

**Oklahoma
Comprehensive Water Plan**

Regional Input Meeting #8

Tulsa, OK
Oct. 9, 2008

Meeting Agenda

Time	Topic	Speaker/Facilitator
3:05 pm	Afternoon Session Convened	
3:45 pm	Meeting Purpose and Staff Introductions	Mike Langston, Institute Assistant Director
3:57 pm	Discussant Introductions and Water Facts Discussion	Dianna Leggett, Facilitator
4:07 pm	Small Group Discussions of Issue Ratings	
5:35 pm	Plenary Group Discussion of Issue Ratings	Dianna Leggett
7:50 pm	Afternoon Session Adjourned	
8:00 pm	Public Discussion of Issue Ratings	Mike Langston
8:45 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.

Twenty-seven 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, 14 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 is a high priority. This is easy to agree on because it is our drinking water.
Qn-2. maintenance of water supply systems, such as dams and pipelines	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If we are going to rank Qn-1 high then maintenance is important as well.
Qn-3. State and federal funding of water storage infrastructure	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is important to discuss.
Qn-4. the effects of climate change on water supplies	H//L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We had quite a bit of difference of opinion and we determined this was a mixed decision. This is important to discuss because global warming is impacted by human activities and water supplies are going to be impacted. The time is now to start thinking about it. We don't have any ability to control the affect of climate on water but we do have the ability to store water so that is why Qn-1 and 2 are high. So this is a lower priority. I agree it would be a low priority because there are more important things to discuss, and if we have time we could. We have one of the best meteorology schools anywhere and this should be high because they can help us. This should be low because water is cyclical and we deal with it all the time.

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 a high priority because of the unfunded mandates.
<p>QI-2. more and better measures to protect drinking water</p>	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a high priority because people are nasty and there are issues like the chicken litter [in excess amounts] and other pollutants. Really the problem is phosphorous in general. • The plan needs to focus not on the problem but the solutions.
<p>QI-3. better technology for treating wastewater</p>	L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are already pretty good ideas out there on treating wastewater. • This does not need to be discussed, the group should focus on the plan and not the technology
<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 a low priority. It is important regionally but probably low statewide • This is very important to allow each of us to have an informed opportunity to participate in the process and if we don't know the quality and quantity of the water we can't participate and this should be discussed. There are other issues besides municipalities that don't have to report and don't have regulations, and these issues need to be addressed. • There are already so many regulations on this; we shouldn't spend much time on this because more regulations are being placed on us. • There are other areas that don't have to report, such as those on an impaired list, and this information should be made available to the public so this should be discussed. • When you educate the public you make political impacts that can create change so this should be discussed. • This is important to discuss, even though regulations are there, not all of the state gets tested and this needs to be discussed.

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 especially concerning potable water.
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 a high priority and it fits with C-1. It makes sense to use water wisely
C-3. improved educational programs about water conservation for all Oklahomans	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Education has to be an ongoing process and this is a high priority.
C-4. incentives to promote water conservation	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This should be discussed though we don't know what types of incentives would be used.
C-5. research programs that assess improved methods for water conservation	L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a lower priority because there are a lot of people out there doing it, but some think it was high statewide but low regionally.

APPROPRIATED WATER USES (AP) ISSUE CATEGORY

(ISSUES ASSOCIATED WITH USES OF WATER, INCLUDING CONJUNCTIVE MANAGEMENT (OF SURFACE AND GROUND WATER) AND MINIMUM STREAM FLOWS (TO PROTECT AQUATIC LIFE))

THE PLAN SHOULD CONSIDER...	STATE-WIDE PRIORITY	EXPLANATION/RATIONALE
UA-1. changes in water law regarding groundwater and surface water use	H/L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> It needs to be look at because UA-2 and UA-1 are related. However, we don't need to get into deep discussions about the law. That is not our job.
UA-2. the interaction between ground and surface water in allocation decisions	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is going to have to be considered, the failure to recognize the science would be a mistake. We can't have a plan that doesn't reflect the interaction.
UA-3. prioritizing water uses during shortages	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This should be done more regionally and not necessarily for the plan to discuss. Though one thought it needed to be discussed to consider a statewide drought.
UA-4. the water quality and quantity needs of ecosystems in allocation decisions	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Needs a lot of discussion to protect reference streams and help dilute effluent. Though the decision needs to be based on historical data in further discussions.
UA-5. the need of adequate amounts of water to further economic development in allocation decisions	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a no brainer economic develop needs to be considered.
UA-6. the effect of population change on water needs in allocation decisions	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Other issues may be more important. This is also more a local or regional issue. However, if you think economic development is high then this must be high also. There is becoming more a switch from urban to rural and they are depending more on rural water so this does need to be discussed because the districts are going to grow and may need help. Worldwide population is the number one pressure on water so it would be a mistake to ignore it and this should be discussed.
UA-7. the water needs of recreation and tourism in allocation decisions	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a very high regional priority but not really a high priority statewide. This may not be in the right group but it is a vital industry around all of

