Brooke T. Paup, *Chairwoman*
Catarina R. Gonzales, *Commissioner*
Tonya R. Miller, *Commissioner*
Kelly Keel, *Executive Director*

TEXAS COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY

Protecting Texas by Reducing and Preventing Pollution

May 22, 2026

Laurie Gharis, Chief Clerk
Office of the Chief Clerk
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality
P.O. Box 13087, MC-105
Austin, Texas 78711-3087

Re: **TCEQ Docket No. 2026-0463-WR**; Application by the Port of Corpus Christi Authority of Nueces County for Water Use Permit No. 13902 in Aransas, Nueces and San Patricios Counties, Texas.

Dear Ms. Gharis:

Enclosed for filing as agenda backup is the Executive Director's Response to Hearing Requests regarding Application No. 13902, set for review by the Commission at Agenda on **June 17, 2026.**

Please let me know if you have any questions. I can be reached at 512-239-6635 or ruth.takeda@tceq.texas.gov. Thank you.

Sincerely,

Ruth A. Takeda

Ruth Takeda, Staff Attorney – Office of Legal Services, Environmental Law Division

Enclosure

Cc: Mailing List

TCEQ DOCKET NO. 2026-0463-WR

APPLICATION BY THE PORT OF CORPUS CHRISTI AUTHORITY OF NUECES COUNTY TO OBTAIN WATER USE PERMIT NO. 13902 IN ARANSAS, NUECES, AND SAN PATRICIO COUNTIES, TEXAS	**§**	**BEFORE THE TEXAS COMMISSION ON ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY**

EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S RESPONSE TO HEARING REQUESTS

The Executive Director of the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality (TCEQ or Commission) respectfully submits this response to the hearing requests filed regarding Application No. 13902 by the Port of Corpus Christi Authority of Nueces County (Applicant) to obtain a water use permit authorizing diversion of 350,000 acre-feet of water from the Gulf of America (Gulf) to use for municipal and industrial purposes in Aransas, Nueces, and San Patricio Counties.

Timely hearing requests were received from:

1. Alfred, Valerie
2. Birkholz, Jennie
3. Callow, Tracy K.
4. Campbell, Payton Gray
5. Cerwonka, Thomas
6. Duran, Margaret Ann
7. Ferrell, Larry R.
8. Gutierrez, Veronica
9. Halloran, Maria
10. Ikonomopoulos, Nikki
11. Kotalik, Theresa
12. McMulin, Phillip
13. McQueen, Neil Robert, Co-Chair, Surfrider Foundation - Coastal Bend Chapter
14. Meany, David
15. Mountain, Misty
16. Nye, Julie Ann
17. Owens, Deanna
18. Porter, Brenda
19. Porter, Lynne
20. Porter, William Ross
21. Rosson, Donna
22. Schwenke, Diane
23. Sheffield, Patricia

One untimely request was received:

24. 24. Garza, Gerardo.

The Executive Director will not address the untimely request further.

The Executive Director recommends granting the application and has prepared a draft permit which includes special conditions.

In the hearing requests that describe concerns, the requesters focus generally on environmental and ecosystem impact, but specifically on issues related to water quality: salinity; brine discharges; turbidity; water quality; discharge locations and environmental impacts of the discharges. The Executive Director notes that water quality is not regulated under the laws governing water rights and that this application requests a water right.

Requesters also express concerns relating to the draft permit that generally exceed the scope of a water rights permit: requirements for mitigation/restoration and construction safeguards; requirements for the discharge location, dilution, and monitoring of the discharge; requirements for brine management and monitoring; additional review of full buildout/ maximum operation; and consideration of cumulative effects of desalination projects in the area. Finally, some issues of concern raised in the requests – such as pipeline construction and tourism – are beyond the scope of Tex. Water Code Chapter 11, which governs this application.

ED staff in TCEQ's Water Availability Division (program staff) prepared a map indicating the location of requesters and the Applicant's proposed water right location. Requesters not shown on the map either provided a post office box address or provided a physical mailing address not located within the area mapped. The map is attached as Attachment A.

