Oklahoma
Comprehensive Water Plan

Regional Input Meeting #3

McAlester, OK
Aug. 21, 2008

Meeting Agenda

Time	Topic	Speaker/Facilitator
3:09 pm	Afternoon Session Convened	
3:10 pm	Meeting Purpose and Staff Introductions	Mike Langston, Institute Assistant Director
3:22 pm	Discussant Introductions and Water Facts Discussion	Dianna Leggett, Facilitator
4:03 pm	Small Group Discussions of Issue Ratings	
5:30 pm	Plenary Group Discussion of Issue Ratings	Dianna Leggett
8:03 pm	Afternoon Session Adjourned	
8:10 pm	Public Discussion of Issue Ratings	Mike Langston
9:27 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-four 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, 53 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
Qn-1. the improvement and expansion of drinking water infrastructure, such as impoundments, distribution systems and aquifer recharge measures	**H**	• **The state needs to be able to provide drinking water to those that need it. Without infrastructure we minimize economic development.**
Qn-2. maintenance of water supply systems, such as dams and pipelines	**H**	• **It is important to take care of what we have. We need to discuss the real issue and set a standard (bar) for maintenance.** • **Water districts have a lot of water loss in systems and this is costing them money.** • *The siltation level in flood control structures requires that this does need to be a high priority.*
Qn-3. State and federal funding of water storage infrastructure	**H**	• **QN-1 and QN-2 can't be done without funding regardless of where it comes from – state for federal.** • **There was some hesitation about making this high. What does the plan do exactly – identify needs or solution recommendations?** • **Without funding this plan is just a plan.** • **This doesn't say anything about local funding. We want benefits to be local, so the funding should be local. Usually the city is involved in the funding along with the state or federal funding.** • **The state plan may not deal with the local issues.**

Qn-4. the effects of climate change on water supplies	**L/H**	• **We need to recognize this issue, but it is not timely for the planning process. It is important but not as important here in Oklahoma as in other places.** • **Maybe there should be a framework in the plan. We can't predict what climate change is going to do.** • **Its importance should be understood and we have the tools now to make the predictions. This should be addressed in the plan by using these tools.** • **It's not timely now, but when we get in a long-term drought it will be timely and we should give consideration to what could happen and this issue should be considered high.** • **What probability of drought are we looking at? If the plan is for 50 years, then we should consider the past 50-year record of droughts.** • **This issue should be considered high.**

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
QI-1. State and federal funding of water treatment and protection	**H**	• **Why have all this wonderful water if we don't protect it and prevent pollution and other contaminants. What do we have otherwise?**
QI-2. more and better measures to protect drinking water	**H**	• **Some of the groundwater resources aren't being as well protected as they should be. I'm not sure why though. It is an important statewide issue; and it is more than just a drinking water issue. It is an agriculture and industrial issue as well.** • **Even though plans are available to help protect water quality, there are no laws in place that will enforce those plans, so our water does not get protected. There is some concern that the oil and gas industry is being protected and not the water quality. It is a very important issue.**
QI-3. better technology for treating wastewater	**L**	• **This might be imbedded in some of the other issues, which is why it is a lower priority.** • **We think that technology is coming down the pike, so we don't need to necessarily consider it at this time.** • **Water reuse technology already exists** • **What we have been short on is compliance and enforcement, not so much a lack of technology.**

QI-4. requirements for providing the public with accurate and timely water quality information	**L/H**	• **There is quite a bit of oversight out there now. There are already laws on the books that cover this. However, notification is not always timely.** • **If the issue is serious, information comes quickly.** • **We need to be careful rating this low because if we ask the public for their support for the plan, they may think this is a high priority issue.** • **This should be rated high to ensure that the public is well informed.** • **We need to come to a higher standard level for informing the public on water quality issues.**

