

ITEM FOR ENVIRONMENTAL COMMISSION AGENDA

COMMISSION MEETING DATE:	04/15/2020
NAME & NUMBER OF PROJECT:	Albert H. Ullrich Water Treatment Plant SPC-03-0005C(R1)
NAME OF APPLICANT OR ORGANIZATION:	MWM Design Group; Shari Pape
LOCATION:	3602½ Redbud Trail Unit C, 78746
COUNCIL DISTRICT:	District 8
Environmental Review staff:	Scott Hiers, Environmental Scientist Senior, Watershed Protection Department, 512.974.1916, scott.hiers@austintexas.gov
	Pamela Abee-Taulli, Environmental Review Specialist Senior, Development Services Department, 512.974.1879, pamela.abee- taulli@austintexas.gov
WATERSHED:	Bee Creek, Little Bee Creek, & Lake Austin watersheds, Water Supply Rural Classification, Drinking Water Protection Zone
REQUEST:	Variance request is as follows: Request to vary from LDC 25-8-281(C)(2)(b) to allow the construction within 150-foot Critical Environmental Feature (CEF) buffer for a Rimrock CEF.
STAFF RECOMMENDATION:	Staff recommends this variance, having determined the findings of fact to have been met.
STAFF CONDITIONS:	None.

Staff Findings of Fact



Development Services Department Staff Recommendations Concerning Required Findings

Project Name & Case Number:	Albert H. Ullrich Water Treatment Plant - SPC-03-0005C(R1)
Ordinance Standard:	Watershed Protection Ordinance
Variance Request:	To allow construction within 150-foot Critical Environmental Feature (CEF) buffer for a Rimrock CEF [LDC 25-8-281(C)(2)(b)].

Include an explanation with each applicable finding of fact.

- A. Land Use Commission variance determinations from Chapter 25-8-41 of the CityCode:
 - 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. Other City of Austin water treatment plants have the same chemical feed system in place to help control zebra mussel infestations in the raw water transmission main. Chemical treatment is necessary to control zebra mussel infestations in raw water transmission mains.

- 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 variance is not necessitated by the design. No alternative locations are available on site for a Zebra Mussel Mitigation System. The system must be placed in or near the existing intake pump house. There is not enough room in the existing pump station to house the entire system, such as the chemical storage. All the proposed construction coincides within areas of existing impervious cover. No additional impervious cover is being added.

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

Yes. The variance is a minimum deviation from the code requirement and is allowing for a reasonable use of the property. No new impervious cover is proposed. The Zebra Mussel Mitigation System and the associated construction activities is in areas, or adjacent to areas, with existing impervious cover or development. The piping for the chemical storage and metering station is the shortest and most direct route to the existing building, and the system is located where there is already an asphalt driveway or development.

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

Yes. The variance with the staff recommended conditions does not create a probability of significant harmful environmental consequences. Construction is within existing structures or where there is existing impervious cover. The chemical tank and piping are double contained. The equipment pad is curbed and covered with a canopy. The pump metering station includes a virtual day tank and there are automated valves at the pump bay that close if the pumps fail or when the pumps are not running. No new impervious cover is being added. As part of the Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan, temporary sedimentation and erosion controls will be installed prior to the start of construction activities. The applicant is providing wetland plantings along the shoreline that will reduce shoreline erosion and reduce the possibility of sediment-laden surface runoff from entering the lake.

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 variance will result in water quality that is at least equal to the water quality achievable without the variance. The proposed construction will not impact existing water quality. No new impervious cover is proposed. During construction, Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan best practices will be employed to prevent construction sediment and debris from entering the stormwater runoff, and additional wetland plants along the shoreline will be provided to enhance the water quality of surface water runoff.

Staff Recommendation: Staff recommends the Findings of Fact have been met.

- 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 Recommendation: N/A.

