

OKLAHOMA WATER RESOURCES BOARD
OFFICIAL MINUTES
November 14, 2012

1. Call to Order

The regular monthly meeting of the Oklahoma Water Resources Board was called to order by Chairman F. Ford Drummond at 3:30 p.m., on November 14, 2012, in Salon A at the Tulsa Marriott Southern Hills, located at 1902 E. 71st Street, Tulsa, 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 November 7, 2012, at 3:30 p.m., at the Oklahoma Water Resources Board's offices.

A. Roll Call

Board Members Present

Ford Drummond, Chairman
Tom Buchanan, Secretary
Bob Drake
Ed Fite
Rudy Herrmann
Jason Hitch
Richard Sevenoaks

Board Members Absent

Linda Lambert, Vice Chairman
Marilyn Feaver

Staff Members Present

J.D. Strong, Executive Director
Dean Couch, General Counsel
Joe Freeman, Chief, Financial Assistance Division
Julie Cunningham, Chief, Planning and Management Division
Derek Smithee, Chief, Water Quality Programs Division
Amanda Storck, Chief, Administrative Services Division
Mary Schooley, Executive Secretary
Josh McClintock, Director of External Affairs

Others Present

Marla Peek, Oklahoma Farm Bureau, Oklahoma City, OK
Blake Rudd, City of Ardmore, OK
Arnella Karnes, State Chamber of Commerce, Oklahoma City, OK
Kenneth Schwab, City of Broken Arrow, OK
Roger Hughes, City of Broken Arrow, OK
Barbara Albritton, Indian Nations Council of Governments, Tulsa, OK/Town of Slick,OK
Christy Harper, Public Finance Law Group, Oklahoma City, OK
Andrew Pinkerton, TXI, Dallas, TX
Jason Groves, University of Tulsa Law School, Tulsa, OK
Tom Caldwell, City of Broken Arrow, OK
Tom Liu, Bank of America Merrill Lynch, New York, NY
Jesse M. Reed, Town of Oaks, OK
George Knight, Town of Oaks, OK
Mike Wofford, Town of Oaks, OK
Tom Pearce, Delaware County Rural Water District #11, Rose, OK
Mike Russell, Delaware County Rural Water District #11, Rose, OK
Prioe Abontgwa, School of Geology, Oklahoma State University, Stillwater, OK
Sharon Edgar, Eufaula, OK

B. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

Chairman Drummond said the draft minutes of the October 16, 2012, Regular Meeting had been distributed, and he asked if there were corrections to the minutes. There were none, and he stated he would entertain a motion to approve the minutes.

Mr. Herrmann moved to approve the minutes of the October 16, 2012 meeting, and Mr. Buchanan seconded.

AYE: Buchanan, Drake, Herrmann, Hitch, Drummond, Sevenoaks, Fite
NAY: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Feaver, Lambert

Mr. Sevenoaks and Mr. Fite joined the meeting at 3:31 p.m. and later in the meeting indicated their “aye” vote.

C. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S REPORT

Mr. Strong began his report stating he thought the Governor’s 33rd Annual Water Conference was highly successful, and he recognized staff for their efforts in coordinating the event, and the Board members’ participation. Chairman Drummond added his compliments.

Mr. Strong said there is little legislative activity at both the state and federal levels. He said today state legislators are participating in their swearing-in ceremony. Leadership positions will be filled, and bill filing deadline is set for next month, and the session will begin in February.

Mr. Strong offered congratulations on the passage of State Question 764 as many Board members were involved in the process on their own time, and he said staff is looking forward to the work ahead.

The maximum annual yield order for the Arbuckle Simpson is expected at any time, and there was a new development by protestors to stop or stay the process, Mr. Strong said. He said staff was looking at whether there would be any changes in the process as a result, and this is probably only one of many steps along the process. He mentioned mediation in ongoing in the Chickasaw/Choctaw litigation, and there has not been any new development from the Supreme Court on the Tarrant Case asking the Solicitor General to opine on whether to take the appeal; there is no time limit.

Mr. Strong mentioned the organizations he had spoken to: Save Our Water Lake Eufaula, Ag Expo, and the Weatherford Chamber of Commerce, and he had attended a screening of the “Dustbowl” with Congressman Lucas at Stillwater. He will be attending and speaking to the Western States Water Council Water Management Symposium in Phoenix, AZ the remainder of the week.

