

Potpourri

POTPOURRI

Department of Agriculture and Forestry Horticulture Commission

Landscape Architect Registration Examination

The next landscape architect registration examination will be given June 8-10, 1998, beginning at 7:45 a.m. at the College of Design Building, Louisiana State University Campus, Baton Rouge, LA. The deadline for sending the application and fee is as follows:

New Candidates: February 28, 1998

Re-Take Candidates: March 14, 1998

Reciprocity Candidates: May 8, 1998

Further information pertaining to the examination may be obtained from Craig Roussel, Director, Horticulture Commission, Box 3118, Baton Rouge, LA 70821-3118, phone (504) 925-7772.

Any individual requesting special accommodations due to a disability should notify the office prior to February 28, 1998. Questions may be directed to (504) 925-7772.

Bob Odom
Commissioner

9801#013

POTPOURRI

Department of Environmental Quality Office of Air Quality and Radiation Protection Air Quality Division

St. James Parish Redesignation Plan

Under the authority of the Environmental Quality Act, R.S. 30:2001 et seq., and in accordance with the provisions of the Administrative Procedure Act, R.S. 49:950 et seq., the secretary gives notice that a revision in the State Implementation Plan (SIP) for ozone abatement procedures has been initiated to correct the point source emissions for 1990, and subsequently, to correct totals for the overall emissions budget found in the redesignation SIP which was approved by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency on November 13, 1995. The Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality (LDEQ) is also revising the contingency plan to identify the triggering event that will cause implementation of a contingency measure, an actual monitored ozone violation of the National Ambient AirQuality Standards

(NAAQS), as defined in 40 CFR 50.9, determined not to be attributable to transport.

The public comment period begins on January 20, 1998 and ends on March 4, 1998. A public hearing will be held at 7 p.m., Wednesday, February 25, 1998 in the Council Chambers, 5800 La. Highway 44, Convent, LA, to receive comments on these proposed changes. Interested persons are invited to attend and submit written or present oral comments on the proposal.

Other written comments concerning the SIP change should be submitted no later than Wednesday, March 4, 1998, at 4:30 p.m. to Annette Sharp, LDEQ Air Quality Regulatory Division, Box 82135, Baton Rouge, LA 70884-2135, phone (504) 765-0914.

A copy of the SIP changes may be viewed at the Air Quality Regulatory Division from 8 a.m. to 4 p.m., Monday through Friday, 7290 Bluebonnet, Second Floor, Baton Rouge or the Capital Regional Office, 5222 Summa Court, Baton Rouge, LA.

Gustave Von Bodungen, P.E.
Assistant Secretary

9801#085

POTPOURRI

Department of Environmental Quality Office of Air Quality and Radiation Protection Air Quality Division

State Implementation Plan (SIP) (LAC 33:III.Chapters 3-30)

The Department of Environmental Quality, Office of Air Quality and Radiation Protection, Air Quality Division will conduct a public hearing to receive comments regarding revisions to the State Implementation Plan (SIP). The revisions include amendments to various rules in LAC 33:III.Chapters 2, 5, 15, 21, 23, 25, and 30.

The hearing will be held on February 27, 1998, at 1:30 p.m. on the third floor of the Maynard Ketcham Building, Room 326, 7290 Bluebonnet Boulevard, Baton Rouge, LA. All interested persons are invited to attend and submit oral comments on the SIP revisions. Written comments may be submitted no later than March 6, 1998, to Carla Ogden, Air Quality Division, Box 82135, Baton Rouge, LA 70884-2135 or to 7290 Bluebonnet Boulevard, Second Floor, Baton Rouge, LA 70810.

A copy of the SIP changes may be viewed Monday through Friday, from 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., at the following DEQ locations:

Headquarters
Air Quality Division
7290 Bluebonnet Boulevard
Second Floor
Baton Rouge, LA

Capitol Regional Office
5222 Summa Court
Baton Rouge, LA

Acadiana Regional Office
100 Asma Boulevard
Suite 151
Lafayette, LA

Northeast Regional Office
804 Thirty-First Street
Suite D
Monroe, LA

Bayou Lafourche Regional Office
104 Lococo Drive
Raceland, LA

Northwest Regional Office
1525 Fairfield
Room 11
Shreveport, LA

Kisatchie Central Regional Office
402 Rainbow Drive
Pineville, LA

Southeast Regional Office
3501 Chateau Boulevard
W. Wing
Kenner, LA

Southwest Regional Office
3519 Patrick Street
Room 265A
Lake Charles, LA

The SIP is also distributed to the State Library of Louisiana, Louisiana Section, 760 North Third Street, Baton Rouge, LA, and 25 other depository libraries throughout the state. Please contact the State Library for locations and viewing times.