Hydrogeologic Reviewer (WPD)

Scort & Him

Date: 04-02-2020

Scott E. Hiers

CA

Date: 04/02/2020

Environmental Officer (WPD)

Chris Herrington

Applicant Form and Findings of Fact



ENVIRONMENTAL COMMISSION VARIANCE APPLICATION FORM

PROJECT DESCRIPTION Applicant Contact Information

Name of Applicant	Minda Sarmiento, Austin Public Works	
Street Address	6800 Burleson Road, Bldg 312, Ste 200	
City State ZIP Code	Austin, Texas 78744	
Work Phone	512-974-5645	
E-Mail Address	minda.sarmiento@austintexas.gov	
Variance Case Information		
Case Name	ALBERT H. ULLRICH WATER TREATMENT PLANT	
Case Number	SPC-03-0005C(R1)	
Address or Location	3602 1/2 REDBUD TRL UNIT C	
Environmental Reviewer Name	Pamela Abee-Taulli	
Environmental Resource Management Reviewer Name	Scott Hiers	
Applicable Ordinance	LDC 25-8-261 LDC 25-8-42(A)	
Watershed Name	Lake Austin; Bee Creek	
Watershed Classification	Urban Suburban Water Supply Suburban Water Supply Rural Barton Springs Zone	
Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone	 Barton Springs Segment Not in Edwards Aquifer Zones 	
Edwards Aquifer Contributing Zone	🗆 Yes 📮 No	

Distance to Nearest Classified Waterway	40'
Water and Waste Water service to be provided by	Not Applicable
Request	The variance request is as follows (Cite code references: Land Development Code 25-8-281: Construction is prohibited within 150' of a Critical Environmental Feature (rimrock and wetlands).

Impervious cover	Existing	Proposed
square footage:		0
acreage:	8.81	0
percentage:	6.24%	0
	1	

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) The site terrain slopes (~13%) towards the lake shoreline and is located in the Lake Austin and Bee Creek Watersheds. The chemical metering station will be installed at an elevation of ~562' and the chemical piping will be installed under the access road, which is cut into the hillside, and slopes to the low service pump station (LSPS) at elevation ~512'. The terrain is covered with trees and brush. The trees are sycamore, juniper, cedar elm, live oaks, maple silverleaf and a Spanish oak. There is one heritage tree: a 33.5" live oak located outside of the LOC at an elevation higher than the proposed work ground, although the dripline extends over the LOC. The chemical metering station will be installed in the WQTZ and the chemical piping will have to cross through the CWQZ in order to reach the pump station. There is rimrock adjacent to the LSPS so the proposed installation will be located inside of the 150' rimrock CEF buffer. No work is proposed inside the 100-year floodplain. In addition, there are two identified wetlands areas on either side of the LSPS right at the shoreline. The wetlands will not be impacted by the proposed construction.

Clearly indicate in what way the proposed project does not comply with current Code (include maps and exhibits)	• Construction will be performed within the 150' rimrock CEF buffer and within 150' wetlands CEF buffer.

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: Zebra Mussel Mitigation Techniques – Chemical Storage and Feed System

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 The proposed construction prevents zebra mussels from clogging the LSPS of the water treatment plant. All water plants with LSPSs drawing water from zebra mussel infested water bodies will require treatment to prevent zebra mussels from settling on the pump intake equipment and piping. If there is no room in the existing pump station, then the new construction must be installed outdoors in protected areas adjacent to the lakeshore.

- 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 design decision to place the chemical storage and metering station next to the lakeshore is because the LSPS is already on the lakeshore. There is no other feasible location.

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

Yes The chemical storage and metering station was situated where there is already an asphalt driveway, which means the station will require no new impervious area. The chemical piping was routed in the shortest and most direct route and does not disturb any vegetated areas.

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

Yes The chemical storage and metering station is designed to prevent any harmful environmental consequences. The tank and piping are double contained. The equipment pad is curbed and covered with a canopy. The pump metering station includes a virtual day tank and there are automated

valves at each pump bay that automatically close if the pumps fail and whenever the pumps are not running.

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 proposed construction will not impact existing water quality. During construction, SWPPP best practices will be employed to prevent construction sediment and debris from entering the stormwater runoff.

- 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):
 - 1. The criteria for granting a variance in Subsection (A) are met;
 - Yes Installing a utility line in the CWQZ is permitted per Article 7 Division 1 (D) as long as the utility line follows the most direct path to minimize disturbance, which is true for the proposed utility lines.

