Date: November 6, 2019

Subject: 3801 Westlake Drive, SP-2019-0243DS (District 10)

Motion by: Kevin Ramberg  Seconded by: Wendy Gordon

RATIONALE:

WHEREAS, the Environmental Commission recognizes the proposed applicant is requesting a variance from LDC 25-8-281(C)(2)(b) to allow construction of a boat dock and shoreline access within a 150-foot Critical Environmental Feature (CEF) buffer for a Rimrock CEF; and

WHEREAS, the Environmental Commission recognizes that City of Austin Staff recommends this variance, having determined the findings of fact to have been met, with the Staff conditions detailed below.

THEREFORE, the Environmental Commission recommends approval of the requested variance from 25-8-281(C)(2)(b) for the above noted project with the following;

Staff Conditions:
1. The portion of the existing access path that will be bypassed, between the point where the new path will branch off from the existing path and the endpoint of the current path where it connects with the current bridge, shall be removed and revegetated.
2. In the plan set, a non-erodible surface (e.g., paving, shallow stairs, etc.) for the proposed path shall be specified.

Environmental Commission Conditions:
1. The owner comply with boat dock registration process after the completion of the improvements consistent with the Lake Patrol requirements for Lake Austin boat docks.
2. The existing dock demolition and new dock construction be completed by water borne barge and not via the site.

VOTE 10-0

For: Bedford, Creel, Smith, Thompson, Ramberg, Guerrero, Nill, Neely, Gordon, and Maceo
Against: None
Abstain: None
Recuse: None
Absent: Coyne
Approved By:

Linda Guerrero, Environmental Commission Chair
ITEM FOR ENVIRONMENTAL COMMISSION AGENDA

COMMISSION MEETING DATE: November 6, 2019

NAME & NUMBER OF PROJECT: 3801 Westlake SP-2019-0243DS

NAME OF APPLICANT OR ORGANIZATION: Eric Moreland, Laguna Taco LLC

LOCATION: 3801 Westlake Drive, Austin, Texas, 78746

COUNCIL DISTRICT: District 10

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW STAFF: Pamela Abee-Taulli, Environmental Review Specialist Senior, Development Services Department, 512-974-1879, pamela.abee-taulli@austintexas.gov

HYDROLOGIST REVIEW STAFF: Lindsey Sydow, Environmental Scientist, Watershed Protection Department, 512-974-2746, lindsey.sydow@austintexas.gov

WATERSHED: Lake Austin Watershed, Water Supply Rural, Drinking Water Protection Zone

REQUEST: Variance request is as follows: Request to vary from LDC 25-8-281(C)(2)(b) to allow construction of a boat dock and shoreline access within a 150-foot Critical Environmental Feature (CEF) buffer for a Rimrock CEF.
Staff recommends this variance, having determined the findings of fact to have been met, with the following conditions:

1. The portion of the existing access path that will be bypassed, between the point where the new path will branch off from the existing path and the endpoint of the current path where it connects with the current bridge, shall be removed and revegetated.

2. In the plan set, a non-erodible surface (e.g., paving, shallow stairs, etc.) for the proposed path shall be specified.
Staff Recommendations Concerning Required Findings

Project Name: 3801 Westlake Drive – SP-2019-0243DS
Ordinance Standard: Watershed Protection Ordinance
Variance Request: To vary from LDC 25-8-281(C)(2)(b) to allow construction of a boat dock and shoreline access within a 150-foot Critical Environmental Feature (CEF) buffer for a Rimrock CEF

Include an explanation with each applicable finding of fact.

A. Land Use Commission variance determinations from Chapter 25-8-41 of the City Code:

1. The requirement will deprive the applicant of a privilege available to owners of similarly situated property with approximately contemporaneous development subject to similar code requirements.

   Yes / No

   Yes. Similarly situated properties, with a rimrock CEF buffer that extends to the shoreline frontage along Lake Austin, frequently contain boat docks and shoreline access. The adjacent properties have boat docks and shoreline access. The width of the proposed boat dock is 21 feet, which does not exceed the allowable 20% of the shoreline frontage.

2. The variance:
   a) Is not necessitated by the scale, layout, construction method, or other design decision made by the applicant, unless the design decision provides greater overall environmental protection than is achievable without the variance;

   Yes / No

   Yes. The variance is not necessitated by the design. No alternative locations outside of the CEF buffer are available on site for shoreline access because the entire shoreline for this property is within the canyon rimrock CEF buffer. Additionally, the applicant is proposing a more favorable location for shoreline access than the current boat dock, for which the access crosses the canyon rimrock. All areas of demolition and construction within the
buffer will be revegetated according to City specifications. The design of this project results in a plan that provides greater overall environmental protection than is achievable without the variance.

b) Is the minimum deviation from the code requirement necessary to allow a reasonable use of the property;

Yes / No

Yes. The variance is a minimum deviation from the code requirement and is allowing for reasonable use of the property. The code requires a 150-foot critical environmental feature buffer. This buffer is not being reduced. The scope of the variance is limited to allowing construction activities to occur within a critical environmental feature buffer for only a boat dock and a pathway for shoreline access.

c) Does not create a significant probability of harmful environmental consequences.

Yes / No

Yes. The variance does not create significant harmful environmental consequences. The construction of the boat dock and access will not disturb the rimrock critical environmental feature.

3. Development with the variance will result in water quality that is at least equal to the water quality achievable without the variance.

Yes / No

Yes, the construction activities will minimize disturbance to terrestrial vegetation, and all disturbed areas will be revegetated according to City specifications. Furthermore, the existing dock that is rotting will be removed, thereby providing water quality that is at least equal to the water quality achievable without the variance.

B. The Land Use Commission may grant a variance from a requirement of Section 25-8-422 (Water Supply Suburban Water Quality Transition Zone), Section 25-8-452 (Water Supply Rural Water Quality Transition Zone), Section 25-8-482 (Barton Springs Zone Water Quality Transition Zone), Section 25-8-368 (Restrictions on Development Impacting Lake Austin, Lady Bird Lake, and Lake Walter E. Long), or Article 7, Division 1 (Critical Water Quality Zone Restrictions), after determining that:

1. The criteria for granting a variance in Subsection (A) are met;

Yes / No N/A
2. The requirement for which a variance is requested prevents a reasonable, economic use of the entire property;

Yes / No  N/A

3. The variance is the minimum deviation from the code requirement necessary to allow a reasonable, economic use of the entire property.

