

George H. Russell

1401 19th Street
Huntsville, Texas 77340
936.295.5767 Telephone 936.294.0233 Fax
ghr@cyberclone.net

LWD
8 5675

4 November 2013

REVIEWED

NOV 05 2013

By RR

RFR

CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE

2013 NOV -5 PM 2:52

TEXAS
COMMISSION
ON ENVIRONMENTAL
QUALITY

To: Bridget C. Bohac, Chief Clerk
TCEQ, MC-105
P. O. Box 13087
Austin, Texas 78711-3087
www.tceq.texas.gov/about/comments.html

Subject: Request for Reconsideration of the Executive Director's Decision.

Ref: Steely Lumber Co, Inc.
TPDES Permit No. WQ0004249000

I, George H. Russell, an effected party, do hereby request that the Executive Director's Decision in regard to the above stated permit be reconsidered.

My name, address, telephone number and fax number are on my letterhead.

My cell phone number is 936-581-4302

WHY THE DECISION SHOULD BE RECONSIDERED

RESPONSE 1

"...discharges at Outfall 001 are intermittent and driven by stormwater."

Approximately 95% of the 79 acres of our properties affected are in the floodplain and when the waste pond floods and our properties flood, the waste is deposited on our properties.

Floodplains are NOT considered "property of the State". Only stream channels are claimed to be properties of the State when transporting State

Handwritten signature

owned wastewater to public drinking water supplies as in this case, which is Lake Houston.

Steely has no legal right to deposit admittedly stormwater driven waste on to our three properties downstream from Steely Lumber and associated industries.

RESPONSE 2

“Steely Lumber currently collects samples at Outfall 001.”

This is obviously a case of the “fox guarding the henhouse” and it will be shown that TCEQ oversight should be “standard TCEQ practice” when there are obvious errors and omissions in both the Steely application as well as the TCEQ examination of the application.

RESPONSE 3

“The issuance of this permit does not grant to the permittee the right to use private or public property for conveyance of wastewater along the discharge route described in this permit.”

“It is the responsibility of the permittee to acquire property rights as may be necessary to use the discharge route.”

Steely has made no attempt to acquire an easement for the transport of his wastewater through our properties, especially through our flood plains.

“Accordingly, the TCEQ is authorized to permit the discharge of TREATED effluent into the water in the state.”

The TCEQ hereby uses a specious and bogus argument to allow Steely to discharge his wastewater through our properties:

1. The wastewater is NOT treated. The TCEQ uses the term “treated effluent” four times in its argument on behalf of Steely. The wastewater finds its way into a dark colored pond where any toxins or wastes are allowed to concentrate, especially during drought

2. DOMEL v. CITY OF GEORGETOWN has ZERO legal validity in the Steely situation. The case is about a “GOVERNMENT ENTITY returning TREATED wastewater...”
3. Steely is NOT a GOVERNMENT ENTITY, but rather an industry that is based on the destruction of our Texas native forest ecosystems and their conversion into sterile monocultures of low grade cellulose and low grade wood products.
4. The wastewater from Steely Lumber is NOT treated and certainly has no time to allow pollutants to settle to the bottom of the waste pond, during storm events when it oftentimes flows OUTSIDE the stream channel and onto large parts of our properties as occurred on October 30-31, 2013.
5. The misapplied case is also based on the repeated statement that Georgetown’s TREATED wastewater “is an authorized PUBLIC use.”
6. The untreated industrial wastewater from a “for profit” private company is in no way “an authorized PUBLIC use” of our private property, especially our extensive flood plains.
7. The Court says that “water in a WATERCOURSE is the property of the State, held in trust for the PUBLIC.” Even if this opinion proved to be true the Steely wastewater is admitted to be discharged during storm events in which it would be deposited in our floodplains well outside of the “watercourse”.
8. The case uses the phrases “public purpose”, “legitimate public purpose”, lawful public purposes” and “general public use and welfare”. In no way can Steely’s discharge of UNTREATED wastewater be considered a “legitimate public purpose for general public use and welfare.”
9. The misuse of this case is a FATAL ERROR that in no way legitimizes Steely’s use of either our watercourse through our private properties or the use of our floodplains for his private commercial purposes.
10. Another FATAL FLAW in the misuse of the case is that “The State’s usage rights DO NOT include the right to flood lands owned by riparian landowners; such flooding may result in a constitutional taking or damaging of property.” The majority of the acreages through which Shepherd Creek flows through our properties are “riparian” and Steely has obtained no easement to use our floodplains and riparian acreages.

