

TCEQ PERMIT NO. WQ0015381001

| | | |
|-------------------------------|----------|------------------------------|
| APPLICATION BY | § | BEFORE THE |
| NANTUCKET HOUSING, LLC | § | TEXAS COMMISSION |
| FOR TPDES PERMIT NO. | § | ON |
| WQ0015381001 | § | ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY |

**APPELLANT’S RESPONSES TO HEARING REQUESTS/REQUESTS
FOR RECONSIDERATION**

TO THE COMMISSIONERS OF THE TEXAS COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY:

Applicant, Nantucket Housing, LLC (“Nantucket” or “Applicant”), files this its Responses to the Hearing Requests/Requests for Reconsideration which have been filed in this matter as follows:

INTRODUCTION: APPLICATION AND PROJECT

Nantucket has filed its Application for a Texas Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (“TPDES”) permit so that it can construct and operate a wastewater treatment plant (“WWTP”) to serve a multi-family residential community known as the “Meadows at Cypress Creek” located on Huffmeister Road in Cypress, an unincorporated community located in northwest Harris County within the extraterritorial jurisdiction of the City of Houston.

The Meadows at Cypress Creek is a 170 unit multi-family residential development (the “Project”) which has previously been approved for financing by the Texas Department of Housing and Community Affairs and which is set to welcome its first residents sometime within the next sixty (60) days. Nantucket would note that certain residents of the nearby neighborhoods have strongly opposed the construction and operation of the Project since its inception solely due to the fact that it has an affordable housing component as a portion of its financing. Accordingly, these individuals have done everything within their power to prevent the Project from being built, including making clear their opposition to a number of nearby municipal utility

districts and other water districts which might have been capable of providing wastewater treatment service to the Project. As a result, these districts have indicated their inability to provide that service and Nantucket has been forced to seek its TPDES permit so that it can construct and operate its own wastewater treatment facility at the Project to serve its residents.

Notwithstanding the community opposition, Nantucket has received all approvals and permits from all governmental entities necessary for the operation of the Project. Indeed, construction of the Project is nearly complete and it will commence accepting residents sometime in September 2016.

The Executive Director of the Commission has determined that the Application filed by Nantucket meets all requirements of applicable law and should be granted.

If granted, the proposed wastewater treatment facility will be an activated sludge process plant with treated effluent being discharged directly to an enclosed stormwater pipe and then to Cypress Creek in Segment No. 1009 of the San Jacinto River Basin. The Executive Director has found that the effluent limitations in the draft permit will maintain and protect existing in-stream uses, Tier 1 anti-degradation review has determined that existing water quality usage will not be impaired by the permit and Tier 2 review has determined that no significant degradation of water quality is expected in Cypress Creek. Existing uses will be maintained and protected.

INTRODUCTION: REQUESTS

As noted above, the Project has engendered opposition from certain elements in the neighboring community which has led, in part, to the large number of individuals seeking to participate in this matter. According to the mailing list contained on the Chief Clerk's Notice of Public Meeting, 174 individuals have made Requests for a Contested Case Hearing and/or Requests for Reconsideration while an additional approximately 397 individuals are listed as

“Interested Persons.” Due to space and time limitations, it is not possible for Applicant to respond individually to each and all of the Requests and the stated concerns of these individuals. The issue is further exasperated by the fact that well over 100 of the Requestors and a large number of the Interested Parties made their Requests on a “form” document apparently handed to them by representatives of a coalition opposing the Project known as the “Cypress Coalition.” Applicant has identified seven individuals (one with additional tenants and several together with their spouses) whose property is directly adjacent to and/or downstream from Applicant’s proposed facility who might possibly qualify as affected persons in this matter and to which Applicant intends to respond directly to the concerns expressed in their individual Requests. Applicant will then respond to the numerous other Requests filed both by individuals utilizing the “form” document described above and by those who filed their own, separate Requests. Finally, Applicant will provide general comments to the concerns expressed by the numerous “Interested Persons” identified by the Chief Clerk.

RESPONSES TO ADJACENT/DOWNSTREAM LANDOWNERS

Charles Bertani. Mr. Bertani, who owns property directly adjacent to the Project, filed both a “form” Request document and correspondence to the Commission filed by an attorney on his behalf.

