

**Oklahoma  
Comprehensive Water Plan**

**Regional Input Meeting #10**

Oklahoma City, OK  
Nov. 6, 2008

## Meeting Agenda

Time	Topic	Speaker/Facilitator
3:05 pm	Afternoon Session Convened	
3:20 pm	Meeting Purpose and Staff Introductions	Mike Langston, Institute Assistant Director
3:35 pm	Discussant Introductions and Water Facts Discussion	Dianna Leggett, Facilitator
3:50 pm	Small Group Discussions of Issue Ratings	
5:00 pm	Plenary Group Discussion of Issue Ratings	Dianna Leggett
7:20 pm	Afternoon Session Adjourned	
7:30 pm	Public Discussion of Issue Ratings	Mike Langston
9:05 pm	Evening Session Adjourned	

The purpose of the Regional Input Meetings is to determine which issues deserve priority attention as we move forward in the water planning process. In this region, 34 citizens were invited to participate in a discussion about the importance of 54 issue categories, which were created by grouping the 2500+ comments obtained from the 42 Local Input Meetings held in 2007. The participants ranked an issue category as highly important if they believed that the issue category should be discussed in the planning workshops that will be held in 2009. Otherwise, they ranked the issue category as having low importance.

Thirty-four citizens participated in the afternoon session, which was witnessed by another 24 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, 29 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**

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

THE PLAN SHOULD CONSIDER...	STATE-WIDE PRIORITY	EXPLANATION/RATIONALE
<p><b>Qn-1.</b> the improvement and expansion of drinking water infrastructure, such as impoundments, distribution systems and aquifer recharge measures</p>	<p align="center"><b>H</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>This is important to discuss. It is the foundation of the entire plan.</b></li> <li>• <b>The discussion should not be restricted to just drinking water and we should look at marginal waters as well.</b></li> <li>• <b>By the time this plan is ½ way through the majority of impoundments will have reached their life expectancy so this is important to discuss.</b></li> <li>• <b>Maybe this issue could be combined with the discussion on wastewater reuse.</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>Qn-2.</b> maintenance of water supply systems, such as dams and pipelines</p>	<p align="center"><b>H</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>This is high. The infrastructure is getting old and we need to maintain it. It is cheaper to maintain what we have than build new infrastructure.</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>Qn-3.</b> State and federal funding of water storage infrastructure</p>	<p align="center"><b>H</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>There does need to be more funding and the state and federal government needs to contribute to that.</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>Qn-4.</b> the effects of climate change on water supplies</p>	<p align="center"><b>L/H</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>This is already being done and there is no need to include this in the plan. The plan cannot really address this specifically so this is less important to discuss.</b></li> <li>• <b>There are things you can work into a comprehensive water plan that can speak to this. There are models that can be used to better prepare us for climate change. There are also mitigation technologies to implement that will make Oklahoma more sustainable. When you talk about the water plan you have to think about the word comprehensive. If we don't include it into the plan then that information will not be considered and the technologies you could implement to protect ourselves from the effects won't be mandated.</b></li> <li>• <b>Climate change needs to be a high priority for discussion. We will see new information monthly on this and it is an important issue to discuss. By the time the plan is complete the information may be there.</b></li> <li>• <b>If climate change is really happening the effect will be miniscule and does not need to be discussed in the plan.</b></li> <li>• <b>If there is change it may be from climate cycles and I think everyone would agree there are climate cycles and those cycles need to be considered in the water plan.</b></li> <li>• <b>We didn't discuss whether climate change is real we just thought there was already a lot being done both in and outside the state of Oklahoma so that is why we thought it was a lower priority.</b></li> </ul>