Comments may be directed to Carla Ogden at (504) 765-0916.

Gustave A. Von Bodungen, P.E.
Assistant Secretary

9801#084

POTPOURRI

Department of Environmental Quality Office of the Secretary

Risk/Cost/Benefit Statement for Laboratory Accreditation (OS007)

The following is an abbreviated version of the Risk/Cost/Benefit Statement prepared for the Joint Legislative Committee on the Budget, which consists of the main body of the statement but which excludes the attachments. The complete statement may be viewed or purchased at the Department of Environmental Quality, Investigations and Regulatory Development Division, Fourth Floor, 7290 Bluebonnet Road, Baton Rouge, LA. Additionally, the complete statement is available on the Internet at <http://www.deq.state.la.us/olae/irdd/olaeregs.htm>. Call (504) 765-0399 for additional information.

Introduction

The Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality is proposing the Laboratory Accreditation Rule (OS007). This rule seeks to establish a formal regulatory program to provide for accreditation of commercial environmental laboratories

which produce environmental data pursuant to department regulations or permits or to the Environmental Quality Act (R.S. 30:2001 et seq.). This program is authorized under R.S. 30:2011(D)(22). This program will include commercial environmental laboratories in Louisiana and those outside the state which do business in Louisiana. The department roughly estimates this to be approximately 120 laboratories.

This statement is prepared to satisfy the requirements of R.S. 30:2019(D) and R.S. 49:953(G) (Acts 600 and 642 of the 1995 Louisiana Legislature, respectively). However, this document does not purport to be a scientific quantitative analysis of cost, risk, or economic benefit, although costs of implementation were quantified to the extent practical.

The department interprets the statutes above as allowing a qualitative analysis of economic and environmental benefit where a more quantitative analysis is not practicable and when the qualitative benefits outweigh the costs in a manner which is intuitively obvious. The statute allows the secretary to certify, based on qualitative benefits alone, that the benefits of a rule outweigh the costs.

This is the approach which is taken with this risk/cost/benefit statement. As discussed further in this document, the Laboratory Accreditation Rule provides indirect environmental and economic benefits by ensuring high quality laboratory data. Assessing dollar benefits of avoided environmental risk or economic benefits of this rule is not practicable. In addition, the department asserts that the indirect and direct environmental and economic benefits to be derived from this rule will, in the judgment of reasonable persons, outweigh the costs associated with the implementation of the rule and that the rule is the most cost-effective alternative to achieve these benefits.

Risks Addressed by the Rule

Although the Laboratory Accreditation Rule does not address direct risks to human health or the environment, it does impact risk that indirectly can have great effects on human health and environment. Most regulatory programs of the department, such as the air, water, waste, and radiation programs rely principally on self-reported data from regulated entities to determine environmental violations, environmental contamination, human health and environmental risk, environmental contamination and damage, etc. Much of this self-reported information is laboratory data (e.g., discharge monitoring reports, air quality data, groundwater monitoring reports). It is absolutely essential to these programs that these laboratory data are sound. In addition, most facilities regulated by the department rely on third-party, commercial laboratories to produce part or all of their laboratory data which, in turn, is submitted to the department. These facilities are ultimately responsible for the quality of this data. It is of the utmost importance that the department, the regulated community, and the public have confidence in environmental laboratory data.

This rule addresses the direct risks of use of improper or inconsistent laboratory procedures and methods; use of faulty laboratory equipment; failure to properly maintain laboratory equipment; poor or fraudulent record keeping; improper

QA/QC procedures or data; fraudulent laboratory data; fraudulent QA/QC data; employment of untrained or unqualified personnel; and the simple accumulation of minor procedural, equipment, or record keeping errors that lead to overall lower quality laboratory data.

These direct risks can lead to many indirect risks that may be of great consequence. For example, poor or fraudulent data can lead to under reporting or over reporting of environmental violations (e.g., incorrect NPDES Discharge Monitoring Reports). It can also cause underestimation or overestimation of the extent of contamination of a remediation site. Underestimation or overestimation of human exposure to toxic agents can result from incorrect laboratory sample results. Another example is liner construction for hazardous waste or solid waste disposal facilities (e.g., landfills). Incorrect or fraudulent sample results from QA/QC testing during liner construction can lead to improper liner construction and ultimate liner failure.

