

OKLAHOMA WATER RESOURCES BOARD
OFFICIAL MINUTES
January 16, 2018

1. CALL TO ORDER

The regular monthly meeting of the Oklahoma Water Resources Board was called to order by Vice Chairman Hitch at 9:34 a.m., on January 16, 2018, at the offices of the Oklahoma Water Resources Board, 3800 N. Classen Boulevard, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma.

The meeting was conducted pursuant to the Oklahoma Open Meeting Law with due and proper notice provided pursuant to Sections 303 and 311 thereof. The agenda was posted on January 11, 2018, at 5:00 p.m., at the Oklahoma Water Resources Board's offices at 3800 N. Classen Boulevard, Oklahoma City, Oklahoma, and provided on the agency's website.

Vice Chairman Hitch welcomed everyone to the January meeting of the Oklahoma Water Resources Board, and asked for the roll call of members.

A. Roll Call

Board Members Present

Jason Hitch, Vice Chairman
Stephen Allen, Secretary
Tom Buchanan
Charles Darby
Bob Drake
Robert L. Melton
Robert Stallings

Board Members Absent

Ford Drummond, Chairman
Linda Lambert

Staff Members Present

Julie Cunningham, Executive Director
Sara Gibson, Interim General Counsel
Cleve Pierce, Chief, Administrative Services Division
Joe Freeman, Chief, Financial Assistance Division
Kent Wilkins, Chief, Planning and Management Division
Bill Cauthron, Chief, Water Quality Programs Division
Mary Schooley, Executive Secretary

Others Present

Alan Woodcock, US Fish and Wildlife Service, Tulsa, OK
Chris Browning, Oklahoma City Water Utilities Trust, Oklahoma City, OK
Sam Samandi, Oklahoma City Water Utilities Trust, Oklahoma City, OK
Billy Little, Oklahoma City Water Utilities Trust, Oklahoma City, OK
Nathan Madenwald, Oklahoma City Water Utilities Trust, Oklahoma City, OK
Amy Anne Ford, Citizens for the Protection of the Arbuckle Simpson Aquifer, Ada, OK
Josh McClintock, Citizens for the Protection of the Arbuckle Simpson Aquifer, Edmond, OK
Cody Holcomb, City of Ada, OK
Tom Elkins, Cherokee Nation, Tahlequah, OK
Saba Tahmassebi, Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality, Oklahoma City, OK
Bud Ground, Environmental Federation of Oklahoma, Oklahoma City, OK
Edie Rhandour, Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality, Oklahoma City, OK
Gwendolyn Caldwell, Conservation Coalition, Oklahoma City, OK
Candy Thompson, Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality, Oklahoma City, OK
Johnathan Fisher, US Fish and Wildlife Service, Tulsa, OK
Robert P. Streets, Midwest City, OK
Cate Brantley, Oklahoma State Senate, Oklahoma City, OK
Carlos E. Johnson, BKD, LLP, Oklahoma City, OK
Bill Graham, City of Del City, OK
Krystina Phillips, Citizens for the Protection of the Arbuckle Simpson Aquifer, Ada, OK
Susan Paddack, Oka' Institute, East Central University, Ada, OK
J. Paul Davis, Oklahoma Department of Environmental Quality, Oklahoma City, OK
Anthony Mackey, M&M Natural Resource Management, Noble, OK
Nadia Kyrlova, ONEOK, Oklahoma City, OK
Senator David Rader, Oklahoma State Senate, Tulsa, OK
Megan Seward, State Auditor and Inspector, Oklahoma City, OK
Rory Gaines, State Auditor and Inspector, Oklahoma City, OK
Charles Swinton, BancFirst, Oklahoma City, OK
Jeremy Seiger, Oklahoma Department of Agriculture, Food & Forestry, Oklahoma City, OK
Ken Komiske, City of Norman, OK

B. Discussion, Amendments, and Vote to Approve Official Minutes of the December 19, 2017, Regular Meeting.

Vice Chairman Hitch asked if there were any corrections to the minutes of the December 19, 2017, regular meeting. There were no changes, and Vice Chairman Hitch asked for a motion to approve the December meeting minutes. Mr. Buchanan moved to approve the minutes of the December 19, 2017, meeting, and Mr. Allen seconded.

Vice Chairman Hitch called for the vote.

AYE: Drake, Stallings, Buchanan, Allen, Darby, Melton, Hitch

NAY: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Drummond, Lambert

C. Executive Director's Report

Ms. Julie Cunningham, OWRB Executive Director, welcomed everyone in attendance and began her report recognizing Senator David Rader in attendance, as well as former Senator Susan Paddack who initiated the state interest regarding aquifer storage and recovery. She continued with an

update on statewide drought conditions which is now beginning to affect increasing portions of the states. Regarding calendar items, she met with House of Representatives analyst Jenny Mobley regarding agency functions and budget, as well as a how the agency is meeting statutory requirements. Energy and Environment Cabinet agencies met with the new Region 6 Administrator of the Environmental Protection Agency, Anne Idsal, about the state's administration of the EPA programs and funding, and her commitment to take the lead regarding development of the Illinois River TMDL. The Oklahoma City permit motion was heard in District Court on January 4. Board Member Darby attended, and was well many citizens with presentations by the parties, including OWRB Interim General Counsel Sara Gibson. The Judge has allowed briefs to be submitted, and a decision is expected March 8. The Produced Water Workgroup is presenting workshops on technology on January 16 and 17.

Ms. Cunningham announced the agency has been awarded a "Certified Healthy Work Place" for the third year. The legislative deadline for bill introduction is January 18; there are several bills regarding water: allowing use of marginal quality water (greater than 5,000 ppm TDS) as part of the Oklahoma Comprehensive Water Plan and Water for 2060 Act. Mr. Pierce will present an update on the audit finding and correction report, and there may be comments by the State Auditor's Office. She noted the Congressional report in the members' notebooks and highlighted actions regarding reauthorization the WRDA bill.

Ms. Cunningham concluded her report. There were no questions or comments from members.

1. D. Financial Update

1. Budget Report. Mr. Cleve Pierce, Administrative Services Division Chief, addressed the members and stated the budget report covers the time period through December 2017. He said for the time period, the agency spent 47% of its appropriated budget, 31% of the revolving fund budget, and 30% of the federal dollars budgeted. Overall, the total budget remaining is 65% with 50% of the year remaining, and this time last year there was 68% remaining. He said that he and the Financial Manager monitor the cash and the budget every month to ensure dollars are being spent appropriately.