I. BACKGROUND

The Applicant seeks authorization to divert and use 350,000 acre-feet of water per year at a diversion rate of 484 cubic feet per second (217,000 gallons per minute) from a diversion point located in the Gulf in San Patricio County. As noted earlier, the diverted water will be used for municipal and industrial purposes in Aransas, Nueces, and San Patricio Counties.

II. PROCEDURAL HISTORY

The Commission received this application on February 14, 2023. The application was declared administratively complete on March 14, 2023. Technical review was completed on October 21, 2025. Notice of the application was mailed by the Commission's Chief Clerk on December 23, 2025. Notice of the application was published in the Rockport Pilot in Aransas County on January 15, 2026. The Executive Director notes that notice of the application was also published online at Public Notices Texas State | Texas State Press Association.

The comment period and hearing request period for this application closed on February 17, 2026.

No public meeting was held.

III. LEGAL AUTHORITY

Pursuant to 30 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 55.251(a), the following may request a contested case hearing on water rights applications: the Commission, the Executive Director; the applicant; and affected persons when authorized by law.

Affected persons are authorized to submit hearing requests for water rights applications under TEX. WATER CODE § 11.132(a). The Commission, on the request of any affected person, shall hold a hearing on a water rights application. The procedures for determining whether a hearing requester is an affected person and whether the hearing request is valid are set forth in 30 TEX. ADMIN. CODE §§ 55.250-55.256.

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." 30 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 55.256(a). An interest "common to members of the general public" does not qualify as a personal justiciable interest. Id.

Governmental entities with authority under state law over issues contemplated by the application may be considered affected persons. 30 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 55.256(b). *See* 30 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 55.103.

To determine whether a hearing requester is an affected person, all relevant factors shall be considered. 30 TEX. ADMIN. CODE. § 55.256(c). These factors include, but are not limited to:

(1) whether the interest claimed is one protected by the law under which the application will be considered;
(2) distance restrictions or other limitations imposed by law on the affected interest;
(3) whether a reasonable relationship exists between the interest claimed and the activity regulated;
(4) likely impact of the regulated activity on the health, safety, and use of property of the person;
(5) likely impact of the regulated activity on use of the impacted natural resource by the person; and
(6) for governmental entities, their statutory authority over or interest in the issues relevant to the application.

A hearing request by a group or association must meet the requirements set forth in 30 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 55.252(a). There are three requirements. First, at least one member of the group or association would have standing to request a hearing in his or her own right. Second, the interests that the group or association seeks to protect must be germane to its purpose. Third, neither the claim asserted or the relief requested by the group or association requires participation of the individual member(s) in the case.

A hearing request must substantially comply with the four requirements set forth in 30 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 55.251(c):

(1) give the name, address, and daytime telephone 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, a valid email address, who shall be responsible for receiving all official communications and documents for the group.

(2) identify the person's personal justiciable interest affected by the application, including a brief, but specific, written statement explaining in plain language the requester's location and distance relative to the activity that is the subject of the application and how and why the requester believes he or she will be affected by the activity in a manner not common to members of the general public;

(3) request a contested case hearing; and

(4) provide any other information specified in the public notice of the application.

The request for a contested case hearing must be filed with the Commission's Chief Clerk within the time period specified in the notice. 30 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 55.251(d).

The Commission shall grant a request for a contested case hearing made by an affected person if the request complies with the requirements of 30 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 55.251, is timely filed with the Chief Clerk, and is pursuant to a right to hearing authorized by law. 30 TEX. ADMIN. CODE § 55.255(b)(2).

IV. IV. HEARING REQUESTS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Twenty-three requests were filed timely. No requester holds a water right.

After reviewing all requests, the Executive Director concludes that none of the requests established affected person status because they expressed concerns about issues which are not subject to the law governing this application, such as water quality issues, or identified interests common to members of the general public. The Executive Director therefore recommends denying all hearing requests because no request established associational standing or identified a personal justiciable interest affected by the application.

