

1. Administrative Details

Proposal Name: Graham-Salt Creek, Texas, Flood Control Project

by Agency: Brazos River Authority (BRA)

Locations: TX

Date Submitted: 09/17/2015

Confirmation Number: 177770bb-6e89-4cae-a625-264b422075be

Supporting Documents

| File Name | Date Uploaded |
|--|----------------------|
| 09 11 15 Letter to Corps re Graham-BRA.pdf | 09/17/2015 |
| ASA-inclusion in annual rpt-BRA-09142015.pdf | 09/17/2015 |
| Graham-ltr to Corp.pdf | 09/17/2015 |

2. Provide the name of the primary sponsor and all non-Federal interests that have contributed or are expected to contribute toward the non-Federal share of the proposed feasibility study or modification.

| Sponsor | Letter of Support |
|---------------------------------|--|
| Brazos River Authority(Primary) | The Brazos River Authority (BRA) has been the non-federal sponsor for this project since 2004. Years of delays and cost escalations have led BRA to seek a modification in the form of a de-authorization, so that we, along with the City of Graham, may finalize this project ourselves. |

3. State if this proposal is for a feasibility study, a modification to an authorized USACE feasibility study or a modification to an authorized USACE project. If it is a proposal for a modification, provide the authorized water resources development feasibility study or project name.

[x] Modification to an Authorized USACE Project : Graham-Salt Creek, Texas, Flood Control Project

4. Clearly articulate the specific project purpose(s) of the proposed study or modification. Demonstrate that the proposal is related to USACE mission and authorities and specifically address why additional or new authorization is needed.

The City of Graham has experienced urban flooding on a periodic basis for many years. The most significant events on the two waterways bounding the city were a major flood on the Brazos River in 1978 and a major flood on Salt Creek in 1990. During the 1978 flood, 50 homes were destroyed and 335 homes were damaged. During the 1990 flood, 15 homes and commercial properties were inundated with up to four feet of water, resulting in estimated damages in excess of \$625,000.

Since 2005, BRA has been the non-federal sponsor in partnership with the USACE of the Graham-Salt Creek, Texas Flood Control Project which seeks to minimize the flood risk to the residents of the City of Graham through acquisition and evacuation of the 10-year floodplain. The initial project objectives were to: purchase and permanently remove approximately 94 residences, 30 commercial properties, and three public structures from the 10-year floodplain within Graham city limits; provide relocation services for residents to comparable housing outside the project area; develop and install a flood warning system to protect residents living above the evacuation zone to minimize losses; enhance recreation in the area with three miles of hiking and nature trails; and restore riparian habitat with native species of trees and shrubs.

This project has experienced years of cost escalations and delays. Thus far, after a decade, only the first of the objectives listed above has progressed towards completion. As a result, the BRA, together with the City of Graham, have attempted to work with USACE to amend the original scope of the project to bring about a conclusion. Negotiations over several years have shown that a potential solution involving USACE is not possible. Therefore, the BRA and the City of Graham are seeking to de-authorize this project so that we may finally bring about a conclusion, and allow the citizens of Graham to beneficially utilize the area in the form of a public park.

5. To the extent practicable, provide an estimate of the total cost, and the Federal and non-Federal share of those costs, of the proposed study and, separately, an estimate of the cost of construction or modification.

| | Federal | Non-Federal | Total |
|---------------------|---------|-------------|-------------|
| Study | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Construction | \$0 | \$1,300,000 | \$1,300,000 |

Explanation (if necessary)

Proposed changes in scope and proportional responsibility of non-federal sponsorship have effected estimated costs of the ongoing project. The updated estimated cost of the project is \$13,663,000 with a Federal cost of \$8,734,250 and a non-Federal cost of \$4,928,750 split between the BRA and the City of Graham. The BRA share is calculated at \$4,439,750 for flood reduction and ecosystem restoration features representing 63.9% of total project cost. The City share is calculated at \$489,000 for recreation features and represents 3.6% of total project cost.

