TCEQ DOCKET NO. 2025-1295-MWD

APPLICATION OF HAYS	8 §	BEFORE THE TEXAS
COMMONS DEVELOPMENT, INC.	§	
FOR TCEQ PERMIT NO.	§	COMMISSION ON
WQ0016373001	§	
	§	ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

APPLICANT'S RESPONSE TO HEARING REQUESTS AND REQUESTS FOR RECONSIDERATION

Hays Commons Development, Inc. ("Applicant") respectfully submits this Response to Hearing Request and Requests for Reconsideration in the above-referenced matter.

BACKGROUND

I. FACILITY DESCRIPTION

The Applicant applied for new TCEQ/TLAP Permit No. WQ0016373001 (draft permit) to serve the wastewaters needs of areas in both Travis and Hays Counties that will contain restaurants, apartments, and commercial spaces proposed in the Hays Commons Development by authorizing the land application as opposed to the discharge of treated domestic wastewater (effluent) at a daily average flow rate not to exceed flow not to exceed 0.05, 0.10, and 0.15 million gallons per day (MGD) in the Interim I, II, and Final phases; via surface irrigation of 60 acres of non-public access land only according to the effluent limitations (limits) in the draft permit which does not authorize any effluent discharges into Waters in the State.

When constructed the Proposed facility will be located approximately 0.25 miles southwest of the intersection of Farm-to-Market Road 1626 and State Highway 45 Southwest in Hays County, Texas 78610. The facility and disposal site will be located in the drainage basin of Onion Creek in Segment No. 1427 of the Colorado River Basin.

The Proposed facility will be a membrane bioreactor (MBR) facility.

II. SUMMARY OF RESPONSES

According to the Commissioner's Integrated Database, there are 93 Requests for a Contested Case Hearing. An overarching theme is that the requesters obtain water from public supply wells that draw water from the aquifer. If drinking water from a well that draws from the aquifer grants standing in a TLAP permit, there can almost be no limit – thousands of people do so, which makes it a generalized concern. The Commission should require more.

RESPONSES TO INDIVIDUAL REQUESTS

I. REQUESTERS WHO EXPRESSED ONLY GENERALIZED CONCERNS OR NOT ENOUGH OR IRRELEVANT INFORMATION ABOUT INDIVIDUALIZED CONCERNS.

The requesters listed below express generalized concerns that are common to the general public in their hearing requests but do not even attempt to explain how they have a personal justiciable interest. Their requests, therefore, should be denied:

1. Aboussie, Karen

- a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- b. She is not adjacent to the Applicant's property. In fact she states in her comments that she is "less than 2 miles from the proposed wastewater treatment plant." Two miles is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit.
- c. Applicant agrees with the ED that this individual provided addresses that are not in proximity to any relevant feature of the proposed facility. Because of the lack of proximity, this request cannot be used to establish affectedness because it fails to demonstrate a reasonable relationship exists between the interests claimed and the activity regulated, which decreases the likelihood this individual may be affected in a way not common to the public.

2. Ballou, Hannah

- a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- b. Ms. Ballou's property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities (see Exhibit 1, property ID 4).
- c. Although she asserts that she receives water from the City of Hays well (which she claims "backs up to the proposed development", but she doesn't say whether it is adjacent to the facilities in question), many members of the general public receive water from such well. There is no indication that the City of Hays' well will be affected because a discharge is not permitted. Moreover, the City of Hays will protect the interests of its public well.

3. Beatty, Alanna

- a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- b. Ms. Beatty's property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities (see Exhibit 1, property ID 5). In fact she states in her comments that she is "less than 0.9 miles." Almost a mile is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit.
- c. She claims that she receives water from the "Aqua community well" but does not describe the distance of that well from the facilities nor does she explain how that well might be impacted by a no-discharge TLAP permit.
- d. All of her other concerns are common to members of the general public except possibly the impervious cover concern for the development. Impervious cover, however, is not a subject of this permit.
- e. Applicant agrees with the ED that this individual provided addresses that are not in proximity to any relevant feature of the proposed facility. Because of the lack of proximity, this request cannot be used to establish affectedness because it fails to demonstrate a reasonable relationship exists between the interests claimed and the activity regulated, which decreases the likelihood this individual may be affected in a way not common to the public.

4. Berkowitz, Stuart

- a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- b. Mr. Berkowitz's property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities (see Exhibit 1, property ID 6). In fact he states in his comments that he is "less than 2 miles from the proposed wastewater treatment plant." Two miles is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit.
- c. He claims that he receives water from the Aqua community well but does not describe the distance of that well from the facilities nor does he explain how that well might be impacted by a no-discharge TLAP permit.
- d. Applicant agrees with the ED that this individual provided addresses that are not in proximity to any relevant feature of the proposed facility. Because of the lack of proximity, this request cannot be used to establish affectedness because it fails to demonstrate a reasonable relationship exists between the interests claimed and the activity regulated, which decreases the likelihood this individual may be affected in a way not common to the public.

5. Van Blokland, Dale

- a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- b. Mr. Van Blokland's property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities (see Exhibit 1, property ID 6). In fact he states in his comments that he is 0.6 miles from the proposed wastewater irrigation field. This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit.
- c. He claims that he receives water from the Aqua community well but does not describe the distance of that well from the facilities nor does he explain how that well might be impacted by a no-discharge TLAP permit.
- d. The request of this individual failed to comply with the requirements of 30 TAC § 55.201(c) by not basing their requests on comments that they made during the

appliable comment period. Because this request did not comply on their face with TCEQ rules, this requests failed to identify a personal, justiciable interest affected by the application.

6. Brisky, Phil

- a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- b. His property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities (see Exhibit 1, property ID 8). In fact, he states in his comments that he is "within .5 mile of the proposed Milestone Hays Commons MUD", but does not state how far he is from the facilities. This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit.
- c. He claims that he receives water from a well, but it does not appear to be a private well.
- d. Applicant agrees with the ED that this individual provided addresses that are not in proximity to any relevant feature of the proposed facility. Because of the lack of proximity, this request cannot be used to establish affectedness because it fails to demonstrate a reasonable relationship exists between the interests claimed and the activity regulated, which decreases the likelihood this individual may be affected in a way not common to the public.

7. Brunone, Andrew

- a. His property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities, and we could not locate it on the attached map as Exhibit 1.
- b. He claims that he receives water from a well, but it does not appear to be a private well, and there is no adequate discussion as to why the well he drinks from might be affected.
- c. Applicant agrees with the ED that this individual provided addresses that are not in proximity to any relevant feature of the proposed facility. Because of the lack of proximity, this request cannot be used to establish affectedness because it fails to demonstrate a reasonable relationship exists between the interests claimed and the activity regulated, which decreases the likelihood this individual may be affected in a way not common to the public.

8. Jim & Elizabeth Camp

- a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- b. Their property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities (see Exhibit 1, property ID 12). In fact they state that they are "less than a mile" from the MUD property. This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit.
- c. They claim to receive water from a well, but it appears to be a public or community well.
- d. Applicant agrees with the ED that this individual provided addresses that are not in proximity to any relevant feature of the proposed facility. Because of the lack of proximity, this request cannot be used to establish affectedness because it fails to demonstrate a reasonable relationship exists between the interests claimed and the activity regulated, which decreases the likelihood this individual may be affected in a way not common to the public.

9. Carlon, Alfonso D

- a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- b. His property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities. In fact he states that he is "approximately one mile downstream from the proposed discharge site". This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit.
- c. He expresses concerns about flooding, which is not the subject of this permit.
- d. Applicant agrees with the ED that this individual provided addresses that are not in proximity to any relevant feature of the proposed facility. Because of the lack of proximity, this request cannot be used to establish affectedness because it fails to demonstrate a reasonable relationship exists between the interests claimed and the activity regulated, which decreases the likelihood this individual may be affected in a way not common to the public.