Mr. Strong concluded his report noting the distributed list of proposed meetings dates for 2013 for the 3rd Tuesday of each month with the exception of Water Day at the Capitol at May. The next meeting of the Board will be Tuesday, December 18, 2012, at the OWRB. Mr. Strong said there may or may not be a final proposed order regarding the Arbuckle Simpson Aquifer maximum annual yield, as it had been expected prior to that date.

D. Monthly Budget Report

Ms. Amanda Storck addressed the members and referred to the distributed budget report through the month of October 2012. She said there is 80% of the agency funding available and 67% of the fiscal year remaining. Ms. Storck concluded her report, and there were no questions by the Board members.

Mr. Ed Fite, Chairman of the Board’s Budget Committee, reported the committee met following the October meeting, that everything is in order regarding the budget, and it should be a good year for the OWRB.

Mr. Fite and Mr. Sevenoaks both indicated their “aye” vote on the minutes of the October meeting.

2. FINANCIAL ASSISTANCE DIVISION

A. Consideration of and Possible Action on a Proposed Order Approving Clean Water Funding Application for Broken Arrow Municipal Authority, Tulsa County. Recommended for Approval. Mr. Joe Freeman, Chief, Financial Assistance Division, stated to the members that this first item is a \$6,540,000.00 funding request by the Broken Arrow Municipal Authority. He said the Authority is requesting the loan to go along with \$500,000.00 in local funds for improvements to the Haikey Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant. He said improvements include replacement of a flow equalization basin liner, improvements to the wash down system, replace disinfection process equipment, install odor control system, replace an existing force main, improve the activated sludge handling system and aeration system. He said the loan will be

funded through the Clean Water State Revolving Loan Fund, and he noted provisions of the loan agreement. Broken Arrow has been a good, longtime loan customer of the Board's and currently has ten loans outstanding with the Board. He said the water and sewer connections had increased approximately 20% over the past ten years, and the debt coverage ratio stands at approximately 2.7-times. Staff recommended approval.

Mr. Thom Moton, City Manager; Mr. Tom Caldwell, Finance Director; Mr. Kenny Schwab, Director of Engineering; and Mr. Roger Hughes, Senior Special Projects Engineer were present in support of the loan request.

Mr. Schwab addressed the members and described this first step in the process to upgrade the 40-year old system, and Mr. Herrmann asked the cost for the remainder of the project. Mr. Schwab answered the plan looks at costs that may be incurred over the next ten years, which may be about \$120 million; he said the city would be looking at what could be done to simplify and minimize the process. Broken Arrow is a member of the 5-member Regional Metropolitan Utility Authority, including Bixby, Jenks, Owasso and the Tulsa Metropolitan Utility.

Mr. Fite moved to approve the CWSRF loan to the Broken Arrow Municipal Authority, and Mr. Herrmann seconded.

AYE: Buchanan, Drake, Herrmann, Fite, Hitch, Drummond
NAY: None
ABSTAIN: Sevenoaks
ABSENT: Feaver, Lambert

B. Consideration of and Possible Action on a Proposed Order Approving Clean Water Funding Application for Ardmore Public Works Authority, Carter County. Recommended for Approval. Mr. Freeman said this item is a \$8,880,000.00 Clean Water State Revolving Fund loan for the Ardmore Public Works Authority. He said the Authority is requesting the loan to rehabilitate nine sewer basins' mail lines, service lines, and manholes, and to perform heavy cleaning to restore capacity. Mr. Freeman noted provisions of the loan agreement, and said Ardmore has been a long-time loan customer of the Board's, and currently has four outstanding loans with a principal balance of \$29 million. The debt coverage ratio is a strong 2.14-times. Staff recommended approval of the loan request.

Mr. Blake Rudd, Assistant Public Works Director, was present in support of the loan application.

Mr. Herrmann asked the expected life of the improvements. Mr. Rudd said some of the infrastructure has been in the ground 100 years and before statehood, and he expected the improvements to have a life of 50 years.

Mr. Drake moved to approve the CWSRF loan to the Ardmore Public Works Authority, and Mr. Sevenoaks seconded.