Poor or fraudulent initial background groundwater sample results at a hazardous waste or solid waste disposal facility or at a remediation site can cause the subsequent groundwater monitoring program to be useless. Improper QA/QC procedures or data can render associated sample results as suspect or useless, even though they may in reality be accurate. Poor or fraudulent sample data generated during a permit application process (e.g., emission sources or wastewater discharges) may result in permit limits or conditions that are either overprotective or underprotective of human health or the environment.

These or other risks can lead to increased risk to human health or the environment (e.g., leaking landfill liners, incomplete soil or groundwater cleanups, improper discharges or emissions to surface water or air, delayed or missed detection of significant groundwater contamination, etc.). On the other hand, these risks can lead to increased and unnecessary expense to regulated facilities (e.g., overtreatment of discharges or emissions due to overly protective permits, reinstallation or repair of improperly-installed liners, unnecessary cleanup of soils or groundwater, etc.).

Laboratory Fraud

Fraudulent activity, as stated earlier, is one of the risks addressed by the rule. Although the extent of fraudulent activities in environmental laboratories in Louisiana is not known, fraud does occur. At least four recent cases of laboratory fraud are worth noting.

State of Louisiana vs. Laboratory A

In August 1992, a chemical manufacturing company in St. Gabriel, LA, pleaded no contest to charges of producing fraudulent laboratory QA/QC data in their in-house laboratory and agreed to pay a \$250,000 fine and \$50,000 each to the Iberville Parish Drug Task Force and the East Baton Rouge-Pointe Coupee Drug Task Force. In addition, the company terminated the employment of seven laboratory employees and demoted the laboratory manager to a nonsupervisory level.

In this case, the involved employees logged false spike and blank sample results (associated with the NPDES and

LWPDS permits) over at least a two-year period. Apparently, the data reported on the facility's discharge monitoring reports were not affected.

United States vs. Laboratory B

In January 1991, charges of submission of false claims were filed against a commercial laboratory in Baton Rouge, LA, by the U.S. Attorney's office. The company pleaded guilty and agreed to pay a \$500,000 fine. This commercial lab was performing work on EPA contract.

In this case, two laboratory employees admitted to falsifying laboratory sample results on the instructions of the laboratory manager.

United States vs. Laboratory C

In April 1992, three employees of a commercial laboratory in St. Rose, LA, pleaded guilty to conspiracy to submit false claims. Two were fined \$500 and sentenced to two years probation; one was fined \$250 and sentenced to two years probation. This commercial lab was performing superfund work on contract with EPA.

In this case, the three employees intentionally failed to calibrate a GC/MS instrument and manually overrode the automatic features of the instrument in order to obtain false analytical results, which were ultimately submitted to EPA.

United States vs. Laboratory D

In July 1995, the vice president/manager of a commercial laboratory in Lafayette, LA, pleaded guilty to falsification of laboratory data. In a pretrial diversion agreement, charges against the company were deferred for two years based on the company meeting certain conditions, including submitting to independent lab audits. This commercial laboratory was performing NPDES discharge analysis for oil production companies and publicly-owned treatment works.

In the case, the defendant, who was both vice president of the company and manager of the laboratory, was altering lab results which were obtained by lab technicians, fabricating lab data where no analysis was performed, and directing lab technicians to falsify lab results.

Environmental and Public Health Benefits

Although environmental and public health benefits of the rule are not to be quantified in this statement, on a qualitative basis the benefits are self-evident. This rule will address the direct and indirect risks discussed earlier and produce significant environmental and public health benefits.

Specifically, through a reasonable program of accreditation, self-reporting, performance sampling, and third-party audit inspections, this program will significantly reduce the frequency of laboratory errors and fraudulent results, and will maintain and increase confidence of regulators, customers, and the public in commercial environmental laboratory data. The accreditation program will also help to level the highly competitive playing field among commercial laboratories in the state. The program will provide a means of overseeing out-of-state laboratories which provide services to Louisiana customers. It will also allow accredited in-state laboratories to receive reciprocal accreditation from other states in order to provide analyses to customers in those states. Reciprocal accreditation from multiple states allows laboratories to avoid applying for accreditation in every state, thereby lowering their operating costs.

