

**Oklahoma
Comprehensive Water Plan**

Regional Input Meeting #7

Tishomingo, OK
Oct. 2, 2008

Meeting Agenda

Time	Topic	Speaker/Facilitator
3:05 pm	Afternoon Session Convened	
3:10 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	
5:05 pm	Plenary Group Discussion of Issue Ratings	Dianna Leggett
7:15 pm	Afternoon Session Adjourned	
7:20 pm	Public Discussion of Issue Ratings	Mike Langston
8:00 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 32 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, 27 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"> This issue is high because we need to think about sustainability, a rise in population, and the cost incurred in the future.
Qn-2. maintenance of water supply systems, such as dams and pipelines	H/L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We split on this e realize maintenance is important and saves money; however the people who thought this should be low thinks this is an operator issue and not a state issue. We need to maintain our dams and if we don't take care of them we are going to lose water supply and have problems caused. So this should be discussed. This is important to discuss because we have to take care of what we have especially in light of wanting to have more supply. It's not that this is not important but do we have the money and the will to do it and that is why I rated it low. I think this should be a high priority because if it is a government flood control structure who is responsible for maintaining it. We need to know who is responsible.
Qn-3. State and federal funding of water storage infrastructure	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a high priority. If you don't have the money it won't get done and the money has to come from somewhere.

<p>Qn-4. the effects of climate change on water supplies</p>	<p>H/L</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Drought is causing major effects in water change and it needs to be planned for. However, we can't plan for this so it doesn't need discussion. • This is definitely high because we have been dealing with climate change for a long time and there are things that we can and must do. • This is a high issue because we are looking at lots of statements that say there is surplus water, and if we don't plan for this we could end up with a major problem. • We do think this is important on the natural disaster situation but on climate change there is no solid input on what it means for Oklahoma so we should address issues of storage for drought and if you plan for that, which should take care of things. • This should be considered high because we need to know more about it. • Maybe drought and flood should be used instead of climate change because maybe that is politicizing it. • If you drop the word change in the statement then it should be high.
---	------------	---

QUALITY (QL) ISSUE CATEGORY

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

THE PLAN SHOULD CONSIDER...	STATE-WIDE PRIORITY	EXPLANATION/RATIONALE
<p>QI-1. State and federal funding of water treatment and protection</p>	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is high because we have to stay up with drinking water standards and we are going to need money to stay within the standards.
<p>QI-2. more and better measures to protect drinking water</p>	H/L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • On the high side we need better protection for water sources; however, it is low for local drinking water regulations. There are already regulations for municipalities. But again it is high for the water source. • This is a high priority because water that is protected from contamination is like having an extra gallon of water. If it is contaminated it is lost forever. • We have the technology to treat the water but the municipalities and rural water districts don't have the money to pay good quality workmanship. It is not the technology, it is the funding and people are doing the best they can with what they have. That is why I rated this low.
<p>QI-3. better technology for treating wastewater</p>	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a low priority because the technology is there. More education on using it is need though. • This should be a high topic because of the chemicals that are being found in streams. The technology is not there to take out all the pharmaceuticals that are going into stream water. • I think there is plenty of technology, it is a funding issue. So this should not be discussed. • Better low cost technology could be developed and this should be part of the discussion. • You have to continuously work on finding new treatments because organisms become resistant to treatments.
<p>QI-4. requirements for providing the public with accurate and timely water quality information</p>	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is split. Those that consider this a low priority say the existing procedures are adequate. Those that consider this a high priority say we need to improve it.

WATER CONSERVATION AND REUSE (C) ISSUE CATEGORY

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

THE PLAN SHOULD CONSIDER...	STATE-WIDE PRIORITY	EXPLANATION/RATIONALE
C-1. measures to encourage conservation through improving water use efficiency and wasting less water	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a high priority and the first comment was duh. It is just common sense this is the most cost effective thing to do. We see this, C-1 – C-5, as one lump issue.
C-2. measures that encourage the reuse of treated wastewater, gray water, produced water (oil and gas) and storm water run-off	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is high, it is another way to conserve and conservation should be part of the plan.
C-3. improved educational programs about water conservation for all Oklahomans	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is high. We should also emphasize using what we have now and do more.
C-4. incentives to promote water conservation	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is the cheapest way to retain and conserve water so this is high.
C-5. research programs that assess improved methods for water conservation	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is also high. Over a 50-year plan we are going to need research to improve what we are doing.

