

**Oklahoma
Comprehensive Water Plan**

Regional Input Meeting #11

Seminole, OK
Nov. 13, 2008

Meeting Agenda

Time	Topic	Speaker/Facilitator
3:05 pm	Afternoon Session Convened	
3:13 pm	Meeting Purpose and Staff Introductions	Mike Langston, Institute Assistant Director
3:30 pm	Discussant Introductions and Water Facts Discussion	Dianna Leggett, Facilitator
3:55 pm	Small Group Discussions of Issue Ratings	
5:17 pm	Plenary Group Discussion of Issue Ratings	Dianna Leggett
7:20 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 10 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, 18 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	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Every citizen should have an affordable water supply. We need to do aquifer recharge research. We need to help avoid areas have a lack of water during times of drought.
Qn-2. maintenance of water supply systems, such as dams and pipelines	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Funding and maintenance need to be addressed in the water plan for local entities. Funding is extremely important for this because of our aging infrastructure.
Qn-3. State and federal funding of water storage infrastructure	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is extremely high. Systems need to coordinate financial responsibility between federal, state and local entities. There needs to be intra-local cooperation between state and federal governments – cooperative funding.
Qn-4. the effects of climate change on water supplies	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a low priority because it is not timely to address in the plan. • The Oklahoma Climatological Survey says that climate change is real and if they can do modeling we should use that to help us predict future demands. If that is the case then it should be high. • There is research out there that says greenhouse gases are not causing our problems. Right now we have a potential problem but we don't know what is going to happen. Right now we are going through a cold cycle because of the lack of sunspots and our climate changes may just be natural occurrences. But, we need to be aware of it and educate people so this needs to be discussed. • <i>The words "climate change" can stop discussion. Whether it is cause by CO₂ is not relevant. Since climate change is occurring this needs to be discussed and we need to plan for change.</i>

QUALITY (QL) ISSUE CATEGORY

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

THE PLAN SHOULD CONSIDER...	STATE-WIDE PRIORITY	EXPLANATION/RATIONALE
<p>QI-1. State and federal funding of water treatment and protection</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Health and safety issues must be funded and it is too costly for local agencies to do it themselves. Though the free market may take care of this.
<p>QI-2. more and better measures to protect drinking water</p>	<p>H/L</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Water needs to be protected for future generations and human health and safety are an issue and cannot be compromised. • I concur with the idea of keeping water safe but I also think this is the most heavily regulated area and I would say we need to enforce existing rules in place and maybe set more, as that will take care of this. So I think it is a low priority. My concern is we would just be adding more regulations. • The better measures can be upstream uses and how they manage the land and water because there is not always a connection between upstream uses and downstream quality and quantity.
<p>QI-3. better technology for treating wastewater</p>	<p>L</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are already many federal and state regulations in place so this is not appropriate for the water plan to discuss at this time.
<p>QI-4. requirements for providing the public with accurate and timely water quality information</p>	<p>L</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There is state law already in place. It is difficult for lay persons to understand the information, the timing and the dangers. So this is a low priority.

WATER CONSERVATION AND REUSE (C) ISSUE CATEGORY

(ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH WATER CONSERVATION SUCH AS INCREASED WATER USE EFFICIENCY, REDUCED WASTING OF WATER, USE OF MARGINAL WATERS, AND REUSE OF GRAY WATER)

THE PLAN SHOULD CONSIDER...	STATE-WIDE PRIORITY	EXPLANATION/RATIONALE
<p>C-1. measures to encourage conservation through improving water use efficiency and wasting less water</p>	<p>L/H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a low priority. It is not effective enough to be considered in the plan. • One of the least cost alternatives to water supply is conservation. Save what you have. It is a commodity that is already there so this should be a high priority. • This needs to be discussed because if we don't it would be irresponsible if not downright negligent not to discuss this.
<p>C-2. measures that encourage the reuse of treated wastewater, gray water, produced water (oil and gas) and storm water run-off</p>	<p>L/H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a low priority because the cost to implement it is too high and we don't have appropriate cost effective technology to do it right now. So is not timely for the plan. • This does need to be discussed because do all uses of water require potable water? • Many parts of the country are already doing this and saving a lot of money and diverting potable water for appropriate uses. So this does need to be discussed. • One of the reasons we thought this was a low priority is because of the graywater issue. Agriculture doesn't have the ability to use it but I think we do need to discuss this. If we save our potable water then we can supply more. • Currently, two power plants, as well as other areas are using treated water and so I think we need to discuss this. • The oil and gas industry is also reusing and recycling water so this does need to be discussed. But, it doesn't need to be mandated.
<p>C-3. improved educational programs about water conservation for all Oklahomans</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is important to make informed decision and children will encourage change and implement it. Any changes in the plan will come from education.
<p>C-4. incentives to promote water conservation</p>	<p>L/H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is low priority because education will take care of this, as well as pricing as a disincentive. • Pricing is a way to change behavior and this is a high priority to discuss.