11. The case also states that “Texas law recognizes TREATED wastewater as a valuable resource...” I can find no evidence that the wastewater from the Steely mill and associated industries has been treated in any way to remove pollutants or other impurities before being flushed over our floodplains during storm events. In fact it is the wastewater concentrate that is flushed onto our flood plains during storm events such as occurred the night of October 30th and the early morning of October 31st, 2013
12. A look at the waste pond from FEMA flood maps indicates that the pond is almost black in color and that it overflows directly onto the floodplain during storm events that causes the waste pond to overflow.

RESPONSE 4

This TCEQ response is especially troubling in that from the examination of aerial photographs there is a tremendous amount of junk both outside of the Shepherd Creek floodplain and in the floodplain indicating that there is the probability of oil, gasoline, diesel, antifreeze and other toxic solutions leaking out of or from the junk and into either the waste pond or the Shepherd Creek watershed.

There is no evidence that the “well water” is potable and not contaminated. More importantly, there are radioactive isotopes in some Walker County aquifers. There is concern about radioactive Alpha particles in Lake Houston water used for drinking purposes by the City of Houston. The well originated waste water from the Steely mill should be tested for any radioactivity and precluded from entering Lake Houston if it would add to the already existing public health concern.

There is no analysis of “boiler blowdown” contaminants.

There is no analysis of the water stagnating in the waste pond and its impact and potential adverse toxic effects on aquatic life.

The TCEQ should sample the waste water in the pond and make certain that it is “maintained to preclude adverse toxic effects on aquatic life...”

I believe that the waste water will be in violation of title 30, section 307.6(b)(4) unless scientifically proven otherwise by an independent ecological laboratory.

From the looks of the water, I would further suspect that the water is unfit for consumption by livestock and domestic animals.

40 CFR 429.124 states that: "There shall be NO discharge of process wastewater pollutants into navigable waters."

It is obvious and apparent from the route taken by the wastewater and the almost 100% certainty that there are pollutants in the wastewater, that it will be in violation of EPA standards when it reaches Lake Houston, which is navigable as are the lower stretches of the East Fork of the San Jacinto River.

The "Response" failed to address the main question which concerned the suspected concentration of Alpha-pinenes, turpentine and other volatiles associated with pine trees that are no doubt in the waste water. Both of these chemicals are known to be toxic to aquatic life. The only test to insure that the water in the waste pond that pours into Shepherd Creek and onto our flood plain in storm events is not toxic to aquatic organisms including micro-organisms. We hereby request that the TCEQ conduct some scientifically valid experiments to determine if aquatic life can live and thrive in the waste pond.

RESPONSE 5

Steely's "commingled discharge" does not list any hydrocarbons that may have saturated the ground since the establishment of the saw mill, nor any leakage from the apparent junk yard located both above the flood plain and within the flood plain.

It further appears that the fox is still allowed to guard the henhouse in that Steely is able to do its own testing at times chosen by Steely, which does not offer truly independent and objective analysis, especially during times of extreme drought or during rainstorm events, both of which could create significance fluctuations in possible pollutants in the UNTREATED "effluent discharged through Outfall 001."

RESPONSE 6

Once again, the fox is allowed to guard the henhouse as the pH data is “self reported”. Due to significant errors and omissions in the permit application it would seem that the TCEQ would demand that pH data should come from an independent third party source.

RESPONSE 7

It seems highly unlikely that the untreated wastewater discharged into the “ditch” and ultimately into Lake Houston, which is navigable waters, could possibly meet the rule under 40 CFR 429.124 that “there shall be NO discharge of process wastewater pollutants into navigable waters.”

There seems to be several types of wastewater that are created by Steely operations that would not meet the exclusion definition in 40 CFR. From the aerial photos there appear to be nursery operations involved as well with the probability that if pesticides of any type are used, that they also would find their way to the waste pond and thence to the navigable waters of Lake Houston.

