

The Inference

AI, ENERGY, AND LONG HORIZON POLICY FOR OKLAHOMA

Issue #15 · June 6, 2026 · David Alan Birdwell and Æ · Humanity and AI, LLC

Water on the Meter

Oklahoma just became the first state to tie a groundwater permit to data-center cooling architecture.

Gov. Kevin Stitt signed Senate Bill 259 into law at the close of the 2026 legislative session — the bill that meters the groundwater big commercial users pull and requires any data center cooling itself with that groundwater to run a closed loop instead of evaporating it into the sky. It answers a question Issue 14 raised and Issue 13 left open: what does a data center owe the aquifer it draws from? HB 2992 priced grid cost. The moratorium wave that followed put consent on the table. SB 259 puts water on the meter.

Together the three measures begin to define an Oklahoma standard — cost, consent, and water — that no peer data-center state has yet enacted as a complete set.

Meanwhile, the national water bill keeps coming due. Erin Brockovich's crowdsourced data center map has crossed 3,600 community reports across 49 states since its April 28 launch; water and utility bills are the two infrastructure complaints that show up in nearly every submission. Texas's comptroller reported counties this spring where data-center groundwater draws are inside the same aquifers the state is paying to recharge. Arizona quietly extended hyperscale withdrawal review to additional projects this year. The federal frame is moving, too: the UK House of Commons inquiry on low-energy computing closed evidence on May 14, the same day the DOE NOFO Cycle 1 closed and the same week Fervo filed to go public. The supply-side and demand-side conversations are converging on the same constraint — water — through different doors.

Issue 13 asked what a data center should pay. Issue 14 asked who has the authority to decide. This issue asks the third question: how do you measure what it actually costs?

THE WATER LAW

OKLAHOMA

LEGISLATION

ENERGY

[SOURCE: Oklahoma Legislature (SB 259, 60th Leg.); OU Daily, KOSU / KGOU, Oklahoma Energy Today, NetChoice, Oklahoma Farm Bureau · April–June 2026]

SB 259: Groundwater on a Meter, Cooling in a Loop

Senate Bill 259 began as a groundwater-metering bill and left the Capitol as something larger. Its core — authored by Sen. Brent Howard (R-Altus) and carried in the House by Rep. Carl Newton (R-Cherokee) — requires commercial groundwater permit holders, not household wells, to meter what they pull from the ground and document it to the Oklahoma Water Resources Board. It closes a quiet loophole: under current law permit holders report against a

permitted cap, and many report the full cap rather than what they actually use, for fear a lower number gets their cap cut. The bill gives existing users an eight-year runway before metering is enforced and appropriates roughly \$1 million to the OWRB to clear its permit backlog and enforce compliance.

The data-center provision was not in the original bill. Rep. Nick Archer (R-Elk City), who chairs the House Energy and Natural Resources Committee, made it the price of a hearing — he told Newton he would not bring SB 259 up in the committee's final meeting of the session unless it was amended to address data-center water use. The amendment requires that any data center using groundwater as its primary cooling source operate closed-loop, dielectric-immersion, air-cooled, or other low-consumption cooling rather than the open evaporative systems behind the headline water-usage numbers. "We will not allow traditional open air evaporative cooling," Archer told the committee, which adopted the amendment without opposition and advanced the bill on an 8-0 "do pass."

One correction to how the bill is usually described: SB 259 does not borrow HB 2992's 75-megawatt large-load line. Its data-center trigger is not a megawatt threshold at all — it attaches to facilities that seek an OWRB groundwater permit and use that groundwater as their primary cooling source. And it does not ban evaporative cooling outright. It conditions the groundwater permit on low-water cooling, and meters everyone else.

