

CV-13-2414
Swinton

**IN THE DISTRICT COURT OF OKLAHOMA COUNTY
STATE OF OKLAHOMA**

**Oklahoma Farm Bureau Legal Foundation,
Pontotoc County Farm Bureau, Oklahoma
Independent Petroleum Association,
Environmental Federation of Oklahoma,
Oklahoma Cattlemen's Association,
Oklahoma Aggregates Association, TXI, and
Arbuckle-Simpson Aquifer Protection
Federation of Oklahoma, Inc.,**

Petitioners,

v.

Oklahoma Water Resources Board

Respondent,

-AND-

Other Parties of Record Below:

Tishomingo National Fish Hatchery, United States Fish and Wildlife Service, the United States National Park Service, City of Sulphur, A.S.A.P., the Sierra Club, Arbuckle Master Conservancy District, Oklahoma Geological Survey, City of Ada, Oklahoma Farm Bureau, City of Durant, Richard Day, Institute of Environmental Science, Education & Research, Murray County Rural Water District No. 1, U.S. Silica, City of Tishomingo, C.J. Maxwell, Jr., City of Ada Public Works Authority, Bill Flanigan, Arbuckle-Simpson Landowners Group, Chickasaw National Recreation Area, Jonathan Gourley, CPASA, Nature Conservancy of Oklahoma, Chapman Properties, Gary J. Montin, Dick Scalf, Bill Brunk, Angela Williams, Shannon Shirley, Chapman Family and Related Entities, Estate of Ida Sutton Williams, Chuck Roberts, Joseph Morrow, Ronnie Wartchow, Charles Morrow, Carolyn Sparks, Floy Parkhill, Jerry Lamb, Amy Ford, Wingard

**FILED IN DISTRICT COURT
OKLAHOMA COUNTY**

NOV 10 2013

**TIM RHODES
COURT CLERK**

Case No. **CV-2013-2414**

Water Corporation, James T. Johnson, Paul Warren, Charles Roos, and Julie Aultman, Carl Adcook, Shon Agüero, Woody D. Alexander, Sandra Alexander, Joyce Allgood, Dean Arnold, Deborah Arnold, Mark Atkins, Patricia Baker, Dayna Baker, Anna Baker, Wayne Baker, Sr., Terry Barnes, Michelle P. Bass, Terry Beals, Monica Bell, Terry Bell, Kara Berst, Dorothy Bertino, Nancy Binderim, Stacy Blackwood, Nathan Bright, Donald Brittin, Kathryn Brunk, Johnny P. Bryant, Gary Burdine, Karen Butler, James Bulter, Kenneth J. Bylsma, Linda Byrd, Tracy Campbell, Stephanie Carson, Tim Carson, Cecil C. Carter, Patricia A. Castellow, Michael Castellow, Normna Chaney, Fred Chapman, Connie Chrobot, Jill Clark, Florence Coble, Jon Collins, Ronnie Conner, Ava M. Converse, Ronald Cooper, Kenneth Copeland, Amanda Copeland, Betty Crabtree, Joyce Crosby, Josh Davidson, Melissa Davis, LaQuita Dayton, Steve A. Deen, Terry K. Deen, Mark K. Deen, Denver Donaho, Bob Donaho, Howard Drew, Jean Drew, Nancy Dromgold, Jennifer Dunbar, Tammie Durbin, Dan Elkins, Arlinda Elkins, Roy Ewing, Kathy Eye, Kasy Fincher, Judy G. Fisher, Amy Ford, David Gainey, Jennifer Gallagher, James Gallgher, Craig Garone, Stacey Gibney, Darrell Gipson, Jason R. Girard, Gary Good, M. Charlene Goodson, Rhoda Grayham, Gabe Green, Gary Greene, Justin Grines, Paul Hall, Vicki Harbert, Luther Harbert, Mike Harris, Melissa Heid, Billy D. Howell (HFT), Mark Hughes, Donna Hunt, James T. Huner, Talon Hyatt, Ellen T. Innis, James Johnson, Deanna Johnson, Kimberly Johnson, George W. Johnson, Gary Joiner, Brenda Jones, Royce D. Jones, Sharon Keith, Sara Kendall, Sue Kendall, Elizabeth Kennedy, Dawnita Kennedy, Martha Kimbrouhg, John Kimbrough, K. Wayne King, John Krittenbrick, Agnes Lane, Betty Leggiero, Tisha Lester, Tom Locke, Michael

Long, Mark Lumry, Norma J. Mantzke, Janet Mathis, Rosemary McBee, Debra McCurry, Chris McCurry, Ebony McDonald, Heather McGee, Beverly McMillan, F. Lovell McMillin, Zeno McMillin, Tammy Merrell, Kenneth R. Meyers, Thalia Miller, Sarah Miracle, Jane Mowbray, Virgil M. Mowbray, Edra J. Mullendore, Walter E. Mullendore, Roy David Mullens, Richard K. Muller, Jane Murphy, Shawna Murphy, Richard Murray, Doris Murray, Pat Neasbitt, Randy Neasbitt, Rhonda Newton, Sarah Newton, Mark Newton, Lucille J. Norman, Sherri Owens, Norma L. Paschall, Catherine Pendergrast, Phyllis Perry, Ed Perryman, John C. Pope, Donna L. Pope, Richard Powell, Rosemary Poythress, Josh Presley, Mark T. Presley, Audrey Pruite, Harold D. Pruitt, Yvonne Pruitt, Winifred Rasco, Lois J. Rasseo, Adalene Rhodes, James P. Rhodes, Jett Robbins, Reginald Robbins, C.D. Robertson Jr., Christiane Robinson, Brenda Rolan, Robin Ross, Kerri Rousey, Retha Rousey, James Rowland, Traci Roysc, Whitney Ruelle, Carin Salazar, Carl Schneider, Abbie Schneider, Barry Schrader, Fred Schrader, Ann Schraeder, Diane Shaver, Melissa Shawn, S.L. Sherrell, Brent Shields, E.J. Shipman, Mary Silverman, John David Smith, Luanne Snodgrass, Donnel Somers, Claudia Spalding, David R. Spalding Elle Spraggins, James H. Stevens, Barbara J. Stevens, Priscilla Stevens, Janis Stewart, Jerry Summers, Dawn R. Summers, Michael Summers, John M. Thompson III, Roselyn Tiner, Thom Travis, Jeanie Upson, Jeffery Vick, Anna Vines, Cody Wainscott, Cheryl Whitman, LaDonna Wilbanks, Amber Williams, Angela Williams, Johnny C. Wilson, Amy Wisran, Macy Wisran, Joel Wixon, Larry Wood, Charlie Wright, Benji, Estee Brunk, Robert Brunk, and Pat Gray.

PETITION FOR JUDICIAL REVIEW

Oklahoma Farm Bureau Legal Foundation, Pontotoc County Farm Bureau, Oklahoma Independent Petroleum Association, Environmental Federation of Oklahoma, Oklahoma Cattlemen's Association, Oklahoma Aggregates Association, TXI, and Arbuckle-Simpson Aquifer Protection Federation of Oklahoma, Inc. (collectively "Petitioners") petition the Court for judicial review of the Oklahoma Water Resources Board's ("Board") final order in the Matter of Determining the Maximum Annual Yield for the Arbuckle-Simpson Groundwater Basin issued on November 19, 2013.¹ In support hereof, Petitioners state:

JURISDICTION AND VENUE

1. The Board's determination of a maximum annual yield ("MAY") for a groundwater basin or subbasin is an individual proceeding under Oklahoma law.²

2. Thus, the Board's final order in the Matter of Determining the Maximum Annual Yield for the Arbuckle-Simpson Aquifer ("Order") is subject to judicial review pursuant to the Oklahoma Administrative Procedures Act ("APA").³

3. Venue is proper in this Court, because various petitioners reside in Oklahoma County. Venue is also proper in this Court because the Board is located in Oklahoma County.⁴

¹ A copy of the final order formally adopted by the Board on 11/19/13 through a recorded vote of its members denying motion to reconsider is attached as Exhibit 1.

² *Texas County Irr. & Water Res. Ass'n v. Okla. Water Res. Bd.*, 1990 OK 121, 803 P.2d 1119, 1124.; 82 O.S. § 1020.6 (explicitly requiring that the MAY hearing be conducted pursuant to Article II of the APA); 75 O.S. § 250.3 (defining "individual proceeding").

³ 75 O.S. § 318 (providing for judicial review of final agency orders).

⁴ *Mitchell Manor Convalescent Home, Inc. v. Okla. Health Planning Comm'n*, 1991 OK CIV APP 22, 88 P.2d 998 (holding that the APA's venue provisions are cumulative to other venue statutes such as 12 O.S. § 139).

4. Petitioners seek judicial review of the Board's Order. All persons and entities who were parties to the administrative proceeding below are named in the caption as parties whose interests might be affected by any relief granted herein.

Petitioners substantial rights have been prejudiced, because the Order was made in violation of the APA, fundamental due process, and a writ of mandamus from the Oklahoma Supreme Court.

5. As an individual proceeding, the MAY proceedings require the Board's final action to be based on evidentiary record established at a formal hearing.

6. Petitioners presented all of their evidence at such hearing and presented legal arguments through briefs filed with the Board and served on all parties.

7. Lawyers and witnesses who participated at the hearing thereafter responded to Petitioners' evidence and argument through oral and written communications with Hearing Examiner that were made *ex parte* and/or without notice to the Petitioners.

8. The Hearing Examiner did not disclose these communications, and the Petitioners were never given an opportunity to examine what was said or to respond.

9. Petitioners only learned of the Hearing Examiner's post-hearing communications with lawyers and witnesses after making and diligently pursuing an Open Records Act request. Thereafter, certain Petitioners moved that the Hearing Examiner recuse or be disqualified by the Board.

10. After the Board denied Petitioners' motion, the Oklahoma Supreme Court, upon application by certain Petitioners, found that the Hearing Examiner's receipt of *ex parte* testimony was intolerably suggestive of bias against the Petitioners.

11. The Supreme Court issued a writ of mandamus ordering the Hearing Examiner to incorporate the *ex parte* communications into the record and to give all parties an opportunity to

submit responses to be included in the record. The Board was misinformed about the Hearing Examiner's failure to follow the Oklahoma Supreme Court mandate.

12. All parties who submitted a response, including the Petitioners, attached additional evidence responsive to issues raised by the *ex parte* testimony. Petitioners attached an affidavit from their own witness contesting assertions in the *ex parte* testimony while other parties attached evidence intended to bolster the *ex parte* testimony.

13. The Hearing Examiner struck the Petitioners' evidentiary response and refused to consider it while preserving both the *ex parte* testimony and the additional evidence submitted by other parties in the record.

14. The apparent bias identified by the Oklahoma Supreme Court remains uncured.

The Order is arbitrary and capricious, because it does not give a reasoned explanation for reducing Petitioners' groundwater rights by 90%.

15. In addition to procedural defects requiring that the Order be vacated, it is also substantively defective as being both clearly erroneous in light of the evidentiary record and arbitrary and capricious.

16. Oklahoma groundwater law requires the Board to conduct hydrologic surveys and investigations of each groundwater basin or subbasin and to determine a MAY over a minimum basin or subbasin life of 20 years and based on:

- A. The total land area overlying the basin or subbasin;
- B. The amount of water in storage in the basin or subbasin;
- C. The rate or recharge to and total discharge from the basin or subbasin;
- D. The transmissibility of the basin or subbasin;

E. The possibility of pollution of the basin or subbasin from natural sources.⁵

17. Amendments to Oklahoma groundwater law made in 2003 ("S.B. 288") further require that the MAY of a "sensitive sole source groundwater basin", such as the Arbuckle-Simpson, ensure that any groundwater permit "will not reduce the natural flow of water from springs or streams emanating" from the basin.⁶

18. The Order determines that 14,537,160 acre-feet of water will be available from the Arbuckle-Simpson groundwater basin over the next 20 years. Thus, under the general provisions of Oklahoma groundwater law, the MAY for the Arbuckle Simpson would ordinarily be 726,858 per year.

19. However, the Order determines that the maximum amount of water that can be withdrawn from the Aquifer each year is just 78,404 acre-feet. This amounts to nearly a 90% reduction in the amount of groundwater that the Petitioners and other landowners are entitled to beneficially use each year.