There were no questions by the members.

2. Audit Report. Mr. Pierce stated he had reviewed the audit in whole at the last meeting, and today he will discuss how the agency will address the audit and he referred to a written Audit Response Plan which distributed to the Board. The Plan components are in priority order, and are expected to change as it is implemented. He highlighted the agency's response to Regarding Priority #1, Receipt and Deposit Control, which is to ensure the money coming in is captured and reconciled back to the deposit—for the short term, getting it on an Excel spreadsheet which will be signed and reconciled to the deposit each day. Mr. Pierce and the Finance Manager keep duties separate and are writing a Standard Operating Procedure for daily reconciliation and will train other staff to perform the duties in their absence. Long term, he envisions obtaining an actual receiving program possibly through OMES that could be integrated into the agency system, including online pay, which is outside of an audit plan. At this time, the control issues are being addressed.

Regarding Priority #2 Inventory Control, Mr. Pierce said the agency is updating the existing inventory sheet and contents verified and tagged. A Standard Operating Procedure will be written to verify inventory yearly. The entire inventory is not only located in the Oklahoma City office area. Mr. Pierce said that long term he would like to get the inventory into the state system where it will be constantly updated and verified.

Priority #3 regards expenditure approval from the Water Resources Board fee revolving fund. Mr. Pierce explained this Board as well as OMES is to authorize every payment from this fund which is impossible to do. He said currently there is proposed legislative language this Session in order for the

agency to use this fund the same as any other. Ms. Cunningham added the Auditors acknowledged this is a small fund and the procedures did not need to be that stringent and there is no another fund this way they are aware of that has to be approved by OMES and the entire OWRB Board. Yearly receipts are about \$700,000.00. Mr. Pierce said that if the legislation is not approved, staff will address it in another way in order to be in compliance.

Mr. Pierce stated Priorities #4 and #5 have been taken care of regarding payment control and he will write a Standard Operating Procedure, as well as maintaining the Well Drillers Fund at \$50,000.00 which is being done monthly. He said representatives of the Auditors Office are in attendance.

Mr. Buchanan asked about Priority #1 and if the checks received are from the water use fees and is that spread throughout the year or only at certain times. Mr. Pierce responded that basically the dollars and the account volume are for that program and there are some payments for Financial Assistance Programs. Ms. Cunningham said there is an annual mail out in the spring and a follow up in the fall. Mr. Pierce said the challenge for this finding for Priority #1 to make sure there is a system to control the volume and also do the day-to-day. Ms. Cunningham said staff has proposed on line water use reporting and payment, but it is very expensive to develop that programming. Mr. Pierce described the agency's contract with OMES for a business analyst that in the future will produce on line pay, but for now due to budget constraints, the agency will establish in that program similar fields with federal reporting. Mr. Wilkins added the agency had received a \$100,000.00 grant from the USGS to become compatible with its system as well as accurate with its publishing of a 5-year water use report nationwide.

Mr. Allen asked regarding Priority #3, if there was an advantage to establishing a sort of delegation of authority from the Board, in the interim while waiting for the Legislature to act, so that the agency would be in compliance now. Ms. Gibson responded she would need to research if that is an activity that could be delegated. Mr. Hitch suggested an ERP program and Mr. Pierce said he would need to review the volume and payroll paid from the same system.

Mr. Buchanan welcomed the State Auditor's representatives for coming and asked if the Auditor's Office believed state the agency has adequately addressed the issues that have been brought forward. Ms. Rory Grimes, Audit Manager and Supervisor for the OWRB audit, stated the findings in the report are typical issues with state agencies. She added that Board and OMES Director approval issue is rare, but has a straightforward solution. She said management was very receptive to the recommendations and had been proactive in finding solutions, and she applauds the short and long term solutions that Mr. Pierce has presented.

There were no other questions by the members.

2. FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE DIVISION

A. Consideration of and Possible Action on a Proposed Order Approving Drinking Water Funding Application for Oklahoma City Water Utilities Trust, Oklahoma County. Recommended for Approval.

Mr. Joe Freeman, Chief, Financial Assistance Division, stated to the members that this item is a \$52.5 million dollar loan request by the City of Oklahoma City Water Utilities Trust. The Trust is requesting the loan to go along with approximately \$19 million dollars from other sources for construction of a new clear well at the Draper Water Treatment Plant, buster pump system upgrades at the Hefner Water Treatment Plant, installation of water lines to connect the Draper and Hefner water plants, replace approximately 56,900 feet of 36" and 42" water line, and 35,000 feet of 6" and 8" water line. He said the loan will be funded through the Drinking Water State Revolving Loan Fund program, and he noted provisions of the loan agreement. Mr. Freeman said that over the last ten years the City's water and

sewer connections have increased by approximately 17%, and the debt coverage ratio stands at approximately 2.41-times. Staff recommended approval of the loan application.

Representing the Oklahoma City Water Utilities Trust was Chris Browning, OCWUT General Manager; Sam Samandi, Engineering Manager; Billy Little, Financial Operations Manager; and, Nathan Madenwald. Mr. Browning spoke to the members about how economic prosperity, public safety, and public health is directly dependent upon safe and reliable drinking water. He thanked the Board for its support of the Trust's service to the area's 1.2 million people.

Mr. Buchanan asked if Lake Hefner and Lake Draper had not been connected in the past and the distance between the lakes. Mr. Browning responded that is correct, the lakes have not been connected, and Mr. Samandi said the distance is seven miles.

Mr. Buchanan moved to approve the Drinking Water State Revolving Fund application to the Oklahoma City Water Utilities Trust, and Mr. Drake seconded.

Mr. Allen asked if the calculated debt coverage ratio for OCWUT includes this loan amount, and Mr. Freeman said it is included.

There were no other questions, and Vice Chairman Hitch called for the vote.

AYE: Drake, Stallings, Buchanan, Allen, Darby, Melton, Hitch

NAY: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Drummond, Lambert

3. SUMMARY DISPOSITION AGENDA ITEMS

Any item listed under this Summary Disposition Agenda may, at the requested of any member of the Board, the Board's staff, or any other person attending this meeting, may be transferred to the Special Consideration Agenda. Under the Special Consideration Agenda, separate discussion and vote or other action may be taken on any items already listed under that agenda or items transferred to that agenda from this Summary Disposition Agenda.

A. Requests to Transfer Items from Summary Disposition Agenda to the Special Consideration Agenda, and Action on Whether to Transfer Such Items. There were no requests to transfer items to the Summary Disposition Agenda.