GROUPS OR ASSOCIATIONS

1. Surfrider Foundation, Coastal Bend Chapter – Co-Chair Neil Robert McQueen

The requester represents beachgoers across the Coastal Bend, and indicates that its members surf, swim, fish, boat, sail, beachcomb and generally enjoy the natural settings of San Jose, Mustang and North Padre Islands. No individual members are identified in the request.

The requester's concerns include: environmental impacts of the proposed desalination plant; impingement and entrainment of fish, larvae, and plankton; impacts to species critical to the Gulf ecosystem and local fisheries; potential construction impacts; pipe installation risks to island ecosystems; increased turbidity and harm to marine life; brine discharge; the draft permit does not clearly define discharge location, dilution methods, or long-term monitoring and enforcement; the draft permit does not include mitigation, restoration, or construction safeguards to protect coastal habitats.

The Executive Director concludes that the request does not meet the requirements for associational standing because the request fails to identify a member who would have standing in their own right and recommends that the request be denied.

REQUESTERS WHO OWN WATERFRONT PROPERTY:

2. Julie Nye

The requester's concerns include: environmental impact to the ecosystem of the area.

The Executive Director concludes that the request does not identify a personal justiciable interest and recommends that the request be denied because it identifies an interest common to the general public.

REQUESTERS WHO DO NOT OWN WATERFRONT PROPERTY:

3. Valerie Alfred

The requester's concerns include: the project's scale, long-term environmental risks, and potential impacts to the coast and Gulf.

The Executive Director concludes that the request does not identify a personal justiciable interest and recommends that the request be denied because it identifies interests common to the general public.

4. Jennie Birkholz

The requester provided an address in Round Rock, Texas.

The requester's concerns include: marine life impacts; impingement and entrainment of fish, larvae, and plankton; impacts to species critical to the Gulf ecosystem and local fisheries; ecosystem impacts; risks to fisheries; brine discharge; the draft permit does not clearly define discharge location, dilution methods, or long-term monitoring and enforcement; the draft permit should have a detailed enforceable brine management and monitoring plan; no specific safeguards to protect Gulf water quality and benthic habitats; authorizing expansion from 50 to 100 million gallons per day could lock in greater environmental impacts without a full future review; cumulative impacts of the full buildout and other desalination projects in the region; construction impacts; pipeline installation and risks to barrier island ecosystems; increased turbidity and harm to marine life; draft permit has no clear mitigation, restoration, or construction safeguards to protect coastal habitats; the application does not demonstrate that alternatives to desalination were fully evaluated and maximized; unclear who benefits from the desalinated water – households, industry, or Applicant expansion.

The Executive Director concludes that the request does not identify a personal justiciable interest and recommends that the request be denied because it identifies interests common to the general public and raises issues outside of the scope of the law governing this application.

5. Tracy Callow

The requester provided an address in Helotes, Texas.

The requester's concerns include: the well-being of the Coastal Bend; the impact on area residents and wildlife; project is a violation of environmental justice and not well planned for safety.

The Executive Director concludes that the request does not identify a personal justiciable interest and recommends that the request be denied because it identifies interests common to the general public and raises issues outside of the scope of the law governing this application.

6. Payton Cambell

The requester's concerns include: impact on marine life; impingement and entrainment of fish, larvae, and plankton; impacts to species critical to the Gulf ecosystem and local fisheries; risks to local fisheries; brine discharge; plant may double in size later and current approval could lock in much larger impacts without another full review; cumulative impacts of full buildout and other desalination projects; construction impacts; pipeline installation and risks to barrier island ecosystems; increased turbidity and disruption to marine life; permit has no clear mitigation, restoration or construction safeguards; the application does not demonstrate that less harmful alternatives were fully evaluated and maximized first; unclear who benefits from the desalinated water – households or industry or port expansion.

The Executive Director concludes that the request does not identify a personal justiciable interest and recommends that the request be denied because it identifies interests common to the general public and raises issues outside of the scope of the law governing this application.

7. Thomas Cerwonka

The requestor's concerns include: impact on the area, residents, water quality, and quality of life; ecosystem impacts; risks to commercial and recreational fisheries; brine discharge; draft permit does not clearly define discharge location, dilution methods, or long-term monitoring and enforcement.