AYE: Buchanan, Drake, Herrmann, Sevenoaks, Fite, Hitch, Drummond
NAY: None
ABSTAIN: None
ABSENT: Feaver, 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 from the Summary Disposition Agenda to the Special Consideration Agenda.

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

There were no changes to the Summary Disposition Agenda. Chairman Drummond asked if there were any questions regarding the Summary Disposition Agenda items. There were none, and he asked for a motion to approve the agenda.

Mr. Hitch moved to approve the Summary Disposition, and Mr. Buchanan seconded.

AYE: Fite, Feaver, Hitch, Sevenoaks, Herrmann, Buchanan, Drummond

NAY: None

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: Drake, Lambert

The following items were approved:

C. 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>
EODD				
a.	FAP-11-0023-R	Slick Public Works Authority	Creek	change of scope

D. Consideration of and Possible Action on Contracts and Agreements, Recommended for Approval:

1. Agreement with Meshek & Associates, PLC for Professional Engineering Services for Dam Breach Analysis and Mapping.
2. Second No-Cost Time Extension Agreement with Oklahoma State University Department of Natural Resource Ecology and Management for assessing oxbow wetlands and lakes in Oklahoma (Oxbow Phase II).
3. Proposed Resolution Authorizing Approval and Execution of Combined and Amended Liquidity Facility Commitment Agreements of State Street Bank and Trust Company in Connection with Obligations Relating to the Board's State Loan Program.

E. Applications for Temporary Permits to Use Groundwater:

1. Bonnie M. Muegge, Clay A. Muegge & Jennifer Muegge, Grant County, #2012-509
2. Don E. Muegge, Bonnie M. Muegge, Chad F. Muegge, Jill S. Muegge & Clay A. Muegge, Grant County, #2012-513

3. Collier Farms, L.L.C., Dewey County, #2012-516
4. DCP Midstream L.P., Garvin County, #2012-642

F. Applications to Amend Temporary Permits to Use Groundwater:

1. Alan Ritchey, Inc., Bryan County, #1993-602

G. Applications for Regular Permits to Use Groundwater:

1. Michael J. & Kathy Lee Martin, Greer County, #2011-582
2. Eddie Zaloudek & Sons, Inc., Garfield County, #2011-585
3. Dustin & Sonya Donley, Woodward County, #2012-636
4. Little River National Wildlife Refuge a.k.a. The Nature Conservancy, McCurtain County, #2012-641
5. Riverview Property Company, L.L.C., Cimarron County, #2012-647
6. Pony Creek Farms, Inc., Texas County, #2012-653

H. Applications to Amend Regular Permits to Use Groundwater:

1. Pony Creek Farms, Inc., Texas County, #1973-309
2. Stephens Land & Cattle Company, Inc., Texas County, #1981-507
3. Pony Creek Farms, Inc., Texas County, #1982-586
4. Tommy & Cathy Mitchell, Texas County, #1996-554

I. Applications for Regular Permits to Use Stream Water:

1. Grant & Patricia A. Watkins, Creek County, #2012-047
2. Larry G. & Sandra K. Duck, Creek County, #2012-048
3. Norman Golf Partners d.b.a. The Trails Golf Club, Cleveland County, #2012-049

J. Applications to Amend Regular Permits to Use Stream Water:

1. Johnnie M. Sisemore, Osage County, #2012-030

K. Well Driller and Pump Installer Licensing:

1. New Licenses, Accompanying Operator Certificates and Activities:

- | | | |
|---------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|
| <i>a. Licensee:</i> | <i>GA Services</i> | <i>DPC-0882</i> |
| <i>1. Operator:</i> | <i>Michael David Wright</i> | <i>OP-1939</i> |
| <i>Activities:</i> | <i>Heat exchange wells</i> | |

2. New Operators, Licensee Name Change, and/or Activities for Existing Licenses:

- | | | |
|---------------------|--|-----------------|
| <i>a. Licensee:</i> | <i>Oklahoma Environmental Services</i> | <i>DPC-0363</i> |
| <i>1. Operator:</i> | <i>Kyle Blankenship</i> | <i>OP-1936</i> |
| <i>Activities:</i> | <i>Monitoring wells and geotechnical borings</i> | |

L. Dam and Reservoir Construction:

1. Pine Springs Ranch, Atoka County, #OK30414
2. Pine Springs Ranch, Atoka County, #OK30415

M. Permit Applications for Proposed Development on State Owned or Operated Property within Floodplain Areas:

None

- N. Applications for Accreditation of Floodplain Administrators:
Names of floodplain administrators to be accredited and their associated communities are individually set out in the November 14, 2012 packet of Board materials

4. QUESTIONS AND DISCUSSION ABOUT AGENCY MATTERS AND OTHER ITEMS OF INTEREST.

- A. There were no items for the Board's consideration.