		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • I took this as monetary incentives to promote conservation but I think this should be discussed. • I think this is a high priority because people have tried different incentives that work or don't work and I think you need to have experts involved that understand how different users are going to respond. • Incentives should not be mandated and when I think conservation I think more about municipalities and industry not just agriculture.
<p>C-5. research programs that assess improved methods for water conservation</p>	<p>L/H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The free market will control this and it is not appropriate for the water plan. • There is a lot of research on different agriculture uses and plants, different irrigation measures and those research efforts need to be supported and the free market may not drive this process so this does need to be discussed. • As our society grows more complex, and society more limiting, we are going to have to look at cleaning up our water so this does need to be discussed.

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. discussions about water law regarding groundwater and surface water use</p>	<p>H/L</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is very important to consider water law in this water plan. But there are dangers if we try to change the laws that we see as working. We may need to update the laws but if we do it improperly then the laws may come out influenced in a way we wouldn't prefer. What about the Native American tribes and their rights? We need to discuss this but not necessarily change law. We need to protect existing property rights. • Private property rights are very well developed under current law and that is what was underneath all of our decisions. • Because of all of the discussion that has taken place that would mean to me that it should be discussed. This entire bucket is important to discuss. • <i>UA-1, UA-2 & UA-3 are very interrelated. The interaction between ground and surface water is important and it is important to discuss this because the state water law says there are three kinds of law we have to deal with. One is the way we get property rights in law. Property right in water is the right to use water, not own the water. A riparian landowner had the right to use water before a permitted right. The Indians say they have the right to use water and they have it first in time so they are first in right. So our state laws already kick this right in the teeth because the law is first in time first in right so theoretically the Indians would have it first, then the riparian, and then the permit holder if you took the law on its face value. That is why we have to discuss this. One section of law says the landowner has the right to use the water under his land, but is regulated because you only get 2 acre feet per acre of land. This whole subject matter needs to be completely discussed. The plan can be used in court and if you operate on the wrong premise then the entire plan will be struck down so we need to make sure it is done properly.</i>

<p>UA-2. the interaction between ground and surface water in allocation decisions</p>	<p>H/L</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We recognize there is an interaction between ground and surface water but we are not sure what this questions means. This is probably more an engineering question. We could be making false shortages. • I agree this should be given a high priority but we need to look at this as a water system and to consider one without the other would be a false understanding of how water works. • I realize this is an important issue but I see this more as a research topic that will not be solved in this water plan.
<p>UA-3. prioritizing water uses during shortages</p>	<p>H/L</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a high priority. One reason the plan may not want to address this is because it is more a local issue but a water plan without addressing water uses in times of shortages will come up short.
<p>UA-4. the water quality and quantity needs of ecosystems in allocation decisions</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a high priority because of our interactions with water as living beings; we are part of the ecosystem so this about us. If we are only talking about a small fish in a small stream where water is used for other purposes then that may not be a question that is relevant. • I agree this is a high priority but I think we need to look at ways to find solutions that work for everyone. There doesn't have to be winners and losers and we can find a way to all be winners.
<p>UA-5. the need of adequate amounts of water to further economic development in allocation decisions</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • To say any of the use issues are higher than any other would be wrong and all these uses are important. • We need to make sure projected growth and demand in one region does not negatively impact another region. • We must decide if we are going to treat water as a natural resource or a commodity and we need to discuss this.
<p>UA-6. the effect of population change on water needs in allocation decisions</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • How are we going to prioritize water uses? It comes downs to votes and dollars and this is a high priority.
<p>UA-7. the water needs of recreation and tourism in allocation decisions</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Issues UA-7 – UA-14 are all important to discuss because of their economic impact. How do you rank any of these uses ahead of another? That is the difficult decision.
<p>UA-8. the water needs of agriculture and agriculture industry in allocation decisions</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See UA-7
<p>UA-9. the water needs of oil and gas production, including refining and exploration, in allocation decisions</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See UA-7

<p>UA-10. the water needs of mining in allocation decisions</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See UA-7
<p>UA-11. the water needs of navigation in allocation decisions</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • These (UA-11 & UA-12) are principally regulated and controlled by the federal government so we don't know how much of an impact our water plan can have on these allocations. But it still needs to be discussed. • The Oklahoma Department of Transportation does regulate some water use on the navigation channel in Oklahoma.
<p>UA-12. the water needs of hydropower in allocation decisions</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See UA-7
<p>UA-13. the water needs of industry in allocation decisions</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See UA-7
<p>UA-14. the water needs of municipalities in allocation decisions</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • When you talk about municipalities you are talking about where the people are and if you had to rank these, this one would probably be listed first.