Yes / No  N/A

**Staff Determination:** Staff determines that the findings of fact have been met. Staff recommends the following condition:

1. The portion of the existing access path that will be bypassed, between the point where the new path will branch off from the existing path and the endpoint of the current path where it connects with the current bridge, shall be removed and revegetated.

2. In the plan set, a non-erodible surface (e.g., paving, shallow stairs, etc.) for the proposed path shall be specified.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environmental Reviewer (DSD)</th>
<th>(Pamela Abee-Taulli)</th>
<th>Date 10/8/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Review Manager (DSD)</td>
<td>(Mike McDougal)</td>
<td>Date 10/8/19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland Biologist / Hydrogeologist Reviewer (WPD)</td>
<td>(Lindsey Sydow)</td>
<td>Date 9/6/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Officer (WPD)</td>
<td>(Chris Herrington)</td>
<td>Date 10/9/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ENVIRONMENTAL COMMISSION VARIANCE APPLICATION FORM

### PROJECT DESCRIPTION

#### Applicant Contact Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Applicant</th>
<th>Eric Moreland for Laguna Taco LLC</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Street Address</td>
<td>28 Sundown Parkway</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City State ZIP Code</td>
<td>Austin, TX   78746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Phone</td>
<td>512-480-0848</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-Mail Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:eric@moreland.com">eric@moreland.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Variance Case Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Case Name</th>
<th>3801 Westlake Drive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Case Number</td>
<td>SP-2019-0243DS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address or Location</td>
<td>3801 Westlake Drive</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Reviewer Name</td>
<td>Pamela Abee-Taulli</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Resource Management Reviewer Name</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicable Ordinance</td>
<td>LDC 25-8-281(C)(2)(b)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watershed Name</td>
<td>Lake Austin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watershed Classification</td>
<td>☐Urban ☐Suburban ☐Water Supply Suburban ☒Water Supply Rural ☐Barton Springs Zone</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone**

- ☐ Barton Springs Segment  
- ☐ Northern Edwards Segment

*X Not in Edwards Aquifer Zones*

**Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone**

- ☐ Yes  
- X No

**Distance to Nearest Classified Waterway**

The boat dock is in Lake Austin.

**Water and Waste Water service to be provided by**

NA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Request</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| The variance request is as follows (Cite code references:  
To allow construction in a rimrock CEF buffer. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Impervious cover</th>
<th>Existing</th>
<th>Proposed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>square footage:</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>acreage:</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>percentage:</td>
<td>_______</td>
<td>_______</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Provide general description of the property (slope range, elevation range, summary of vegetation / trees, summary of the geology, CWQZ, WQTZ, CEFs, floodplain, heritage trees, any other notable or outstanding characteristics of the property)

3801 Westlake Drive is a lakefront, 0.8 acre, home site in the Lake Shore Addition subdivision which was platted in 1915. It contains a home constructed in the 60s, a limestone walkway which crosses a rimrock and ends at a dock constructed in the same era as the house. The site remains relatively untouched since its development more than 50 years ago. The proposed project entails construction of a new dock and dock access moved away from the location of the CEF along with the removal of the existing dock and restoration of the shoreline area currently housing the existing dock stairs and gangway. Attachment 1 contains an aerial photo of the site. The site is heavily vegetated with a slope of about 58% in the Critical Water Quality Zone (CWQZ) bordering the lake. The vegetation in the CWQZ is dominated by native vegetation classified as saplings and shrubs. No trees will be removed with this project, and the site will be fully restored per 609S specifications. Attachment 2 contains the Proposed Conditions Site Plan and Erosion Controls Sheet for the project. Attachment 3 contains the Basis of Determination for the Findings of Fact, and Attachment 4 contains the Environmental Resource Inventory.
Clear the proposed project does not comply with current Code (include maps and exhibits) | This project proposes to demolish an existing dock and its access and construct a new dock and access route farther away from a rimrock. The demolition of the dock and access as well as the construction of the new dock and access are within 150 ft. of the rimrock. Please see Attachment 1 for the Proposed Conditions Site Plan and Erosion Controls Sheet.

FINDINGS OF FACT

As required in LDC Section 25-8-41, in order to grant a variance the Land Use Commission must make the following findings of fact:

Include an explanation with each applicable finding of fact.

Project:

Ordinance:

A. Land Use Commission variance determinations from Chapter 25-8-41 of the City Code:

1. The requirement will deprive the applicant of a privilege available to owners of similarly situated property with approximately contemporaneous development subject to similar code requirements.

   Yes/ No  Please see Attachment 3, Basis of Determination.

2. The variance:
   a) Is not necessitated by the scale, layout, construction method, or other design decision made by the applicant, unless the design decision provides greater overall environmental protection than is achievable without the variance;

   Yes/ No  Please see Attachment 3, Basis of Determination.

   b) Is the minimum deviation from the code requirement necessary to allow a reasonable use of the property;

   Yes/ No  Please see Attachment 3, Basis of Determination.

   c) Does not create a significant probability of harmful environmental consequences.

   Yes/ No  Please see Attachment 3, Basis of Determination.
3. Development with the variance will result in water quality that is at least equal to the water quality achievable without the variance.

Yes / No  Please see Attachment 3, Basis of Determination.

B. Additional Land Use Commission variance determinations for a requirement of Section 25-8-422 (Water Quality Transition Zone), Section 25-8-452 (Water Quality Transition Zone), Article 7, Division 1 (Critical Water Quality Zone Restrictions), or Section 25-8-368 (Restrictions on Development Impacting Lake Austin, Lady Bird Lake, and Lake Walter E. Long):

Not Applicable

1. The criteria for granting a variance in Subsection (A) are met;

   Yes / No  [provide summary of justification for determination]

2. The requirement for which a variance is requested prevents a reasonable, economic use of the entire property;

   Yes / No  [provide summary of justification for determination]

3. The variance is the minimum deviation from the code requirement necessary to allow a reasonable, economic use of the entire property.