RESPONSE 8

We disagree with the assumption that the waste water has been, is, or will be treated in any fashion while contained in the waste pond. Any waste water that enters the pond during a storm event will immediately run off onto the Shepherd Creek flood plain and during periodic storm events settle over the private flood plains owned by George H and Suzanne B. Russell.

RESPONSE 9

Although it “is not a standard TCEQ practice to perform aerial inspections and study aerial photographs, we feel that a serious look at the actual facts on the ground be compared with the clumsy and inaccurate renditions provided by Steely in the crudely outlined topo map as well as in Exhibits C and D.

IN REGARD TO STEELY'S PERMIT APPLICATION

P. 3, a.

It appears that Steely failed to "indicate the appropriate use designation for each pond". From the aerial photos there appear to be two ponds on the property.

In addition, Steely states that "wastewater flows through a vegetated area surrounding the area prior to entering the pond, providing some incidental treatment."

We can find no evidence of any such "vegetated area" in the aerial photos.

P. 8, 6, a.

Steely says that "Storm water runoff is commingled with boiler blowdown, steam condensate and wet decking wastewater in the pond." While this seems to be true, Steely fails to mention other pollutants that may commingle with the listed waste waters as may originate from what appears to be a junk yard that is both in the flood plain and above it.

P. 12

We feel that Steely should have provided worksheets in the following areas: 4.1, 6.0, and 7.0.

P. 41, c.

The application is in serious error by misstating the aesthetics of the receiving water and surrounding area.

The approximately half mile through the flood plains on our properties that the waste water passes is managed as a NATURAL AREA and contains the Walker County Champion River Birch for example, along with other significant trees.

P. 45, 5.0, b.

Steely has committed an egregious error by not checking “Yes” to the question: “Does the facility discharge in the Lake Houston watershed?”

The unnamed ditch empties into Shepherd Creek that empties into Winters Bayou that empties into the E. Fork San Jacinto River that empties into the W. Fork San Jacinto River that empties into LAKE HOUSTON all within the Lake Houston watershed.

Exhibit C

This crudely drawn and inaccurate alleged “facility map” in no way accurately corresponds to what is actually on the ground.

Exhibit D

This is another crudely drawn schematic that in no way accurately corresponds to what is actually on the ground.

TOPO MAP

This is another very crude and inaccurate outline alleging to show the Steely Lumber property boundaries and the location of the waste pond, called a settling pond but has the appearance of a cesspool.

OUR EXHIBITS THAT PROVE OUR POINTS ABOUT SERIOUS ERRORS AND OMISSIONS IN THE STEELY APPLICATION THAT RESULTED IN WHAT WE FEEL INDICATES THAT THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR’S DECISION SHOULD BE RECONSIDERED:

OUR EXHIBITS:

Exhibit 1

This photo illustrates part of the junk yard on the Steely Mill property. Runoff during storm events will run off into Shepherd Creek and onto our floodplains.

Exhibit 2

This photo illustrates the position of the surrounding flood plain of Shepherd Creek at the mill. Note that there are two ponds on the property. N. pond seems to be associated with some kind of nursery but there is also a pile of logs nearby that is partially in the flood plain. The “settling pond” in is the lower right hand corner and is nearly black in color.

Exhibit 3

This photo shows our three houses on our three properties that are largely in the Shepherd Creek flood plain.

Exhibit 4

This photo shows the fact that mill associated logs are also located to the east of what appears to be a nursery operation as well as a total picture of the layout of the operation.

Exhibit 5

This photo shows the extent of the suspected junk yard as well as the secondary set of logs partially in the flood plain and adjacent to the nursery.

Exhibit 6

This is another photo showing the extent of the junk yard.

Exhibit 7

This map shows the Steely Mill property in light green plus other Steely owned or controlled properties that are adjacent. The waste pond location is circled.

Exhibit 8

This is a sign on the road under which Shepherd Creek passes just beyond our property line showing that the flooding is frequent.

Exhibit 9

Shepherd Creek on Southwood Forest Drive after some of the rains but before the heaviest rains that came later that night.