The proposed construction is inside the WQTZ but is being installed where an existing asphalt driveway exists. No new impervious cover is proposed.

- 2. The requirement for which a variance is requested prevents a reasonable, economic use of the entire property;
 - Yes The chemical storage and metering station will prevent zebra mussels from clogging the pump intake equipment and piping. Without it, the City would have to constantly physically remove the zebra mussels settling on the equipment at great expense.
- 3. The variance is the minimum deviation from the code requirement necessary to allow a reasonable, economic use of the entire property.
 - Yes The variance requested is the minimum deviation necessary to allow reasonable, economic use of the entire property. The chemical storage and metering station will prevent zebra mussels from clogging the pump intake equipment and piping. Without it, the City would have to constantly physically remove the zebra mussels settling on the equipment at great expense.

**Variance approval requires all above affirmative findings.



OveriewUllrichWTPZebraMusselChemicalStorage&FeedSystem February 07, 2020 Edit this text with your name under File ---> Map Document Properties ---> Author



13 of 53





B-10

14 of 53

 $\overline{2}$

TREE TABLE		
TREE #	DESCRIPTION	
2002	16" SYCAMORE	
2003	17" SYCAMORE	
2004	18" SYCAMORE	
2005	13" SYCAMORE	
2006	15" SYCAMORE	
2007	10" JUNIPER	
1000	20" JUNIPER (10"/2-7"/6")	
2008	16" JUNIPER	
1001	9" JUNIPER	
1002	11" CEDAR ELM	
1004	8" LIVE OAK	
1005	8" LIVE OAK	
1006	14.5" JUNIPER (10"/5"/4")	
1007	10" LIVE OAK	
1008	10" JUNIPER	
1009	10" MAPLE SILVERLEAF	
1010	10" LIVE OAK	
1011	10" LIVE OAK	
1012	33.5" LIVE OAK (3-15"/7")	
1013	9" JUNIPER	
1014	11" LIVE OAK	
1015	11" JUNIPER	
1016	22" CEDAR ELM (15"/14")	
1017	11" SPANISH OAK	
1018	11" LIVE OAK	
1019	9" JUNIPER	

2006 15" SYCAMORE 2007 | 10" JUNIPER 1000 20" JUNIPER (10"/2-7"/6") 2008 16" JUNIPER 1001 9" JUNIPER 1002 11" CEDAR ELM 1004 8" LIVE OAK 1005 8" LIVE OAK 1006 14.5" JUNIPER (10"/5"/4") 1007 10" LIVE OAK 1008 10" JUNIPER 1009 10" MAPLE SILVERLEAF 1010 | 10" LIVE OAK 1011 10" LIVE OAK H1012 33.5" LIVE OAK (3-15"/7") 1013 9" JUNIPER 1014 | 11" LIVE OAK 1015 | 11" JUNIPER 1016 22" CEDAR ELM (15"/14") 1017 11" SPANISH OAK 1018 | 11" LIVE OAK 1019 9" JUNIPER

TREE TABLE - JANUARY 2020

2002 16" SYCAMORE

2003 | 17" SYCAMORE 2004 | 18" SYCAMORE

2005 13" SYCAMORE

DESCRIPTION

TREE #

	NORTHING	AND EASTING	TABLE	
NO.	NORTHING	EASTING	DESCRIPTION	$\boldsymbol{\beta}$
1	10080511.45	3099544.98	90 DEG BEND	$\mathcal{V} / \mathcal{V}$
2	10080649.63	3099604.67	45 DEG BEND	
3	10080744.45	3099576.47	22.5 DEG BEND	
4	10080791.57	3099581.38	22.5 DEG BEND	X / /
5	10080823.26	3099598.54	22.5 DEG BEND	
6	10080847.69	3099628.64	22.5 DEG BEND	₹
7	10080860.14	3099670.51	22.5 DEG BEND	
8	10080853.53	3099734.03	45 DEG BEND	
9	10080823.38	3099758.49	45 DEG BEND	
10	10080535.28	3099471.50	CONCRETE PAD	
11	10080549.06	3099477.43	CONCRETE PAD	<u>}</u>
12	10080535.41	3099509.12	CONCRETE PAD]\$\/\\
13	10080521.64	3099503.19	CONCRETE PAD	3 STA 2-

1011 0

B-10

15 of 53

Applicant Exhibits

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) 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.