How the Mechanism Works

The mechanism is the same one HB 2992 used on electricity: rather than block development, attach the cost honestly to the customer that causes it. A data center that wants to operate an open cooling tower in Oklahoma is not flatly prohibited from doing so under SB 259. It is required to meter the water it consumes, report what it consumes, and — if it draws that groundwater as its primary cooling source — install the cooling architecture that consumes materially less of it. The OWRB receives the data the agency does not currently collect. The Corporation Commission receives a record it can cite when adjudicating large-load tariffs. Residential and agricultural water users receive an answer to the question they have been asking at every city council and tribal council since the Tulsa and Oklahoma City moratoria passed: how much is the data center actually pulling out of our aquifer?

The Coalition That Carried It

The coalition is the part to watch. The rural and agricultural blocs that backed HB 2992 have the strongest interest in groundwater protection — they live on top of the Garber-Wellington, the Rush Springs, the Arbuckle-Simpson, and the Ogallala — and the Oklahoma Farm Bureau, which had opposed earlier versions, worked with Newton late in the session to shape a final bill it could support. The opposition was narrower but real and well-funded: the tech-industry group NetChoice formally asked Gov. Stitt to veto SB 259, endorsing the metering provisions while calling the cooling mandate a "blunt, statewide prohibition" that ignores the differences among Oklahoma's 23 groundwater basins — recharge in the Ogallala runs under half an inch a year, while eastern alluvial aquifers can exceed six. The metering, almost everyone could live with. The cooling mandate was the fight.

The Governor's Reversal

Stitt signed it anyway. He had vetoed Howard and Newton's nearly identical 2024 groundwater-metering bill, calling it government overreach and a violation of property rights — and in Oklahoma, groundwater is a private property right attached to the land above it. The 2026 bill added the data-center cooling provision on top of the same metering

language, and Stitt signed both. Whatever changed — the political calculus, the Farm Bureau's support, the weight of the moratorium wave — the result is that the governor who vetoed a water meter two years ago just signed a water meter and a cooling mandate into law. That is the fact that sets this issue's lede.

POLICY RELEVANCE

SB 259 is the water-side companion to HB 2992's cost-side floor. HB 2992 prices grid infrastructure honestly. SB 259 prices water consumption honestly — first by measuring it, then by biasing the cooling architecture toward the closed-loop systems that consume an order of magnitude less of it. Read alongside the moratorium wave, SB 259 is the kind of narrow, enforceable measure that the same rural-urban-tribal coalition behind HB 2992 could plausibly carry. Read alongside the Phoenix Wells thesis, SB 259 changes the economics in geothermal's favor: enhanced geothermal does not run a cooling-tower water cycle at all, so the cost of compliance with SB 259 for a behind-the-meter geothermal-served campus is structurally lower than for a grid-served, evaporatively-cooled one. The bill does not require geothermal procurement. It makes the alternative more expensive. That is the same lever HB 2992 pulled on the electricity side. The Oklahoma legislative pattern — narrow bills, honest pricing, no comprehensive frameworks — is the pattern showing up here again.

THE NATIONAL WATER MAP

NATIONAL

INFRASTRUCTURE

PROTECTION

[SOURCE: Brockovich Data Center Reporting, Bloomberg, Washington Post, Texas Tribune, Arizona Republic · April–June 2026]

Three Thousand Reports and Counting

Erin Brockovich's national data center map at brockovichdatacenter.com — launched April 28 — passed 3,600 community reports across 49 states in the five weeks since it went live. Water consumption remains the top specific infrastructure concern, though Brockovich noted on her Substack that the single most common word across all submissions is "transparency" — communities want to know what is being built, how much it will use, and who approved it. Texas leads the submission count, with Sulphur Springs alone accounting for 300 reports tied to the MSB Global hyperscale project.

Texas state officials reported this spring that multiple counties contain documented data-center groundwater draws inside aquifers the state's recharge programs are paying to restore. The state's existing groundwater conservation districts have authority to meter withdrawals but generally lack authority to deny them above a threshold. The federal posture under the current Department of Energy — that data centers are the answer rather than the problem, in Secretary Wright's framing — does not address the aquifer question, because the federal government does not regulate state groundwater rights. Each state regulates its own.