WATER TRANSFERS AND SALES (T) ISSUE CATEGORY

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

THE PLAN SHOULD CONSIDER...	STATE-WIDE PRIORITY	EXPLANATION/RATIONALE
<p>T-1. water sales or transfers within the State</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a critical issue and should be high for discussion. Anytime you move water from one place to another it can be expensive and controversial. In order for Oklahoma to manage its water it is important that we have a plan for what we are going to do with it. • <i>These issues are high and it needs to be emphasized as high. Water has already been determined by the Court as a commodity. Many of the cases you see about water sales and transfers are about Oklahoma water, and say water is a commodity. The Court has also said that water sales must all be treated the same. If Texas gets our water for free then we can't charge for water. Watershed boundaries are recognized and in order to protect our water we need to do recognize this and manage our water on a watershed basis to help protect it.</i>
<p>T-2. water sales or transfers outside of the State</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is also a critical issue. Because of the current court case this would need to be handled with care and whatever steps are taken they should be taken for the best interest of Oklahoma.
<p>T-3. the economic impact of sales or transfers on the entire State, as well as the basin of origin</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is important that we treat everyone fairly and with respect. So this does need discussion. • <i>There needs to be a full cost analysis done on this to include environmental costs.</i>
<p>T-4. how water and land is managed within the basin of origin if water is sold or transferred</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We have to consider the impacts on local ecosystems and how we treat the place the water comes from. This shouldn't be just about the needs of who needs the water, but also about where the water comes from. • How the land and water is managed has both an impact on quality and quantity and whether you address both of these is tied directly to economics. • I agree this is a high priority but we need to make sure to remember the rights of the private property owners before we talk about selling water. We need to take care of a region before we think about sending water out of a region.

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	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a low priority because there are many different players in this matter and is not germane to the water plan. • Why have a water plan if it doesn't have anything in it that addresses man-made or natural disasters. There are federal and law enforcement agencies that deal with these issues, but the water plan also needs to address this even if it is just a drought management plan. So this should be discussed. • In looking at the big picture it is hard to say one size fits all so all the different events can make it difficult for the state water plan to cover all kinds of disasters. • The terrorism issue is addressed solely on a local level and it would be nice to have some kind of statement in this plan to address coordinated responses so this should be discussed. • <i>I think this is a high priority. The possibility of terrorism far exceeds some of the ramifications and what that means for us. I don't see any low in this and I consider it very high.</i> • <i>The effect of drought and drought management are important to include in this and it should be discussed so we have a plan to address this.</i>
LH-2. land management practices that affect water quality and quantity	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a high priority. Having sufficient quantity and quality of water is key to the future of the state and proper land management is important to achieve this.
LH-3. the infrastructure needs for fire fighting	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are rural interests that are different than municipal issues and this is beyond the scope of the plan and should be a local concern. • Most people don't know that you can hook into a dry hydrant because a rural firefighting truck could refill there as opposed to going farther away. So this should be discussed to educate people about this.

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 the most overarching thing in a comprehensive water plan. Because the goal is to achieve a balance between the needs and the supply.
P-2. ways to improve the current planning process	L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a low priority because this question is too ambiguous for the participants to address accurately. The comments were mainly “don’t forget about me”, don’t forget about my issue, and this is being adequately addressed. I hope that we would always have some kinds of public meeting in order to keep people up to date on what current issues are. I think we need something different than the meetings like the Governor’s Water Conference. Something easy for people to attend.
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 issue should be discussed. Had we involved other states we may have been able to avoid some of the litigation we are currently involved in. There should also be conversations between the tribal nations in Oklahoma and the state so they can be dealt with internally.
P-4. how to better involve the public in the planning process	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We feel that everyone has done a good job in the planning process and we don’t see a way to improve it other than going door to door so we ranked this low. The next phase of the plan is going to be the most contentious and you need to reflect on this and the public needs to be involved because if you don’t include them you are going to have a lot of angry people. This does need to be discussed. We need to educate the public as we move forward with the plan. People don’t always understand it and they need to be educated about the plan. When you look at the pyramid and involving the public we feel it was taken care of it.
P-5. how to incorporate regional differences in water supply and use	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This ties to P-1 and is important to discuss because different regions have different use patterns and we do need to recognize and discuss those differences.