- There is a total of _____(#'s) Critical Environmental Feature(s)(CEFs) on or within150 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*):

_____ (#'s) Canyon Rimrock(s) _____ (#'s) Wetland(s)

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 <u>not provided</u>, 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. <u>Request forms for administrative variances from requirements stated in LDC 25-8-281 are available from Watershed Protection, Department 9.4 for CEF descriptions.</u>

Please see Attachment 9.4 for CEF descriptions.

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

All ERI reports must include:

- (Attachment 9.1)
 Site Specific Geologic Map with 2-ft Topography
- (Attachment 9.2)
 Historic Aerial Photo of the Site
- (Attachment 9.3)
 Site Soil Map
- (Attachment 9.4) Critical Environmental Features and Well Location Map on current Aerial Photo with 2-ft Topography

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.

Soil Series Unit Names, Infiltration Characteristics & Thickness		
Soil Series Unit Name & Subgroup**	Group*	Thickness (feet)

*Soil Hydrologic Groups Definitions *(Abbreviated)*

- A. Soils having a <u>high infiltration</u> rate when thoroughly wetted.
- B. Soils having a <u>moderate</u> <u>infiltration</u> rate when thoroughly wetted.
- C. Soils having a <u>slow infiltration</u> rate when thoroughly wetted.
- D. Soils having a <u>very slow</u> <u>infiltration</u> rate when thoroughly wetted.

**Subgroup Classification – See <u>Classification of Soil Series</u> Table in County Soil Survey.

Description of Site Topography and Drainage (Attach additional sheets if needed):

List surface geologic units below:

Geologic Units Exposed at Surface			
Group	Formation	Member	

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

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

There are ____(#) wells present on the project site and the locations are shown and labeled

____(#'s)The wells are not in use and have been properly abandoned.

____(#'s)The wells are not in use and will be properly abandoned.

____(#'s)The wells are in use and comply with 16 TAC Chapter 76.

There are ____(#'s) wells that are off-site and within 150 feet of this site.

There are no wells within 150 feet of the project limits. See attachment 9.4 for location of wells on the project property but farther than 150 feet from the project site.

WPD ERM ERI-2014-01

11. **THE VEGETATION REPORT** – Provide the information requested below:

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

Woodland species			
Common Name	Scientific Name		

Grassland/prairie/savanna species			
Common Name	Scientific Name		

Hydrophytic plant species						
Common Name	Scientific Name	Wetland Indicator Status				

A tree survey of all trees with a diameter of at least eight inches measured four and onehalf 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):

- \Box 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.

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. \Box YES \Box NO \Box Not Applicable (*Check one*).

Wastewater lines are proposed within the Critical Water Quality Zone? \Box YES \Box NO (*Check one*). If yes, then provide justification below:

Is the project site is over the Edwards Aquifer?

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: _____

Date(s)

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

Print Name	
MM	S

Signature

Telephone

Email Address

Name of Company

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

1	Project Name:	5	Primary Contact Name:	
2	Project Address:	6	Phone Number:	
3	Site Visit Date:	7	Prepared By:	
4	Environmental Resource Inventory Date:	8	Email Address:	
<u> </u>				

	٩	FEATURE TYPE	FEATURE ID	URE ID (S-1) FEATURE LONGITUDE (WGS 1984 in Meters) coordinate notation		FEATURE LATITUDE WETI (WGS 1984 in Meters) DIMENS		WETLAND RIMRO MENSIONS (ft) DIMEN		CK/BLUFF	RECHARGE FEATURE				Springs Est. Discharge	
	3	Feature, Spring}	(eg S-1)			coordinate	coordinate notation X Y		Y Y	Length Avg Height		X Y Z Trer		Trend	cfs	
**See note below.																