If de-authorization is successful, the BRA will provide the City of Graham a one-time payment of \$1.3M. BRA would also convey acquired properties and deed over the lands to the City of Graham. The City would use the funds to construct a public park and maintain the area. The BRA would retain flood inundation easements over the property to protect against any future flooding.

6. To the extent practicable, describe the anticipated monetary and nonmonetary benefits of the proposal including benefits to the protection of human life and property; improvement to transportation; the national economy; the environment; or the national security interests of the United States.

This proposed modification in the form of a de-authorization will bring a much needed conclusion to a project that has extended unnecessarily for a decade. It will allow the Brazos River Authority and the City of Graham to finish the project, by accomplishing the flood control aspect through completion of buy out and removal of structures. Additionally, this modification will have the added benefit of allowing the City of Graham to finally construct a park in the project area that will be open for public use. To date, the project area has become an eye-sore and a hazard for the local community due to lack of continued maintenance on the part of USACE.

By de-authorizing this project, it will also end USACE involvement, and therefore any future Federal expense. All future expenses will be taken care of at the local level by the BRA and the City of Graham.

7. Does local support exist? If 'Yes', describe the local support for the proposal.

Yes

Local Support Description

The City of Graham and the Brazos River Authority both support modifying this project in the form of a de-authorization so that we may both work together to bring about a workable conclusion to the project. Support letters from the City of Graham, the Brazos River Authority, and Congressman Randy Neugebauer are included as attachments to this request.

8. Does the primary sponsor named in (2.) above have the financial ability to provide for the required cost share?

Yes

Additional Proposal Information

(This is as uploaded, a blank page will show if nothing was submitted)

09 11 15 Letter to Corps re Graham-BRA.pdf

RANDY NEUGEBAUER
19TH DISTRICT, TEXAS

1424 LONGWORTH HOUSE OFFICE BUILDING
WASHINGTON, DC 20515-4319
PHONE: (202) 225-4005
FAX: (202) 225-9616
www.randy.house.gov

Congress of the United States
House of Representatives

September 11, 2015

611 UNIVERSITY AVENUE
SUITE 220
LUBBOCK, TX 79401
(806) 763-1611

1510 SCURRY STREET
SUITE B
BIG SPRING, TX 79720
(432) 264-0722

500 CHESTNUT STREET
SUITE 819
ARLENE, TX 79802
(325) 675-9779

The Honorable Jo-Ellen Darcy
Assistant Secretary of the Army (Civil Works)
108 Army Pentagon
Washington, DC 20310-0108

Assistant Secretary Darcy:

Pursuant to the Federal Register notice regarding Section 7001 of the WRRDA 2014, I request that the Graham – Salt Creek, Texas, flood control project be included in the Corps Annual Report to Congress. The purpose of my letter is to request a modification of the project in the form of de-authorization in the Annual Report. I believe all required criteria have been met in order for USACE to include this project modification in the Annual Report.

This project has been subject to delays and cost escalations which have dragged it out for more than a decade, with very little overall progress to show for it. The Brazos River Authority (BRA) and the City of Graham, Texas, which I represent, have attempted numerous times to work with USACE's Fort Worth District Office to bring the project to a timely conclusion and have only been met with postponements, deferments and obstruction. Based upon my conversations with both BRA and the City of Graham, the relationship between themselves and USACE has become so poisoned that neither feel they can trust USACE and at this point the only way forward is to remove USACE from the project.

Once the project is de-authorized, the BRA and the City of Graham have assured me that they are committed to expeditiously addressing any remaining issues and to maintaining the project in perpetuity. The intent of the City, with the financial support of the BRA, is to construct a local park in the Project area that has on several occasions become severely overgrown due to the lack of maintenance USACE was required to undertake. Allowing the BRA and the City to move forward together, without USACE involvement, is the only path that will truly benefit and provide the necessary safeguards for the local citizenry. If you have any questions or concerns, please do not hesitate to contact Coleman Garrison in my office at 202-225-4005.