On his “form” document, Mr. Bertani expresses his concerns regarding (i) odors; (ii) bacteria and other pollutants being discharged into Cypress Creek; (iii) regionalization issues; (iv) proper characterization of uses; and (v) siting requirements. These issues were raised during the public comment period and have not been withdrawn. Each of the issues is disputed and may involve questions of fact and of law but all issues raised by Mr. Bertani are rejected in

their entirety by the draft permit issued by the Executive Director and have been thoroughly addressed in the Executive Director's Response to Public Comment.

As it relates to "odor" concerns, the Executive Director determined that Nantucket's Application (i) meets all buffer and easement requirements; (ii) that Nantucket intends to comply with the requirement to abate and control nuisance of odors by a combination of ownership and restrictive easements within the part of the buffer zone not owned by Nantucket; and (iii) that all provisions of the Texas Health and Safety Code, the Texas Clean Air Act and the Texas Administrative Code, as they pertain to odor abatement and control requirements, have been met by the Applicant. The Executive Director has incorporated the above noted provisions into the draft permit. Accordingly, nuisance odor is not expected to occur as a result of the permitted activities at the WWTP. In addition, Nantucket proposes that the WWTP will be an activated sludge process plant operated in the extended aeration mode. The activated sludge process is the most frequently used biological wastewater treatment process for treating domestic wastewater and is not expected to have an offensive odor.

Likewise, the Executive Director has determined that the Application meets, indeed that it exceeds, all required effluent limits. In fact, the effluent limits in the draft permit are more stringent than those for other discharges into Cypress Creek, including discharges significantly larger than Nantucket's. The effluent limitations in the draft permit are designed to maintain and protect the existing instream uses and contain limits for the pollutants most likely to be present in treated domestic wastewaters. The draft permit includes effluent limitations, monitoring requirements and additional requirements for the wastewater treatment system to ensure the protection of water quality and human health and for the disposal of domestic sludge generated from the WWTP. The Executive Director has determined that the draft permit meets the

requirements of 30 TAC Chapter 307, the Texas Surface Water Quality Standards (“TSWQS”), and the Commission’s implementation procedures and is protective of the environment, water quality, aquatic life and human health. The Commission rules state that surface waters cannot be made toxic to aquatic or terrestrial organisms by the effluent discharged by Applicant.

Nantucket addressed and met all requirements regarding regionalization, seeking service from four separate, existing wastewater treatment plant providers and receiving no response from one provider and three negative responses all indicating that “there is not enough capacity available to serve the proposed” Project. Community opposition, much of it expressed by the same individuals who now complain that Nantucket has failed to meet the Commission’s regionalization policy, was largely responsible for the negative responses that Nantucket received from existing water districts and wastewater treatment providers. It should also be noted that there is nothing in the Texas Water Code or the Commission’s rules mandating denial of a TPDES permit because other wastewater treatment facilities refused service. The Executive Director evaluated Nantucket’s Application and determined that Nantucket provided sufficient information regarding regionalization and that it was appropriate to move forward with the technical review of the Application.

The Executive Director has also found that all “uses” of the “discharge routes” proposed by Nantucket have been properly characterized and that the flow of effluent will be discharged directly from the proposed WWTP to an enclosed stormwater pipe and then into Cypress Creek.

The Executive Director has determined that all siting requirements have been met. The design criteria for wastewater treatment systems in the Commission rules specify requirements for minimum freeboard. Freeboard is the additional storage depth generally used to contain added flow from rainfall. According to the design criteria, the system must provide 18 inches of

freeboard in the aeration basins and 12 inches of freeboard in the clarifiers at four times the permitted average flow. In addition, 30 TAC Section 217.35(a)(4)(c) states that the Executive Director will not approve a design of a proposed treatment unit within a 100-year flood plain unless the design provides protection for all open process tanks and electric units from inundation during a 100-year flood event. Nantucket's permit application states that the WWTP is not within the 100-year floodplain and therefore is not subject to these requirements; however, the draft permit does require Nantucket to provide protection for the facility from a 100 year-flood. It should be noted that the WWTP is not within 1,000 feet of the 100-year floodplain and accordingly, the distance of a facility from the flood plain is not part of the TPDES application process. It should also be noted that the Project did not flood during the April and May 2016 floods in northwest Harris County, with these floods being considered 500-year flood events.

It should be noted that **Jaime Caraway and Jeff and Amber Pool**, who each live in apartments located on land owned by Mr. Bertani, have also filed the "form" document described above. Applicant's Responses are, thus, applicable to their filings as well.