City of Austin Use Only CASE NUMBER:			Please state precision an <u>Method</u>	e the method nd accuracy of
			GPS	
For rimrock, locate the midpoint of the	For wetlands, locate the	For a spring or seep, locate	Surveyed	
segment that describes the feature.	approximate centroid of the feature and the estimated area.	the source of groundwater that feeds a pool or stream.	Other	
				Professiona
X	×	Ċ		

**City of Austin does not consider the depression identified during the site visit to be a recharge feature per the January 30, 2020 email from Minda Sarmiento.

l of coordinate data collection and the approximate of the points and the unit of measurement.

- Accuracy
- sub-meter 🛛
- meter
- >1 meter

al Geologists apply seal below

ATTACHMENT 9.1 - SITE SPECIFIC GEOLOGIC MAP

Attachment 9.1 - USGS Texas Geology Area Description

USGS Texas Geology describes this area as "Fredericksburg Group undivided, rock unit code Kfr. Edwards limestone, limestone, dolomite, and chert; limestone aphanitic to fine grained, massive to thin bedded, hard, brittle, in part rudistid blostromes, much miliolid biospraite; dolomite fine to very fine grained, porous, medium gray to grayish brown; chert nodules and plates common, varies in amount from bed to bed, some intervals free of chert, mostly white to light gray; in zone of weathering considerable recrystallized, "honeycombed," and cavernous forming an aguifer; forms flat areas and plateaus bordered by scarps; thickness 60-350 feet, things northward. Comanche peak limestone, fine to very fined grained, fairly hard, nodular, light gray, weathers white, extensively burrowed, burrow fillings slightly coarser and darker, typically crops out in scarp face beneath Edwards Limestone; thickness up to 80 feet, feathers out southward near Williamson Travis County line. Keys Valley Marl, soft, white; marine megafossils include Exogyra texana, Gryphaea mucronata, and other pelecypods, ammonites, gastropods, and echinoids; thickness up to 50 feet, feathers out southward near Williamson Travis County line. Cedar PArk Limestone, Kcp, lithologicvally and faunally similar to Comanche Peak Limestone; thickness 40 feet, south of Williamson Travis County line upper part interfingers with Edwards Limestone and lower part is mapped with Bee Cave Marl, Kbc, lithologically and faunally similar to Keys Valley Marl, except Exogyra texana are more abundant and ammonites are scare; thickness 25-40 feet."

ATTACHMENT 9.2 - HISTORIC AERIAL PHOTO OF THE SITE

ATTACHMENT 9.3 - SITE SOIL MAP

Natural Resources
 Conservation Service

Web Soil Survey National Cooperative Soil Survey

31 of 53

ATTACHMENT 9.4 - CEF AND WELL LOCATION MAP

CEF DESCRIPTIONS

Baer Engineering conducted a field survey of the assessment area on August 28, 2019. The assessment area is defined as the project area plus a 150-ft buffer. Approximately five-tenths of an inch of rain were recorded near the project area in the week before commencement of the field surveys. No rain was recorded during field surveys.

For wetland identification, Baer Engineering used the recommended routine method, outlined in the COA ECM Section 1.10.3. This method assumes adequate hydrology and hydric soils if the area under examination is dominated (over 50% vegetative cover) by Facultative-wet and/or Obligate plant species (as listed in the National List of Plant Species That Occur in Wetlands, South Plains, Region 6, U.S. Department of the Interior, Washington D.C.) and an abrupt boundary is evident between these Facultative-wet and/or Obligate plant communities. The wetlands described in this report met the criteria in the wetland delineation method described above. No official delineation was conducted and the dimensions provided in this report are estimates.

Four (4) CEFs (two wetlands, one rimrock, & one recharge feature) were observed within the assessment area. The CEFs are described below.

Wetland, W-1: This wetland was observed along the eastern edge of the assessment area, at the shore of the Colorado River. The river bank was dominated by bald cypress (*Taxodium distichum*, OBL), with some glossy privet (*Ligustrum lucidum*, UPL), green ash (*Fraxinus pennsylvanica*, FAC), and American sycamore (*Platanus occidentalis*, FAC). Jamaican sawgrass (*Cladium mariscus*, OBL) and taro (*Colocasia esculenta*, OBL) were observed beyond the fence line at the shore, but inaccessible. The wetland was approximately 5 to 60 feet wide, observed from the edge of the water, and approximately 250 feet long. Please see **Photographs 1-2**.