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 important to discuss. Currently, the law does not represent or reflect reality and doesn't recognize the interrelationship of the two. • <i>This should be high and we need to rewrite Oklahoma law to recognize the connection of ground water and surface water.</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 high also for similar reasons as UA-1.
<p>UA-3. prioritizing water uses during shortages</p>	<p>L/H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is low because if you start trying to put one use above another then it could be open to abuse so the pain should be shared by all. There should be some method established so we all conserve during times of shortage. • I think this needs to be in writing so when the problem occurs we don't get into a cat fight over who gets what water. • There are situations where there won't be enough water, and we will need a priority system in place so I would give this a high priority. • This is very difficult to determine and who determines it. • I do think this needs discussion because I have lived through a drought and have not had water available. • This does not need discussion because cities already determine who can use the water. • We tried to keep a statewide focus on this, but the decisions need to be made locally. • I think that by saying everyone gets a fair share you are prioritizing so this should be discussed. • <i>As a business owner one of the businesses I am in is in California, and when there are water shortages there they regulate the business. But in rural areas there should be some regulation because municipalities don't regulate the use and this should be a high priority.</i> • <i>I am from an area that has had two communities that were less than 60 days of</i>

		<p><i>running out of water and that was in the eastern part of the state. Leaving rationing or prioritizing to the local municipality is not always the best thing. Washing your car should be one of the first things that should be rationed and then municipalities and industry and other uses could have a plan in place already and in order for that to happen we have to have more information so this should be discussed.</i></p>
<p>UA-4. the water quality and quantity needs of ecosystems in allocation decisions</p>	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is high and we felt all uses should be considered in the plan so all of these through the end (UA-4 – AU-14) should be high. • I think this is one of the keys; everyone has a river or stream that flows through their state and there are people below that need that water. We need minimum instream flows to protect our ecosystems. And this should be discussed. • You have to watch the quality of the ecosystems because it is important because of what is on the system. This has to be discussed.
<p>UA-5. the need of adequate amounts of water to further economic development in allocation decisions</p>	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • High because economic development is key to our future growth.
<p>UA-6. the effect of population change on water needs in allocation decisions</p>	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This one is low as we don't see the population is going to grow that fast in Oklahoma. We may see increases in non-drinking uses but the population is fairly stable in the state. • I think they are coming over the border in droves and I am more optimistic and this should be discussed. • I agree that this should be discussed not so much because of new population but the movement of people and the loss of the ability to use well water. • I do agree this should be discussed because many people are moving from out-of-state back into the state and being put on rural water and we need to consider this. Also, there is a shift of population from urban to rural areas. • We are beginning to see people moving across the border in our area and this does need to be discussed. • On the net though we may be losing people when you look at the state as a whole. • When you look at the amount of water we have and the increase in oil and gas and mining use, as well as an increase in population we may not have as much water as we think. • There are a lot of baby boomers coming here to retire and they are from somewhere else because this is one of the cheapest places in the country to live. We are already seeing this and it needs to be discussed. • <i>This should be rated high because of changes in population, including shifts from</i>

		<i>city to rural and increases in population.</i>
UA-7. the water needs of recreation and tourism in allocation decisions	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is high it is a large economic engine for the state and we have to have good ecosystems and good water resources.
UA-8. the water needs of agriculture and agriculture industry in allocation decisions	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is high not only for food production but ethanol production as well.
UA-9. the water needs of oil and gas production, including refining and exploration, in allocation decisions	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is high. Because of the shale plays in the state and the amount of water they use this must be considered.
UA-10. the water needs of mining in allocation decisions	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Mining will continue to increase even though there are some issues; it is a high priority to work through those issues.
UA-11. the water needs of navigation in allocation decisions	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is low especially for this region besides federal regulations cover this, and it is not a state issue. I think we need to look at this because there may be other streams that could be utilized for navigation statewide. Navigation was planned on the Red River and is the last navigable river that is not used for that purpose. There are plans to make it navigable and this is important to discuss.
UA-12. the water needs of hydropower in allocation decisions	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is high. There isn't a lot of hydropower in this area but a huge amount of water is released to generate that electricity so we need to take that into consideration.
UA-13. the water needs of industry in allocation decisions	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is high and we see this as interrelated with economic development.
UA-14. the water needs of municipalities in allocation decisions	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is high as well and this is interrelated with the others and need to be considered in the plan.

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 a high priority. We need to start where we are and address the issue between the haves and the have nots.
T-2. water sales or transfers outside of the State	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is high priority for discussion. This can create problems with shutting off water if we send it downstream. We need to determine if we have a surplus and it could hinder our future use without knowing what we have.
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"> • This is also high. It is tied into T-1 and the growth follows 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"> • This is also important to discuss. The transfer of water will reduce the environment and the economic growth. Also there is an issue with water quality.

