

Potpourri

POTPOURRI

Department of Agriculture and Forestry Horticulture Commission

Retail Florist Exam

The next retail floristry examination will be given July 20-24, 1998, at 9:30 a.m. at the Lomax Hall, Louisiana Tech Campus, Ruston, LA. The deadline for sending in application and fee is June 5, 1998. No applications will be accepted after June 5, 1998.

Further information pertaining to the examinations 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 our office prior to June 5, 1998. Questions may be directed to (504) 925-7772.

Bob Odom
Commissioner

9805#021

POTPOURRI

Department of Agriculture and Forestry Office of the Commissioner

North Carolina Sweet Potato Quarantine and Embargo Reciprocal

In accordance with the Administrative Procedure Act, R.S. 49:950 et seq., and R.S. 3:1771 and 1772, the commissioner of Agriculture and Forestry hereby exercises the powers granted to him by R.S. 3:1771 and 1772 to lift the reciprocal quarantine on sweet potatoes from North Carolina and embargo prohibiting importation of all sweet potatoes, vines, plants and slips from North Carolina imposed by the commissioner on July 17, 1997 and published in the *Louisiana Register*, Vol. 23, No. 8, page 1070.

Based on a reciprocal agreement with the state of North Carolina the quarantine and embargo on Louisiana sweet potatoes imposed by North Carolina and the quarantine and embargo on North Carolina Sweet Potatoes imposed by Louisiana is hereby lifted, except for the 1997 sweet potato crop, in the following manner and in accordance with the following schedule.

Plants, slips or cuttings to be used to produce the 1998 crop may begin movement on or after May 1, 1998 between the two states. Sweet potatoes harvested from the 1998 crop may begin movement between the two states on or after August 1, 1998. North Carolina and Louisiana will notify each other

when the harvest of the 1998 crop in the respective state begins.

Under no circumstances shall sweet potatoes harvested from the 1997 crop be permitted to move between Louisiana and North Carolina.

Signed this 8th day of May, 1998 at Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

Bob Odom
Commissioner

9805#050

POTPOURRI

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

PM_{2.5} Monitor Siting Plan—Comment Period and Hearing Dates

The final rule for revised requirements for designation of reference and equivalent methods for PM_{2.5} (particulate matter with an aerodynamic diameter less than or equal to a nominal 2.5 micrometers) and ambient air quality surveillance for particulate matter was published in the *Federal Register* on Friday, July 18, 1997. The Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality, Office of Air Quality and Radiation Protection must participate in the development of a PM_{2.5} monitoring network. The purpose of this network is to collect data to determine the applicability of the new PM_{2.5} National Ambient Air Quality Standard (NAAQS) on any metropolitan statistical area in Louisiana.

A PM_{2.5} monitor siting plan is open for public comments beginning on May 20, 1998 and ending on June 24, 1998 at 4:30 p.m. A public hearing will be held at 1:30 p.m. on Wednesday, June 24, 1998 in Room 326 of the Maynard Ketchum Building located at 7290 Bluebonnet Boulevard. Interested persons are invited to attend and submit oral or written comments on the proposed siting plan.

Written comments concerning the proposed siting plan may also be submitted to Manop Vanichchagorn at any time during the public comment period. Those comments must be received no later than 4:30 p.m. on June 24, 1998. Mail comments to Mr. Vanichchagorn at: Air Quality Analysis Section, 5222 Summa Court, Baton Rouge, LA, 70809. Mr. Vanichchagorn may be contacted at (504) 765-2595.

A copy of the PM_{2.5} monitor siting plan may be viewed at the Air Quality Division File Room from 8 a.m. to 4:30 p.m., Monday through Friday, excluding holidays, at 7290 Bluebonnet, Second Floor, Baton Rouge, or at any of the regional offices located at the following addresses: 100 Asma Blvd., Suite 151, Lafayette, LA; 804 31st Street, Suite D, Monroe, LA; 1525 Fairfield, Room 11, Shreveport, LA; 3501

Chateau Boulevard-West Wing, Kenner, LA; 3519 Patrick Street, Room 265A, Lake Charles, LA; 5222 Summa Court, Baton Rouge, LA.