Wetland, W-2: This wetland was observed northwest of the facility at the bank of the Colorado River, at the north end of the assessment area. Bald cypress, smallspike false nettle (*Boehmeria cylindrica*, FACW), and Emory sedge (*Carex emoryii*, FACW) dominated the area, along with some glossy privet and American sycamore. The wetland was approximately 15 feet wide from the edge of the water and 140 feet long following the shoreline. Please see **Photographs 3-4**.

Rimrock, Ullrich Rimrock: Rimrock was observed at the center of the assessment area, northwest of the proposed roadway and southeast of the proposed work adjacent to the existing roadway. The rim rock extends northeast to southwest for approximately 430 feet. The estimated height of the rimrock is 30 feet from the base to the upper edge. Please see **Photograph 5**.

Recharge Feature, Solution Recharge Feature: A recharge feature was observed within a depression that is approximately five to six feet below the nearby footpath surface and approximately three to four feet below the level of the nearby Colorado River. The depression contained several inches of leaf litter and detritus. The initial site visit was conducted after a rain event the evening before and little to no water was observed in the depression. Comparing the depression and rimrock discussed above to geologic maps of the area, these features appear to

correlate with a mapped fault depicted on the site. The feature was approximately 350 long, 20 feet wide, and 4 feet below the surrounding grade. Please see **Photographs 5-6**.

VEGETATION REPORT

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF SITE PLANT COMMUNITIES:

The Site is located in the U.S. EPA-defined Balcones Canyonlands ecoregion, described below:

The Balcones Canyonlands are highly dissected through the erosion and solution of springs, streams, and rivers working both above and below ground; percolation through the porous limestone contributes to the recharge of the Edwards Aquifer. High gradient streams originating from springs in steep-sided canyons supply water for development on the Texas Blackland Prairies at the eastern base of the escarpment. This ecoregion supports a number of endemic plants and has a higher representation of deciduous woodland than elsewhere on the Edwards Plateau, with escarpment black cherry, Texas mountain-laurel, madrone, Lacey oak, bigtooth maple, and Carolina basswood. Some relicts of eastern swamp communities, such as baldcypress, American sycamore, and black willow, occur along major streamcourses. It is likely that these trees have persisted as relicts of moister, cooler climates following the Pleistocene glacial epoch. Toward the west, the vegetation changes gradually as the climate becomes more arid. Plateau live oak woodland is eventually restricted to north and east facing slopes and floodplains, and dry slopes are covered with open shrublands of juniper, sumac, sotol, acacia, honey mesquite, and ceniza.

Vegetation within the project area was characterized by three habitat types: **Juniper Woodland**, **Deciduous Floodplain Forest**, and **Mowed Grasses**.

The **Juniper Woodland** occupied the upland portions of the project area adjacent to the driveway. Canopy cover was mostly dense, with some open grassy areas on the eastern side. Trees were predominantly ashe juniper (*Juniperus ashei*) with some cedar elm (*Ulmus crassifolia*) and live oak (*Quercus fusiformis*). The moderately dense midstory included Texas persimmon (*Diospyrus texana*), Texas mountain laurel (*Sephora secundaflora*), agarita (*Mahonia trifoliolata*), yaupon (*Ilex vomitoria*), and elbowbush (*Forestiera pubescens*). Shrubby boneset (*Ageratina havanensis*) and cedar sedge (*Carex planostachys*) dominated the wooded understory. The grassy opening vegetation predominantly consisted of silver bluestem (*Bothriochloa laguroides*), doveweed (*Croton monanthaginus*), prairie coneflower (*Ratibida columnifera*), and other grasses and forbs as groundcover. Additionally, evergreen and flameleaf sumac (*Rhus virens, Rhus lanceolata*) and Texas kidneywood (*Eysenhardtia texana*) grew as a midstory with some prickly pear species (*Opuntia sp.*). Please see **Photographs 7-9**.

