

DOCKET NO. 2022-0610-MWD

APPLICATION BY
CITY OF BRYAN
FOR NEW TPDES PERMIT
NO. WQ0015930001

§
§
§
§

BEFORE THE
TEXAS COMMISSION ON
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S RESPONSE TO HEARING REQUEST

I. Introduction

The Executive Director of the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ or Commission) files this Response to Hearing Request (Response) on the application by City of Bryan (Applicant) seeking a new Texas Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (TPDES) Permit Number WQ0015930001 and the Executive Director's preliminary decision. The Office of the Chief Clerk received contested case hearing requests from David and Margaret Hyden, Neil Ryan Gallagher, Jenny Gallagher, Anne Cecile Daleon, Mary Louise Sims, Kenneth D. Davis, Georgianne Ku, Glynda Bricker, and Bobbie Meyer.

Attached for Commission consideration is a satellite map of the area.

II. Description of Facility

The City of Bryan has applied for a new Texas Pollutant Discharge Elimination System Permit No. WQ0015930001 to authorize the discharge of treated domestic wastewater at an annual average flow not to exceed 6,000,000 gallons per day in the Interim phase and an annual average flow not to exceed 12,000,000 gallons per day in the Final phase.

The facility will be located approximately 1,400 feet northeast of the intersection of Australia Lane and Cole Lane, in Brazos County, Texas 77845. The treated effluent will be discharged to Brushy Creek, thence to Wickson Creek, thence to the Navasota River Below Lake Limestone in Segment No. 1209 of the Brazos River Basin. The unclassified receiving water uses are limited aquatic life use for Brushy Creek and presumed high aquatic life use for Wickson Creek. The designated uses for Segment No. 1209 are primary contact recreation, public water supply, and high aquatic life use.

In accordance with 30 Texas Administrative Code § 307.5 and the TCEQ's Procedures to Implement the Texas Surface Water Quality Standards (June 2010), an antidegradation review of the receiving waters was performed. A Tier 1 antidegradation review has preliminarily determined that existing water quality uses will not be impaired by this permit action. Numerical and narrative criteria to protect existing uses will be maintained. A Tier 2 review has preliminarily determined that no significant degradation of water quality is expected in Wickson Creek, which has been identified as having a presumed high aquatic life use. Existing uses will be maintained and protected. The preliminary determination can be reexamined and may be modified if new information is received.

III. Procedural Background

TCEQ received the application for a new TPDES permit on September 25, 2020, and declared it administratively complete on January 14, 2021. The Applicant published the Notice of Receipt and Intent to Obtain a Water Quality Permit (NORI) in English on January 20, 2021, in *The Eagle* and in Spanish on January 22, 2021 in *La Voz Hispana*. The application was determined to be technically complete on May 21, 2021. The Applicant published the Notice of Application and Preliminary Decision (NAPD) in English on September 9, 2021 in *The Eagle*, and in Spanish on September 10, 2021 in *La Voz Hispana*. The public comment period ended on January 20, 2022.

This application was filed on or after February 12, 2019; therefore, this application is subject to the procedural requirements adopted pursuant to House Bill (HB) 801, 76th Legislature (1999), and Senate Bill (SB) 709, 84th Legislature (2015), both implemented by the Commission in its rules in 30 TAC Chapter 39, 50, and 55. The Texas Legislature enacted Senate Bill 709, effective September 1, 2015, amending the requirements for comments and contested case hearings. This application is subject to those changes in the law.

IV. The Evaluation Process for Hearing Requests

House Bill 801 established statutory procedures for public participation in certain environmental permitting proceedings, specifically regarding public notice and public comment and the Commission's consideration of hearing requests. Senate Bill 709 revised the requirements for submitting public comment and the Commission's consideration of hearing requests. The evaluation process for hearing requests is as follows:

A. Response to Requests

The Executive Director, the Public Interest Counsel, and the Applicant may each submit written responses to hearing requests. 30 TAC § 55.209(d).

Responses to hearing requests must specifically address:

- whether the requestor is an affected person;
- which issues raised in the hearing request are disputed;
- whether the dispute involves questions of fact or of law;
- whether the issues were raised during the public comment period;
- 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;
- whether the issues are relevant and material to the decision on the application;
- and
- a maximum expected duration for the contested case hearing.

