

SRBA Sunset Review - June 23, 2016

In the sunset commissions initial findings there are few points of contention that I see personally, but there are a few points that need to be highlighted.

Before I go into these points I would like to say- it is going to be difficult to meet North Texas' growth, without the implementation of projects in the Sulphur basin. With that said progress is not always measured by the expansion of concrete jungles. More and more it is about protecting and preserving wide open prairies, productive forests and rural ways of life, all of which have existed for eons of time in this basin. As one of the three new appointees I will strive to meet our states and neighbors water needs while protecting the natural resources, and people who live and work in or near the basin.

1. Seek local control and funding without D/FW ties. With exclusive funding from the metroplex over the last decade few local entities trust any work attached to SRBA. This is obvious in their decisions to use engineering firms that have close ties to projects that are going to be costly both socially and economically to our region while benefiting the metroplex. Much of this work is being done while ignoring or minimizing the greatest problem in the basin – sedimentation.
2. At a minimum, bid the engineering out. It is a conflict of interest that feasibility studies are being done by the same firm that will profit if Marvin Nichols is built. I have yet to see the peer review or scientific standards referenced in the report.
3. Openness and transparency should be a given especially when the stakes are so high for so many people.
4. The antagonists - referenced in the introduction and eluded to on page 11 - are not specified - the report does state that they are driven by their

ownprofit motive. I would like to remind you that so are the engineering firms, sponsor agencies, contractors and developers that have studied, lobbied, and pushed for the development of Marvin Nichols.

Thank You,

Bret McCoy