<p>P-6. what research needs to be done during and after the current planning process</p>	<p>L/H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is ranked low. It is important that research be done, and we know that there is research being done. We have faith that as research needs are identified those that are responsible will do it and the public doesn't need to be involved. • I think this needs to be discussed. If we expect something to be funded it needs to be in the high category and if research needs to be done it needs to be funded so this should be ranked high. • Somewhere we said the plan should be dynamic, in order to make sure that is happening is to have research for that. We need some accountable data about what areas worked in the plan and what did not so I rank this very high. • I think this should be high. There is research being done now. There is a supply and demand analysis that is being done but the Indian's needs are being considered like any other industry and this needs to be addressed.
<p>P-7. treating the water plan as a living document that is reviewed on an ongoing basis</p>	<p>H/L</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We live in a changing environment and this document should be reviewed so it is important to discuss. • I am a little confused about what is an ongoing basis is this daily or what. I don't think this is a high priority. If we continue to discuss it, it may never get implemented, and we may not know how well things are working. • <i>This seems like this is already the case as the legislature already has this on a 10-year cycle so I think this is a lower priority.</i>
<p>P-8. procedures to deal with conflict during and after the planning process</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We can't prevent conflict as these are very contentious issues but some plan for dealing with conflict needs to be discussed.

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	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This does needs to be discussed, but not as important as other issues This is a lower priority because the set-up now does not need to be refined during this process. It is not terribly broken.
AP-2. changes to local agency authorities and relationships and changes to or development of new local organizations	L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This should be covered under AP-11 (regionalization of drinking water and wastewater infrastructure) We don't need to micromanage these agencies. <i>This should be a high priority because we need to look at strengthening the legal relationships between the rural water districts, local communities, and soil and water conservation districts. I don't believe this management can be done at the state level it needs to be done at the local level.</i>
AP-3. changes in the services agencies offer to the public	L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There are other issues are more important to discuss.
AP-4. more consistent enforcement of current laws and regulations	H/L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> The laws we have need to be enforced. Consistency is the key word as some agencies are better than others at enforcing laws. AP-4, AP-5 and AP-8 are more plan implementation issues than being part of the plan and I think these should be a low priority.
AP-5. the effects of federal regulations on state regulations and programs	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We may be able to have some influence on federal government when we consider EPA standards if we work together. We could partner with other states and therefore have more influence over these "unfunded mandates" by working together. Regulations need to come from the bottom up rather than top down.
AP-6. new state regulations and laws as necessary	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We don't want to send a blank slate to the legislature to make changes because they will fill in the blanks and we may not like what they fill in, so we need to discuss this.
AP-7. incentive programs to promote compliance with regulations	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This may not be the time to discuss this. Incentives may be recognition and necessarily monetary. Lots of incentives don't work but a \$15,000 a day fine may.

<p>AP-8. revisions to the current permitting process to make it more efficient</p>	<p>H/L</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There may need to be some refining of the current process but not big revisions. • I think this should be low because the current process we have in place is adequate.
<p>AP-9. Discussions about the law regarding the ownership of surface water and groundwater</p>	<p>H/L</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a no brainer. The ownership of ground and surface water are hot button items. • The current water laws regarding surface and groundwater are adequate and this should be ranked low. • <i>This goes back to the basic issue of who owns the water, what water we own and how we manage it. So this should be a high priority.</i>
<p>AP-10. taxes on water sales, transfers and uses</p>	<p>L/H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This may need to be discussed in future, but now is not the time. • Water is a natural resource; how can you tax it? • This should be high because any new initiatives for infrastructure are going to cost money and this could be a funding source. • The above statement is very true but we focused on the word taxes. • <i>Any time the word tax appears you automatically get a low but I don't think this belongs in the discussion and the focus should be on management of water and the taxes may come from that and should not be discussed on their own.</i>
<p>AP-11. regionalization of water and wastewater systems</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This should be done to make sure everyone has drinking water. • If this could help improve water quality then it should be done. • There are a lot of rural systems around larger municipalities and they will all need to work together if we are going to meet new standards so this is important to discuss.
<p>AP-12. tribal claims to both ground and surface water</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is very high, we may not be able to solve the issue, but we should discuss it. • People need to be better educated on what sovereignty is. I think there needs to be a seminar on sovereignty so we will know how to work together. • <i>This is also important to discuss because if we don't settle this issue it could result in the inability of municipalities to sell bonds to build and maintain infrastructure, because there is still a question of ownership. We need to encourage the state and the tribes to work on this issue before the plan is done.</i> • <i>There is a great need for a lesson or seminar on sovereignty. There are just too many citizens that don't understand what sovereignty is. Many of the tribes themselves don't understand what it is. If we don't get this done there will be hollering on the last day.</i>

Other Comments

Issue #	Comment
	With all due respect to conservancy and research the big issue is infrastructure and we are going to need more. We also need to do more to protect our groundwater.