Gustave Von Bodungen, P.E.
Assistant Secretary

9805#082

POTPOURRI

Department of Environmental Quality Office of the Secretary

Laboratory Accreditation—Risk/Cost/Benefit
Statement (LAC 33:I.Chapters 45-57)(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 has promulgated the Laboratory Accreditation rule (OS007). This rule establishes 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

9805#084

POTPOURRI

**Office of the Governor
Oil Spill Coordinator's Office**

Natural Resource Damages Restoration Plan Draft

On May 19, 1998 a public hearing was held in St. James Parish to present the draft restoration plan for natural resource damages resulting from the May 24, 1996 gasoline release by Marathon Ashland Pipeline LLC (as successor in interest to

Marathon Pipe Line Company). Members of the public are invited to submit written comments on the restoration plan between May 20 and May 29, 1998. Comments may be submitted to the address below, to the attention of Marion Boulden.

This draft restoration plan is available for review at the Louisiana Oil Spill Coordinator's Office in Baton Rouge, Louisiana. Individuals wishing to make an appointment to review this document should contact Marion Boulden at: Louisiana Oil Spill Coordinator's Office, 1885 Wooddale Boulevard, 12th Floor, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70806; (504) 922-3230.

Roland J. Guidry
Oil Spill Coordinator

9805#081

POTPOURRI

**Office of the Governor
Oil Spill Coordinator's Office**

Natural Resource Damage Assessment
Comment Period Extended

The Oil Spill Coordinator's Office announced at an April 29, 1998 public hearing on the proposed Louisiana Natural Resource Damage Assessment rule that the period for submitting written comments has been extended through June 9, 1998, at the request of the Department of Environmental Quality.

Comments on the proposed rule published in the March 1998 Register may be submitted to: Marion Boulden, Oil Spill Coordinator's Office, 1885 Wooddale Blvd., 12th Floor, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70806.

Roland J. Guidry
Oil Spill Coordinator

9805#080

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 Number	Serial Number
Adco Producing Company	Black Hawk	Panola L&D Co A	001	100525

James D. Barber	Milestone Forks	H A Turner Sr et al D	D001	071168
James D. Barber	Milestone Forks	H A Turner Sr et al D	009	080236
James D. Barber	Milestone Forks	H A Turner Sr et al C	010	087902
James D. Barber	Greens Bayou	Yakey GB SWD	002	180941
James D. Barber	Greens Bayou	Yakey GB SWD	003	187202
James D. Barber	South Monterey	MIL SU4; Rabb	001	114633
James D. Barber	South Monterey	Rabb SWD	001	112810
James D. Barber	South Monterey	Madison N	002	151736
James D. Barber	Black Hawk	Peabody SBP	001	214347
Cajun Minerals Inc.	West Mermentau	Bruce et al	001	217815
Cajun Minerals, Inc.	Ellis	A Z Leonards et al SWD	001	972181
Cajun Minerals, Inc.	Pecaniere	NS RB SUA; L Benoit	001	214110
Cajun Minerals, Inc.	Pecaniere	NS RA SUA; Olivier	001	194699
Cajun Minerals, Inc.	Ellis	A Z Leonards et al A	001	209168
Cajun Minerals, Inc.	West Fenris	Y SUA: Deshotels	002	177823
Cajun Minerals, Inc.	West Fenris	VICK RA SUA; Russell	002	109830
Cajun Minerals, Inc.	West Fenris	VUA: L W Russell	2-D	111050
Cajun Minerals, Inc.	Napoleonville	VUA; Armelise Planting Co SWD	002	155997
Cajun Minerals, Inc.	Napoleonville	VUA; Armelise	001	069060
Cajun Mineals, Inc.	Pecaniere	Carroll Olivier SWD	001	972398
Caspen Operating Company	Starks	Industrial Lumber Co C	002	105749
Coastal States - Pel - Tex	South Lake Maurepas	Guste	001	120267
Cretaceous Oil & Gas, Inc.	Caddo Pine Island	Hawkins etal	001	219448