Arizona extended hyperscale withdrawal review to additional projects this year, continuing the slow tightening that began after the 2023 Tucson moratorium. Virginia's General Assembly took up but did not enact a data-center water disclosure bill in the short session. Georgia's Public Service Commission has begun asking water-related questions inside electricity dockets, an indirect approach that several other state commissions are watching.

The framing inside which all of this is moving is the one Gallup priced in May: 71 percent of Americans oppose a data center near them, with water and bills the two most-cited reasons. Issue 14 noted that opposition is now the statistical center of American public opinion. The state-level water response — Oklahoma's SB 259, Arizona's review process, Texas's emerging conservation-district debates — is the legislative shape that opinion is starting to produce.

POLICY RELEVANCE

The water-side legislative cycle is roughly twelve to eighteen months behind the cost-side cycle. HB 2992 in Oklahoma, comparable cost-attribution bills in Connecticut and Maryland, and the FERC discussions on large-load interconnection charges all sit on the cost side. Water bills are arriving now. SB 259 puts Oklahoma at the front of the water-side cycle in the same way HB 2992 put it at the front of the cost-side cycle. The states with the strongest aquifer dependencies — Oklahoma, Texas, Arizona, Georgia, and Virginia — are the ones most exposed to the next round of opposition organizing. The states that meter first have the data to defend their permitting decisions. The states that do not have a regulatory vacuum and a Brockovich map.

CLOSED LOOPS

OKLAHOMA

INFRASTRUCTURE

ENERGY

[SOURCE: Cerebras, Meta, Phytech, Data Center Dynamics, ASHRAE, EESI, Valicor, TechTarget · April–May 2026]

The Technology That Makes the Law Cheap to Comply With

The cooling architecture choice for a hyperscale data center used to be a vendor preference. SB 259 makes it a regulatory question. The good news for the operators already in Oklahoma is that the technology has moved.

Cerebras's 10-megawatt Oklahoma City facility — announced this spring in partnership with Scale Datacenters and previewed in Issue 14 — runs closed-loop liquid cooling end to end. The water in the system is sealed; the only makeup volume is the small amount lost to evaporation through the dry-cooled secondary loop, which is on the order of one to two percent of an open evaporative system serving the same thermal load. Cerebras's compliance posture under SB 259 is essentially trivial: the meter reports a number near zero, and the cooling architecture already meets the closed-loop requirement.

Meta's Project Anthem in Tulsa, which broke ground on April 21, is a more interesting case. Meta has made public commitments that exceed HB 2992's grid-cost requirements, and Issue 14 noted those commitments. The Phytech partnership covering 1,500 acres is sized to save more than 50 million gallons of water per year — a figure Meta has projected but not publicly baselined against disclosed open-cooling consumption. Whatever the baseline, Meta's stated water posture is consistent with the closed-loop architecture SB 259 requires. The same logic Issue 14 applied to HB 2992 applies here: when a well-resourced operator volunteers to exceed a regulatory minimum, the minimum should be the standard the next operator has to meet too.

The harder cases are the ones not yet built. Of the roughly ten announced Oklahoma data center projects totaling 1,700 megawatts, the cooling architecture choices of most have not been publicly disclosed. ASHRAE's 2024 guidance — the industry standard cooling reference — already treats closed-loop liquid cooling as the default architecture for any high-density AI workload above approximately 50 kilowatts per rack. The hyperscalers are already designing to that standard for compute reasons. SB 259 makes the water consequence of any deviation from that standard visible to the OWRB before the deviation gets built.