   Yes / No  [provide summary of justification for determination]

**Variance approval requires all above affirmative findings.**
Exhibits for Commission Variance

- Aerial photos of the site
- Site photos
- Aerial photos of the vicinity
- Context Map—A map illustrating the subject property in relation to developments in the vicinity to include nearby major streets and waterways
- Topographic Map - A topographic map is recommended if a significant grade change on the subject site exists or if there is a significant difference in grade in relation to adjacent properties.
- For cut/fill variances, a plan sheet showing areas and depth of cut/fill with topographic elevations.
- Site plan showing existing conditions if development exists currently on the property
- Proposed Site Plan- full size electronic or at least legible 11x17 showing proposed development, include tree survey if required as part of site or subdivision plan
- Environmental Map – A map that shows pertinent features including Floodplain, CWQZ, WQTZ, CEFs, Setbacks, Recharge Zone, etc.
- An Environmental Resource Inventory pursuant to ECM 1.3.0 (if required by 25-8-121)
- Applicant’s variance request letter
ATTACHMENT 1

AERIAL SITE PHOTO
ATTACHMENT 2

PROPOSED CONDITIONS SITE PLAN SHEET
AND EROSION CONTROLS
1. ALL WORK SHALL OCCUR WITHIN THE LIMITS OF CONSTRUCTION AS SHOWN ON THE PLAN. MATERIALS AND WORK PERFORMED OUTSIDE OF THESE LIMITS MAY BE ILLEGALLY POURED.

2. SHORELINE IMPROVEMENTS, INCLUDING GANGWAY ACCESS, ARE AUTHORIZED WITH THE PROVISION THAT THE SHORELINE SETBACK AREA, EXCEPT FOR RETAINING WALLS, PIERS, WHARVES, CONSTRUCTION ACTIVITY, INCLUDING STAGING AND SPOIL STORAGE, WILL BE LEFT UNDISTURBED.

3. CONTAINERS OF HAZARDOUS MATERIALS, FUEL, OIL, HERBICIDES, INSECTICIDES, AND OTHER LIQUID OR SOLID SUBSTANCES ARE PROHIBITED.

4. FOR ZONING, PERMANENT IMPROVEMENTS ARE PROHIBITED WITHIN THE REMAINDER OF THE PROPERTY. THE EXISTING DOCK IS PROHIBITED.

5. NO WATER OR WASTEWATER UTILITIES ARE PROPOSED WITH THIS DEVELOPMENT.

6. DOCK SHALL BE AT LEAST 66% OPEN.

7. PILINGS SHALL BE 6-5/8" DIAMETER STEEL PIPE.

8. DREDGE MATERIAL SHALL BE DISPOSED DRY IN A LEGALLY PERMITTED LANDFILL.

9. REGULATORY AND ENVIRONMENTAL INSPECTOR HAS THE AUTHORITY TO ADD AND/OR MODIFY EROSION/SEDIMENTATION CONTROLS ON SITE TO KEEP PROJECT IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE CITY OF AUSTIN RULES AND REGULATIONS.

NOTE:

1. COMPLIANCE WITH BUILDING CODE REQUIRED AND IS TO BE REVIEWED FOR COMPLIANCE DURING BUILDING CODE REVIEW.

2. FOR THE BUILDING PERMIT, A SIGNED AND SEALED LETTER SHALL BE SUBMITTED TO THE CITY OF AUSTIN PER THE LOCAL DEVELOPMENT CODE, IN CLC 25-12, ARTICLE 1 (UNIFORM BUILDING CODE) AND THE BUILDING CRITERIA MANUAL.

3. ENVIRONMENTAL INSPECTOR HAS THE AUTHORITY TO ADD AND/OR MODIFY EROSION/SEDIMENTATION CONTROLS ON SITE TO KEEP PROJECT IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE CITY OF AUSTIN RULES AND REGULATIONS.

4. FOR LA ZONING, PERMANENT IMPROVEMENTS ARE PROHIBITED WITHIN THE LIMITS OF CONSTRUCTION/SILT FENCE.

5. NO WATER OR WASTEWATER UTILITIES ARE PROPOSED WITH THIS DEVELOPMENT.

6. DOCK SHALL BE AT LEAST 66% OPEN.

7. PILINGS SHALL BE 6-5/8" DIAMETER STEEL PIPE.

8. DREDGE MATERIAL SHALL BE DISPOSED DRY IN A LEGALLY PERMITTED LANDFILL.

9. REGULATORY AND ENVIRONMENTAL INSPECTOR HAS THE AUTHORITY TO ADD AND/OR MODIFY EROSION/SEDIMENTATION CONTROLS ON SITE TO KEEP PROJECT IN COMPLIANCE WITH THE CITY OF AUSTIN RULES AND REGULATIONS.
ATTACHMENT 3

BASIS OF DETERMINATION FOR THE FINDINGS OF FACT
A. 1. The requirement will deprive the applicant of a privilege available to owners of similarly situated property with approximately contemporaneous development subject to similar code requirements.

YES. Attached is a summary of the variance applications pertaining to LDC 25-8-281(C)(2)(b) for the past five years. The Environmental Commission has recommended every application except one which included a tram.

2. The variance:
   a. Is not necessitated by the scale, layout, construction method, or other design decision made by the applicant, unless the design decision provides greater overall environmental protection than is achievable without the variance;

   YES. The entire shoreline is within the CEF setback. The existing dock is rotting; it’s unsafe and unusable; and the stairs and gangway to the dock cross the rimrock. The replacement dock will be built as far away as possible from the rimrock while making maximum use of the existing access route from the house in order to minimize the disturbance on the shoreline. Runoff from the limit of construction will not flow toward the rimrock.

   b. Is the minimum deviation from the code requirement necessary to allow reasonable use of the property;

   YES. A dock cannot be constructed on the lot without obtaining this variance.

   c. Does not create a significant probability of harmful environmental consequences.

   YES. The project will eliminate disturbance to the CEF by removing the access that crosses the CEF. Overland flow from the Limit of Construction will not reach the rimrock.

3. Development with the variance will result in water quality that is at least equal to the water quality achievable without the variance.

   YES. The existing dock and access are crumbling with tar paper sloughing off of the roof of the dock into the lake. The structures are unsound, and it’s not possible to construct a dock without the variance. All disturbed areas will be revegetated per the 609s specification.

B. 1. The criteria for granting a variance in Subsection (A) are met:

   YES. Please see answers to A (1), (2), and (3).
2. The requirement for which a variance is requested prevents a reasonable, economic use of the entirety of the property;

YES. The existing dock is not functional or safe, and building any dock will require a variance on this property. Denying the owner the ability to build a dock on the lakefront lot would prevent “a reasonable economic use of the entirety of the property”.