10. Carracedo, Lucia

- a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- b. Her property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities. In fact she states that she is "approximately 3 miles south of this proposed site". This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit.
- c. This request lacked written explanations plainly describing the individuals' locations and distances relative to the proposed facility, the relevant and material issues the individuals raised, and why the individuals believe they will be affected by the application in a way not common to the public. Because this requests did not comply on their face with TCEQ rules, this requests failed to identify a personal, justiciable interest affected by the application. Because this request does not include analysis of the Affected Person provisions in 30 TAC § 55.203, the request should be denied.

11. Cunningham, Diana

- a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- b. Her property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities. In fact she states that she is "less than 2 miles from the proposed wastewater treatment plant". This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit.
- c. Applicant agrees with the ED that this individual provided addresses that are not in proximity to any relevant feature of the proposed facility. Because of the lack of proximity, this request cannot be used to establish affectedness because it fails to demonstrate a reasonable relationship exists between the interests claimed and the activity regulated, which decreases the likelihood this individual may be affected in a way not common to the public.

12. DePenning, Joel Thomas

- a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- b. His property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities (see Exhibit 1, property ID 23). In fact, he does not describe where his property is vis-à-vis the facilities. This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit.
- c. He claims to receive water from a well, but it appears to be a public or community well.

13. Duke, Chris & Erin

a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.

- b. His property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities. In fact he states that his neighborhood (not his property) is "located approximately 0.9 miles from the proposed" facilities. This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit.
- c. The request of this individual failed to comply with the requirements of 30 TAC § 55.201(c) by not basing their requests on comments that they made during the appliable comment period. Because this request did not comply on their face with TCEQ rules, this requests failed to identify a personal, justiciable interest affected by the application.

14. Gaston, Brandon

- a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- b. His property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities. In fact he states that his neighborhood (not his property) is "located approximately 0.9 miles from the proposed" facilities. This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit.
- c. He claims to receive water from a well, but it appears to be a public or community well.
- d. The request of this individual failed to comply with the requirements of 30 TAC § 55.201(c) by not basing their requests on comments that they made during the appliable comment period. Because this request did not comply on its face with TCEQ rules, these requests failed to identify a personal, justiciable interest affected by the application.

15. Gaston, Christian

- a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- b. His property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities. In fact he states that his neighborhood (not his property) is "less than a mile from the proposed" facilities. This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit.
- c. He claims to receive water from a well, but it appears to be a public or community well.
- d. The request of this individual failed to comply with the requirements of 30 TAC § 55.201(c) by not basing their requests on comments that they made during the appliable comment period. Because this request did not comply on its face with TCEQ rules, this request failed to identify a personal, justiciable interest affected by the application.

16. Gordon, Carol

- a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- b. Her property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities. In fact, he states that her property is "less than a mile from the proposed" facilities. This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit.
- c. Applicant agrees with the ED that this individual provided addresses that are not in proximity to any relevant feature of the proposed facility. Because of the lack of proximity, this request cannot be used to establish affectedness because it fails to demonstrate a reasonable relationship exists between the

interests claimed and the activity regulated, which decreases the likelihood this individual may be affected in a way not common to the public.

17. Hall, Jason

- a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- b. His property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities. In fact, he states that his property is "within 1 mile of the proposed wastewater treatment plant" facilities. This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit.
- c. This request lacked written explanations plainly describing the individuals' locations and distances relative to the proposed facility, the relevant and material issues the individuals raised, and why the individuals believe they will be affected by the application in a way not common to the public. Because this requests did not comply on their face with TCEQ rules, this requests failed to identify a personal, justiciable interest affected by the application. Because this request does not include analysis of the Affected Person provisions in 30 TAC § 55.203, the request should be denied.

18. Hall, Krista

- a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- b. Her property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities. In fact, she states that her property is "within 1 mile of the proposed wastewater treatment plant" facilities. This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit.
- c. This request lacked written explanations plainly describing the individuals' locations and distances relative to the proposed facility, the relevant and material issues the individuals raised, and why the individuals believe they will be affected by the application in a way not common to the public. Because this requests did not comply on their face with TCEQ rules, this requests failed to identify a personal, justiciable interest affected by the application. Because this request does not include analysis of the Affected Person provisions in 30 TAC § 55.203, the request should be denied.

19. Haschke, Gerald

- a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- b. His property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities. In fact, he states that his property is "about one mile" south of the proposed facilities. This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit.
- c. Applicant agrees with the ED that this individual provided addresses that are not in proximity to any relevant feature of the proposed facility. Because of the lack of proximity, this request cannot be used to establish affectedness because it fails to demonstrate a reasonable relationship exists between the interests claimed and the activity regulated, which decreases the likelihood this individual may be affected in a way not common to the public.

20. Holloway, Mark Alan

a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.

- b. His property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities. (see Exhibit 1, property ID 40). This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit.
- c. Applicant agrees with the ED that this individual provided addresses that are not in proximity to any relevant feature of the proposed facility. Because of the lack of proximity, this request cannot be used to establish affectedness because it fails to demonstrate a reasonable relationship exists between the interests claimed and the activity regulated, which decreases the likelihood this individual may be affected in a way not common to the public.

21. Jamison, Gina

- a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- b. Her property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities. (see Exhibit 1, property ID 41). This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit.
- c. The request of this individual failed to comply with the requirements of 30 TAC § 55.201(c) by not basing their requests on comments that they made during the appliable comment period. Because this request did not comply on its face with TCEQ rules, this request failed to identify a personal, justiciable interest affected by the application.

22. Kammerdiener, Tesha

- a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- b. Her property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities. (see Exhibit 1, property ID 42). This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit.
- c. The request of this individual failed to comply with the requirements of 30 TAC § 55.201(c) by not basing their requests on comments that they made during the appliable comment period. Because this request did not comply on its face with TCEQ rules, this request failed to identify a personal, justiciable interest affected by the application.

23. Knight, William L

- a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- b. Expresses concerns about flooding, which is not the subject of this proceeding.
- c. His property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities. In fact, he states that his property is ½ from the proposed facilities. This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit.
- d. This request lacked written explanations plainly describing the individuals' locations and distances relative to the proposed facility, the relevant and material issues the individuals raised, and why the individuals believe they will be affected by the application in a way not common to the public. Because this requests did not comply on their face with TCEQ rules, this requests failed to identify a personal, justiciable interest affected by the application. Because this request does not include analysis of the Affected Person provisions in 30 TAC § 55.203, the request should be denied.

24. Kurzawski, Ken

a. Does not specifically request a contested case hearing.

- b. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- c. Applicant agrees with the ED that this individual provided addresses that are not in proximity to any relevant feature of the proposed facility. Because of the lack of proximity, this request cannot be used to establish affectedness because it fails to demonstrate a reasonable relationship exists between the interests claimed and the activity regulated, which decreases the likelihood this individual may be affected in a way not common to the public.

25. Lakey, Aimee

- a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- b. Her property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities. In fact, she states that her property is 4 miles from the facilities. This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit.
- c. This request lacked written explanations plainly describing the individuals' locations and distances relative to the proposed facility, the relevant and material issues the individuals raised, and why the individuals believe they will be affected by the application in a way not common to the public. Because this requests did not comply on their face with TCEQ rules, this requests failed to identify a personal, justiciable interest affected by the application. Because this request does not include analysis of the Affected Person provisions in 30 TAC § 55.203, the request should be denied.