B. Discussion, Questions, and Responses Pertaining to Any Items Remaining on Summary Disposition Agenda and Action on Items Listed.

Vice Chairman Hitch asked if there were actions regarding items on the Summary Disposition Agenda.

Mr. Wilkins asked that item 3.G.1., regular groundwater permit #2017-561 for No Water Farms, L.L.C., be withdrawn from the Board's consideration. Mr. Buchanan asked about stream water diversions (3.J.) in Grady County and Mr. Wilkins responded.

There were no other changes or other questions by members, and Vice Chairman Hitch asked for a motion to approve the Summary Disposition Agenda.

Mr. Stallings moved to approve the Summary Disposition Agenda, and Mr. Allen seconded. Vice Chairman Hitch called for the vote.

AYE: Drake, Stallings, Buchanan, Allen, Darby, Melton, Hitch

NAY: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Drummond, Lambert

The following items were approved:

C. Consideration of and Possible Action on Financial Assistance Division Items:

1. Rural Economic Action Plan (REAP) Grant Applications:

<u>Item No.</u>	<u>Application No.</u>	<u>Entity Name</u>	<u>County</u>	<u>Amount Recommended</u>
NODA				
a.	FAP-18-0005-R	Cherokee Development Authority	Alfalfa	\$79,999.00

D. Consideration of and Possible Action on Contracts and Agreements:

1. Agreement Amendment between OWRB and Office of the Secretary of Energy and Environment to have a no-cost time extension for reimbursement of monies for the water management planning program.

2. Contract for Professional Services Agreement with HISINC, LLC., to prepare and present the National Flood Insurance Program training course for floodplain administrators and other duties as requested by the OWRB.

3. Intergovernmental Agreement between OWRB and Central Oklahoma Master Conservancy District for water quality monitoring at Lake Thunderbird.

4. Amendment Agreement between OWRB and Meshek & Associates, PLLC to provide professional engineering services in connection with Cooperating Technical Partnership Program Assistance for the creation and maintenance of Flood Hazard Data.

E. Consideration of and Possible Action on Applications for Temporary Permits to Use Groundwater:
None

F. Consideration of and Possible Action on Applications to Amend Temporary Permits to Use Groundwater:
None

G. Consideration of and Possible Action on Applications for Regular Permits to Use Groundwater:

1. *No Water Farms, LLC, Cimarron County, #2017-541* *Item withdrawn*
2. Stanley Lee & Charlotte Kay Hargrove, Major County, #2017-561

H. Consideration of and Possible Action on Applications to Amend Regular Permits to Use Groundwater:
None

I. Consideration of and Possible Action on Applications to Amend Prior Rights to Use Groundwater:
None

J. Consideration of and Possible Action on Applications for Regular Permits to Use Stream Water:

1. Clayton Fisher, Blaine County, #2017-040
2. David Olie & Jo Ann Hale, Grady County, #2017-041
3. David Olie & Jo Ann Hale, Grady County, #2017-042
4. Gulfport MidCon, LLC, Grady County, #2017-043
5. Gulfport MidCon, LLC, Grady County, #2017-044

K. Consideration of and Possible Action on Dam and Reservoir Construction:
None

- L. Consideration of and Possible Action on Well Driller and Pump Installer Licensing:
 - 1. New Licenses and Operators:
 - a. Licensee: Oklahoma Department of Transportation DPC-0956
 - 1. Operator: Gregory Garland OP-1915
 - 2. Operator: Stephen Atkin OP-2001

- M. Consideration of and Possible Action on Permit Applications for Proposed Development on State Owned or Operated Property within Floodplain Areas:
 - 1. Oklahoma Department of Transportation, Carter County, #FP-17-50
 - 2. Oklahoma Department of Transportation, Grady County, #FP-17-51
 - 3. Oklahoma Department of Transportation, Grady County, #FP-17-52
 - 4. Oklahoma Department of Transportation, Cotton County, #FP-17-53
 - 5. Oklahoma Department of Transportation, Ottawa County, #FP-17-54
 - 6. Oklahoma Department of Transportation, Sequoyah County, #FP-17-55
 - 7. Oklahoma Department of Transportation, Woodward County, #FP-17-56

- N. Consideration of and Possible Action on Applications for Accreditation of Floodplain Administrators:
None

4. PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED NEW AND AMENDED PERMANENT RULES OF THE BOARD **Vice Chairman Hitch**

A. Staff Presentations and Public Comment on Amendments to Permanent Rules Proposed for Adoption During 2018.

This public hearing is an opportunity for interested persons to present oral or written argument, data, and views on the new and amended rules of the Board which are being proposed for Title 785 of the Oklahoma Administrative Code specified below.

Other than this public hearing, no action will be taken by the Board on the proposed rules at the January 16, 2018 meeting. The comment period for these proposed amendments is currently ongoing and will expire at the conclusion of the Board meeting on January 16, 2018. The proposed amended rules are expected to be scheduled for consideration and possible adoption or any other action by the Board at its February 20, 2018 meeting.

Vice Chairman Hitch stated to the audience that he is acting chairman of the meeting today as OWRB Chairman Ford Drummond is unable to attend. He stated anyone that wanted to speak to the Board today should sign in, and stated each person would be limited to two minutes. He asked that comments be new and not be repetitive to other speakers on the same issue. The 2018 Public Hearing on proposed rules began at 10:03 a.m.

1. a. Summary of Proposed Amendments to Chapter 5 – Fees – Mr. Kent Wilkins and Mr. Bill Cauthron

Mr. Kent Wilkins addressed the members said that today staff is proposing amendments to four chapters: 5, 45, 46, and 50; and proposed a new Chapter 32 regarding Aquifer Storage and Recovery. He said Mr. Bill Cauthron and Mr. Joe Freeman will speak to their Division's proposed rules changes.

Mr. Wilkins referred to the proposed rules provided the members in the meeting notebooks, and reviewed the proposed Chapter 5 updates to fees related to specific applications and petitions, creates a new fee for Aquifer Storage and Recovery, eliminates several unnecessary and unneeded fees, changes to loan application language, and creates a fee related to site-specific criteria for water quality standards.

