

Oklahoma Comprehensive Water Plan

Regional Input Meeting #9

Muskogee, OK
Oct. 23, 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
4:00 pm	Small Group Discussions of Issue Ratings	
5:15 pm	Plenary Group Discussion of Issue Ratings	Dianna Leggett
7:25 pm	Afternoon Session Adjourned	
7:25 pm	Public Discussion of Issue Ratings	Mike Langston
8:40 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 citizens participated in the afternoon session, which was witnessed by another 18 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, 26 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>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Without adequate impoundments and distribution systems we can't capture the water we have and we won't need a water plan. • <i>The plan does not adequately deal with supply. You can't deal with quantity if you don't deal with supply. The state assumes ownership and stewardship of the water. Our state water laws say the landowner owns the groundwater and along the streams the riparian land owner is entitled to what he wants that is reasonable now or in the future and you can't take either of these rights away without due process of law. The Indian tribes also claim ownership, along with the state, of surface water and you can't have a good plan unless you deal with the supply side of things. And this needs to be addressed in the planning process.</i>
<p>Qn-2. maintenance of water supply systems, such as dams and pipelines</p>	<p>H/L</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Maintenance is important and this should be discussed. • I think the maintenance of the dams and supply lines should be done by the owners of those things and not the OWRB and this should not be discussed. • A lot of the really major projects were done with federal money but the rest are being done with local money and the state has not actually built a lot of infrastructure so this can impact whether they would be involved with the maintenance.
<p>Qn-3. State and federal funding of water storage infrastructure</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If the government owns the water they should pay for the infrastructure. There will have to be new infrastructure in the next 50 years. There isn't enough local money so the federal and state governments are going to have come together to provide funding.

<p>Qn-4. the effects of climate change on water supplies</p>	<p>H/L</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• The is high because we need to recognize climatic patterns and planning for wet and dry periods will be an important part of the plan.• This is probably important but I don't think the Oklahoma water plan is the place to deal with this. There are already things that will deal with this.• We can't predict long or short-term climate change and we should plan for our water no matter what the climate is because we can't predict what it is going to be.• In order to quantify what your resource is you're going to have to know what your climate is.• You can't really predict what effect climate change will have and if you plan properly you will be okay you just can't know what the effects are going to be. So I do think this is a low priority.• I agree you can't plan on what the climate is going to do but what we do know is there are going to be dry and wet periods and we need to plan for those to a certain degree.
--	------------	---

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>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Cities are having a hard time meeting federal mandates for water quality and we feel this is a very high priority to be included in the discussion. • When you look at rural water systems the cost per customer is very high when looking at cities and so I agree this should be discussed and is important to do so. • This would be more effective if the government did cost/benefit studies before they set their standards and so I agree this should be discussed.
<p>QI-2. more and better measures to protect drinking water</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have a lot of requirements already in place but in certain situations, such as the Illinois River, we know what we have in place is not working or protecting the water supply; we need to strengthen the requirements so this should be high. Enforcement of those regulations is what needs to be strengthened. • There should be funding for conservation and it should be given to the people so protection can be done and the money is put on the ground. Again this goes to the different agencies and this is important to discuss.
<p>QI-3. better technology for treating wastewater</p>	<p>L/H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We already have good technology available and consider this a low priority. • I think this should be a high priority because this is a 50-year plan and the treatment of wastewater is going to be more important especially when considering sustainability. • This should be very high because the smaller communities are not being informed by OWRB of the new technologies available to them at lower costs. There needs to be better communication of what rapid advances of new technology are available.