Mr. Bertani also had issues raised on his behalf by an attorney, Mr. Charles W. Irvine, in a letter to the Chief Clerk in November 2015. That letter cites issues (i) that the discharged wastewater will degrade or otherwise adversely affect surface water quality; (ii) that the discharge route is regularly used for recreational purposes that will be impaired by the proposed discharge; (iii) Applicant's alleged non-compliance with regionalization policies (iv) that nuisance conditions will result to neighboring landowners; (v) odors; and (vi) mischaracterization of the discharge routes. Issues (i), (iii), (v) and (vi) have been responded to by Applicant above.

Regarding any impairment along Cypress Creek for recreational purposes, the draft permit contains effluent limitations and conditions that comply with the TSWQS and are designed to maintain and protect the existing instream uses of Cypress Creek. Further, in accordance with 30 TAC Section 307.5(b) and Commission Procedures to Implement the Texas Surface Water Quality Standards for the TSWQS, an antidegradation review of the receiving waters was performed. The Tier 1 antidegradation review preliminarily determined that existing water quality uses will not be impaired by this permit action. A Tier 2 review also determined that no significant degradation of water quality is expected in Cypress Creek. The Executive Director concludes that existing uses will be maintained and protected.

The Executive Director cites in the draft permit and in the Response to Public Comment that the wastewater permit does not allow the permit holder to create or maintain a nuisance that interferes with a landowner's use and enjoyment of his or her property. In addition, the scope of the Commission's regulatory jurisdiction does not affect or limit the ability of a landowner to seek relief from a court in response to activities that interfere with the landowner's use and enjoyment of his or her property. The Executive Director further points out that the facility, upon operating in accordance with the permit and the applicable Commission rules and state law, will not create nuisance conditions that would interfere with the use and enjoyment of a landowner's property.

Janie and John Laird. Mr. and Mrs. Laird, who live approximately one mile downstream from Nantucket's proposed WWTP, filed both "form" documents and their own, individual requests. All issues contained on their "form" document filings have been responded to above. As for their individual requests, their primary stated issues are the flooding of Cypress Creek during extreme rain events which, they assert, causes water damage to their homes and those of adjacent

neighbors; and their concerns regarding the pollution of this flood water. The Commission does not have the jurisdiction to address the Laird's concerns regarding flooding which is not an issue relevant or material to a decision on this Application. It should be noted, however, that Nantucket's relatively small request of effluent flow will have virtually no impact on the amount of water flowing through Cypress Creek in the vicinity of the Laird's property; indeed, that increase has been equated to the "equivalent of water flowing from 2 small water hoses." It is also noted as described above, that Nantucket's WWTP is located above the 100-year frequency flood level, is compliant with all flood plain prevention and related requirements and has been approved by all other applicable governmental entities.

Poppy and John Parker. The Parker's assert that they live approximately one mile from the proposed Nantucket facility. Both Mr. and Mrs. Parker filed only a "form" document with the Commission. All of their cited issues have been responded to by the Applicant above.

Phillip Neisel. Mr. Neisel owns property approximately eleven hundred feet north of Nantucket's proposed facility. Mr. Neisel filed an individual request and is also one of the individuals whose issues are addressed in the letter to the Commission from attorney Charles Irvine. The issues contained in the letter from Mr. Irvine have already been responded to above. In his individual Request, Mr. Neisel raises issues of odor, flooding, and regionalization, each and all responded to by Applicant above. Mr. Neisel also raises an issue regarding the cost and quality of Nantucket's operation and maintenance of the WWTP. On this issue, Mr. Neisel appears to complain that since Nantucket originally desired to have its water and sewer service provided by a water district, there are no "budgeted costs" to build the WWTP. Mr. Neisel asserts that Nantucket may not be able to operate and maintain the facility as required. This issue is disputed and involves questions of fact. It was raised during the public comment period

and has not been withdrawn but, obviously, it is not relevant or material to a decision on the Application. It is true that Nantucket desired, indeed continues to desire, that it be provided water and sewer service by nearby utility districts but, having had that desire frustrated by the Requestors, Nantucket has proceeded with the prosecution of this Application. There is no evidence of any kind to indicate that Nantucket will not have the available resources to operate and maintain the WWTP contemplated by its Application in a manner required by the Commission.

Don Royall. Mr. Royall, who asserts that he lives approximately two miles from the proposed facility, filed a “form” document with the Commission. All issues raised therein have been previously responded to by Applicant above.