Exhibit 10

Another photo showing the flooding of Shepherd Creek beyond any bank that the State of Texas may allege to have a claim to for the transport of Steely's waste water.

Exhibit 11

This is Sheperd Creek just beyond our property line.

Exhibit 12

The stream channel is quite narrow at this point and the photo shows the flood waters flowing out onto the flood plain and through the woods.


Exhibit 13

This photo shows the Steely Mill and associated activities in their relationship to our properties largely in the Shepherd Creek flood plain but also proving that the properties are NATURAL AREAS.

Exhibit 14

This photo shows that the diagrams provided in the Steely application are not accurate in regard to actually showing the relationship with the facts on the ground.

Therefore we pray that THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR will reconsider his decision to grant Steely Lumber a permit to discharge its untreated wastewater through our NATURAL AREAS and their associated RIPARIAN FLOOD PLAINS.





George M. Russell

Exhibit 1

1:600

Property Search By GEO ID Property Search By WCAD Property ID



- Results**
- Map Contents
 - Flood Data
 - City of Huntsville Benchmarks
 - Study Data
 - Floodplains and Flood Zones
 - Topography
 - Water Features
 - Property
 - Property
 - Setbacks
 - Easements
 - Address Points
 - Street Names
 - Planimetrics
 - Aerial Map (2012)
 - Features
 - Map Boundary (Surrounding County)
 - TerrainMap
 - Features
 - Map Boundary (Surrounding County)

Exhibit 2


Property Search By GEO ID Property Search By WCAD Property ID 1:6,000



- Results
- Map Contents
 - Flood Data
 - City of Huntsville Benchmarks
 - Study Data
 - Floodplains and Flood Zones
 - Topography
 - Water Features
 - Property
 - Property
 - Setbacks
 - Easements
 - Address Points
 - Street Names
 - Planimetrics
 - Aerial Map (2012)
 - Features
 - Map Boundary (Surrounding County)
 - TerrainMap
 - Features
 - Map Boundary (Surrounding County)

Exhibit 3

Property Search By GEO ID Property Search By WCAD Property ID 1:6,000



- Results
- Map Contents
 - Flood Data
 - City of Huntsville Benchmarks
 - Study Data
 - Floodplains and Flood Zones
 - Topography
 - Water Features
 - Property
 - Property
 - Setbacks
 - Easements
 - Address Points
 - Street Names
 - Planimetrics
 - Aerial Map (2012)
 - Features
 - Map Boundary (Surrounding County)
 - TerrainMap
 - Features
 - Map Boundary (Surrounding County)

Exhibit 4

Property Search By GEO ID Property Search By WCAD Property ID

1:6,000



- Results**
- Flood Data
 - City of Huntsville Benchmarks
 - Study Data
 - Floodplains and Flood Zones
 - Topography
 - Water Features
 - Property
 - Property
 - Setbacks
 - Easements
 - Address Points
 - Street Names
 - Planimetrics
 - Aerial Map (2012)
 - Features
 - Map Boundary (Surrounding County)
 - TerrainMap
 - Features
 - Map Boundary (Surrounding County)

Exhibit 5

Google

To see all the details that are visible on the screen, use the "Print" link next to the map.




Exhibit 6


Google

To see all the details that are visible on the screen, use the "Print" link next to the map.



Exhibit 7


Map Title



October 22, 2013

Parcels

1:12,353



Ownership_Information

© 2012 Zentri © AND © 2013 Microsoft Corporation

Microsoft Corporation. All rights reserved. Microsoft, Windows, and Windows Live are either registered trademarks or trademarks of Microsoft Corporation in the United States and/or other countries.

Exhibit 8

CAUTION
WATCH FOR
WATER ON
ROAD

October 30, 2013 12:10pm




Exhibit 9




October 30, 2013 12:11pm

Exhibit 10




October 30, 2013 12:12pm

Exhibit 11



October 30, 2013 12:12pm

Exhibit 12



October 30, 2013 12:12pm

Exhibit 13

Google

To see all the details that are visible on the screen, use the "Print" link next to the map.



Exhibit 14

Google

To see all the details that are visible on the screen, use the "Print" link next to the map.