26. Lauger, Scott

- a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- b. His property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities. In fact, he states that his property is 2 miles from the facilities. This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit.
- c. The request of this individual failed to comply with the requirements of 30 TAC § 55.201(c) by not basing their requests on comments that they made during the appliable comment period. Because this request did not comply on their face with TCEQ rules, this requests failed to identify a personal, justiciable interest affected by the application.

27. Lowder, Kelly

- a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- b. Her property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities. In fact, she states that her property is 1 mile from the development. This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit.
- c. Applicant agrees with the ED that this individual provided addresses that are not in proximity to any relevant feature of the proposed facility. Because of the lack of proximity, this request cannot be used to establish affectedness because it fails to demonstrate a reasonable relationship exists between the interests claimed and the activity regulated, which decreases the likelihood this individual may be affected in a way not common to the public.

28. Lozano, Brenda

a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.

- b. Her property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities. In fact, she states that her property is "less than a mile" from the facilities. This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit.
- c. Applicant agrees with the ED that this individual provided addresses that are not in proximity to any relevant feature of the proposed facility. Because of the lack of proximity, this request cannot be used to establish affectedness because it fails to demonstrate a reasonable relationship exists between the interests claimed and the activity regulated, which decreases the likelihood this individual may be affected in a way not common to the public.

29. Marinus, Mattia

- a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- b. Her property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities. In fact, she states that her property is 0.9 miles from the facilities. This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit.
- c. The request of this individual failed to comply with the requirements of 30 TAC § 55.201(c) by not basing their requests on comments that they made during the appliable comment period. Because this request did not comply on their face with TCEQ rules, this requests failed to identify a personal, justiciable interest affected by the application.

30. Matthews, Glenda

- a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- b. Her property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities. In fact, she states that her property is "less than a mile" from the facilities. This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit.
- c. Raises irrelevant concerns such as impervious cover.
- d. Applicant agrees with the ED that this individual provided addresses that are not in proximity to any relevant feature of the proposed facility. Because of the lack of proximity, this request cannot be used to establish affectedness because it fails to demonstrate a reasonable relationship exists between the interests claimed and the activity regulated, which decreases the likelihood this individual may be affected in a way not common to the public.

31. Moccia, Eric N

- a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- b. His property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities. In fact, he states that his property is "within 1 mile" of the facilities. This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit.
- c. The request of this individual failed to comply with the requirements of 30 TAC § 55.201(c) by not basing their requests on comments that they made during the appliable comment period. Because this request did not comply on their face with TCEQ rules, this requests failed to identify a personal, justiciable interest affected by the application.

32. Novak, Rob

a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.

b. This request lacked written explanations plainly describing the individuals' locations and distances relative to the proposed facility, the relevant and material issues the individuals raised, and why the individuals believe they will be affected by the application in a way not common to the public. Because this requests did not comply on their face with TCEQ rules, this requests failed to identify a personal, justiciable interest affected by the application. Because this request does not include analysis of the Affected Person provisions in 30 TAC § 55.203, the request should be denied.

33. Novak, Tiffany

- a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- b. This request lacked written explanations plainly describing the individuals' locations and distances relative to the proposed facility, the relevant and material issues the individuals raised, and why the individuals believe they will be affected by the application in a way not common to the public. Because this requests did not comply on their face with TCEQ rules, this requests failed to identify a personal, justiciable interest affected by the application. Because this request does not include analysis of the Affected Person provisions in 30 TAC § 55.203, the request should be denied.

34. Ochoa, Claudia

- a. Makes no attempt to identify a personal justiciable interest.
- b. Applicant agrees with the ED that this individual provided addresses that are not in proximity to any relevant feature of the proposed facility. Because of the lack of proximity, this request cannot be used to establish affectedness because it fails to demonstrate a reasonable relationship exists between the interests claimed and the activity regulated, which decreases the likelihood this individual may be affected in a way not common to the public.

35. Sorahan, Kyle

- a. Did not request a contested case hearing.
- b. Makes no attempt to identify a personal justiciable interest.
- c. Applicant agrees with the ED that this individual provided addresses that are not in proximity to any relevant feature of the proposed facility. Because of the lack of proximity, this request cannot be used to establish affectedness because it fails to demonstrate a reasonable relationship exists between the interests claimed and the activity regulated, which decreases the likelihood this individual may be affected in a way not common to the public.

36. Stolzenburg, Lucinda

- a. Did not request a contested case hearing.
- b. Makes no attempt to identify a personal justiciable interest.

37. Perlman, Paula

- a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- b. Her property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities. In fact, she states that her property is "about 1 mile" of the MUD boundaries (not the facilities). This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit.

c. Applicant agrees with the ED that this individual provided addresses that are not in proximity to any relevant feature of the proposed facility. Because of the lack of proximity, this request cannot be used to establish affectedness because it fails to demonstrate a reasonable relationship exists between the interests claimed and the activity regulated, which decreases the likelihood this individual may be affected in a way not common to the public.

38. Potts, Kendra

- a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- b. Her property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities. In fact, Applicant could not locate her property on the attached Exhibit 1. This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit.
- c. Applicant agrees with the ED that this individual provided addresses that are not in proximity to any relevant feature of the proposed facility. Because of the lack of proximity, this request cannot be used to establish affectedness because it fails to demonstrate a reasonable relationship exists between the interests claimed and the activity regulated, which decreases the likelihood this individual may be affected in a way not common to the public.

39. Ross, Jeff

- a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- b. His well (apparently a community well) is not adjacent to the proposed facilities. In fact, he states that well is "about 1 mile" away from either the MUD boundaries or the facilities. This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit.
- c. This request lacked written explanations plainly describing the individuals' locations and distances relative to the proposed facility, the relevant and material issues the individuals raised, and why the individuals believe they will be affected by the application in a way not common to the public. Because this requests did not comply on their face with TCEQ rules, this requests failed to identify a personal, justiciable interest affected by the application. Because this request does not include analysis of the Affected Person provisions in 30 TAC § 55.203, the request should be denied.

40. Ruff, Matt

- a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- b. His property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities. In fact, his property is identified as No. 72 on the attached Exhibit 1. This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit.
- c. Applicant agrees with the ED that this individual provided addresses that are not in proximity to any relevant feature of the proposed facility. Because of the lack of proximity, this request cannot be used to establish affectedness because it fails to demonstrate a reasonable relationship exists between the interests claimed and the activity regulated, which decreases the likelihood this individual may be affected in a way not common to the public.

41. Seymour, Dustin

a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.

- b. His property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities. In fact, his property is identified as No. 73 on the attached Exhibit 1. This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit.
- c. The request of this individual failed to comply with the requirements of 30 TAC § 55.201(c) by not basing their requests on comments that they made during the appliable comment period. Because this request did not comply on their face with TCEQ rules, this requests failed to identify a personal, justiciable interest affected by the application.

42. Smith, Dane

- a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- b. He does not identify his location with respect to the facilities.
- c. The request of this individual failed to comply with the requirements of 30 TAC § 55.201(c) by not basing their requests on comments that they made during the appliable comment period. Because this request did not comply on their face with TCEQ rules, this requests failed to identify a personal, justiciable interest affected by the application.

43. Sorahan, Kyle

- a. Did not request a contested case hearing.
- b. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.

44. Starr, Darlene & Michael

a. Although on a private well .3 miles from this proposed TLAP, does not explain how their well will be affected.

45. Stolzenburg, Lucinda

- a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- b. Her property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities. In fact, Applicant could not locate her property on the attached Exhibit 1. This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit.

46. Alexis Tancredo

- a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- b. Her property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities. In fact, she states that her property is ³/₄ mile away from the site. This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit.
- c. This request lacked written explanations plainly describing the individuals' locations and distances relative to the proposed facility, the relevant and material issues the individuals raised, and why the individuals believe they will be affected by the application in a way not common to the public. Because this requests did not comply on their face with TCEQ rules, this requests failed to identify a personal, justiciable interest affected by the application. Because this request does not include analysis of the Affected Person provisions in 30 TAC § 55.203, the request should be denied.

