



Dick Scalf

**Statement of Stakeholder Interest and Comments of Support
For Tentative Determination of Maximum Annual Yield of Groundwater
from the Arbuckle-Simpson Groundwater Basin
Rules Implementation of SB 288
Oklahoma Water Resources Board (OWRB) Formal Hearing May 15, 2012**

I'm Dick Scalf. I'm currently a member of the Ada City Council, the CPASA board of directors, and Farm Bureau. However, my testimony today in support of OWRB's maximum annual yield (MAY) is as an individual user of Arbuckle-Simpson water and a civil and environmental engineer with 30-plus years of experience in the ground water sciences.

There has been a lot of good science from the Arbuckle-Simpson hydrology study used by OWRB to develop and support a maximum annual yield. However, I would like to boil it down to one critical piece of scientific information and very simple math. Scott Christianson nailed it in his testimony but I'm not sure that it registered with everyone.

Science and common sense tell us that we can't take more water out than goes in on a sustainable basis. Senate Bill 288 established that the total amount of water under consideration for the MAY is the average annual recharge because of the requirement for sustainability. The critical piece of scientific data is the estimated average annual recharge of 5.58 inches. We can argue about whether it really is 4.7 or 5.8 or 7.2, but there is no reasonable doubt that it is approximately one-half foot. That is the input.

The output is spring flow and pumping from wells. Every gallon pumped reduces total spring flow by an equal amount. The issue is then how much reduction in the flow of surface sources such as Blue River, Pennington Creek, the springs in Chickasaw National Recreation Area, Byrd's Mill Spring, and Turner Falls is acceptable.

Those that propose an equal proportionate share (EPS) of the recharge rate are, in effect, proposing that these surface waters cease to flow except when it is raining and all of the available water be subject to pumping in the future for uses, most of which are yet to be determined, while potentially eliminating the water that thousands of surface water users are using now and have been using for decades and, in some cases, over a century. I do not believe that is acceptable to most Oklahomans.

The MAY proposed by OWRB results in an EPS of 0.2 acre-feet per acre. That will make over one-third (2.4 inches) of the total recharge (5.58 inches) subject to ground water pumping. In the interest of sustainability and fairness to all, most of the water providers that serve thousands of water users throughout the area support the proposed MAY of 0.2 acre-feet per acre even though it may threaten over one-third of their current surface water resource. They do so because of long term rather than short term values and vision. These values, expressed by "sustainability", also serve ground water users and those who would market their ground water. I think that is more than fair to ground water interests.