20. The Order does not provide a reasoned explanation for this reduction.

21. Though at times the Order purports to apply S.B. 288, it actually acknowledges that the criteria developed to apply S.B. 288 do not account for this reduction, and it never explains what other criteria have been applied.

The Order is clearly erroneous in view of the evidence in the record, because it is based on modeling data that is not related to the criteria it purports to apply.

22. To apply S.B. 288, Board adopted criteria that staff developed to protect native fish populations by specifying the threshold portion of natural fish habitat in area streams that must be preserved during the driest parts of each year based upon an Instream Flow Assessment.

⁵ 82 O.S. §§ 1020.4 and 1020.5.

⁶ 82 O.S. § 1020.9A.

The Board then sought to use a computer model to project how much groundwater could be withdrawn without causing the amount of fish habitat to drop below this threshold.

23. However, the record shows that the MAY adopted by the Order is based on the modeled impact of groundwater withdrawal on long-term average stream flows, which are unrelated to the availability of suitable habitat during dry periods.

24. In fact, the Order explicitly acknowledges that the model results cannot be converted into a measurement that the Board is capable of using to predict the availability of stream habitat.

25. Thus, the MAY established by the Order is clearly --- even admittedly --- not supported by the evidence in the record.

26. Petitioners contend that the Board's Order is clearly erroneous, contrary to applicable law, made upon unlawful procedure, affected by errors of law, exceeds the statutory authority or jurisdiction of the agency, is arbitrary and capricious, lacks essential findings of fact, violates applicable constitutional provisions, and is clearly erroneous in view of the reliable, material, probative, and substantial competent evidence or the weight thereof and that, therefore, this Court should judicially review set aside, modify, or reverse the Board's Order. Additional errors which should be reviewed include, without limitation the following:

- A. The Board erred in issuing the Order without considering Petitioners' response to *ex parte* testimony that the Oklahoma Supreme Court ordered be included in the record.
- B. The Board failed to afford an impartial adjudication of the Petitioners' rights.
- C. The Board erred in making findings of fact based in part on evidence that was not received and matters that were not officially noticed.

- D. The Board erred by failing to provide Petitioner's with notice and an opportunity to contest materials on which the hearing examiner considered or relied in evaluating the evidence.
- E. The Board erred by failing to provide Petitioners with notice and an opportunity to contest materials on which the Order is based.
- F. The Board erred by adopting a rule for the implementation of S.B. 288 that substantially curtailed Petitioners' property rights without complying with the APA's procedural requirements for the adoption of agency rules.
- G. The Board erred by delegating the construction and implementation of S.B. 288 to a committee heavily composed of non-agency personnel that did not properly represent groundwater users and that was selected entirely by a staff member responsible for water quality.
- H. The Board's MAY determination exceeds its statutory authority or jurisdiction.
- I. The Board construed the term "natural flow" in a manner that is inconsistent with the intent of S.B. 288.
- J. The Board erred in construing S.B. 288 in a manner that doesn't account for the aquifer's use as the sole supply of drinking water within the basin.
- K. The Board erred in failing to use the purpose of the sole source aquifer designation, *i.e.*, protecting the *use* of groundwater, in its determination of the MAY.
- L. The Board erred in construing the S.B. 288 to mean the protection of fish populations in area streams.

- M. The Board erred in construing S.B. 288 to require preservation of stream habitat by reducing groundwater rights without any corresponding reduction in rights to use stream water.
- N. The Board erred in disregarding long-standing legal construction of “natural flow” in construing and applying S.B. 288.
- O. The Board erred by adopting and applying criteria to determine whether groundwater use is reasonable that do not consider the use to which withdrawn groundwater is put and do not otherwise compare the value of competing uses.
- P. It was improper for the Board to rely upon fish population and/or habitat as the criteria to determine the MAY.
- Q. The Board’s determination that the maximum amount of water that can be withdrawn from the Arbuckle-Simpson groundwater basin each year is 78,404 acre-feet is clearly erroneous, contrary to the undisputed and/or weight of the evidence, and demonstrates that the Board is applying S.B. 288 in an unconstitutionally arbitrary and capricious way.
- R. The Board’s failure to provide a reasoned explanation for how it determined the MAY established by the Order renders such determination arbitrary and capricious and made without determining principle.
- S. The Board’s determination that the Arbuckle-Simpson groundwater basin contains 11,000,000 acre-feet of water in storage is clearly erroneous in light of the evidence in the record.
- T. The Board’s adjustments to the modeled results are not explained or supported by the record.

- U. The MAY is based on unreliable modeling data.
- V. The Board erred by failing to sustain the Petitioner's demurrer at the conclusion of the evidence offered in support of the MAY at the hearing.
- W. The Board's determination to equate reductions in fish habitat with reductions in fish population is not explained or supported by the record.
- X. The Board's reliance on an Instream Flow Assessment to determine the expected impact of groundwater withdrawals on fish habitat and populations was arbitrary and capricious and clearly erroneous in light of the evidence.
- Y. The Board's determination to equate different stream flow regimes is arbitrary and capricious and clearly erroneous in light of the evidence in the record.
- Z. The Board's determination of a MAY for three distinct aquifers of the Arbuckle-Simpson based on information and modeling data applicable to only one of them is clearly erroneous and arbitrary and capricious.
- AA. The Board's reliance on the results of a model using a single data point for the storage coefficient of all zones and portions of the Arbuckle-Simpson Groundwater basin is arbitrary and capricious and clearly erroneous in light of the evidence in the record.
- BB. The Board's reliance on the results of a model that fails to properly account for the unconfined layer of the Arbuckle-Simpson groundwater basin is arbitrary and capricious and clearly erroneous in light of the evidence in the record.
- CC. The Board erred in construing S.B. 288 to authorize the Board to regulate the use of groundwater from sensitive sole source groundwater basins in any manner that the Board decided.

DD. S.B. 288 is unconstitutional in that it fails to provide a clear, unambiguous and/or objective standard that can be applied in a fair and consistent manner, and constitutes an abdication of legislative authority.

EE. The Board's MAY determination is unconstitutional, because the effective appropriation of 90% of the Petitioners' groundwater rights constitutes a taking of private property without compensation.

The errors described above include irregularities in procedure before the agency that are not shown in the record and that will necessitate the taking of testimony thereon.

Wherefore, Petitioners ask this Court to review the Board's Order and afford all proper relief to modify and correct the procedural and substantive errors referenced above and embodied therein.

Respectfully submitted,



L. MARK WALKER, OBA #10508
SCOTT A. BUTCHER, OBA #22513
CROWE & DUNLEVY, P.C.
20 N. Broadway Ave., Suite 1800
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102
(405) 235-7700
(405) 239-6651 (Facsimile)
mark.walker@crowedunlevy.com
scott.butcher@crowedunlevy.com

**Attorneys For Petitioners Oklahoma
Farm Bureau Legal Foundation,
Pontotoc County Farm Bureau,
Oklahoma Independent Petroleum
Association, Environmental Federation
of Oklahoma, Oklahoma Cattlemen's
Association, and Oklahoma Aggregates
Association**



MICHAEL C. WOFFORD, OBA# 9810
DOERNER, SAUNDERS, DANIEL
& ANDERSON, LLP

201 Robert S. Kerr Ave., Suite 700
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102
(405) 319-3500
(405) 319-3534 (Facsimile)

ATTORNEYS FOR PETITIONERS
OKLAHOMA AGGREGATES ASSOCIATION
AND TXI



JAMES R. BARNETT, OBA# 547
DOERNER, SAUNDERS, DANIEL
& ANDERSON, LLP

201 Robert S. Kerr Ave., Suite 700
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102
(405) 319-3500
(405) 319-3534 (Facsimile)

ATTORNEYS FOR PETITIONER
ARBUCKLE-SIMPSON AQUIFER
PROTECTION FEDERATION OF
OKLAHOMA, INC.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that a copy of the attached document was mailed on November 19, 2013 to the addresses on Exhibit 2.



L. Mark Walker

**BEFORE THE OKLAHOMA WATER RESOURCES BOARD
STATE OF OKLAHOMA**

IN THE MATTER of Determining the Maximum)
Annual Yield for the Arbuckle-Simpson)
Groundwater Basin underlying parts of Murray,)
Pontotoc, Johnston, Garvin, Coal and Carter)
Counties)

FINDINGS OF FACT, CONCLUSIONS OF LAW, AND BOARD ORDER

Background

This proceeding took place pursuant to the Oklahoma Groundwater Law, 82 O.S. § 1020.1 et seq., which authorizes the Oklahoma Water Resources Board (OWRB or “the Agency” or “the Board”) to complete an administrative proceeding to determine the maximum annual yield (MAY) of fresh groundwater that may be used from, and allocated to each acre of land over, a groundwater basin. The Groundwater Law further provides that, once the Agency has set a tentative MAY determination it shall call, give notice of, and hold a public hearing at a centrally located place within the area of the basin.

On March 13, 2012, the Agency issued a tentative determination of the MAY of fresh groundwater that may be used from the Arbuckle-Simpson Groundwater Basin (“Arbuckle-Simpson” or “A-S Aquifer”) underlying portions of Murray, Pontotoc, Johnston, Garvin, Coal and Carter Counties. Thereafter, the Hearing Examiner, Emily Hammond Mezell, held a pre-hearing conference on May 9, 2012 in Ada, Oklahoma, at which numerous individuals and entities appeared as parties in opposition to, in support of, and interested in the Tentative MAY. The Hearing Examiner conducted a full hearing on May 15-16, 2012, in Sulphur, Oklahoma, during which all parties had the opportunity to present evidence and comments.

The hearing was divided into two phases. In the first phase, the Hearing Examiner took evidence for purposes of compiling a record on the Tentative MAY; in the second phase, those present had the opportunity to provide comments and other information associated with various MAY-related rulemaking matters that the Board expects to pursue at a later date.¹ Appearing at the hearing for both phases were numerous individuals as well as various groups and entities who took part in the evidentiary portion of the hearing. The latter include: (1) the OWRB;² (2) Protestants Oklahoma Farm Bureau Legal Foundation, Pontotoc County Farm Bureau, Oklahoma Independent Petroleum Association, Environmental Federation of Oklahoma,

¹ These include a potential phase-in period and well-spacing rules. This Proposed Order relates only to the MAY. However, all other materials and comments may be considered by the OWRB in connection with future rulemakings.

² OWRB exhibits are labeled “OWRB Exh. __.”

Oklahoma Aggregates Association and Oklahoma Cattlemen's Association;³ (3) Protestants Oklahoma Aggregates Association and TXI, a business corporation operating a facility in the central aquifer;⁴ (4) Protestants Arbuckle-Simpson Aquifer Protection Federation of Oklahoma, Inc., Charles Roos, Paul Warren, Bill Clark, John Sparks, and Floyd Bergen;⁵ (5) Citizens for the Protection of the Arbuckle-Simpson Aquifer ("CPASA"), which supports the Tentative MAY;⁶ (6) the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service ("FWS");⁷ and (7) the National Park Service ("NPS").⁸ In addition, the City of Ada appeared through its City Attorney to submit evidence regarding the rulemaking portion of the hearing.⁹ The various Protestants supported and joined in each others' presentations of evidence and legal arguments, and they are referred to collectively as "Protestants."

At the conclusion of the hearing, the Hearing Examiner issued an order setting forth a timeframe during which the parties had the opportunity to file post-hearing briefs, responses, and comments. All the named parties listed above submitted post-hearing materials, as did many individuals.

Having considered the entire record, the Board makes the following Findings of Fact and Conclusions of Law, and directs that a MAY be established for the Arbuckle-Simpson as set forth below.

I. FINDINGS OF FACT

A. Notice of Hearing and Pre-Hearing Conference

1. After the Board adopted the Tentative MAY, Agency staff prepared a notice of the hearing and pre-hearing conference and caused the notice to be published in Johnston County, Garvin County, Murray County, Coal County, Carter County, and Pontotoc County as indicated by the Affidavits of Publication in OWRB Exh. 12. No parties objected to the notices.

B. Evidentiary Motions; Record

³ These Protestants were represented by the law firm Crowe & Dunlevy; their exhibits are labeled "Prot. Exh. ____."

⁴ Oklahoma Aggregates Association, along with TXI, was also represented separately by the law firm Doerner, Saunders Daniel & Anderson, LLP; their exhibits are labeled "OKAA Exh. ____."