Sincerely,



Randy Neugebauer
Member of Congress

Additional Proposal Information

(This is as uploaded, a blank page will show if nothing was submitted)

ASA_inclusion in annual rpt_BRA_09142015.pdf



Brazos River Authority



September 14, 2015

Honorable Jo-Ellen Darcy
Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works
US Army Corps of Engineers
Attn: CECW-CE (Lisa Kiefel)
441 G Street N.W.
Washington, DC 20314-1000

Dear Secretary Darcy:

As the non-Federal sponsor of the Salt Creek, Graham, Texas Project, the Brazos River Authority (BRA) formally requests that the project be included in the USACE's Annual Report to Congress as prescribed by Title VII, Section 7001 (a)(1) of the Water Resources Reform Development Act of 2015.

The Salt Creek, Graham, Texas Project has been ongoing for more than a decade. It has been met with numerous delays and cost escalations that have resulted in a great deal of frustration for both the BRA and the City of Graham. Several meetings have been held to date between the USACE, the City of Graham, and the BRA regarding the timely conclusion of this project. It appears that while a path forward has been the goal of these discussions that has proven to be unattainable.

We, along with the City, are requesting that this project be "modified" in the form of a de-authorization. We formally request that this project be a part of the USACE's Annual Report to better assist with what will be necessary to complete the de-authorization process. The City of Graham and the BRA are prepared to expeditiously address the Project's intended purpose -- to remove, re-locate, and re-condition the area and maintain it in perpetuity. With the commitment of financial assistance from the BRA, the City will be able to realize a completed project while providing long-term benefits to the local citizenry in the form of a local park that will be open for public use.

I have attached, for your review, supporting information to include this project in the USACE's Annual Report to Congress should you need it.

Sincerely,

Phil Ford
General Manager/CEO

cc: Rep. Neugebauer, Senator Cornyn, Senator Cruz
Attachments: Graham Flood Project History

Salt Creek, Graham, Texas, Project Project Background

Location

The project is located in the north central Texas City of Graham, in Young County, along Salt Creek, a tributary of the Brazos River.

Project Description

The Graham project consists of a buy-out of 113 structures, mostly residential; installation of a flood warning system estimated to provide a 12-hour warning time; 129 acres of restored ecosystem; and creation of a local educational/recreational trail system connecting two existing park areas. Project construction was initiated in FY05.

In an effort to conclude this project, and after many delays from lack of funding and cost escalations, a scope reduction was agreed upon, but an agreement reflecting that consensus has been unattainable. The primary changes to the originally authorized project were the removal of a large business, J & N Feed Store, from the Project, elimination of the flood warning system, and removal of the ecosystem restoration features portion of the project. Another significant change in scope included City of Graham, with financial assistance from the Brazos River Authority, assumption of the construction and maintenance aspects for a park as opposed to a trail that was first envisioned.

Project cost

Proposed changes in scope and proportional responsibility of non-federal sponsorship have effected estimated costs. The updated estimated cost of the project is \$13,663,000 with a Federal cost of \$8,734,250 and a non-Federal cost of \$4,928,750 split between the BRA and the City of Graham. The BRA share is calculated at \$4,439,750 for flood reduction and ecosystem restoration features representing 63.9% of total project cost. The City share is calculated at \$489,000 for recreation features and represents 3.6% of total project cost.