**QUALITY**

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

THE PLAN SHOULD CONSIDER...	STATE-WIDE PRIORITY	EXPLANATION/RATIONALE
<p><b>QI-1.</b> State and federal funding of water treatment and protection</p>	<p align="center"><b>H</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Small towns do need funding help. The EPA forces regulations on them and they need funding to help meet those regulations.</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>QI-2.</b> more and better measures to protect drinking water</p>	<p align="center"><b>H or L/H</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The term <i>measures</i> needs to be defined. We are for enforcing the regulations we already have. But we would consider this low if it means more regulations.</b></li> <li>• <b>There should be point-source testing done on excess organic materials and water well testing so this should be discussed.</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>QI-3.</b> better technology for treating wastewater</p>	<p align="center"><b>H or L</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>We need to implement the proven technology that is already there. But on the low side better technology is going to occur and become available without the water plan or anyone else addressing it.</b></li> <li>• <b>There is a barrier to implementing technologies from outside the state and you can't go to DEQ to do that. You can't predict today what technology will be in here the future.</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>QI-4.</b> requirements for providing the public with accurate and timely water quality information</p>	<p align="center"><b>L/H</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>This is already being done and we are doing a good job of it.</b></li> <li>• <i>This should be high because we have a tourist rate in the state and those people need accurate information.</i></li> </ul>

**WATER CONSERVATION AND REUSE**

*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...	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"> <li>• This needs to be discussed and we consider this a high priority.</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• We do need to reclaim all the water we can, treat it and reuse it.</li> <li>• <i>There is a tremendous amount of work that has been on reusing water and we do a terrible job of using those resources. It can be used on urban landscapes and golf courses and we need to use it so this should be discussed.</i></li> </ul>
C-3. improved educational programs about water conservation for all Oklahomans	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This needs to be done. It is important to educate people so they understand the importance of conservation. It always needs to be done.</li> </ul>
C-4. incentives to promote water conservation	H/L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• A carrot is better than a stick and we do need to provide incentives rather than regulations. However if we do C-1 – C-3 it will take care of this issue.</li> <li>• This has always been a high priority for me because incentives really help the landowners out there with conservation and this needs to be discussed.</li> <li>• This should be more uniform through all groups that should conserve. I'm not sure it is appropriate for the plan to discuss, but if you are going to do it, it needs to be consistent.</li> <li>• Other states that have incentives in watersheds to protect water quality have been proven to be cost effective.</li> <li>• There are still some places in the US that spend most of their money upstream to protect their municipal water supply so this does need to be a high priority for discussion.</li> <li>• Conservation is its own incentive and that is one of the reasons we considered it a lower priority to discuss.</li> <li>• It is very important for agriculture to have incentives and this needs to be discussed.</li> <li>• We need to prime the pump to get people in the habit of doing these things.</li> <li>• There is a difference in supporting conservation by someone who lives in a town as opposed to say someone who irrigates because of the cost of the infrastructure so incentives can be helpful to them. Even though they may not pay for their water they do have to pay to get it out of the ground.</li> <li>• <i>One of our greatest opportunities is to use drip irrigation and it is going to take incentives to do this because a lot of the crops we grow are low income crops and farmers need the incentives to switch to this technology. So this needs to be discussed.</i></li> </ul>

<p><b>C-5.</b> research programs that assess improved methods for water conservation</p>	<p><b>L/H</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is already being done and the plan does not need to address this. The state itself cannot do this.</li> <li>• This is something the state can do because land grant universities, such as OSU are supposed to do it and governmental agencies do it as well. Though I don't know this needs to be discussed.</li> <li>• I think this is a high priority for discussion in order to accomplish C-1 – C-4.</li> <li>• Because of the lack of funding for research I think this does need to be addressed because the plan could recommend research be funded.</li> <li>• <i>I would say this definitely high and even though a lot of research is being done sometimes it is taking research that is being done and applying it to certain areas. Showing what research is already out there and using it here is critical and we need to discuss this issue.</i></li> </ul>
--	-------------------	--