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**	• **We are not just thinking about drinking water we are thinking about all water uses.** • **We think that C-1 – C-5 will be part of the plan at some point.**
C-2. measures that encourage the reuse of treated wastewater, gray water, produced water (oil and gas) and storm water run-off	**H**	• **There are certainly some parts of the state that are doing this or should be doing this. There may be other areas where this is not a high priority – but statewide, it is important.** • **The way to get good treated wastewater or gray water is by improved technology; therefore, if you say C-2 is high then QI-2 should be rated high as well.** • **Private entities are looking more at this technology. Maybe we shouldn't use public money for technologies. (referring to QI-2)** • **Compliance and enforcement will help with this; the technology is there.**
C-3. improved educational programs about water conservation for all Oklahomans	**H**	• **Education has to start somewhere, especially with the youth. Everyone needs to understand all aspects of conservation.**
C-4. incentives to promote water conservation	**L**	• **Economics may play a role in taking care of this. Gas is an example of this. The more expensive it is, the less people may use. Therefore, we may not need government programs to do this.** • **Local water districts should deal with this, not the statewide plan.**
C-5. research programs that assess improved methods for water conservation	**L/*H***	• **There is already a lot of research out there now and new technologies are being developed. Our challenge is to be receptive to available technologies and not spend state resources to do research that may have been done already.** • *This should be high as we need continued research.*

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
UA-1. discussions about water law regarding groundwater and surface water use	**H**	• **We may need to consider changing groundwater and stream water withdrawal. We may also need to look at private versus state ownership of water. We didn't want to leave it out so that it could be talked about.**
UA-2. the interaction between ground and surface water in allocation decisions	**H**	• **There is a lot of interaction between the two. Wells can affect stream water and withdrawals from streams can dry up wells. Thus, it is important to discuss.**
UA-3. prioritizing water uses during shortages	**H**	• **It is critical that decisions be made before there is a crisis. We had more discussion on this item than almost anything. We were split on it. Because there was so much dissension and discussion, we finally felt it was of high importance to discuss.** • **Do we set a priority list now before the shortage or during the shortage?** • **A regional plan for one area might have different priorities than another.** • **The plan should not be a prioritizing plan. We have a plan that has been in place for 40 years; if ain't broke don't fix it.**
UA-4. the water quality and quantity needs of ecosystems in allocation decisions	**H**	• **What is an ecosystem? W should take care of what we have now. We need to identify (define) what an ecosystem is (not politically or bureaucratically). Ecosystems will take care of themselves.** • **The ecosystem in southeast OK is what is making land values in this area go up; we have protected them.**

UA-5. the need of adequate amounts of water to further economic development in allocation decisions	**H**	• **Economic development is important to all of Oklahoma, especially in rural areas. We could possibly use lower quality water for some uses to dilute pollution. Economic development is based on water.** • *We need to make use of our water and develop it here. In southeast Oklahoma, we don't have a conservation problem. Allocation decisions should be made to meet future water needs for areas to develop the economy. This should be a high priority.* • *This should be a high priority because development is threatened where there is not enough water available. In rural areas, there may not be regulations so overdevelopment could happen.*
UA-6. the effect of population change on water needs in allocation decisions	**H**	• **We have to meet the needs for growth in rural areas and cities.** • **People and industries will move to water – so this may be a low priority.**
UA-7. the water needs of recreation and tourism in allocation decisions	**H**	• **This is extremely important to Oklahoma. There was no debate on this. If you are taking care of recreation, you are taking care of ecosystems (refers to UA-4).**
UA-8. the water needs of agriculture and agriculture industry in allocation decisions	**H**	• **We rated this extremely high. It is our highest water demand. Oklahoma may need to raise more of its own food in the future.**
UA-9. the water needs of oil and gas production, including refining and exploration, in allocation decisions	**H**	• **Important to southeast OK, as well as the entire State. Oil and gas is working to recycle and treat their water.** • *It is important to discuss the needs of the oil and gas industry because of the economic impact it has on the entire state.*
UA-10. the water needs of mining in allocation decisions	**H**	• **Water is important economically, so we must consider all water demands.**
UA-11. the water needs of navigation in allocation decisions	**H**	• **This is a federal issue that we can't do anything about. It is important but low. But we only considered the Arkansas River in the discussion.** • **Both UA-11 and UA-12 should be discussed because Lake Eufaula deals with both of these. These should be discussed in the next phase of process.** • **The Arkansas is not the only river in Oklahoma that has been looked at for navigation. The US Army Corp of Engineers has looked at**

		other areas.
UA-12. the water needs of hydropower in allocation decisions	**H**	• **There are other sources for power generation so even though important, it is a lower priority** • *This needs to be discussed because it needs better oversight. One company shouldn't be able to come in and control the land around a dam. There should be local economic benefit from hydropower production.*
UA-13. the water needs of industry in allocation decisions	**H**	• **This is important because that is our economy.**
UA-14. the water needs of municipalities in allocation decisions	**H**	• **Duh! This about the water needs of municipalities and water supply.**