30 TAC § 55.209(c).

B. Hearing Request Requirements

In order for the Commission to consider a hearing request, the Commission must first determine whether the request meets certain requirements:

Affected persons may request a contested case hearing. The request must be made in writing and timely filed with the chief clerk. The request must be based only on the requestor's timely comments and may not be based on an issue that was raised solely in a public comment that was withdrawn by the requestor prior to the filing of the Executive Director's Response to Comment.

30 TAC § 55.201(c).

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. 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;

identify the person's personal justiciable interest affected by the application, including a brief, but specific, written statement explaining in plain language the requestor's location and distance relative to the proposed facility or activity that is the subject of the application and how and why the requestor 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;

request a contested case hearing; and

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 requestor should, to the extent possible, specify any of the Executive Director's responses to comments that the requestor disputes and the factual basis of the dispute and list any disputed issues of law; and provide any other information specified in the public notice of application.

30 TAC § 55.201(d).

C. Requirement that Requestor be an Affected Person/"Affected Person" Status

In order to grant a contested case hearing, the Commission must determine that a requestor is an "affected" person. 30 TAC § 55.203 sets out who may be considered an affected person. For any application, 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. Except as provided by 30 TAC § 55.103, governmental entities, including local governments and public agencies with authority under state law over issues raised by the application may be considered affected persons.

In determining whether a person is an affected person, all factors shall be

considered, including, but not limited to, the following:

whether the interest claimed is one protected by the law under which the application will be considered;

distance restrictions or other limitations imposed by law on the affected interest;

whether a reasonable relationship exists between the interest claimed and the activity regulated;

likely impact of the regulated activity on the health and safety of the person, and on the use of property of the person;

likely impact of the regulated activity on use of the impacted natural resource by the person;

whether the requestor timely submitted comments on the application which were not withdrawn; and

for governmental entities, their statutory authority over or interest in the issues relevant to the application.

30 TAC § 55.203.

In making affected person determinations, the commission may also consider, to the extent consistent with case law:

the merits of the underlying application and supporting documentation in the commission's administrative record, including whether the application meets the requirements for permit issuance;

the analysis and opinions of the Executive Director; and

any other expert reports, affidavits, opinions, or data submitted by the Executive Director, the applicant, or hearing requestor.

30 TAC § 55.203(d).

D. Referral to the State Office of Administrative Hearings

“When the Commission grants a request for a contested case hearing, the commission shall issue an order specifying the number and scope of the issues to be referred to SOAH for a hearing.” 30 TAC § 50.115(b). The Commission may not refer an issue to SOAH for a contested case hearing unless the Commission determines that the issue:

involves a disputed question of fact or a mixed question of law and fact;

was raised during the public comment period by an affected person whose hearing request is granted; and

is relevant and material to the decision on the application.

30 TAC § 50.115(c).

V. Analysis of Hearing Requests

The Executive Director has analyzed the hearing request to determine whether it complies with Commission rules, if the requestor qualifies as an affected person, what issues may be referred for a contested case hearing, and what is the appropriate length of the hearing.

A. **Whether the Hearing Requests Complied with Section 55.201(c) and (d).**

David and Margaret Gail Hyden, Neil Ryan Gallagher, Jenny Gallagher, Anne Cecile Daleon, Mary Louise Sims, Glynda Bricker, and Bobbie Meyer submitted timely hearing requests that raised issues presented during the public comment period that have not been withdrawn. They provided their names, addresses, email addresses, and requested a public hearing. They identified themselves as persons with what they believed to be personal justiciable interests affected by the application, which will be discussed in greater detail below, and provided a list of disputed issues of fact they raised during the public comment period. Therefore, the Executive Director concludes that the hearing requests of David and Margaret Gail Hyden, Neil Ryan Gallagher, Jenny Gallagher, Anne Cecile Daleon, Mary Louis Sims, Glynda Bricker, and Bobbie Meyer substantially comply with the section 55.201(c) and (d) requirements.

Kenneth D. Davis and Georgianne Ku also submitted hearing requests. However, they did not identify personal justiciable interests affected by the application. The Executive Director concludes that the hearing requests of Kenneth D. Davis and Georgianne Ku fail to comply with the section 55.201(c) and (d) requirements.