The Executive Director concludes that the request does not identify a personal justiciable interest and recommends that the request be denied because it identifies interests common to the general public and raises issues outside of the scope of the law governing this application.

8. Margaret Ann Duran

The requester's concerns about the application include: concentrated brine hurting marine life; project is a bad idea both environmentally and technically; the draft permit should have an enforceable brine management plan as well as mitigation, construction, and restoration safeguards.

The Executive Director concludes that the request does not identify a personal justiciable interest and recommends that the request be denied because it identifies interests common to the general public and raises issues outside of the scope of the law governing this application.

9. Larry Ferrell

The requester's concerns include: destruction of the bay's ecosystem that would result from the Applicant's proposed diversion; any desalination plant that harms

what is an already compromised bay.

The Executive Director concludes that the request does not identify a personal justiciable interest and recommends that the request be denied because it identifies interests common to the general public.

10. Veronica Gutierrez

The requester's concerns include: marine life impacts; impingement and entrainment of fish, larvae, and plankton; impacts on species critical to the Gulf ecosystem and local fisheries; lack of independent, comprehensive studies on ecosystem impacts; risks to fisheries; impact on coastal livelihoods; brine discharge; permit does not clearly define discharge location, dilution methods, or long-term monitoring and enforcement; permit should have a detailed, enforceable brine management and monitoring plan; permit lacks specific safeguards for Gulf water quality and benthic habitats; plant may expand from 50 million gallons to 100 million gallons per day and approving the permit now could lock in greater environmental impacts without a full future review; cumulative impacts of the full buildout and other desalination projects in the region.

The Executive Director concludes that the request does not identify a personal justiciable interest and recommends that the request be denied because it identifies interests common to the general public and raises issues outside of the scope of the law governing this application.

11. Maria Halloran

The requester's concerns include: risks to marine life, coastal ecosystems, and water quality; desalination intake and brine discharge could harm fisheries, disrupt habitats, and negatively impact the livelihoods of coastal communities; plans to expand production from 50 million gallons per day to 100 million gallons per day

represents a massive industrial project with long-term environmental consequences that have not been adequately studied or transparently addressed, particularly cumulative effects, climate resilience, energy use, and disposal of concentrated brine.

The Executive Director concludes that the request does not identify a personal justiciable interest and recommends that the request be denied because it identifies interests common to the general public and raises issues outside of the scope of the law governing this application.

12. Nikki Ikonomopoulos

The requester's concerns include: the intake and discharge should be off-shore rather than at the mouth of the Lydia Ann Channel at Harbor Island; this is also leading to Redfish Bay State scientific area, which is known for protected sea grass beds; this place is important for larval marine life and ecotourism.

The Executive Director concludes that the request does not identify a personal justiciable interest and recommends that the request be denied because it identifies interests common to the general public and raises issues outside of the scope of the law governing this application.

13. Theresa Kotalik

The requester provided an address in Laguna Vista, Texas.

The requester's concerns include: brine discharge; draft permit does not clearly define discharge location, dilution methods, or long-term monitoring and enforcement.

The Executive Director concludes that the request does not identify a personal justiciable interest and recommends that the request be denied because it identifies interests common to the general public and raises issues outside of the scope of the law governing this application.

14. Phillip McMulin

The requester provided a post office box address.

The requester does not describe concerns but requests a public hearing.

The Executive Director concludes that the request does not identify a personal justiciable interest or identify any concerns and recommends that the request be denied.

15. David Meany

The requester's concerns about the application include: brine discharge; plant is designed to expand from 50 to 100 million gallons per day; approving the permit now could lock in greater environmental impacts without a full future review; cumulative impacts of full buildout and other desalination projects in the region; brine disruption of ecosystem not designated for the discharge levels; impact on the fishing industry in the area

The Executive Director concludes that the request does not identify a personal justiciable interest and recommends that the request be denied because it identifies interests common to the general public and raises issues outside of the scope of the law governing this application.

16. Misty Mountain

The requester's concerns include: desalination; application does not demonstrate that less harmful alternatives were fully evaluated and maximized first.

