Bryan W. Shaw, Ph.D., P.E., *Chairman*
Toby Baker, *Commissioner*
Richard A. Hyde, P.E., *Executive Director*

Vic McWherter, Public Interest Counsel

TEXAS COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Protecting Texas by Reducing and Preventing Pollution

June 8, 2015

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

RE: **NAVASOTA NORTH COUNTRY PEAKERS OPERATING COMPANY I, LLC**
TCEQ DOCKET NO. 2015-0566-AIR

Dear Ms. Bohac:

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

Sincerely,

Rudy Calderon, Attorney
Assistant Public Interest Counsel

cc: Mailing List

Enclosure

DOCKET NO. 2015-0566-AIR

APPLICATION OF	**§**	**BEFORE THE**
NAVASOTA NORTH COUNTRY	**§**	
PEAKERS OPERATING	**§**	**TEXAS COMMISSION ON**
COMPANY I, L.L.C.	**§**	
FOR	**§**	**ENVIRONMENTAL**
AIR QUALITY PERMIT	**§**	
121051/PSDTX 1418	**§**	**QUALITY**

OFFICE OF PUBLIC INTEREST COUNSEL'S RESPONSE TO HEARING REQUESTS

To the Members of the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality:

The Office of Public Interest Counsel (OPIC) at the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ) files this response to the hearing requests in the above-referenced matter.

I. BACKGROUND

Navasota North Country Peakers Operating Company I, L.L.C. (Navasota or Applicant) has applied to the TCEQ for a New Source Review Authorization under Texas Clean Air Act (TCAA), §382.0518. This will authorize the construction of a new plant that contains facilities that may emit air contaminants.

This permit will authorize the applicant to construct the Van Alstyne Energy Center. The plant is located as follows: from US 75 in Van Alstyne turn east onto Van Alstyne Pkwy and go 0.6 miles then

turn south onto Waco St and go 0.1 miles then turn east onto Jefferson St and go 0.2 miles then turn south onto Sherman Rd and go 0.4 miles then turn east on Ballard Rd and go 1.6 miles, Van Alstyne, Grayson County. Contaminants authorized under this permit include volatile organic compounds (VOC), carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen oxides (NOx), and particulate matter (PM), including particulate matter with diameters of 10 micrometers or less (PM10) and 2.5 micrometers or less (PM2.5), sulfur dioxide (SO2), sulfuric acid (H2SO4), hazardous air pollutants, and lead (Pb).

Before work is begun on the construction of a new facility that may emit air contaminants, the person planning the construction must obtain a permit from TCEQ. This permit application is for the initial issuance of Air Quality Permit Number 121051 and Prevention of Significant Deterioration (PSD) Air Quality Permit Number PSDTX1418.

The application was received June 23, 2014, and declared administratively complete July 1, 2014. The Notice of Receipt and Intent to Obtain an Air Quality Permit (public notice) for this permit application was published in English on July 11, 2014, in the *Van Alstyne Leader* and *Herald Democrat.* The Notice of Application and Preliminary Decision for an Air Quality Permit was published on December 26, 2014, in English in the *Van Alstyne Leader* and *Herald Democrat*.

A public meeting was held on January 13, 2015 in Sherman. The notice of public meeting was published in English on December 26, 2014 in the *Van Alstyne Leader* and *Herald Democrat.* The public comment period ended on January 26, 2015. The TCEQ Executive Director (ED) prepared a response to comments (RTC), and the RTC was mailed April 13, 2015. The period to request a contested case hearing ended May 13, 2015.