⁵ These Protestants were represented by a separate attorney of Doerner, Saunders, Daniel & Anderson, LLP; their exhibits are labeled 'Ranchers Exh. ____.'

⁶ CPASA was represented by The Aamodt Law Firm; its exhibits are labeled "CPASA Exh. ____."

⁷ FWS exhibits are labeled "FWS Exh. ____."

⁸ NPS exhibits are labeled "NPS Exh. ____."

⁹ For further details on the City's post-hearing motion to admit evidence, see *infra* Finding of Fact No. 4.

2. Prior to the Hearing, CPASA filed a Motion to Include Certain Documents in the Administrative Record. The Hearing Examiner granted the motion to the extent each document met the applicable criteria set forth in 785 O.A.C. § 4-7-7.

3. Prior to the Hearing, Protestants filed a Motion in Limine, requesting that the Hearing Examiner limit matters to be heard to evidence and legal argument of parties and providing for cross-examination of any person or entity that proposed to enter any evidence into the record. The Hearing Examiner granted the motion to the extent that only parties were allowed to present evidence, conduct cross examinations, and the like. The motion was denied to the extent that others would be excluded from making statements in support or opposition to the MAY, which was permitted following the evidentiary portion of the Hearing.

4. Following the Hearing, the City of Ada moved to present an affidavit from the City Manager with respect to the rulemaking portion of the Hearing. As the City explained, its attorney was unable to be present for the second day of the hearing. The City stated that it had no notice the Hearing would go a second day; however, the Hearing Examiner conveyed to all present at the pre-hearing conference that a second day was a possibility. In any event, the City's affidavit is relevant to the rulemaking, not the MAY determination, and as such, it need not be subject to cross-examination. Furthermore, the Hearing Examiner did not rely on the affidavit in preparing the proposed findings of fact and conclusions of law set forth herein.¹⁰ Thus, the Motion to Admit Evidence is denied to the extent it is offered in connection with the MAY; and it is denied as moot to the extent it is offered in connection with the future rulemakings because no such motion is necessary to offer comment on rulemakings. To be clear, the Board accepts the Affidavit for purposes of considering future rulemakings, but it has not relied on the Affidavit for purposes of this Order.

5. During the time that the Hearing Examiner had the MAY determination under consideration, she received, unsolicited, a memorandum drafted by one of the witnesses in the matter, Scott Christensen that had been provided to Board staff. Having determined that the memorandum did not add new material to the record, the Hearing Examiner disregarded the memorandum in preparing a proposed order.

6. A proposed order was provided to the parties on December 27, 2012. Thereafter, various Protestants challenged, among other things, the Christensen memorandum and sought a Writ of Mandamus in the Supreme Court of Oklahoma. Pursuant to the Court's mandate in *Arbuckle-Simpson Aquifer Protection Fed'n of Okla. v. OWRB*, 2013 OK 29, the Hearing Examiner placed the Christensen memorandum in the record and issued an order providing the parties an opportunity to provide responses to the material in the memorandum.

7. Protestants and CPASA filed responses to the Christensen memorandum. These same parties also filed various motions following the Court's remand. In an Order on

¹⁰ The Board is entitled to consider any legal arguments that the parties presented in the post-hearing briefs, and it did so with respect to *all* briefs filed, including the City of Ada's. However, the Board did not consider evidence relevant to the MAY that was not presented at the hearing and therefore not subject to cross examination.

Evidentiary Matters Following Remand, which is issued contemporaneously with notice of this Proposed Order, the Hearing Examiner ruled on the various motions and detailed her conclusion that the Christensen memorandum added no new evidence to the record. Thus, the Christensen memorandum has not been relied upon in preparing this Order.

8. In summary, although the Hearing consisted of two phases, the Board bases the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and MAY set forth herein on the record compiled during the evidentiary portion of the Hearing.

C. Arbuckle-Simpson Hydrology Study

9. To develop a MAY for the A-S Aquifer, the Agency collaborated with the Bureau of Reclamation, the U.S. Geological Survey (USGS), Oklahoma State University (OSU), and University of Oklahoma (OU), to manage a comprehensive, multi-year study of the A-S Aquifer that is known as the Arbuckle-Simpson Hydrology Study. The purpose of the Study was to provide the scientific information necessary to inform the Agency's consideration of an appropriate MAY.

10. Thus, the Hydrology Study comprises numerous hydrologic surveys and investigations that are part of the record. These include but are not limited to: Scott Christenson et al., *Geochemical Investigation of the Arbuckle-Simpson Aquifer, South-Central Oklahoma, 2004-06*, USGS Sci. Invs. Report 2009-5036; Scott Christenson et al., *Hydrogeology and simulation of groundwater flow in the Arbuckle-Simpson aquifer, south-central Oklahoma*, Sci. Invs. Report 2011-5029 [hereinafter USGS Report]; Noel I. Osborn, *Arbuckle-Simpson Hydrology Study/Final Report to the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation* (Dec. 2009); Jim Puckette, *Report for the Arbuckle-Simpson Study: Analysis of Bit Cuttings, Wire-Line Logs and Flow Test from a Deep Test Well in the Arbuckle-Simpson Aquifer, Johnston County, Oklahoma* (Oct. 2009); Jim Puckette et al., *Characterization of the Arbuckle-Simpson Aquifer* (Oct. 2009); Kayyun Rahi & Todd Halihan, *Estimating Selected Hydraulic Parameters of the Arbuckle-Simpson Aquifer from the Analysis of Naturally-Induced Stresses* (Oct. 2009); Titus S. Seilheimer & William L. Fisher, *Instream Flow Assessment of Streams Draining the Arbuckle-Simpson Aquifer* (June 2008); Ellen C. Tejan & C. Stephen Haase, *Indicators of Hydrologic Alteration (IHA) Analysis of Selected Streams of the Arbuckle-Simpson Aquifer, South Central Oklahoma* (May 2008); Aondover Tarhule, *Hydroclimatic Reconstruction of the Arbuckle-Simpson Aquifer Using Tree Rings* (Aug. 2009); and Roger A. Young et al., *Analysis of Seismic Reflection Data from the Hunton Anticline* (Mar. 2009).

11. The USGS Report, which describes the hydrogeology and simulation of groundwater flow of the A-S Aquifer, provided a focal point for the Hearing. However, the Board emphasizes that in developing this Order, it relied on the entire record.

12. **Aquifer Characteristics.** The evidence shows, and the Board finds, that the Arbuckle-Simpson Aquifer (the "A-S Aquifer" or the "Aquifer"), found in parts of Murray, Pontotoc, Johnston, Garvin, Coal, and Carter Counties, is a distinct body of groundwater overlain by contiguous land that has substantially the same geological and hydrological characteristics. The Aquifer is contained within three major rock units of Upper Cambrian and Middle

Ordovician age, including the (1) Timbered Hills Group, (2) Arbuckle Group, and (3) Simpson Group. (USGS Report at 6.) As a bedrock aquifer, the A-S is distinguished from an alluvium or alluvium-and-terrace aquifer by its highly fractured, folded, and faulted characteristics, which makes a study of its geology more complex. (See USGS Report at 3; CPASA Exh. 12 at 5.)

13. The Aquifer is comprised of three major areas. These areas are depicted in Figure 2 of the USGS Report and are designated as the "Eastern Arbuckle-Simpson Aquifer," the "Central Arbuckle-Simpson Aquifer," and the "Western Arbuckle-Simpson Aquifer."¹¹ Most delineated areas shown on the map are outcrop areas where the actual rock formations that constitute the aquifer form the land surface. However, an area in the northwestern portion of the Eastern Arbuckle-Simpson Aquifer dips below the surface and is referenced as the Arbuckle-Simpson subcrop. (USGS Report Figs. 10-12.) This subcrop aquifer area is confined above by younger rocks of various ages. Where the subcrop dips beneath rocks of lower permeability, the aquifer is confined, and wells that penetrate below the confining layer may be artesian. The Vendome Well, located in the Chickasaw National Recreation Area, is such a well.

14. **Aquifer Areas Comprising A-S Aquifer.** Although designated with three aquifer names for purposes of describing the general geographic areas where major rock units are found, the evidence supports, and the Board finds, that the three areas contain a distinct body of water overlain by contiguous land that has substantially the same—albeit not identical—geological and hydrological characteristics. (USGS Report at 6.) For example, the record shows that all three areas of the Aquifer consist of a series of northwest-southeast-trending structural features that are separated by Paleozoic faults and fault zones. (USGS Report at 14.) Further, contiguous, regional exposures of the Timbered Hills, Arbuckle, and Simpson Group rock units comprise all three areas of the Aquifer outcrop. (CPASA Exh. 18 at 8.) The entire outcrop lies in an uplifted area known as the Arbuckle Mountains, which consist of folded and faulted igneous and metamorphic rocks of Proterozoic and Cambrian ages and Paleozoic sedimentary rocks ranging in age from Cambrian through Late Pennsylvanian. (USGS Report at 6.) Thus, the Agency included all of these aquifer areas, and the overlying land area, in its determinations providing the basis for the MAY. A map of these areas is attached as Appendix 1.

15. Protestants contend that the Agency improperly treated the three areas as a single aquifer in developing the proposed MAY. Specifically, they presented evidence showing that the Central and Western portions of the aquifer exhibit more folding and faulting than the Eastern portion.¹² In his testimony, Dr. Kyle Murray, a hydrologist with the Oklahoma

¹¹ In previous reports and other documents, these three areas were often referred to as the Hunton Anticline, the Tishomingo Anticline, and the Arbuckle anticline, respectively.

¹² Protestants also offered evidence showing that at times in the past, the Board has developed MAYs that divide aquifers into sub-basins. (See, e.g., OKAA Exh. 1 (listing MAYs for various Oklahoma groundwater basins).) However, there was no showing as to why those aquifers were treated in that manner, such that they could be thought similar to, or different from, the A-S Aquifer.

Geological Survey,¹³ noted these differences; although he has not conducted research to test his hypothesis, he offered the opinion that the Central and Western portions may behave differently than the Eastern portion. Indeed, he had previously developed a proposal to undertake further study of the Central and Western portions. (See also OKAA Exh. 2 (Kyle E. Murray, Ph.D., Project Proposal: Augmented Hydrologic Assessment of the Arbuckle-Simpson Groundwater Basin, at 7 (Apr. 2012).) Dr. Eileen Poeter offered similar testimony.

16. The USGS Report, which was one of the sources upon which the Agency relied, also acknowledged these differences. (See USGS Report at 97.) However, the USGS focused its hydrogeologic study and groundwater-flow model on the Eastern portion of the aquifer because (1) the necessary data for building the model were sparse in the Western and Central portions; (2) the eastern portion is the largest part of the aquifer by area and volume; (3) as of 2011, most of the groundwater withdrawals from the aquifer were from the Eastern portion; and (4) the largest streams and springs (by flow) sourced from the aquifer are from the Eastern portion. (*Id.* at 5.) Furthermore, the USGS Report explains that an understanding of the entire aquifer, especially with respect to geology, was necessary for studying the Eastern portion. *Id.* The USGS Report evidences consideration of the full aquifer system throughout, even though the model itself was constructed for only the Eastern portion.

17. In addition, in developing the MAY, the Agency conducted and considered numerous other studies that ranged across the entire A-S Aquifer. As Noel Osborn, a scientist at USGS who was previously at OWRB, testified, these included a tree-ring analysis to assess climatic assumptions, synoptic streamflow measurements, a geochemistry study, examinations of springs, wells, and sinkholes, and extensive literature reviews. (Osborn Test. (13) 00:43:00 – :46:28.) Other studies included geophysical studies to characterize the geology of the aquifer.

18. The Board finds that substantial evidence supports its decision to treat the Western, Central, and Eastern portions of the A-S Aquifer as a single groundwater basin for purposes of establishing this MAY.

19. **Well Yields.** Wells completed in the A-S Aquifer commonly yield between 200 and 500 gpm. (USGS Report at 96.)

20. **Water Quality.** The quality of groundwater in the A-S Aquifer is described in the USGS Report at 32-33. Overall, freshwater in the A-S Aquifer has low dissolved solids concentrations. One study, for example, documented a median dissolved solids concentration of 347 mg/L, with an interquartile range of 331 to 384 mg/L. (See USGS Report at 32.) Thus, the evidence shows that the overall quality of the groundwater is considered good. No evidence in opposition to this finding was presented.

