

**TCEQ AIR QUALITY PERMIT NUMBERS 120973 and PSDTX1420
TCEQ DOCKET NO. 2015-1170-AIR**

APPLICATION BY	§	BEFORE THE
NAVASOTA SOUTH PEAKERS	§	
OPERATING COMPANY I LLC	§	TEXAS COMMISSION ON
UNION VALLEY ENERGY	§	
CENTER	§	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY
NIXON, WILSON COUNTY	§	

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S RESPONSE TO HEARING REQUESTS

The Executive Director (ED) of the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (Commission or TCEQ) files this response (Response) to the requests for a contested case hearing submitted by persons listed herein. The Texas Clean Air Act (TCAA) § 382.056(n) requires the commission to consider hearing requests in accordance with the procedures provided in Tex. Water Code (TWC) § 5.556.¹This statute is implemented through the rules in 30 Texas Administrative Code (TAC) Chapter 55, Subchapter F.

A map showing the location of the site for the proposed facility is included with this response and has been provided to all persons on the attached mailing list. In addition, a current compliance history report, technical review summary, modeling audit memorandum, and draft permit prepared by the ED's staff have been filed with the TCEQ's Office of Chief Clerk for the commission's consideration. Finally, the ED's Response to Public Comments (RTC), which was mailed by the chief clerk to all persons on the mailing list, is on file with the chief clerk for the commission's consideration.

BACKGROUND

Description of Facility

Navasota South Peakers Operating Company I, L.L.C. 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 facility that may emit air contaminants.

This permit will authorize the applicant to construct the Union Valley Energy Center. The site can be reached as follows: go 4.5 miles northwest of Nixon on FM 1681 then take CR 475 south for 1 mile; the property is located on the east side of CR 475 where CR 475 turns back to the south, Nixon, Wilson County. Contaminants authorized under this permit include carbon monoxide (CO), nitrogen oxides (NO_x), particulate matter (PM) including particulate matter with diameters of 10 micrometers or less (PM₁₀) and 2.5 micrometers or less (PM_{2.5}), volatile organic compounds (VOC), sulfur dioxide (SO₂), and sulfuric acid mist (H₂SO₄).

¹ Statutes cited in this response may be viewed online at www.capitol.state.tx.us/statutes/statutes.html. Relevant statutes are found primarily in the Texas Health and Safety Code and the Texas Water Code. The rules in the Texas Administrative Code may be viewed online at www.sos.state.tx.us/tac/index.shtml, or follow the "Rules, Policy & Legislation" link on the TCEQ website at www.tceq.state.tx.us.

Procedural Background

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 the commission. This permit application is for an initial issuance of Air Quality Permit Numbers 120973 and PSDTX1420.

The permit application was received on June 23, 2014, and declared administratively complete on July 3, 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 16, 2014, in the *Wilson County News*. The Notice of Application and Preliminary Decision for an Air Quality Permit was published on February 11, 2015, in English in the *Wilson County News*. The notice of public meeting was mailed to interested parties on February 18, 2015. A public meeting was held on March 10, 2015 in Nixon. The public comment period ended on March 13, 2015. The ED's RTC was filed on June 29, 2015.

The time for requests for reconsideration and hearing requests ended on August 3, 2015. The TCEQ received timely hearing requests during the public comment period that were not withdrawn from Lornna Talley and Patti Werley. Patti Werley submitted a letter stating that she has withdrawn her "intent to hire a lawyer to stop the Navasota Union Valley energy center," but has not specifically withdrawn the request for a contested case hearing.

II. Applicable Law for Hearing Requests

The commission must assess the timeliness and form of the hearing requests, as discussed in Section I above. The form requirements are set forth in 30 TAC § 55.201(d):

(d) A hearing request must substantially comply with the following:

- (1) give the name, address, daytime telephone number, and, where possible, fax number of the person who files the request. If the request is made by a group or association, the request must identify one person by name, address, daytime telephone number, and, where possible, fax number, who shall be responsible for receiving all official communications and documents for the group;
- (2) identify the person's personal justiciable interest affected by the application, including a brief, but specific, written statement explaining in plain language the requester's location and distance relative to the proposed facility or activity that is the subject of the application and how and why the requester believes he or she will be adversely affected by the proposed facility or activity in a manner not common to members of the general public;
- (3) request a contested case hearing;
- (4) list all relevant and material disputed issues of fact that were raised during the public comment period and that are the basis of the hearing request. To facilitate the commission's determination of the number and scope of issues to be referred to hearing, the requester should, to the extent possible, specify any of the executive director's responses to comments that the requester disputes and the factual basis of the dispute and list any disputed issues of law or policy; and
- (5) provide any other information specified in the public notice of application.