TCEQ received timely hearing requests from Pamela Boddie, Christy Bryant, Jeffrey Farley, James Firtos, Emily and David Franklin, Donna Franus, Theresa Green, Kelly ansd Frank Herndon, Virginia and Brent Kennedy,Mollie and George Kennemer, Chrissy Marie Koth, Martha and Bobby McKee, Delanna and Michael Mitchell, Christopher Scott Moreno, Charles Netherlain, Brittany Nettles, Rebecca Rodriguez, Velynda Short, Brad Spence, Tracy Spence, Amanda Stormquist, Lori Jean Williams, and Rita Beving on behalf of the Dallas Sierra Club. For the reasons stated herein, OPIC recommends the Commission grant the hearing requests of Pamela Boddie, Virginia and Brent Kennedy, Chrissy Marie Koth, Martha and Bobby McKee, Delanna and Michael Mitchell, Christopher Scott Moreno, Brittany Nettles, Rebecca Rodriguez, Brad Spence, and Tracy Spence, and refer the matter to the State Office of Administrative Hearings (SOAH) on the issues outlined below.

II. APPLICABLE LAW

This application was declared administratively complete after September 1, 1999, and is subject to the requirements of Texas Water Code (TWC) § 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. Section 55.203(c) provides

relevant factors to 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 restrictions 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; and

(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.

A group or association, pursuant to 30 TAC § 55.205(a), may request a contested case hearing only if the group or association meets all of the following requirements:

(1) one or more members of the group or association would otherwise have standing to request a hearing in their own right;

(2) the interests the group or association seeks to protect are germane to the organization's purpose; and

(3) neither the claim asserted nor the relief requested requires the participation of the individual members in the case.

The executive director, the public interest counsel, or the applicant may request that a group or association provide an explanation of how the group or association meets the requirements of 30 TAC § 55.205(a).

III. ANALYSIS OF HEARING REQUESTS

A. Determination of Affected Person Status

Pamela Boddie

According to a map prepared by ED staff, Pamela Boddie resides less than 1 mile from the closest boundary of the proposed facility. As stated in her hearing request, Ms. Boddie's concerns include air quality and health effects.

Ms. Boddie's proximity to the proposed plant, when combined with her concerns regarding air quality and health effects, gives her a personal justiciable interest in this matter. Her proximity also indicates she could be impacted in a manner not common to the general public, and distinguishes her personal justiciable interest from an interest common to the general public.

Consideration of the § 55.203(c) affected person determination factors further indicates that Ms. Boddie qualifies as an affected person. First, her interests concerning air quality and health effects are protected by the law under which this application will be considered. Second, a reasonable relationship exists between that interest and the regulation of air contaminants. Finally, the proximity of Ms. Boddie to the proposed facility increases the likelihood of impacts to her health, safety, and use of property. OPIC finds that under § 55.203, Pamela Boddie qualifies as an affected person.

Virginia and Brent Kennedy

According to a map prepared by ED staff, Virginia and Brent Kennedy reside adjacent to the proposed facility. As stated in their hearing request, the Kennedys' concerns include air quality, health effects, off-site air monitoring, property damage, water quality, and effects on livestock.

The Kennedys' proximity to the proposed plant, when combined with their concerns regarding air quality, health effects, property damage, and effects on livestock, give them a personal justiciable interest in this matter. Their proximity also indicates they could be impacted in a manner not common to the general public, and distinguishes their personal justiciable interest from an interest common to the general public.

Consideration of the § 55.203(c) affected person determination factors further indicates that the Kennedys qualify as affected persons. First, their interests concerning air quality, health effects, property damage, and effects on livestock are protected by the law under which this application will be considered. Second, a reasonable relationship exists between that interest and the regulation of air contaminants. Finally, the proximity of the Kernnedys to the proposed facility increases the likelihood of impacts to their health, safety, and use of

property. OPIC finds that under § 55.203, Virginia and Brent Kennedy qualify as affected persons.

Chrissy Koth

According to a map prepared by ED staff, Chrissy Koth resides adjacent to the proposed facility. As stated in her hearing request, Ms. Koth's concerns include air quality, health effects, and effects on livestock.

Ms. Koth's proximity to the proposed plant, when combined with her concerns regarding air quality, health effects, and effects on livestock, gives her a personal justiciable interest in this matter. Her proximity also indicates she could be impacted in a manner not common to the general public, and distinguishes her personal justiciable interest from an interest common to the general public.