21. **Total Land Over Basin.** The total land area overlying the aquifer areas (including the narrow “connecting” areas between the three larger aquifer areas) is

¹³ At the hearing, Protestants presented evidence tending to show that Dr. Murray had been asked not to testify. The Board finds no cause to address this matter; the fact is that Dr. Murray did testify pursuant to a subpoena, and, like all the experts who testified, he was a credible witness.

approximately 612.5 square miles, or 392,019 acres. The evidence showed that the Aquifer surface outcrop encompasses approximately 520 square miles, but during the course of the hydrologic investigation, areas of fresh groundwater from the Aquifer were identified beyond the outcrop that were contiguous to the surface outcrop. (CPASA Exh. 18 at 5.) For these reasons, the Board finds that the total land area overlying the A-S Groundwater Basin is approximately 612.5 square miles.¹⁴ No evidence in opposition to this finding was presented.

22. **Amount of Water in Storage.** The Board finds that the amount of water in storage is estimated at about 11,000,000 acre-feet; this number is based in part on an average saturated thickness of 3,400 feet.¹⁵ (See USGS Report at 70.)

23. At the hearing and in their briefs, Protestants noted that OWRB Planning and Management Division Chief Julie Cunningham used a different amount of storage, 9,408,461 acre-feet, in a PowerPoint presentation to the Board on February 13, 2012. (See OWRB Exh. 4.) This amount was based on an average saturated thickness of 3,000 feet; and Ms. Cunningham explained that agency staff met with USGS staff following the February 13 presentation and made this revision to better reflect the scientific data. (Cunningham Test. (1) at 00:35:01-:47.) While Protestants complain about the change, they submitted no evidence contrary to the 11,000,000 acre-feet finding. The Board finds that the agency adequately explained the change, and moreover, the change is supported by substantial evidence.

24. **Rate of Recharge.** The 5-year average rate of recharge (volume of water that percolates into the geological formation from precipitation), from 2004 through 2008, is estimated at 5.58 inches per year. See USGS Report at 71 (Table 19.) Using this recharge rate and with the total land area overlying the aquifer of approximately 392,000 acres, the total amount of recharge for the aquifer areas is calculated at approximately 182,300 acre-feet of water per year. Accordingly, over a 20-year period, the cumulative total amount of recharge to the aquifer would be approximately 3,645,800 acre-feet.

25. **Total Discharge.** To calculate the total amount of discharge from the basin attributable to withdrawals, the Board assumes that holders of "prior rights" will pump their full (100%) authorized annual volume of groundwater. "Prior rights" are rights to use groundwater established under state laws as those laws existed prior to July 1, 1973, with such rights being recognized in final orders of the OWRB determining prior rights to use groundwater. For the Arbuckle-Simpson aquifer, prior rights authorize withdrawal of a cumulative total of 5,432 acre-feet per year. Therefore, the cumulative total discharge attributable to the assumed full exercise

¹⁴ The Board recognizes that site-specific information such as the lithology from a well drilled on a particular tract of land located near or on the boundaries shown in the map attached as Appendix 1 may show that a particular tract or acre of land overlie or do not overlie the aquifer material, but such site-specific information may be presented in an individual proceeding conducted to consider a particular application for permit to use groundwater with determinations as to inclusion or exclusion of acres of land made on that site-specific scale.

¹⁵ The average saturated thickness of the Arbuckle-Timbered Hills hydrostratigraphic unit in the model domain was 3,366 feet (USGS Report at 70), and the storage coefficient was input as 0.008 (USGS Report at 70); these values were input for the model's transient calibration (*id.*).

of prior rights over a 20-year period is 108,640 acre-feet. No evidence was presented to the contrary.¹⁶

26. **Transmissibility.**¹⁷ The evidence shows, and the Board finds, that Aquifer has an average transmissivity of 11,000 feet squared per day based on an average hydraulic conductivity of 3.3 feet per day (*see* USGS Report at 64) and average saturated thickness of 3,400 feet (*see id.*).¹⁸

27. **Potential for Pollution from Natural Sources.** The evidence shows, and the Board finds, that the possibility of pollution from natural sources is negligible. Study information does show that water of lower quality may be found in differing aquifer formations located below and to the west of the known sub-crop area within the Eastern Aquifer area and that water from the differing aquifer formation is known to surface in springs within the Chickasaw National Recreation Area (CNRA) (sometimes referred to as "bromide" water or "mineral" water). Induced infiltration of poorer quality water, possibly from formations outside the outcrop area of the Arbuckle Group and Simpson Formation, could occur in areas where there is heavy pumping of water. The mineral springs located in the CNRA and Sulphur area is evidence of the mixing of these poorer quality waters with the fresh waters of the Arbuckle-Simpson aquifer. However, the water quality concerns cannot be quantified with reasonable certainty and are not expected to significantly alter the amount of water available from the basin for the typical purposes for which groundwater in the basin is used.

28. **Natural Flow, Habitat, and Modeled Flow.** Senate Bill 288 imposes a moratorium on issuing temporary permits to withdraw groundwater from a sensitive sole source groundwater basin until such time as the OWRB conducts and completes a hydrologic survey and approves a maximum annual yield that will ensure that any permit for any removal of water from a sensitive sole source groundwater basin or subbasin pursuant to a permit "*will not reduce the natural flow of water from basin area springs or streams.*" *See* § 1020.9A(B)(2)(emphasis added).

29. For reasons discussed under Conclusions of Law 9 - 15, the Board construes the phrase "natural flow" to refer to the essential component of the natural habitat of area streams. Accordingly, to develop the MAY the Board undertook an analysis of the effect of groundwater withdrawals on the area's flowing streams' ability to provide habitat.

¹⁶ A full water budget was completed as part of the USGS study; further details are presented at Table 20 of the USGS Report.

¹⁷ The Groundwater Law uses the term "transmissibility," which the Board treats as synonymous with the term "transmissivity," which is the more modern term preferred by geologists and hydrologists. Transmissivity is "the rate at which water . . . is transmitted through a unit width of the aquifer under a unit hydraulic gradient." (USGS Report at 42.)

¹⁸ Note that the USGS Report discusses a value for transmissivity of 12,000 ft²/day, which is from a site-specific aquifer test (*see infra* Finding of Fact No. 37). The average value found above may be obtained by multiplying the hydraulic conductivity by the average saturated thickness of the Aquifer.

30. To operationalize its interpretation of the statutory mandate, the Board convened a Surface Water Technical Advisory Group.¹⁹ The Group identified representative species—two species of minnows and two species of darters found in the Blue River and Pennington Creek—to consider what level of withdrawals would accommodate an acceptable maintenance of the species' habitat.

31. The Blue River and Pennington Creek carry water discharged from the Eastern Aquifer area and each stream has significant water-flow records from USGS gauges; these records were used in the in-stream flow assessments. Mill Creek also carries water discharged from the Eastern Aquifer area and some water discharged from the Central Aquifer area, Oil Creek carries water discharged from the Central Aquifer Area, and Honey Creek (on which Turner Falls is located) carries water discharged from the Western Aquifer area. Thus, the Board determined that the species of minnows and darters and effects of flow reduction on such species in Mill Creek, Oil Creek and Honey Creek would be substantially similar to those assessed for the Blue River and Pennington Creek, and accordingly, a reduction in base flow of those streams of not more than 25% should also be acceptable.

32. Protestants challenge the following components of the Instream Flow Assessment. First, they object to the selection of indicator fish species, which was based on those most sensitive to reductions in stream flow. Second, they argue that the Instream Flow Assessment improperly measured impacts on fish habitat, rather than on fish populations themselves. They emphasize Mr. Smithee's testimony that he could not predict precisely what reductions in fish populations might occur when fish habitats were reduced. Finally, Protestants point out that although the Working Group determined that a 25% reduction in baseline low flow would be the maximum allowable reduction, it asked the USGS to consider a different flow regime in its modeling efforts, without offering any explanation for the change.

33. The Board finds that the selection of indicator fish species was reasonable and is supported by the record. The Instream Flow Assessment explains the rationale for the selected species, as did Mr. Derek Smithee, OWRB Water Quality Programs Division Chief, when he testified at the Hearing. (OWRB Exh. 2 at 5; Smithee Test. (10) at 00:17:50 - :18:35.) Protestants did not provide any evidence to the contrary; their argument is purely one of policy and does not raise issues of fact.

34. Second, the Instream Flow Assessment makes a reasonable connection between protection of fish populations and availability of fish habitat. For example, it cites studies in Texas showing reductions in various fish populations due to aquifer withdrawals that have reduced stream flows. (OWRB Exh. 2 at 3.) It also logically connects population reductions to loss of habitat; for example, it notes that "species in groundwater dependent sites like Spring

¹⁹ In addition to Board staff, the Group consisted of, among others, Phil Moershel, OWRB; Jennifer Back, National Park Service; Collin Balcombe, Bureau of Reclamation; Hayley Dikeman, Fish & Wildlife Service; Bill Clark, landowner; Noel Osborn, USGS; Titus Seilheimer, Oklahoma State University; and Bill Fisher, Oklahoma State University and USGS. (Prot. Exh. 1; see Smithee Test. (10) 00:07:30-08:23 (describing some fluidity of work group members).)

Creek could experience lower survival under reduced flows because there is no adjacent refuge. . . causing species to move downstream . . . where the habitat might be less suitable and predation risk greater.” (*Id.* at 18.)

35. The Board finds there is substantial evidence to support the conclusion that its reliance on the fish habitat, as established by the Instream Flow Assessment, was reasonably related to protecting fish populations.

36. Protestants’ final argument relates to the Working Group’s instructions to the USGS. The Working Group was to transmit a maximum allowable flow reduction to the USGS for modeling purposes. Although the Working Group determined that a 25% reduction in baseline low flow (which is the lowest annual average at that location) would be the maximum allowable reduction, it asked the USGS to consider whether the impact of pumping would reduce the 75% exceedence of total flow by 10-25%. (Prot. Exh. 13; Smithee Test. (10) at 00:28:30 - :34:01.) Indeed, the USGS modeled the 5-year average streamflow, the 5-year average base flow, the 75-percent exceedence, and depletion of the 75-percent exceedence.

37. The record offers no rationale for this change. There is no indication how a conversion from the 75-percent exceedence to baseline low flow would work, how it would impact fish habitat, or how using the baseline low flow instead of the 75-percent exceedence would have impacted the model results—nor is there any explanation to show that the difference would be immaterial.

38. Even without relying on the 25% baseline low reduction, however, the Board concludes that the modeling approach—which examined the impact of pumping at different EPSs on different types of flow—is reasonable given the language of Senate Bill 288. As described in more detail in the Conclusions of Law below, nothing in the statute *requires* the linkage of “natural flow” to fish population or habitat. Natural flow could just as reasonably be interpreted as relating to the 75-percent exceedence: this approach accounts for the relationship of pumping to streamflow as contemplated by the statute; and it tolerates some but not too much reduction in streamflow, which harmonizes the “will not reduce” language with the overall Groundwater Law’s policy of permitting groundwater use.

39. **Groundwater Model.** As already noted, the Board collaborated with USGS to describe the hydrogeology and simulate the groundwater flow in the A-S Aquifer. Understanding the relationship between groundwater withdrawals, groundwater flow, and natural stream flow was important particularly because Senate Bill 288 provides that for sensitive sole source groundwater basins, the Board in developing a MAY is to ensure that removals of groundwater will not interfere with the natural flow of streams or springs. At the Hearing, Protestants challenged a number of details related to the groundwater model. Thus, the Board makes the following findings relevant to the reasonableness of its reliance on the model in developing the MAY.

40. **Storage Coefficient.**²⁰ The USGS report describes a number of sources from which it developed the storage coefficient that was used for the model. First, it conducted a two-well aquifer test. Transmissivity computed from the analytical solution used to evaluate the results was 12,000 ft²/day. (USGS Report at 44.) The test was not of a sufficient duration to confidently determine a storage coefficient, though a previous study had arrived at 0.008, and the best fit between the data and analytical solution was 0.011. (*Id.* at 46.)

