

My name is George Frost. I am a Region D member representing the public.

Had I not felt the responsibility of representing the thousands of citizens in my region I would not have made this six hour trip to Austin, because I believe this trip is in vain. I believe that this Board has already made its decisions on the final water plan and is going through the motions of this hearing.

If this meeting is anything like the one held in Region D, then no questions will be answered and not one board member was present. We might as well emailed our comments and saved the state time and money.

This whole process has seemed very unfair to the rural areas of my region. It appears we have no one who looks out for our concerns. We know and realize that people need water and that the surface water belongs to all of Texas including *us*. But when our region can offer a plan to deliver the same water with no adverse socio-economic impact, that plan should be considered first.

We hear the cry, that it will cost more to do this. Yet on page 126 of the proposed water plan under the chart entitled COMPARISON OF PER-PERSON WATER USE, income of customers is listed as one of the seven factors. For a few dollars more homes, jobs, farms, and natural resources could all be saved.

To be more specific according to figures in the proposed state water plan a little over 900,000 acre feet of water flows down the Sulphur River annually. Instead of building Marvin Nichol but raising Lake Patman 15 feet from 220 to 235 elevation would catch that entire amount. The 235 foot elevation is 23.5 feet below the 258.5 spillway, *not an acre of land would be lost. Land has already been taken to 265 elevation. This still leaves 1,410,000 acre feet for flood*

*control.*

In conclusion, we feel that the 2007 State Water Plan totally disregards the portion of 16.051 of the water code concerning protection of the agricultural and natural resources of the entire State.

Concerns or questions that need answers:

The definition of regional conflict.

Who is going to make the final written report of the State Water Plan to be presented to the board?

We need a clarification of Rule 353.9 entitled DELEGATION OF RESPONSIBILITY. Does this apply to regional hearings held by the State Water Board?

Why should land be acquired even before a project is permitted? And what would happen to the land that is purchased and the permit is denied? (reservoir site)

Why is there no conflict of interest when a firm is allowed to do a feasibility study to determine if a water project is needed and then allowed to bid and/or build the same project?