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
T-1. water sales or transfers within the State	**H**	• **This issue is appropriate to talk about. There is a value for our state.** • **The ball is already rolling, so we need to discuss it.** • **T-1 and T-2 should not be high priority because of timeliness. The plan needs to be concluded before we know if we will have any water to sell.** • **The current litigation needs to be addressed so this is timely. We may not be able to resolve the issue, but it needs to be addressed.**
T-2. water sales or transfers outside of the State	**H**	• **This issue is already on the table and is a political issue. There is statewide and local interest and there are a lot of concerns surrounding the issue, so it needs to be discussed.**
T-3. the economic impact of sales or transfers on the entire State, as well as the basin of origin	**H**	• **The water in southeast OK is our oil and gas revenues. Water is going to be the survival of southeast OK. It is a natural resource and economic issue. The discussion is already underway and we should be involved.** • *This should be a high priority because the money from any sale should be required to be used at least partially to improve drinking water infrastructure in the area of origin.*
T-4. how water and land is managed within the basin of origin if water is sold or transferred	**H**	• **Wherever our water goes, they are going to want that water clean, so this needs to be discussed.**

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/L**	• **There may already be plans in place, but we do need to talk about it.** • **There may already be agencies and organizations that take care of all these issues, so that may relegate it to low. There are other funding sources besides the state.** • *This should be a high priority because the oil and gas companies need to be held accountable for their impacts on the land that affects water.* • *This is important and should be discussed because there needs to be a central database to help monitor changes in water quality.* • *This should be a high priority because of the rural isolationism, there needs to be adequate preparation for dealing with disasters in rural areas.*
LH-2. land management practices that affect water quality and quantity	**H**	• **The land management practices that are applied do affect the quality and the quantity of the water. Particularly in the basin of origin.**
LH-3. the infrastructure needs for fire fighting	**L/H**	• **This is an important issue statewide but there are already mechanisms in place that take care of those issues.** • **If regulations were in place to allow for fire hydrants, then that would affect Oklahoma's ISO to allow for lower insurance rates; so this is important.** • **There are already things in place to take care of this. Even though it is a huge issue it may not be appropriate to the planning process.** • **Some of the funding is allowing for upsized line so this is being addressed (but is important to water infrastructure).**

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**	• **This is what the whole process is about.**
P-2. ways to improve the current planning process	**L**	• **The process currently in place is quite adequate and working well.**
P-3. whether and how Oklahoma should work with other states on ground and surface water quality and quantity	**H/L**	• **Mainly high because you have to look long-term.** • **Good communication with our neighbors can avoid legal conflicts. It is our best opportunity to talk to our neighbors before the Attorney General has to, or vice-versa.** • **The legal process is taking care of this now and that will not change.**
P-4. how to better involve the public in the planning process	**L/H**	• **The process going on now is a good plan and covering the entire state and includes a good cross section of the population. Even those not included in the initial discussion are given the opportunity to speak. The more transparent the more advantages to the plan.** • **The technical studies need to be peer reviewed because that is where the decisions will be made.** • **There needs to be something in the plan addressing continued public involvement in the planning process so should be high.** • **This is 100% better than it was 5 years ago.**
P-5. how to incorporate regional differences in water supply and use	**H**	• **Knowledge about the different regions of the state is important. It is important in decision making and should be spelled out in the plan.** • *There is concern that we will be locked into a plan that is not appropriate for an individual area.* • *There should be a proportional representation based on the size of the resource (raw water in its natural standing state) not just the population.*
P-6. what research needs to be done during and after the current planning process	**L/H**	• **Research can be used as a strategic stop-block to stop movement of the planning process, but there is a need to continually gain and review that data. As technology advances, things will get better.**