41. Thus, the USGS used multiple regional methods to determine storage coefficient, as set forth in the USGS Report at 46-48, to arrive at a storage coefficient of 0.008. Other studies produced comparable results. (*See id.* at 48-49.) The Board finds that the methodology used to determine the overall storage coefficient was reasonable.

42. At the hearing, Protestants questioned the model's use of the 0.008 storage coefficient for the entirety of the aquifer. It is undisputed that the A-S Aquifer is comprised of an unconfined zone, a semi-confined zone, and a confined zone. Protestants presented the testimony of Dr. Eileen Poeter, who stated that, because unconfined zones can dampen the impact of groundwater pumping on surface water, the model should have taken that difference into account. She testified that when a modeler treats an unconfined zone as a confined zone, two corrections ought to be made. First, the zone should be assigned an unconfined storage coefficient; and second, the storage coefficient for the unconfined zone should be divided by the thickness of the unconfined zone rather than the thickness of the entire aquifer.

43. With respect to the first concern, Mr. Christenson testified that the A-S Aquifer's unconfined zone actually behaves the way one would expect a confined zone to behave. This testimony is supported by and consistent with the USGS Report. (Christenson Test. (6) at 00:21:50 – 22:46.)

44. With respect to the second concern, this dispute could be characterized in two ways. First, as a classic dispute between experts, the weight to accord each expert's viewpoint is within the agency's discretion. Here, both experts had high credibility. Both are experts in modeling methods; furthermore, the USGS Study underwent a peer review that did not identify any modeling issues. (*See Christensen Test.* (13) at 00:06:00 – 00:06:20 (noting USGS peer review team did not raise issues with methodology.)

45. Second, even assuming Dr. Poeter were correct that a better technique might have been used, it is unclear what impact such an approach would have made on the outcome. Dr. Poeter testified that she re-ran the model using a higher storage coefficient for the unconfined zone from a single well, Well No. 85182. She explained that the model predicted a much lower impact on stream flow when that adjustment was made. However, she also acknowledged that other parameters would have needed to be adjusted in the model if the storage coefficient were changed so that the model could be recalibrated. (Poeter Test. (9) 00:11:15-:12:00.)

²⁰ "The storage coefficient of a hydrostratigraphic unit is the volume of water an aquifer releases from or takes into storage per unit surface area of the aquifer per unit change in head, and is dimensionless." (USGS Report at 42.)

46. At the most, this evidence suggests that a different modeling approach *might* have made a difference. Even if a different approach would have been reasonable, other record evidence supports the reasonableness of relying on the USGS model. To understand why, it is necessary to return to Senate Bill 288's directive to consider natural flow. First, in light of that directive, the Board accords great weight to the model's calibration to observed streamflows. Second, the focus on natural flow means that for purposes of this study, recharge rate was more important than storage coefficient. (Christenson test. (6) 00:15:08-:16:01; 00:21:25-:21:30.) As explained by the USGS Report, long-term stream and spring flows are derived from recharge, not storage:

Stream and spring flows are maintained in the long term (during time periods of years) by water entering the aquifer as recharge (during short time spans, on the order of days to weeks, stream and spring flows are maintained by water from storage), and, therefore, groundwater withdrawals could not exceed recharge. In fact, for longer time scales (years to decades) withdrawals must be less than recharge because if withdrawals equal or exceed recharge then stream and spring flow eventually would be reduced to zero. (USGS Report at 81.)

47. Finally, even assuming that Dr. Poeter's approach would have resulted in greater flows at the modeled EPSs, the Board notes that, after the modeling was complete, it selected a number for the MAY *higher than* might have been indicated by the model. Thus, to the extent Mr. Christenson's approach incorporated conservative assumptions (in the sense that it could lead to lesser stream flows), the Board's ultimate selection of the MAY incorporated a more liberal assumption (in the sense that it permits higher withdrawals). The Board therefore concludes that it was reasonable to rely on the model as one of the considerations for setting the MAY; and even if a different modeling approach with respect to the storage coefficient could have been used, the failure to do so was harmless.

48. **Model Calibration.** The process used to calibrate the model is documented in the USGS Report at pages 62-69. The model was calibrated in two steps, consisting of steady-state and transient calibrations. (USGS Report at 62.) The model was calibrated to 5-year average streamflow and base flow for the streamflow gages at Blue River near Connerville and Pennington Creek near Reagan. The model was calibrated to average flows to ensure that the amount of flow (both streamflow and base flow) computed by the model represented actual observed flows.

49. The calibrated steady-state model simulation reproduced the major features of previously mapped potentiometric surfaces. (USGS Report at 66-67.) Under steady-state conditions, the water budget for the Eastern A-S is 158.11 cfs of recharge and 158.11 cfs of discharge to drains. (*Id.* at 67.) Other model parameters from the steady-state calibration, including transmissivity, are presented in Table 17.

50. The model was also calibrated to transient conditions for the five-year time period of water years 2004 to 2008 (between October 1, 2003 and September 30, 2008). Details are set forth in the USGS Report at 70-72. The average saturated thickness of the Arbuckle-Timbered Hills hydrostratigraphic input in the model domain was 3,366 feet.²¹ (*Id.* at 70.) Area-weighted annual recharge rates applied to the model domain averaged 5.58 inches per year for the five-year period studied. (*Id.* at 71.)

51. As described above, the transient model was calibrated to streamflows in Blue River and Pennington Creek. The calibration resulted in very close observed and modeled values. (See USGS Report Table 22 (presenting observed and modeled values).)

52. Although the transient model calibration was based primarily on streamflows in Blue River and Pennington Creek, the model can also reproduce head response in observation wells. Daily head observations were compared to simulated median monthly head observations; comparisons are depicted in Figure 38. As the USGS Report explains, differences in observed and simulated water levels were considered acceptable given the study objective's emphasis on streamflow. (USGS Report at 72.)

53. Dr. Blaine T. Reely testified for the Protestants that the transient model did not appear to have been calibrated to the potentiometric data for the same calibration period. (See Ranchers' Exh. 3 at 2.) In his testimony, Dr. Reely emphasized the differences between observed and simulated water levels. However, he also noted the close match between observed and modeled streamflow values: "It's an amazing calibration. It's almost a perfect calibration, or match" (Reely Test. (12) 00:14:58-:15:07.)

54. The Board finds that its reliance on the USGS Report with respect to the transient model calibration is reasonable. Again, Senate Bill 288 emphasizes the connection of groundwater to the natural flow of streams and springs. Thus, it is reasonable to calibrate the transient model to streamflows. Further, the USGS Report explicitly considered head response in observation wells and determined again that the difference in observed and simulated levels was acceptable given the study objectives.

55. **Determination of MAY.** Having duly considered the entire record, the Board finds that the maximum amount that can be withdrawn from the Aquifer each year is 78,404 acre-feet. The Board also finds that this amount will not reduce the natural flow of springs and streams within the Aquifer basin. This MAY is equivalent to an equal proportionate share of 0.2 acre-feet per acre of land overlying the basin per year.

56. Protestants challenge the Board's designation of the .2 acre-feet/acre EPS, arguing it deviates from the study results. Protestants' argument seems to be premised on the belief that the groundwater model would produce a single "answer" as to the appropriate MAY. But as is evident from the testimony at the Hearing and the above Findings of Fact, the Board's decision rests on *all* the evidence in the record. Further, the statutory mandate contemplates that the

²¹ This number was rounded up to 3,400 feet and was used in calculating the amount of water in storage.

Board will apply its expertise and scientific judgment in developing a MAY. During her testimony, for example, Ms. Cunningham provided a reasonable explanation for the ultimate decision: it draws on all factors; it accounts for model variability, conservative assumptions, the recharge rate, and concerns about reasonable use. (Cunningham Test. (1) 1:03:00-:06:00; OWRB Exh. 4 at 14; *see also* Smithee Test. (10) 00:34:16 – :34:36 (“Science doesn’t give us the answer. Science *informs* our answer.”)) These criteria are reasonable and well within the agency’s authority. Indeed, they rest on the reasonable acknowledgment that the agency is operating within both scientific uncertainty and policy constraints imposed by the Groundwater Law and Senate Bill 288.

CONCLUSIONS OF LAW

A. Agency Authority

1. The Board is given authority by the Oklahoma Groundwater Law, 82 O.S. §§ 1020.4, 1020.5 and 1020.6 to make hydrologic surveys and investigations, enter orders to make tentative determinations, hold hearings on the tentative determinations, and make final determinations of the maximum annual yields of each groundwater basin and subbasin. The Board is also given authority to cooperate with state and federal agencies engaged in similar surveys and investigations and may accept and use the findings of such agencies. *Id.* § 1020.4(C).

B. Personal Jurisdiction; Notice; Procedural Due Process

2. The Board finds that the requirements of jurisdiction, notice, and procedural due process were met in connection with this proceeding. *See* 82 O.S. §§ 1020.4 - .6, 1020.9A & B; *see also* U.S. Const. amend. XIV.

C. Statutory Framework

3. According to 82 O.S. § 1020.5, after completing hydrologic surveys, the Board is to make a tentative determination of the maximum annual yield of groundwater to be produced from a basin or subbasin based upon the following:

- a. total land area overlying the basin or subbasin;
- b. amount of water in storage in the basin or subbasin;
- c. rate of recharge to and total discharge from the basin or subbasin;
- d. transmissibility of the basin or subbasin; and
- e. possibility of pollution of the basin or subbasin from natural sources.

4. Section 1020.5 also provides that the maximum annual yield shall be based on a minimum basin life of 20 years from the effective date of the final order determining the maximum annual yield. This approach is known as a mining policy. *See Okla. Water Resources Bd. v. Tex. Cnty. Irr. & Water Resources Ass’n*, 1984 OK 96, 711 P.2d 38, 41 (Okla. 1984) (describing groundwater policy as one of “use regulation and management”).

5. Senate Bill 288 amended the Oklahoma Groundwater Law and required additional determinations relating to the maximum annual yield of any “sensitive sole source groundwater basin or subbasin.” Section 1020.9A imposes a moratorium on the issuance of “temporary” permits that allow for municipal use of groundwater from a sensitive sole source groundwater basin or subbasin outside of any county that overlies in whole or in part such basin or subbasin.²²

6. Section 1020.9A defines “sensitive sole source groundwater basin” as “a major groundwater basin or subbasin all or a portion of which has been designated as a Sole Source Aquifer’ by the United States Environmental Protection Agency . . . and any portion of any contiguous aquifer located within five (5) miles of the known areal extent of the surface outcrop of the sensitive sole source groundwater basin.” 82 O.S. § 1020.9A. In 1989, the EPA designated a portion of the Arbuckle-Simpson Aquifer as a Sole Source Aquifer. 54 Fed. Reg. 39,230.

7. Senate Bill 288 places a limitation on the maximum annual yield for sensitive sole source groundwater basins: the MAY must ensure that any permit for any removal of water from a sensitive sole source groundwater basin or subbasin pursuant to a permit “*will not reduce the natural flow of water* from basin area springs or streams.” See § 1020.9A(B)(2)(emphasis added).

8. The Oklahoma Supreme Court upheld the constitutionality of Senate Bill 288 in *Jacobs Ranch, LLC v. Smith*, 2006 OK 34, 184 P.3d 842 (Okla. 2006).

D. Agency Interpretation of “Will Not Reduce Natural Flow”

9. As noted above, Senate Bill 288 requires that the MAY is set so that it “*will not reduce the natural flow of water* from basin area springs or streams.” See § 1020.9A(B)(2) (emphasis added). The Bill does not define “will not reduce” or “natural flow.” Several principles guide the Board’s construction of that term. First, Senate Bill 288 did not expressly alter the pre-existing Groundwater Law; therefore, the terms of each should be harmonized to the extent possible. Second, Senate Bill 288 contemplates the interconnectedness of groundwater

²² Section 1020.11(B) defines “temporary permit” as an authorization for the same purposes as a “regular” permit but granted by the OWRB prior to completion of a hydrologic survey and determination of the maximum annual yield of groundwater from the basin or subbasin from which the groundwater will be withdrawn. Pursuant to the provisions of § 1020.11(B), the temporary permits allocate and authorize the withdrawal of two acre-feet of groundwater per acre of land per year, subject to limited circumstances where deviations can be authorized. Temporary permits establish no permanent right to the allocation amount provided, although the law provides for an “automatic” annual revalidation process. By contrast, § 1020.11(A) defines “regular permits” as authorizations to put groundwater to beneficial use and is issued after completion of the hydrologic survey and determination of the maximum annual yield. Regular permits allocate equal proportionate shares of the maximum annual yield of the basin or subbasin. *Id.* § 1020.11(B). As described in more detail below, the Board directs the Agency to initiate a rulemaking proceeding for the purpose of timely transitioning from the moratorium on temporary permits to the issuance of regular permits.

and surfacewater, in that it recognizes that groundwater withdrawals could reduce flows in springs or streams. Finally, as an administrative agency exercising authority delegated by the state legislature, the Board is required to bring its expertise and reasoned judgment to bear on interpretations of its statutory mandate.