		<p>the lakes and there is an ongoing battle with the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers about water use. This should always be in the conversation.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreation and tourism's needs should always be a priority and to exclude it would be to shirk our responsibilities. To ignore it would be to miss a great asset or resource.
UA-8. the water needs of agriculture and agriculture industry in allocation decisions	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • All of the issues UA-8 – UA-14 need to be discussed as a group. You can't leave any of them out, it would be counterproductive.
UA-9. the water needs of oil and gas production, including refining and exploration, in allocation decisions	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See UA-8
UA-10. the water needs of mining in allocation decisions	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See UA-8
UA-11. the water needs of navigation in allocation decisions	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • However, this issue could be a low priority because it is a more regional issue but maybe not high on the statewide issue but it does need further discussion. • This should be a high priority because this asset will become more and more important and the navigation system we have will become more and more important. • <i>Not clear why navigation would be coming more and more valuable. All basis of decisions must be economically justified.</i>
UA-12. the water needs of hydropower in allocation decisions	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are other sources of power becoming available so this may not be as important as other issues. • Potentially the above statement might be true but right now hydropower is an important source of power while we make a transition to other sources of power, and this should be ranked high. • Amen. • <i>There is no economic basis to state that hydropower value will dwindle in the future. Hydropower is a significant part of a variety of energy sources. Hydropower is renewable, clean and potentially a sound partner with wind power. Any use of hydropower reduces some portion of fossil fuel use and any associated carbon foot print. So this should be included in the discussion.</i>
UA-13. the water needs of industry in allocation decisions	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See UA-8
UA-14. the water needs of municipalities in allocation decisions	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • See UA-8

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"> • There is a lot of crossover in this group. There is some unequal water distribution of water so you have to talk about where the water is, how do we get it there and what do we have. • <i>Every one of these issues should be very high as the plan should deal with demand and supply and the plan has not dealt with the supply and the ownership of the water. The plan assumes the state does have plenary jurisdiction over water. The ability to move water has legal impingements on it due to ownership questions. This is the same for surface water. The subject matter of these issues has to be expanded to include ownership. The state doesn't have documentation showing the water was transferred to them and given plenary power and ownership; however, the Native American tribes do, and we have to be concerned that it is not public water.</i> • <i>All of us (discussants and observers) were working on the assumption that it was public water.</i>
<p>T-2. water sales or transfers outside of the State</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a no brainer for the water plan. The reality is we have the issue now so it is important to discuss. • Water sales and transfers out-of-state makes water a commodity and therefore public property and so there should be a pricing mechanism made available to the public. We need to make the public informed of the value of water. So I agree this should be discussed.
<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"> • We looked at the local level and the entire state. What about the money so these are all important issues to discuss because of the impact on the state. • Any time a natural resource is used as a commodity it should be regulated so it is important to discuss this. • If we have to sell water then the state should make income off of it.
<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"> • This folded into T-3 and is high as well.

LAND MANAGEMENT AND HAZARD MITIGATION (LH) ISSUE CATEGORY

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

THE PLAN SHOULD CONSIDER...	STATE-WIDE PRIORITY	EXPLANATION/RATIONALE
<p>LH-1. how to reduce the impact of natural or man-made disasters that could affect water supply or infrastructure</p>	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We did discuss terrorism because man-made disasters could encompass this but vulnerability measures are already in place. However, natural disasters are not included in this and they can alter how water is delivered and used. This is a high priority for the natural disasters. The plan needs to consider this to get the dialogue going.
<p>LH-2. land management practices that affect water quality and quantity</p>	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> If you don't control pollution at the source you will spend a lot more at the tap or the treatment system. You have to have some land management plans included and this is a high priority for discussion. The plan should consider extraterritorial neighbors such as other states and the affect they have on our water quality and quantity. There are industries on our borders that can affect well water levels in Oklahoma. One of the major issues when talking about land management issues is how do CAFOs affect stream water quality. There is opportunity in to increase technology and make the water quality better. This does need to be addressed in the planning process.
<p>LH-3. the infrastructure needs for fire fighting</p>	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This is a low priority. Municipal firefighting may use a small amount of water overall but a small city could drain their supply fighting a fire. Rural areas may have more problems but maybe this is not appropriate for the water plan to address, and may be going too far down into the technical side. This should be high because small cities are growing and rural water systems fall under completely different guidelines so this is going have to be addressed. Rural water systems can't necessarily supply the water needed. Because this is a public safety issue this does need to be addressed and because the infrastructure is not adequate it could cause a public safety hazard so this does need to be addressed. If the community is regulating growth then the firefighting issue will be taken care of, so this is a low priority.

