

**From:** [Sunset Advisory Commission](#)  
**To:** [Cecelia Hartley](#)  
**Subject:** FW: Public Input Form for Agencies Under Review (Public/After Publication)  
**Date:** Friday, June 03, 2016 4:42:50 PM

---

-----Original Message-----

From: sundrupal@capitol.local [<mailto:sundrupal@capitol.local>]  
Sent: Friday, June 03, 2016 4:00 PM  
To: Sunset Advisory Commission  
Subject: Public Input Form for Agencies Under Review (Public/After Publication)

Agency: SULPHUR RIVER BASIN AUTHORITY

First Name: Oran

Last Name: Caudle

Title: self

Organization you are affiliated with: self

Email:

City: Texarkana

State: Texas

Your Comments About the Staff Report, Including Recommendations Supported or Opposed:  
To the Texas Sunset Advisory Commission:

After a careful and full analysis of the research and recommendations of the Sunset Commission Staff, it is concluded that the Staff's report on the Sulphur River Basin Authority is both fair and objective. Furthermore, the Staff's recommendations are in the best interests of Northeast Texans living within the boundaries of the SRBA, and of the people of the State of Texas.

Since the passage of Senate Bill 1 in 1997, there have been undue and unacceptable influences emanating from a few entities and organizations in the Dallas-Ft. Worth area on the SRBA. The SRBA has relented to this undue influence. The special DFW interests have gained control of the activities and direction of the SRBA for their own personal agenda and personal profit.

Shortly after the implementation of SB1, only two engineering companies actually competed in the selection for engineer for the SRBA projects under the new planning process. This was an immediate red flag. The selected engineering company stood to see their organization handle in excess of \$1 Billion in Engineering Fees. Despite the magnitude and price tag of the projects being considered, the engineer bidding should have attracted applications from hundreds of engineering companies from around the United States. The winner was an organization with close ties to a few DFW water agencies, with its very own and quite active Political Action Committee, and which previously had worked to see that the Texas Legislature named the primary reservoir project within the Sulphur River Basin after a former senior partner of their company. This same engineering company has continued to be careful to be selected for all studies within the Sulphur River Basin that might cause competition with the selection of the primary reservoir wished by DFW special interests and water agencies. Instead of objective engineering studies being done, a memorial (in the form of attempting to build the second largest lake within the State of Texas) for a former partner of the engineering group has been constantly put forward as the

option that "must" be implemented and built.

There exists evidence that numerous alternatives to the "selected" reservoir are available, and preferable. Superior projects have been put forward that have shown that the devastation that would be caused by building the primary "selected" reservoir in the Sulphur River Basin is unnecessary.

During the State of Texas' water planning process of this century, the taxpayers of Texas have seen the initial price tag estimates for the "selected" reservoir balloon from \$1.4 Billion, to a 2002 Texas Water Plan price of \$1.7 Billion, to a 2007 Texas Water Plan price of over \$2 Billion, to a 2012 Texas Water Plan price of over \$3 Billion, to the current Texas Water Plan flavor of \$4.3 Billion. That is over a 300 percent increase in cost estimates in just 16 years, even though the reservoir project site was even moved several miles closer to DFW, which actually should have lowered its price tag because the massive pipelines were significantly shorter.

While it is expected that, with time, cost estimates increase at a moderate rate, a 300 percent increase in 16 years indicates a policy of intentional misrepresentation by the DFW special interests, with no objections or scrutiny from the SRBA. Yet even the current \$4.3 Billion price tag has been documented as "extremely low-balled" in an effort to get the selected reservoir past further public criticism. This methodology aids the hopes of a few profiteers in DFW, even though this strategy would inflict a Boston, Massachusetts style "Big Dig" project surprise on Texas taxpayers. This budget escapade fact is one of the largest failings of the SRBA, and shows that change of the SRBA is critical for the benefit of the entire State of Texas.

The SRBA has been unduly influenced, and indeed purchased, by a few special interests and a few water agencies in DFW since the beginning of the current Texas Water Planning Process of this new century. The Sunset Commission Staff's report on the SRBA shows that the SRBA budget is overwhelming funded by a few DFW water agencies. These same agencies publicly insist that the SRBA's primarily studied reservoir must be built. As a result, the SRBA has become a stooge and a puppet for these few special interests and water agencies in DFW. Closer examination shows that even the best interests of the taxpayers' water rate payers of DFW are being ignored.

Again, the analysis by the Sunset Commission Staff on the SRBA returned a fair and reasonable assessment of the operations of the SRBA. The Sunset Commission's Staff is to be applauded for their objective work. It is hoped that the Sunset Commissions Staff's SRBA recommendations will be implemented.

Doing so may finally help provide the State of Texas a water plan regarding the Sulphur River Basin that is in its best interests of all Texans, not just for a few special interests after personal fortunes at Texas taxpayer's expense.

Sincerely,

Oran Caudle  
Texarkana, Texas

Any Alternative or New Recommendations on This Agency: If the recommendations of the Sunset Commission Staff is not implemented, the best viable alternative is for the Texas Legislature to abolish the current Sulphur River Basin Authority and create a new, improved SRBA. This would negate the current contracts of the SRBA and offer a new and clean approach for the SRBA.

My Comment Will Be Made Public: I agree