Consideration of the § 55.203(c) affected person determination factors further indicates that Ms. Koth qualifies as an affected person. First, her interests concerning air quality, health effects, and effects on livestock are protected by the law under which this application will be considered. Second, a reasonable relationship exists between that interest and the regulation of air contaminants. Finally, the proximity of Ms. Koth to the proposed facility increases the likelihood of impacts to her health, safety, and use of property. OPIC finds that under § 55.203, Chrissy Koth qualifies as an affected person.

Martha and Bobby McKee

According to a map prepared by ED staff, Matha and Bobby McKee reside less than .5 miles from the closest boundary of the proposed facility. As stated in their hearing request, the McKees' concerns include air quality, health effects, water quality, property damage, and use and enjoyment of their property.

The McKees' proximity to the proposed plant, when combined with their concerns regarding air quality, health effects, property damage, and use and enjoyment of their property, gives them a personal justiciable interest in this matter. Their proximity also indicates they could be impacted in a manner not common to the general public, and distinguishes their personal justiciable interest from an interest common to the general public.

Consideration of the § 55.203(c) affected person determination factors further indicates that the McKees qualify as affected persons. First, their interests concerning air quality, health effects, property damage, and use and enjoyment of their property are protected by the law under which this application will be considered. Second, a reasonable relationship exists between that interest and the regulation of air contaminants. Finally, the proximity of the McKee's to the proposed facility increases the likelihood of impacts to their health,

safety, and use of property. OPIC finds that under § 55.203, Martha and Bobby McKee qualify as affected persons.

Delanna and Michael Mitchell

According to a map prepared by ED staff, Delanna and Michael Mitchell reside adjacent to the proposed facility. As stated in their hearing request, the Mitchell's concerns include air quality, health effects, impact on plants and animals, property damage, and use and enjoyment of their property.

The Mitchells proximity to the proposed plant, when combined with their concerns regarding air quality, health effects, impact on plants and wildlife, property damage, and use and enjoyment of their property, gives them a personal justiciable interest in this matter. Their proximity also indicates they could be impacted in a manner not common to the general public, and distinguishes their personal justiciable interest from an interest common to the general public.

Consideration of the § 55.203(c) affected person determination factors further indicates that the Mitchells qualify as affected persons. First, their interests concerning air quality, health effects, impact on plants and wildlife, property damage, and use and enjoyment of their property are protected by the law under which this application will be considered. Second, a reasonable relationship exists between that interest and the regulation of air contaminants. Finally, the proximity

of the Mithcell's to the proposed facility increases the likelihood of impacts to their health, safety, and use of property. OPIC finds that under § 55.203, Delanna and Michael Mitchell qualify as affected persons.

Christopher Moreno

According to a map prepared by ED staff, Christopher Moreno resides approximately 1 mile from the closest boundary of the proposed facility. As stated in his hearing request, Christopher Moreno is concerned about air quality.

Christopher Moreno's proximity to the proposed plant, when combined with his concerns regarding air quality, gives him a personal justiciable interest in this matter. His proximity also indicates he could be impacted in a manner not common to the general public, and distinguishes his personal justiciable interest from an interest common to the general public.

Consideration of the § 55.203(c) affected person determination factors further indicates that Christopher Moreno qualifies as an affected person. First, his interests concerning air quality are protected by the law under which this application will be considered. Second, a reasonable relationship exists between those interests and the regulation of air contaminants. Finally, the proximity of Christopher Moreno to the proposed facility increases the likelihood of

impacts to his health, safety, and use of property. OPIC finds that under § 55.203, Christopher Moreno qualifies as an affected person.

Brittany Nettles

According to a map prepared by ED staff, Brittany Nettles resides less than 0.5 miles from the closest boundary of the proposed facility. As stated in her hearing request, Brittany Nettles' concerns include air quality and health effects.