Print postage online

Please Rush to Addressee
PLEASE PRESS FIRMLY



EXPRESS MAIL

UNITED STATES POSTAL SERVICE

Flat Rate®
Visit us at usps.com



U.S. POSTAGE
FLAT RATE
NOV 4 2013
AMOUNT
\$0.00
00085327-18

EXTREMELY URGENT


Please Rush To Addressee

773520
EXPRESS MAIL
POSTAGE REQUIRED



PLEASE NOTE:

When used internationally, affix customs
declaration (PS Form 2975, or 2976).



EH 3E5E6666 US

PRESS HARD. YOU ARE MAKING 3 COPIES.

Weight	11.4	lb	13	oz
Postage	\$ 19.95			
Insurance fee	\$ 0.00			
Signature fee	\$ 0.00			
Return Receipt fee	\$ 0.00			
Total Postage & Fees	\$ 19.95			

FRONT: (PLEASE PRINT) PHONE 1
George W. Russell
1401 19th St.
Huntsville, TX
77340

FOR PICKUP OR TRACKING
Visit www.usps.com
Call 1-800-222-1811



PostOffice To Addressee
HUNTSVILLE, TX
COMMERCIAL CENTER

Day	Time	Day	Time
Nov 05	AM	Nov 05	AM
Delivery Date	Time	Delivery Date	Time
Nov 05	AM	Nov 05	AM

TO: (PLEASE PRINT) PHONE 1
Bridget C. Bohag, Director
TCEQ, MC-105
PO Box 13087
Austin, TX

787111+3087

2013 NOV -5 PM 2:46
CHIEF CLERKS OFFICE

COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY



PS10001000006

Marisa Weber

From: PUBCOMMENT-OCC
Sent: Monday, July 08, 2013 8:34 AM
To: PUBCOMMENT-OCC2
Subject: FW: Public comment on Permit Number WQ0004249000

From: ghr@cyberclone.net [<mailto:ghr@cyberclone.net>]
Sent: Thursday, July 04, 2013 1:10 PM
To: donotReply@tceq.state.tx.us
Subject: Public comment on Permit Number WQ0004249000

LWD
85675

REGULATED ENTY NAME STEELY LUMBER WWTF

RN NUMBER: RN103015566

PERMIT NUMBER: WQ0004249000

DOCKET NUMBER:

COUNTY: WALKER

PRINCIPAL NAME: STEELY LUMBER CO INC

CN NUMBER: CN600786719

FROM

NAME: George Haw Russell

E-MAIL: ghr@cyberclone.net

COMPANY: Ethician Foundation

ADDRESS: 1401 19TH ST
HUNTSVILLE TX 77340-5057

PHONE: 9365814302

FAX: 9362940233

COMMENTS: I disagree that the permit "meets all statutory and regulatory requirements." It is my understanding that to discharge wastewater through private property not owned by the permit holder that the statute requires that the discharger has an easement or other permit to do so. Steely has no such permission to discharge waste water through two of our properties that are managed for native biodiversity. We have seen no scientific proof that even if Steely acquired the legal right to discharge waste through our wildlife sanctuaries

MW

that the wastewater would do zero harm to all native life forms including micro-organisms. Questions: (Associated specifically to this permit) 1. What is the chemical composition of "wet decking wastewater? What are the impacts on aquatic life from alpha-pinenes, turpines and other volatiles associated with pine trees? 2. What tests have been made to determine the chemicals associated with Wastewater (boiler blowdown)? 3. What is the ph level of the wastewater from all sources and how does it impact the ph of the naturally occurring water in Shepherd Creek downstream? 4. Is the mill in compliance with EPA "Effluent Limitations Guidelines.?" 5. Has an "on site" inspection of the facilities been conducted to determine is there are any hazardous chemicals such as those associated with "treated" (PT, CCA, Creosote) materials? 6. Has an "aerial" inspection or inspection of aerial photographs been conducted to determine if there are any dump sites, junk piles, or other debris that could pollute "stormwater runoff"? It is my belief unless proven otherwise by competent authority that no permit should be granted to run wastewater through our wildlife sanctuaries unless or until Steely obtains legal approval to do so and unless or until Steely can prove that the wastewater from the plant site does zero harm to aquatic life in Shepherd Creek including micro-organisms. I hereby reserve the right, to within the rules to submit additional questions or comments at a later date.