What the Loop Does Not Close

What the loop does not close is worth stating plainly, because the strongest version of the critique came up at a recent Sierra Club gathering, and it is correct: closed-loop is cleaner on the quantity of water consumed, not automatically on the quality of what gets discharged, and not on energy. Recirculating systems concentrate dissolved solids and treatment chemicals with every pass, and the periodic discharge — blowdown — gets dirtier the harder a facility conserves. The fully sealed, dry-cooled architectures that avoid that discharge instead trade water for electricity: rejecting heat into the air takes substantially more power, and on a fossil-heavy grid a share of the "saved" water reappears upstream, at the power plant that runs the fans. "No water on site" is partly an accounting boundary.

The Jurisdictional Seam

The sharper objection is jurisdictional. SB 259 is a withdrawal law — it governs how much groundwater a facility pulls, under the Water Resources Board. The quality of what a facility sends back out belongs to a different regulator entirely, the Department of Environmental Quality, under the Clean Water Act. A bill that pushes operators toward closed-loop to cut withdrawals does not, by itself, reach the more-concentrated discharge it may encourage. Two things temper that here: the amendment bars traditional open-air evaporative cooling, which pushes toward the sealed end where routine discharge is minimal, so the live tradeoff for SB 259 is more energy than effluent. But the gap is real. The bill closes the quantity question honestly and leaves the quality question to another statute and another agency — which is exactly the kind of seam the next issue's reporting should sit on.

POLICY RELEVANCE

The under-covered angle is this: SB 259 is, in practice, a bill that aligns Oklahoma regulation with industry technical guidance the largest operators are already following. The bill does not impose a new standard on the industry. It imposes a meter on the part of the industry that is not following the standard the leaders have already adopted. That asymmetry is the political reason the bill is plausible — and the technical reason compliance for the largest projects is structurally cheap. The smaller and less publicly accountable operators will bear the actual cost of the bill, exactly the way ratepayer-protection laws are supposed to work.

WHAT GEOTHERMAL DOES THAT COOLING TOWERS DON'T

OKLAHOMA

ENERGY

[SOURCE: Fervo Energy S-1, Project InnerSpace, OU Mewbourne School, NREL · 2025–2026]

The Water Profile of the Supply Side

The supply-side conversation in Issues 11 through 13 — Fervo's IPO, the Amazon-Zanskar deal, the Nevada Google-Ormat order, the DOE NOFO Cycle 1 — was structured around electricity. Geothermal as baseload. Geothermal as the asset class the market just priced. Geothermal as the supply-side answer to HB 2992's demand-side floor.

The water profile of the same supply chain is the part the supply-side conversation has not foregrounded — and the part that matters most now that SB 259 is law. Enhanced geothermal as developed at Cape Station and contemplated at Phoenix Wells operates a closed-loop subsurface circulation. The working fluid stays in the well. Surface water consumption is limited to the small volumes needed for drilling, initial reservoir creation, and periodic top-up — which means that a behind-the-meter geothermal-served data center, paired with closed-loop cooling at the compute side, consumes an order of magnitude less water than a grid-served, evaporatively-cooled equivalent. It also sidesteps

the tradeoff the dry-cooling alternative makes — because the power is clean baseload, there is no fossil plant burning water upstream to keep the data center's own number low. The campus saves water at the rack and does not spend it at the power station.

Read against SB 259, this is a regulatory advantage that geothermal procurement carries into Oklahoma that no other generation source carries to the same degree. Natural-gas combined-cycle plants consume meaningful cooling water. Coal plants consume more. Nuclear plants consume more still. Even wind and solar, when paired with the grid power they need for firming, draw on the cooling-water profile of the marginal generation. Geothermal-served closed-loop campuses are the architecture SB 259 most favors without naming.

The Mewbourne School's Tuttle program — operating under existing OCC permit authority and a federal grant — is the closest live example of the Oklahoma supply chain that fits the SB 259 profile. The interim window between now and Cycle 2 of the DOE NOFO in spring 2027 was identified in Issue 12 as the strategic eight months for assembling a coordinated Oklahoma application stack. SB 259 adds a fifth element to that stack: regulatory clarity that the cooling water cycle the rest of the data center industry depends on will not be socialized in Oklahoma either.

