

Buddy Garcia, *Chairman*
Larry R. Soward, *Commissioner*
Bryan W. Shaw, Ph.D., *Commissioner*



TEXAS
COMMISSION
ON ENVIRONMENTAL
QUALITY

Blas J. Coy, Jr., *Public Interest Counsel*
2008 FEB -1 PM 4:08

TEXAS COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE
Protecting Texas by Reducing and Preventing Pollution

February 1, 2008

LaDonna Castañuela, Chief Clerk
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
Office of the Chief Clerk (MC-105)
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, Texas 78711-3087

RE: **SUPERIOR CRUSHED STONE, LC**
TCEQ DOCKET NO. 2007-1529-AIR

Dear Ms. Castañuela:

Enclosed for filing is the Public Interest Counsel's Response to Request for Hearing in the above-entitled matter.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in cursive script that reads "Scott A. Humphrey" followed by a flourish.

Scott A. Humphrey, Attorney
Assistant Public Interest Counsel

cc: Mailing List

Enclosure

REPLY TO: PUBLIC INTEREST COUNSEL, MC 103 • P.O. BOX 13087 • AUSTIN, TEXAS 78711-3087 • 512-239-6363

P.O. Box 13087 • Austin, Texas 78711-3087 • 512-239-1000 • Internet address: www.tceq.state.tx.us

printed on recycled paper using soy-based ink

TCEQ DOCKET NO. 2007-1529-AIR

2008 FEB -1 PM 4:08

IN THE MATTER OF THE
APPLICATION BY SUPERIOR
CRUSHED STONE, LC FOR
A PORTABLE ROCK CRUSHER
IN FLORENCE, BELL COUNTY

§
§
§
§
§

BEFORE THE
TEXAS COMMISSION ON
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE

**THE OFFICE OF PUBLIC INTEREST COUNSEL'S
RESPONSE TO REQUEST FOR HEARING**

TO THE MEMBERS OF THE TEXAS COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY:

The Office of Public Interest Counsel (OPIC) of the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (Commission or TCEQ) files this Response to Requests for a Contested Case Hearing in the above-referenced matter:

I. INTRODUCTION

Superior Crushed Stone, LC (Applicant) has applied to the TCEQ for a New Source Review permit under Texas Clean Air Act (TCAA) § 382.0518. The Applicant seeks authorization to construct a new facility that would emit air contaminants.

The permit would authorize the Applicant to construct three portable rock crushers. The proposed facility would be located approximately 3.5 miles northeast of Highway 195 on Country Road 228 in Florence, Bell County, Texas. Contaminants authorized under this permit would include particulate matter less than 10 microns in diameter.

The permit application was received on February 23, 2005, and the Executive Director declared the application administratively complete on March 25, 2005. The Notice of Receipt of Application and Intent to Obtain an Air Quality Permit was published on April 21, 2005 in the *Killeen Daily Herald*.

In response to the notice, the TCEQ received numerous requests for a contested case hearing. For the reasons discussed *infra*, OPIC recommends granting the requests submitted by

Barry A. Clemens, J.T. & Adrian L. Madden, Debbie Porterfield and Arthur Winans and referring this matter to the State Office of Administrative Hearings (SOAH). OPIC recommends denying the remaining hearing requests.

II. REQUIREMENTS OF APPLICABLE LAW

This application was declared administratively complete on March 25, 2005. Because the application was declared administratively complete after September 1, 1999, it is subject to the requirements of Texas Health & Safety Code § 382.056 and Texas Water Code § 5.556 added by Acts 1999, 76th Leg., ch 1350 (commonly known as "House Bill 801").

Under the applicable statutory and regulatory requirements, a hearing request must substantially comply with the following: give the name, address, daytime telephone number, and, where possible, fax number of the person who files the request; identify the requestor's personal justiciable interest affected by the application showing why the requestor is an "affected person" who may be adversely affected by the proposed facility or activity in a manner not common to members of the general public; request a contested case hearing; list all relevant and material disputed issues of fact that were raised during the comment period that are the basis of the hearing request; and provide any other information specified in the public notice of application. 30 TAC § 55.201(d).