5. SPECIAL CONSIDERATION

For INDIVIDUAL PROCEEDINGS, a majority of a quorum of Board members, in a recorded vote, may call for closed deliberations for the purpose of engaging in formal deliberations leading to an intermediate or final decision in an individual proceeding under the legal authority of the Oklahoma Open Meeting Act, 25 O.S. 2001, Section 307 (B)(8) and the Administrative Procedures Act, 75 O.S. 2001, Section 309 and following.

A majority vote of a quorum of Board members present, in a recorded vote, may authorize an executive session for the purposes of CONFIDENTIAL COMMUNICATIONS between the public body and its attorney concerning a pending investigation, claim, or action if the public body, with the advice of its attorney, determines that disclosure will seriously impair the ability of the public body to process the claim or conduct the pending investigation, litigation, or proceeding in the public interest, under the legal authority of the Oklahoma Open Meetings Act, 25 O.S. 2001, Section 307(B)(4).

A. Application of Rural Water Sewer, Gas and Solid Waste Management District No. 11, Delaware County, to Acquire the Assets of Oaks Water Works, Inc.:

1. Summary – Ms. Julie Cunningham, Chief, Planning and Management Division, stated to the members this item regards an application to acquire assets of Oaks Water Works, Inc., by Delaware County Rural Water Sewer, Gas and Solid Waste Management District No. 11. She explained that the Oklahoma Acquisitions Assets Act states that anyone desiring to acquire the assets of a rural water district or rural water corporation must first go to the OWRB for the Board's review and the determination the acquisition will not adversely affect existing customers, or is in the interest of the public. There are four criteria: (1) acquisition of control would adversely affect the contractual obligations of the district or corporation, or its ability or commitment to render the same level of service to its customers; (2) the financial condition of the acquiring party might adversely affect the financial stability of the district or corporation; (3) the acquiring party's plans to liquidate the district or corporation, or consolidate or merge with other person or corporation would be detrimental to customers; and (4) the competence, experience and integrity of the persons who would control the operation of the district would not be in the interest of the customers and the public. If these criteria are absent, the Board must approve.

Ms. Cunningham said a hearing was conducted and the application was protested by the Town of Oaks; there was no one present representing the Oaks Water Works, Inc. Testimony was presented by Delaware #11 and the Town of Oaks, but it was not clear which parties would enter the contractual agreement. She said conclusion no. 6 makes clear the Board's assessment

of the four criteria and stated the affects of the four criteria are separate from an agreement between the two parties. The Board determines there is no basis for disapproval, the District clearly met the conditions of approval, and conditions between the parties are separate. Staff recommended approval according to the proposed findings of fact, conclusions of law and Board order.

Mr. Sevenoaks asked if the assets as well as the corporation were being purchased, and Ms. Cunningham said those details would be in the agreement between the parties. Mr. Dean Couch, OWRB General Counsel, stated that under the law, the Board is to review the proposal; the law came about in the mid-1990s when there was concern that private entities would attempt to acquire assets of public entities, primarily rural water. He said the legislature wanted a review of a private entity's capability to take over, operate, and provide water to citizens, and the law put into place that the OWRB is to analyze—both credit worthy and otherwise—the situation where a private entity would take over a public entity. However, the legislature also recognized that on occasion there may be a public entity seeking to take over another public water supply entity and in that statute the requirements are much less stringent, acknowledging that a public entity already should be capable of operating the system. What is presented here, he said, is a situation where the town voted in the 1960s—through what is now USDA Rural Development—to allow a nonprofit corporation to provide water so that the federal government could provide assistance. He said eventually the corporation became less active, attempted to convert to a rural water district, but it could not operate and sought Delaware #11 to take over.