The **Deciduous Floodplain Forest** was observed below the bluff, east of the paved driveway. Canopy cover was dense, with cottonwood (*Populus deltoides*), bald cypress, American sycamore, and glossy privet as overstory. Smaller woody vegetation included ash species (*Fraxinus sp.*) and chinaberry (*Melia azedarach*), with some groundcover from poison ivy (*Toxicodendron radicans*), frostweed (*Verbesina virginica*), and Virginia wild rye (*Elymus virginicus*). The understory vegetation had relatively low density. The previouslydescribed wetlands occurred along the river bank on the edges of this habitat. Please see **Photograph 10**.

Mowed Grasses were observed along the paved driveway within the project area. Identifiable grasses included silver bluestem and perennial rye (*Lolium perenne*), and forbs included lemon beebalm (*Monarda citriodora*), tie vine (*Ipomoea cordatotriloba*), western ragweed (*Ambrosia psilostachya*), Indian Blanket (*Gaillardia pulchella*), marestail weed (*Erigeron canadensis*), as well as plants as found in the wooded openings in the Juniper Woodland, described above. Please see **Photograph 11**.

Photograph 1: Wetland W-1 – A view of the wetland, dominated by bald cypress along the bank of the Colorado River.

Photograph 2: Wetland W-1 – Photo through perimeter fence of taro at river bank.

Photograph 3: Wetland W-2 – Wetland observed on northern side of assessment area along bank of the Colorado River, outside of perimeter fence. Bald cypress and American sycamore can be seen.

Photograph 4: Wetland W-2 – View of wetland vegetation at the river bank outside of perimeter fence, including sedges and shortspike false nettle.

Photograph 5: Ullrich Rimrock, Solution Recharge Feature – This depression was observed east of the paved driveway and at the foot of the rimrock.

Photograph 6: Ullrich Rimrock, Solution Recharge Feature – The figure below depicts the location of the feature in blue.

Photograph 7: Example of Juniper Woodland, west of paved driveway.

Photograph 8: Example of Juniper Woodland, east of paved driveway and above floodplain bluff.

Photograph 9: Grassy opening in Juniper Woodland, east of paved driveway.

Photograph 10: Example of Deciduous Floodplain Forest between the river bank and Ullrich Rimrock.

Photograph 11: Example of Mowed Grasses along paved driveway.

ATTACHMENT 9.5 - EDWARDS AQUIFER RECHARGE AND CONTRIBUTING ZONES MAP

B-10

42 of 53

ATTACHMENT 9.6 - WQTZ AND CWQZ MAP

ATTACHMENT 9.7 - CITY OF AUSTIN FULLY DEVELOPED FLOODPLAINS MAP

ENVIRONMENTAL COMMISSION MOTION 20200415 006b

Date: April 15, 2020

Subject: Albert H. Ullrich Water Treatment Plant, SPC-03-0005C(R1)

Motion by: Kevin Ramberg

Seconded by: Katie Coyne

RATIONALE:

WHEREAS, the Environmental Commission recognizes the applicant is requesting a variance from LDC 25-8-281 (C)(2)(b) to allow construction within the 150-foot buffer for a rimrock Critical Environmental Feature.

WHEREAS, the Environmental Commission recognizes that staff recommend the variance without conditions having determined the findings of fact have been met.

THEREFORE, the Environmental Commission recommends approval of the requested variance from LDC 25-8-281 (C)(2)(b) to allow construction within the 150-foot buffer for a rimrock Critical Environmental Feature with the following;

Staff Conditions: None

Environmental Commission Conditions: None

VOTE 9-0

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

Approved By:

hinde to guerrero

Linda Guerrero, Environmental Commission Chair

50 of 53

OveriewUllrichWTPZebraMusselChemicalStorage&FeedSystem February 07, 2020 Edit this text with your name under File --> Map Document Properties --> Author