47. Tinsley, Mary Jeannine

- a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- b. Her property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities. In fact, she states that her property is 1½ miles away from the site. This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit..

c. The request of this individual failed to comply with the requirements of 30 TAC § 55.201(c) by not basing their requests on comments that they made during the appliable comment period. Because this request did not comply on their face with TCEQ rules, this requests failed to identify a personal, justiciable interest affected by the application

48. Tookoian, Annelouise

- a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- b. Her property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities. In fact, Applicant could not locate her property on the attached Exhibit 1. This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit.
- c. This request lacked written explanations plainly describing the individuals' locations and distances relative to the proposed facility, the relevant and material issues the individuals raised, and why the individuals believe they will be affected by the application in a way not common to the public. Because this requests did not comply on their face with TCEQ rules, this requests failed to identify a personal, justiciable interest affected by the application. Because this request does not include analysis of the Affected Person provisions in 30 TAC § 55.203, the request should be denied.

49. Trombley, Valerie

- a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- b. Her property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities. In fact, her property is identified as No. 80 on the attached Exhibit 1. This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit.
- c. This request lacked written explanations plainly describing the individuals' locations and distances relative to the proposed facility, the relevant and material issues the individuals raised, and why the individuals believe they will be affected by the application in a way not common to the public. Because this requests did not comply on their face with TCEQ rules, this requests failed to identify a personal, justiciable interest affected by the application. Because this request does not include analysis of the Affected Person provisions in 30 TAC § 55.203, the request should be denied.

50. Tuttle, Charles L

- a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- b. His property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities. In fact, he states that his property is 7/10^{ths} mile away from the site. This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit.

51. Valdez, Antonio S and Lydia Bryan-

a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.

52. Valdez, Eloy and Tina

- a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- b. Their property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities. In fact, Applicant could not locate their property on the attached Exhibit 1. This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit.
- c. This request lacked written explanations plainly describing the individuals' locations and distances relative to the proposed facility, the relevant and

material issues the individuals raised, and why the individuals believe they will be affected by the application in a way not common to the public. Because this requests did not comply on their face with TCEQ rules, this requests failed to identify a personal, justiciable interest affected by the application. Because this request does not include analysis of the Affected Person provisions in 30 TAC § 55.203, the request should be denied.

53. Wood, Carolyn

- a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- b. Her property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities. In fact, her property is 0.4 miles from the site. This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit.
- c. This request lacked written explanations plainly describing the individuals' locations and distances relative to the proposed facility, the relevant and material issues the individuals raised, and why the individuals believe they will be affected by the application in a way not common to the public. Because this requests did not comply on their face with TCEQ rules, this requests failed to identify a personal, justiciable interest affected by the application. Because this request does not include analysis of the Affected Person provisions in 30 TAC § 55.203, the request should be denied.

54. Wright, Lois

- a. No concerns expressed that are not common to members of the public.
- b. Her property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities. In fact, her property is identified as No. 84 on the attached Exhibit 1. This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit.
- c. This request lacked written explanations plainly describing the individuals' locations and distances relative to the proposed facility, the relevant and material issues the individuals raised, and why the individuals believe they will be affected by the application in a way not common to the public. Because this requests did not comply on their face with TCEQ rules, this requests failed to identify a personal, justiciable interest affected by the application. Because this request does not include analysis of the Affected Person provisions in 30 TAC § 55.203, the request should be denied.

55. Zavaleta, Edgar (Jr.)

a. Makes no attempt to show he is an affected person.

II. REQUESTERS WHO HAVE ATTEMPTED TO SHOW A PERSONAL JUSTICIABLE INTEREST, BUT DO NOT ACTUALLY SHOW HOW THEY ARE AFFECTED

The requesters listed below attempt to identify a personal justiciable interest, but their requests do not adequately tie their concerns to the facilities. It is important to note that this is a TLAP permit, not a discharge application. Their requests, therefore, should be denied:

1. Balke, Candace

Ms. Balke's property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities. In fact she states in her comments that he is "less than a mile" from the property, but does not state how far it is from the facilities. One mile is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP Permit. She does assert that she might be affected by odors, but at a mile away, this should not be an issue.

2. Hirn, Jessica N

Applicant agrees with the ED that this individual provided addresses that are not in proximity to any relevant feature of the proposed facility. Because of the lack of proximity, this request cannot be used to establish affectedness because it fails to demonstrate a reasonable relationship exists between the interests claimed and the activity regulated, which decreases the likelihood this individual may be affected in a way not common to the public.

Ms. Hirn does point out that she has a private water well, but it is over two miles away from the property (it is unknown how far away her property is from the facilities). She shows no possible connection to TLAP field (no discharge) and her well.

3. Knight, Stacey

Ms. Knight points out that she has a private water well, but it is 0.4 miles away from the proposed MUD. She does not state how far away the well is from the proposed facilities. She shows no possible connection to TLAP field (no discharge) and her well. All her other concerns (impervious cover, for example) are concerns that could be raised by the general public or are irrelevant to this proceeding.

4. McKnight, Gerald and Linda

The McKnights are not adjacent to the facility. Their property is identified as property No. 54 on the attached Exhibit 1. This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP

Permit and for the alleged smells they say they will experience that might exacerbate their health concerns. With respect to the public well with which they express concern, that is a concern common to members of the general public.

5. Meagher, Aedin

Applicant agrees with the ED that this individual provided addresses that are not in proximity to any relevant feature of the proposed facility. Because of the lack of proximity, this request cannot be used to establish affectedness because it fails to demonstrate a reasonable relationship exists between the interests claimed and the activity regulated, which decreases the likelihood this individual may be affected in a way not common to the public.

Ms. Meagher points out that she has a private water well, but it is 0.9 miles away from the proposed facilities. She shows no possible connection to TLAP field (no discharge) and her well – especially at 0.9 miles away. All her other concerns (high density, for example) are concerns that could be raised by the general public or are irrelevant to this proceeding.

6. Mugan, Monica

Ms. Mugan expresses health concerns and states she has a private well =. Her property, however, is not adjacent to the TLAP facilities or MUD property (see Property ID No. 58 on Exhibit 1) and, due to the distance, there is no evidence showing any connection between the facilities and her concerns.

7. Patterson, David L

Applicant agrees with the ED that this individual provided addresses that are not in proximity to any relevant feature of the proposed facility. Because of the lack of proximity, this request cannot be used to establish affectedness because it fails to demonstrate a reasonable

relationship exists between the interests claimed and the activity regulated, which decreases the likelihood this individual may be affected in a way not common to the public.

Mr. Patterson states that he has a private water well, but his property is not even located on the map shown at Exhibit 1. He shows no possible connection to TLAP field (no discharge) and his well.

8. Pennington, Carol

Applicant agrees with the ED that this individual provided addresses that are not in proximity to any relevant feature of the proposed facility. Because of the lack of proximity, this request cannot be used to establish affectedness because it fails to demonstrate a reasonable relationship exists between the interests claimed and the activity regulated, which decreases the likelihood this individual may be affected in a way not common to the public.

Ms. Pennington states that she has a private water well, but her property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities. In fact, she states that her property is "0.8 miles" from the plant. This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP permit. She shows no possible connection to TLAP field (no discharge) and her well.

9. Ploeger, Kristen

The request of this individual failed to comply with the requirements of 30 TAC § 55.201(c) by not basing their requests on comments that they made during the appliable comment period. Because this request did not comply on their face with TCEQ rules, this requests failed to identify a personal, justiciable interest affected by the application.