LAND MANAGEMENT AND HAZARD MITIGATION (LH) ISSUE CATEGORY

(ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH LAND MANAGEMENT PRACTICES TO PROTECT WATER RESOURCES (E.G., RIPARIAN AREA RESTORATION, SOIL CONSERVATION, AND WETLANDS ENHANCEMENT) AND WITH MEASURES TO REDUCE THE DAMAGE FROM NATURAL AND MAN-MADE HAZARDS, INCLUDING TERRORISM)

THE PLAN SHOULD CONSIDER...	STATE-WIDE PRIORITY	EXPLANATION/RATIONALE
LH-1. how to reduce the impact of natural or man-made disasters that could affect water supply or infrastructure	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This needs to be discussed. It is relative and pushed in other issues but we looked at it as a drought or flood scenario. A flood can impact your infrastructure for example your dams. Droughts can also impact your infrastructure because of what you have to do to get water. • Man-made needs to be taken out as that should be under homeland security. • I think of man-made disasters also of blow-out oil wells that contaminate the water and if it happens near a large river it could cause real problems so the man-made disaster side also needs discussion.
LH-2. land management practices that affect water quality and quantity	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is also important because of water quality issues. We also looked at land management such as run-off and fertilization.
LH-3. the infrastructure needs for fire fighting	H/L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We were split on this because firefighting is very important, especially in rural areas. The other side of that argument is the plan should not consider this issue; it should be up to the municipalities and rural water districts. • This should be high because it is difficult for rural areas to have the water needed to fight fire. • The problem is now the lines are not large enough in the rural areas to fight fire and this needs to be a high priority because of the infrastructure. • This seems to fall under tactical and not strategically thinking and should not be discussed. • I see all three of these issues tied together because it is about land management and the pumps put in ponds could affect the water quality. • I think this is a local issue and not for this plan to discuss. • Maybe the definition of infrastructure is different for each area. Maybe infrastructure just means having a plan for firefighting in place. • This should be considered high. The infrastructure needs to be

		<p>addressed because of the influx of the population into rural areas and greater utilization of water. We have had lots of wildfire and it is impossible for small districts to lay a 6" line for fire protection. We need to also protect our basins and by making sure we have adequate supply for firefighting needs because if we rely on other ways it can contaminate the water.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none">• I agree with the fire issue on the infrastructure. There may need to be increased capacity on a storage supply.• <i>The need for water for firefighting must be addressed to ensure the availability when needed.</i>
--	--	--

WATER RESOURCE MANAGEMENT PLANNING (P) ISSUE CATEGORY

(ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH HOW PLANNING SHOULD BE CONDUCTED, INCLUDING SCOPE, PUBLIC PARTICIPATION PROCEDURES, FUNDING, EVALUATION, AND CONFLICT MANAGEMENT)

THE PLAN SHOULD CONSIDER...	STATE-WIDE PRIORITY	EXPLANATION/RATIONALE
P-1. ways to balance demand and supply over the long-term	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a high priority and it is the number one issue. We have to figure out how to have a sustainable issue.
P-2. ways to improve the current planning process	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is low because it is working well now. This should be high because I would like to see the plan go further into the future than 50 years. Master plans are generally done for 50 – 60 years because that is about the limit for getting good statistical analysis.
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 high because cooperation is always good and we can help avoid some of the legal conflicts we currently face.
P-4. how to better involve the public in the planning process	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is low. The public has been given lots of opportunity to be involved. The role of the public needs to be an integral part of the plan so this needs to be continued and included in the plan. Public involvement is extremely important and we can't always assume this will always be the case so we need to include it in the plan. The discussion doesn't need to happen but the process needs to be included in the plan.
P-5. how to incorporate regional differences in water supply and use	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is high because it is going to become necessary for the regions to find a balance.
P-6. what research needs to be done during and after the current planning process	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This should be high because ongoing research and education is important. We need to know what we have and that is vital. The planning group needs to look at other states and what they are doing. We don't need to reinvent the wheel so this should be in the discussion.
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"> Split on this. Low side thinks it is a given as research is done. On the high side you shouldn't assume anything.