Mr. Couch said the Board analyzed the information presented. The corporation tried to convert to RWD #12, but was not fully formed as an official entity, and the citizens were paying this “non-entity” (RWD #12) and forwarded that (payment) to RWD #11, which was supplying the water. The idea was that without the contractual step, RWD #11 would take over directly and be the supplier for those citizens within the municipality of the Town of Oaks. However, he said, in the process of presenting the information at the OWRB hearing, it became clear that some of the citizens wanted to take control through their public trust, but the order explains the limited decision by this agency under this law is only to analyze a proposal, and the Board's decision is not the final determination and agreement allowing the acquisition of assets. Mr. Sevenoaks asked the extent of the Board's decision—to say they can proceed? And Mr. Couch responded if the Board's decision is that if that were to occur, the citizens will be served correctly and has a credit worthy entity to supply the water. Again, the Board's analysis is limited, and is not a final determination of what will actually happen.

Mr. Drake said that staff recommended the Board's action be in favor (of the proposal) and he moved to approve.

Mr. Strong summarized that staff's recommendation is for approval, based on the limited scope of the decision which is not approving the takeover, but approving the application of the entity interested in taking over the corporation and is saying they are basically competent.

Mr. Hitch said he would second the motion for discussion.

Mr. Fite asked what entity provided water to the Town of Oaks during a shortage this past summer. Chairman Drummond said there is a motion and second, and he invited the representatives of the parties to address the Board, allowing five minutes each.

2. Discussion and presentation by parties. Mr. Tom Pearce, Secretary of Delaware County Rural Water District #11, said he put together the proposal with Oaks Water Works/Delaware RWD #12, and regarding the water supply issue for the Town, he said the wells went dry in August 2011 and the District had water lines within one mile of where they could

connect and are now the sole provider of water. Regarding the proposal, Mr. Pearce said he had no other testimony in addition to the Board's order and it has been stated well by staff. He said the only thing the District is not doing for Oaks Water Works is not providing the billing. He said the District's efficient manager, Mike Russell, is taking care of their system. Mr. Hitch asked, and Mr. Pearce responded there are two entities, Oaks Water Works, and Oaks Public Works Authority, which is the only protestant and were not included in the acquisition talks. Mr. Sevenoaks asked who owned the assets, and Mr. Pearce answered the non-profit corporation, the Oaks Water Works owns it outright. The Town of Oaks is not involved in the water distribution system. Mr. Sevenoaks asked if there is some value to the system, and Mr. Pearce said there is; that since the District has worked with the corporation, its water loss has been reduced from 60% to around 25%. Mr. Sevenoaks asked if the customers are metered, and Mr. Pearce said they are, but he wasn't certain how well the meters functioned.

Mr. Michael Wofford, with Doerner Saunders Daniel & Anderson law firm representing the Town of Oaks, addressed the members and introduced Town of Oaks Mayor George Knight and Town Clerk and Treasurer Jesse Reed. He said the recommended order has been closely examined, which he found in his view to be legally flawed. He said there are two things the hearing examiner found which they disagree with: (1) the acquisition would be in the public's interest, and (2) that the same level of service will be provided by RWD #11 as is currently being provided by the Oaks Water Works. He said that several years ago the sewer system became faulty and the Department of Environmental Quality met with all parties including the Town, and the solution was that the Oaks PWA would take over the system, and obtain financing for repairs. The Town of Oaks stepped up to solve the environmental issue for which there was no reasonable solution, and is obtaining financing. He argued that towns that don't own both the water and sewer systems have no leverage with citizens to get bills paid. The current PWA has an agreement with Oaks Water Works to cut off sewer service through proper procedures. The Town of Oaks is a water user of this system and that won't apply as a user of the system and without the agreement that is not in the public interest nor is that providing the same level service. He said the hearing examiner made the correct factual findings, but the conclusions cannot reach that level.