ZONING AND PLATTING COMMISSION SITE PLAN VARIANCE AND COMMISSION APPROVAL REVIEW SHEET

CASE NUMBER:	SPC-03-0005C(R1)	ZAP DATE : 5/5/2020
PROJECT NAME:	Albert H. Ullrich Water Treatment Plant	
ADDRESS:	3602-1/2 Redbud Trail Unit C	
APPLICANT:	City of Austin	
AGENT:	MWM Design (512) 689-3289	
CASE MANAGER:	Jeremy Siltala (512) 974-2945 or jeremy.siltala@austintexas.gov	
WATERSHED:	Bee Creek, Little Bee Creek, Lake Austin (Suburban)	

APPLICATION REQUEST: The applicant has requested a variance from LDC 25-8-281(C)(2)(b) to allow construction within the 150-foot buffer for a rimrock Critical Environmental Feature. The site is zoned Public (P) and is greater than one acre in size so a Conditional Use Permit is required [25-2-625].

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: The applicant is proposing installation of chemical storage and metering system at the Low Service Pump Station with associated improvements.

SUMMARY STAFF COMMENT: This is an urgent City project to mitigate Zebra Mussels.

STAFF RECOMMENDATION:

Staff recommends approval of the variance and conditional use permit request. The site plan will comply with all other requirements of the Land Development Code prior to its release.

SITE AREA	141.29 acres or 6,154,546 SF
ZONING	Public (P)
LAND USE	Water Treatment Plant
IMPERVIOUS COVER	SF, %
BUILDING COVERAGE	SF, %
BUILDING HEIGHT	N/A
F.A.R	N/A
VEHICULAR ACCESS	N/A
PARKING	44 automobile

PROJECT INFORMATION:

NEIGHBORHOOD ORGANIZATIONS:

Austin Lost and Found Pets Austin Neighborhoods Council Bike Austin City of Rollingwood Friends of Austin Neighborhoods Neighborhood Empowerment Foundation Preservation Austin SELTexas Save Barton Creek Assn. Save Our Springs Alliance Sierra Club, Austin Regional Group TNR BCP - Travis County Natural Resources

CONDITIONAL USE PERMIT REVIEW AND EVALUATION CRITERIA

The following evaluation is included to provide staff position on each point of the conditional use permit criteria. Section 25-5-145 of the Land Development Code states: "The Commission shall determine whether the proposed development or use of a conditional use site plan complies with the requirements of this section.

A conditional use site plan must:

- 1. Comply with the requirements of this title; Staff response: This application complies with the requirements of this title.
- 2. Comply with the objectives and purposes of the zoning district; Staff response: This application complies with the objectives and purposes of the zoning district.
- 3. Have building height, bulk, scale, setback, open space, landscaping, drainage, access, traffic circulation, and use that are compatible with the use of an abutting site; Staff response: This application is compatible with the abutting sites.
- 4. Provide adequate and convenient off-street parking and loading facilities; Staff response: Adequate parking and loading facilities have been provided.
- 5. Reasonably protect persons and property from erosion, flood, fire, noises, glare, and similar adverse effects; Staff response: The proposed project does not contribute to any of these adverse effects.

A conditional use site plan may not:

- 1. More adversely affect an adjoining site than would a permitted use; Staff response: The site plan will conform with all regulations and standards established by the Land Development Code prior to its release.
- 2. Adversely affect the safety or convenience of vehicular or pedestrian circulation, including reasonably anticipated traffic and uses in the area; Staff response: The project is not anticipated to have any detriment to safety or convenience.
- 3. Adversely affect an adjacent property or traffic control through the location, lighting, or type of signs; Staff response: No signage or lighting is proposed that would affect adjacent properties or traffic control.

COMMISSION ACTION:

The Commission may either; approve, approve with conditions or deny the conditional use site plan permit. To make a determination required for approval under <u>Section 25-5-145</u> (Evaluation of Conditional Use Site Plan), the Land Use Commission may require that a conditional use site plan comply with a condition of approval that includes a requirement for:

- 1) A special yard, open space, buffer, fence, wall, or screen;
- 2) Landscaping or erosion;
- 3) A street improvement or dedication, vehicular ingress and egress, or traffic circulation;
- 4) Signs;
- 5) Characteristics of operation, including hours;
- 6) A development schedule; or
- 7) Other measures that the Land Use Commission determines are required for compatibility with surrounding uses or the preservation of public health, safety, or welfare.