Marisa Weber

From: PUBCOMMENT
Sent: Thursday, January 17, 2013 3:56 PM
To: PUBCOMMENT-OCC2
Subject: FW: Public comment on Permit Number WQ0004249000

From: PUBCOMMENT-OCC
Sent: Thursday, January 17, 2013 3:21 PM
To: PUBCOMMENT
Subject: FW: Public comment on Permit Number WQ0004249000

*100D
05675*

From: ghr@cyberclone.net [<mailto:ghr@cyberclone.net>]
Sent: Thursday, January 17, 2013 2:46 PM
To: donotReply@tceq.state.tx.us
Subject: Public comment on Permit Number WQ0004249000

REGULATED ENTY NAME STEELY LUMBER WWTF

RN NUMBER: RN103015566

PERMIT NUMBER: WQ0004249000

DOCKET NUMBER:

COUNTY: WALKER

PRINCIPAL NAME: STEELY LUMBER CO INC

CN NUMBER: CN600786719

FROM

NAME: George Haw Russell

E-MAIL: ghr@cyberclone.net

COMPANY:

ADDRESS: 1401 19TH ST
HUNTSVILLE TX 77340-5057

PHONE: 9362955767

FAX: 9362940233

MW

COMMENTS: 17 January 2013 We are re-submitting our earlier comments that may or may not have been entered into your system correctly. I might add that due to the apparent fact that Steely has never asked us for an easement for the flow of their treated wastes through our natural areas, we hereby request that extra efforts be made by the TCEQ on behalf of the wildlife, including micro-organisms on up that rely on Shepherd Creek be given extra scrutiny to make sure that there is zero harm done by the Steely discharge and that the water is as pure as any natural spring fed creek in e. Texas. Thank you for your kind consideration. We will need a "clean bill of health" before we will consider granting an easement to Steely. We suspect that any toxic elements that are being discharged during this period of heavy rains will be much more diluted than during times of drought. Therefore we hope that TCEQ Water Quality Scientists are able to take samples during time of heavy discharge from Steely as well as during times of drought to make sure that none of our aquatic or terrestrial organisms are harmed in any way. George H. Russell 2 January 2013 Dear Friends, I would like to comment on the "Water Quality Permit Renewal" for Steely Lumber in Huntsville, Texas but am having a hard time finding the subject "Permit No. WQ0004249000. Perhaps I am pricking the wrong buttons on the computer that is tied to your web site. Please help me comment per the rules and regulations of the TCEQ. Very briefly: 1. It appears that the wastewater flows through over 2,000 linear feet through our wilderness wildlife sanctuaries on Shepherd Creek, in Walker County and thence into Lake Livingston. 2. We are very concerned that none of our native aquatic species to include but not be limited to micro-organisms, and on up through the biological chain to fish, mussels, turtles, and any other native species that need pure water in which to lead healthy and productive lives are harmed in any way by hatching in, living in, or ingesting any chemical in the water. 3. We are also concerned about the health and welfare of any native invertebrate, mammal, bird, or reptile that may ingest said "treated" waters flowing through our pristine properties. 4. Of special note is the potential for Red-cockaded Woodpeckers residing in the old growth pines on the properties since National Forest RCW habitat is quite close-by. Thank you for your kind attention to this matter. George H. Russell P. S. We would like for your specialists to be able to test the waters in Shepherd Creek both now and in the future and thus please feel free to call me to secure access at my office at 936-295-57676 January 2012 In reference to PERMIT RENEWAL NUMBER WQ0004249000 (Steely Lumber Company) In an earlier permit extension dated 3 June 2010 with an expiration date of 1 July 2013, the cover letter from the TCEQ states the following: "The issuance of this permit does not grant the permittee the right to use private or public property for the conveyance of wastewater along the discharge route described in this permit...It is the responsibility of the permittee to acquire property rights as may be necessary to use the discharge route." I have no record of granting an easement for the discharge of "wastes" from the Steely Lumber Company through two of our properties. Does the TCEQ have any record of any right that may have been granted by the persons from whom we purchased the properties through which the wastes will flow? We have owned the first property through which the wastes flow along Shepherd Creek for a distance of some 1,500 or more feet, since February 1977. I just checked the Title Policy and there were no easements recorded as of the date of purchase and I have never granted an easement for the flow of "waste" though this or our other adjacent property. The stream is not navigable and thus is not a public stream. Does the TCEQ issue permits even if the person or entity requesting the "waste discharge" permit has no legal right for the effluent to flow through our private properties? Thank you for your kind attention to this matter. George H. Russell