10. The plain language “will not reduce” could be read to mean that groundwater pumping may not in any way impact the amount of flow in basin springs or streams. This interpretation, however, would so restrict the possible use of the A-S Aquifer that it could not be harmonized with the pre-existing Groundwater Law, which contemplates mining over a 20-year timeframe. Moreover, such a strained interpretation would be inconsistent with the declared policy of the Groundwater Law to utilize groundwater resources of the state and to provide reasonable regulations for the allocation for reasonable use of groundwater, as expressed in a later-enacted provision of the Oklahoma Groundwater Law. *See* 82 O.S. § 1020.2(A). Thus, the Board concludes that “will not reduce” should not be read literally.

11. “Natural flow” is also subject to multiple interpretations. For example, both Derek Smithee and Jennifer Back, a hydrologist for the National Park Service, testified that they could define natural flow as that which is unaltered by human activities. Again, this definition would likely preclude or restrain groundwater withdrawals so severely that it would be inconsistent with the overall policy of the Groundwater Law of utilizing water resources.

12. To accommodate the policies expressed in the Groundwater Law—including a general policy of use but an interest in protecting streams and springs in sensitive sole source groundwater basins—the Board construes the phrase “natural flow” to refer to the essential component of the natural habitat of area streams. Protecting the flow of springs is an integral component of the primary intent to protect area stream flows. Accordingly, an analysis of the effect of potential pumping of groundwater on the habitat of the area’s flowing streams is a reasonable approach; it is based on the Board’s long experience implementing Oklahoma’s Groundwater Law as well as its expertise with respect to the State’s waters.

13. Protestants argue that the Board should have taken account of the use of the term “natural flow” in a different statute—60 O.S. § 60, which concerns the rights and obligations of riparian owners with respect to water in streams. The provision states that “[w]ater running in a definite stream, formed by nature over or under the surface, may be used by the owner of the land riparian to the stream for domestic uses . . . but he may not prevent the natural flow of the stream.” As argued by Petitioners, *Franco-American Charolaise, Ltd. v. OWRB*, 1990 OK 44, 855 P.2d 568, interpreted “natural flow” in this context to refer to reasonable use by people, not fish.

14. This argument is unpersuasive for several reasons. First, it takes 60 O.S. § 60 out of context; statutory language need not be given the same meaning when used in entirely different provisions. The very different context in which the term is used in 60 O.S. § 60 is highlighted by the *Franco-American* case upon which Protestants rely. The provision was discussed in *Franco-American* as it related to old common-law doctrines that are no longer recognized in the State. Specifically, the “natural flow” doctrine for *surface water* was held to have been replaced by the reasonable use doctrine. 855 P.2d at 575-76. But this reading only

supports the Board's approach of refusing to read the "will not reduce" language as barring withdrawals from the A-S Aquifer; instead, the Board's interpretation is consistent with the policy that water in Oklahoma may be put to reasonable use.

15. Protestants point to no alternative interpretations of "natural flow" that are meaningful in the context of Senate Bill 288. The argument is correct, so far as it goes, that the sole source groundwater basin designation is concerned with protecting drinking water supplies—a designation consistent with the purpose of the SDWA's Sole Source Aquifer designation. But their argument does not reach Senate Bill 288's concern that too many groundwater withdrawals could interfere with the surface waters in the basin area. The Board's interpretation of "natural flow" does not prioritize fish over people; rather, it develops a reasonable proxy for determining how much of an impact to basin springs and streams should be tolerated under the Maximum Annual Yield framework.²³

16. Finally, Protestants argue that the Board may not adopt an interpretation of "natural flow" via this adjudication; rather, they contend that the Board should have adopted this interpretation via rulemaking. Protestants correctly cite the definition of "rule" from the Administrative Procedures Act, 75 O.S. § 250.3, but they do not account for agencies' authority more broadly. It is well established that agencies may adopt interpretations of their statutory mandates as necessary to carry out adjudications. *See SEC v. Chenery Corp.*, 332 U.S. 194, 203 (1947). Further, the Groundwater Law *requires* that MAYs be conducted according to adjudicatory procedures. *See* 82 O.S. § 1020.6.

E. Other Statutory Factors

17. Senate Bill 288 also includes a separately stated condition and limitation on the issuance of any kind of permits (not just regular permits after the maximum annual yield is determined) to use groundwater from a sensitive sole source groundwater basin. The separately stated condition should be read in conjunction with Section 1020.9A relating to maximum annual yield determinations for sensitive sole source groundwater basins. The separately stated condition is found in § 1020.9, which was amended by Senate Bill 288 to provide that before issuing a (i.e. any kind of) permit, the OWRB must determine whether the proposed use "is likely to degrade or interfere" with basin area springs and streams. The "degrade or interfere" language appears to contemplate some use of groundwater to be authorized by permits, but imposes the limitation that such use cannot "degrade or interfere" with the flow of springs or streams.²⁴ Interpreting the contemporaneous "natural flow" limitation as indicating legislative intent that the maximum annual yield must prohibit any groundwater withdrawals, would be

²³ As explained in Finding of Fact No. 25, however, even without use of this proxy, the Board's choice of flow regimes for modeling are reasonable interpretations of the term "natural flow."

²⁴ This additional language supports the Board's determination that the "natural flow" language should not be read to prohibit withdrawals altogether; such an interpretation would be inconsistent with the "degrade or interfere" language, which appears to contemplate at least some pumping.

inconsistent with a reasonable interpretation of the permit specific “degrade or interfere” language that appears to authorize some pumping.

18. To harmonize this language with the “natural flow” language discussed above, the Board concludes that the restriction on maximum annual yield determination to avoid reducing the natural flow of area springs and streams applies on a macro basin-wide scale, and requires a general analysis of the general effects of pumping groundwater on the average flow of area springs and streams. By contrast, the “degrade or interfere” limitation language applies on a micro site-specific basis and lends itself to an analysis of evidence of potential impacts of specific pumping rates of specific wells on specific springs and streams. Thus, as described in more detail below, the Board directs the Agency to initiate rulemaking proceedings to determine how such evidence should be handled in individual permitting proceedings.

F. Constitutional Arguments

19. In their post-hearing brief, Protestants also argue that the proposed MAY violates the Constitution’s prohibition on takings without just compensation. The only authority Protestants cite for this proposition is *Franco-American*. Again, that case is inapposite. It held that restrictions on riparian owners’ *domestic use* amounted to taking. The Board’s groundwater permitting authority does not extend to domestic use, and so the MAY does not relate to such uses. It is well established that states may impose reasonable restrictions on water use; the State Legislature has done so here in the context of the Groundwater Law and Senate Bill 288. *See Jacobs Ranch, LLC v. Smith*, 148 P.3d at 849-50. Furthermore, the Oklahoma Supreme Court has already upheld the constitutionality of Senate Bill 288 against a takings challenge; because that statute provides the basis of the Board’s authority, Protestants’ argument amounts to an attempt to revisit an issue that the Court has already decided. *See id.* at 855-56 (rejecting takings challenge).

20. Other Protestants appear to argue that the MAY violates their due process rights. As to procedural due process, Protestants provide no evidence suggesting any violations. As to substantive due process, Protestants fail to explain why there is a fundamental right or suspect classification that would result in strict scrutiny.²⁵ Rather, Protestants’ argument is simply that the MAY should be rejected as arbitrary and capricious, which is a standard of administrative, not constitutional law. As is evident from the above discussion, the Board concludes that it has drawn reasonable connection between the facts found and the ultimate decision; thus, it does not violate the arbitrary-and-capricious standard.

ORDER AND DIRECTIVES

IT IS THEREFORE ORDERED by the Oklahoma Water Resources Board that:

1. The Arbuckle-Simpson aquifer underlying areas in Murray, Pontotoc, Johnston, Garvin, Coal and Carter Counties in the south central part of the state shall be and the same is

²⁵ Like the takings challenge, this argument has already been considered and rejected by the Oklahoma Supreme Court. *See Jacobs Ranch*, 148 P.2d at 856-57.

hereby designated the Arbuckle-Simpson Groundwater Basin, with outcrop and subcrop boundaries generally depicted on the map set forth as Appendix 1;

2. The basin is hereby declared to be a major groundwater basin under the provisions of the Oklahoma Groundwater Law;
3. The basin is also declared to be a sensitive sole source groundwater basin under the provisions of the Oklahoma Groundwater Law as amended by Senate Bill 288 enacted in 2003;
4. The determination of the maximum annual yield of the basin is 78,404 acre-feet;
5. The equal proportionate part of the yield to be allocated to each acre of land overlying the basin, based on the maximum annual yield and total overlying land area, is determined to be 0.20 acre-foot per acre per year (equivalent to two-and-four-tenths inches (2.4") per acre per year); and
6. The Agency is directed to initiate rulemaking proceedings for two purposes. First, the Agency is directed to initiate a rulemaking proceeding to establish a time period for reasonable implementation of this order as it relates to when existing valid temporary permits to withdraw groundwater from the Arbuckle-Simpson Groundwater Basin must be replaced by regular permits. Second, the Agency is directed to initiate rulemaking proceedings concerning a potential modification of the well spacing provisions set forth in the current rules relating distances of proposed wells to other wells, adoption of an established spacing distance between new proposed wells and springs and streams in the Arbuckle-Simpson Groundwater Basin, and a methodology for assessing and determining the effects of proposed pumping of specifically proposed wells on specific springs and streams.


IT IS SO ORDERED by the Oklahoma Water Resources Board in regular and open meeting this ____ day of ____, 2013.

OKLAHOMA WATER RESOURCES BOARD


ATTEST:

Rudolf J. Herrmann 10-23-2013
Rudolf J. Herrmann, Chairman Date

Linda P. Gandy
Linda P. Gandy, Secretary



Appendix 1. Boundaries of the Arbuckle-Simpson Groundwater Basin.



Bill Holley
City of Sulphur
600 W. Broadway
Sulphur, Oklahoma 73086

City of Sulphur, A.S.A.P.