3. The variance is the minimum deviation from the code requirement necessary to allow a reasonable, economic use of the entire property;

YES. Denying the owner the ability to build a dock on the lakefront lot doesn’t “allow a reasonable, economic use of the entire property”; it’s not possible to construct a dock on this property without securing the variance; so this project is the minimum deviation from the code.
### SUMMARY OF VARIANCE APPLICATIONS FOR LDC 25-8-281(C)(2)(b)

#### 2014 to PRESENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>Watershed</th>
<th>Request</th>
<th>EC Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3919 Westlake Drive, SP-2018-0320DS (D-10)</td>
<td>3919 Westlake Drive, Austin, TX 78746</td>
<td>Lake Austin</td>
<td>To allow the construction of a boat dock within a 150-foot Critical Environmental Feature buffer (Canyon Rimrock/Seep Complex). 25-8-281(C)(2)(b)</td>
<td>Recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schwausch Boat Dock (SP-2018-0128D)</td>
<td>3335 Far View Drive</td>
<td>Lake Austin</td>
<td>Variance request is as follows: 1. Critical Environmental Features [LDC 25-8-281(C)(2)(b)]. To allow construction of a tram and boat dock within a critical environmental feature buffer</td>
<td>Not recommended</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Settle Boat Dock SP-2017-0032D Variance</td>
<td>3825 Westlake Drive, Austin, TX</td>
<td>Lake Austin Water Supply Rural Drinking Water Protection Zone</td>
<td>To allow construction of a boat dock within several 150 foot Critical Environmental Feature Buffers (2) Canyon Rimrocks and (2) Springs. 25-8-281(C)(2)(b)</td>
<td>Recommended with conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bulkhead for 2200 Lauranne Lane SP-2016-0420D</td>
<td>2200 Lauranne Lane Austin, TX 78733</td>
<td>Lake Austin Water Supply Rural Drinking Water Protection Zone</td>
<td>Variance from 25-8-281(C)(2)(b) Critical Environmental Features, to allow construction of a bulkhead and shoreline stabilization within a Critical Environmental Feature (CEF) buffer for a canyon rimrock.</td>
<td>Recommended with conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristin Boat Dock SP-2016-0185D (D-10)</td>
<td>3811 Westlake Drive</td>
<td>Lake Austin, Water Supply Rural Drinking Water Protection Zone</td>
<td>To allow the construction of a boat dock within a 150 foot Critical Environmental Feature buffer (Canyon Rimrock). LDC 25-8-281(C)(2)(b)</td>
<td>Recommended with conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caven Boat Dock SP-2015-0202DS</td>
<td>2006 Scenic Drive</td>
<td>Taylor Slough North (Water Supply Suburban), Drinking Water Protection Zone</td>
<td>To allow the construction of a boat dock within a 150 foot Critical Environmental Feature buffer (Canyon Rimrock/Bluff). 25-8-281(C)(2)(B)</td>
<td>approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallagher Boat Dock SP-2015-0232DS (D-10)</td>
<td>3909 Westlake Drive</td>
<td>Lake Austin (Water Supply Rural), Drinking Water Protection Zone</td>
<td>1) To allow the construction of a tram within a 150-foot Critical Environmental Feature Buffer (Canyon Rimrock/Bluff), 25-8-281(C)(2)(B).</td>
<td>approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASWELL ESTATES C8-2014-0134.0A</td>
<td>3336 Mount Bonnell Dr</td>
<td>Huck's Slough Watershed and Lake Austin Watershed</td>
<td>1 – To allow a CEF within a residential lot [LDC 25-8-281(B)] and 2 – To reduce a CEF setback to 50 feet [LDC 25-8-281(C)(2)(A)]</td>
<td>approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Far View SP-2014-0135D</td>
<td>3337 Far View Drive</td>
<td>Drinking Water Protection Zone</td>
<td>To modify the standard 150-foot width Critical Environmental Feature buffer in order to allow construction of a tram within a Critical Environmental Feature rimrock and seep) buffer corridor 10 feet wide and 420 feet long that spans 2 canyon rimrocks and a seep. 25-8-281(C)(2)(B)</td>
<td>approved with conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>70 Pascal Lane SP-2014-0144D</td>
<td>70 Pascal Lane</td>
<td>Lake Austin (Water Supply Suburban), Drinking Water Protection Zone</td>
<td>To allow the construction of a tram within a 150 foot Critical Environmental Feature buffer (Canyon Rimrock/Bluff) to provide a single point of shoreline access to a proposed boat dock that is outside of the buffer. 25-8-281(C)(2)(B).</td>
<td>approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAYES BOAT DOCK SP-2014-0182D</td>
<td>3715 Westlake Dr</td>
<td>Lake Austin Watershed / Water Supply Rural Classification / Drinking Water Protection Zone</td>
<td>Variance requests are as follows: 1. To allow construction of a boat dock, shoreline access, and shoreline stabilization within a CEF buffer for a canyon rimrock [LDC 25-8-281(C)(2)(B)]; and 2. To allow fill up to 8 feet [LDC 25-8-342(A)]</td>
<td>approved</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iles Boat Dock SP-2014-0212DS</td>
<td>2415 Big Horn Dr., Bldg. BD</td>
<td>Lake Austin (Water Supply Suburban), Drinking Water Protection Zone</td>
<td>Variance to allow construction of a boat dock within a bluff Critical Environmental Feature buffer. 25-8-281(C)(2)(B).</td>
<td>approved</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT 4

ENVIRONMENTAL RESOURCE INVENTORY
City of Austin – Environmental Resource Inventory (ERI)
3801 Westlake Dr
Travis County, Texas
July 13, 2018

Prepared for:

PERMIT PARTNERS
Permit Partners
105 W. Riverside Drive, Suite 225
Austin, Texas 78704

By:
DESCO Environmental Consultants, LP
26902 Nichols Sawmill Road
Magnolia, Texas 77355
List of Attachments for the Environmental Resource Inventory Form

Figure 1: Site Specific Geologic Map with 2’ Topography

Figure 2: Historical Aerial Imagery

Figure 3: Site Soil Map

Figure 4: Critical Environmental Features and Well Locations

Figure 5: CWQZ and Fully Developed Floodplain Map

Figure 6: 3801 Westlake Dr-ERI Site Photos
The ERI is required for projects that meet one or more of the criteria listed in LDC 25-8-121(A), City Code 30-5-121(A).