P-8. procedures to deal with conflict during and after the planning process	H/L	<ul style="list-style-type: none">• Split on this as well. Some thought it was high so the document would already have guidelines in place so we know what needs to be done. Others thought it was low because there are already items in place.• I think this should be a high priority because anytime you can establish guidelines for dealing with conflict before the conflict you lessen the potential for conflict.
--	-----	---

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>	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a high priority. It deserves discussion but we don't want it to bog the process down. • This entire section is a very important section and there should be a comprehensive review of all the agencies that deal with water. There are just too many agencies. All the agencies, if not brought under one umbrella, should be moved into one building so people could be more effectively involved. • <i>All laws, rules and regulations affecting water should be under one agency under the new state water policy. So I agree this should be a high priority.</i> • <i>There are too many agencies involved in too many issues. This needs to be discussed and agencies need to be combined. This applies to AP-3 as well.</i>
<p>AP-2. changes to local agency authorities and relationships and changes to or development of new local organizations</p>	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Important for the plan to address so there can be some local control but let the locals be involved. • <i>This and AP-8 both should be considered high priorities because there should be regional water resource management boards developed.</i> • <i>This should be a high priority. The state plan need to have accommodations for regional water issues.</i>
<p>AP-3. changes in the services agencies offer to the public</p>	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Low because if you address AP-1 and AP-2 then this will get addressed as well.
<p>AP-4. more consistent enforcement of current laws and regulations</p>	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is also tied to AP-1 and AP-2 and will be addressed in the first two. • AP-4 needs to be high because there does need to be more consistent enforcement. • The original group doesn't disagree just felt like it would be addressed in AP-1 and AP-3
<p>AP-5. the effects of federal regulations on state regulations and programs</p>	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a part of the whole landscape and you are going to get what you get. • This should be a high issue because federal regulations impact the state. • The federal agencies are going to hand the regulations down to the state and we are probably just going to have to live with what the feds do.

<p>AP-6. new state regulations and laws as necessary</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The laws need to be looked at and reviewed so this does need to be discussed. • <i>I agree this should be a high priority. The plan needs flexibility to deal with changing conditions.</i>
<p>AP-7. incentive programs to promote compliance with regulations</p>	<p>L/H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Why do you need incentives if you have laws? This also will be addressed in AP-1 and 2. • Sometimes it is cheaper to incentivize than to criminalize. In some cases it is more cost effect to promote good behavior than punish bad behavior so this should be a high priority. • I disagree with incentives so this should be low because if the law doesn't work take it off the books. • The conservation issue is a high issue but in this issue it is low. • There are a lot of federal rules about water quality that are not enforced on the state level so if you go to the federal you can maybe encourage the feds not to regulate so this should be high. • There are already incentives to make your home more efficient and these are the incentives I am thinking about – not paying people to do something wrong but to do something better. So this should be high. • This is different because it is about incentives to promote compliance and so this is low. • We have a lot of agencies that have authority over water and we began our discussion about structural issues and these get through the structure and we don't have to talk necessarily about this directly. • <i>I don't believe money incentives solve anything so this does not need to be discussed.</i>
<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 needs to be discussed not just for surface and groundwater but wastewater as well. • I agree that this is important and it does need to be revised • <i>This and AP-2 both should be considered high priorities because there should be regional water resource management boards developed.</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"> • We need to make some decisions and not just have discussions. This is important to discuss.
<p>AP-10. taxes on water sales, transfers and uses</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It definitely needs discussion.

<p>AP-11. regionalization of water and wastewater systems</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is important because it is more efficient and can save money.
<p>AP-12. tribal claims to both ground and surface water</p>	<p>H/L</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • It is going to impact everything we do and it has to be discussed. • I suggest this is a low priority because it is a legal matter and I don't see where discussion will solve the issue. The plan is about the water. This plan is not about basic ownership issues. • Claims can be construed about who owns what, but also about who controls what. If you look to the western states that have not had these discussions then you have more conflict. This is the best resource of discussion of water policy. I understand the plan won't settle the issue but it needs to be address. If all we do is move forward on recommendations already suggested then it deserves discussion. • We need to plan for everything so we need to plan for the impact of whatever decision is made so this needs to be discussed. • I agree that if you don't address it in the plan then you have a lot of native Oklahomans that will be left out so it needs to be addressed in the plan. • <i>Every effort must be made to include the tribes in our state water policy and plans to include working to compact with each sovereign tribe across the state. This is important to discuss.</i>

Other Comments

Issue #	Comment
	<i>Why were the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and CDM picked for the technical studies? It seems like the U.S. Geological Survey and universities would have been a better choice. Scientists versus engineers point of view.</i>
	<i>We must retain Sardis Lake for southern and southwest Oklahoma.</i>
	<i>All interested towns should start paying interest on bonds for ownership of Sardis Lake water. Texas wants to buy the Lake for their state. We must move fast as Oklahoma grows, water is so important for this drought state.</i>
	<i>Oklahoma must implement a distribution system for "ALL" residents of this state. Texas has as much ground and surface water as they need if they also had a distribution system. All commercial endeavors, mining, manufacturing, and cities should provide catchment basins for their needs. All waters should be under one overmaster.</i>