Tommy Kramer
215 N. 4th
Durant, Oklahoma 74701

City of Durant

George Mathews
426 Westchester
Ada, Oklahoma 74820

U.S. Silica, Oklahoma Aggregates Association

James Dunegan, City Manager
City of Durant
P.O. Box 578
Durant, Oklahoma 74702

City of Durant

Dave Roberson
P.O. Box 235
Sulphur, Oklahoma 73086

Murray County Rural Water District No. 1

Cody Holcomb
Ada Public Works Authority
231 S. Townsend
Ada, Oklahoma 74820

City of Ada, Ada Public Works Authority

Jona Tucker
Nature Conservancy of Oklahoma
31700 CR 3593
Stonewall, Oklahoma 74871

Nature Conservancy of Oklahoma

Thomas J. Enis
100 N. Broadway, Suite 1700
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102

Estate of Ida Sutton Williams

Kevin Blackwood
P.O. Box 2352
Ada, Oklahoma 74820

CPASA

Shannon Shirley
2370 N. Daube Ranch Road
Mill Creek, Oklahoma 74856

Edward T. Tillery
210 W. Grant Ave.
Pauls Valley, Oklahoma 73075

Arbuckle Master Conservancy District

Richard Day
3284 State Highway 1 W
Roff, Oklahoma 74865

Gary Kinder, City Engineer
City of Ada
231 S. Townsend
Ada, Oklahoma 74820

City of Ada

Jerry L. Tomlinson, Mayor
City of Durant
P.O. Box 578
Durant, Oklahoma 74702

City of Durant

Lewis Parkhill, Mayor
City of Tishomingo
409 S. Mickle
Tishomingo, Oklahoma 73460

City of Tishomingo

Kelly Hurt
P.O. Box 299
Allen, Oklahoma 74825

Arbuckle-Simpson Landowners Group

Gary J. Montin
P.O. Box 202
Connerville, Oklahoma 74836

Joseph Morrow
23475 CR 3500
Roff, Oklahoma 74865

Fred Chapman
Chapman Properties
P.O. Box 1754
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Chapman Properties

Chuck Roberts
21745 CR 3510
Fitzhugh, Oklahoma 74843

Marla Peck
Oklahoma Farm Bureau
2501 N. Stiles
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73105

Oklahoma Farm Bureau

Jim Rodriguez
Oklahoma Aggregates Association
3500 N. Lincoln
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73072

Oklahoma Aggregates Association

D. Craig Shew
Box 1373
Ada, Oklahoma 74821

City of Ada

Guy Sewell
1100 E. 14th St.
Ada, Oklahoma 74820

**Institute of Environmental Science, Education
& Research**

C.J. Maxwell, Jr.
4500 Highway 7 West
Tishomingo, Oklahoma 73460

Jonathan Gourley
901 N.W. 37th St.
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73118

Bill Brunk
P.O. Box 280
Fittstown, Oklahoma 74842

Bruce Noble
National Park Service
Chickasaw National Recreation Area
1008 W. 2nd Street
Sulphur, Oklahoma 73086

**National Park Service, Chickasaw National
Recreation Area**

Dick Scalf
P.O. Box 851
Ada, Oklahoma 74820

Ronnie Wartchow
26440 CR 3520
Roff, Oklahoma 74865

Carolyn Sparks
P.O. Box 502
Sulphur, Oklahoma 73086

Charles Morrow
24044 Highway 1 W
Roff, Oklahoma 74865

Floy Parkhill
409 S. Mickle St.
Tishomingo, Oklahoma 73460

Velta Wingard
Wingard Water Corporation
10371 CR 1620
Fitzhugh, Oklahoma 74843

Paul Warren
P.O. Box 60
Mill Creek, Oklahoma 74856

Julie Aultman
P.O. Box 1209
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73402

Wingard Water Corporation

Jerry Lamb
12160 CR 1690
Roff, Oklahoma 74865

James T. Johnson
J.B. Johnson
1133 Fletcher Road
Sulphur, Oklahoma 73086

Charles Roos
7955 CR 1670
Roff, Oklahoma 74865

Carl Adcock
1035 Republic NW
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Joyce Allgood
717 4th S.E.
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Dean Arnold
4405 S. Prairie Road
Tishomingo, Oklahoma 73460

Deborah Arnold
4405 S. Prairie Road
Tishomingo, Oklahoma 73460

Mark Atkins
7481 Mesquite Ridge
Sanger, Texas 76266

Patricia Baker
147 Mark Rd.
Lone Grove, Oklahoma 73443

Dayna Baker
601 L. St. N.E.
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Monica Bell
507 Fleming Drive
Mt. Pleasant, TX 75455

Johnny P. Bryant
2201 Oakglen Dr.
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

James Butler
918 3rd Ave. NE
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Kenneth J. Byisma
407 Ash
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Tracy Campbell
2021 4th N.W. #83
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Michael Castellow
201 Country Club Rd.
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Norma Chaney
1160 W. Webb Rd.
Tishomingo, Oklahoma 73460

Jill Clark
1908 7th N.W.
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Jon Collins
460 Willowridge
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Kenneth Copeland
57 Wisteria
Lone Grove, Oklahoma 73443

Amanda Copeland
57 Wisteria
Lone Grove, Oklahoma 73443

Betty Crabtree
23011 Indian Meridian Rd.
Pauls Valley, Oklahoma 73075

Joyce Crosby
800 Rosewood
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Josh Davidson
692 Spring Hope Rd.
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Howard and Jean Drew
2232 Clover Leaf Pl.
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Kathy Eye
236 S. Pichens Rd.
Madill, Oklahoma 73446

Judy G. Fisher
P.O. Box 234
Fittstown, Oklahoma 74842

Tammie Durbin
337 Lakeside Rd.
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Dan Elkins
1301 Division
Sulphur, Oklahoma 73086

Arlinda Elkins
1301 Division
Sulphur, Oklahoma 73086

James Gallgher
3302 Rancho Lane
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Benji
602 1/2 W. Tishomingo
Sulphur, Oklahoma 73086

Estee Brunk
1015 Chambers Drive
Colorado Springs, CO 80904

Robert Brunk
1015 Chambers Drive
Colorado Springs, CO 80904

Macy Wisran
P.O. Box 500
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Larry Wood
1412 Sunny Lane
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Jeanie Upson
924 Sioux
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Anna Vines
86 Laurel
Lone Grove, Oklahoma 73443

John M. Thompson III
819 Bixby
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Roselyn Tiner
P.O. Box 178
3005 US Highway 70
Wilson, Oklahoma 73463

Luanne Snodgrass
91 Overland Rt.
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Donnel Somers
34237 E. CR 1650
Wynnewood, Oklahoma 73098

Claudia F. Spalding
2649 Silo Road
Durant, Oklahoma 74701

David R. Spalding
P.O. Box 902
Tuttle, Oklahoma 73089

Ellen Spraggins
118 P.N.E.
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

James H. Stevens
627 W. 21
Ada, Oklahoma 74820

Barbara J. Stevens
627 W. 21
Ada, Oklahoma 74820

Jerry Summers
701 S. Turner
Ada, Oklahoma 74820

Mary Silverman
1200 Holly
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

E.J. Shipman
3073 E. Highway 22
Tishomingo, Oklahoma 73460

Retha Rousey
1470 Enterprise
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Carin Salazar
416 P St. N.E.
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

C.D. Robertson, Jr.
8900 OK Highway 7E
Wapanucka, Oklahoma 73461

Christiane Robinson
1378 8th N.W.
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

James Rowland
8834 Egypt Road
Milburn, Oklahoma 73450

Phyllis Perry
1960 Woodridge Dr.
Newalla, Oklahoma 74857

Ed Perryman
404 Eastwood Circle
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Richard Powell
1415 Holt
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Rosemary Poythress
515 8th N.W.
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Mark T. Presley
8 10 S.E.
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Yvonne Pruitt
500 S. Highland
Ada, Oklahoma 74820

Lois J. Rasseo
320 B SW
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Norma L. Paschall
P.O. Box 1133
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Catherine Pendergrast
4727 Cass Lane
Connerville, Oklahoma 74836

Lucille J. Norman
1400 W. Ott Lane
Pontotoc, Oklahoma 74820

Rhonda Newton
205 Country Club Rd.
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Doris Murray
606 N. Kemp
Tishomingo, Oklahoma 73460

Virgil M. Mowbray
1220 Beverly
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Beverly McMillan
5487 Myall Rd.
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Walter E. Mullendore
8003 Joan T. White Rd.
Ft. Worth, TX 76120

Roy David Mullens
41255 E. Co. Rd 1510
Pauls Valley, Oklahoma 73075

Richard K. Muller
6642 N. Dogwood Road
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

F. Lovell McMillin
814 Wood N. Creek Rd.
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Zeno McMillin
7995 South Lone Cedar Road
Mannsville, Oklahoma 73447

Rosemary McBee
23695 Wolfcrest Way
Wister, Oklahoma 74966

Debra McCurry
1 Overland Rt.
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Ebony McDonald
1914 Knox Road, Apt. 807
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Michael Long
8905 Hwy 7 E
Wapanucka, Oklahoma 73441

Mike Harris
2004 7th N.W.
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Mark Lumry
10707 Evans Road
Marietta, Oklahoma 73448

Norma J. Mantzke
28 T & C Circle
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Tom Locke
906 Oaktree Lane
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Elizabeth Kennedy
2188 Highway 77 South
Davis, Oklahoma 73030

Martha Kimbrough
607 W. Kemp
Tishomingo, Oklahoma 73460

John Kimbrough
607 W. Kemp
Tishomingo, Oklahoma 73460

Ellen T. Innis
1501 Persimmon Lane
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Mark Hughes
337 Lakeside Road
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Brenda Jones
1623 W. Broadway Place
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Sharon Keith
5256 Myall Road
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Talon Hyatt
2719 N. Shearer Road
Mill Creek, Oklahoma 74856

Paul Hall
11815 Wistinsond Road
Mill Creek, Oklahoma 74856

Vicki Harbert
2502 E. Harbert Road
Tishomingo, Oklahoma 73460

Heather McGee
9801 Silver Lake Drive
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73162

Pat Gray
7100 E. Egypt Road
Milburn, Oklahoma 73450

Rhoda Grayham
1020 8th N.E.
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Gabe Greene
5601 Bullet Prairie
Tishomingo, Oklahoma 73460

Gary Greene
5601 Bullet Prairie
Tishomingo, Oklahoma 73460

Justin Grimes
306 G Street SE
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Darrell Gipson
612 Sunset Road
Ada, Oklahoma 74820

Jason R. Girard
713 Ash N.W.
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Gary Good
409 10th N.W.
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Alan Woodcock
Department of the Interior
7906 E. 33rd Street
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74145
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Park
Service

David Ocamb
4900 Richmond Square, Suite 203
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73118

Kyle E. Murray
Oklahoma Geological Survey
University of Oklahoma
100 E. Boyd Street, Suite N131
Norman, Oklahoma 73019
Oklahoma Geological Survey

Peter Fahmy
Office of the Solicitor
Branch of National Parks
12795 W. Alameda Parkway, Suite 155A
Lakewood, CO 80228
National Park Service

Sierra Club

Mike Wofford
Doerner Saunders Daniel & Anderson LLP
201 Robert S. Kerr, Suite 700
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102

James R. Barnett
Doerner Saunders Daniel & Anderson LLP
201 Robert S. Kerr, Suite 700
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73102
Arbuckle-Simpson Aquifer Protection,
Environmental Federation of Oklahoma, Inc.

Kerry Graves
5501 Highway 7 West
Tishomingo, Oklahoma 73460

Oklahoma Aggregates Association, TXI

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Tishomingo
National Fish Hatchery

Peter Burck
P.O. Box 1306
Albuquerque, NM 87103

Bill Flanigan
1341 W. Mockingbird
Dallas, TX 75247

Jason Aamodt
Aamodt Law Firm
1723 E. 15th Street, Suite 100
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74104

U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service

CPASA

Angela Williams
11937 N CR 3250
Paoli, Oklahoma 73074

Donald J. Chaffin
P.O. Box 1766
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73402

Amy Ford
889 Knight Drive
Durant, Oklahoma 74701

Chapman Family & Related Entities

Shon Augero
1533 Estelle St.
Durant, Oklahoma 74701

Woody D. Alexander
P.O. Box 116
Marietta, Oklahoma 73448

Sandra Alexander
5353 Brock Road
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Anna and Wayne Baker
133 Orchard Hill
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Terry Barnes
1920 Overlook Ridge Dr.
Keller, TX 76248

Michelle Bass
114 7th Ave. NW
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Terry Beals
4001 S. Golf Course Rd.
Tishomingo, Oklahoma 73460

Terry Bell
122 Vinyard Rd.
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Kara Berst
11138 CR 1518
Ada, Oklahoma 74820

Dorothy Bertino
18440 CR 3864
Ada, Oklahoma 74820

Stacy Blackwood
P.O. Box 2352
Ada, Oklahoma 74820

Nathan Bright
602 2nd Ave NW
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Donald Brittin
PO Box 586
Davis, Oklahoma 73401

Kathryn Brunk
P.O. Box 260
Fittstown, Oklahoma 74842

Gary Burdine
600 NE 14th St.
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73012

Karen Butler
1116 Potter St. SE
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Linda Byrd
17857 CR 1499 CT
Ada, Oklahoma 74820

Stephanic and Tim Carson
1201 Bernard
Ada, Oklahoma 74820

Cecil Carter
One Murray Campus
Tishomingo, Oklahoma 73460

Patricia Castellow
201 Country Club Rd
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Fred Chapman
P.O. Box 1754
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73402

Connie Chrobot
1711 Broadway Place
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Florence Coble
615 B Street NW
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Ronnie Conner
806 N. Washington #5
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Ava Converse
2719 N. Shearer Rd
Mill Creek, Oklahoma 74856