<p>QI-4. requirements for providing the public with accurate and timely water quality information</p>	<p>H/L</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have a lot of requirements now for informing the public; cities are already required to notify about water quality. • Some felt that even though we have these in place people need to be better informed. • The state and agencies have done a pretty good job of giving the information in a timely manner. The plan needs to address procedures and definitions for accurate information so decisions are scientifically valid and correct. • <i>There should be a lot of emphasis on communication for citizens. There needs to be a website where the public can get one stop shopping for details about water quality issues. This way we wouldn't have to go to a bunch of different sites to find out where poultry farms are going in before we wake up and find them in our backyard. We also need to know about sewage sludge spread in the community because currently there are no requirements for public hearings on any of this.</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"> Anything we can do to encourage conservation is extremely important.
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"> Even though in Oklahoma this probably not going to be an issue soon, in 50-years it will be. So even though it is not an immediate issue it should be a discussion item for a 50-year plan.
C-3. improved educational programs about water conservation for all Oklahomans	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We do a fairly good job educating the public now but any improvement would help support the water plan and help decision makers make wise decisions about our resources.
C-4. incentives to promote water conservation	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Any measure to promote water conservation is good and if incentives can be developed to help that, it would be a wise decision. This is not necessarily getting money back but increasing rate structures and other items. Incentive can go both way and you can have positive and negative ones. Charge those that are wasting and reward those that are conserving. I agree that all of these are high issues. If an entity has a non-consumptive use it should get priority over a consumptive use.
C-5. research programs that assess improved methods for water conservation	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Research over the next 50 years will be an ongoing process and very valuable in conserving our resources. This will be critical for the western part of the state concerning research on aquifers and recharge.

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>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a high priority because the regulation of these entities is difficult because of the interrelation of the two. • This (the entire bucket) is the cornerstone of the water plan and all of the other issues could be fit in here. All of the uses are what make our state survive. Every one of these issues should be considered for further discussion. • I agree that all these issues are important to discuss including hydropower. I disagree though that water going through a dam is wasted it can be used for other purpose and needs to be discussed. • The water plan should focus on sustainability for quality of life and the allocations for economic development should be set on a sustainable basis and economics will then dictate. • <i>I agree this should be a high priority. Under Oklahoma law the ground and surface water laws treat them separately. In the Arbuckle-Simpson area the state is already looking at this and this will likely cause a big dispute. The main reason eastern Oklahoma opposes water transfers to western Oklahoma is the "first in time, first in right" rule and if you have priority you can drain a stream. The appropriative doctrine is dangerous when talking about transferring water because it leaves potential users without a chance to get water when it is most needed. The state of Oklahoma in negotiating with the Indian tribes to set up new standards on how the water could be appropriated and requires water be left in the stream.</i>
<p>UA-2. the interaction between ground and surface water in allocation decisions</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is also a high priority because of the hydrological cycle. We must be good managers of our resources and the determination of the rights could be disputed so this should be discussed. • <i>This issue with all of these (UA-2 – UA14) need to consider supply. We have 16 basins that need consideration before water is transferred out of them. When we talk about needs there is an absence of agriculture economist and industrial economist studying and understanding our needs and therefore we</i>

		<i>can't value our water properly.</i>
UA-3. prioritizing water uses during shortages	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We thought that because of the recent past drought it was better to establish guidelines, especially for small communities and municipalities; they could look at these state developed guidelines and take the politics out of it. This is a high priority.
UA-4. the water quality and quantity needs of ecosystems in allocation decisions	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This was as split decision. On the low side you have to choose between people and animals and people should have priority. However there are large economic impacts from having water in the streams. The state gets millions of dollars from the fishing industry and if we impact that negatively it could take centuries for them to recover. We must take care of our ecosystems it is a health and economic issue. Keeping the water clean reduces the cost.
UA-5. the need of adequate amounts of water to further economic development in allocation decisions	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Economic development should be provided with water and recreation and tourism have an impact on the state's economy.
UA-6. the effect of population change on water needs in allocation decisions	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is important to know and is tied to UA-4.
UA-7. the water needs of recreation and tourism in allocation decisions	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is important especially for eastern Oklahoma.
UA-8. the water needs of agriculture and agriculture industry in allocation decisions	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are a lot of issues with agriculture and is a priority industry. The needs of this use are important to discuss.
UA-9. the water needs of oil and gas production, including refining and exploration, in allocation decisions	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The impact of oil and gas industry on our state along with ecological issues is important to discuss.
UA-10. the water needs of mining in allocation decisions	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are a lot of different types of mining and they need water and this is important to discuss.
UA-11. the water needs of navigation in allocation decisions	H/L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is important and especially for this region.