**Executive Director's Response to Hearing Requests
Navasota South Peakers Operating Company I, L.L.C.
Permit Nos. 120973 and PSDTX1420; TCEQ Docket No. 2015-1170-AIR
Page 3 of 8**

The next necessary determination is whether the requests were filed by “affected persons” as defined by TWC § 5.115, implemented in commission rule 30 TAC § 55.203. Under 30 TAC § 55.203, 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. An interest common to members of the general public does not qualify as a personal justiciable interest. Local governments with authority under state law over issues raised by the application receive affected person status under 30 TAC § 55.203(b).

In determining whether a person is affected, 30 TAC § 55.203(c) requires all factors be considered, including, but not limited to, the following:

- (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 and safety of the person, and on the 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.

In addition to the requirements noted above regarding affected person status, in accordance with 30 TAC § 55.205(a), a group or association 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.²

If the commission determines a hearing request is timely and fulfills the requirements for proper form and the hearing requester is an affected person, the commission must apply a three-part test to the issues raised in the request to determine if any of the issues should be referred to the State Office of Administrative Hearings (SOAH) for a contested case hearing. The three-part test in 30 TAC § 50.115(c) is as follows:

- (1) The issue must involve a disputed question of fact;
- (2) The issue must have been raised during the public comment period; and
- (3) The issue must be relevant and material to the decision on the application.

² 30 TAC § 55.205(a)

The law applicable to the proposed facility may generally be summarized as follows. A person who owns or operates a facility or facilities that will emit air contaminants is required to obtain authorization from the commission prior to the construction and operation of the facility or facilities.³ Thus, the location and operation of the proposed facility requires authorization under the TCAA. Permit conditions of general applicability must be in rules adopted by the commission.⁴ Those rules are found in 30 TAC Chapter 116. In addition, a person is prohibited from emitting air contaminants or performing any activity that violates the TCAA or any commission rule or order, or that causes or contributes to air pollution.⁵ The relevant rules regarding air emissions are found in 30 TAC Chapters 101 and 111-118. In addition, the commission has the authority to establish and enforce permit conditions consistent with this chapter.⁶ The materials accompanying this response list and reference permit conditions and operational requirements and limitations applicable to this proposed facility.

III. Analysis of Hearing Requests

A. Were the requests for a contested case hearing in this matter timely and in proper form?

The TCEQ received timely hearing requests during the public comment period that were not withdrawn from Lornna Talley and Patti Werley. Patti Werley has withdrawn her "intent to hire a lawyer to stop the Navasota Union Valley energy center," but has not specifically withdrawn the request for a contested case hearing. Therefore, the request for Patti Werley will be evaluated as a timely hearing request.

The address provided by Lornna Talley was just over one-half mile from the proposed plant (see attached map). The address provided by Patti Werley was approximately two miles from the proposed plant. These hearing requests were submitted during the public comment period or during the period for requesting a contested case hearing after the filing of the ED's RTC. Furthermore, the ED has determined these hearing requests substantially comply with all of the requirements for form in 30 TAC § 55.201(d).

The ED addressed all public comments in this matter by providing responses in the RTC. The cover letter from the Office of the Chief Clerk attached to the RTC states that requesters should, to the extent possible, specify any of the ED's responses in the RTC that the requesters dispute and the factual basis of the dispute, and list any disputed issues of law or policy.⁷ In the absence of a response from any of the hearing requesters or their representatives within the thirty-day period after the RTC was mailed, the ED cannot determine or speculate whether the hearing requesters continue to dispute issues of fact, or whether there are any outstanding issues of law or policy. The ED nevertheless has included all of the issues raised by hearing requesters and commenters regarding this application as listed below.