Mr. Wilkins stated throughout the past year, the OWRB Water Rights staff has tracked work hours required to analyze and review correspondence and process applications. He described the application process and said the fees reflect direct service provided to the customer. The application fees of surrounding states of Nebraska, Kansas, Texas, and New Mexico were reviewed and other than New Mexico, Oklahoma fees are lower. He said it was determined that the actual fee structure covered very little of the work being done by the OWRB Permitting Section staff, and there is also technical review, legal review, hearings and information technology which contribute to the process which the current fees only cover by about 60% of the actual work being performed. Mr. Wilkins stated the current proposed updated fee schedule on an average year will increase revenue by about \$120,000.00, increasing to about 70% in covering the OWRB actual work performed and while not covering 100%, the proposal is a reasonable increase.

Mr. Wilkins began on page 4009 of the Board's packet and reviewed the three major proposed fee changes in Chapter 5:

Subchapter 1. General Provisions

785:5-1-1. Purpose [AMENDED]

785:5-1-2. Definitions [AMENDED]

785:5-1-3. Board to charge and collect fees [AMENDED]

785:5-1-6. Stream water permit application and administration fees [AMENDED]

785:5-1-7. Watercourse reclamation permit fee [REVOKED]

785:5-1-10. Groundwater application and administration fees [AMENDED]

785:5-1-14. Stream Water and Groundwater petition fees [AMENDED]

785:5-1-15. Fees for reproduction, maps and publications [AMENDED]

785:5-1-16. Fees required in other matters [AMENDED]

785:5-1-17. Loan application fees [AMENDED]

785:5-1-19. Request for Water Quality Standards site specific criteria fee [NEW]

785:5-1-20. Aquifer storage and recovery permit fees [NEW]

Mr. Wilkins explained the increase for stream water permit applications (785:5-1-6) is based upon the amount of water that is being applied for, and there is a graduated fee scale accordingly, which he noted with the minimum of \$250.00 and maximum of \$4,000.00. There is a proposed increase on applications for a stream water permit from a scenic river, outstanding water resource, and provisional temporary permits and expedited provisional temporary permits.

Regarding groundwater application fee increases (785:5-1-10), Mr. Wilkins said the amount increase is from a minimum of \$250 and maximum of \$4,000, as well as provisional temporary permits from \$200 to \$250.00 or expedited applications.

The third main section of the fee proposals regards stream water and groundwater petition fees (785:5-1-14, (1) through (6)), increasing from \$55 to \$100, from \$155 to \$200. Mr. Wilkins explained staff is conducting additional review on the provisional permit applications as historically the amount applied for was .5 to 3 acre feet; however, now 90-day applications are being made for 100-500 acre-feet to frac horizontal wells. Review of the larger applications include whether water is available, whether there is adequate land dedicated to the permit, if looking at situations where there is conflict between domestic users and oil and gas users. Mr. Wilkins stated other proposed rule changes regarded fees that are unnecessary and or outdated and are proposed to be eliminated.

Finally, Mr. Wilkins noted the new filing and application fee for aquifer storage and recovery permit (785:5-1-20) fees of \$5,000.00, with an annual review fee of \$2,000.00. The permit application process will be complex with site-specific plans to recover the water, demonstration of no impact to adjacent water right users, etc., and staff estimated the level of effort that will be needed would cost about \$7,000.00 with a hearing and \$4,000.00 without a hearing. This fee regards the new proposed Chapter 32. Ms. Cunningham added this would be per statute; the applicant is required to submit a highly technical engineering and hydrologic study to determine when you put water into the system, where is it going and how the applicant is assuring it is taking out the quantity that was put in. She said there is a suite of rules proposed to implement the statute and for the engineering and legal review and approval process. Mr. Wilkins added these types of projects will be quite expensive and the proposed fee will not be cost prohibitive.

Mr. Bill Cauthron, Chief, Water Quality Programs Division, addressed the members and stated the Water Quality Programs Division is pursuing a new fee related to site-specific criteria development in the process, contained in 785:5-1-19, and the amount proposed is \$5,000.00. Mr. Cauthron explained site-specific criteria and for example, he referred to the criteria developed some years ago regarding the Illinois River. This proposal refers to an interested party such as a municipality, industry, or business that is interested in looking at metals criteria which is highly related to hardness. Generally, the criteria is developed when the water quality standard for a certain discharge point is not necessarily indicative of the area, and a request is made for a site-specific criteria -- water effects study -- and are generally looking for a number that will relax the criteria in the permit allowing greater flexibility. The OWRB staff provides a guidance document outlining how the studies should be conducted, hire a consultant to perform the work, and staff provides input, guidance and technical thought regarding the study, review documents for completeness and accuracy, and work closely with the entity to consult regarding the number that will be implemented.

b. Questions and Discussion by Board Members. Mr. Buchanan asked how the other states' fees compared and Mr. Wilkins stated that New Mexico charged only one fee, which is lower than Oklahoma's, and no matter the type of permit. He said Texas, Nebraska and Kansas fees are higher and the proposed fee increase will bring Oklahoma in line closer with surrounding states, except Oklahoma. Ms. Cunningham added other western states' fees were also reviewed. California fees were significantly higher, and were dropped from the comparison. Mr. Allen asked the last time fees were adjusted and Mr. Wilkins answered a minor increase was approved in 2010 and was the last time there was any increase. Mr. Buchanan stated the fee increases for stream water and groundwater are basically the same, where stream water permits are for public water and groundwater is a private property right. Mr. Wilkins explained that groundwater permits are more complicated citing an instance where a landowner applied to amend his groundwater permit from 100 acre-feet to 10,000 acre-feet which required an additional six weeks to review the deeds and leases requiring a considerable amount of effort. He said there have been several large applications for oil and gas use over the past years, as well as more landowners making applications than in the past. Ms. Cunningham added there has also been an increase in protested applications as water -- stream water and groundwater -- becomes more high profile, well spacing, etc., adding another level of costs. There is no additional fee if a protest is received which requires a hearing making 75% of staff attorney time dedicated to the water permitting process.

Regarding the Water Quality Standards site specific criteria fee, Ms. Cunningham asked if that is an EPA requirement. Mr. Cauthron responded it is an EPA requirement as part of rule promulgation for Chapter 45, i.e., current proposal for copper for the City of Idabel; the results will go through the normal rulemaking process, with final approval by the EPA. Mr. Cauthron said the fee is roughly a month's time for the staff reviewing the study when dealing with an entity familiar with the work; but

will not cover staff time for work with an entity that is not familiar with the process. Mr. Buchanan asked the fee prior to the proposed increase, and Mr. Cauthron answered there was no prior fee. Mr. Buchanan stated this is not a revenue-generator, but just covers costs, and Mr. Cauthron responded with only one or two permit applications per year, the fee will not generate revenue.