<p>UA-12. the water needs of hydropower in allocation decisions</p>	<p>H/L</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The efficiency of hydro power isn't very high and for energy production this is not the most efficient use of water. • I believe the hydropower on our lakes is mismanaged and misused and it needs to be discussed because of the amount of water that is wasted.
<p>UA-13. the water needs of industry in allocation decisions</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is important to discuss.
<p>UA-14. the water needs of municipalities in allocation decisions</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is also very important. • This is very key to the water plan. One of the facts pointed out the amount of people around the world who get sick from untreated or undertreated water and wastewater. Municipalities supply 90% of drinking water in the state and if this element is missed it could result in health hazards and I agree it should be discussed.

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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is important throughout the state because we have areas with water and areas without water. • We need to be aware of the biological effect of the transfer of water between basins and this needs to be discussed and addressed in the plan.
T-2. water sales or transfers outside of the State	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This needs to be discussed because we need to have a plan before someone else gives us a plan.
T-3. the economic impact of sales or transfers on the entire State, as well as the basin of origin	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We need to make sure we have a plan to have a benefit to the producer and the receiver of the water.
T-4. how water and land is managed within the basin of origin if water is sold or transferred	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These issues are very important in the water plan. It is important how water and land is managed especially in the basin of origin.

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
<p>LH-1. how to reduce the impact of natural or man-made disasters that could affect water supply or infrastructure</p>	<p>L/H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a low priority. It is important but is not important in the discussion for the water plan and is more a regional than state issue when dealing with disasters. • There are ways to reduce the impact of these based on planning where you put industries, and there is a need to be particular where you place them so this should be discussed. • The initial group said that these are important but if we get the overall plan right then these will fall into place and be considered in the plan.
<p>LH-2. land management practices that affect water quality and quantity</p>	<p>L/H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is more a conservation issue and should be dealt with outside of the water plan. • Salvaging and protecting the wetlands we have are tremendous filters for our water supply. If we manage our wetlands we increase both wildlife and water quality which will in turn reduce the amount of treatment we have to do. • This should be a high priority because protecting the quality of the water we have is a priority across the state. By doing prevention work for pollution in both ground and surface water we will protect it and this issue is important to discuss. • I do think this is important but I do wonder if this is not appropriate for the plan as there are other agencies that deal with these issues such as NRCS and DEQ. • <i>The planning and management of water and land use go together. The laws on water give landowners riparian rights and one of the biggest issues is how do you get those interests together and manage the water at the base level of supply. The key unit to this is the watershed and setting up local legal interests that take care of their needs and make water available outside their area. Our soil and conservation districts have the authority to bring the owners together to manage water. Texas has done this but north Texas is resolving those issues by going outside their area to get waters to meet their needs. Within the watershed management aspect we can make it work. If we don't we won't be able to bring those interests together and this section deserves a</i>

		<i>high priority for this purpose.</i>
LH-3. the infrastructure needs for fire fighting	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is important but it is not appropriate for the plan to discuss. • If we don't have good infrastructure in the rural areas and are unable to control wildfires that will affect the ecosystem for years to come and this needs to be discussed in the water plan. • The current plan doesn't address this. Basically the only water needs addressed for firefighting are in the urban areas but doesn't address it in the rural areas and this needs to be addressed. A rural firefighter can't do much without water.

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"> This is a high priority because we feel this is what the water plan is all about. Water for the state of Oklahoma.
P-2. ways to improve the current planning process	L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is low because the planning process is okay now and we don't know if we need to include this.
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"> This is a high priority because there are a lot of issues currently happening such as several lawsuits and this should be a part of the plan as water flows across borders.
P-4. how to better involve the public in the planning process	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is being done now and we don't think it needs discussion in the water plan. If this is a living document then we need to strive to better include the public and educate them about the plan. So this should be discussed. The key words in this statement was "better involve the public" and the current process already does that and since this says better we think what is done now is working well. Those people who want to be involved are becoming involved and the general public is encouraged to participate and we don't know how to make the process better.
P-5. how to incorporate regional differences in water supply and use	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is necessary to come to a conclusion of how to deal with areas that have and don't have water.
P-6. what research needs to be done during and after the current planning process	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is important but we believe the current research will fit in this plan and the research we do will affect more the future. <i>This should be high because we don't know what our water inventory is and we have many scientific tools that are being wasted. It is an ongoing basis of what will work. Research on water supplies, climate change and medical issues should be a constant.</i>