**APPROPRIATED WATER USES**

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. discussion about water law regarding groundwater and surface water use</p>	<p align="center">L/H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We ranked this low because the water law works well now. This is really not appropriate or timely for the water plan and the legislature will deal with this. We didn't think we need to open this can of worms because there is already a lot of precedent out there now.</li> <li>• I don't think the legislature, given SB 288, thinks this won't be talked about and I think this and UA-2 need to continue on in the discussion at least to the Town Hall.</li> <li>• We should be looking at past laws and to see how that has worked and do an evaluation on the baseline and how well those laws have taken us through today.</li> <li>• This has to be addressed because we know we have aquifers that are dropping. We need to know if we are using our aquifers wisely and we won't know that until we know the recharge rates on the aquifers. We have to take this into account and we definitely need to discuss both this and UA-2</li> <li>• The way the water laws are written it looks at an aquifer as one whole supply. The way water rights are allocated now, you can own groundwater rights in one part of a basin and have your well field in another part. Your water rights should be where your well field is and I think this needs discussion.</li> <li>• The discussion on this and UA-2 needs to happen because our water law is not adequate and we need to work on updating the water law to be more comprehensive and systematic.</li> <li>• We don't think you need to open up the water law for the sake of changing water law. If UA-2 is addressed then it may cause some discussion of changes in water law but this issue will come out in other issues and this issue should not be separated out and discussed by itself.</li> <li>• This would be fine but if rating it low means it won't be discussed then I'm not okay with that. It must be addressed in one of the other issues. Maybe combine UA-1 and UA-2</li> <li>• <i>This should be very high because we have all attended the workshop on water law in Oklahoma and it is based on the premise that Oklahoma has a legal interest in the water in Oklahoma and under that system groundwater is in the hand of the landowner and stream water is under state appropriation. Last week the state of Oklahoma heard from the 10<sup>th</sup> Circuit court on the motion to dismiss the Tarrant County lawsuit. The judge said Oklahoma does not enjoy ownership in water resources in Oklahoma. The Indian tribes have also asserted their rights to water. So it is of high importance to discuss this issue.</i></li> <li>• <i>I agree this should be high because all wells do not enjoy the same protection even if they come out of the same aquifer. Some irrigation wells are allowed to be connected to a polluted water line with a backflow preventer between them. There should never be a connection between an irrigation line and a polluted water line.</i></li> <li>• <i>These (UA-1 &amp; UA-2) should be ranked really high and strategic planning and laws should be based on science regarding the connection between groundwater and surface water. This is going to be a difficult discussion but it should be a central part of all of this.</i></li> </ul>