Clayton Terry. Mr. Terry, who asserts that he owns property adjacent to the property owned by Nantucket, is the third individual whose issues were raised to the Commission by an attorney, Mr. Charles Irvine. Each and all of the issues contained in Mr. Irvine’s letter have been responded to by Applicant above.

Kathleen Zofsak. Ms. Zofsak, who asserts that she lives approximately 1/8th of a mile from the Nantucket property, has filed a “form” document with the Commission. All issues contained in that document have been responded to by Applicant above.

RESPONSES TO ADDITIONAL REQUESTORS

As noted above, 118 of the 174 individuals listed as Requestors on the Chief Clerk’s Notice made their Request by filing the “form” document described above. Certain of those 118 did, however, add additional Request items. Applicant has responded to the contents of the “form” and, thus, will not include individual Responses to those Requests. Applicant responds to the Additional Requestors as follows:

Doug Allen. Mr. Allen raises issues (flooding; increase in waterborne pathogens; harm to aquatic life; regionalization) which have already been responded to by Applicant or issues (“government subsidized” property; questions regarding water service; questions regarding emergency services; issues regarding school district overcrowding) which are not relevant or material to a decision on the Application.

Andrew Baird. Mr. Baird raises issues (flooding; waterborne pathogens; harm to aquatic life) which have already been responded to by Applicant above.

Sara Garcia. Ms. Garcia, apparently the spouse of Nick Benefiel who filed a “form” document, complains regarding the issue of “low income housing,” which is not relevant or material to a decision on the Application.

Jim Black. Mr. Black raises issues (Cypress Creek being “overtaxed”; flooding; opposition to development) which have already been responded to by Applicant or which are not relevant or material to a decision on the Application.

Jeff and Melody Braun. Mr. and Mrs. Braun, in addition to issues which have already been responded to by Applicant above (odor; regionalization), raise issues regarding “recreational community amenities.” It is again noted that the minimal increase of flow in Cypress Creek resulting from the amount of effluent being discharged from Applicant’s WWTP will have virtually no effect on that flow or any uses of the Creek.

David Bruce. Mr. Bruce raises issues (flooding; waterborne pathogens; harm to aquatic life; eutrophication) which have already been responded to by Applicant.

Linda Camacho. In addition to issues which already have been responded to by Applicant (flooding; waterborne pathogens; harm to aquatic life; eutrophication), Ms. Camacho objects to

claimed impacts on the community which are not relevant or material to a decision on the Application.

Peter Carpenter. In addition to his “form” document, Mr. Carpenter raises issues related to claimed damage to recreational areas along Cypress Creek to which Applicant has already responded.

Carolyn Christian. In addition to the “form” document which she filed, Ms. Christian raises issues regarding flooding which are not relevant or material to a decision on the Application and claimed harm to aquatic life to which Applicant has responded.

Kevin Coates. Mr. Coates raises issues regarding flooding and what he describes as “health concerns” which are not relevant or material to a decision on the Application.

Arlis Dean. Ms. Dean raises issues regarding flooding which are not relevant or material to a decision on the Application.

Terry Deville. Mr. or Ms. Deville raises issues regarding flooding which are not relevant or material to a decision on the Application and claimed harm to aquatic life in Cypress Creek to which Applicant has already responded.

Diana Dougherty. In addition to her “form” document, Ms. Dougherty raises issues regarding flooding which are not relevant or material to a decision on the Application.

Gwen Durrenberger. In addition to her “form” document, Ms. Durrenberger raises issues regarding flooding and claimed impacts on traffic and crime which are not relevant or material to a decision on the Application.

Chris Edwards. In addition to his “form” document, Mr. Edwards raises issues regarding flooding which are not relevant or material to a decision on the Application.

Ethan Edwards. Mr. Edwards raises issues regarding flooding which are not relevant or material to a decision on the Application.

James Ellis. Mr. Ellis raises issues regarding flooding which are not relevant or material to a decision on the Application.

Lisa Foley. In addition to flooding issues which are not relevant or material to a decision on the Application and other issues to which Applicant has already responded, Ms. Foley raises objections to the proposed development, not relevant or material to a decision on the Application.

Ofelia Garcia. Ms. Garcia raises issues (flooding; waterborne pathogens; harm to aquatic life; eutrophication) which are either not relevant or material to a decision on the Application or to which applicant has already responded.

Patricia Guarino. Ms. Guarino raises “environmental” issues which have already been responded to by the Applicant.