2. We are very concerned that none of our native aquatic species to include but not be limited to micro-organisms, and on up through the biological chain to fish, mussels, turtles, and any other native species that need pure water in which to lead healthy and productive lives are harmed in any way by hatching in, living in, or ingesting any chemical in the water.

3. We are also concerned about the health and welfare of any native invertebrate, mammal, bird, or reptile that may ingest said "treated" waters flowing through our pristine properties.

4. Of special note is the potential for Red-cockaded Woodpeckers residing in the old growth pines on the properties since National Forest RCW habitat is quite close-by.

Thank you for your kind attention to this matter.

George H. Russell

P. S. We would like for your specialists to be able to test the waters in Shepherd Creek both now and in the future and thus please feel free to call me to secure access at my office at 936-295-5767

THURSDAY, DECEMBER 20, 2012

LEGALS

LEGALS

**TEXAS COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENTAL
QUALITY
NOTICE OF RECEIPT OF APPLICATION AND
INTENT TO OBTAIN WATER QUALITY
PERMIT RENEWAL**

PERMIT NO. WQ0004249000

APPLICATION. Steely Lumber Co., Inc., 1405 Southwood Drive, Huntsville, Texas 77340-2479, which operates the Steely Lumber Co., a sawmill facility, has applied to the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) to Renew Texas Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (TPDES) Permit No. WQ0004249000 (EPA I.D. No. TX0123421) to authorize the discharge of treated wastewater at an intermittent and flow variable rate. The facility is located at 1405 Southwood Drive in

TO
HE
FO
yo
ap
nu
pr
fac
wo
a v
an
co
co
a g
des
rec
ind
be
fac

**APPLICATION TO RENEW
TEXAS COMMISSION ON
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY**

INDUSTRIAL WASTEWATER PERMIT NO. 0004249000

**ISSUED TO
STEELY LUMBER CO., INC.**

December 2012

**Prepared For:
Steely Lumber Co., Inc.
1405 Southwood Drive
Huntsville, TX 77340**

**Prepared By
Source Environmental Sciences, Inc.
4100 Westheimer, Suite 106
Houston, Texas 77027
P: 713-621-4474**

**EST.
1984**

www.source-environmental.com

**BBB
T**

TO RENEW

SION ON
QUALITY

ERMIT NO. 0004249000

O

CO., INC.

STEELY LUMBER CO., INC.

December 2012

Prepared For:
Steely Lumber Co., Inc.
1405 Southwood Drive
Huntsville, TX 77340

Prepared By:
Source Environmental Sciences, Inc.
4100 Westheimer, Suite 106
Houston, Texas 77027
P: 713-621-4474

www.source-environmental.com

disposal site:

N/A

k. For TLAP applications please identify the nearest watercourse to the discharge point which rainfall runoff might flow if not contained: _____

l. Is the location of the sewage sludge disposal site in the existing permit?

Yes No If no, or a new permit application, please give an accurate description.

m. Provide an original full size USGS Topographic Map with all required information. Indicate by a check mark that the information is provided.

- Applicant's property boundary Attachment
- Treatment facility boundaries
- Labeled point of discharge and highlighted discharge route
- Sewage sludge disposal site
- Effluent disposal site boundaries
- New and future construction
- 1 mile radius and 3 miles downstream information
- All ponds

n. Is/will the treated wastewater discharge to a city, county, or state highway, or a flood control district drainage ditch? Yes No

If Yes, indicate by a check mark if:

Authorization granted Authorization pending

(For new and amendments, provide copies of letters that show proof of the approval letter upon receipt.)