<p><b>UA-2.</b> the interaction between ground and surface water in allocation decisions</p>	<p>L/H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• On the low side of this if you manage this together you may make artificial shortages. If you are a property owner then you would abrogate property rights. On the high side though we need to at least look at this and see what other states are doing.</li> </ul>
<p><b>UA-3.</b> prioritizing water uses during shortages</p>	<p>L/H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is tough and is a local issue and could create chaos because you would be pitting industries against others and it is already done through the Water Board.</li> <li>• How can you call it a plan if you don't discuss this? This is a top issue. At some point in the last 20 years some part of the state has been in a drought and all of our water is connected so prioritizing water uses should stay on the table to get more regional input. Also the technical studies will provide information. We are talking about what issues are important to our region and our state and we need to talk about what to do in times of shortage to avoid a situation that pits industry against agriculture. The comprehensive water plan is basically going to be a steering document for the rest of our state and will influence the laws that get implemented. By keeping this on the table it gives us influence on which direction the legislature will go with this issue. The longer we keep the issue on the table the better we protect not only our region but the entire state.</li> <li>• There should be contingency plans because there are times there is not enough water in a reservoir to fulfill all the allocations so we need to discuss this.</li> <li>• I think this is a bad path to go down because there will be a lot of conflict between users and what we need to focus on is good management. So everyone can have water even in bad times. This is not as important to discuss.</li> <li>• We are not talking about contingency plans. You can't prioritize groundwater because that is private property and surface water is addressed through junior and senior water rights. So this does not need discussion.</li> </ul>
<p><b>UA-4.</b> the water quality and quantity needs of ecosystems in allocation decisions</p>	<p>L/H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The low group said this is not an allocation issue now and this is not appropriate for the plan. Also it could create artificial shortages. On the high side you have to maintain a base flow or you lose fish and wildlife. What about other areas of the state. There is some fear that the federal government would make us do it anyway and we should be a head of the power curve.</li> <li>• Given the things that have happened in other states we need to talk about this. There are areas such as in the Illinois River area that this is important to discuss.</li> <li>• We can create artificial water systems that are not native to a stream as happened with the Arkansas River Shiner and we need to be very careful about any discussion but I don't think this is a high priority.</li> <li>• This one needs to be ranked low because you are going to create a minimum instream flow that will then go out of the state and be available for a beneficial use by a lot of users.</li> <li>• There are already too many examples of the federal government coming and if we don't take care of this they will come in and do it for us. You really won't like the result.</li> <li>• I'm not sure how the federal government can come in and do anything? The Edwards aquifer issue was determined by the court not the government.</li> <li>• <i>This should be ranked high because of protection of wetlands as a filtration device. They protect the downstream people.</i></li> <li>• <i>This should be ranked high partly because instream life in all of its forms gets left out of most discussions and what happens is streams become devoid of water and if we don't keep those</i></li> </ul>

		<i>uses in mind we diminish the quality of life we have and in our streams. We need to consider tourism and recreation as a part of this issue. This is not just the amount of water but also the water quality.</i>
<b>UA-5.</b> the need of adequate amounts of water to further economic development in allocation decisions	H/L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>We had a high/low split on the rest of these issues because one person felt that we had plenty of water and adequate permitting process so the discussion is moot.</b></li> <li>• <b>This is important to discuss because of we don't use it then it will go to Texas and we need to do our own economic development.</b></li> <li>• <i>From UA-5 – UA-14 these should all be considered of high importance.</i></li> <li>• <i>OWRB does not regulate domestic water wells but when you have a concentration of them, like putting them on ¼ of an acre lots in a development, they can have a detrimental effect on the groundwater levels and this needs to be discussed.</i></li> </ul>
<b>UA-6.</b> the effect of population change on water needs in allocation decisions	H/L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>We need to be prepared because we don't know what will happen over the next 50 years.</b></li> <li>• <i>I think this should be a high priority. Texas is in the situation they are in because they did not plan for population change.</i></li> </ul>
<b>UA-7.</b> the water needs of recreation and tourism in allocation decisions	H/L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>This is big business. Federal lakes were built for specific purposes and therefore we can do little because it is a federal issue. The economies around the lakes grew up because the lakes were there not because it was a designated purpose.</b></li> </ul>
<b>UA-8.</b> the water needs of agriculture and agriculture industry in allocation decisions	H/L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Duh, you gotta eat! It is important to the economy.</b></li> </ul>
<b>UA-9.</b> the water needs of oil and gas production, including refining and exploration, in allocation decisions	H/L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>This is important for as long as oil and gas last. But how do you allocate when you don't know their needs. The economic impact on the state is huge and important to the state.</b></li> </ul>
<b>UA-10.</b> the water needs of mining in allocation decisions	H/L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Commonly the water is used and reused and is a non-consumptive use and it is a big money and growth industry for Oklahoma.</b></li> </ul>
<b>UA-11.</b> the water needs of navigation in allocation decisions	H/L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>The ports in Oklahoma are very important to the state not only to the Tulsa area but for the entire state; this is our gateway to the world.</b></li> <li>• <b>Navigation affects us not only at the port but because we have to hold water in our lakes to ensure the navigation level is at the proper level.</b></li> </ul>
<b>UA-12.</b> the water needs of hydropower in allocation decisions	H/L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Goes with navigation, if it captures economic benefits then we should consider it.</b></li> </ul>
<b>UA-13.</b> the water needs of industry in allocation decisions	H/L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>Duh! We would like to attract more industry and they need to know it is going to be there. If we can allocate enough there will be none for Texas.</b></li> <li>• <i>This should be addressed only to industries located in Oklahoma.</i></li> </ul>
<b>UA-14.</b> the water needs of municipalities in allocation decisions	H/L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>This is a big duh it is joined with economic development and growth of population.</b></li> <li>• <i>This needs to be specified that this is for municipalities in Oklahoma.</i></li> </ul>

