

Comments from Dan Barton

1) The figures for flow of the Mississippi River as well as those rivers flowing through the body of the state look unreasonably high, i.e., the reported average discharge of the Mississippi of 593,000 cuft/sec calculates as ~433 million acre-feet/year. This flow also begs the question of why the Mississippi is not considered on the eastern side of the state as a source of surface water?

2) Since the Arkansas Method is used to estimate a satisfactory flow to meet instream fish and wildlife demands, why is there not a good copy included with the Water Plan or a link to one? The Arkansas Academy of Science Archive has one that is fuzzy when magnified to read tables and maps.

<http://libinfo.uark.edu/aas/issues/1987v41/v41a12.pdf>

It might also be good to know if the success of using the Arkansas Method since implementation has been measured by the AGFC or others. If not, why not?

3) After approval of the AWP will the arwaterplan page be maintained to keep the public/stakeholders informed about the progress in implementing recommendations? I would be interested in hearing about:

a) progress on legislative items like the change of the 25% of excess stream flow definition for available nonriparian water use, as well as the authority to condemn land to dig wells or mandate accessibility for groundwater measurements;

b) planning for new wells, measurements, areas of interest where data is to be focused and the objectives of the testing;

c) to have results in a format easily transferred to spreadsheet;

d) to have announcements when groups are formed or stakeholders' meetings take place;

e) when general obligation bonds are to be issued and how accessed;

f) and if a person is named with oversight of the AWP implementation, which seems like a good idea.

4) Does making these comments through CDM Smith mean that someone in Arkansas will not necessarily see them?