Under 30 TAC § 55.203(a), an affected person is "one who has a personal justiciable interest related to a legal right, duty, privilege, power, or economic interest affected by the application." This justiciable interest does not include an interest common to the general public. In addition, 30 TAC § 55.203(c) provides relevant factors that will be considered in determining

whether a person is affected. These factors include:

- (1) whether the interest claimed is one protected by the law under which the application will be considered;
- (2) distance restriction or other limitations imposed by law on the affected interest;
- (3) whether a reasonable relationship exists between the interest claimed and the activity regulated;
- (4) likely impact of the regulated activity on the health, safety, and use of property of the person;
- (5) likely impact of the regulated activity on use of the impacted natural resource by the person; and
- (6) for governmental entities, their statutory authority over or interest in the issues relevant to the application.

The Commission shall grant an affected person's timely filed hearing request if: (1) the request is made pursuant to a right to hearing authorized by law; and (2) the request raises disputed issues of fact that were raised during the comment period and that are relevant and material to the commission's decision on the application. 30 TAC § 55.211(c).

Accordingly, pursuant to 30 TAC § 55.209(e), responses to hearing requests must specifically address:

- (1) whether the requestor is an affected person;
- (2) which issues raised in the hearing request are disputed;
- (3) whether the dispute involves questions of fact or law;
- (4) whether the issues were raised during the public comment period;
- (5) whether the hearing request is based on issues raised solely in a public comment withdrawn by the commenter in writing by filing a withdrawal letter with the chief clerk prior to the filing of the Executive Director's response to Comment;
- (6) whether the issues are relevant and material to the decision on the application; and
- (7) a maximum expected duration for the contested case hearing.

III. DISCUSSION

A. Determination of Affected Person Status

1. Barry A. Clemens

Mr. Clemens resides at 21500 Firefly Road in Florence, Texas. His primary concerns relate to impacts on wildlife, increased noise and traffic and dust pollution on his property.

Mr. Clemens operates a registered wildlife management area and has documented numerous native and endangered species. He is required to follow the guidelines of Texas Parks and Wildlife's chief biologist, Derrick W. Walter. He is concerned about the impact of dust from the proposed facility on the native and endangered species.

Mr. Clemens also states that truck traffic around his property would increase as a result of the proposed facility's operations. He also indicates that the prevailing winds blow directly across his property about eight months out of the year, and the proposed facility would leave a coating of rock dust on his property (he is currently experiencing this problem with the existing facility).

OPIC concludes that Mr. Clemens is an affected person entitled to a contested case hearing. Based on the map provided by the ED, it appears that Mr. Clemens' property is more than one mile away from the proposed operating site. However, based on the experience Mr. Clemens has had with the existing facility, which is located nearby the proposed facility's footprint, it is likely that Mr. Clemens would experience an adverse impact from the proposed operation. Mr. Clemens has identified an interest not common to members of the general public.

His concerns about the dust and native and endangered species are interests protected by the law under which this application will be considered. A reasonable relationship exists between the interest claimed and the activity regulated. There is a likely impact of the regulated activity on his health and use of his property as well as an impact on a natural resource. Therefore, OPIC recommends a finding that Mr. Clemens is an affected person entitled to a contested case hearing.

2. J.T. & Adrian L. Madden

The Maddens state their home is located directly across from a large open field off of CR 228 approximately one mile up the private access known as Indian Lake Rd. They have expressed concerns regarding the Applicant's current operations, health related issues, water usage and property values.

With respect to current operations, the Maddens indicate that the Applicant has already been operating in this area, and there is a huge gravel pile that is visible from their front porch. They have heard and seen a portable crusher operating in the vicinity several times. They assert the Applicant's current operation has raised the dust level in the area to a serious level. They also indicate their home is continuously inundated with a fine dust which covers every portion of the interior and exterior.

Regarding health issues, water usage and property values, the Maddens indicate they both suffer from allergies and Mr. Madden has asthma. They are concerned that the proposed permit will exacerbate those problems. They also discuss that the proposed permit will result in an increased usage of water by the Applicant and may cause a reduction in their water pressure.

Finally, the Maddens contend that their future plans to sell their home will be adversely affected to the point they will find it difficult to sell due to the severe amount of continuous dirt and interior dust that infiltrates their home.

The Maddens' concerns regarding dust and impacts on their health are interests protected by the law under which this application will be considered. A reasonable relationship exists between the interest claimed and the activity regulated. There is a likely impact of the regulated activity on the Maddens' health and use of their property. Therefore, OPIC recommends a finding that the J.T. and Adrian Madden are affected persons entitled to a contested case hearing.