The Executive Director concludes that the request does not identify a personal justiciable interest and recommends that the request be denied because it identifies interests common to the general public and raises issues outside of the scope of the law governing this application.

17. Deanna Owens

The requester's concerns include: the project's scale, long-term environmental risks, and potential impacts to the coast and Gulf.

The Executive Director concludes that the request does not identify a personal justiciable interest and recommends that the request be denied because it identifies interests common to the general public.

18. Brenda Porter

The requester's concerns include: all intake and discharge need to be taken offshore.

The Executive Director concludes that the request does not identify a personal justiciable interest and recommends that the request be denied because it identifies interests common to the general public and raises issues outside of the scope of the law governing this application.

19. Lynne Porter

The requester does not identify specific concerns but requests a public hearing and asks TCEQ to deny the permit.

The Executive Director concludes that the request does not identify a personal justiciable interest or identify specific concerns and recommends that the request be denied.

20. William Porter

The requester does not identify specific concerns but requests a public hearing and asks TCEQ to deny the permit.

The Executive Director concludes that the request does not identify a personal justiciable interest or identify specific concerns and recommends that the request be denied.

21. Donna Rosson

The requester's concerns include: plant is designed to expand from 50 million to 100 million gallons per day and approving the permit now could lock in greater environmental impacts without a full future review; cumulative impacts of full build out and other desalination projects in the region; construction impacts from subsea pipelines; pipeline installation risks to seagrass, benthic habitats, and barrier island ecosystems; increased turbidity and harms to marine life.

The Executive Director concludes that the request does not identify a personal justiciable interest and recommends that the request be denied because it identifies interests common to the general public and raises issues outside of the scope of the law governing this application.

22. Diane Schwenke

The requester's concerns include: impact on salinity of the water in local bays and estuaries; impact on sport fishing and local tourism; 1 1/2 miles does sound like enough distance to discharge without affecting the shallow waters of inland wildlife.

The Executive Director concludes that the request does not identify a personal justiciable interest and recommends that the request be denied because it identifies interests common to the general public and raises issues outside of the scope of the law governing this application.

23. Patricia Sheffield

The requester's concerns include: application lacks independent, comprehensive studies on ecosystem impacts; risks to commercial and recreational fisheries that support coastal livelihoods; brine discharge from the proposed desalination plant; draft permit does not clearly define discharge location, dilution methods, or long-term monitoring and enforcement.

The Executive Director concludes that the request does not identify a personal justiciable interest and recommends that the request be denied because it identifies interests common to the general public and raises issues outside of the scope of the law governing this application.

V. CONCLUSION

The Executive Director respectfully recommends denying all hearing requests because no request established associational standing or identified a personal justiciable interest affected by the application, therefore no affected person has requested a contested case hearing.

Respectfully submitted,

Kelly Keel
Executive Director

Phillip Ledbetter, Director
Office of Legal Services

Amy L. Browning, Deputy Director
Environmental Law Division

by Ruth A. Takeda

Ruth Ann Takeda
State Bar of Texas No. 24053592
Environmental Law Division, MC 173
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, Texas 78711-3087
Phone: (512) 239-6635
ruth.takeda@tceq.texas.gov

CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE

I certify that on May 22, 2026, the foregoing *Executive Director's Response to Hearing Requests* was filed electronically with the Chief Clerk of the Texas Commission on Environmental Quality in Austin, Texas, and that a true and correct copy was delivered as indicated to the persons on the attached Mailing List.