Furthermore, Ms. Ploeger states that she has a private water well, but her property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities. In fact, she states that her property is "less than a mile" from

the plant. This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP permit. She shows no possible connection to TLAP field (no discharge) and her well.

10. Reeves, Barbara S

Applicant agrees with the ED that this individual provided addresses that are not in proximity to any relevant feature of the proposed facility. Because of the lack of proximity, this request cannot be used to establish affectedness because it fails to demonstrate a reasonable relationship exists between the interests claimed and the activity regulated, which decreases the likelihood this individual may be affected in a way not common to the public.

Ms. Reeves states that she has a private water well, but her property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities. In fact, she states that her property is "less than a mile" from the plant. This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP permit. She shows no possible connection to TLAP field (no discharge) and her well.

11. Thomas, Nicholas

This request lacked written explanations plainly describing the individuals' locations and distances relative to the proposed facility, the relevant and material issues the individuals raised, and why the individuals believe they will be affected by the application in a way not common to the public. Because this requests did not comply on their face with TCEQ rules, this requests failed to identify a personal, justiciable interest affected by the application. Because this request does not include analysis of the Affected Person provisions in 30 TAC § 55.203, the request should be denied.

Mr. Thomas does states that he has a private water well, but his property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities. In fact, he states that his property is "less than 2 miles from the proposed wastewater treatment site and spray fields." This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP permit. He shows no possible connection to TLAP field (no discharge) and his well.

12. Waters, G

This request lacked written explanations plainly describing the individuals' locations and distances relative to the proposed facility, the relevant and material issues the individuals raised, and why the individuals believe they will be affected by the application in a way not common to the public. Because this requests did not comply on their face with TCEQ rules, this requests failed to identify a personal, justiciable interest affected by the application. Because this request does not include analysis of the Affected Person provisions in 30 TAC § 55.203, the request should be denied.

Mr. Thomas does state that he has a private water well, but his property is not adjacent to the proposed facilities. In fact, he states that his property is "less than a mile" from the proposed wastewater treatment site. This distance is much too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP permit. He shows no possible connection to TLAP field (no discharge) and his well.

III. GOVERNMENTAL OR PRIVATE ORGANIZATION REQUESTS

1. Coves of Cimarron Homeowners Association ("Coves")

The Coves asserts that it relies on water provided by the Cimarron Park Water Company, a Class B water utility company located 1.7 miles from the proposed Hays Commons Development. Such a distance is too far to be considered relevant for a TLAP permit. Moreover, Coves does not identify a member that has standing in his or her own right. The request should be denied.

2. The City of Austin

The City of Austin requested a public meeting and requested reconsideration, but did not request a contested case hearing. Applicant agrees with the ED that the Commission find that the City of Austin is not an affected persons under 30 TAC § 55.203(c)(7).

3. The City of Buda

The City of Buda does not assert that the facilities are in the ETJ or in the City limits. It has not and cannot identify its statutory authority over or interest in the issues relevant to the application. All of its concerns are common to members of the general public. Applicant agrees with the ED that the Commission find that the City of Buda is not an affected persons under 30 TAC § 55.203(c)(7).

4. The City of Hays

The City of Hays requested a contested case hearing and asserts it is an affected person.

On September 1, 2023, Applicant filed a petition with the City to release property that it owns from the ETJ of the City pursuant to Senate Bill 2038. As of September 26, 2023, the District's property is no longer in the ETJ of the City of Hays. The City, therefore, has no statutory authority over or interest in the issues relevant to the application. It is, therefore, not an affected person and should not be deemed an affected person.

The City expressed concerns, for example, with regionalization or water quality in the Edwards Aquifer, which are concerns that are common to members of the general public.

Nothing in this hearing request shows that the City of Hays has a personal justiciable interest. 30 Tex. Admin. Code § 55.256(a).

5. Greater Edwards Aquifer Alliance

As a group, Greater Edwards Aquifer Authority ("GEAA") must identify, by name and physical address, one or more members of the group or association that would otherwise have

standing to request a hearing in their own right. 30 Tex. Admin Code § 55.205(b)(2). GEAA did not do so, and its hearing request should, therefore, be denied.

6. Save Our Springs Alliance

SOS lists comments and were allegedly not adequately addressed in the ED's Response to Comments ("RTC"). But SOS never really explains what was deficient. SOS claims that "the responses did nothing more than recite the regulatory requirements, recite the parameters of the draft permit, and/or conclude without evidence or explanation that the proposed permit met applicable requirements." But SOS does not explain why such responses were inadequate. SOS's request should be denied.

7. the Barton Springs-Edwards Aquifer Conservation District

BSEACD has jurisdiction over groundwater. This is not a discharge permit. The rules require that the effluent be consumed by vegetation. BSEACD has not jurisdictional authority over surface application of treated effluent and should not be granted party status.

IV. REQUESTS FOR RECONSIDERATION SHOULD BE DENIED

Alonna Beatty, Alfonso Carlon, Lucia Carracedo, John Dugdale, Erin and Chris Duke, Brandon and Christian Gaston, Gina Jamison, Liz Johnston, Tesha Kammerdiener, Stacey Knight, William Knight, Aimee Lakey, Scott Lauger, Mattia Marinus, Eric Moccia, Thomas Nichols, Claudia Ochoa, Kristen Ploeger, Barbara Reeves, Dustin Seymour, Dane Smith, Darlene and Michael Starr, Mary Tinsley, Dale Van Blokland, Edgar Zavaleta, John Dugdale on behalf of the City of Buda, and Liz Johnston on behalf of the City of Austin all filed RFRs. However, all the RFRs failed to raise any new information for the ED to analyze. Therefore, all their requests should be denied.

CONCLUSION

All Hearing Requests and all Motions for Reconsideration should be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

THE AL LAW GROUP PLLC

/s/ David Tuckfield

David J. Tuckfield State Bar Number: 00795996 12400 West Hwy 71, Suite 350-150 Austin, TX 78738

Telephone: (512) 576-2481 Facsimile: (512) 366-9949 david@allawgp.com

ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANT

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I hereby certify that a true and correct copy of the foregoing document was served on the persons on the attached mailing list following parties as shown below on this 26th day of September 2025 as follows:

By efiling

Docket Clerk
Texas Commission on
Environmental Quality
Office of Chief Clerk, MC-105
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, Texas 78711
https://www.tceq.texas.gov/goto/efilings

By email

TCEQ Executive Director

Michael T. Parr II, Staff Attorney Environmental Law Division State Bar No. 24062936 P.O. Box 13087, MC 173 Austin, Texas 78711 3087 Telephone No. 512-239 0611 Facsimile No. 512-239-0626

TCEO Office of Public Interest Counsel

Garrett T. Arthur Public Interest Counsel P.O. Box 13087, MC 103 Austin, Texas 78711-3087 garrett.arthur@tceq.texas.gov

TCEQ External Relations

Ryan Vise, Deputy Director TCEQ External Relations Division MC-108 P.O. Box 13087 Austin, Texas 78711-3087 ryan.vise@tceq.texas.gov

By email

Requesters as listed below

karen.aboussie@gmail.com;