3. Arthur Winans

Based on the map provided by the ED, it appears that Mr. Winans lives approximately two miles from the proposed facility. He indicates that within two miles of his home, six quarries have opened up, including one across from his home. He states that people who have moved to this quiet area now have to put up with dust pollution, noise pollution and the constant heavy traffic from speedy truckers. He also discusses how last summer, he could not go out in the evening due to the loud noise coming from across the road from the cutting machines that operate both day and night. He complains that the road between Florence and Jarrell has been ruined by the large trucks and that Firefly Road had to be completely redone due to the constant damage by the quarry. OPIC infers that he is concerned that the proposed permit will exacerbate the problems related to dust, noise, traffic and the use and enjoyment of his property.

Based on the map provided by the ED, it appears that Mr. Winans lives approximately two miles from the proposed facility. His issues regarding dust and use and enjoyment of

property and how they will be impacted by another rock crushing facility are interests protected by the law under which this application will be considered. A reasonable relationship exists between the interest claimed and the activity regulated. There is no distance limitation applicable to who may be deemed an "affected person" on this application. OPIC concludes that based on the nature of proposed operations and the concerns expressed by Mr. Winans, there is a likely impact of the regulated activity on his health and use of his property as well as an impact on a natural resource. Therefore, OPIC recommends a finding that Mr. Winans is an affected person entitled to a contested case hearing.

4. Debbie Porterfield

Ms. Porterfield claims that the proposed facility is located on property that abuts her northwest property line. Her concern arises from the fact that this property has an easement and apparently a road that runs down the entire length of her property line. She discusses her husband's health problems and their desire to move out of the area after the rock crushing activity began. She indicated that it has been difficult to sell the house with the Applicant's rock quarry adjacent to her property. She also expresses concerns regarding about how the facility will affect her property value, water well and air quality.

OPIC could not identify Ms. Porterfield's property on the map provided by the ED. However, based on her representation that her property is adjacent to the proposed facility, OPIC recommends a finding that Ms. Porterfield is an affected person entitled to a contested case hearing. Her concerns regarding how the emissions from the proposed facility will impact the air quality on her property and how it may adversely impact their health are interests protected by the

law under which this application will be considered. A reasonable relationship exists between the interest claimed and the activity regulated. There is a likely impact of the regulated activity on their health and use of their property as well as an impact on a natural resource. Therefore, OPIC recommends a finding that Ms. Porterfield is an affected person entitled to a contested case hearing.

5. The Remaining Hearing Requests

The remaining hearing requests were sent on postcards by the following: Jeff Adams; Bob Baier; Monica Baier; Dorothy Beesley; Patrick Beesley; Glyn M. Bell; Brandi Benoit; Thomas Bohac; Jim D. Bowmer; William Brooks; Johnny L. Buck; John Burchard; Mina Burchard; Glynsha Glayzer-Castro; Lance M. Castro; Sadie Clark; Eric Clemens; Shiela Clemens; Alice Colt; Robert Colt; Clyde M. Floyd; Glenice A. Ford; Glenda Glayzer; Kimberly Goodelle; Richard Goodelle; Chester Green; Ralph Hale; Vicki Hale; Michael David Heiser; Lonnie Henderson; Cheryl A. Hildebrand; Phil Hopkins; Jasper E. Hunter; Donnie Jackson; Floyd A. Jackson; Marilyn Jaeger; Ann Johnson; Bill Jones; Frances Jones; Janet Kenyar; Lynn Lemmons; Beth Mann; Edward Mann; Peter D. Maskunas; Paul B. Mitchell; Mary Moore; Col. Netherton; Barbara Newton; Jean Porras; Johnny Porras; Alan D. Procter; Gene S. Ray; Michael A. Robinson; Jan Roth; Ed Rothbauer; David Schuchardt; Destiny Schuchardt; Martha Shreeve; Michael Shreeve; Jimmy Simpson; Nancy Simpson; Shirley Simpson; Wilburn Simpson; Shirley Thompson; Stayton Thompson; H.A. Thornton; Duff Tucker; Pat Tucker; Paul Vaccaro; Lynn Walker; Mike Walker; Jessie V. Warrick; Floyd W. Watson, Jr.; Paula Watson; Thomas Watson; Clint Watts; Randy Watts; Brenda Wilbur; Scott Wilbur; Virginia Wilson; and Jessica Wise.