³ TEXAS HEALTH & SAFETY CODE § 382.0518

⁴ TEXAS HEALTH & SAFETY CODE § 382.0513

⁵ TEXAS HEALTH & SAFETY CODE § 382.085

⁶ TEXAS HEALTH & SAFETY CODE § 382.0513

⁷ See 30 TAC § 55.201(d)(4).

B. Are those who requested a contested case hearing in this matter affected persons?

The threshold test of affected person status, as defined in 30 TAC § 55.203, is whether the requestor has a personal justiciable interest affected by the application. An interest common to members of the general public does not qualify as a personal justiciable interest.

Lornna Talley claimed a personal justiciable interest not common to the general public as part of her request for a contested case hearing. Ms. Talley specifically noted a concern that emissions from the proposed plant would adversely affect the health of her teenaged son, who has asthma. The only other issues raised by Ms. Talley were the more general issues relating to water use by the proposed plant.

Patti Werley did not claim any interests in her request or in her formal oral comments at the public meeting that were not common to the general public. Ms. Werley noted concerns about water, concerns about the possible effects of air emissions from the proposed facility on native wildlife and migratory sandhill cranes, general concerns about light and sound pollution, general concerns about the possible effects of air emissions from the proposed facility on school children who live in the area and who go to school a few miles away from the proposed facility, and the general concern that air pollutants from the proposed facility could be harmful to human inhabitants of the area. Ms. Werley did not identify a specific, personal justiciable interest that was not common to the general public.

The commission must consider whether the interest claimed by the protestants are protected by the law under which the application will be considered. As discussed below, protestants did raise issues that satisfy this requirement. The commission must consider whether a reasonable relationship exists between the interest claimed and the activity regulated. The activity the commission regulates is the authorized emissions into the air of contaminants by a person who owns or operates a facility or facilities. Those persons who own or operate a facility or facilities are prohibited from emitting air contaminants or performing any activities that contravene the TCAA or any other commission rule or order, or that causes or contributes to air pollution.

The interest claimed by Lornna Talley concerning the possible effects of air emissions from the proposed facility on the health of her son is within the scope of an air quality authorization because they focus on the potential adverse effects of potential air contaminants from the facility. Therefore, the ED finds that a reasonable relationship exists between the interest claimed and the activity the commission regulates, and that this issue is relevant and material to the decision on this air quality application.

The commission must consider distance restrictions or other limitations imposed by law on the affected interest, the likely impact of the regulated activity on the health and safety of the person, and on the use of the property of the person, and the likely impact of the regulated activity on the use or the impact on the natural resource by the person. For air authorizations, distance from the proposed facility is particularly relevant to the issue of whether there is a likely impact of the regulated activity on a person's interests because of the dispersion and effects of individual air contaminants emitted from a facility. The natural resource that is the subject of this permit is the ambient air that the requesters breathe, and they have indicated a

**Executive Director's Response to Hearing Requests
Navasota South Peakers Operating Company I, L.L.C.
Permit Nos. 120973 and PSDTX1420; TCEQ Docket No. 2015-1170-AIR
Page 6 of 8**

manner in which emissions from the plant could impact it. Because distance from the proposed facility is key to the issue whether or not there is a likely impact of the regulated activity on a person's interests such as the health and safety of the person, and on the use of property of the person, the ED has identified an area of approximately 1 mile from the proposed facility on the provided map.

The ED has identified Lornna Talley as having an address that is less than 1 mile of the proposed plant and thus she may be affected in a manner different from the general public (see the attached map). The ED also finds that Patti Werley resides approximately 2 miles away from the proposed plant, and therefore it is not likely to impact her health and safety or the use of her property in a manner different from the general public. Therefore, Patti Werley is not an affected person under 30 TAC § 55.203

C. Which issues in this matter should be referred to SOAH for hearing?

If the commission determines any of the hearing requests in this matter are timely and in proper form, and some or all of the hearing requesters are affected persons, the commission must apply the three-part test discussed in Section II to the issues raised in this matter to determine if any of the issues should be referred to SOAH for a contested case hearing. The three-part test asks whether the issues involve disputed questions of fact, whether the issues were raised during the public comment period, and whether the issues are relevant and material to the decision on the permit application, in order to refer them to SOAH.