Jena Heap. In addition to her “form” document, Ms. Heap raises issues regarding flooding and development which are not relevant or material to a decision on the Application.

Lauren Heap. In addition to her “form” document, Ms. Heap raises issues regarding flooding and property values which are not relevant or material to a decision on the Application.

Mr. Greg Hood. In addition to his “form” document, Mr. Hood raises issues regarding flooding, waterborne pathogens and eutrophication which are either not relevant or material to a decision on the Application or to which Applicant has already responded.

Mary Ihfe. In addition to her “form” document, Ms. Ihfe raises issues regarding flooding and waterborne pathogens which are not relevant or material to a decision on the Application or to which Applicant has already responded.

Kevin Jensen. Mr. Jensen raises issues regarding flooding and waterborne pathogens which are not relevant or material to a decision on the Application or to which Applicant has already responded.

Mark Kite. In addition to his “form” document, Mr. Kite raises issues regarding development, flooding, waterborne pathogens, harm to aquatic life and eutrophication which are not relevant or material to a decision on the Application or to which Applicant has already responded.

Brandy Klafka. Ms. Klafka merely states that she is opposed to the Application without raising any supporting issues.

Catherine Kralowetz. In addition to her “form” document, Ms. Kralowetz raises issues regarding the development and flooding which are not relevant or material to a decision on the Application and also issues related to waterborne pathogens and eutrophication to which Applicant has already responded.

Adrienne Leigh. Ms. Leigh raises issues regarding flooding, property values and school overcrowding which are not relevant or material to a decision on the Application and issues regarding waterborne pathogens and eutrophication to which Applicant has already responded.

Deborah Leppelt. In addition to her “form” document, Ms. Leppelt raises issues regarding flooding which are not relevant or material to a decision on the Application.

Cathy Levin. Ms. Levin raises issues regarding school overcrowding, flooding, the use of the property and other issues which are not relevant or material to a decision on the Application.

Angela Martin. Ms. Martin raises issues regarding flooding and area development which are not relevant or material to a decision on the Application.

Jody Martinez. In addition to her “form” document, Ms. Martinez raises issues regarding flooding which are not relevant or material to a decision on the Application.

Robert McCreary. In addition to his “form” document, Mr. McCreary raises issues regarding flooding which are not relevant or material to a decision on the Application and issues regarding waterborne pathogens, harm to aquatic life and eutrophication to which Applicant has already responded.

Lauri Jo McDonald. In addition to her “form” document Ms. McDonald merely requests that the permit be denied without raising any supporting issues.

Linda McQueen. Ms. McQueen does not raise any issues in her Request.

Mike Nelub. Mr. Nelub raises issues regarding flooding which are not relevant or material to a decision on the Application and issues regarding claimed harms to recreational areas and waterborne pathogens to which Applicant has already responded.

Brandon Newton. Mr. Newton does not raise any issues in his Request that the permit be denied.

Michael Patton. Mr. Patton raises issues regarding flooding and development which are not relevant or material to a decision on the Application and issues regarding regionalization and water quality to which Applicant has already responded.

Louise Burke Purvis. In addition to her “form” document, Ms. Purvis raises issues regarding flooding which are not relevant or material to a decision on the Application and issues regarding waterborne pathogens, harm to aquatic life, harm to recreational areas and eutrophication to which Applicant has already responded.

Gayle Rudolff. In addition to her “form” document, Ms. Rudolff raises issues regarding recreational uses, school overcrowding, and other issues already responded to by Applicant or not relevant or material to a decision on the Application.

Lois Saucier. In addition to her “form” document, Ms. Saucier raises no issues in her Request that the permit be denied.

Barbara Smith. Ms. Smith raises issues regarding flooding which are not relevant or material to a decision on the Application and issues regarding harm to recreational areas, waterborne pathogens, harm to aquatic life and eutrophication to which Applicant has already responded.

Leah Stephanow. Ms. Stephanow raises issues regarding flooding which are not relevant or material to a decision on the Application and issues regarding claimed harm to recreational areas to which Applicant has already responded. She also raises issues regarding claimed creek erosion. As noted above, the very minor effluent flow sought by the Application does not add sufficient volume to the flow of Cypress Creek so as to impact in any significant way on possible erosion of the creek bed.

Molly B. Talley. In addition to her “form” document, Ms. Talley raises issues regarding flooding which are not relevant or material to a decision on the Application and issues regarding claimed harm to recreational areas, waterborne pathogens and harm to aquatic life to which Applicant has already responded.