Hiballou@gmail.com: alonna.beatty@gmail.com; stuberk625@yahoo.com; darrenbien@gmail.com; candace.blk@gmail.com; dale@dalevanblokland.com; pib aus@austin.rr.com; andrew.brunone@gmail.com; jimcamp00@gmail.com; Alfonso.carlon@sbcglobal.net; cmsgtlucy@gmail.com; kaela.champlin@austintexas.gov; dianac802@yahoo.com; itdepenning@gmail.com; jessica@texasmunicipallawyers.com; erinrenee87@gmail.com; Cduke8185@gmail.com; brandon.gaston@yahoo.com; Chrisw9521@gmail.com; starfishx6@yahoo.com; jasongrant22@yahoo.com; krisie6@yahoo.com; Gerald1508@aol.com; rockettesauce169@hotmail.com; hornswon@yahoo.com; glee@ginaleeswings.com; Liz.Johnston@austintexas.gov; Kaela.Champlin@austintexas.gov; teshavandusen@gmail.com; rfburk@bickerstaff.com; ikatz@bickerstaff.com: sknight19@austin.rr.com; sprinkler@austin.rr.com; kaapski@gmail.com;

aimee.lakev@gmail.com: slauger@gmail.com; Wonderkel@yahoo.com; lozanobrenda@aol.com; tiamarinus@gmail.com: texastom56@sbcglobal.net; aedin7717@gmail.com; lindamcknight1@gamail.com; aedin7717@gmail.com; rickymoccia@yahoo.com; Monicamugan@yahoo.com; robnovak6@gmail.com; tiffnovak00@gmail.com; loganethanyl@yahoo.com; budadave83@gmail.com; annalisa@aquiferalliance.org; kyle.sorahan@asu.edu; lucysburg@gmail.com; cpenn43@yahoo.com; p.perlman@mail.utexas.edu; docplo@aol.com; clapssleeker.00@icloud.com; bsr0216@grnail.com; bill@sosalliance.org; victoria@sosalliance.org; jeffrossta@Yahoo.com; matt.ruff.spam@gmail.com; dustin.seymour82@gmai[.com; kyle.sorahan@asu.edu; starrsdar@gmail.com; michaelstarrrocks@gmail.com: lucysburg@gmail.com; alexis.tancredo@gmail.com; nick.thomas512@gmail.com; mitinstr@outlook.com; atookoian@vahoo.com: vtrombley56@yahoo.com; drew.miller@kempsmith.com; ctuttle@austin.rr.com; Lydiabryanvaldez@gmail.com; evaldez14@austin.rr.com; etnz2valdez@gmail.com; ggatsea@gmail.com;

editorgal.wood9@gmail.com;