The ED addressed all public comments in this matter by providing responses in the RTC. The cover letter from the Office of the Chief Clerk transmitting the RTC cites 30 TAC § 55.201(d)(4), which states that requesters should, to the extent possible, specify any of the ED's responses in the RTC the requesters dispute and the factual basis of the dispute, and list any disputed issues of law or policy. In the absence of a response from any of the hearing requesters or their representatives within the thirty-day period after the RTC was mailed, the ED cannot determine or speculate whether the hearing requesters continue to dispute issues of fact, or whether there are any outstanding issues of law or policy. The ED nevertheless has included all of the issues raised by hearing requesters regarding this application as listed below.

1. Issues involving questions of fact.

Protestants raised the following issues in comments and hearing requests filed on this application:

- Possible health effects from air emissions from the proposed plant;
- Possible effects on the environment, native wildlife, and migratory sandhill cranes from air emissions from the proposed plant;
- Possible effects on water wells from the amount of water used by the proposed plant; and
- Possible noise and light pollution from the proposed plant.

2. Were the issues raised during the public comment period?

The public comment period is defined in 30 TAC § 55.152. The public comment period begins with the publication of the Notice of Receipt and Intent to Obtain an Air Quality Permit. The end date of the public comment period depends on the type of permit. In this case, the public comment period began on July 16, 2014 and ended March 13, 2015. The RTC was filed on June 29, 2015 and mailed on July 3, 2015. The 30-day period to file the Request for Reconsideration and contested case hearing requests ended on August 3, 2015. All of the issues listed above upon which the hearing requests in this matter are based were raised in comments received during the public comment period.

3. Whether the issues are relevant and material to the decision on the application.

In this case, the permit would be issued under the commission's authority in Tex. Water Code § 5.013(11) (assigning the responsibilities in Chapter 382 of the Tex. Health and Safety Code) and the TCAA. The relevant sections of the TCAA are found in Subchapter C (Permits). Subchapter C requires the commission to grant a permit to construct or modify a facility if the commission finds the proposed facility will use at least the best available control technology (BACT) and the emissions from the facility will not contravene the intent of the TCAA, including the protection of the public's health and physical property. In making this permitting decision, the commission may consider the Applicant's compliance history. The commission by rule has also specified certain requirements for permitting. Therefore, in making the determination of relevance in this case, the commission should review each issue to determine if it is relevant to these statutory and regulatory requirements that must be satisfied by this permit application.

The ED finds the following issues relevant and material to the decision on the application:

- Possible health effects from air emissions from the proposed plant; and
- Possible effects on the environment, native wildlife, and migratory sandhill cranes from air emissions from the proposed plant.

The ED finds the following issues are beyond the jurisdiction of TCEQ and thus not material to the decision on the application:

- Possible effects on water wells from the amount of water used by the proposed plant; and
- Possible noise and light pollution from the proposed plant.

IV. Maximum Expected Duration of the Contested Case Hearing

The ED recommends the contested case hearing, if held, should last no longer than six months from the preliminary hearing to the proposal for decision.

V. Executive Director's Recommendation

The Executive Director respectfully recommends the commission:

- A. Find all hearing requests in this matter were timely filed.
- B. Find that the requests of Lornna Talley satisfy the requirements for form under 30 TAC § 55.201(d) and that she is an affected person under 30 TAC § 55.203.
- C. Find that Patti Werley is not an affected person under 30 TAC § 55.203 in this matter;
- D. If the commission determines any requester is an affected person, refer the following issues to SOAH:
 - Possible health effects from air emissions from the proposed plant;and
 - Possible effects on the environment, native wildlife, and migratory sandhill cranes from air emissions from the proposed plant;
- E. Find the maximum expected duration of the contested case hearing, if held, would be six months.


Respectfully submitted,

Texas Commission on Environmental Quality

Richard A. Hyde, P.E., Executive Director

Caroline Sweeney, Deputy Director
Office of Legal Services

Robert Martinez, Division Director
Environmental Law Division


Ms. Amy Lynn Browning, Staff Attorney
Environmental Law Division
State Bar Number 24059503
(512) 239-0891
PO Box 13087, MC 173
Austin, Texas 78711-3087

REPRESENTING THE
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE
TEXAS COMMISSION ON
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

ED's Response to Hearing Request Navasota South Peakers Operating Company I, L.L.C

Map Requested by TCEQ Office of Legal Services
for Commissioners' Agenda





Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
GIS Team (Mail Code 197)
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, Texas 78711-3087

Date: 8/20/2015



- Facility
- 1 mi radial distance from facility
- Requester

ID	Requester
1	Lornna Talley
2	Patti Werley




The facility is located in Wilson County. The circle (green) in the left inset map represents the approximate location of the facility. The inset map on the right represents the location of Wilson County (red) in the state of Texas.