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"> Duh, this is what the plan is for.
P-2. ways to improve the current planning process	L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> We have an excellent planning process and in 10 years when this is done again they will employ the best process they can. We can't see into the future to know what technology will be out there and the planning process is working now. So this is a low priority. <i>The technical and engineering studies are the engine that drives this entire state plan and it is flawed, this must be corrected now and the correction procedure is to place an impartial, independent peer review group to be involved in the technical and engineering studies and without this the whole thing will fall off a cliff. For example the state is not dealing with the supply side, we do not have scientific based inventory of all waters in the state. So how can we possibly do any futuristic distributions without know what the inventory is. This must be dealt with so this must be a high priority otherwise all these public meetings are an exercise in futility.</i>
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"> If this is not done now it will be done with litigation. We already have some agreements that do work and by bringing this forward in the water plan we will bring the issue forward.
P-4. how to better involve the public in the planning process	L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> This goes with P-2. We think the process is good and we think it will be good again so there isn't a lot that the plan needs to address in this regard.
P-5. how to incorporate regional differences in water supply and use	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> There is such an unequal distribution of water resources in Oklahoma and we need to work with all areas. This is almost another duh because of all the differences and this is a high priority. We really have to look at regionalization of plants for treatment and wastewater and this is important to discuss.

<p>P-6. what research needs to be done during and after the current planning process</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Advanced technical and new research will be done in 10 years. This is going to be addressed in the plan and this should be carried forward. • <i>I think it is important that we look at how we peer review the data that is being driven so we take away any argument. Let's get someone else to look at our data so there is no suggestion that the fix is in. So I think this does need to be discussed.</i>
<p>P-7. treating the water plan as a living document that is reviewed on an ongoing basis</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a good use of the water plan because the alternative is to not use it or consider it a static document. Things are going to change and this has to be a dynamic document and this has to be discussed even if just in an educational way. The plan must be used.
<p>P-8. procedures to deal with conflict during and after the planning process</p>	<p>L/H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a low priority because there will be a lot of things driven by lawsuits, agency decisions and if we do the planning well that is the best we can do to avoid conflict. • I think this is a high priority. What we do about our water quality, quantity and allocations will be contentious and we need to have some way to resolve 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>	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There are numerous agencies that govern and regulate our water resources and sometimes they overlap and conflicts of interest occur. So this should be discussed. • This is the responsibility of the governor and the legislature and I don't think it is appropriate for us to be discussing changing agencies. This should be a low priority. We maybe can make a recommendation for development of a committee to do this but not to have the discussion ourselves. • I think this is high. We are trying to develop a statewide plan and if there are several different regulations by different agencies we should bring them together. • This was done about 10 years ago to consolidate as much as they could and so I'm not sure we need to do this again, and I'm not sure how much change will happen. So I think this is a low priority. • GRDA should no longer have sole jurisdiction over the Neosho Basin and should be included and subject to the plan so this needs to be discussed. • <i>This should be a high priority. There are records of the current statutes allowing inequities in allocations of public water. OWRB has become too powerful an agency.</i>
<p>AP-2. changes to local agency authorities and relationships and changes to or development of new local organizations</p>	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a low priority, there are a lot of laws that differ across the state and a little more conformity would be helpful. But we don't want to see the state chopped up. We liked umbrella agencies but someone within that agency that covered an area. There should be some local control. • This should be a high priority because of the issue of rural water districts versus municipalities needs to be addressed. I also think AP-4, AP-5 and Ap-6 should be high. The rural water districts operate under different rules and this issue needs to be addressed in the above mentioned issues. • <i>Local units of government don't have many laws or authority to manage water but not own water so when it comes to the supply side they are a consumer. Much of the management of the water falls to the landowner and the most extensive local agency is the soil and water conservation commission. They have riparian water rights and as a result the management of riparian and groundwater rights falls</i>