GRAHAM FLOOD PROJECT HISTORY

Summary by year of project status, milestones, and correspondence:

2004 – 2011

- Project Cooperative Agreement (PCA) is executed in November 2004
- BRA remits a total of \$3.63 M to USACE during this period for property acquisition and relocations.
- Unbeknownst to the BRA, the USACE has been applying annual “cost escalations” to the project from the outset. This greatly increases the cost obligation to the BRA while the project itself sits idle due to a chronic shortage of Federal funding.
- It also becomes very apparent that the USACE is unable or unwilling to properly manage and maintain the project area as required under the PCA. Vandalism and crime become a common occurrence because of the number of abandoned structures and overgrown lots.
- Because of the lack of funding, increasing overall cost obligations to the BRA, concerns over liability to the BRA, and numerous complaints from the City Manager and citizens of Graham, the BRA informs the USACE that they would like to pursue terminating the agreement and pursuing a solution with the City.
- In 2011, suddenly the USACE receives project funding and informs the BRA that they can still complete the project if the most expensive property, the feed store, is removed from the project along with the ecosystem restoration phase of the project.

2011

- May 2011 – USACE notified that \$6.8M in federal funds allocated to project; Corps and BRA hold town-hall meeting in Graham to discuss process with residents and businesses.
- June 7, 2011 – Received environmental phase I report from USACE
- September 26, 2011 – Meeting in Waco with USACE Ft. Worth District managers, real estate group and legal team to discuss progress of acquisitions, feed store status, and legal issues regarding closing on properties with encumbrances.
 - Estimated remaining BRA non-fed obligation for acquisition is \$300K
 - Discussed flood easements and supplied info to USACE;
 - Agreed to place feed store at end of list because of cost;
 - Corps stated that they would supply balance sheet within one week – did not receive;
 - Corps attorneys continued correspondence with BRA legal staff regarding legal issues for closing tracts;
- October 10, 2011 – Email to USACE 1) affirming BRA position to delay acquisition of feed store, 2) rejecting request to purchase state property directly,

and 3) Requesting a formal letter by November to notify the BRA of availability of federal funding. USACE did not respond to funding question until January.

- November 16, 2011 – Various title documents submitted by USACE attorneys to BRA Legal for review
- December 14, 2011 – List of information and questions submitted to USACE via email in response to conference call with USACE

2012

- January 6, 2012 – Met with USACE to discuss feed store and BRA Board action proposed for January board meeting
- January 10, 2012 – Email to USACE requesting a response to BRA questions from December 14, 2011
- January 11, 2012 – Email from USACE stating that a letter response is forthcoming **BUT** that additional non-fed funding is needed from the BRA in order to continue
- January 17, 2012 – Another USACE email stating that a letter response is forthcoming and that **no Federal project funding** is available FY2012
- January 18, 2012 – USACE provides feed store appraisal
- January 25, 2012 – Letter response from USACE (Peggy Grubbs) stating concurrence with our January 10 email but reiterating that additional non-fed funding is needed to continue
- January 26, 2012 – Requesting clarification to correspondence originating from the USACE Ft. Worth District becomes the norm as BRA again requests clarification to items included in the January 25 letter
- **February 14, 2012 – Sent letter to USACE notifying them of our understanding of conditions to conclude project; includes statement that BRA will independently pursue our own settlement with the feed store and that upon project termination, all obligations by the BRA to the project will cease. Also informed USACE that we were working on an agreement to terminate to submit to USACE.**
- February 22, 2012 – Email to USACE requesting title commitments and project status updates; also advised that we would send “project termination agreement” soon
- March 5, 2012 – Resent above email because of no response from USACE
- March 6, 2012 – Submitted agreement to terminate to USACE (Peggy Grubb) which included stipulation that all obligations cease at project conclusion
- **March 12, 2012 – Email response from USACE had received the draft agreement but that they would not sign an agreement. They would accept a “short and sweet letter” from us instead**
- March 15, 2012 – VM from USACE reiterating the above

