



Platte River Truth

Providing **TRUTH** instead of **MYTHS** on Platte River Issues

<http://www.platterivertruth.org>

For additional information, contact:

Ron Klein, Executive Director - facts@platterivertruth.org

December 17, 2003

For Immediate Release

Landowner requests Central Platte NRD Board to immediately act to correct defects in the technical approach and management of the COHYST project.

A Dawson County native, farm owner, and Professional Engineer has formally requested the Board of Directors of the Central Platte Natural Resources District (CPNRD) to take immediate action to correct deficiencies he has discovered in both the management and technical approach being followed on the **COHYST** [**CO**operative **HY**drology **ST**udy] project planned for completion in 2004. This request was formally made by Ron Klein in a December 15, 2003 letter to the CPNRD board. Mr. Klein made this request due to the complete failure and refusal of the CPNRD to take any kind of responsive action on the various serious issues that he has identified and communicated to them both in writing, and during formal presentations, beginning nearly 1 year ago.

The most recent attempt to help the CPNRD board to understand the seriousness of the defects in COHYST, and urge them to act to correct them, occurred in a formal presentation at CPNRD headquarters to the CPNRD Water Resources Committee on October 23, 2003. As before, Mr. Klein explained in detail the reasons the problems identified were serious and will cause future harm to irrigated agriculture in the Platte Valley. He also provided specific practical recommendations on actions they can – and should - take to correct them. To date, it is apparent the CPNRD has failed to act responsibly and are simply continuing to "do nothing". By doing nothing, they are putting the future of irrigated agriculture in the Platte Valley at risk.

The specific defects identified include the following items:

1. After **FIVE (5)** years of effort and consuming at least **\$7Million**, there is **NO** specific definition of why the project is necessary based on sound scientific proof there is depletion of river flows due to groundwater development. **In fact, credible data shows that is NOT the case.**
2. There is **NO** specific definition of exactly what the COHYST model will be expected to do, how well it will work, exactly how it will be used, and exactly how discrepancies between model predictions and field results will be resolved.
3. There is **NO** adequately defined, proven, and demonstrated practical test plan to verify that the model results matches actual physical field test results.
4. There is **NO** adequately defined plan to resolve discrepancies between the COHYST predictions and actual results that will vary due to aquifer variations. COHYST representatives have said '... if the **farmer** believes the model is wrong, the **farmer** can appeal a regulatory decision and **the farmer can prove the model wrong...**' **This is the wrong answer.**
5. There is not an adequate **technically based** set of criteria defined for when COHYST tasks are complete, because the requirements for what it is to do, how well, and how it will be used are not defined. The only criteria is "... the technical committee will decide...". The problem is **the "technical committee" is NOT TECHNICAL...** it consists primarily of bureaucrats, environmentalists, and politicians who are actually there to serve their **POLITICAL** interests.
6. **The regional model concept is completely inadequate** because of localized aquifer variations that are well known to occur.
7. The project is **NOT** being conducted as a sound engineering project affecting the future livelihood of farmers. Instead, it is conducted as an **ACADEMIC EXERCISE**. The proof of this fact is the completely inadequate definition, as described above, for why the project is necessary, what it will do, how well it will work, or how it will be proven in the field.
8. **The NRD Board and staff are simply not prepared** by education, training, or experience to manage or technically execute such a complicated project that affects people's livelihood. If they were, this project would not be in the poor state it is in after 5 years and more than \$7Million being spent.

The recommendations made by Mr. Klein specifically would correct the above defects, with details as to how to do that, and why. And, there would be an independent firm engaged as the responsible project manager empowered to control both the technical and managerial aspects of COHYST. That firm would be one with a demonstrated record of performance on large and complex projects and a **true engineering – not research – firm**. It would NOT be a hydrological research firm to avoid political influences. This concept would eliminate the problem of the project being executed based on politics, and it would institute engineering discipline so the end result will not harm the farmer. Unless these corrections are made, the future of irrigated agriculture will be seriously harmed as the result of the project being politically based causing a technically defective outcome.

A copy of Mr. Klein's letter requesting action is attached. Additional supporting information is available at <http://www.platterivertruth.org> and by telephone or email as shown on the letterhead.