1. **David and Margaret Hyden**

According to the information provided by David and Margaret Hyden, their property surrounds the City's tract. Additionally, the Hyden's are listed on the affected landowner's list. They raised concerns about how the proposed discharge will affect the water level of Brushy Creek, flooding, whether they will have access to their property, interference with their use and enjoyment of their property, contamination of water wells and groundwater, nuisance odor, the location of the site in the 100 year floodplain, antidegradation, and whether the wastewater treatment plant or the requested discharge volume should be denied or altered in consideration of need for the facility. Contamination of groundwater and wells, interference with use and enjoyment of property, nuisance odor, and antidegradation are issues that are protected by the laws under which the application will be considered. Thus, based on the location of their property and the issues raised, David and Margaret Hyden have demonstrated they have a personal justiciable interest related to a legal right, duty, privilege, power, or economic interest affected by the application not common to members of the general public and are affected persons.¹

The Executive Director recommends the Commission find that David and Margaret Hyden are affected persons. The Hyden's raised issues 1-5, 11-12 in their hearing request.

¹ *Id.* § 55.203(a); *see also id.* § 55.211(c)(2) (addressing hearing requests from affected persons that will be granted).

2. Neil Ryan Gallagher

According to the information provided by Neil Ryan Gallagher, his property is located directly across from the proposed facility location. He raises concerns such as human health and safety, airborne hazards, and airborne pests. Human health and safety, and control of vectors are issues that are protected by the laws under which the application will be considered. Thus, based on the location of his property and the issues raised, Neil Ryan Gallagher has demonstrated that he has a personal justiciable interest related to a legal right, duty, privilege, power, or economic interest affected by the application not common to members of the general public and is an affected person.²

The Executive Director recommends the Commission find that Neil Ryan Gallagher is an affected person. Neil Ryan Gallagher raised issues 6, and 8-9 in his hearing request.

3. Jenny Gallagher

According to the information provided by Jenny Gallagher, her property is directly across the street from the proposed facility location. She raises concerns such as human health and safety, harm to animal life, airborne hazards caused by fumes, gases, and bacteria, airborne pests, and flooding. Human health and safety, effects on wildlife, and control of vectors are issues that are protected by the laws under which the application will be considered. Thus, based on the location of her property and the issues raised Jenny Gallagher has demonstrated that she has a personal justiciable interest related to a legal right, duty, privilege, power, or economic interest affected by the application not common to members of the general public and is an affected person.³

The Executive Director recommends the Commission find that Jenny Gallagher is an affected person. Jenny Gallagher raised issues 6-8, and 11 in her hearing request.

4. Anne Cecile Daleon

According to the information provided by Ms. Daleon, her property is directly across Cole Lane from the proposed facility. She raises concerns about air quality, use and enjoyment of her property, water quality, and harm to wildlife. Ms. Daleon's concerns about water quality, and harm to wildlife are issues that are protected by the law under which the application will be considered and thus are referable.⁴ Due to her proximity to the facility and the issues raised, Ms. Daleon has demonstrated that she has a personal justiciable interest related to a legal right, duty, privilege, power, or economic interest affected by the application not common to members of the general public and is an affected person.⁵

The Executive Director recommends the Commission find that Ms. Daleon is an affected person. Anne Cecile Daleon raised issues 1-2, and 10 in her hearing request.

² *Id.* § 55.203(a); *see also id.* § 55.211(c)(2) (addressing hearing requests from affected persons that will be granted).

³ *Id.* § 55.203(a); *see also id.* § 55.211(c)(2) (addressing hearing requests from affected persons that will be granted).

⁴ *Id.* § 55.203(3)(e).

⁵ *Id.* § 55.203(a); *see also id.* § 55.211(c)(2).

5. Mary Louise Sims

According to the information provided by Ms. Sims, her property is 50 feet from the City's property. She raised concerns about flooding, erosion, and water quality of wells. Ms. Sims concern about water quality is affected by the law under which the application will be considered and thus is referable.⁶ Therefore, based on the location of her property and the issues raised, Ms. Sims has a personal justiciable interest related to a legal right, duty, privilege, power, or economic interest affected by the application not common to members of the general public and is an affected person.⁷

The Executive Director recommends the Commission find that Ms. Sims is an affected person. Mary Louise Sims raised issues 1, 11, and 13 in her hearing request.