The identical postcards had the same printed message: "Request a Public Hearing on Air Quality Permit Application 75068L001." Then each person printed his or her name on the postcard.

These postcards are expressions of concern but do not provide any basis for finding that the requesters are affected persons with interests not common to members of the general public. Therefore, OPIC cannot recommend that any of these hearing requesters are affected persons entitled to a contested case hearing. If any of these individuals provide further information regarding where they live with respect to the proposed facility and specific interests that are protected by the law under which the application will be considered, then OPIC will reconsider its recommendation.

B. Issues Raised in the Hearing Requests

The issues raised in the hearing requests include the following: (1) whether the dust pollution created by the proposed facility will impact the air quality and environment; (2) whether the proposed facility will result in increased traffic; (3) whether the proposed facility will result in an increase in noise; (4) whether the proposed facility will adversely affect property values; (5) whether the proposed facility will adversely affect nearby endangered and native species; (6) and whether the proposed facility will adversely affect a nearby water well.

1. Disputed Issues of Fact

There is no agreement of the parties on the issues discussed above. In his Response to Comments, the Executive Director states the Applicant will use the Best Available Control Technology to minimize the level of emissions. Furthermore, the ED conducted a protectiveness review and anticipates no adverse health effects as a result of the proposed facility. If the facility

is operated in accordance with the conditions of the permit, the ED believes there should be no adverse impacts to public health and welfare, the environment or animal. The ED also states he has no jurisdiction regarding issues pertaining to traffic, noise or property values. The ED also states that water quality are beyond the scope of this air quality permit application.

2. Issues Raised During the Comment Period

The hearing requests were filed with the Chief Clerk's Office prior to the close of the public comment period in this case. Consequently, the issues presented in the hearing request were raised in a timely manner and are appropriate for consideration by the Commission.

3. Relevant and Material Issues

OPIC concurs with the ED that the Texas Clean Air Act (TCAA) and TCEQ rules require an evaluation of air quality permit applications to determine whether adverse effects to public health, general welfare or physical property are expected from the emissions that would be generated by the emissions from the Applicant's proposed facility. However, the TCEQ's jurisdiction in this matter is limited to air quality issues regulated under the TCAA. Therefore, insofar as this application is concerned, the Commission has no jurisdiction with respect to issues relating to traffic, noise, property values or water quality.

C. Issues Recommended for Hearing and Maximum Expected Duration of Hearing

Based on the foregoing, the OPIC recommends the following issues be referred to SOAH:

- (1) whether the proposed facility will adversely impact public health or physical property; and
- (2) whether the proposed facility will adversely impact native and endangered species.

Section 50.115(d) of the Commission rules requires that any Commission order referring

a case to SOAH specify the maximum expected duration of the hearing by stating a date by which the judge is expected to issue a Proposal for Decision. The rule also provides that no hearing shall be longer than one year from the first day of the preliminary hearing to the date the Proposal for Decision is issued. To assist the Commission in stating a date by which the judge is expected to issue a Proposal for Decision, and as required by 30 TAC § 55.209(d)(7), OPIC estimates that the maximum expected duration of a hearing on this application would be nine months from the first date of the preliminary hearing until the Proposal for Decision is issued.

IV. CONCLUSION

OPIC recommends granting the hearing requests submitted by Barry Clemens, J.T. and Adrian Madden, Arthur Winans and Debbie Porterfield and referring the above-reference issues to the State Office of Administrative Hearings. OPIC further recommends a hearing duration of nine months. In addition, OPIC recommends denying the remaining hearing requests. However, OPIC notes that if any hearing request is granted and a contested case hearing is convened, any person may attend the preliminary hearing and request to be a party and have their request considered by the Administrative Law Judge.

Page 12
OPIC's Response to Request for Hearing
Superior Crushed Stone, LC
TCEQ Docket No. 2007-1529-AIR
February 1, 2008


Respectfully submitted,

Blas J. Coy, Jr.
Public Interest Counsel

By 
Scott A. Humphrey
Assistant Public Interest Counsel
P.O. Box 13087 MC 103
Austin, Texas 78711
(512)239-6363 PHONE
(512)239-6377 FAX

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on February 1, 2008 the original and eleven true and correct copies of the foregoing were filed with the Chief Clerk of the TCEQ and a copy was served to all persons listed on the attached mailing list via hand delivery, facsimile transmission, Inter-Agency Mail or by deposit in the U.S. Mail.