Source: The location of the facility was provided by the TCEQ Office of Legal Services (OLS). OLS obtained the site location information from the applicant and the requestor information from the requestor. The background imagery of this map is from the current Environmental Systems Research Institute (ESRI) map service, as of the date of this map.

This map was generated by the Information Resources Division of the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality. This product is for informational purposes and may not have been prepared for or be suitable for legal, engineering, or surveying purposes. It does not represent an on-the-ground survey and represents only the approximate relative location of property boundaries. For more information concerning this map, contact the Information Resource Division at (512) 239-0800.

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

On the 31st day of August, 2015, a true and correct copy of the foregoing instrument was served on all persons on the mailing list by the undersigned via deposit into the U.S. Mail, inter-agency mail, facsimile, electronic mail, or hand delivery.



Amy L. Browning

MAILING LIST
NAVASOTA SOUTH PEAKERS OPERATING COMPANY I, L.L.C.
DOCKET NO. 2015-1170-AIR; PERMIT NOS. 120973 and PSDTX1420

FOR THE APPLICANT:

Frank Giacalone
Navasota South 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
Navasota South Peakers Operating
Company I, L.L.C.
403 Corporate Wood Drive
Magnolia, Texas 77354-2758
Tel: (281) 560-6640

Bill Skinner
Navasota South 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
via electronic mail:

Amy Browning, 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

Sean O'Brien, Technical Staff
Texas Commission on Environmental
Quality
Air Permits Division, MC-163
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, Texas 78711-3087
Tel: (512) 239-1137
Fax: (512) 239-7815

Brian Christian, Director
Texas Commission on Environmental
Quality
Environmental Assistance Division
Public Education Program, MC-108
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, Texas 78711-3087
Tel: (512) 239-4000
Fax: (512) 239-5678

FOR PUBLIC INTEREST COUNSEL
via electronic mail:

Vic McWherter, Public Interest Counsel
Texas Commission on Environmental
Quality
Public Interest Counsel, MC-103
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, Texas 78711-3087
Tel: (512) 239-6363
Fax: (512) 239-6377

FOR ALTERNATIVE DISPUTE
RESOLUTION

via electronic mail:

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:

Bridget C. 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

REQUESTER(S) / INTERESTED
PERSON(S):

See attached list.

REQUESTER(S)

MRS LORNNA TALLEY
1497 COUNTY ROAD 476
NIXON TX 78140-4079

MRS PATTI WERLEY
1285 COUNTY ROAD 477
STOCKDALE TX 78160-6731

INTERESTED PERSON(S)