6. Glynda Bricker

According to the information provided by Ms. Bricker, her property is located approximately 1 mile from the proposed facility. Glynda Bricker submitted a hearing request that raises concerns about odor, chemicals, erosion, stress to wildlife, and damage to personal property. Ms. Bricker's concern about odor is protected by the law under which the application will be considered and is referable. Due to her proximity to the facility and the issue raised, Ms. Bricker has demonstrated that she has a personal justiciable interest related to a legal right, duty, privilege, power, or economic interest affected by the application not common to members of the general public and is an affected person.⁸

The Executive Director recommends the Commission find that Glynda Bricker is an affected person. Glynda Bricker raised issue 4 in her hearing request.

7. Bobbie Meyer

According to the information provided by Bobbie Meyer, her property is located approximately 0.75 miles from the proposed facility. Ms. Meyer submitted a hearing request that raises the issue of odor. Ms. Meyer's concern about odor is protected by the law under which the application will be considered and is referable. Due to her proximity to the facility and the issue raised, Ms. Meyer has demonstrated that she has a personal justiciable interest related to a legal right, duty, privilege, power, or economic interest affected by the application not common to members of the general public and is an affected person.⁹

The Executive Director recommends the Commission find that Bobbie Meyer is an affected person. Bobbie Meyer raised issue 4 in her hearing request.

8. Kenneth D. Davis

According to the information provided by Kenneth D. Davis, his property is within 2,500 feet of the proposed facility. However, Mr. Davis has not shown that he has a personal justiciable interest. The concerns he raises such as pollution and floodplain displacement are either too general to show that they are relevant and

⁶ *Id.* § 55.203(3)(e).

⁷ *Id.* § 55.203(a); *see also id.* § 55.211(c)(2).

⁸ *Id.* § 55.203(a); *see also id.* § 55.211(c)(2).

⁹ *Id.* § 55.203(a); *see also id.* § 55.211(c)(2).

material to the application or are issues common to the general public. Thus, the ED recommends denial of his hearing request.

The Executive Director recommends the Commission find that Kenneth D. Davis is not an affected person.

9. Georgianne Ku

According to the information provided by Ms. Ku, she lives in the state of Washington. Based on her provided location, Ms. Ku has not demonstrated how she has a personal justiciable interest related to a legal right, duty, privilege, power, or economic interest affected by the application not common to members of the general public.¹⁰

The Executive Director recommends the Commission find that Georgianne Ku is not an affected person.

B. Whether Issues Raised Are Referable to SOAH for a Contested Case.

The following issues were raised during the public comment period:

1. Whether the draft permit contains adequate provisions to protect water quality, including the water quality in creeks and groundwater. (RTC Response Nos. 6, 7, 8, 14, 15, 20, 25, 27).

The issue involves a disputed question of mixed fact and law, was raised during the comment period, was not withdrawn, and is relevant and material to the issuance of the draft permit. If it can be shown the draft permit does not provide sufficient controls to protect water quality, that information would be relevant and material to a decision on the application. The Executive Director recommends referring this issue to SOAH.

2. Whether the permit will be protective of the use and enjoyment of private property. (RTC Response No. 4, 11).

The issue involves a disputed question of mixed fact and law, was raised during the comment period, was not withdrawn, and is relevant and material to the issuance of the draft permit. If it can be shown the draft permit might interfere with the use and enjoyment of private property, that information would be relevant and material to a decision on the application. The Executive Director recommends referring this issue to SOAH.

3. Whether the Commission should deny or alter the terms and conditions of the draft permit based on the consideration of need under Texas Water Code § 26.0282. (RTC Response No. 22).

The issue involves a disputed question of mixed fact and law, was raised during the comment period, was not withdrawn, and is relevant and material to the issuance of the draft permit. If it can be shown the draft permit does not substantially comply with Texas Water Code § 26.0282, that information would be

¹⁰ *Id.* § 55.203(a); *see also id.* § 55.211(c)(2).

relevant and material to a decision on the application. The Executive Director recommends referring this issue to SOAH.

4. Whether the draft permit complies with the TCEQ rules regarding nuisance odor. (RTC Response No. 16).

The issue involves a disputed question of mixed fact and law, was raised during the comment period, was not withdrawn, and is relevant and material to the issuance of the draft permit. If it can be shown the draft permit does not comply with the TCEQ's rules regarding control of nuisance odor, that information would be relevant and material to a decision on the application. The Executive Director recommends referring this issue to SOAH.

5. Whether the draft permit complied with the TCEQ's antidegradation policy. (RTC Response No. 21).

The issue involves a disputed question of mixed fact and law, was raised during the comment period, was not withdrawn, and is relevant and material to the issuance of the draft permit. If it can be shown the draft permit does not comply with the TCEQ's antidegradation policy, that information would be relevant and material to a decision on the application. The Executive Director recommends referring this issue to SOAH.