		• **There should be more research. This should be more a scientific study than a political study.** • **Streams and aquifers need to be studied.** • **There is a need for research because there is still a lot of things we don't know.** • **There are still a lot of questions about how much water we have and about our infrastructure.** • **There has to be a baseline set, so the research base has to be reviewed.** • **The plan should consider defining what we don't know and then what research we need to get that information. If that is what this issue means, then this should be high.** • **The initial group felt that research could lead to more studies and more studies and may slow the planning process down.** • *Had the wording been different, omitting the word "during," the original discussion group may have rated it high, so maybe that word should be omitted from the issue.* • *This must be rated high. How can any definitive conclusions be drawn on a plan if full knowledge and understanding of the resources you are planning for are not available? There needs to be hydrologic, ecological, and environmental research done, as well as research and studies done on other issues.*
P-7. treating the water plan as a living document that is reviewed on an ongoing basis	**L/H**	• **Every ten years is sufficient. If it is a living document it could be changed. Such changes could affect so many areas that things could come to a stop or get confused.** • **There are some special circumstances such as a change in the law that could change the plan.** • **The plan should not be set in stone. There should be a continuous review.** • **As new research comes in, the plan may change. This needs to be addressed with a process that is already established.**
P-8. procedures to deal with conflict during and after the planning process	**H/L**	• **A framework for conflict resolution needs to be established so people don't have to go right into litigation.** • **The process is what needs to be defined, not the solutions.** • **Some people will want to go straight to litigation and are not satisfied with any process.**

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**	• **This issue needs to be discussed at future water planning meetings. The OWRB has a lot of responsibility.** • **The first four items (AP-1 – AP-4) may not be appropriate.** • *There should be some change to the way Water Board members are appointed and this deserves discussion.* • *This is important because there needs to be a central database to help monitor changes in water quality. There needs to be a point person who is in charge of water in our state, and has the power to execute the responsibility.*
AP-2. changes to local agency authorities and relationships and changes to or development of new local organizations	**H**	• **This was talked about as regionalization of control of water to allow local people to be involved.** • **State agencies would still need to be involved as the plan will affect all the agencies.**
AP-3. changes in the services agencies offer to the public	**H**	• **If AP-1 or AP-2 is high then all must be high as they are all dealing with basically the same thing.** • **There should be information made available to rural water districts about what new technologies are available to them.**
AP-4. more consistent enforcement of current laws and regulations	**H**	• **It is fundamental and timely, as well as important and appropriate for discussion.** • *This is a high issue and there should be a state agency that investigates water availability and quality complaints caused by industrial exploitation on the land. It is very expensive (cost-prohibitive) for private landowners to try to get the information they need to prove the cause of impacts on their water.* • *There should be legislation that deals with bad actors.* • *At some point there needs to be consideration of criminal prosecution for repeat offenders.* • *This is high but there needs to be adequate inspectors to enforce the laws*

		we have.
AP-5. the effects of federal regulations on state regulations and programs	**H**	• **Since the federal government has priority over state regulations, the state needs to know what the federal government is doing to stay in compliance.**
AP-6. new state regulations and laws as necessary	**L/H**	• **Let's get our water plan done and then go to the legislators to say what we want.** • **The minority opinion is that you better keep those legislators involved so they know what is going on.**
AP-7. incentive programs to promote compliance with regulations	**L/***H*	• **This is not really appropriate for the water plan. We could do negative incentives though.** • *Negative incentives do not work. There should be positive incentives instead. So this should be discussed.*
AP-8. revisions to the current permitting process to make it more efficient	**H**	• **There is much contention (in the comments) so it needs to be understood and therefore discussed. Make it more efficient or more equitable.**
AP-9. Discussions about the law regarding the ownership of surface water and groundwater	**H**	• **This is one of the most contentious issues and needs to be discussed.**
AP-10. taxes on water sales, transfers and uses	**H**	• **This issue needs a lot of discussion. We may need to also discuss what the price of water is.** • **Should also include property taxes and fees in lieu of taxes.** • **Part of the discussion will have to address where the money goes; it should be done fairly.**
AP-11. regionalization of water and wastewater systems	**H**	• **Two questions: will it be one big plan for a region or is it more like consolidation of schools to make things more efficient?** • **This needs to be discussed but should not be allowed to create monopolies.**
AP-12. tribal claims to both ground and surface water	**H**	• **It must be discussed and needs to be understood. The tribes are the elephant in the room.** • *This could turn into a legal issue and something needs to be done before that happens. Rights need to be resolved and clarified.*