Ruth Ann Takeda, Staff Attorney
Environmental Law Division
Texas Commission on Environmental Quality

MAILING LIST
Port of Corpus Christi Authority of Nueces County
TCEQ DOCKET NO. 2026-0463-WR;
APPLICATION FOR WATER USE PERMIT NO. WRPERM 13902

FOR THE APPLICANT
via first-class and electronic mail:

Stephanie Bergeron Perdue, Esq.
Baker Botts, L.L.P.
401 South 1st Street, Ste. 1300
Austin, Texas 78704-1296
stephanie.bergeron.perdue@bakerbotts.com

Sarah L. Garza
Director of Environmental Planning and Compliance
Port of Corpus Christi
Authority of Nueces County
P.O. Box 1541
Corpus Christi, Texas 78403
sarah@pocca.com

FOR THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR
via electronic mail:

Ryan Vise, Deputy Director
Texas Commission
On Environmental Quality
External Relations Division
Public Education Program, MC-108
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, Texas 78711
ryan.vise@tceq.texas.gov

FOR PUBLIC INTEREST COUNSEL
via electronic mail:

David Timberger, Public Interest Counsel
Texas Commission
On Environmental Quality
Public Interest Counsel, MC-103
P.O. Box 13087
Austin, Texas 78711
david.timberger@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
kyle.lucas@tceq.texas.gov

CHIEF CLERK
via electronic filing:

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

REQUESTERS
See attached list

REQUESTERS
via first-class mail:

Valerie Alfred
4722 Fox Trot DR
Corpus Christi TX 78413

Jennie Birkholz
3441 Alexandrite Way
Round Rock TX 78681

Tracy Callow
10202 Rafter S Trl
Helotes TX 78023

Payton Campbell
6214 Londonderry Dr
Corpus Christi TX 78415

Thomas Cerwonka
691 Starlight
Ingleside TX 78362

Margaret Ann Duran
4022 Congressional DR
Corpus Christi TX 78413

Larry Ferrell
132 Sunset
Ingleside on the Bay TX 78362

Veronica Gutierrez
2045 Parkview PL
Ingleside TX 78362

Maria Halloran
126 Owens LN
Aransas Pass TX 78337

Nikki Ikonomopoulos
5801 Bonner DR
Corpus Christi TX 78412

Theresa Kotalik
87 Bethpage DR
Laguna Vista TX 78578

Phillip McMulin
PO Box 179
Ingleside TX 78362

Neil McQueen
4213 Estate DR
Corpus Christ TX 78412

David Meany
2210 S Young ST
Rockport TX 78382

Misty Mountain
600 Enterprise Blvd Lot 201
Rockport TX 78382

Julie Nye
1018 Bayshore Dr
Ingleside TX 78362

Deanna Owens
2837 Hargus
Ingleside TX 78362

Brenda Porter
328 Sandhill Cir
Port Aransas TX 78373

Lynne Porter
511 Bayshore DR
Ingleside TX 78362

William Porter
511 Bayshore DR
Ingleside TX 78362

Donna Rosson
2119 Bay Breeze
Portland TX 78374

Diane Schwenke
4407 FM-1069
Aransas Pass TX 78336

Patricia Sheffield
3565 Golden Oak Dr
Corpus Christi TX 78418

Attachment A

DOCKET No. 2026-0463-WR

Port of Corpus Christi of Nueces County No. 13902

Port of Corpus Christi of Nueces County

Application No. 13902

Hearing Requesters

- Requesters with waterfront property
- Requesters without waterfront property

Requesters not shown

Birkholz, Jennie;
Callow, Tracy K.;
Kotalik, Theresa;
McMulin, Phillip.

Mountain, Misty
Meany, David
Halloran, Maria
Schwenke, Diane
Rosson, Donna
Owens, Deanna
Gutierrez, Veronica
Cerwonka, Thomas
Ferrell, Larry R.
Porter, Lynne Ross and Porter, William Ross
Nye, Julie Ann
Porter, Brenda
McQueen, Neil Robert (Coastal Bend Chapter of the Surfrider Foundation)
Campbell, Payton Gray
Duran, Margaret Ann
Ikonomopoulos, Nikki
Alfred, Valerie
Sheffield, Patricia

Proposed Diversion Point

Port Aransas
Gregory
Portland
Aragon
Ingleside
Ingleside on the Bay
Aransas Pass
Estes
Corpus Christi
Naval Air Station Corpus Christi
Mustang Island
Highway 35 S
15 ft
FM 893
188
361
358
357



This map was generated by the Water Availability 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 Water Availability Division at (512)239-4600.

0 2 4 6 8 10 Miles