There were no other questions by members.

c. Public Comment. Vice Chairman Hitch invited members of the public to comment on the proposed fees.

There were no comments by the public on the proposed amendments to Chapter 5.

2. a. Summary of Proposed Amendments to Chapter 32 – Aquifer Storage and Recovery

Mr. Kent Wilkins stated to the members this is a new chapter specifically for aquifer storage and recovery following the passage of Senate Bill 1219 in 2016 directing the OWRB to promulgate and implement rules regarding the taking and use of water stored in an aquifer pursuant to a site specific storage and recovery plan. The agency was also directed to mandate the spacing of wells necessary to ensure the storage of water and recovery does not interfere with any domestic or permitted groundwater use in the basin. Water Quality Standards reflecting the legislation was approved in 2016 and regarded water quality, this proposed chapter regards water quantity. Mr. Wilkins explained the criteria for applying for a permit, including a recovery plan and minimum standard for well spacing which also includes rules for the processing and approval of applications and public notice requirements. The applicant must have legal access to the property; submit a site-specific plan to the Board that will be part of the application and approved at the time the permit application is approved. Compliance with the Department of Environmental Quality rules is required before being submitted to the OWRB Board for approval and a water permit for the source water will be required including reuse water from another basin. An ASR well shall not interfere with a permitted groundwater use in the basin, and there are distance requirements in place in bedrock aquifers for no new or proposed wells at 1320 feet within existing or proposed wells, and 660 feet in terrace deposit basins, and in sensitive sole source basins. An ASR system shall not interfere with base flow to groundwater that supplies springs or creeks where the Maximum Annual Yield has been determined, which is the Arbuckle Simpson at this point in time. Mr. Wilkins stated the entity will have to complete a site-specific plan for storing and recovering water, identify the area of hydrologic influence, recharge and recovery rates, infiltration rates, and a plan in place to determine the portion of the water that will actually be recovered. The location of the water system features will be identified, along with an annual site monitoring plan which is reviewed on an annual basis. Additional requirements include a basic description of the aquifer and surrounding aquifers and a general geologic description; know the elevation of the groundwater, location of water rights and other wells in the area, and general groundwater flow direction. For the aquifer that will be recharged, site specific characteristics of the aquifer are to be identified, i.e., storage capacity, hydraulic conductivity, transmissivity, saturated thickness, and the recharge per year. Public notice is required in county or counties where the site is located, certified mail notification for landowners located within a certain distance from any ASR activity, and any person may protest and present evidence and testimony as long as the protest is ruled valid. If the permit is denied by staff, the applicant has a right to appeal through a hearing before the Board. Mr. Wilkins reviewed the components of an annual review of the permit and site-specific plan, and staff developed a flow chart to guide the applicant through the process, i.e, flow direction, amount of source water recovered, effects of the operation on the water table, leakage, increases/decreases in discharge rates on the groundwater, and impacts to surface water features. Mr. Wilkins stated staff's belief that to achieve success collaboration should occur between the OWRB, DEQ, and the applicant as it will be important to document what is thought to happen and what does happen, which is why data collections and analysis is important. The OWRB has designed

rules regarding water quantity to be flexible for planning and designing systems. He said staff believes ASR water will be a reliable tool in the future to have fresh water resources for Oklahoma.

Subchapter 1. General Provisions [NEW]

785:32-1-1. Purpose [NEW]

785:32-1-2. Definitions [NEW]

Subchapter 3. Permit Application Requirements and Processing [NEW]

785:32-3-1. Requirement for permit [NEW]

785:32-3-2. Site-specific aquifer storage and recovery plan [NEW]

785:32-3-3. Well spacing [NEW]

785:32-3-4. Fees [NEW]

785:32-3-5. Acceptance of application for filing; when applications deemed withdrawn [NEW]

785:32-3-6. Notice of application [NEW]

785:32-3-7. Approval of application [NEW]

Subchapter 5. Aquifer Storage and Recovery Permits [NEW]

785:32-5-1. Contents of permits [NEW]

785:32-5-2. Withdrawal of stored water [NEW]

785:32-5-3. Annual reports [NEW]

785:32-5-4. Cancellation or suspension of permits [NEW]

b. Questions and Discussion by Board Members. Mr. Hitch asked if the leakage (from an ASR activity) would be deducted from the amount covered. Mr. Wilkins answered yes, there would be a complete water balance occur where water losses and gains would be identified. Mr. Darby asked who would be making an application for this type of activity, and Mr. Wilkins said that, in general, most likely the applicant would be a larger municipality or larger industrial facility; it is not anticipated a small farmer or irrigator, or small city would find it beneficial. Mr. Melton asked if this would be used for fracking, and Mr. Wilkins said this is not considered injection but recharge. He said it is not done under pressure that would cause fracturing of the aquifer--this would have to be identified in the site-specific plan. Ms. Cunningham asked if this is something that could be seen to recycle oil and gas water, and Mr. Wilkins responded that the water to recharge would have to be in compliance with the Water Quality Standards for that basin, so potentially if there were reuse water that could meet that standard it could be stored for use in the future for fracking purposes. Mr. Drake asked how the agency was working with the Department of Environmental Quality. Mr. Wilkins said DEQ's responsibility regards implementation of the water quality standards; the OWRB is concerned with water quantity. He said a stakeholders meeting was held in November 2017 and DEQ had comments about the OWRB quantity regulations. Ms. Cunningham mentioned and Mr. Wilkins explained DEQ personnel had conducted a study on standards in other states on water quality and OWRB staff looked at rules in other states regarding water quantity. Ms. Cunningham said this is potentially increasing storage capacity, it is an option and fairly rare and expensive to assess not only the water quality issues the aquifer to make sure the water quality is protected, and making sure groundwater rights are not interfered with when withdrawing this water.