- March 26, 2012 – Email to USACE stating that BRA **still** had not received a response letter
- March 28, 2012 – Received response letter from USACE; did not address the agreement or property transfer
- April 9, 2012 – Submitted modified draft agreement that stated that cost-share figure was an “estimate” and not necessarily a firm number. Final accounting at conclusion of project would determine actual cost.
- May 24, 2012 – City and USACE are in disagreement regarding City park plans for project area. City states that USACE said RV park would be fine and that USACE wanted to “wash their hands” of us. An RV park was a point of contention between the City and USACE. City wanted one but USACE said no.
- June 11, 2012 – Email to USACE discussing park agreement issues between USACE and City. BRA did not want to be involved in park negotiations
- June 18, 2012 – USACE provided property closing status update and requested \$463K in additional non-fed BRA funds.
- June 20, 2012 – BRA legal staff sends email to USACE stating that staff had multiple unreturned calls to USACE legal team.
- June 28, 2012 – Met with City at USACE office to discuss project status. BRA stated that GM/CEO would address need for a new project agreement during upcoming meeting with new Colonel (Colonel Kling). City inquired about transfer of acquired property and condemned property in two phases. BRA stated that we were moving forward with feed store flood easement.
- September 7, 2012 – Email from USACE to City describing “current agreement” to reduce scope of project. USACE also stated that Corps would develop O&M manual at conclusion of project and would provide to “existing sponsor” under “existing agreement”. The different agreement references within the letter are unclear.
- September 14, 2012 – BRA met with Colonel Klinge at Central Office. We briefed him on project history and outstanding issues with agreement. We reiterated that we needed an executed agreement memorializing the change in project scope and including language stating that our obligations to the project area would cease entirely once the project was terminated. The Colonel and Peggy Grubb seemed amenable to our request.
- **November 29, 2012 – Email from USACE Project Manager stating 3 way discussion ongoing between Division, District, and HQ regarding agreement and that supplemental information was requested and provided to District/HQ**
- **December 11, 2012 – Email stating that USACE is proceeding with amendment and now a new agreement w/City**
- December 11, 2012 – Email response from BRA stating that we agree that all property should be transferred at once

- December 21, 2012 – USACE returned draft agreement with edits; USACE removed the section that stated that the BRA would have no future obligations to maintain the project area after conclusion and execution of the agreement. This is a key point to transferring the project area to the City.

2013

- January 22, 2013 – Phone call from BRA GM/CEO to Colonel Klinge notifying him that BRA staff would be meeting with USACE the following day to discuss project. GM/CEO stated our concern that the USACE had revised the agreement by redacting the stipulation removing the BRA from all future project obligations.
- January 23, 2013 – Met with USACE in Ft. Worth to discuss agreement. We stated that we intended to add back the provision regarding future maintenance as well as ability to transfer property in two phases (due to several requiring condemnation).
- January 30, 2013 – Email to USACE advising that revised agreement is forthcoming
- February 1, 2013 – Assignment of PCA (revised agreement) draft submitted to USACE
- March 22, 2013 – USACE PM informed BRA that “agreement” was still at Division and that HQ had been briefed. HQ had requested a final accounting before submitting to HQ in one month (April)
- March 28, 2013 – USACE Ft. District provided PCA amendment schedule that stated an expectation of **HQ approval of amended agreement by the end of September 2013**
- July 3, 2013 – Spoke to USACE PM about agreement status. PM stated it had **not** gone to HQ. It was still at Division and PM did not know who had it but would try to find out.
- August 2, 2013 – Email to USACE PM requesting an update from July 3 conversation
- September 9, 2013 – Memo and email response from USACE stating Division had sent agreement back to District to provide justification for “de-scoping” of project.
- September 13, 2013 – Notification from USACE of yet another Project Manager. The **fifth** since 2007 not counting interim managers.
- September 16, 2013 – Email from BRA to Lemunyon detailing the various concerns with the project.
- September 17, 2013 – Email USACE (Elston Eckhardt) to “clarify some current items” in response to “your note to the guy in DC”. Elston states that BRA submitted the “proposed modification” to the agreement which the District forwarded to Division. Division returned the agreement with a couple of

alternative strategies. Primary issue raised by division was the issue that if we retained flowage easements we would have to remain party to the agreement. USACE (Elston) **proposes meeting for late October 2013.**