In directly reducing the frequency of errors and fraudulent results, the laboratory accreditation program will also yield indirect benefits. Improved monitoring and enforcement of emission, discharge, and disposal regulations and permits should result from better laboratory data. Further, the accreditation program can be expected to reduce the indirect environmental and human health risks, some of which were listed in the previous section. Better laboratory data is a double-edged sword. It makes catching violators easier, but it also may result in fewer regulated entities being unfairly penalized. Also, assessment and remediation of contaminated sites become a more precise, fair, and environmentally-protective process with good laboratory data.

Estimated Social and Economic Costs

Implementation Costs to Regulated Community

Costs to the regulated community of complying with the rule were estimated by surveying a sample of affected laboratories. It should be noted that these costs were strictly based on these laboratory survey responses which were interpreted using best agency judgment. There is the strong possibility that these figures overstate actual implementation costs to some degree because many laboratories in the state already meet all or part of the rule requirements and will incur lower implementation costs. However, to what degree this is true is not easy to quantify.

Surveys were sent to 43 laboratories within the state. Completed surveys were returned by 19 environmental laboratories. These survey results were averaged to obtain a per-laboratory cost to implement the rule. The average costs per laboratory were as follows:

First Year Costs Per Lab	\$38,412
Second Year Costs Per Lab	\$26,777
Third Year Costs Per Lab	\$21,215
Total Costs Per Lab	\$86,404

These costs do not include fees charged by the department. These per-laboratory costs were multiplied by 120 environmental laboratories to determine a total cost to the regulated community for implementing the rule. These total costs were as follows:

Total First Year Cost	\$ 4,609,440
Total Second Year Cost	\$ 3,213,240
Total Third Year Cost	\$ 2,545,800
Total Three-Year Cost	\$10,368,480

Fee Costs to Regulated Community

Under the rule, each laboratory must submit a \$500 accreditation fee once every three years. In addition, each laboratory must submit an annual fee which ranges from \$250 to \$2500 depending on the size and complexity of the laboratory. To estimate costs to the regulated community due to fees, it was assumed that each laboratory would pay an average annual fee equal to the midpoint between the minimum and maximum annual fees, or \$1375 per year. Using the figure of 120 laboratories, the following costs due to fees were estimated:

Total First Year Accreditation Fees	\$ 60,000
Total First Year Annual Fees	\$165,000
Total Second Year Annual Fees	\$165,000
Total Third Year Annual Fees	\$165,000
Total Three-Year Fees	\$555,000

Audit Costs to the Regulated Community

The rule requires that each laboratory must undergo an independent third-party audit once every three years. Based on telephone inquiries, audits by private auditors are assumed to range in cost from \$500 to \$750 per day and last from 2.5 to 3.5 days. Averaging these figures gives an average per day cost of \$625 and average audit duration of three days. Based on this, the average audit can be assumed to cost \$1875. Using the figure of 120 laboratories, the following costs due to audit expenses were estimated:

Total First Year Audit Expenses	\$ 75,000
Total Second Year Audit Expenses	\$ 75,000
Total Third Year Audit Expenses	\$ 75,000
Total Three-Year Audit Expenses	\$225,000

Total Costs to Regulated Community

Therefore, the total costs to the regulated community over three years can be estimated by totaling compliance costs, audit costs, and fee costs, as follows:

	Implementation	Fees	Audit	Expense Total
First Year Costs	\$ 4,609,440	\$225,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 4,909,440
Second Year Costs	\$ 3,213,240	\$165,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 3,453,240
Third Year Costs	\$ 2,545,800	\$165,000	\$ 75,000	\$ 2,785,800
Total Three-Year Costs	\$10,368,480	\$555,000	\$225,000	\$11,148,480

Agency Costs

Agency Costs were estimated by totaling personnel, equipment, and supply costs for the number of new department personnel that would be needed to implement the rule. The new personnel identified were as follows:

- Environmental Quality Coordinator;
- Environmental Chemist 3;
- Environmental Chemist 2;
- Environmental Program Analyst 1; and
- Word Processor Operator 1.

Costs for these personnel were estimated using midpoint salaries plus related benefits, and using generic equipment, supply, travel, and telephone costs. These were estimated as follows:

Total First Year Agency Cost	\$187,944
Total Second Year Agency Cost	\$188,489
Total Third Year Agency Cost	\$194,969
Total Three-Year Agency Cost	\$571,402

It should be noted that above agency costs do not represent additional costs of implementing the rule, as these agency costs will be borne by the user fees which were previously counted.

Total Cost of Implementation

The total estimated cost of implementing the rule over the first three years is \$11,148,480, which yields an average annual cost of approximately \$3,716,160.