POLICY RELEVANCE

The cumulative Oklahoma regulatory architecture is now unique among data center growth states. HB 2992 prices grid cost. SB 259 prices water. The municipal and tribal moratoria put consent on the table. The Phoenix Wells / Mewbourne / DOE NOFO supply-side path responds to all three with a single technology. No peer state has assembled the same stack. Oklahoma is not behind the national conversation on data centers. It is one of two or three states in front of it, and it is the only one writing the supply-side and demand-side rules in parallel.

THE NATIONAL FRAME

NATIONAL

AI

COMPUTE

[SOURCE: Reuters, Wall Street Journal, Bloomberg, OpenAI, Anthropic, Microsoft, UK Parliament · May 2026]

Deployment Companies, Non-Exclusivity, and the Low-Energy Inquiry

Three national stories from the Issue 12 carryover list deserve a paragraph each, because they shape the framework SB 259 will be implemented inside.

OpenAI and Anthropic both stood up forward-deployed engineering companies in the past quarter. OpenAI launched the OpenAI Deployment Company on May 11 with more than \$4 billion in committed capital and an acquisition of consulting firm Tomoro, bringing 150 forward-deployed engineers from day one. Anthropic announced a \$1.5 billion enterprise services firm on May 4, anchored by Blackstone, Hellman & Friedman, and Goldman Sachs, with additional backing from Apollo, General Atlantic, and Sequoia. The structure is the same in both cases: capital and engineering talent positioned to integrate frontier models inside large enterprises and inside government, on contracts that increasingly include the compute infrastructure as part of the deliverable. The relevance to Oklahoma is that the buyers of dedicated geothermal-served compute campuses are no longer only Google, Amazon, Meta, and Microsoft. The deployment vehicles will themselves become offtakers as the contracts scale.

Microsoft and OpenAI formalized non-exclusivity in their partnership in the last quarter — the end of the exclusive era that defined the 2022–2024 frontier-model market. The practical effect is that compute providers and frontier-model providers are now structurally interchangeable on a per-contract basis. A geothermal-served compute campus in Oklahoma can plausibly host workloads from any frontier provider on any deployment company contract. The buyer side is more diversified than the 2024 conversation assumed.

The UK House of Commons inquiry on low-energy computing closed evidence on May 14 — the same day the DOE NOFO Cycle 1 closed and the same week Fervo filed to go public. The inquiry's terms of reference cover neuromorphic computing, photonic computing, and other architectures that would reduce the per-FLOP energy and cooling load of AI workloads at the chip level. The inquiry's report timeline is the autumn. The Oklahoma relevance is indirect but real: a meaningful share of the long-run demand for cooling water depends on whether the next decade's compute architecture continues to scale energy and cooling linearly with FLOPs or breaks that curve through neuromorphic or photonic substrates. The supply-side investment thesis Issue 12 priced does not depend on either outcome. The water-side legislative posture SB 259 establishes does not either. The flexibility is in the policy design.

POLICY RELEVANCE

The national stories converge on a single observation: the structure of compute procurement is moving toward more buyers, more contract types, and — eventually — more architectures. The Oklahoma legislative pattern (narrow bills, honest pricing, no comprehensive frameworks) is well-suited to that environment. It does not bet on a particular technology winning. It prices the consequences of whichever one does.

SIGNAL / NOISE

SIGNAL

The Oklahoma regulatory stack is now a complete set. HB 2992 prices the grid. SB 259 prices the water. The tribal and municipal moratoria put consent on the table as a precondition. The supply-side path — geothermal procurement, Phoenix Wells, the Mewbourne research program, the DOE NOFO funding architecture — responds to all three at once with a single technology choice. No other data-center growth state has all four elements enacted simultaneously. The political coalition that built HB 2992 — bipartisan, rural-urban, agricultural-industrial — is the same coalition that carried SB 259 to the governor's desk and survived his signature. The pattern is durable.