		<i>through the crack. The state can't regulate them. This should be a high priority to get to those supply sources that can manage the quality of water. The laws need to expand their role in the water management process in the state.</i>
AP-3. changes in the services agencies offer to the public	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Making information more easily available is important, but this is not really appropriate for the water plan to discuss. This should be handled by the individual agencies. We do think it is important for the agencies to make information available to the public but is a low priority. • <i>This should be a high priority. All groundwater geology, hydrology services should be transferred to Okla. Geological Survey as mandated in the constitution. It will help separate politics and special interest from overruling quality science.</i>
AP-4. more consistent enforcement of current laws and regulations	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • The wording of this could have been different. There could be issues with agencies regulating themselves. Some did think this should be a high priority.
AP-5. the effects of federal regulations on state regulations and programs	L/H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • There has been a lot of discussion about this but if the feds say you have to do it you have to comply. A lot of the issues are political issues and will be settled by the courts or attorneys and so this is a low priority. • This should be a high priority for the reason stated in AP-6
AP-6. new state regulations and laws as necessary	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is appropriate for the water plan and must be part of this plan for the next 50 years. Some laws are old and need to be changed. • This needs to be discussed because the federal government isn't informative and if they are going to pass laws that affect us, we need to know about them ahead of time. The same for AP-5 as well.
AP-7. incentive programs to promote compliance with regulations	L	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This should be a low priority. But this is not really important for the plan to discuss though they can be useful. • This should be low we should not reward people for doing what they are supposed to do. There should be fines instead of incentives.
AP-8. revisions to the current permitting process to make it more efficient	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is a high priority because there does need to be some change to the process.
AP-9. changes in the law regarding the ownership of surface water and groundwater	H	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We ranked this as a high priority. Conjunctive management is an important issue and this issue bleeds over to other issues. There is concern about the separation of land and water ownership. Some did think it wasn't a high priority because the property rights issue is a fundamental issue the plan should not interrupt. However, the plan may be an opportunity for the administrative process to make a definite statement about the issue so

		<p>ultimately we determined this is a high priority.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This was changed not too long ago and so you are going to rehash something that has already been done. We may need to discuss it but I don't think it will make much difference.
<p>AP-10. taxes on water sales, transfers and uses</p>	<p>H/L</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We were split on this issue. We felt if we are selling water then there should be a tax on it. But the tax would provide additional funding. The word tax may not be the right word maybe it should be considered a use fee or some other term. It could be used as a way to encourage conservation by defining a use payment. • However, others felt this was not appropriate for discussion in the water plan. Also some think it might be a constitutional issue and it could be difficult to get passed.
<p>AP-11. regionalization of water and wastewater systems</p>	<p>H</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • This is important to discuss because it promotes efficiency and conservation. Can also be cost saving. It has been beneficial in both Oklahoma and other states. • There was some discussion about we shouldn't penalize people who do a good job already.
<p>AP-12. tribal claims to both ground and surface water</p>	<p>H/L</p>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • We were split on this. Some were concerned the tribes would try to take over. • This is not appropriate for the planning process. It needs to be done through government-to-government relations. There could be a statement in the plan about it. • This is the elephant in the living room and this should be a high priority because if you say it is a high/low you are putting your head in the sand. This is going to affect everyone because if we have to pay the Tribes for the water and then a municipality to treat the water, we are kidding ourselves if we think this not a high priority. • I agree this has to be discussed because of the private property issue with agriculture. • I agree this is a low priority because you can't plan for this. We can't do anything about it. • I agree it is a high priority and part of the plan should be the legislature addresses this immediately and gets the lawsuits started. • I have a neighbor who is an Osage Indian and he is scared because he is also a landowner and is very concerned he won't own the water later. • When talking about water sales the only entity that can make sure money comes to the state is the tribes and there needs to be some partnership developed. • <i>This should be very high. The state of Oklahoma and the Choctaw and Chickasaw tribes addressed this issue in the 1980s. For over 10 years the Tribes, DEQ and</i>

		<p><i>OWRB worked and put together a compact. In the compact groundwater would remain with the landowner. They also laid out procedures for other aspects including the sale of water. However, a compact has to be worked out between the Tribal governments and the state government. This issue needs to be resolved because it could impact bond sales and could limit funding for infrastructure improvements.</i></p>
--	--	---

Other Comments

Issue #	Comment
	<i>There are three other parties involved, Arkansas, Louisiana and the EPA. If we sell water out of the Kiamichi it will impact the salinity level in the Red River and then those two states are posed to file suits against us. The EPA is the guardian of water quality and the compact only covers quantity. We need the highest scientific committee possible.</i>
	<i>The video Tarrant County is running saying they won't hold us to the contract if we need to stop sending them water. But what are the homeowners down there going to do if we stop sending water. The video also talks about all the jobs that will be brought to Oklahoma to build the pipeline and new construction. Who is going to say they won't sue and force us to send them water and that may mean that homeowners here in Oklahoma won't have water for themselves? It could impact rural Oklahoma and many small towns.</i>
	<i>The Compact, between the Tribes and state set criteria for the sale of water but did not specifically say water would be sold. We have to plan for these kinds of things and set some pretty high fences. They have to be in the plan so they can start being implemented before any water is sold.</i>