Brittany Nettles' proximity to the proposed plant, when combined with her concern regarding air quality and health effects, gives her a personal justiciable interest in this matter. Her proximity also indicates she could be impacted in a manner not common to the general public, and distinguishes her personal justiciable interest from an interest common to the general public.

Consideration of the § 55.203(c) affected person determination factors further indicates that Brittany Nettles qualifies as an affected person. First, her interests concerning air quality and health effects are protected by the law under which this application will be considered. Second, a reasonable relationship exists between that interest and the regulation of air contaminants. Finally, the proximity of Brittany Nettles to the proposed facility increases the likelihood of impacts to her health, safety, and use of property. OPIC finds that under § 55.203, Brittany Nettles qualifies as an affected person.

Rebecca Rodriguez

According to a map prepared by ED staff, Rebecca Rodriguez resides approximately 1 mile from the closest boundary of the proposed facility. As stated in her hearing request, Ms. Rodriguez's concerns include air quality, health effects, property value, property damage, future property development, use and enjoyment of her property, and the impact on plants and animals.

Ms. Rodriguez's proximity to the proposed plant, when combined with her concerns regarding air quality, health effects, use and enjoyment of her property, property damage, and the impact on plants and animals, gives her a personal justiciable interest in this matter. Her proximity also indicates she could be impacted in a manner not common to the general public, and distinguishes her personal justiciable interest from an interest common to the general public.

Consideration of the § 55.203(c) affected person determination factors further indicates that Ms. Rodriguez qualifies as an affected person. First, her interests concerning air quality, health effects, property damage, use and enjoyment of her property, and the impact on plants and animals are protected by the law under which this application will be considered. Second, a reasonable relationship exists between those interests and the regulation of air contaminants. Finally, the proximity of Ms. Rodriguez to the proposed facility

increases the likelihood of impacts to her health, safety, and use of property. OPIC finds that under § 55.203, Rebecca Rodriguez qualifies as an affected person.

Brad Spence

According to a map prepared by ED staff, Brad Spence resides adjacent to the proposed facility. As stated in his hearing request, Brad Spence is concerned about air quality and health effects.

Brad Spence's proximity to the proposed plant, when combined with his concerns regarding air quality and health effects, gives him a personal justiciable interest in this matter. His proximity also indicates he could be impacted in a manner not common to the general public, and distinguishes his personal justiciable interest from an interest common to the general public.

Consideration of the § 55.203(c) affected person determination factors further indicates that Brad Spence qualifies as an affected person. First, his interests concerning air quality and health effects are protected by the law under which this application will be considered. Second, a reasonable relationship exists between those interests and the regulation of air contaminants. Finally, the proximity of Brad Spence to the proposed facility increases the likelihood of impacts to his health, safety, and use of property. OPIC finds that under § 55.203, Brad Spence qualifies as an affected person.

Tracy Spence

According to a map prepared by ED staff, Tracy Spence resides adjacent to the proposed facility. As stated in his hearing request, Tracy Spence is concerned about air quality and health effects.

Tracy Spence's proximity to the proposed plant, when combined with his concerns regarding air quality and health effects, gives him a personal justiciable interest in this matter. His proximity also indicates he could be impacted in a manner not common to the general public, and distinguishes his personal justiciable interest from an interest common to the general public.

Consideration of the § 55.203(c) affected person determination factors further indicates that Tracy Spence qualifies as an affected person. First, his interests concerning air quality and health effects are protected by the law under which this application will be considered. Second, a reasonable relationship exists between those interests and the regulation of air contaminants. Finally, the proximity of Tracy Spence to the proposed facility increases the likelihood of impacts to his health, safety, and use of property. OPIC finds that under § 55.203, Tracy Spence qualifies as an affected person.