Mr. Stallings asked if there will be a permit from the DEQ. Mr. Saba Tahmassebi, Chief Engineer with the Department of Environmental Quality, approached the members and responded DEQ had worked closely with OWRB and the groups on the water quantity rules and overall is supportive of the effort, but has submitted minor comments. He explained Senate Bill 1219 requirements for a DEQ approval and permit prior to the OWRB issuing a water quantity/water rights permit. The DEQ passed rules in January and will go before Legislative approval this session. He explained the DEQ process for an applicant that DEQ staff and OWRB staff will meet with an applicant so that everyone "is on the

same page." Mr. Hitch asked if applications will be made to the agencies simultaneously, and Saba responded no, the DEQ permit will be issued before the OWRB permit. Ms. Sara Gibson, OWRB Interim General Counsel, stated an OWRB permit can be applied for at the same time; however, the Board will not consider it until the DEQ permit has been issued. She and Saba stated it will be a type of underground injection permit (UIC) and that a water treatment permit will also be needed. Saba further explained the DEQ chapter dedicated to ASR which includes provisions for injections and that three permits will be required: (1) treatment of raw water to be amenable to the purpose of the aquifer, (2) construction of the facility, and (3) operation of the facility. Mr. Allen noted the comments made regarding waste by pollution, and asked if through coordinated effort the DEQ is making determination of waste by pollution. Saba responded DEQ makes determination of the content of the water for the area of hydrologic effect, and OWRB makes the determination of where the water will go and how will that affect the water table; it makes sense for one study rather than two and is important that both agencies work together and eliminate duplication. Ms. Gibson confirmed the waste by pollution statutes whether under the jurisdiction of DEQ, for example or Department of Agriculture permitting process, determination of pollution is by other agencies, not the OWRB. Mr. Allen stated then, while not being duplicative, there is no conflict between the agencies. Mr. Wilkins added the agencies had tried to not have duplicative services, and he thanked Saba and his team for reviewing and providing comments, and collaboration on the matter.

There were no other questions by the Board members regarding rules proposals for Chapter 32.

c. Public Comment. Vice Chairman Hitch invited members of the public to make comments within the limit of two minutes.

Mr. Cody Holcomb, City of Ada, approached the Board and stated his appreciation to the Board and staff on this effort, and believed it will assist in the state achieving the Water for 2060 goal. Mr. Holcomb commented on the following definitions: 785:32-1-2, changing "area of hydrologic influence" to "area of hydrologic effect" as regards the raising of the water table; 785:32-3-2 (a)(1)(D)(3), and 785:32-3-2 (a)(2)(A), changing "wells screened" to "wells as desired or determined" as a screened well may be detrimental to necessary data; 785:32-3-3 regarding well spacing, whether that is the same language regarding the separation of streams and springs; and 785:32-3-3(c) regarding well spacing within a sensitive sole source groundwater basin and that the notice of application was burdensome to the extent notice is based on reasonable criteria; and 785:32-3-7 (a) adding "reasonable" to "substantial, competent evidence..."

Mr. Holcomb and the Board members talked about whether comments written following his presentation could be submitted for consideration due to the limitation of two minutes and that he had not prepared written comments. Mr. Drake added this is a pilot project in the Arbuckle Simpson and sensitive, and Ms. Gibson stated that his comments will be in the record, and he could submit what he had stated today, but could not add new comments. He asked if there is opportunity to work with staff, and Ms. Gibson said that staff would evaluate comments received today and propose changes if there are any to the Board at the next meeting. Mr. Drake asked and staff answered the Board will not vote today, and Vice Chairman Hitch added this hearing is at the end of a 45-day period --longer than the statutorily required 30-day period--allowing more time to submit written comment. Vice Chairman Hitch extended the comment time per person to three minutes, and Ms. Cunningham said Mr. Holcomb had mentioned the areas and he could provide written comment for clarification.

Ms. Krystina Phillips, represented the Citizens for the Protection of the Arbuckle Simpson Aquifer (CPASA), and provided written comments which were included in the members meeting materials. Ms. Phillips stated to members that the CPASA's mission is to protect the springs and streams that emanate from the ASA (Aquifer) as well as the aquifer itself. Generally, CPASA is supportive of the Chapter 32 rules, and feel it is in the best interest of the State to explore management

techniques as water demands increase, as well as climate change. She did not review all written comments provided, but highlighted three: (1) that mines be included in the definition of "aquifer storage and recovery" as is included in SB 597 and the agreement requiring mines to submit annual reports; (2) a detailed site specific plan is necessary in order to process the ASR activity and suggests the Board specify in its rules that information needed that does not already exist be undertaken by the applicant in coordination with the OWRB, i.e, maximum annual yield determination; and (3) because the county that overlies the ASA does not have a newspaper of general circulation for public notice, CPASA requests that the OWRB create a database or software for electronic notification, for instance, when an ASR application is made.

There were no other comments from the public regarding on Chapter 32.

3. a. Summary of Proposed Amendments to Chapter 45 – Oklahoma’s Water Quality Standards

Mr. Bill Cauthron reviewed the changes to Chapter 45 stating the proposal regards the copper site specific change for the City of Idabel. Copper toxicity is related to water chemistry and water hardness. The City has the option to adjust the criteria to reflect its site specific conditions which it has done following the OWRB guidance document, conducted the water effects study for Mud Creek and proposed new numbers for acute and chronic. He said staff has reviewed and determined all requirements in the guidance document have been met.

Ms. Cunningham stated this is a Clean Water Act, Environmental Protection Agency authorized process which is included in the OWRB rules. Mr. Cauthron stated, yes, and that Idabel followed the process for generating the site specific criteria as part of any standards-setting process. There are certain items required by EPA that must be met, and EPA will approve the proposed numbers, after having been approved by the Board, the Legislature and Governor. The EPA may also consult with other agencies for comments.

Subchapter 5. Surface Water Quality Standards

Part 5. Special Provisions

785:45-5-25. Implementation Policies for the Antidegradation Policy

Statement [AMENDED]

Subchapter 7. Groundwater Quality Standards

785:45-7-1. Scope and Applicability; Purpose [AMENDED]

Appendix E. Requirements for Development of Site-Specific Criteria for Certain Parameters [REVOKED]

Appendix E. Requirements for Development of Site-Specific Criteria for Certain Parameters [NEW]

b. Questions and Discussion by Board Members. There were no questions by Board members.

c. Public Comment. Vice Chairman Hitch invited public comments.

Mr. Cody Holcomb, City of Ada, stated he had met with staff and discussed antidegradation issues regarding nitrates, and asked if that is being addressed in Chapter 45 proposals that are being considered today. Mr. Cauthron responded those issues are not related to the City of Idabel proposal.

Mr. Ken Komiske did not provide comments regarding the proposal to Chapter 45.

There were no other comments to the proposals for Chapter 45.