1. **SITE/PROJECT NAME:** 3801 Westlake Drive

2. **COUNTY APPRAISAL DISTRICT PROPERTY ID (#’s):** 123443

3. **ADDRESS/LOCATION OF PROJECT:** 3801 Westlake Drive

4. **WATERSHED:** Lake Austin

5. **THIS SITE IS WITHIN THE (Check all that apply)**
   - Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone* (See note below) .................☐YES ☐No
   - Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone* .......................... ☐YES ☐No
   - Edwards Aquifer 1500 ft Verification Zone* ......................... ☐YES ☐No
   - Barton Spring Zone* .......................................................... ☐YES ☐No

   *(as defined by the City of Austin – LDC 25-8-2 or City Code 30-5-2)

   **Note:** If the property is over the Edwards Aquifer Recharge zone, the Hydrogeologic Report and karst surveys must be completed and signed by a Professional Geoscientist Licensed in the State of Texas.

6. **DOES THIS PROJECT PROPOSE FLOODPLAIN MODIFICATION?** ....... ☐YES** ☐NO
   If yes, then check all that apply:
   - ☐ (1) The floodplain modifications proposed are necessary to protect the public health and safety;
   - ☐ (2) The floodplain modifications proposed would provide a significant, demonstrable environmental benefit, as determined by a **functional assessment** of floodplain health as prescribed by the Environmental Criteria Manual (ECM), or
   - ☐ (3) The floodplain modifications proposed are necessary for development allowed in the critical water quality zone under LDC 25-8-261 or 25-8-262, City Code 30-5-261 or 30-5-262.
   - ☐ (4) The floodplain modifications proposed are outside of the Critical Water Quality Zone in an area determined to be in poor or fair condition by a **functional assessment** of floodplain health.

   **If yes, then a functional assessment must be completed and attached to the ERI (see ECM 1.7 and Appendix X for forms and guidance) unless conditions 1 or 3 above apply.

7. **IF THE SITE IS WITHIN AN URBAN OR SUBURBAN WATERSHED, DOES THIS PROJECT PROPOSE A UTILITY LINE PARALLEL TO AND WITHIN THE CRITICAL WATER QUALITY ZONE?** ................................. ☐YES*** ☐NO

   ***If yes, then riparian restoration is required by LDC 25-8-261(E) or City Code 30-5-261(E) and a functional assessment must be completed and attached to the ERI (see ECM 1.7 and Appendix X for forms and guidance).

8. There is a total of 1 (#’s) Critical Environmental Feature(s)(CEFs) on or within 150 feet of the project site. If CEF(s) are present, attach a detailed **DESCRIPTION** of the CEF(s), color **PHOTOGRAPHS**, the **CEF WORKSHEET** and provide **DESCRIPTIONS** of the proposed CEF buffer(s) and/or wetland mitigation. Provide the number of each type of CEFs on or within 150 feet of the site (Please provide the number of CEFs):
Soil Series Unit Names, Infiltration Characteristics & Thickness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Series Unit Name &amp; Subgroup**</th>
<th>Group*</th>
<th>Thickness (feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant soils and Urban land, 5 to 18 percent slopes</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant soils and Urban land, 18 to 40 percent slopes</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subgroup Classification – See Classification of Soil Series Table in County Soil Survey.

Soil Hydrologic Groups Definitions (Abbreviated)

A. Soils having a high infiltration rate when thoroughly wetted.
B. Soils having a moderate infiltration rate when thoroughly wetted.
C. Soils having a slow infiltration rate when thoroughly wetted.
D. Soils having a very slow infiltration rate when thoroughly wetted.

Note: Standard buffers for CEFs are 150 feet, with a maximum of 300 feet for point recharge features. Except for wetlands, if the standard buffer is not provided, you must provide a written request for an administrative variance from LDC 25-8-281(C)(1) and provide written findings of fact to support your request. Request forms for administrative variances from requirements stated in LDC 25-8-281 are available from Watershed Protection Department.

9. The following site maps are attached at the end of this report (Check all that apply and provide):

All ERI reports must include:
- Site Specific Geologic Map with 2-ft Topography
- Historic Aerial Photo of the Site
- Site Soil Map
- Critical Environmental Features and Well Location Map on current Aerial Photo with 2-ft Topography

Only if present on site (Maps can be combined):
- Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone with the 1500-ft Verification Zone
- Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone
- Water Quality Transition Zone (WQTZ)
- Critical Water Quality Zone (CWQZ)
- City of Austin Fully Developed Floodplains for all water courses with up to 64-acres of drainage

10. HYDROGEOLOGIC REPORT – Provide a description of site soils, topography, and site specific geology below (Attach additional sheets if needed):

Surface Soils on the project site is summarized in the table below and uses the SCS Hydrologic Soil Groups*. If there is more than one soil unit on the project site, show each soil unit on the site soils map.
Description of Site Topography and Drainage *(Attach additional sheets if needed)*:

The property slopes from the west south west to the east northeast toward Lake Austin/Colorado River. The property slopes steeply adjacent to the river. A canyon rimrock (CEF) averaging approximately 8 feet tall transects the property in a north northwest/south south east orientation. The canyon rimrock abuts Lake Austin for a significant portion of the property shoreline. Westlake Drive abuts the property to the west southwest. An outbuilding is also present to the west of the main residence. The entire property is forested. No fringe wetlands are present along the property shoreline.

List surface geologic units below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geologic Units Exposed at Surface</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Group</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Brief description of site geology *(Attach additional sheets if needed)*:

Limestone, dolomite, and marl in alternating resistant and recessive beds forming stair step topography; limestone, alphanfic to fine grained, hard to soft and marly, light grey to yellowish grey; dolomite, fine grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include steinkems, rudistids oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more dolomitic and less fossiliferous than lower part, thickness about 220 feet.

**Wells** – Identify all recorded and unrecorded wells on site (test holes, monitoring, water, oil, unplugged, capped and/or abandoned wells, etc.):

There are 0 (#) wells present on the project site and the locations are shown and labeled 0 (#’s) The wells are not in use and have been properly abandoned. 0 (#’s) The wells are not in use and will be properly abandoned. 0 (#’s) The wells are in use and comply with 16 TAC Chapter 76.