6. Whether the draft permit is protective of human health and safety. (RTC Response No. 8).

The issue involves a disputed question of mixed fact and law, was raised during the comment period, was not withdrawn, and is relevant and material to the issuance of the draft permit. If it can be shown the draft permit is not drafted to be protective of human health and safety, that information would be relevant and material to a decision on the application. The Executive Director recommends referring this issue to SOAH.

7. Whether the draft permit is protective of animal life. (RTC Response No. 13).

The issue involves a disputed question of mixed fact and law, was raised during the comment period, was not withdrawn, and is relevant and material to the issuance of the draft permit. If it can be shown the draft permit is not drafted to be protective of animal life, that information would be relevant and material to a decision on the application. The Executive Director recommends referring this issue to SOAH.

8. Whether the draft permit complies with TCEQ's rules regarding control of vectors. (RTC Response Nos. 4, 18).

The issue involves a disputed question of mixed fact and law, was raised during the comment period, was not withdrawn, and is relevant and material to the issuance of the draft permit. If it can be shown the draft permit does not comply with the TCEQ's rules regarding the control of vectors, that information would be relevant and material to a decision on the application. The Executive Director recommends referring this issue to SOAH.

9. Whether the draft permit is drafted to limit airborne hazards resulting from fumes, gas, and bacteria. (RTC Response No. 8).

The issue involves a disputed question of mixed fact and law, however, it is not relevant and material to a decision on the application. The Executive Director does NOT recommend referring this issue to SOAH.

10. Whether the draft permit is protective of air quality. (RTC Response No. 8, 27).

The issue involves a disputed question of mixed fact and law, however, it is not relevant and material to a decision on the application. The Executive Director does NOT recommend referring this issue to SOAH.

11. Whether the draft permit will contribute to flooding. (RTC Response No. 4, 20).

This is an issue of fact. However, it is not relevant and material to a decision on the application, as the TCEQ does not have jurisdiction over flooding. The Executive Director does NOT recommend referring this issue to SOAH.

12. Whether the draft permit will contribute to rising water levels in the creek. (RTC Response No. 3).

This is an issue of fact. However, it is not relevant and material to a decision on the application, as the TCEQ does not have jurisdiction over water levels. The Executive Director does NOT recommend referring this issue to SOAH.

13. Whether the draft permit will contribute to erosion. (RTC Response No. 17).

This is an issue of fact. However, it is not relevant and material to a decision on the application, as the TCEQ does not have jurisdiction over erosion. The Executive Director does NOT recommend referring this issue to SOAH.

VI. Analysis of Request for Reconsideration

The Chief Clerk received one timely request for reconsideration (RFR) by Jamie Overton. As required by 30 Texas Administrative Code § 55.201(d), Ms. Overton gave her request in writing and specifically requested reconsideration of the ED's decision on the Selinger application. Ms. Overton provided her name, address, and daytime telephone number.

The issues that Ms. Overton brought up included impacts on the environment and endangered species, and the location of the proposed facility. Impact on endangered species is a new issue, however, TPWD rather than TCEQ has jurisdiction over endangered species. The RFR did not present any new information not already considered by the ED during the permitting process. Therefore, the ED recommends denial of the RFR.

VII. Contested Case Hearing Duration

If there is a contested case hearing on this application, the Executive Director recommends that the duration of the hearing be 180 days from the preliminary hearing to the presentation of a Proposal for Decision to the Commission.

VIII. Conclusion

The Executive Director recommends the following actions by the Commission:

Find David and Margaret Hyden, Neil Ryan Gallagher, Jenny Gallagher, Anne Cecile Daleon, Mary Louise Sims, Glynda Bricker, and Bobbie Meyer as affected persons and grant their hearing requests;

Refer the following issues to SOAH:

Issue 1. Whether the draft permit contains adequate provisions to protect water quality, including the water quality in creeks and groundwater.

Issue 2. Whether the draft permit will be protective of the use and enjoyment of private property.

Issue 3. Whether the Commission should deny or alter the terms and conditions of the draft permit based on the consideration of need under Texas Water Code § 26.0282.

Issue 4. Whether the draft permit complies with the TCEQ's requirements regarding nuisance odor.