4. a. Summary of Proposed Amendments to Chapter 46 – Implementation of Oklahoma’s Water Quality Standards – Mr. Bill Cauthron addressed the members and stated the Water Quality Standards contain a designation for SWSR--Sensitive Water Supply Reuse. He provided background

that the Sensitive Water Supply (SWS) designation has existed for some time and usually applied to smaller municipal reservoirs for drinking water. Staff brought to the Board the reuse classification which the Board did approve to advance Water for 2060. The rules proposed now are to allow Indirect Potable Reuse (IPR) projects to move forward, where treated municipal water could be discharged to a SWS reservoir. These proposed rules outline the process to move a water into the SWSR classification, initiated by an interested party and requirements that need to be met, specifically, providing water quality and water planning information, stakeholder notice documentation, drought of record information and water monitoring information, all included in the proposed rules.

Mr. Cauthron explained the current antidegradation policy in the OWRB rules has a 3-tier protection: (1) basic protection for all waters of the state; (2) protection that maintains or improves water quality--high quality waters, sensitive water supply, and sensitive water supply reuse; and (3) outstanding resource water, i.e., scenic rivers. Mr. Cauthron stated in general from tier 3 down there is decreasing water quality, but does not allow impairment. The proposal is to amend the current tiers to include a 2.5 level which requires determination of assimilative capacity, moving the existing language to a new tier, and he explained the process for moving a water body to an SWSR. The proposed amendments indicated by underline and strikethrough, and additionally, substantive changes include 785:46-13-4, and 785:46-13-8 regards moving language in creating the new tier 2.5; he emphasized that is not new language. The new language regards SWSR under 785:46-13-4(a).

Mr. Cauthron said there were three public stakeholder meetings to receive informal comment, as well as 15 individual meetings with stakeholders, the formal comment period that ends today, and email notice to 270 parties as well as postal notice to 680. He added there is a WQS/IPR work group that has been meeting periodically for some time representing several agencies, cities and consulting firms, which vetted the concepts and subject matter experts that provided input.

Subchapter 13. Implementation of Antidegradation Policy

785:46-13-1. Applicability and scope [AMENDED]

785:46-13-4. Tier 2 protection; maintenance and protection of ~~high quality waters, sensitive water supplies, and~~ Sensitive Water Supply-Reuse and other Tier 2 waterbodies [AMENDED]

785:46-13-5. ~~Tier 3 protection; prohibition against degradation of water quality in outstanding resource waters~~ Tier 2.5 protection; maintenance and protection of high quality waters, sensitive water supplies, and other tier 2.5 waterbodies [AMENDED]

785:46-13-6. ~~Protection for Appendix B areas~~ Tier 3 protection; prohibition against degradation of water quality in outstanding resource waters [AMENDED]

785:46-13-7. Protection for Appendix B areas [NEW]

785:46-13-8. Antidegradation review in surface waters [NEW]

b. Questions and Discussion by Board Members. Mr. Buchanan stated then there is very little new language, just shifted language, and Mr. Cauthron that is correct.

There were no other questions by Board members regarding proposals to Chapter 46.

c. Public Comment. Vice Chairman Hitch invited members of the public to provide comments to the proposed amendments to Chapter 46. He asked that comments be kept concise as possible and not repetitive to others' comments.

Mr. Alan Woodcock, US Fish and Wildlife Service, stated to the Board he had looked at the proposed amendments and is still evaluating the impact the wildlife refuges in southeast Oklahoma and would appreciate the opportunity to learn more and have dialogue.

Mr. Cody Holcomb, City of Ada, stated to the members the City intends to be the first applicant and an initial application is with the DEQ now and the City is currently applying for over a

million dollars in grants to do ASR. He said there is a lot of time, man power and money in this effort and he wanted to understand and see the path forward if the Board approved the rules, and if an application is made. He asked if the Board could approve the city's application based on the rules today if provided the information required in the rules. He said ASR benefits landowners, cities, downstream municipalities, and he wanted to be sure that the antidegradation has been addressed in Chapter 45. He asked for assurance that ASR can be implemented if the amendments in Chapter 32, 45, and 46 are approved, and Mr. Cauthron answered, yes.

Mr. Ken Komiske, Utilities Director for the City of Norman, addressed the members and stated support for these rules. He had earlier submitted to staff a signed resolution by the Norman City Council supporting the effort and these rules. He said the rules require a lot of reporting, testing, requirements and monitoring prior to starting the project and he asked why we would want to do that. Because we need the water, he said, and this is the heart and soul of the Water for 2060 initiative. Whether it is because communities are growing, or whether there is a drought, more water is going to be needed. He mentioned that Norman had borrowed \$50 million from the OWRB to upgrade its water reclamation facility, which is the single greatest asset for any city because technology, treatment, and discharge are now better.

Ms. Krystina Phillips, representing CPASA, stated general support for the rules. The aquifer is the host of two high quality waters -- Pennington Creek and the Blue River -- and it is important to the citizens to protect the water quality and the rules impose requirements that protect water quality. Particularly given the interconnection between the aquifer, creeks and springs, it is important to have an overarching structure to protect the water quality of both surface water and groundwater. The CPASA supports the OWRB continuing to facilitate that endeavor.

Mr. Robert Streets, Assistant Public Works Director, City of Midwest City, spoke to the members and stated he is representing 57,305 citizens of Midwest City and he submitted a resolution unanimously passed by the City of Midwest City Council reaffirming Council Resolution no. 2015-07 stating its opposition to the implementation of any type of augmentation project for Lake Thunderbird by way of indirect potable reuse of treated wastewater effluent without regard to unregulated emergency contaminants of concern. Mr. Streets offered three comments (stated in the resolution): (1) Even though the SWS-R rule has merit, or at the very least limited application in regions of the State that are arid and particularly prone to drought, It would not be prudent in any situation or circumstances to allow a new permitted discharge to ANY impaired water body such as those enumerated in the 303-D list; (2) Given the credible dangers associated with contaminants of emerging concern (CEC) and the lack of peer reviewed research and defensible scientific findings to prove that pharmaceutical compounds in particular, do not pose a risk to any aquatic wildlife or human beings, it would be prudent to postpone any path forward for indirect or direct potable reuse until water quality standards with specific Maximum Contaminant Levels (MCL's) are developed and approved for all known CEC's; and (3) If an SWS-R designation is granted or allowed, then the estimated additional volume of water should in no way be allowed to be considered in the permitted allocations to surface water treatment facilities from the reservoir. If in fact the spirit of the amendment to allow the discharge of treated wastewater, directly or indirectly, to any SWS is to prevent or mitigate drought conditions, then the additional volume or augmentation should only be used to preserve existing allocations and should not be used to calculate or amend any increase to existing allocations. Mr. Streets added if IPR is allowed and new allocations are developed based on additional augmentation but then can't treat to the standard the Board is allowing excessive allocation on a water body that should had limitations put in place. He said Midwest City has never had to limit water use to its citizens and if in a situation such as Norman, he would recommend DPR rather than IPR as the best use of the water is tied to the head of the plant, not indirectly to a stream. He said impacting the residents of Midwest City so that Norman citizens can have water is unfair.