There are 0 (#’s) wells that are off-site and within 150 feet of this site.
11. **THE VEGETATION REPORT** – Provide the information requested below:

**Brief description of site plant communities (Attach additional sheets if needed):**

The property has a forested vegetation community, with natural/native vegetation on much of the property. Escarpment live oak (Quercus fusiformis), southern live oak (Quercus virginiana), and sugar-berry (Celtis laevigata) are the dominant canopy species on the property. Both canopy species along with Texas persimmon (Diospyros texana), Chinese privet (Ligustrum sinense), Carolina cherry laurel (Prunus caroliniana), and Chinese tallow (Triadica sebifera) are included in the sapling/shrub layer. The herbaceous layer on the property includes landscaping ivies, Chinese privet, turk's cap (Malvaviscus arboreus), poison ivy (Toxicodendron radicans), and Indian wood-oats (Chasmanthium latifolium).

There is woodland community on site …………………….. □ YES □ NO (Check one).
If yes, list the dominant species below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woodland species</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern live oak</td>
<td>Quercus virginicus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escarpment live oak</td>
<td>Quercus fusiformis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar-berry</td>
<td>Celtis laevigata</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is grassland/prairie.savanna on site …………………….. □ YES □ NO (Check one).
If yes, list the dominant species below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grassland/prairie/savanna species</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Common Name</td>
<td>Scientific Name</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is hydrophytic vegetation on site …………………….. □ YES □ NO (Check one).
If yes, list the dominant species in table below (next page):
Hydrophytic plant species

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Wetland Indicator Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A tree survey of all trees with a diameter of at least eight inches measured four and one-half feet above natural grade level has been completed on the site.

☐ YES ☐ NO (Check one).

12. WASTEWATER REPORT – Provide the information requested below.

Wastewater for the site will be treated by (Check of that Apply):

☐ On-site system(s)
☑ City of Austin Centralized sewage collection system
☐ Other Centralized collection system

Note: All sites that receive water or wastewater service from the Austin Water Utility must comply with City Code Chapter 15-12 and wells must be registered with the City of Austin.

The site sewage collection system is designed and will be constructed to in accordance to all State, County and City standard specifications.

☐ YES ☐ NO (Check one).

Calculations of the size of the drainfield or wastewater irrigation area(s) are attached at the end of this report or shown on the site plan.

☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ Not Applicable (Check one).

Wastewater lines are proposed within the Critical Water Quality Zone?

☐ YES ☑ NO (Check one). If yes, then provide justification below:
Is the project site is over the Edwards Aquifer?

☐ YES  ☑ NO (Check one).

If yes, then describe the wastewater disposal systems proposed for the site, its treatment level and effects on receiving watercourses or the Edwards Aquifer.

13. One (1) hard copy and one (1) electronic copy of the completed assessment have been provided.

Date(s) ERI Field Assessment was performed: June 22, 2018

My signature certifies that to the best of my knowledge, the responses on this form accurately reflect all information requested.

Christopher Little
Print Name

281 252 9799
Telephone

clittle@descoenv.com
Email Address

DESCO Environmental Consultants, LP
Name of Company

July 13, 2018
Date

For project sites within the Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone, my signature and seal also certifies that I am a licensed Professional Geoscientist in the State of Texas as defined by ECM 1.12.3(A).
# City of Austin Environmental Resource Inventory - Critical Environmental Feature Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FEATURE TYPE (Wetland, Rimrock, Bluffs, Recharge Feature, Spring)</th>
<th>FEATURE ID (eg S-1)</th>
<th>FEATURE LONGITUDE (WGS 1984 in Meters)</th>
<th>FEATURE LATITUDE (WGS 1984 in Meters)</th>
<th>WETLAND DIMENSIONS (ft)</th>
<th>RIMROCK/BLUFF DIMENSIONS (ft)</th>
<th>RECHARGE FEATURE DIMENSIONS (ft)</th>
<th>Springs Est Discharge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Canyon Rimrock</td>
<td>Rimrock</td>
<td>3355498.24604</td>
<td>617392.46950</td>
<td>72.31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**City of Austin Use Only**

**CASE NUMBER:**

- For rimrock, locate the midpoint of the segment that describes the feature.
- For wetlands, locate the approximate centroid of the feature and the estimated area.
- For a spring or seep, locate the source of groundwater that feeds a pool or stream.

Please state the method of coordinate data collection and the approximate precision and accuracy of the points and the unit of measurement.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GPS</td>
<td>sub-meter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveyed</td>
<td>meter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>&gt; 1 meter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional Geologists apply seal below.
Figure 1: Site Specific Geologic Map with 2' Topography
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Travis County, Texas

Map Base: 2016 CIR Aerial Imagery from TNRIS
Map Datum: NAD 1983 UTM Zone 14N, meters
Map Date: June 27, 2018
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Kgru: Glen Rose Formation
Wa: Water
Figure 2: Historical Aerial Imagery
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Figure 3: Site Soil Map
3801 Westlake Drive

Travis County, Texas

Map Base: 2016 Aerial Imagery from TNRIS
Map Datum: NAD 1983 UTM Zone 14N, meters
Map Date: June 27, 2018
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Soil Series
Lu: Gaddy soils and Urban land, 0 to 1 percent slopes, occasionally flooded
Te-E: Tarrant soils and Urban land, 5 to 18 percent slopes
Te-F: Tarrant soils and Urban land, 18 to 40 percent slopes
Tu-D: Travis soils and urban land, 1 to 8 percent slopes
W: Water
Figure 4: Critical Environmental Features and Well Locations
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Travis County, Texas
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Figure 5: CWQZ and Fully Developed Floodplain Map
3801 Westlake Drive
Travis County, Texas

Map Base: 2016 Aerial Imagery from TNRIS
Map Datum: NAD 1983 UTM Zone 14N, meters
Map Date: June 27, 2018
Figure 6: 3801 Westlake Dr - ERI Site Photos

Photo 1: Looking down driveway from Westlake Drive. Photo is facing the east northeast.

Photo 2: Front of property from Westlake Drive. Photo is facing the east northeast.
Photo 3: Front of residence taken from driveway. Photo is facing the northeast.