**WATER TRANSFERS AND SALES**

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"> <li>You can't talk about making a water plan if you don't talk about transferring or selling water. We think both T-1 and T-2 are high.</li> </ul>
T-2. water sales or transfers outside of the State	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>See above</li> </ul>
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"> <li>This is also very high because it is important for economic development. It is important to both the receiver and the area the basin came from.</li> </ul>
T-4. how water and land is managed within the basin of origin if water is sold or transferred	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>If you appropriately address T-3 then this will be taken care of. But if you weren't going to do this then this would need discussion. This could be combined with T-3.</li> <li><i>This should be ranked high. It applies to T-1 – 3 as well. Water is a commodity in interstate commerce and the courts have said we cannot protect our water for economic purposes, we can only protect it for health and public welfare. If we sell or transfer it, it kicks it out of that protection. Watersheds are sub-basins of the larger basins and the court favors management based on watersheds rather than political boundaries. You can put protective measures in place to protect health and public welfare. In order to keep as much water as we can we need to be able to justify the need we have to manage it on the watershed basis. The second aspect is that in-state and out-of-state transfers have to be treated equally and if the state of Texas is allowed to get water free then every place in our state can get their water free, thus there will be no money for infrastructure and economic development from water sales and transfers.</i></li> <li><i>Our water and land is managed in a basin of origin and this should be a high priority. For example Lake Murray water is allocated and sold and there is no meter so they sell water as needed and if there is no water left for recreation then that is just how it is. If the water board is going to issue a permit then the entity getting the water should be metered so everyone knows how much is being taken out.</i></li> </ul>

**LAND MANAGEMENT AND HAZARD MITIGATION**

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><b>LH-1.</b> how to reduce the impact of natural or man-made disasters that could affect water supply or infrastructure</p>	<p align="center"><b>L/H</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>This was mixed. Those that thought it was high thought so because you must consider this. On the low side we thought this was a little below the scope of the plan.</b></li> <li>• <b>This may not be the arena for discussion because there are already agencies that discuss and deal with this.</b></li> <li>• <b>The scope of mitigating hazards is huge and while there are agencies that do this they don't always do it adequately. The federal government expects us to do this bottom up; so start very locally but the federal government won't come in until local/state resources are exhausted and then they don't come in quickly. Our water resources are important to us. Every time we have a drought we have wildfires and flooding that also can cause problems and we need to plan for them. There are some plans out there that have been in place for 20 years and no one uses or updates them. We need to plan now because we don't want to be the next Louisiana.</b></li> <li>• <b>We already have plans in place for hazard mitigation and we should look at these because this might be a duplication effort to discuss this.</b></li> </ul>
<p><b>LH-2.</b> land management practices that affect water quality and quantity</p>	<p align="center"><b>H</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>This is essential to both quality and quantity.</b></li> <li>• <b>I am a steward of the land and I think the cities also have a tremendous opportunity. Cities are putting human waste on land and maybe they are causing some of the problems and we need some laws to protect for nitrates and phosphates as the problems may not be from the farmers but what is put on the farmland by cities and this needs to be discussed very highly.</b></li> <li>• <b>Land application of bio-solids is regulated by agencies and there are lot of regulations on how much can be put on and it is only domestic waste and not industrial waste. This issue does need to be discussed.</b></li> <li>• <i>There needs to be some legislation to support cities to work together to protect the water quality within watersheds and basins and not along political boundaries. The legislation needs to be there to encourage this type of planning.</i></li> </ul>
<p><b>LH-3.</b> the infrastructure needs for fire fighting</p>	<p align="center"><b>L/H</b></p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• <b>This is important but this topic is not within the scope of the plan.</b></li> <li>• <i>This is an important issue and it connects to all of the other issues in this bucket. You need to have infrastructure there for the purpose of fighting fires. Because wildfires impact water quality in lakes and rivers because of their impact on the land water runs off of.</i></li> </ul>

**WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANNING**

*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"> <li>• This is the planning process.</li> </ul>
P-2. ways to improve the current planning process	L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is low because we are pretty comfortable with the way the process is now. We interpret this with what we are doing today.</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• This is high because water does not recognize state boundaries.</li> </ul>
P-4. how to better involve the public in the planning process	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We feel the public has had all kinds of opportunities to participate and if we keep doing what we are doing that is okay.</li> <li>• <i>I spoke to both ACOG and OWRB and nobody ever mentioned this process going on. There needs to be a mechanism in place to encourage the employees to let people know about what is going on with the planning process.</i></li> <li>• <i>This should be considered high because we should continue to ask the public for input.</i></li> </ul>
P-5. how to incorporate regional differences in water supply and use	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Part of what the plan is going to do or should do is recognize this, so this is important to discuss.</li> </ul>
P-6. what research needs to be done during and after the current planning process	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We think you should remove the word “what” and say “research needs to be done” and this is a high priority.</li> <li>• This issue and C-5 could be combined because they both deal with research.</li> <li>• The plan may want to address this. There may be a list of research needs to come out of the plans. I think we need to keep in mind that there should be a list of research to come out of this plan and this does need to be discussed.</li> <li>• The OWRB is charged with the responsibilities of making the maximum annual yields determinations and I think this process needs to be sped up, particularly in urban areas it is important that these be done and the problem is the lack of funding. This does need discussion.</li> </ul>
P-7. treating the water plan as a living document that is reviewed on an ongoing basis	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• It should be considered on a periodic basis. You shouldn’t change it every day. Rather than putting an exact time line we think “periodic review” is a good way to say it.</li> <li>• I agree that the plan should be revised on a set schedule but I also think it needs to be a living document. When the plan is complete we may need to make some changes. This plan should not sit on a shelf and should be used for the benefit of Oklahoma.</li> </ul>

<p><b>P-8.</b> procedures to deal with conflict during and after the planning process</p>	<p>L/H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• <b>The existing mechanisms are adequate. There may be some need for better educating the public on this but the existing mechanisms works so this is a lower priority.</b></li><li>• <i>This needs to be high because at the point we discuss the plan it is past the point of conflict so it leaves this to resolution of conflict after the plan. If we don't have a conflict resolution procedure that allows for due process there is going to be a multitude of cases that is going to be hard to handle.</i></li><li>• <i>When you look at the comments regarding this issue they are about conflicts between agencies not necessarily between water users.</i></li></ul>
---	------------	---