Scott A. Humphrey

MAILING LIST
SUPERIOR CRUSHED STONE, LC
TCEQ DOCKET NO. 2007-1529-AIR

FOR THE APPLICANT:

John Schuler
Superior Crushed Stone, LC
1405 E. Riverside Dr.
Austin, Texas 78741-1137
Tel: (512) 447-7773
Fax: (512) 440-0989

Monique Wells, Engineer
Hill Country Environmental, Inc.
2499 Capital of Texas Highway South
Building A, Ste. 204
Austin, Texas 78746

FOR THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR:

Erin Selvera, Staff Attorney
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
Environmental Law Division, MC-173
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, Texas 78711-3087
Tel: (512) 239-0600
Fax: (512) 239-0606

Michael P. Wilson, Technical Staff
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
Air Permits Division, MC-163
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, Texas 78711-3087
Tel: (512) 239-1922
Fax: (512) 239-1300

FOR OFFICE OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE:

Bridget Bohac, Director
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
Office of Public Assistance, MC-108
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, Texas 78711-3087
Tel: (512) 239-4000
Fax: (512) 239-4007

FOR ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE

RESOLUTION:

Kyle Lucas
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
Alternative Dispute Resolution, MC-222
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, Texas 78711-3087
Tel: (512) 239-4010
Fax: (512) 239-4015

FOR THE CHIEF CLERK:

LaDonna Castañuela
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
Office of Chief Clerk, MC-105
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, Texas 78711-3087
Tel: (512) 239-3300
Fax: (512) 239-3311

REQUESTERS:

See attached list.