LANE ADCOCK
4240 COUNTY ROAD 437
STOCKDALE TX 78160-6373

LILLIAN & TOMMY ADCOCK
811 N PARKER AVE
NIXON TX 78140-3135

WANDA A BARSCH
4131 ELM CREEK RD
SEGUIN TX 78155-0776

RICHARD BURRIER
2220 FM 1107
STOCKDALE TX 78160-6288

RICKY BURRIER
PO BOX 757
STOCKDALE TX 78160-0757

ROBERT & SANDY CANNON
2728 COUNTY ROAD 438
STOCKDALE TX 78160-6314

LARRY CHILDRESS
1943 FM 3335
STOCKDALE TX 78160-6454

MR ELBERT ALLEN COLEMAN
176 COUNTY ROAD 471
NIXON TX 78140-4012

GINGER COLEMAN
PO BOX 70
STOCKDALE TX 78160-0070

NORMAN COLEMAN
588 COUNTY ROAD 116
NIXON TX 78140-4060

PHYLLIS DAVENPORT
253 WINTER FROST
CIBOLO TX 78108-4210

MAGDALENE DE LEON
707 N FM 108
SMILEY TX 78159-5991

DONNA DIXON
PO BOX 331
STOCKDALE TX 78160-0331

CHERYL EMBREY
3270 COUNTY ROAD 448
NIXON TX 78140-4011

ED R FARRIS
1800 SAINT JAMES PL STE 450
HOUSTON TX 77056-4109

LOUISE FISCHER
1237 COUNTY ROAD 475
NIXON TX 78140-4019

W J GIBBS, JR
1012 C ST
FLORESVILLE TX 78114-2224

ARMANDINA M GONZALES
1713 COUNTY ROAD 475
NIXON TX 78140-4087

MR ERNEST R GONZALES
1709 COUNTY ROAD 475
NIXON TX 78140-4087

BROOKE GORDON
3473 COUNTY ROAD 475
NIXON TX 78140-4013

JOE & MARY HEWELL
PO BOX 733
NIXON TX 78140-0733

MR JOHN B HEWELL, JR
12330 FM 1681
NIXON TX 78140-4103

TRES HEWELL
111 MONTWOOD
SEGUIN TX 78155-1215

CHARLES H HOBBS
6596 FM 1681
STOCKDALE TX 78160-6682

DICKIE JACKSON
1103 4TH ST
FLORESVILLE TX 78114-2014

JIM JACKSON
5866 COUNTY ROAD 117
NIXON TX 78140-4085

MS MARY ANN KORZEKWA
PO BOX 139
PANDORA TX 78143-0139

DAKOTA KOTARA
KOTARA BOYS ELECTRICAL TEAM LLC
2095 COUNTY ROAD 475
NIXON TX 78140-4116

DEAN KOTARA
KOTARA BOYS ELECTRICAL TEAM LLC
2095 COUNTY ROAD 475
NIXON TX 78140-4116

JOSETTE KOTARA
PO BOX 318
STOCKDALE TX 78160-0318

ALTON KUYKENDALL
2177 COUNTY ROAD 448
STOCKDALE TX 78160-6361

ALTON & PAT KUYKENDALL
2177 COUNTY ROAD 448
STOCKDALE TX 78160-6361

SUE LAMASTUS
4086 COUNTY ROAD 437
STOCKDALE TX 78160-6319

THOMAS LOESSIN
12725 FM 1347
STOCKDALE TX 78160-6774

KAY LOVE
PO BOX 700
STOCKDALE TX 78160-0700

LUKE MAY
PO BOX 61
STOCKDALE TX 78160-0061

JEFF MCGREW
PO BOX 575
STOCKDALE TX 78160-0575

RALPH MCGREW
PO BOX 43
STOCKDALE TX 78160-0043

JAMES O & KATHY MILLER
PO BOX 224
PANDORA TX 78143-0224

NOAH POMPO
1190 SCHNEIDER RD
SEGUIN TX 78155-7751

MARK POTTER
3630 BELGIUM LN
SAN ANTONIO TX 78219-2506

FRANK & LISA RILEY
876 COUNTY ROAD 433
STOCKDALE TX 78160-6492

GEORGINA SCHWARTZ
3006 BELVOIR DR
SAN ANTONIO TX 78230-4410

CHARLES WAYNE SCRIBNER
1405 COUNTY ROAD 475
NIXON TX 78140-4028

CHARLES SCRIBNER
PO BOX 189
STOCKDALE TX 78160-0189

REBECCA SCRIBNER
PO BOX 243
STOCKDALE TX 78160-0243

BRIAN & MELISSA SMITH
1358 COUNTY ROAD 438
STOCKDALE TX 78160-3201

ELIZABETH TALLEY
1236 COUNTY ROAD 475
NIXON TX 78140-4019

ROLAND TALLEY, JR
1497 COUNTY ROAD 476
NIXON TX 78140-4079

RUTHIE WAGENER
PO BOX 163
GILLET TX 78116-0163

CHUCK WAITE
2351 COUNTRY GRACE
NEW BRAUNFELS TX 78130-8933

CLARK & TERRY WEBB
941 BURGESS ST
SEGUIN TX 78155-6705

DENNIS WERLEY
1285 COUNTY ROAD 477
STOCKDALE TX 78160-6731

THOMAS E WHITE
1358 COUNTY ROAD 438
STOCKDALE TX 78160-3201

LARRY WILEY
104 N MESQUITE
STOCKDALE TX 78160-6629