**WATER MANAGEMENT AGENCIES**

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	L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Things seem to be working well now. This is more a statutory/legislative issue.</li> </ul>
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"> <li>• Economics and other issues will cover this. There are a lot of things already in place and some areas where this is already happening.</li> </ul>
AP-3. changes in the services agencies offer to the public	L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There might be other areas, such as education, that will take care of this. There are more important overarching issues.</li> </ul>
AP-4. more consistent enforcement of current laws and regulations	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Consistency is great but there are issues within agencies that may cause some inconsistencies but overall it is working well so we ranked it low.</li> <li>• The public has a mixed understanding of water rights and water laws and I think this does need to be discussed. There may not need to be changes but consistency among the agencies is important.</li> <li>• <i>This needs to ranked high. The laws need to be consistent because if they are not then the people lose trust of the government. If you aren't consistent then you get people who aren't complying.</i></li> </ul>
AP-5. the effects of federal regulations on state regulations and programs	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are a number of different areas where federal regulations significantly impact the various agencies. There was some discussion on whether we could change this or not but overall we thought it should be discussed.</li> </ul>
AP-6. new state regulations and laws as necessary	L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Other issues may address this issue. A lot of time should not be spent on this. The legislature will come up with new laws based on the water plan.</li> </ul>
AP-7. incentive programs to promote compliance with regulations	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• What does incentives mean? Did it mean fines and violations? There should be positive incentives, but there are programs out there already and we don't really need to discuss this.</li> <li>• I have always considered cost-share programs as a high priority for watershed management. There should be funding for long-term watershed programs so I think this is a high priority.</li> <li>• I agree that this should be high. Incentives talk to more than just drinking water and a carrot is better than a stick.</li> <li>• If only 1% of the people are out of compliance then they are just bad actors but if 90% are</li> </ul>

		<p>out of compliance either the regulation is bad or there needs to be more education of the regulation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Incentives help people be able to comply with regulations so I do think this should be discussed.</li> </ul>
<b>AP-8.</b> revisions to the current permitting process to make it more efficient	L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The comments in this section didn't really go to efficiency. Some of the comments were good but the whole issue should be ranked low.</li> </ul>
<b>AP-9.</b> discussions about the law regarding the ownership of surface water and groundwater	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is an ownership issue and the relationship between groundwater and surface water needed to be addressed first before beginning this discussion.</li> <li>• Until the interaction between surface and groundwater is address I think this still needs to be discussed until there is a full understanding of the issues.</li> <li>• There are areas where the relationship is known but there is nothing in our legal standards now to recognize it, so it is important to discuss.</li> <li>• We don't have adequate statutes that will recognize this. I do think we need to look at other states and what they do. Colorado is a state we may want to look at. This may not be a priority for the water plan itself but it does warrant further discussion.</li> <li>• This should be discussed. The issue is not going to go away and we don't want the federal government to come in and settle it for us.</li> <li>• I think this is being addressed in UA-1 and should be addressed there and not here. It should not be a discussion about changes but a discussion about the relationship of surface and groundwater.</li> <li>• I think we can discuss this but groundwater is private property and if the state wants it they are going to have pay just compensation for it.</li> </ul>
<b>AP-10.</b> taxes on water sales, transfers and uses	L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This might not be appropriate because it is talking about taxes and this is more for the legislature to do.</li> </ul>
<b>AP-11.</b> regionalization of water and wastewater systems	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a high priority but it should be done through incentives and suppliers should not be forced to do it.</li> </ul>
<b>AP-12.</b> tribal claims to both ground and surface water	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• This is a topic that will get a lot of discussion but we ranked it low because we didn't think this body was the appropriate place to discuss it.</li> <li>• This is going to be settled in court someday so there is no point in someone else jumping in.</li> <li>• <i>This should be ranked high because of possible issues from federal courts and we need to have plans in place for what could happen.</i></li> <li>• <i>This needs to be ranked high because this is the 800 lb gorilla in the house. If we don't resolve this conflict before we get our plan together we are probably going to jeopardize the ability of our communities to fund their infrastructure. If we don't settle this issue then I am concerned that we will not be able to sell our bonds to fund the infrastructure we need.</i></li> </ul>

**Other Comments**

Issue #	Comment
<b>P-6</b>	<i>There is not a water quantity study on the Garber-Wellington. I would like to see a study done on aquifers where people are putting in a development so that the residents and municipalities can be assured their water supply will be protected both in quality and quantity. Before a major allocation of water there needs to be a study to determine the quantity of water in the aquifer and we need to do this so we can assure there is adequate water. This should also be a consideration in any out of area sales.</i>