Conclusion

The department understands that there are significant costs associated with the implementation of the Laboratory Accreditation Rule. However, as described in this document, the department believes that the benefits of avoided environmental and public health risk, as well as other benefits, significantly outweigh the costs of implementation of the rule in a manner that is intuitively obvious.

J. Dale Givens
Secretary

9801#080

POTPOURRI

**Department of Environmental Quality
Office of the Secretary
and**

**Office of Legal Affairs and Enforcement
Investigations and Regulation Development Division**

Reportable Quantity List
(LAC 33:I.3931)(OS023*)

Under the authority of the Environmental Quality Act, R.S. 30:2001 et seq., the secretary gives notice that the department is withdrawing the proposed rule, Log OS023*, Reportable Quantity List Amendments. The proposed rule would establish reporting requirements for 361 new pollutants and adjust the existing reporting thresholds for 81 pollutants. This proposal was published in the October 20, 1997, issue of the *Louisiana Register*.

As a result of comments received and further review by the staff, the department has chosen to withdraw the rule known as Log OS023*. A new rule reflecting many of the public comments and suggestions by the staff will be proposed in the near future. Questions may be directed to Patsy Deaville at (504) 765-0399.

Tim B. Knight
Administrator

9801#083

POTPOURRI

**Department of Health and Hospitals
Board of Veterinary Medicine**

Spring/Summer Examination Dates Correction

(Editor's Note: Examination dates were incorrectly published in the November 1997 *Louisiana Register*, page 1591).

The Board of Veterinary Medicine will administer the national and state examinations for licensure to practice veterinary medicine on the following correct dates:

Examination	Date	Deadline to Apply
National Board	Tuesday, April 14, 1998	Friday, February 27, 1998
Clinical Competency Test	Wednesday, April 15, 1998	Friday, February 27, 1998
State Board	First Tuesday of Every Month	No less than two weeks prior to desired exam date

Applications for all examinations must be received on or before the deadline date. Applications and information may be obtained from the board office at 263 Third Street, Suite 104, Baton Rouge, LA 70801 or by calling (504) 342-2176.

Charles B. Mann
Executive Director

9801#005

POTPOURRI

**Department of Natural Resources
Office of Conservation**

Orphaned Oilfield Sites

Office of Conservation records indicate that the oilfield sites listed in the table below have met the requirements as set forth by Section 91 of Act 404, R.S. 30:80 et seq., and as such are being declared Orphaned Oilfield Sites.

Operator	Field	Well Name	Well No.	Serial No.
Harold J. Basso	Wildcat	LL & E	001	058349
Joel B. Brown	Caddo Pine Island	G M Huckabay	001	166653
Joel B. Brown	Caddo Pine Island	Hudson-Bonnette	001	161182
Joel B. Brown	Caddo Pine Island	CV RA SUB;Hobbs	001	165010
Joel Brown	Caddo Pine Island	Florence	001	159455
Joel Brown	Caddo Pine Island	CV RA SUA;Joel B Brown	001	155306
Energy Corp. of America, Inc.	Caillou Island	LL & E	002	059411
Ethredge Oil Company	Caddo Pine Island	Thacker	002	172494
Ethredge Oil Company	Caddo Pine Island	Barr-Peak	001	158613
Ethredge Oil Company	Caddo Pine Island	Muslow A	001	038912

Ethredge Oil Company	Caddo Pine Island	Barr-Peak	002	158614
Ethredge Oil Company	Caddo Pine Island	J Hamm	001	158642
Ethredge Oil Company	Caddo Pine Island	Thacker	001	132942
Ethredge Oil Company	Caddo Pine Island	Thigpen-Herold	002	158534
Ethredge Oil Company	Caddo Pine Island	D T Land Est	001	022154
Ethredge Oil Company	Caddo Pine Island	D T Land Est	002	184671
Ethredge Oil Company	Caddo Pine Island	Gamm A	001	038211
Ethredge Oil Company	Caddo Pine Island	Gamm A	002	039458
Ethredge Oil Company	Caddo Pine Island	Bussa	001	158160
Ethredge Oil Company	Caddo Pine Island	Bronner-Simon	001	053742
Ethredge Oil Company	Caddo Pine Island	Muslow	001	111662
Ethredge Oil Company	Caddo Pine Island	Walke-Bourquin	001	172078
Ethredge Oil Company	Caddo Pine Island	Waite	001	134962
Ethredge Oil Company	Caddo Pine Island	Noel Est	001	035078
Ethredge Oil Company	Caddo Pine Island	Thigpen-Herold	001	158533
Ethredge Oil Company	Caddo Pine Island	Henderson et al	001	174264
Ethredge Oil Company	Caddo Pine Island	W G Godfrey	001	158615
C.H. Lyons	Shreveport	W C Agurs	001	022388
St. Mary Oil Company	Charenton	W C Hertel et al	B-3	023317
W. H. Talbot	Charenton	Mrs Sidney Kern	008	023396