<p>P-7. treating the water plan as a living document that is reviewed on an ongoing basis</p>	<p>L/H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is low for discussion in the water plan but it does need to be done. On a year-to-year basis we don't need to make changes because there may not be cohesion and we need that in the plan. It does need to be reviewed but not necessarily every single year. There are more important things to discuss. • There needs to be a statement in the plan that this is a living document and mechanisms in place to allow for new information and this should not be a static document.
<p>P-8. procedures to deal with conflict during and after the planning process</p>	<p>L/H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • If we come up with the right plan we will reduce the conflict and we can't plan for what conflicts will happen and know how to deal with them now. • This should be discussed because even though you can't know in advance the conflict you need to have some discussion about how to deal with conflict so we don't always have to go to litigation.

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
<p>AP-1. changes to State agency jurisdictions, authorities and relationships</p>	<p>H/L</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The low thought this may not be appropriate for the plan and there are other things that are more important to discuss. • On the high side there needs to be a hierarchy established and/or better coordination between agencies. • The OWRB has rules and standards and in some cases they don't have the authority to enforce the regulations they develop and it is left to other agencies so this would help them out with enforcement and I think this should be discussed. This also goes to AP-4 • There is confusion about overlap of the agencies and I don't know how this can be addressed through the water plan. • <i>In regards to OWRB that agency needs to be completely reorganized and has too much power. So this should be a high priority. All groundwater and hydrology studies should be transferred to OGS so we can better separate science from special interest and politics. The protest hearings should be transferred to a water court division under the Corporation Commission. They have 27 administrative law judges hearing cases daily over mineral rights to ensure conservation of oil and gas natural resources. The same needs to be done on our water resources. Currently there is strong evidence of mismanagement by OWRB on its adjudication of water rights. Since OWRB handles loans and grants for billions of dollars for water systems and billions dollars of public water assets there needs to be better regulatory review and auditing.</i> • <i>The OWRB handles the water rights if you don't use those rights they will be taken away from you. The storage rights are issued from the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers.</i>
<p>AP-2. changes to local agency authorities and relationships and changes to or development of new local organizations</p>	<p>L/H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This may be too difficult to do because it would be a big net. • <i>We need to look at the authority of local government and any local water planning entities and anyone else that could be involved so this should be a high priority.</i>
<p>AP-3. changes in the services agencies offer to the public</p>	<p>L</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • In regards to this issue, through the planning process and other discussions this will be accomplished. Some issues have already been accomplished through the planning.