- September 20, 2013 – Email from BRA to USACE (Elston) agreeing on importance of meeting in October to discuss, again, what we thought was an agreed upon solution. **We bring up the fact that the District brought us the very solution we were pursuing including purchase of an inundation for the feed store and removing recreation and ecosystem features from the project.**
- October 3, 2013 – USACE PM (Kathy Gately) requested copy of flood easement and agreement for feed store.
- October 18, 2013 – Teleconference with USACE District (Peggy Grubb and Elston) and Division (Paula Johnson-Muic joined late). **District stated that primary issue with agreement is BRA retaining flood easements on property gifted to Graham.** Districts opinion is that all property including flowage easements be transferred to City and City perform O&M. We again explain why this makes no sense to us and remind them that their attorney, Kendra Laffe, had agreed with us on this in the past. Paula from Division joined teleconference and after carefully explaining the basis for our stance, she also agreed. **Paula suggested that the agreement be modified so that it states that the BRA will maintain the flowage easements in perpetuity with no additional responsibilities to the BRA.**
- November 19, 2013 – USACE PM sends a draft O&M manual for BRA and City review. O&M manual is supposed to specify how property will be treated by the non-fed sponsor after conclusion of the project. The draft manual does not remotely resemble anything like we had agreed to with the USACE. More USACE disconnect.
- **December 17, 2013 – USACE Ft. Worth District Assistant District Council (Kendra Laffe) sends us their latest draft of the project agreement outlining concluding the project. We are satisfied with this draft and now apparently it is to go back to Division and HQ again for review.**
- December 19, 2013 – Sent USACE extensive comments on O&M manual that reflect the current draft PCA agreement.

2014

- April 1, 2014 – Email from BRA to USACE PM requesting specific update on status of agreement to close-out project as well as status of condemnations.
- April 11, 2014 – Response from USACE PM stating that USACE agrees that a meeting is in order and that the City should be included because they have made multiple meeting requests. In addition, she stated that the condemnations have

still not been filed with DOJ and that it will take an **additional 12 – 18 months** to complete this process.

- May 8, 2014 – Teleconference meeting including Elston and Kathy from USACE District and David Casteel with the City of Graham. **Essentially, Elston informs us that the deal we thought we had, has been killed by Division and that he was overruled. Division stated that District could not justify “de-scoping” the project and that the BRA also did not have the right to terminate the agreement. We immediately requested a meeting with the decision makers at Division. This meeting was scheduled for June 16, 2014.**
- June 16, 2014 – Meeting in Dallas; email date June 25th from BRA attorney to USACE summarizing the agreed upon course of action. The USACE agrees to draw up a new amendment to the PCA along with flowage easement language that the USACE states needs to be in deeds.
- September 2014 – Several back and forth emails between BRA and USACE; USACE backtracks on agreed upon provisions from June meeting; advises they continue to work on amendment preparation. City of Graham sends email reminding USACE that they said November was start of construction. BRA advises USACE that it is their responsibility to upkeep the project area (mow).
- October 1, 2014 – BRA begins mowing the Project Area because the USACE would not mow in accordance with PCA. Citizens of Graham up in arms over nuisance animals and unkempt project. USACE also has not provided easement language it stated it would provide in June 16 meeting.
- November 26 meeting USACE, City of Graham, BRA. BRA attorney summarizes by email of Dec. 1st yet again, another agreed upon path forward and specific timeline for events, to include construction of park in June or July 2015.
- December 23, 2014 – Ray Russo with the USACE again brings up issues after the fact that are in direct contrast to discussions at meetings.