Warren A. Fleet
Commissioner

9801#036

POTPOURRI

**Department of Natural Resources
Office of Conservation
Injection and Mining Division**

Public Hearing—Oilfield Waste Facility

Pursuant to the provisions of the laws of the state of Louisiana and particularly Title 30 of the Louisiana Revised

Statutes of 1950, as amended, and the provisions of Statewide Order No. 29-B, notice is hereby given that the commissioner of Conservation will conduct a public hearing at 6 p.m., Tuesday, March 3, 1998, at the St. Mary Parish Council Meeting Room, 500 Main St., Franklin, LA.

At such hearing, the commissioner, or his designated representative will hear testimony relative to the application of Environmental Treatment Team, Inc., Box 84127, Baton Rouge, LA 70884-4217. The applicant requests authorization to operate a commercial Nonhazardous Oilfield Waste (NOW) processing facility in Morgan City. NOW will be mechanically and chemically de-watered. The recovered solids will be used as Subtitle "D" industrial sanitary landfill cover and the recovered water processed for discharge to the Morgan City Waste Water Treatment Plant (W.W.T.P.). The proposed facility will be located in St. Mary Parish, in Section 7, Township 16S, Range 13E.

The application is available for inspection by contacting Pierre Catrou, Office of Conservation, Injection and Mining Division, Room 257 of the State Land and Natural Resources Building, 625 North Fourth Street, Baton Rouge, LA, or by visiting the St. Mary Parish Council Office in Franklin, LA, or the Morgan City branch of the St. Mary Public Library located at 220 Everett Street, Morgan City, LA. Verbal information may be received by calling Pierre Catrou at (504) 342-5567.

All interested persons will be afforded an opportunity to present data, views, or arguments, orally or in writing, at said public hearing. Written comments which will not be presented at the hearing must be received no later than 4:30 p.m., Tuesday, March 10, 1998, at the Baton Rouge Office. Comments should be directed to Office of Conservation, Injection and Mining Division, Box 94275, Baton Rouge, LA 70804, Re: Docket No. IMD 98-01, Commercial Facility, St. Mary Parish.

Warren A. Fleet
Commissioner

9801#081

POTPOURRI

**Department of Natural Resources
Office of Conservation
Injection and Mining Division**

Public Hearing—Oilfield Waste Facility

Pursuant to the provisions of the laws of the state of Louisiana and particularly Title 30 of the Louisiana Revised Statutes of 1950, as amended, and the provisions of the Statewide Order No. 29-B, notice is hereby given that the commissioner of Conservation will conduct a public hearing at 6 p.m., Tuesday, March 3, 1998, at the St. Mary Parish Council Meeting Room, 500 Main Street, Franklin, LA.

At such hearing, the commissioner, or his designated representative, will hear testimony relative to the application

of US Liquids of Louisiana, Box 1467, Jennings, LA 70546-1467. The applicant intends to drill, construct, and operate three Class II nonhazardous oilfield waste fluids injection wells in Section 16, Township 16 South, Range 12 East of St. Mary Parish, LA.

The application is available for inspection by contacting Pierre Catrou, Office of Conservation, Injection and Mining Division, Room 257 of the State Land and Natural Resources Building, 625 North Fourth Street, Baton Rouge, LA, or by visiting the St. Mary Parish Council Office in Franklin, LA, or the Morgan City branch of the St. Mary Public Library located at 220 Everett Street, Morgan City, LA. Verbal information may be received by calling Pierre Catrou at (504) 342-5567.

All interested persons will be afforded an opportunity to present data, views, or arguments, orally or in writing, at said public hearing. Written comments which will not be presented at the hearing must be received no later than 4:30 p.m., Tuesday, March 10, 1998, at the Baton Rouge Office.

Comments should be directed to Office of Conservation, Injection and Mining Division, Box 94275, Baton Rouge, LA 70804, Re: Docket Number IMD 98-03, Commercial Facility, St. Mary Parish.

Warren A. Fleet
Commissioner

9801#082