Christy Bryant, Jeffrey Farley, James Firtos, Emily and David Franklin, Donna Franus, Theresa Green, Kelly and Frank Herndon, Mollie and George Kennemer, Charles Netherlain, Velynda Short, Amanda Stormquist, and Lori Jean Williams

Given the intervening distance between the proposed plant and these requestors, OPIC finds that the likely impact of these regulated activity on the health, safety, and use of property of the requestors is too attenuated to support a finding of affectedness under 30 TAC § 55.203(a). OPIC therefore recommends that these requests be denied. However, any of these requestors feel that they are an affected person, they may attempt to seek party status any preliminary hearing convened in this matter, as allowed by 30 TAC §§ 55.211(e), 80.105, and 80.109.

Rita Beving on behalf of the Dallas Sierra Club

Pursuant to 30 TAC § 55.205(a)(1), a group or association must identify one or more members of the group or association that would otherwise have standing to request a hearing in their own right in order for the group or association to be granted party status. The hearing request submitted by Rita Beving on behalf of the Dallas Sierra Club failed to identify any such member or members. OPIC therefore recommends that the hearing request submitted by Rita Beving on behalf of the Dallas Sierra Club be denied.

B. Disputed Issues

All of the issues raised in the hearing requests are disputed.

C. Disputed Questions of Fact or Law

All of the disputed issues involve questions of fact.

D. Issues Raised During Public Comment Period

All of the issues were raised during the public comment period.

E. Hearing Request Based on Withdrawn Public Comment

None of the hearing requests are based on issues raised solely in a public comment which has been withdrawn.

F. Relevant and Material Issues

The hearing requests raise issues relevant and material to the Commission's decision under the requirements of 30 TAC §§ 55.201(d)(4) and 55.211(c)(2)(A). In order to refer an issue to SOAH, the Commission must find that the issue is relevant and material to the Commission's decision to issue or deny this permit. *See Anderson v. Liberty Lobby, Inc.*, 477 U.S. 242, 248–251 (1986) (in discussing the standards applicable to reviewing motions for summary judgment the Court stated "[a]s to materiality, the substantive law will identify which facts are material . . . . it is the substantive law's identification of which facts are critical and which facts are irrelevant that governs"). Relevant and material issues are those governed by the substantive law under which this permit is to be issued. *Id.* Therefore, under Tex. Health & Safety Code § 382.002, the concerns related to potential negative impacts on air quality, human health, livestock, property

damage, use and enjoyment of property, and plant and animal life are material and relevant to the Commission's decision on this application.

In contrast, the requestors' concerns related to water quality, off-site air monitoring, future property development, and property value fall outside the Commission's jurisdiction under the TCAA to safeguard the state's air resources from pollution, and are not properly referred to a contested case hearing.

G. Issues Recommended for Referral

OPIC therefore recommends that the following disputed issues of fact be referred to SOAH for a contested case hearing:

1. Whether the proposed plant will negatively impact air quality.
2. Whether the proposed plant will negatively impact human health.
3. Whether the proposed plant will negatively impact plant and animal life.
4. ~~Whether the proposed plant will negatively impact livestock.~~
5. Whether the proposed plant will cause property damage.
6. Whether the proposed plant will negatively use and enjoyment of property.

H. Maximum Expected Duration of Hearing

For the contested case hearing, OPIC recommends a maximum duration of nine months from the first day of the preliminary hearing to issuance of the proposal for decision.

IV. CONCLUSION

OPIC finds that Pamela Boddie, Virginia and Brent Kennedy, Chrissy Marie Koth, Martha and Bobby McKee, Delanna and Michael Mitchell, Christopher Scott Moreno, Brittany Nettles, Rebecca Rodriguez, Brad Spence, and Tracy Spence qualify as affected persons. Also, each of these hearing requestors has raised at least one issue which is relevant and material to the Commission's decision on this application. Therefore, we respectfully recommend the Commission grant their hearing requests.

Respectfully submitted,

Office of Public Interest Counsel

By _____

Rudy Calderon
Assistant Public Interest Counsel
State Bar No. 24047209
P.O. Box 13087, MC 103
Austin, Texas 78711
512-239-3144
512-239-6377 (fax)

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that on June 8, 2015, the foregoing document was filed with the TCEQ Chief Clerk, and copies were served to all parties on the attached mailing list via hand delivery, facsimile transmission, electronic mail, inter-agency mail, or by deposit in the U.S. Mail.