<u>Devilbackcanyon@hotmail.com;</u> <u>Edgarzavaletamunoz1@gmail.com</u>

/s/ David Tuckfield

EXHIBIT 1

ID Owner Name		ap ID		Oumar Naves	Coame = Adding = c (4)	 				LEGEND		1 5 =
Owner Name 1 ABOUSSIE , KAREN	Owner Address (1) 2402 CHAPARRAL PARK RD MANCHACA TX 78652-4113	Owner Name71 TOOKOIAN , ANNELOUISE	Owner Address (1) 12607 TAYLOR DR BUDA TX 78610-2453		Owner Address (1)					COMMENTING / REQUESTING	400 200 0 400 80	
AYRES, JONATHAN & 2 PERLMAN, DR. PAULA	13301 RAMROD DR MANCHACA TX 78652-3037 511 COUNTRY LN	71 TOOKOIAN , ANNELOUISE 72 RUFF , MATT	207 DEWBERRY CV BUDA TX 78610-2821	MERCER , PHILLIP NEIL	12708 DOVE DR BUDA TX 78610-2501		祖一川路湖里		9)	LANDOWNER	COALE IN EEET	
3 BAKER , KATHLEEN 4 BALLOUL HANNAH	BUDA TX 78610-9397 530 TANGLEWOOD TRL BUDA TX 78610-9232	73 SEYMOUR , DUSTIN	12622 LIVE OAK LN BUDA TX 78610-9322	MILLER , ANDREW S KEMP S	STE 205 WITH 2905 SAN GABRIEL ST AUSTIN TX 78705-3500						SCALE IN FEET	
4 BALLOU , HANNAH 5 BEATTY , ALONNA MICHELLE	903 BLUEBIRD DR MANCHACA TX 78652-4155	74 MCCORKLE , JUSTIN	12618 LIVE OAK LN BUDA TX 78610-9322		UNIT B 14909 FITZHUGH RD							
6 BERKOWITZ, MR STUART	2500 ROBIN RD MANCHACA TX 78652-4169 12620 LIVE OAK LN BUDA TX	75 STARR , MRS & MR MICHAEL	2301 SPARROW DR MANCHACA TX 78652-4180	NAPIORKOWSKI , MRS CARE	IE AUSTIN TX 78736-6300 TRLR 12							
7 BLAKE , CANDACE	78610-9322 2200 CHAPARRAL PARK RD	76 STARR , MRS DARLENE	2301 SPARROW DR MANCHACA TX 78652-4180 2301 SPARROW DR	OLIVER , BILL	2728 S CONGRESS AVE AUSTIN TX 78704-6445			✓ <u> </u>				
8 BRISKY , PHILIP BRYAN-VALDEZ, LYDIA & 9 VALDEZ,ANTONIO SANCHEZ	MANCHACA TX 78652-4109 546 COUNTRY LN BUDA TX 78610-9398	77 STARR , MR MICHAEL	MANCHACA TX 78652-4180 12617 DARRYL DR	PANCAKE . AMY	STE A 8105 S 1ST ST AUSTIN TX 78748-5406							
10 BRYAN-VALDEZ , LYDIA	546 COUNTRY LN BUDA TX 78610-9398 301 AVOCET DR	78 STEWART , DAVID	BUDA TX 78610-2553 12705 DARRYL DR	FANCARE, AWIT	BUDA TREEHOUSE STUDIOS							
11 CALDWELL , BOB CAMP , ELIZABETH & JIM W W	BUDA TX 78610-2430 3803 CATTLEMAN DR	79 TUCKER , TOBIE	BUDA TX 78610-2554 2701 CARDINAL DR	 PATTERSON , DAVID L	16220 REMUDA TRL BUDA TX 78610-9349	TOTAL STATE OF THE PARTY OF THE						∃ ≰
12 NORTON 13 CAMP , JAMES	MANCHACA TX 78652-3042 3803 CATTLEMAN DR MANCHACA TX 78652-3042	80 TROMBLEY , MRS VALERIE	MANCHACA TX 78652-4133 12503 SHADY ACRES DR		GREATER EDWARDS AQUIFER ALLIANCE 1809							<u>-</u>
14 CARLON, ALFONSO D	2808 ROBIN RD MANCHACA TX 78652-4104	81 TUTTLE , CHARLES L 82 VALDEZ , MR ANTONIO S	BUDA TX 78610-2517 546 COUNTRY LN BUDA TX 78610-9398	PEACE , ANNALISA	BLANCO RD SAN ANTONIO TX 78212-2616							_
15 CARLON, ALFONSO D	2805 ROBIN RD MANCHACA TX 78652-4105 21 COUNTRY OAKS DR BUDA	83 VAN BLOKLAND , DALE	13606 COPPER HILLS DR MANCHACA TX 78652-3158	- PERELSTEIN , DAVID & DAVID	1010 BENDEL RANCH RD NEW BRAUNFELS TX 78133-							_
16 CARRACEDO , LUCIA	TX 78610-9338 13410 COPPER HILLS DR	84 WRIGHT , LOIS	527 TANGLEWOOD TRL BUDA TX 78610-9316	PESEK, CHRIS	12450 SUMMIT PASS AUSTIN TX 78737-9641	NA THE STATE OF TH	<i>Y</i>					DATE
17 CHUN , MARK 18 CLEMENTS-LEMMAN . THERESA	MANCHACA TX 78652-3135 12600 LIVE OAK LN BUDA TX 78610-9315	NOT LISTED IN MA		POLLOCK , PATSY	2402 SANDERS LN AUSTIN TX 78748-1345	AL HAMMING						+
19 CRAWFORD , MRS PAT N	3401 BARKER HOLLOW PASS AUSTIN TX 78739-7540	Owner Name AKEROYD , DANIEL SENATOR	Owner Address (1) PO BOX 12068	POLLOCK , JOEL	2402 SANDERS LN AUSTIN TX 78748-1345		7					
CUMMINGHAM, DEBORAH & 20 WESCOTT, DANIEL	1000 DOVE DR MANCHACA TX 78652-4144 208 BUTTERCUP TRL	DONNA CAMPBELL	AUSTIN TX 78711-2068 1220 W BARTLETT DR BUDA		UNIT 27456 3575 FAR WEST BLVD	APAHAUI /						
21 CUNNINGHAM , DIANA DAVIS , HARVEY LEE HARVEY	BUDA TX 78610-2828 12604 RED BUD TRL BUDA TX	ARELLANO , DEBORAH	TX 78610-3271 306 HIGH PLAINS DR DRIPPING SPRINGS TX 78620	POTTS , KENDRA	AUSTIN TX 78731-3064 APT 465							<u> </u>
22 DAVIS CPA DEPENNING , JOANN B 23 J DEPENNING CONSULTING INC	78610-9325 12700 EAGLE NEST DR BUDA TX 78610-2448	BECKER, TERESA	2748 189 BELWOOD DR	PUGANINI , NICHOLAS	3320 HARMON AVE AUSTIN TX 78705-2131 12908 BUCKWHEAT PASS							<i>L</i>
24 DEPENNING, JOEL THOMAS	523 COUNTRY LN BUDA TX 78610-9397	BERNHARD , BETH A	BUDA TX 78610-2283 1002 MAGNOLIA CV	RAINEY, AMANDA	BUDA TX 78610-2835 12908 BUCKWHEAT PASS							_
25 DEPENNING , LAYTON	12700 EAGLE NEST DR BUDA TX 78610-2448 2706 ROBIN RD	BIEN , DARREN BIRDWELL , SHANE CHIEF OF	BUDA TX 78610-2876	RAINEY , ZEPHYR	BUDA TX 78610-2835 13104 WELLS FARGO TRL						TITTE HALL	
26 DERRICK , DAVID	MANCHACA TX 78652-4173 912 BLUEBIRD DR	STAFF SENATOR DONNA CAMPBELL	PO BOX 12068 AUSTIN TX 78711-2068	REYNOLDS , MR EDWARD J	AUSTIN TX 78737-9587 300 SUNDOWN RDG	J \						
27 DUKE , CHRIS 28 DUKE , ERIN	MANCHACA TX 78652-4154 912 BLUEBIRD DR MANCHACA TX 78652-4154	BORST , LAURA		RICE , LEONARD	AUSTIN TX 78737-9596							<u> </u>
29 GARBER , ELISA	12512 TAYLOR DR BUDA TX 78610-2470	BROCK-BATES , JODI	1401 MONTELL RD WIMBERLEY TX 78676-9710	DODDIE!	701 N CANYONWOOD DR DRIPPING SPRINGS TX 78620-	47///////						<i>├</i> sc
30 GASTON , BRANDON	903 BLUEBIRD DR MANCHACA TX 78652-4155 903 BLUEBIRD DR	BRUNONE , ANDREW BUNCH , WILLIAM G EXECUTIVE	330 WOODLAND OAKS TRL BUDA TX 78610-3119	RODRIGUEZ , MR WILLIAM A	3974 SAVE OUR SPRINGS ALLIANCE 3201 MENCHACA						ATTICK XXXXITY	<u>,= </u>
31 GASTON , CHRISTIAN	MANCHACA TX 78652-4155 920 HAWK DR		S STE D401 4701 W GATE BLVD	ROSE , VICTORIA ANN	RD AUSTIN TX 78704-5941						MATAXXXXIIII	J
32 GORDON , CAROL 33 GREEN , AARON	MANCHACA TX 78652-4177 12619 RED BUD TRL BUDA TX 78610-9230	, (10)	APT 307 1000 E 5TH ST	SCHLEGEL , LISA	8434 OAK THICKET SAN ANTONIO TX 78255-3642			The second				Ī
OU GIVEEN, PARVOIN	ARROYO DOBLE WATER SYS	CAMP , MICHELLE	AUSTIN TX 78702-3802	JOSTILLOZZ, LIGA	HUMANE SOCIETY OF THE NEW BRAUNFELS ARE 28535							-
34 GRUBERT , MRS NORMA	INC 12710 EAGLE NEST DR BUDA TX 78610-2448 12607 CRYSTAL CREEK DR	CAMPBELL , THE HONORABLE DONNA STATE SENATOR	RM 3E.8		OAK CREEK DR NEW BRAUNFELS TX 78132-							
35 HALL, JASON	BUDA TX 78610-2561 12607 CRYSTAL CREEK DR	THE SENATE OF TEXAS DISTRI 25	AUSTIN TX 78711-2068	SCULLARY, LINDA	3626 UNIT 30							
36 HALL, KRISTA 37 HARGROVE, FRANCES	BUDA TX 78610-2561 2505 CARDINAL DR MANCHACA TX 78652-4129	CLEARKIN , MRS ANN	13501 TRAILS END AUSTIN TX 78737-9117 APT 605	SEYMOUR , DUSTIN	301 W STASSNEY LN AUSTIN TX 78745-3145			— APPLICANT'S PROPERTY BOUN	DARY (497 AC) —			