Clayton Terry. Mr. Terry’s issues were raised in the letter to the Commission from attorney Charles Irvine to which Applicant has already responded.

Rosanna West. In addition to her “form” document, Ms. West has raised no issues in her Request that the permit be denied.

William C. Wilson. Mr. Wilson raises issues regarding development and flooding that are not relevant or material to a decision on the Application.

RESPONSES-INTERESTED PARTIES

As noted above, the Chief Clerk in the Notice of Public Meeting in this matter has identified approximately 397 individuals as “Interested Persons,” based for the most part on these individuals having prepared public comment forms and forwarded them to the Commission in the summer of 2015. Virtually all of these comments raise the identical issues – flooding, claimed impact on property values, opposition to an affordable housing project, school overcrowding and the like – as raised in so many of the Requests that are not relevant or material to a consideration of the Application. A number also raise the claims of negative impacts on aquatic life in Cypress Creek and concerns regarding waterborne pathogens and eutrophication likewise raised in the Requests to which Applicant has responded above and which are thoroughly addressed by the Executive Director in the draft permit and the Executive Director’s Response to Public Comments. Applicant’s review of these comment documents did not disclose any new or other issues relevant or material for consideration by the Commission not previously addressed.

CONCLUSION: ITEMS CONTAINED IN 30 TAC 55.209(e)

Notwithstanding the large numbers of individuals identified as “Requestors” by the Chief Clerk in the Notice of Public Meeting, it appears that only the individuals identified above as “Adjacent/Downstream Landowners” might possibly meet the Commission requirements to be considered “affected persons” in this matter. These individuals own land or live on property either immediately adjacent to the Applicant’s proposed Project or downstream of the WWTP. It should be taken into consideration, however, that the tenants of Mr. Bertani - Mr. Caraway and Mr. and Ms. Pool - and Mr. and Ms. Parker, Mr. Royall and Ms. Zofsak all filed only the Cypress Coalition “form” document to express their opposition to the Project. It should also be

noted that the only issue raised by Mr. and Ms. Laird in their individual Requests (they also filed “form” documents) were their concerns regarding flooding, not an issue relevant or material to a consideration of the Application. Likewise, although he was included as a client of Mr. Irvine in Mr. Irvine’s correspondence to the Commission, Mr. Terry’s only stated individual issues were those raised in a “form” document. Applicant, thus, urges that at most, only Mr. Bertani and Mr. Neisel might possibly be considered as “affected persons” as this matter proceeds.

While all issues described above are disputed, were raised during the public comment period and have not been withdrawn, Applicant asserts that only those issues having to do with the water quality in Cypress Creek and the impact, if any, on that water quality by the grant of Applicant’s permit are issues that are relevant and material to a further consideration of the Application. These are issues of law and fact but the Executive Director has determined in the draft permit that these issues have been adequately addressed by Applicant, that the Application is in compliance with all applicable laws and regulations, and, accordingly, that no further proceedings are needed and the permit should be granted.

Obviously, with so many individuals contained on the Chief Clerk’s Notice of Public Meeting, a determination of the possible length of a contested case hearing in this matter, should the Commission deem the need for one, is impossible to predict until the Commission has determined the number of “affected persons” who might be entitled to participate.

Applicant respectively urges that the determination of the Executive Director that the permit sought by its Application be granted. Alternatively, should the Commission determine that this matter should be referred for a contested case hearing, that none other than Messers. Bertani and Neisel receive “affected person” status and that only the above described water quality issues be referred for a determination by the State Office of Administrative Hearings.

Respectfully submitted,

GARDERE WYNNE SEWELL LLP

By: /s/ Arthur Val Perkins

Arthur Val Perkins
State Bar No. 15782600
David G. Cabrales
State Bar No. 00787179
1000 Louisiana Street, Suite 2000
Houston, Texas 77002-5011
Telephone: (713) 276-5008
Facsimile: (713) 276-5555
yperkins@gardere.com

**ATTORNEYS FOR NANTUCKET
HOUSING, LLC**

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing document has been served upon the following by electronic mail, hand delivery, facsimile, and/or regular mail on this the 11th day of July, 2016: Executive Director; Public Interest Counsel; Chief Clerk; and all Requestors and Interested Persons

/s/ Arthur Val Perkins
Arthur Val Perkins