2015

- January 15, 2015 – BRA’s General Manager/CEO calls Colonel Richard Muraski to express concern over the status and lack of progress. Colonel Muraski wrote a letter in 2012 detailing the path forward. That letter was the basis by which BRA took significant economic steps and reliance upon. It is also the agreement that the USACE has back-tracked from ever since. BRA provides a reminder, in detail, of the previously agreed upon path forward.
- February 9, 2015 – Colonel Muraski submits email with bureaucratic language concerning “submission up the vertical chain as quickly as possible”.
- March 16, 2015 – Elston Eckert with the USACE provides a letter from W. Neil Craig, III, P.E., which is replete with inaccuracies and in direct contrast to prior discussions. On March 20, 2015 the BRA responds and notes the factual errors.

For example, the letter states that the BRA has agreed upon a specific course of action. In fact, the BRA had not even been afforded the opportunity to review the “options” that the USACE sent to Congressman Randy Neugebauer.

- March 26, 2015 – The USACE attends the City of Graham’s Council meeting. The USACE notes that problems were “their bad”. They agreed that the Feed Store is out of the project. That ecosystem restoration is not required. They will plant some native grass on 20 acres. And, all issues will be resolved by November, so that the City can begin construction of the park facilities.
- April 7, 2015 – The USACE advises that they are in a holding pattern until they receive a “division of roles and responsibilities” from the BRA and the City referencing back to their letter from Lt. Col. Craig which was grossly inaccurate. The USACE further asks about the “insistence of the BRA” to hold the USACE to previously agreed upon commitments. BRA’s UB Regional Manager replies that the BRA already has a letter from a District (now Division) Colonel that explicitly states how the USACE is going to proceed. Now the USACE is opting to completely ignore that fact and move in another direction addition. The USACE’s recent misrepresentations to the Congressman only further enhance the mistrust of the USACE.
- April 22, 2015 – Brian Kamisato with the USACE takes part in conference call with the BRA and states that the USACE will forward a list of options and variations to options. On April 29th, the USACE sends a letter with options.
- May 6, 2015 – BRA replies to the USACE letter. The BRA letter defines the roles and responsibilities of both the City and the BRA. The BRA letter also defines the items to be addressed in an amendment to the PCA.
- June 25, 2015 – Elston with the USACE sends BRA an email stating the PCA amendment will not address all of the points in our May 6th letter.
- July 16 letter from Brian Kamisato transmitted via email on July 20th from Elston Eckert contains the USACE’s proposed amendment.
- August 2015 – The amendment provided by the USACE is not remotely close to previously agreed upon means by which to complete the project. BRA is making substantial modifications and will submit to the USACE; however it has become most apparent that the best course for all parties is to de-authorize the project. The BRA and City can complete much more efficiently and effectively.

Additional Proposal Information

(This is as uploaded, a blank page will show if nothing was submitted)

Graham_ltr to Corp.pdf



Hon. Jo-Ellen Darcy
Assistant Secretary of the Army for Civil Works
108 Army
The Pentagon
Washington, DC 20310-0108

Dear Secretary Darcy:

The US Army Corp of Engineers flood control project in Graham, Texas has been ongoing for more than a decade. Having watched the project “progress” over the years, our local citizens are to the point that we believe it will never actually be completed. We have witnessed the Project area become an overgrown, vermin-infested, mess due to USACE’s refusal to maintain it, even though it is USACE’s responsibility to do so. The land at this point just sits idle and offers no benefit to the local community that I represent.

Because of this, I fully support the Brazos River Authority’s (BRA) request to de-authorize the Project. I feel confident that the BRA and the City can finally bring about closure to this project. We have already made arrangements with the BRA for them to provide financial assistance so that we may build a community park in the Project area. We also pledge to work with BRA to maintain the property in perpetuity. The citizens of Graham deserve better than what we’ve seen for the last several years. I ask that you will look favorably on BRA’s request to de-authorize this project.

Sincerely,

Brandon Anderson 9-4-2015

Brandon Anderson
City Manager

CC Congressman Randy Neugebauer
Senator John Cornyn
Senator Ted Cruz