Mr. Bill Graham, Public Utilities Director for the City of Del City, stated to the members City Manager Mark Edward, was unable to attend. He said he will submit a resolution, and Del City is in unison with the City of Midwest City. He said the water regulations at the tap will not change as the ability to analyze the water only increase as will the regulations. Del City has not had to implement water rationing but if the source water is degraded the plant water will be degraded, and he was concerned the plant would then have to be modified costing the citizens. He asked for further review.

Vice Chairman Hitch asked if Mr. Graham had participated in the 45-day comment period, and Mr. Graham responded he had not participated personally, but was aware of it.

There were no other comments or questions regarding the proposals for Chapter 46.

3. a. Summary of Proposed Amendments to Chapter 50 – Financial Assistance –

Mr. Joe Freeman stated to the members that the Financial Assistance Staff goal this year was to make the rules user friendly. A product workgroup was formed comprised of service provider representatives and division staff that recommended reduction of redundant rules found in other legal citations, statutes, and EPA and DEQ rules. Certain sections of the rules were modified that do not require updates to EPA, the National Environmental Policy Act, or require federal reauthorizations or appropriation when the rules changes are made. The emergency grant rules were moved to a separate section within Subchapter 6, making it easier for staff and applicants to follow. The loan application fee schedule has been amended in Chapter 5 to clarify the fees are not exceeding a certain dollar amount. Mr. Freeman stated staff had not received any comments following completion of the proposed rule modifications.

Subchapter 1. General Provisions

785:50-1-2. Definitions [AMENDED]

Subchapter 5. Applications for Financial Assistance

785:50-5-1. Application form and required information [AMENDED]

785:50-5-2. Application verification and approval [AMENDED]

Subchapter 6. Water and Sewer Program Emergency Grants Requirements and Procedures [NEW]

785:50-6-1. Approval criteria [NEW]

785:50-6-2. Evaluation procedure for grant application [NEW]

785:50-6-3. Emergency grant priority point system [NEW]

785:50-6-4. Disbursement of grant funds [NEW]

Subchapter 7. Water and Sewer Program (~~Bond Proceed Loans and Emergency Grants~~State Loan Program Revenue Bond) Requirements and Procedures

785:50-7-1. General procedures [AMENDED]

785:50-7-2. Approval criteria [AMENDED]

785:50-7-3. Evaluation procedures for grant applications [REVOKED]

785:50-7-5. Emergency grant priority point system [REVOKED]

785:50-7-7. Disbursement of funds [AMENDED]

Subchapter 8. Rural Economic Action Plan (REAP) Grant Program Requirements and Procedures

785:50-8-3. Application review and disposition [AMENDED]

Subchapter 9. Clean Water State Revolving Fund Regulations

Part 1. General Provisions

785:50-9-9. Definitions [AMENDED]

Part 3. General Program Requirements

785:50-9-21. Eligible project [AMENDED]

785:50-9-24. Intended use plan [AMENDED]

- 785:50-9-28. Pre-Application for funding [AMENDED]
- 785:50-9-29. Pre-Planning conference [REVOKED]
- 785:50-9-30. Planning documents [AMENDED]
- 785:50-9-31. Pre-Application conference [REVOKED]
- 785:50-9-33. Application for financial assistance [AMENDED]
- 785:50-9-35. Loan closing [AMENDED]
- 785:50-9-36. Refinancing construction loans [AMENDED]
- 785:50-9-37. Minimum assistance agreement conditions [REVOKED]
- 785:50-9-38. Construction phase [AMENDED]
- 785:50-9-39. Project changes [AMENDED]
- 785:50-9-40. Building phase submittal [REVOKED]
- 785:50-9-41. Progress payments [REVOKED]
- 785:50-9-42. Retainage [AMENDED]
- 785:50-9-43. Post Building phase responsibilities of the recipient [AMENDED]
- 785:50-9-44. Accounting [AMENDED]
- 785:50-9-45. Compliance with federal authorities [AMENDED]
- Part 7. SRF Environmental Review Process
- 785:50-9-60. Requirement of environmental review [AMENDED]
- 785:50-9-61. Environmental information documents required by the Board [AMENDED]
- 785:50-9-62. Environmental impact statement review by the Board [AMENDED]
- Subchapter 10. Drinking Water Treatment Revolving Loan Program Regulations
- 785:50-10-3. Terms and conditions [AMENDED]
- Subchapter 11. Miscellaneous Provisions
- 785:50-11-4. Application fees [AMENDED]
- 785:50-11-5. Project completion, inspection and audit [AMENDED]
- 785:50-11-7. Approval and notification regarding certain proposed action of an eligible entity [REVOKED]
- 785: 50-11-10. Insurance requirements for loan recipients [AMENDED]

b. Questions and Discussion by Board Members. There were no questions by Board members regarding the proposed amendment to Chapter 50.

c. Public Comment. There were no comments by the public regarding the proposed amendments to Chapter 50.

The public hearing on the 2018 proposed new and amended permanent rules of the Board concluded at 11:30 a.m.

5. SPECIAL CONSIDERATION

A. No items. There were no Special Consideration items for the Board's consideration.

B. Consideration of and Possible Action on Items Transferred from Summary Disposition Agenda, if any. There were no items transferred from the Summary Disposition Agenda.

6. NEW BUSINESS

Under the Open Meeting Act, this agenda item is authorized only for matters not known about or which could not have been reasonably foreseen prior to the time of posting the agenda or any revised agenda.

There were no New Business items for the Board’s consideration.

7. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Vice Chairman Hitch adjourned the meeting of the Oklahoma Water Resources Board at 11:31 a.m. on January 16, 2018.

OKLAHOMA WATER RESOURCES BOARD

_____/s/_____
F. Ford Drummond, Chairman

_____/s/_____
Jason Hitch, Vice Chairman

_____/s/_____
Linda P. Lambert

_____/s/_____
Tom Buchanan

_____/s/_____
Charles Darby

_____/s/_____
Bob Drake

_____/s/_____
Robert L. Melton, Sr.

_____/s/_____
Robert Stallings

ATTEST:

_____/s/_____
Stephen B. Allen, Secretary (SEAL)