JEFF ADAMS
PO BOX 657
FLORENCE TX 76527-0657

GLENDIA & LANCE M CASTRO
20816 FIREFLY
FLORENCE TX 76527-3906

RALPH & VICKI HALE
20281 FIREFLY
FLORENCE TX 76527-3941

BOB & MONICA BAIER
16068 FM 2843
FLORENCE TX 76527-3953

SADIE CLARK
15741 ABBOTT SPRINGS LN
FLORENCE TX 76527-3961

MICHEAL HEISER
1640 COUNTY ROAD 228
FLORENCE TX 76527-4145

DOROTHY & PATRICK BEESLEY
18865 STILLMAN VLY
FLORENCE TX 76527-3963

BARRY A CLEMENS
21500 FIREFLY
FLORENCE TX 76527-3957

LONNIE HENDERSON
15987 ABBOTT SPRINGS LN
FLORENCE TX 76527-3977

GLYNYSHA & MRS GLYN M BELL
20816 FIREFLY
FLORENCE TX 76527-3906

ERIC CLEMENS
21500 FIREFLY
FLORENCE TX 76527-3957

CHERYL A HILDEBRAND
PO BOX 184
NOLANVILLE TX 76559-0184

BRANDI BENOIT
23020 FIREFLY
FLORENCE TX 76527-3939

SHEILA CLEMENS
21500 FIREFLY
FLORENCE TX 76527-3957

PHIL HOPKINS
15984 ABBOTT SPRINGS LN NO 100
FLORENCE TX 76527-3945

THOMAS BOHAC
PO BOX 145
JARRELL TX 76537-0145

ALICE & ROBERT COLT
879 COUNTY ROAD 231
FLORENCE TX 76527-3938

JASPER E HUNTER
19011 STILLMAN VLY
FLORENCE TX 76527-4139

JIM D BOWMER
PO BOX 844
TEMPLE TX 76503-0844

CLYDE M FORD
604 WHITE OAK LN
HARKER HEIGHTS TX 76548-1648

DONNIE JACKSON
14075 CEDAR VALLEY RD
SALADO TX 76571-5015

WILLIAM BROOKS
556 RAMMS DR
FLORENCE TX 76527-3995

GLENICE A FORD
604 WHITE OAK LN
HARKER HEIGHTS TX 76548-1648

FLOYD A JACKSON
17670 CROWS RANCH RD
SALADO TX 76571-5073

JOHNNY L BUCK
16611 ABBOTT SPRINGS LN
FLORENCE TX 76527-3950

KIMBERLY & RICHARD GOODELLE
21200 FIREFLY
FLORENCE TX 76527-3946

MARILYN JAEGER
PO BOX 502
FLORENCE TX 76527-0502

JOHN & MINA BURCHARD
20100 FIREFLY
FLORENCE TX 76527-4155

CHESTER GREEN
21190 FIREFLY
FLORENCE TX 76527-4077

ANN JOHNSON
18185 STILLMAN VLY
FLORENCE TX 76527-4067

BILL & FRANCES JONES
24657 STILLMAN VLY
FLORENCE TX 76527-3999

JEAN PORRAS
23020 FIREFLY
FLORENCE TX 76527-3939

MICHAEL SHREEVE
21425 FIREFLY
FLORENCE TX 76527-3966

JANET KENYAR
PO BOX 803
PFLUGERVILLE TX 78691-0803

JOHNNY PORRAS
23020 FIREFLY
FLORENCE TX 76527-3939

JIMMY & NANCY SIMPSON
790 COUNTY ROAD 231
FLORENCE TX 76527-3938

LYNN LEMMONS
683 COUNTY ROAD 231
FLORENCE TX 76527-3938

DEBBIE PORTERFIELD
17680 COMANCHE PASS
FLORENCE TX 76527-3962

SHIRLEY & WILBURN SIMPSON
680 COUNTY ROAD 231
FLORENCE TX 76527-3938

ADRIAN & J T MADDEN
1249 INDIAN LAKE RD
FLORENCE TX 76527

ALAN D PROCTER
21705 HIDEOUT TRL
FLORENCE TX 76527-3973

SHIRLEY & STAYTON THOMPSON
PO BOX 8
FLORENCE TX 76527-0008

BETH & EDWARD MANN
PO BOX 546
FLORENCE TX 76527-0546

GENE S RAY
18776 FM 2484
KILLEEN TX 76542-5065

H A THORNTON
17451 STILLMAN VLY
FLORENCE TX 76527-3965

PETER D MASKUNAS
21191 FIREFLY
FLORENCE TX 76527-3949

MICHAEL A ROBINSON
750 COUNTY ROAD 231
FLORENCE TX 76527-3938

DUFF & PAT TUCKER
15810 ABBOTT SPRINGS LN
FLORENCE TX 76527-3969

PAUL B MITCHELL
1319 INDIAN LAKE RD
FLORENCE TX 76527-3829

JAN ROTH
23250 FIREFLY
FLORENCE TX 76527-3980

PAUL VACCARO
674 COUNTY ROAD 231
FLORENCE TX 76527-3938

MARY MOORE
20872 FIREFLY
FLORENCE TX 76527-3906

ED ROTHBAUER
880 COUNTY ROAD 229
FLORENCE TX 76527-3972

LYNN & MIKE WALKER
15046 CEDAR VALLEY RD APT 50
SALADO TX 76571-5336

COL NETHERTON
3933 BALCONES DR
AUSTIN TX 78731-5809

DAVID & DESTINY SCHUCHARDT
1249 B INDIAN LAKE RD
FLORENCE TX 76527

JESSIE V WARRICK
528 MOTH RD
KILLEEN TX 76542-5219

BARBARA NEWTON
950 SEVEN RANCH RD
SALADO TX 76571-5391

MARTHA & MICHAEL SHREEVE
21425 FIREFLY
FLORENCE TX 76527-3966

FLOYD W WATSON
16170 ABBOTT SPRINGS LN
FLORENCE TX 76527-3968

PAULA WATSON
2705 EAGLE RD
TEMPLE TX 76502-1113

THOMAS WATSON
16308 ABBOTT SPRINGS LN
FLORENCE TX 76527-4051

CLINT & RANDY WATTS
24657 STILLMAN VLY
FLORENCE TX 76527-3999

BRENDA & MR SCOTT WILBUR
684 COUNTY ROAD 231
FLORENCE TX 76527-3938

VIRGINIA WILSON
1548 INDIAN LAKE RD
FLORENCE TX 76527-3853

ARTHUR WINANS
1941 FM 2843
FLORENCE TX 76527-3924

JESSICA WISE
21500 FIREFLY
FLORENCE TX 76527-3957