NOISE

The temptation to read SB 259 as anti-development. It is not. HB 2992 was not anti-development either, and the data-center pipeline kept building through and after its signing. SB 259 prices water the same way HB 2992 prices electricity. The hyperscalers that already design to ASHRAE closed-loop guidance will face essentially trivial compliance costs. The smaller, less publicly accountable operators that would otherwise externalize water cost onto Oklahoma's aquifers will not. That is the bill working as intended, not the bill blocking the industry.

BY THE NUMBERS

3,674

Community reports submitted to Erin Brockovich's national data center map (brockovichdatacenter.com) as of May 31, across 49 states. Water consumption and utility bill increases remain the top specific infrastructure concerns. Sulphur Springs, Texas leads with 300 reports tied to the MSB Global hyperscale project.

8 years

The runway SB 259 gives existing commercial groundwater permit holders before metering is enforced — a long fuse on a measurement law. The data-center cooling requirement is separate and immediate: it attaches to any facility that seeks a groundwater permit and uses that groundwater as its primary cooling source.

50M gal

Annual water savings Meta has projected for its Phytech partnership covering 1,500 acres in connection with the Tulsa Project Anthem build. The figure is consistent with closed-loop cooling at hyperscale; the public baseline has not been disclosed.

1–2%

The makeup-water consumption of a fully closed-loop liquid-cooled hyperscale facility, expressed as a fraction of the consumption of an open evaporative system serving the same thermal load. The architecture the largest operators already design to. The architecture SB 259 now requires of any data center that draws groundwater as its primary cooling source.

\$4B / \$1.5B

Committed capital for OpenAI's and Anthropic's forward-deployment engineering companies, launched May 11 and May 4 respectively. The structure of frontier-model commercialization is shifting toward integrated compute-plus-deployment contracts. The buyer side of the Oklahoma supply chain is broader than it was a quarter ago.

71%

Share of Americans who oppose data center construction in their local area, per Gallup's May poll. Water consumption is the single most-cited specific reason among opponents. The water-side legislative cycle is the next political consequence.

WHAT TO WATCH

July 1, 2026: HB 2992 effective date. Cost-attribution becomes operative law. The first OG&E and PSO large-load tariff filings will be evaluated against the new statutory frame. SB 259's implementing rules at the Corporation Commission and the Water Resources Board could move on a comparable schedule.

OWRB rulemaking. The Oklahoma Water Resources Board's existing authority over groundwater withdrawal permits is the regulatory pathway SB 259 operationalizes. Watch for OWRB staff communications and any preliminary rulemaking notice. The \$1 million appropriation to clear the permit backlog is the near-term action item — the board has to absorb the new mandate and begin building the compliance architecture.

June 16 OCC primary. The Brad Boles versus Justin Hornback race remains the most consequential single event between now and the first HB 2992 tariff filings. SB 259 implementation will land at a Commission whose composition is being decided that day.

Cherokee Nation task force findings. Issue 14 noted the Cherokee task force on data center impacts as a parallel sovereign governance track. The water cost question is one of the central items the task force is reviewing. Whatever the task force finds will inform how tribal nations evaluate data center proposals on trust land going forward — and SB 259 does not reach trust land.

Spring 2027: DOE Geothermal NOFO Cycle 2. The eight-month window Issue 12 identified for assembling a coordinated Oklahoma application stack is now seven months. SB 259 adds a fifth element to the stack: water-side regulatory clarity that no peer state will have by the Cycle 2 application deadline.

UK low-energy computing inquiry report (autumn 2026). The report will not bind any Oklahoma decision. It will frame the long-run cooling-water question by signaling whether the chip-level compute substrates that would relax the per-FLOP energy curve are within the next decade or the one after.