Issue 5. Whether the draft permit complies with the TCEQ's antidegradation policy.

Issue 6. Whether the draft permit is protective of human health and safety.

Issue 7. Whether the draft permit is protective of animal life.

Issue 8. Whether the draft permit complies with the TCEQ's requirements regarding the control of vectors.

Find Kenneth D. Davis and Georgianne Ku are not affected persons and deny their hearing requests.

Respectfully submitted,

Texas Commission on Environmental Quality

Toby Baker
Executive Director

Erin. E. Chancellor, Deputy Director
Environmental Law Division

Charmaine Backens, Deputy Director
Environmental Law Division



Aubrey Pawelka, Staff Attorney
Environmental Law Division
State Bar No. 24121770
P.O. Box 13087, MC 173
Austin, Texas 78711-3087
Phone: (512) 239-0622
Fax: (512) 239-0606

REPRESENTING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF
THE TEXAS COMMISSION ON
ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

IX. CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on June 6, 2022, the “Executive Director’s Response to Hearing Request” for new TPDES Permit No. WQ0015930001 by City of Bryan was filed with the TCEQ’s Office of the Chief Clerk, and a copy was served to all persons listed on the attached mailing list via hand delivery, facsimile transmission, inter-agency mail, electronic submittal, or by deposit in the U.S. Mail.



Aubrey Pawelka, Staff Attorney
Environmental Law Division
State Bar No. 24121770
P.O. Box 13087, MC 173
Austin, Texas 78711-3087
Phone (512) 239-0622
Fax: (512) 239-0606

**MAILING LIST CITY OF BRYAN
DOCKET NO. 2022-0610-MWD; PERMIT NO. WQ0015930001**

FOR THE APPLICANT:
via electronic mail:

Kean Register, City Manager
City of Bryan
P.O. Box 1000
Bryan, Texas 77805
Tel: (979) 209-5100
Fax: (979) 209-5106
kregister@bryantx.gov

Jayson Barfknecht, Ph.D., P.E.
Director of Public Works
City of Bryan Public Works
1111 Waco Street
Bryan, Texas 77803
Tel: (979) 209-5900
jbarfknecht@bryantx.gov

Allen Woelke, P.E., Vice President
CDM Smith
9430 Research Boulevard, Suite 1-200
Austin, Texas 78759
Tel: (512) 265-5331
woelkead@cdmsmith.com

FOR THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
via electronic mail:

Aubrey Pawelka, Staff Attorney
Texas Commission on Environmental
Quality
Environmental Law Division, MC-173
P.O. Box 13087 Austin, Texas 78711
Tel: (512) 239-0622
Fax: (512) 239-0606
aubrey.pawelka@tceq.texas.gov

Gordon Cooper, Technical Staff Texas
Commission on Environmental Quality
Water Quality Division, MC-148
P.O. Box 3087
Austin, Texas 78711
Tel: (512) 239-1963
Fax: (512) 239-4430
gordon.cooper@tceq.texas.gov

Ryan Vise, Deputy Director
Texas Commission on Environmental
Quality
External Relations Division
Public Education Program, MC-108
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, Texas 78711
Tel: (512) 239-4000
Fax: (512) 239-5678
pep@tceq.texas.gov

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
Tel: (512) 239-6363
Fax: (512) 239-6377
vic.mcwherter@tceq.texas.gov

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
Tel: (512) 239-0687
Fax: (512) 239-4015
kyle.lucas@tceq.texas.gov

FOR THE CHIEF CLERK:

Docket Clerk
Texas Commission on Environmental
Quality
Office of Chief Clerk, MC-105
P.O. Box 13087 Austin, Texas 78711
Tel: (512) 239-3300
Fax: (512) 239-3311
www.tceq.texas.gov/goto/efilings

REQUESTER(S)/INTERESTED PERSONS
See attached list

REQUESTER(S)

Glynda Bricker
5036 Enchanted Oaks Dr
College Station, TX 77845-7652

Anne Cecile Daleon
5695 Cole Ln
College Station, TX 77845-7612

Kenneth D Davis
11455 Deer Creek Dr
College Station, TX 77845-7626

Adam M Friedman
McElroy Sullivan Miller & Weber LLP
1201 Spyglass Dr
Ste 200
Austin, TX 78746-6925

Adam M Friedman
McElroy Sullivan Miller & Weber LLP
PO Box 12127
Austin, TX 78711-2127