Rudy Calderon

MAILING LIST
NAVASOTA NORTH COUNTRY PEAKERS OPERATING COMPANY I, LLC
TCEQ DOCKET NO. 2015-0566-AIR

FOR THE APPLICANT:
Frank Giacalone
Chief Executive Officer
Navasota North Country Peakers
Operating Company I, L.L.C.
403 Corporate Wood Drive
Magnolia, Texas 77354-2758
Tel: 281/252-5202 Fax: 832/ 442-3259

Jeff Maida
Vice President Asset Management
Navasota North Country Peakers
Operating Company I, L.L.C.
403 Corporate Wood Drive
Magnolia, Texas 77354-2758
Tel: 281/252-5203

Bill Skinner
Navasota North Country Peakers
Operating Company I, L.L.C.
403 Corporate Wood Drive
Magnolia, Texas 77354-2758
Tel: 281/252-5221 Fax: 832/ 442-3259

FOR THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
Ashley McDonald, Staff Attorney
TCEQ Environmental Law Division
MC-173
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, Texas 78711-3087
Tel: 512/239-0600 Fax: 512/239-0606

Phillip Urbany, Technical Staff
TCEQ Water Quality Division, MC-148
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, Texas 78711-3087
Tel: 512/239-4542 Fax: 512/239-4430

Brian Christian, Director
TCEQ Environmental Assistance
Division, MC-108
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, Texas 78711-3087
Tel: 512/239-4000 Fax: 512/239-5678

FOR ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE RESOLUTION
Kyle Lucas
TCEQ 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:
Bridget Bohac
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:
Rita J. Beving
Dallas Sierra Club
13214 Glad Acres Dr
Farmers Branch, Texas 75234-5201

Pamela Boddie
PO Box 250
Van Alstyne, Texas 75495-0250

Christy Bryant
243 Lamont Rd.
Anna, Texas 75409-5877

Jeffrey A. Farley
21 Stone Marshell Rd.
Van Alstyne, Texas 75495-5114

James Firtos
60 Brad Ct.
Van Alstyne, Texas 75495-3492

Emily & David Franklin
332 Carlyle St.
Anna, Texas 75409-5899

Donna Franus
3969 FM 3133
Van Alstyne, Texas 75495-8229

Theresa Green
60 Brad Ct.
Van Alstyne, Texas 75495-3492

Kelly & Frank Herndon
239 Belford Street South
Anna, Texas 75409-5892

Brent & Virginia Kennedy
921 Willy Vester Rd.
Van Alstyne, Texas 75495-2711

George & Mollie Kennemer
Anna, Texas

Chrissy Marie Koth
921 Willy Vester Rd.
Van Alstyne, Texas 75495-2711

Bobby & Martha McKee
660 Willy Vester Rd.
Van Alstyne, Texas 75495-2806

Delanna & Michael R. Mitchell
PO Box 1241
Howe, Texas 75459-1241

Christopher Scott Moreno
690 Ballard Rd.
Van Alstyne, Texas 75495-2742

Charles Netherlain
114 Edwards Rd.
Van Alstyne, Texas 75495-5060

Brittany Nettles
890 Willy Vester Rd
Van Alstyne, Texas 75495-2708

Rebecca A Rodriguez
798 Ballard Rd.
Van Alstyne, Texas 75495-2743

Velynda Short
2960 Winding Oaks Trl.
Anna, Texas 75409-6023

Brad Spence
1591 Ballard Rd.
Van Alstyne, Texas 75495-2752

Tracy Spence
1631 Ballard Rd.
Van Alstyne, Texas 75495-2753

Amanda Stromquist
1813 Walnut Way
Anna, Texas 75409-4546

Lori Jean Williams
5068 Theresa Dr.
Denison, Texas 75020-2931