Mr. Wofford continued that it was established at the hearing that the Oaks Water Works may not possess the easements necessary to operate the water distribution system meaning RWD #11 would be acquiring a system that doesn't have easements. And, he said, in this situation the Town of Oaks would basically not be in control of the water system but be responsible for the system to be financial viable. He said it is important to examine the finances of RWD #11 which does not have its own water supply, as it purchases water from a private entity, and it appeared from the records at the hearing it is not operating at a "break-even point" and wants to acquire the corporation to become financially stable. Lastly, Mr. Wofford said a portion of the Town is located in Cherokee County and he questioned whether Delaware County RWD #11 had the legal authority to operate outside the county boundary. He also questioned the Board's interpretation of the governing statute as to what the Board is approving and that there must be final agreements. He argued there should be final agreements to make sure the Town will be supported, that they don't have the ability to acquire easements, then how is that in the public interest, or that the same level of service will be provided. Mr. Wofford said the Town would like to suggest that the Board not approve the application today, and that all the parties go to the table together to work out a way that the Town can have these interests addressed either through agreement or through the Town actually taking over the system which would provide long term

stability and long term agreement tying the sewer and water system together in the public interest.

The members asked about the boundary, why the Oaks PWA wasn't included in the negotiations, and Mr. Wofford said the Town was not given the opportunity and he asked for time to put final agreements in place. Mr. Drake said the Board is not to have involvement in the contractual agreements, the Board is following the law, and staff has recommended approval. Mr. Sevenoaks said the Town is giving up a revenue source, and it seemed logical to allow all the entities to get together and reach agreement before the Board approves it to go forward. Mr. Buchanan asked if approval precluded further negotiation, and Mr. Strong said, no, and the Board's approval does not preclude the Town of Oaks submitting an application for acquisition. Mr. Sevenoaks asked what happens next, there should be a step to conclude a contractual arrangement for the acquisition, and Mr. Strong responded they (the parties) may or may not reach an agreement. Mr. Wofford said it isn't in the public interest or same level of service unless those agreements are in place, and the law does not require the Board to approve it without the agreements.

Ms. Cunningham stated that under findings of fact #9, regarding the protestant issues, the District may obtain easements through eminent domain powers, and indicated it would through agreement discontinue water service if sewer charges aren't collected. In any event, it is not within the scope of the proceedings of the Board to determine which of several entities might best serve the acquiree, but whether the application before the Board meets the four criteria, and does not preclude others from reaching agreements.

Mr. Strong added this is a rare thing, but it has been the practice of the Board to view this as a simple step in the complicated process of acquisitions. Historically, the Board has not attempted to force parties to get together or mediate take overs such as this. The Board has separate statutory authority to settle boundary disputes and could be involved in that discussion, but it would be a departure from the practice of the Board which has been to determine if it is capable and competent. The Board is not saying it should or should not be one or the other, and could approve applications by both entities that they are competent, that is the limited role of the Board in the process.

3. Possible executive session – the Board did not vote to enter executive session.

4. Vote on whether to approve the proposed order as presented or as may be amended, or vote on any other action or decision relating to the proposed Order.

Chairman Drummond summarized, it's an unusual law, the staff found the application to meet requirements of the law and recommends approval. He said there is a motion and second, and he asked if there were further questions.

There were no further questions, and Chairman Drummond called for the vote.

AYE: Buchanan, Drake, Herrmann, Fite, Hitch, Drummond

NAY: Sevenoaks

ABSTAIN: None

ABSENT: None

B. Items transferred from Summary Disposition Agenda, if any.

There were no items transferred from the Summary Disposition Agenda.

6. CONSIDERATION OF SUPPLEMENTAL AGENDA ITEMS, IF ANY

There were no Supplemental Agenda items for the Board’s consideration

7. 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. Chairman Drummond reminded member the next meeting is December 18 in Oklahoma City, and he thanked the staff of the OWRB for the excellent 33rd Governor’s Water Conference.

8. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business, Chairman Drummond adjourned the meeting of the Oklahoma Water Resources Board at 4:20 p.m. on Wednesday, November 14, 2012.

OKLAHOMA WATER RESOURCES BOARD

_____/s/_____
F. Ford Drummond, Chairman

_____/s/_____
Linda P. Lambert, Vice Chairman

_____/s/_____
Edward H. Fite

_____/s/_____
Rudolf J. Herrmann

_____/s/_____
Marilyn Feaver

_____/s/_____
Richard Sevenoaks

_____/s/_____
Bob Drake

_____/s/_____
Absent
Jason W. Hitch

ATTEST:

_____/s/_____
Tom Buchanan
(SEAL)