Ronald Cooper
256 Muse
Lone Grove, Oklahoma 73443

Melissa Davis
28 Dexter Rd
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

LaQuita Dayton
210 Oak Lawn Rd
Sulphur, Oklahoma 73086

Steve Deen
3390 Rock Creek Dr.
Sulphur, Oklahoma 73086

Terry Deen
1940 McIntire Drive
Sulphur, Oklahoma 73086

Mark Deen
3785 Rocky Point Dr.
Sulphur, Oklahoma 73086

Denver Donaho
938 P Street SW
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Nancy Dromgold
1490 Savage Rd
Hartshorne, Oklahoma 74547

Jennifer Dunbar
805 Northwestern Blvd.
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Roy Ewing
114 7th Ave NW
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Kasy Fincher
PO Box 1722
Lone Grove, Oklahoma 73443

David Gainey
2255 Castle Rock Dr.
Sulphur, Oklahoma 73086

Jennifer and James Gallagher
3302 Rancho Ln.
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Craig Garone
6558 E. Cedar Rd.
Milburn, Oklahoma 73450

Stacy Gibney
19990 CR 1543
Ada, Oklahoma 74820

M. Charlene Goodson
PO Box 248
Wapanucka, Oklahoma 73461

Luther Harbert
2502 E. Harbert Rd
Tishomingo, Oklahoma 73460

Melissa Heid
409 10th NW
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Billy Howell
29480 CR 3620
Stonewall, Oklahoma 74871

James Hunter
3108 Rolling Stone Rd.
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73120

James Johnson
14815 CR 3585
Ada, Oklahoma 74820

Deanna Johnson
15989 Lacey Hull Rd
Madiil, Oklahoma 73446

Kimberly Johnson
1204 Hailey Street SW
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

George Johnson
4200 E Blue Boy Ln
Milburn, Oklahoma 73450

Gary Joiner
14718 N. Country Rd 3400
Stratford, Oklahoma 74872

Royce Jones
306 N. 3 Rd.
Davis, Oklahoma 73030

Dawnita Kennedy
14431 US HWY 70 W
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Wayne King
1015 Mike St.
Ada, Oklahoma 74820

Jon Krittenbrick
409 Riverside Dr.
Moore, Oklahoma 73160

Agnes Lane
18315 CR 1580
Ada, Oklahoma 74820

Betty Leggiero
10600 Kunkel
Norman, Oklahoma 73026

Tisha Lester
2959 Bull Run Road
Wilson, Oklahoma 73463

Janet Mathis
6 Aspen Lane
Davis, Oklahoma 73030

Chris McCurry
1 Overland Route
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Tammy Merrell
3061 Copper Memorial Drive
Sulphur, Oklahoma 73086

Kenneth R. Meyers
1333 Red Cedar Road
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Thalia Miller
19575 CR 3560
Ada, Oklahoma 74820

Sarah Miracle
409 S. 14th Place
Ada, Oklahoma 74820

Jane Mowbray
1220 Beverly
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Edra L. Mullendore
8003 Joan T. White Road
Fort Worth, Texas 76120

Jane Murphy
16365 CR 1562
Ada, Oklahoma 74820

Shawna Murphy
1028 E 9 #A
Ada, Oklahoma 74820

Richard Murray
606 N. Kemp
Tishomingo, Oklahoma 73460

Pat Neasbitt
504 Oakland Ct.
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Randy Neasbitt
261 Old Hwy 70
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Sarah Newton
P.O. Box 845
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73402

Mark Newton
205 Country Club Road
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Sherri Owens
P.O. Box 136
Kenefic, Oklahoma 74748

John C. Pope
11700 S. Lakeview Lane
Tishomingo, Oklahoma 73460

Donna L. Pope
11700 S. Lakeview Lane
Tishomingo, Oklahoma 73460

Josh Presley
1316 Morning Star
Ada, Oklahoma 74820

Audrey Pruitt
615 2nd Ave NW
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Harold D. Pruitt
615 2nd Ave NW
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Winifred Rassco
320 B SW
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Adalene Rhodes
1005 E. Davis
Davis, Oklahoma 73030

James P. Rhodes
1770 Sooner Rock Road
Davis, Oklahoma 73030

Jett Robbins
2370 N. Daube Ranch Road
Mill Creek, Oklahoma 74856

Reginald Robbins
2370 N. Daube Ranch Road
Mill Creek, Oklahoma 74856

Brenda Rolan
P.O. Box 177
Paoli, Oklahoma 73074

Robin Ross
7644 N. Meridian Rd.
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Kerri Rousey
1234 Enterprise Road
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Traci Roysse
1407 Rosedale
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Whitney Ruelle
3073 OK Highway 22 E
Tishomingo, Oklahoma 73460

Carl Schneider
712 N. Maxwell
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Abbie Schneider
712 N. Maxwell
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Barry Schrader
700 E. Wynnewood
Sulphur, OK 73086

Fred Schraeder
6402 E. 56th
Stillwater, Oklahoma 74074

Ann Schraeder
508 Oakland Ct.
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Melissa Shawn
215 W. 14th
Ada, Oklahoma 74820

S. L. Sherrell
13210 CR 1550
Ada, Oklahoma 74820

Brent Shields
906 N. McKinley
Shawnee, Oklahoma 74801

John David Smith
P.O. Box 1011
Lone Grove, Oklahoma 73443

Priscilla Stevens
409 Riverside Drive
Moore, Oklahoma 73160

Janis Stewart
203 S. Byrd Street
Tishomingo, Oklahoma 73460

Dawn R. Summers
P.O. Box 872
Davis, Oklahoma 73030

Michael Summers
111 Lakewood
Davis, Oklahoma 73030

Thom Travis
110 R Street SW
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Jeffery Vick
2545 Stadium Drive
Fort Worth, TX 76109

Cody Wainscott
P.O. Box 42
Allen, Oklahoma 74825

Cheryl Whitman
808 D Street NW
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

LaDonna Wilbanks
P.O. Box 82
Atwood, Oklahoma 74827

Amber Williams
7715 Roundrock Road
Dallas, TX 75248

Angela Williams
11937 N. CR 3250
Paoli, Oklahoma 73074

Johnny C. Wilson
4725 Brock Road
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Amy Wisran
P.O. Box 500
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Joel Wixon
P.O. Box 500
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Charlie Wright
1102 W. Lindsay
Sulphur, Oklahoma 73086

Oklahoma Water Resources Board
c/o Jerry Barnett, Counsel
3800 N. Classen Blvd.
Oklahoma City, Oklahoma 73118

Bob Donaho
P.O. Box 962
Davis, Oklahoma 73030

Donna Hunt

Sara Kendall
Sulphur, Oklahoma

Sue Kendall

Diane Shaver

Nancy Binderim
Dickson, Oklahoma

Wayne Kellogg
1509 S. Broadway Blvd
Ada, Oklahoma 74820

Jim Baker
Box 52- 2808
Harris Ranch Rd
Connerville, Oklahoma 74836

Leonia Barger
2606 E. Palmer Rd.
Sulphur, Oklahoma 73086

Diane Barrett
1401 Sunny Lane
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Retha Beals
4001 South Golf Course Rd
Tishomingo, Oklahoma 73460

Peggy Bell
16240 CR 1584
Ada, Oklahoma 74820

Leonard D. Briley
902 E. Gardena
Ada, Oklahoma 74820

Michaeli Brunk
P.O. Box 280
Fittstown, Oklahoma 74842

Bill Brunk
P.O. Box 280
Fittstown, Oklahoma 74842

John P. Bruno
4800 W. Slippery Falls Rd.
Tishomingo, Oklahoma 73460

Lou Carlton
34145 E. CR 1650
Wynnewood, Oklahoma 73098

Darryl Carter
3048 Country Club Rd
Sulphur, Oklahoma 73086

John H. Chrobot
1711 Broadway Place
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Scott Clark
P.O. Box 16
Mill Creek, Oklahoma 74856

Virginia Cooper
506 Church
Lone Grove, Oklahoma 73443

Sandra Czajkowski
149 Pinewood Trails Dr.
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Claude V. Czajkowski
149 Pinewood Trails Dr.
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Sara Donaho-Jones
1414 3rd Ave SW
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Joe S. Duncan
PO Box 45
Connerville, Oklahoma 74836

Jana L. Dutton
586 Hwy 110
Davis, Oklahoma 73030

David Earsom
1126 W. Broadway
Sulphur, Oklahoma 73086

Eddie Easterling
HCP 64 Box 241
Pontotoc, Oklahoma 74820

Gloria Ellis
1608 Knox Rd
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Janice Ellis
1608 Knox Rd
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Thomas M. Forster
5407 Hwy 1 S.
Mill Creek, Oklahoma 74857

Dana Forster
5407 Hwy 1 S.
Mill Creek, Oklahoma 74856

Cathy Gardner
101 Country Hill Rd.
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Jerry A. Gray
7100 E. Egypt Rd
Milburn, Oklahoma 73450

Pat Gray
7100 E. Egypt Rd
Milburn, Oklahoma 73450

James F. Herndon
302 Larsh Lane
Ada, Oklahoma 74820

Susan Ingram
214 W. 16th
Ada, Oklahoma 74820

Jamie Inman
8301 S. Rockcreek Loop
Tishomingo, Oklahoma 73460

Dana Kelley
214 W. 16th
Ada, Oklahoma 74820

Austin LeMay
1709 FM 27
Wortham, Texas 76693

Ray Lokey
P.O. Box 520
Tishomingo, Oklahoma 73460

John Manning
1208 S. Stockton St.
Ada, Oklahoma 74820

Mike Martin
1419 Oxford Rd.
Davis, Oklahoma 73030

Mary J. Massey
307 W. Kentucky
Tishomingo, Oklahoma 73460

Cindy Matheny
P.O. Box 250
Tishomingo, Oklahoma 73460

C I Maxwell Jr.
4500 Hwy 7 W
Tishomingo, Oklahoma 73460

S.S. McGill
5399 Pete Nelson Rd.
Davis, Oklahoma 73030

Tim Metzger
134 Scivally
Springer, Oklahoma 73458

Esther Miller
9071 S. Willard Rd
Milburn, Oklahoma 73450

Marvin M. Munger
20267 NE 63
Harrah, Oklahoma 73045

Larry Murphy
16365 CR 1562
Ada, Oklahoma 74820

Mary Jane Nelson
P.O. Box 236
Tishomingo, Oklahoma 73460

Donald H. Nichols
603 E. 21st St.
Tishomingo, Oklahoma 73460

Gary Paddack
500 S. E. Country Rd
Ada, Oklahoma 74820

Floy Parkhill
409 S. Mickle St.
Tishomingo, Oklahoma 73460

Curtis Perry
1960 Woodridge Dr.
Newalla, Oklahoma 74857

Stanley Rice
1324 W. Elm
Durant, Oklahoma 74701

Paula Rush
1621 Chickasaw Blvd #590
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Patti Sanders
14917 CR 3599
Ada, Oklahoma 74820

Donald Schraeder
508 Oakland Ct
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

John Sikes
12055 W. Jewel Sikes Rd
Mill Creek, Oklahoma 74856

Wayne Smith
PO Box 53
Bromida, Oklahoma 74543

Josh Talkingtion
602 E NW
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Y. Steven Thompson
47 Ranch Acres
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Helen Thompson
315 F. SW
Ardmore, Oklahoma 73401

Rogelio Trevino
932 W. 10th St
Sulphur, Oklahoma 73086

Wayne Walker
P.O. Box 115
Tishomingo, Oklahoma 73460

Gloria Webb
1250 Webb
Tishomingo, Oklahoma 73460

Danny Wells
800 W. Smith
Stratford, Oklahoma 74872

Steve Wheeler
4262 Devils Den Rd
Tishomingo, Oklahoma 73460

Dovena White
4896 Fairview Rd.
Davis, Oklahoma 73030

Glenna Wright
923 Crooked Oak
Durant, Oklahoma 74701

Paul D. Young
12681 County Rd. 1700
Roff, Oklahoma 74865

Charles W. Shipley
6336 S. Harvard Ave
Tulsa, Oklahoma 74136

Derek L. Collins
PO Box 280
Tishomingo, Oklahoma 73460

Betty Sue Boyd
6100 W. Woodbrook Rd.
Warr Acres, Oklahoma 73132

Darrell Morris
586964 A North
224 Mack Alford Correctional Center
PO Box 220
Stringtown, Oklahoma 74569