		• *This does need to be a high priority because of the legal issues. It could prevent us from selling bonds to improve our infrastructure. At each level along the way (in the planning process) this is a priority and the state needs to begin the discussion today with the tribes.* • *This is a very big issue.*

OTHER COMMENTS OFFERED DURING THE RIM SESSION

ISSUE #	COMMENT
AP-1	The number of board members on the OWRB should be based upon the number of lakes in the region (need a formula). The appointment of board members needs to be taken out of the governor's hands.
AP-4	There must be a State-level agency to investigate water quality and availability complaints.
AP-9	Water is owned by the landowner first and the State second.
AP-10	Only 10% of our tax money comes back to southeast OK. Why does that money not come back here to fix rural bridges and roads, they are falling apart.
AP-10	Do not tax everything
AP-11	Wastewater and disposal wells destroy underground shelf water used for private wells and eventually drain into streams.
P-2	It is easier to contrive a plant at the top-level; what provisions are there in the plan to prevent interference from Texas?
P-6	There should be legal documentation to prepare for the worst. Texas suing OK for our water. Make all documentation so that it would count in court. And scientific data should be peer reviewed.
Ql-4	Any sales of water should include a tax to specifically build/improve drinking water infrastructure.
Qn	"Quantity" should include soil conservation
Qn-1	*The plan should maybe dovetail with the soil conservation plan that is currently in place.*
T-1	Southeast OK water stays in southeast OK and that water is to be used in OK.
T-1	*Water sales should not happen in this area.*
T-2	How do we keep our rights to water away from the control of politicians so they can't sell our water out from underneath us?
T-2	Transfers within the State should be prioritized over out-of-state transfers by a large margin
UA-1	We shouldn't undo existing permitted rights.
UA-2	Don't take ranchers water rights. Everyone knows there is interaction between ground and surface water. When and if changes are made we need to make sure the definition of what is owned by ranchers is made clear.
UA-6	A damping mechanism must prevent the two large cities in OK from determining the entire future of water in OK.
UA-9	Someone needs to address the oil and gas industry dumping chemicals and pollutants, it is making ponds turn red.
UA-9	XTO is closely monitoring the treatment results of several pilot programs regarding water ruse, but we are practicing some reuse, when practical, but the economics of water treatments in the Woodford Shale area of southeast OK currently make these technologies uneconomical presently. Recycling and reuse of O&G frac water is being studied and several pilot projects are being implemented. Treatments technologies (RO, evaporation and capture, etc.) are evolving and economics and production results are being carefully studied. My understanding is that a few other O&G companies are practicing the reuse option and using some water from emerging technology (i.e., Devon in North Texas)
UA-9	Other very important issues to allow O&G temporary, usually 1 time use of water, for fracture treatments and 30 day drilling water use, (EPA studies has found NO evidence of drinking water aquifers contamination due to Hydraulic fracturing = NO Concern!) are the following: 1) 7% gross production tax = $1.1 billion and 1/7th of ALL STATE REVENUES!

	2) Indirectly O&G provides 25% of taxes collected by the state! (income tax, sales tax, grosses production, etc.)! 3) Nationally - OK is 2nd in Natural gas and 6th in oil production! 4) O&G in 71 or 77 OK counties! 5) O&G = provides roughly 80--100,000 jobs (estimate 104, 000 total jobs, and an 900 new jobs alone in Jan. 2008)! 6) OK 5 Refineries = 5,120 jobs 7) Studies in other basins (Barnett Shale - FT. Worth, TX) - an area water board studies concluded a huge frac treatment (one time, temporary usage) responding to area home owners' complaints during a extreme drought period, concluded that an O&G frac's water usage was much less than 1 day's evaporation from a small local lake and effectively a non-issue versus drought and evaporation on lake water level.
UA-10	*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.*
UA-13	*The aggregate industry is high priority due to the importance to the Oklahoma economy. Aggregate operations create good job opportunities and a strong tax base for local communities. Products provided are important for regional growth and vital to provide cost effective material used to build and maintain roads, schools, churches, hospitals, dams, sewers, and other infrastructure. The aggregates industry produces end product value at over $1 billion annually.*