbon credit system and water could be handled in a similar matter and so this should be a high priority.
<p>AP-8. revisions to the current permitting process to make it more efficient</p>	<p>L/H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a low priority. The process works okay now, but may need to be discussed in the future. • This should be a high priority. The word efficient should be changed to equitable because of the use it or lose it provision. We also need to determine the water quantity precisely before we issue any permits. • This is important to discuss because the notice process is antiquated by using the legal notices in the paper. • The use it or lose it provision needs to be changed and so this should be a high priority for discussion. • This should be high because the cities that use the water have to keep their water rights and the use it or lose it rule is a disincentive to conservation. Water suppliers need to be able to protect their investment in their infrastructure. • It is obvious on the face that this should be a high priority because the water board is issuing temporary permits based on incomplete data. • <i>This should be a high priority because this relates to AP-9 and if AP-9 is high then this should be.</i> • <i>This should be high because there is a lot of improvement that could be done, for example more metering on wells so we know what we have. When the state issues a permit they don't actually know what water is</i>

		<p><i>underground so this could interfere with other users. We need more accurate information and policing on metering.</i></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>• Sometimes multiple agencies are doing similar things so there needs to be better communication between them so this should be high.</i> <i>• The notification system could be improved in the permitting process because the current notice system is not very good, for both the groundwater and surface water permits. So this should be a high priority.</i> <i>• How can AP-8 possibly be low if AP-9 is high? They are most definitely very closely related.</i>
AP-9. changes in the law regarding the ownership of surface water and groundwater	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a high priority. It is very important to be discussed.
AP-10. taxes on water sales, transfers and uses	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is low regionally but high for the state. We may only need to look at taxing out-of-state transfers.
AP-11. regionalization of water and wastewater systems	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a high priority because of population changes. We need to figure out how to do this. The rural development association is already trying to get this done.
AP-12. tribal claims to both ground and surface water	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is an issue that needs to be settled and should be done through the plan.

OTHER COMMENTS OFFERED DURING THE RIM SESSION

ISSUE #	COMMENT
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>All industry including agricultural, oil and gas have some type of pollution that needs to be addressed</i>
T-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We need to be careful of dependency and we need to make sure the water we sell is surplus water. What is to keep someone from Texas coming and buying groundwater water rights and taking that water to Texas?
LH-2	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Poor land management fills in our reservoirs. We have improved our land management practices and floods are floods and farmers cannot control that. Agriculture has worked hard to mitigate damages. All the watershed dams in the state were built with a 50 year life span and many of them are filling in.
LH-3	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>The rural fire departments face a real challenge in maintaining their equipment as they don't have funding available to replace it as it wears out.</i>
	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>I heard several times (in reports from the groups) comments such as "handled by other departments in Oklahoma" This does not matter. When we consider the questions "should it be addressed in the <u>Water Plan</u>?" then it doesn't really matter what other department is doing it or is responsible. It if drips then it belongs in the <u>Plan</u>.</i> <i>On the question of "reducing" the number issues – is that a goal in itself? What if all issues in a bucket are in fact high? The Planning workshops will be able to combine several issues – as we have seen in these discussions. In other words, we have already reduced the numbers when you review the comments from the groups. For example, C-1 and C-3 are very closely related and could be combines without losing either one. It doesn't have to be an either/or situation. One more - AP-1 and AP-3 are very close.</i>
AP-6	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>There were some comments but not a lot of discussion about the problems and restrictions imposed by DEQ regarding use of treated wastewater. We need to get Oklahoma law caught up with the rest of the country on safe uses for wastewater.</i>
P-4	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <i>I feel that landowners, whether Indian or non-Indian should be allowed to comment on all aspects of these group meetings. To disallow any participation would preempt their right to due process concerning their water rights and regress.</i>