38 HASCHKE , MR GERALD	308 FOX HOLW BUDA TX 78610-2827	CLIFFORD , MICHAEL	512 EBERHART LN AUSTIN TX 78745-4486	SMITH , DANE	135 JAY GOULD WAY BUDA TX 78610-5096 1908 BARTON PKWY							-
39 HIRN , JESSICA N	2901 CHAPARRAL PARK RD MANCHACA TX 78652-2906 TEXAS ATTORNEY	OLI I OND , INIOTIVEE	CITY OF AUSTIN ATTENTION WATERSHED	SMITH , MR COURTNEY CRAI	I							
49 119 119 119 119 119 119 119 119 119 1	GENERAL'S OFFICE 213 DEWBERRY CV		PROTECTION PO BOX 1088	SORAHAN , KYLE	AUSTIN TX 78737-9531 13315 TRAIL DRIVER					(2) (3) (4) (5) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4) (4		=
40 HOLLOWAY , MARK ALAN 41 JAMISON , MS GINA	BUDA TX 78610-2821 1011 BLUEBIRD DR MANCHACA TX 78652-4157	COYNE , KATIE	AUSTIN TX 78767-1088 1910 W 39TH ST	SPINN , ROSLYNN MCDOUGA	L AUSTIN TX 78737-9531 13310 TRAIL DRIVER							
42 KAMMERDIENER , TESHA	2313 CHAPARRAL PARK RD MANCHACA TX 78652-4112	CROSS, PETER	AUSTIN TX 78731-6017	STOLZENBURG , LUCINDA L	AUSTIN TX 78737-9579 2602 RIVER HILLS RD AUSTIN				\bigvee			
43 KNIGHT , MARTA E KNIGHT , STACEY A PENTECOST	305 RANGER DR BUDA TX 78610-2539 T 2208 CHAPARRAL PARK RD	CUDA, MARK	1704 TREBLED WATERS TRL DRIFTWOOD TX 78619-8109 THE BOJORQUEZ LAW FIRM		TX 78733-2135 305 W MILTON ST AUSTIN TX 78704-3017							
44 SPRINKLER KNIGHT, WILLIAM L PENTECOST 45 SPRINKLER	MANCHACA TX 78652-4109 C 2208 CHAPARRAL PARK RD MANCHACA TX 78652-4109		PC STE 300 11675 JOLLYVILLE RD	TALBOT, JAMES	BLUE MOUNTAIN PEAK							11
46 KURZAWSKI, KEN	3445 BLISS SPILLAR RD MANCHACA TX 78652-3122	DUGDALE , JOHN	AUSTIN TX 78759-3939 13300 PAISANO TRL	TAYLOR . RICHARD P	RANCH 3699 BLUE MOUNTAIN LN MASON TX 76856-5521							_
47 LATHAM , TINA	811 DOVE DR MANCHACA TX 78652-4141 1006 POST OAK PATH	DUVAL, MRS SALLY CASSELL	AUSTIN TX 78737-9551 LLANO RIVER WATERSHED	THERIOT , COLLEEN	3404 CHERRY LN AUSTIN TX 78703-2610							<u>-</u>
48 LAUGER , MR SCOTT	MANCHACA TX 78652-4007		ALLIANCE PO BOX 725 JUNCTION TX 76849-0725		KEMP SMITH LAW STE 205 2905 SAN GABRIEL ST							_
49 LEMMAN , TOM E 50 LOZANO , BRENDA K	78610-9315 13102 TURKEY ROOST DR MANCHACA TX 78652-3066	FAWCETT , LINDA	CITY OF BUDA	TREJO , DEBORAH C	AUSTIN TX 78705-3500 211 OAK FOREST DR BUDA							\
ID Owner Name	Owner Address (1)	GRAU , MICAH CITY MANAGER	BLDG 100 405 E LOOP ST BUDA TX 78610-4003	VALDEZ, MR ELOY	TX 78610-3117 211 OAK FOREST DR BUDA		00					_
51 MARINUS , MATTIA	2309 CHAPARRAL PARK RD MANCHACA TX 78652-4112	GIAO, MICATOTT MANAGEN	BOJORQUEZ LAW FIRM PC STE 300	VALDEZ , MRS TINA	TX 78610-3117 DAVID VENHUIZEN P E 5803 GATESHEAD DR							
52 MCGLOTHLIN , RUDYE	1008 SPANISH OAK TRL MANCHACA TX 78652-4001 2003 SPANISH OAK TRL	GROSEK, JESSICA	11675 JOLLYVILLE RD AUSTIN TX 78759-3939	VENHUIZEN , DAVID	AUSTIN TX 78745-3526 PO BOX 669			0 0 0				
53 THOMAS , NICHOLAS 54 MCKNIGHT , GERALD & LINDA	MANCHACA TX 78652-4004 12628 RED BUD TRL BUDA TX 78610-9325	GRUBERT, JEFF	PO BOX 587 MANCHACA TX 78652-0587	WATERS , G	MANCHACA TX 78652-0669 APT B		\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\\					
54 MCKNIGHT , GERALD & LINDA 55 MEAGHER , AEDIN	2402 ROBIN RD MANCHACA TX 78652-4166	HENDRICKSON , JACOB	1213 BURLESON ST SAN MARCOS TX 78666-4766	WHITE , BARBARA DARE	3312 DOOLIN DR AUSTIN TX 78704-5965							
56 MOCCIA, ERIC N	2602 ROBIN RD MANCHACA TX 78652-4171	HIYON DAVID MICHAEL	APT E 1205 KINNEY AVE AUSTIN TX 78704-2156		LYNX PROPERTY SERVICES.COM 13511		Take to the same t					
57 TINSLEY, MARY JEANNINE	2803 ROBIN RD MANCHACA TX 78652-4176	HIXON , DAVID MICHAEL JENKINS , GREG	AUSTIN TX 78704-2156 13800 TRAIL DRIVER AUSTIN TX 78737-9524	WHITTINGTON , KEITH L	CARPENTER LN MANCHACA TX 78652-3142 SENATOR DONNA CAMPBELL		4					-
58 MUGAN , MRS MONICA	16001 SCENIC OAKS TRL BUDA TX 78610-9336 16002 SCENIC OAKS TRL	JOHNSON , JENNIFER M MUIR	12522 MISTY CRK SAN ANTONIO TX 78232-4629	YANNUZZI , JOYCE	PO BOX 12068 AUSTIN TX 78711-2068							
59 TANCREDO , ALEXIS	BUDA TX 78610-9337 2704 CHAPARRAL PARK RD	.,,	CITY OF AUSTIN WATERSHED		SAVE BARTON CREEK ASSOCIATION UNIT 670							
60 NICHOLS , KATHRYN 61 PLOEGER , DR. KRISTEN	MANCHACA TX 78652-4121 2802 CHAPARRAL PARK RD MANCHACA TX 78652-4123		PROTECTION DEPAR 505 BARTON SPRINGS RD		15241 STATE HIGHWAY 53 TEMPLE TX 76501-3489							= [
62 NOVAK , MR ROB	40 COUNTRY OAKS DR BUDA TX 78610-9338	JOHNSTON , LIZ	AUSTIN TX 78704-1328	ZABCIK , BRIAN	UNIT A							
63 NOVAK , TIFFANY	40 COUNTRY OAKS DR BUDA TX 78610-9338 901 QUAIL RD		BICKERSTAFF HEATH DELGADO ACOSTA LLP STE	ZAVALETA JR , EDGAR ZWIENER , THE HONORABLE	2502 HOWELLWOOD WAY AUSTIN TX 78748-5954							
64 OCHOA , CLAUDIA	MANCHACA TX 78652-4160 1005 BLUEBIRD DR	KATZ , JOSHUA D	1601 S MOPAC EXPY AUSTIN TX 78746-7009		PO BOX 12910	7						
65 PENNINGTON , CAROL 66 PERRY , ROBIN T	MANCHACA TX 78652-4157 307 LAKEWOOD DR BUDA TX 78610-2507	KHAN, ROSIE	7640 NEZ PERCE TRCE MANOR TX 78653-9600	REPRESENTATIVES DISTRIC		2000						1
67 WOOD , CAROLYN	310 LAKEWOOD DR BUDA TX 78610-2575 3415 BLISS SPILLAR RD	KNIGHT , DR. LESLIE	45 SABINAS SPRINGS RD BOERNE TX 78006-8381					(a) (b) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c) (c				1
68 MATTHEWS , GLENDA	MANCHACA TX 78652-3121 3411 BLISS SPILLAR RD	LAKEY, AIMEE	1165 CLARK BROTHERS DR BUDA TX 78610-5127									-
69 REEVES , BARBARA S	MANCHACA TX 78652-3121 12607 TAYLOR DR	LEVINSKI, BOBBY	248 CAMARO WAY SAN MARCOS TX 78666-3034									_
70 ROSS, JEFF	BUDA TX 78610-2453	LITTLE IOUNI MICUOLAC	1200 BARTON HILLS DR									-
		LITTLEJOHN , NICHOLAS	AUSTIN TX 78704-1902 BARTON SPRINGS - EDWARDS AQUIFER	-								JOB N
		LOFTUS , DR. TIMOTHY T	EDWARDS AQUIFER CONSERV 1124 REGAL ROW AUSTIN TX 78748-3701)					— JOB N
		ESTISS, DIV. HIVIOTITI I	UNIT B 7003 TREASURE CV	1				(3)				_
		LORINI , EVA	AUSTIN TX 78745-5472	-								_
		LOWDER , KELLY	BUDA TX 78610-5093 DELTA DENTAL									SHEET
		I .	· · · · · · · · -			· ·				1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		
		MCALESTER , AGGIE L	13201 WELLS FARGO TRL AUSTIN TX 78737-9535 507 MCKINNON LOOP					(3)				_

|:\|#6712\|D401 (Gragg 330)\exhibits\TLAP\|Comteasted Coxee ||Hearing Exhibits\||H User: enaranjo Lost Modified: Sep. 24, 25 — 168:49 Plot Date/|Timme: Sep. 24, 25 — 17:26:37