<p>AP-4. more consistent enforcement of current laws and regulations</p>	<p>L/H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This may be addressed during the process and not really appropriate for discussion. • They do need to be enforced equally and some aspects of this are important.
<p>AP-5. the effects of federal regulations on state regulations and programs</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There needs to be some coordination between the federal government and the state and that is not really happening right now. The state needs to know what is coming and there needs to be good coordination.
<p>AP-6. new state regulations and laws as necessary</p>	<p>L/H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This will happen through the planning process. We don't really need to encourage more. • <i>This is supposed to be a 50-year water plan and things will change so this should be high because we don't know our future. The comment was they didn't want to encourage more regulations but maybe we need to reevaluate the ones we already have.</i> • <i>If you do AP-2 you have to do this because it will be necessary to reconcile the relationship between the agencies.</i>
<p>AP-7. incentive programs to promote compliance with regulations</p>	<p>L</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a low priority because incentives don't work well to encourage compliance and fines and penalties are the most effect way.
<p>AP-8. revisions to the current permitting process to make it more efficient</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a high priority. There need to be some changes to make it more consistent and better informed uses of the water. The permitting process needs to allow for more public input and more negotiation. It is difficult to make long-range plans with the current restrictions on surface water use. There needs to be a lot of work done on this. • <i>The first in time, first in right provision is dangerous and needs to be changed and we should incorporate some of the issues resolved with the tribes on the Kiamichi River.</i>
<p>AP-9. changes in the law regarding the ownership of surface water and groundwater</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This needs to be discussed no matter which side you are on. It is already an issue across the state and needs to be included. • <i>That is the issue between the tribes and the state. Also, who has the plenary power to appropriate that water. Again the compact that developed with the tribes in the Kiamichi area addressed this and could resolve it. There is a joint capability for this.</i>
<p>AP-10. taxes on water sales, transfers and uses</p>	<p>L/H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is low. We don't want to encourage any new taxes even if some come out of the planning process. • This should be a high priority because to not deal with an issue could really backfire. Prior planning prevents poor performance. The reality is it is being discussed and to not embrace and discuss it in the plan could be a mistake as there are groups on both sides of the issue and we need to be prepared.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> I agree this should be discussed and you have to pay for infrastructure in some way and I think a tax on the use of water may be a way to get that done.
<p>AP-11. regionalization of water and wastewater systems</p>	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is important to discuss. It is going to be a difficult discussion to have but we need to find ways to get it done to make things more efficient and effective.
<p>AP-12. tribal claims to both ground and surface water</p>	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is a lot of conflict and discussion now and it will be a lot better if we work together now and try to resolve it rather than go to court especially federal court. <i>This should be addressed because without settling this issue it could have an effect on municipalities and rural water districts abilities to sell their bonds to build infrastructure. It has happened before during the previous attempt to sell water to Texas. The compacts dealt with the administration of water not the sale of water. The only thing addressed regarding the sale of water was any sale had to be approved by the state legislature and the tribal councils. We need to encourage the state to work with the tribes and develop an agreement to make sure local authorities can get water.</i> <i>When you are talking about storage rights then you also have to include the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers because they control the storage rights. For example Sequoyah Fuels has water rights but don't necessarily use it and talks about water rights should include water storage rights.</i>

Other Comments

Issue #	Comment
	When it gets down to the end of the plan it will ultimately be up to the legislature and in the end special interest groups may try to make changes not consistent with the plan. The legislature should take the plan as a whole and not let special interest have a large impact on the vote. The plan should be left alone once completed and there should be something in the plan that directs that.
	There should be more education on what each agency does and how they overlap. This information should come on the front side before we begin to put this together.
C-4	One suggestion for this issue (refer to C-4) is letting the fishery use the water first and then the municipalities could take the water below the fishery.
	The water that goes through the dam at Eufaula is a waste of water but the Corps has no choice because of Southwest Power. When the Office of Management and Budget says generate then the Corps has to no matter the amount of water in the lake. This water could be better used for other purposes.
	I think it would be beneficial if everyone participating was better educated about the issues around our state. We in eastern Oklahoma don't necessarily know about issues in western Oklahoma and we should be.
	Maybe we should build coffer dams to pump water to areas that need it such as western Oklahoma.
	<i>The tree ring studies give us information about past severe droughts and these need to be studied so we can plan for them. The supply study also involves having the Corps doing new studies and reprioritizing the purposes of their 23 reservoirs which were all built in pre-computer day. For example in Lake Eufaula the primary purpose is recreation and tourism and not hydropower and this needs to be addressed. The current scientific information will not pass peer review.</i>
	<i>I object to the lack of hydrologist, biologist etc. not being included in the technical studies and without the technical studies being transparent to the general public. We cannot attend those meetings. Why?</i>
	<i>The citizens of the state of Oklahoma have not been informed Texas will build reservoirs in southeast Oklahoma strictly dedicated to Dallas/Ft. Worth use. This information has been known by the top management of the OWRB but has not been shared with the general public.</i>
	<i>We cannot talk about distribution systems without understanding that this state does not have any adequate information about the supply we have. There are no complete studies on all of the aquifers in the state. We have no studies at all on the alluvial deposits and there is a deficiency of science and understanding.</i>
	<i>Not one tribe in the state of Oklahoma has filed in a court of Oklahoma their water rights. Until that is done it is just an unfiled claim. The Corps has mandated all allocations of water from its reservoirs to OWRB. OWRB makes the allocations.</i>
	<i>Many upstream reservoirs could be built to store water and prevent sediment from our large lakes. I'm talking smaller to medium size reservoirs not Keystone or Eufaula size lakes.</i>