Photo 4: Outbuilding located to the west of the main residence. Photo is facing the north.
Photo 5: Back of residence and drained swimming pool. Photo is facing the northwest.

Photo 6: Path from residence down to the dock. Photo is facing the east northeast.
Photo 7: Dock over Lake Austin. Photo is facing the east northeast.

Photo 8: Canyon rimrock (CEF) adjacent to Lake Austin along the eastern boundary of the property. Photo is facing the north northwest.
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Environmental Resource Inventory
For the City of Austin
Related to LDC 25-8-121, City Code 30-5-121, ECM 1.3.0 & 1.10.0

The ERI is required for projects that meet one or more of the criteria listed in LDC 25-8-121(A), City Code 30-5-121(A).

1. SITE/PROJECT NAME: 3801 Westlake Drive

2. COUNTY APPRAISAL DISTRICT PROPERTY ID (#’s): 123443

3. ADDRESS/LOCATION OF PROJECT: 3801 Westlake Drive

4. WATERSHED: Lake Austin

5. THIS SITE IS WITHIN THE (Check all that apply)
   - Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone* (See note below) .................. □ YES □ No
   - Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone* ................................. □ YES □ No
   - Edwards Aquifer 1500 ft Verification Zone* ....................... □ YES □ No
   - Barton Spring Zone* .................................................... □ YES □ No

   *(as defined by the City of Austin – LDC 25-8-2 or City Code 30-5-2)

   Note: If the property is over the Edwards Aquifer Recharge zone, the Hydrogeologic Report and karst surveys must be completed and signed by a Professional Geoscientist Licensed in the State of Texas.

6. DOES THIS PROJECT PROPOSE FLOODPLAIN MODIFICATION? ...... □ YES** □ NO
   If yes, then check all that apply:
   - □ (1) The floodplain modifications proposed are necessary to protect the public health and safety;
   - □ (2) The floodplain modifications proposed would provide a significant, demonstrable environmental benefit, as determined by a functional assessment of floodplain health as prescribed by the Environmental Criteria Manual (ECM), or
   - □ (3) The floodplain modifications proposed are necessary for development allowed in the critical water quality zone under LDC 25-8-261 or 25-8-262, City Code 30-5-261 or 30-5-262.
   - □ (4) The floodplain modifications proposed are outside of the Critical Water Quality Zone in an area determined to be in poor or fair condition by a functional assessment of floodplain health.

   ** If yes, then a functional assessment must be completed and attached to the ERI (see ECM 1.7 and Appendix X for forms and guidance) unless conditions 1 or 3 above apply.

7. IF THE SITE IS WITHIN AN URBAN OR SUBURBAN WATERSHED, DOES THIS PROJECT PROPOSE A UTILITY LINE PARALLEL TO AND WITHIN THE CRITICAL WATER QUALITY ZONE? ............................................................ □ YES*** □ NO

   ***If yes, then riparian restoration is required by LDC 25-8-261(E) or City Code 30-5-261(E) and a functional assessment must be completed and attached to the ERI (see ECM1.5 and Appendix X for forms and guidance).

8. There is a total of 1 (#’s) Critical Environmental Feature(s)(CEFs) on or within 150 feet of the project site. If CEF(s) are present, attach a detailed DESCRIPTION of the CEF(s), color PHOTOGRAPHS, the CEF WORKSHEET and provide DESCRIPTIONS of the proposed CEF buffer(s) and/or wetland mitigation. Provide the number of each type of CEFs on or within 150 feet of the site (Please provide the number of CEFs):
Soil Series Unit Names, Infiltration Characteristics & Thickness

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Soil Series Unit Name &amp; Subgroup**</th>
<th>Group*</th>
<th>Thickness (feet)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant soils and Urban land, 5 to 18 percent slopes</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tarrant soils and Urban land, 18 to 40 percent slopes</td>
<td>C</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*(Soil Hydrologic Groups Definitions (Abbreviated))

A. Soils having a high infiltration rate when thoroughly wetted.
B. Soils having a moderate infiltration rate when thoroughly wetted.
C. Soils having a slow infiltration rate when thoroughly wetted.
D. Soils having a very slow infiltration rate when thoroughly wetted.

**Subgroup Classification – See Classification of Soil Series Table in County Soil Survey.
**Description of Site Topography and Drainage (Attach additional sheets if needed):**

The property slopes from the west south west to the east northeast toward Lake Austin/Colorado River. The property slopes steeply adjacent to the river. A canyon rimrock (CEF) averaging approximately 8 feet tall transects the property in a north northwest/south south east orientation. The canyon rimrock abuts Lake Austin for a significant portion of the property shoreline. Westlake Drive abuts the property to the west southwest. An outbuilding is also present to the west of the main residence. The entire property is forested. No fringe wetlands are present along the property shoreline.

**List surface geologic units below:**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Geologic Units Exposed at Surface</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trinity Group</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Brief description of site geology (Attach additional sheets if needed):**

Limestone, dolomite, and marl in alternating resistant and recessive beds forming stair step topography; limestone, alphanthic to fine grained, hard to soft and marly, light grey to yellowish grey; dolomite, fine grained, porous, yellowish brown; marine megafossils include steinkems, rudists oysters, and echinoids; upper part relatively thinner bedded, more dolomitic and less fossiliferous than lower part, thickness about 220 feet.

**Wells – Identify all recorded and unrecorded wells on site (test holes, monitoring, water, oil, unplugged, capped and/or abandoned wells, etc.):**

There are 0 (#) wells present on the project site and the locations are shown and labeled 0 (#'s) The wells are not in use and have been properly abandoned. 0 (#'s) The wells are not in use and will be properly abandoned. 0 (#'s) The wells are in use and comply with 16 TAC Chapter 76. There are 0 (#)'s wells that are off-site and within 150 feet of this site.
11. **THE VEGETATION REPORT** – Provide the information requested below:

**Brief description of site plant communities (Attach additional sheets if needed):**

The property has a forested vegetation community, with natural/native vegetation on much of the property. Escarpment live oak (*Quercus fusiformis*), southern live oak (*Quercus virginiana*), and sugar-berry (*Celtis laevigata*) are the dominant canopy species on the property. Both canopy species along with Texas persimmon (*Diospyros texana*), Chinese privet (*Ligustrum sinense*), Carolina cherry laurel (*Prunus caroliniana*), and Chinese tallow (*Triadica sebifera*) are included in the sapling/shrub layer. The herbaceous layer on the property includes landscaping ivies, Chinese privet, turk's cap (*Malvaviscus arboreus*), poison ivy (*Toxicodendron radicans*), and indian wood-oats (*Chasmanthium latifolium*).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Woodland species</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Common Name</strong></td>
<td><strong>Scientific Name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern live oak</td>
<td><em>Quercus virginiana</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Escarpment live oak</td>
<td><em>Quercus fusiformis</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sugar-berry</td>
<td><em>Celtis laevigata</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is woodland community on site ………………… □ YES □ NO (Check one).
If yes, list the dominant species below:

There is grassland/prairie/savanna on site……………… □ YES □ NO (Check one).
If yes, list the dominant species below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Grassland/prairie/savanna species</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Common Name</strong></td>
<td><strong>Scientific Name</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There is hydrophytic vegetation on site ………………… □ YES □ NO (Check one).
If yes, list the dominant species in table below (next page):
## Hydrophytic plant species

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Common Name</th>
<th>Scientific Name</th>
<th>Wetland Indicator Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A tree survey of all trees with a diameter of at least eight inches measured four and one-half feet above natural grade level has been completed on the site.

☐ YES ☐ NO (Check one).

### 12. WASTEWATER REPORT – Provide the information requested below.

Wastewater for the site will be treated by (Check of that Apply):

☐ On-site system(s)
☑ City of Austin Centralized sewage collection system
☐ Other Centralized collection system

*Note: All sites that receive water or wastewater service from the Austin Water Utility must comply with City Code Chapter 15-12 and wells must be registered with the City of Austin*

The site sewage collection system is designed and will be constructed to in accordance to all State, County and City standard specifications.

☐ YES ☐ NO (Check one).

Calculations of the size of the drainfield or wastewater irrigation area(s) are attached at the end of this report or shown on the site plan.

☐ YES ☐ NO ☐ Not Applicable (Check one).

Wastewater lines are proposed within the Critical Water Quality Zone?

☐ YES ☑ NO (Check one). If yes, then provide justification below:
Is the project site is over the Edwards Aquifer?
☐ YES ☑ NO (Check one).

If yes, then describe the wastewater disposal systems proposed for the site, its treatment level and effects on receiving watercourses or the Edwards Aquifer.


13. One (1) hard copy and one (1) electronic copy of the completed assessment have been provided.

Date(s) ERI Field Assessment was performed: June 22, 2018

Date(s)

My signature certifies that to the best of my knowledge, the responses on this form accurately reflect all information requested.

Christopher Little
Print Name

281 252 9799
Telephone
clittle@descoenv.com
Email Address

Signature

DESCO Environmental Consultants, LP
Name of Company

July 13, 2018
Date

For project sites within the Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone, my signature and seal also certifies that I am a licensed Professional Geoscientist in the State of Texas as defined by ECM 1.12.3(A).

P.G.
Seal
# City of Austin Environmental Resource Inventory - Critical Environmental Feature Worksheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Primary Contact Name</th>
<th>Christopher Little</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Phone Number</td>
<td>512-252-9799</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepared By</td>
<td>Christopher Little</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Email Address</td>
<td><a href="mailto:clittle@descoenv.com">clittle@descoenv.com</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Feature Details

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Type</th>
<th>Feature ID</th>
<th>Feature Longitude (WGS 1984 in Meters)</th>
<th>Feature Latitude (WGS 1984 in Meters)</th>
<th>Wetland Dimensions (ft)</th>
<th>Rimrock/Bluff Dimensions (ft)</th>
<th>Recharge Feature Dimensions</th>
<th>Springs Est Discharge</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Canyon Rimrock</td>
<td>Rimrock</td>
<td>3355498.24604</td>
<td>617392.48950</td>
<td>72.31</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Please state the method of coordinate data collection and the approximate precision and accuracy of the points and the unit of measurement.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Accuracy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GPS</td>
<td>sub-meter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Surveyed</td>
<td>meter</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>&gt; 1 meter</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Professional Geologists apply seal below.

For rimrock, locate the midpoint of the segment that describes the feature.

For wetlands, locate the approximate centroid of the feature and the estimated area.

For a spring or seep, locate the source of groundwater that feeds a pool or stream.
Figure 1: Site Specific Geologic Map with 2' Topography
3801 Westlake Drive
Travis County, Texas

Map Base: 2016 CIR Aerial Imagery from TNRIS
Map Datum: NAD 1983 UTM Zone 14N, meters
Map Date: June 27, 2018
Figure 2: Historical Aerial Imagery
3801 Westlake Drive
Travis County, Texas

Map Base: 1996 Aerial Imagery from TNRIS
Map Datum: NAD 1983 UTM Zone 14N, meters
Map Date: June 27, 2018
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Figure 3: Site Soil Map
3801 Westlake Drive
Travis County, Texas

Map Base: 2016 Aerial Imagery from TNRIS
Map Datum: NAD 1983 UTM Zone 14N, meters
Map Date: June 27, 2018
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Soils (USDA/NRCS)

Soil Series
Lu: Gaddy soils and Urban land, 0 to 1 percent slopes, occasionally flooded
TeE: Tarrant soils and Urban land, 5 to 18 percent slopes
TeF: Tarrant soils and Urban land, 18 to 40 percent slopes
TuD: Travis soils and urban land, 1 to 8 percent slopes
W: Water
Figure 5: CWQZ and Fully Developed Floodplain Map
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Figure 6: 3801 Westlake Dr - ERI Site Photos

Photo 1: Looking down driveway from Westlake Drive. Photo is facing the east northeast.

Photo 2: Front of property from Westlake Drive. Photo is facing the east northeast.
Photo 3: Front of residence taken from driveway. Photo is facing the northeast.

Photo 4: Outbuilding located to the west of the main residence. Photo is facing the north.
Photo 5: Back of residence and drained swimming pool. Photo is facing the northwest.

Photo 6: Path from residence down to the dock. Photo is facing the east northeast.
Photo 7: Dock over Lake Austin. Photo is facing the east northeast.

Photo 8: Canyon rimrock (CEF) adjacent to Lake Austin along the eastern boundary of the property. Photo is facing the north northwest.