Jenny Gallagher
5663 Cole Ln
College Station, TX 77845-7612

Neil Ryan Gallagher
5663 Cole Ln
College Station, TX 77845-7612

Georgianne Sims Ku
14040 168Th Ave Ne
Woodinville, WA 98072-9027

Bobbie Meyer
5445 Cole Ln
College Station, TX 77845-7614

Jamie Overton
4711 Enchanted Oaks Dr
College Station, TX 77845-4831

Mary Louise Sims
5565 Cole Ln
College Station, TX 77845-7613

PUBLIC OFFICIALS - INTERESTED PERSON(S)

The Honorable Kyle Kacal
State Representative, Texas House of
Representatives District 12
PO Box 2910
Austin, TX 78768-2910

INTERESTED PERSON(S)

Lee Banse
McElroy Sullivan
1201 Spyglass Dr
Ste 200
Austin, TX 78746-6925

Lee Banse
McElroy Sullivan
PO Box 12127
Austin, TX 78711-2127

Jennifer M Bronson Warren
1601 E Crest Dr
Waco, TX 76705-1555

Don Darensbourg
5078 Cole Ln
College Station, TX 77845-7604

Marcetta Y Darensbourg
5078 Cole Ln
College Station, TX 77845-7604

Ryan Deer
5345 Enchanted Oaks Dr
College Station, TX 77845-7657

Robert Dotson
5001 Cole Ln
College Station, TX 77845-7617

Fred Fontana
4968 Winding Crk
College Station, TX 77845-3003

Adam Friedman
4330 Gaines Ranch Loop Ste 200
Austin, TX 78735-6733

Teri Gardner
4785 Enchanted Oaks Dr
College Station, TX 77845-7662

Laura Gelderd
5274 Enchanted Oaks Dr
College Station, TX 77845-7653

David J Hyden Jr
5632 Cole Ln
College Station, TX 77845-7609

Tristin Cole Hyden
5632 Cole Ln
College Station, TX 77845-7609

Ben Jones
11695 Australia Ln
College Station, TX 77845-7625

Michelle Jones
11695 Australia Ln
College Station, TX 77845-7625

Judy Ludwig
2111 Nicole Ct
Bryan, TX 77802-2171

Katie Martin
11490 Deer Creek Dr
College Station, TX 77845-7629

Lee S Martin
11490 Deer Creek Dr
College Station, TX 77845-7629

Steve Maxwell
5041 Whispering Oaks Dr
College Station, TX 77845-7672

Kenneth R Mayes Jr
11520 Deer Creek Dr
College Station, TX 77845-7628

Glen N Molitor
Bar M Ranch
13333 State Highway 30
College Station, TX 77845-7641

Steve Rathbone
4922 Whispering Oaks Dr
College Station, TX 77845-7674

Bernice Schiller
5032 Cole Ln
College Station, TX 77845-7604

Eugene Schiller
5032 Cole Ln
College Station, TX 77845-7604

Gary Sims
5565 Cole Ln
College Station, TX 77845-7613

Oliver Sims
3039 Wolfpack Loop
Bryan, TX 77808-1501

Ginger Smith
11552 Deer Creek Dr
College Station, TX 77845-7628

M Earl Smith
11552 Deer Creek Dr
College Station, TX 77845-7628

Janie Velasquez
5033 Cole Ln
College Station, TX 77845-7617

Charlie Williams
5531 Cole Ln
College Station, TX 77845-7613

Steven Witkowski
5695 Enchanted Oaks Dr
College Station, TX 77845-7656

Attachment A

City of Bryan, WQ0015930001

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





Protecting Texas by
Reducing and
Preventing Pollution

Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
GIS Team (Mail Code 197)
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, Texas 78711-3087
Date: 5/31/2022
CRF 0069470_Edits
Cartographer: CHoddePi

Requestor List:

1. David and Margaret Gail Hyden
2. Neil Ryan and Jenny Gallagher
3. Kenneth D. Davis
4. Anne Cecile Daleon
5. Mary Louise Sims
6. Glynda Bricker
7. Bobbie Meyer

- Requestor
- Proposed Facility
- 1 Mile Downstream
- Watercourses
- Waterbodies
- Half Mile Radius
- 1 Mile Radius
- 1.5 Mile Radius



The facility is located in Brazos County. The square (green) in the left inset map represents the approximate location of the facility. The inset map on the right represents the location of Brazos 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.

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.