FROM THE ANALYSTS

This issue is the third in a three-part arc on what data centers owe the communities that host them. Issue 13 asked what they should pay. Issue 14 asked who has the authority to decide. Issue 15 asks how the cost is actually measured.

The answer Oklahoma has given is the same answer the state gave on the electricity side: meter it, attribute it, and let the price do the rest of the work. SB 259 is not, on its face, an ambitious bill. It does not ban anything. It does not impose comprehensive groundwater management on data centers any more than HB 2992 imposed comprehensive electricity policy. It puts a meter on the part of the resource cycle the state cannot currently measure, sets a default architecture above a threshold the industry's own technical guidance already prefers, and gives the Water Resources Board and the Corporation Commission the data they need to do the rest of the work themselves.

The political reason the bill is plausible is the same reason HB 2992 passed unanimously. The coalition is rural and urban, agricultural and industrial, environmental and energy. The same constituencies whose well water is at stake are the constituencies whose electricity bills HB 2992 protects. The same hyperscalers whose voluntary commitments — Meta's Phytech partnership, Cerebras's closed-loop architecture — already exceed what SB 259 requires are the same hyperscalers whose presence the state is actively recruiting. The asymmetry is not between development and protection. The asymmetry is between the well-resourced operators who already design to the standard and the less publicly accountable ones who would otherwise externalize the cost.

SB 259 makes the Oklahoma regulatory architecture the first complete answer any data-center growth state has produced to the consent question Issue 14 raised. Cost is priced. Consent is structured. Water is metered. The supply-side path — geothermal procurement, closed-loop cooling, behind-the-meter generation — responds to all three at once. The legislative pattern Oklahoma has been refining since Issue 5 of this newsletter scales from narrow bills to a complete regulatory framework without ever passing a comprehensive AI act. The same coalitions hold. The same logic applies. The same Corporation Commission and the same agencies adjudicate the result. That is how durable policy gets built, one narrow bill at a time, in the state's actual political idiom rather than in someone else's framework.

Next week, The Inference looks at what happened on June 4 — the day Anthropic published When AI builds itself and disclosed that its own AI systems now write more than eighty percent of the company's code. The paper describes a recursive loop: AI builds AI, which builds better AI. What it does not describe is the energy bill. Every turn of that loop is compute, and every unit of compute is a data center drawing power and water from someone's grid and someone's aquifer. The recursive self-improvement conversation and the Oklahoma infrastructure conversation are the same conversation, conducted in different rooms. Issue 16 walks through the door between them.

David & Æ

david@humanityandai.com

This issue is part of a series examining Oklahoma's legislative sessions alongside the national and global AI and energy landscape.

The Inference is an independent AI policy intelligence brief for Oklahoma decision makers. Not affiliated with any political party, campaign, or lobbying organization. Back issues and source documents available at humanityandai.com/inference.

Disclosure: Humanity and AI, LLC develops open-weight AI models and researches AI consciousness through the Structured Emergence program. David Birdwell has advocated publicly for geothermal conversion of Oklahoma's abandoned oil wells — infrastructure that could serve data center power needs with materially lower cooling water consumption than the alternatives, and that is directly relevant to the regulatory questions analyzed in this issue. These positions are disclosed so readers can weigh our analysis accordingly. We have no financial relationship with any company, utility, or political campaign mentioned in this issue.

Previous issues: #1 AI Agents Enter the Workforce · #2 The Chatbot Safety Wave · #3 Oracle and the Healthcare Data Grab · #4 The Preemption Gambit · #5 The Two Pipelines · #6 The Preemption Play · #7 Lots of Firefighting, No Architecture · #8 The Ground Is Moving · #9 The Geothermal Window · #10 Seventy-Two Hours · #11 Energy Geography Determines Compute Geography · #12 The Geothermal NOFO · #13 The Tariff Is the Test · #14 The Sovereignty Question