Cretaceous Oil & Gas, Inc.	Caddo Pine Island	Hawkins SWD	002	214808
D&M Operating Company, Inc.	Ragley	VUA; Hollingsworth et al	001	203997
Davis Oil & Meyers-Lasher Inc.	South Lake Maurepas	Lutcher & Moore	001	136977
Davis Oil & Meyers-Lasher Inc.	South Lake Maurepas	Lutcher & Moore	002	139389
Jade Petroleum, Inc.	Tepetate	Jack R Eaton	003	205541
Jade Petroleum, Inc.	Tepetate	Jack R Eaton	004	205807
Jade Petroleum, Inc.	Tepetate	Carrol J & Calvin J Ortego	001	198881
Jade Petroleum, Inc.	Tepetate	Jack R Eaton	001	087052
Jade Petroleum, Inc.	Tepetate	Jack R Eaton	002	078035
Jade Petroleum, Inc.	West Parcperdue	MAYO 12700 RA VUA; Lily B Huval	001	213220
Jade Petroleum, Inc.	West Parcperdue	G B Duhon SWD	001	971808
Lake A, Ltd.	Lake Athanasio	SL 7684	002	167200
Lake A, Ltd.	Lake Athanasio	SL 7684	004	214581
LA.-TX. Operating, Inc.	Greenwood-Waskom	Gray-Hickey	021	080294
LA.-TX. Operating, Inc.	Greenwood-Waskom	Gray-Hickey	003	117353
LA.-TX. Operating, Inc.	Greenwood-Waskom	Gray-Hickey	004	117463
LA.-TX. Operating, Inc.	Greenwood-Waskom	Gray-Hickey	001	126595
LA.-TX. Operating, Inc.	Greenwood-Waskom	Gray-Hickey	007	126778
LA.-TX. Operating, Inc.	Greenwood-Waskom	Gray-Hickey	009	126844

LA.-TX. Operating, Inc.	Greenwood-Waskom	Gray-Hickey	016	129072
LA.-TX. Operating, Inc.	Greenwood-Waskom	Gray-Hickey	010	129444
LA.-TX. Operating, Inc.	Greenwood-Waskom	Gray-Hickey	019	129543
LA.-TX. Operating, Inc.	Greenwood-Waskom	Gray-Hickey	018	129975
LA.-TX. Operating, Inc.	Greenwood-Waskom	Gray-Hickey	020	130118
LA.-TX. Operating, Inc.	Greenwood-Waskom	Gray-Hickey	014	130549
LA.-TX. Operating, Inc.	Greenwood-Waskom	Gray-Hickey	012	130888
LA.-TX. Operating, Inc.	Greenwood-Waskom	Gray-Hickey	011	133684
LA.-TX. Operating, Inc.	Greenwood-Waskom	Gray-Hickey	013	134119
LA.-TX. Operating, Inc.	Greenwood-Waskom	Gray-Hickey	008	134545
LA.-TX. Operating, Inc.	Greenwood-Waskom	Gray-Hickey	017	138292
Don R. Long	Tullos Urania	Hosea J Coleman	001	174295
M&Z Engineering, Inc.	Bayou Chauvin	X 1 RA SUA; Laterre	001	187158
M&Z Engineering, Inc.	Bayou Chauvin	Y RB SUB; Laterre	003	194134
M&Z Engineering, Inc.	Bayou Chauvin	Tenneco Laterre	004	198456
M&Z Engineering, Inc.	Bayou Chauvin	X RA SUA; Laterre	005	200014
M&Z Engineering, Inc.	Bayou Chauvin	Tenneco-Laterre	3-D	201095
M&Z Engineering, Inc.	Bayou Chauvin	W RB SUA; Laterre	4-D	201953
M&Z Engineering, Inc.	Bayou Chauvin	Tenneco Laterre SWD	006	202590
M&Z Engineering, Inc.	Bayou Chauvin	Tenneco Laterre	007	204070

Magnum Minerals, Inc.	Delta Farms	C W Hopkins	001	028743
Magnum Minerals, Inc.	Delta Farms	C W Hopkins	003	029880
Magnum Minerals, Inc.	Delta Farms	C W Hopkins	004	049101
Magnum Minerals, Inc.	Delta Farms	C W Hopkins	007	142060
Magnum Minerals, Inc.	Stella	Numa C Hero	001	206750
Magnum Minerals, Inc.	Stella	Numa C Hero	002	207392
MA-SI, Inc.	Lisbon	LI NEP RE SU; Henry A	009	037613
MA-SI, Inc.	Lisbon	LI NEP RE SU; Enloe A	010	037933
MA-SI, Inc.	Lisbon	LI NEP RE SU; Fowler A	016	038260
MA-SI, Inc.	Lisbon	LI NEP RE SU; Fowler B	011	038829
MA-SI, Inc.	Lisbon	LI NEP RE SU; Henry C	008	039004
MA-SI, Inc.	Lisbon	LI NEP RE SU; Enloe B	014	039280
MA-SI, Inc.	Lisbon	LI NEP RE SU; Tatum	012	039493
MA-SI, Inc.	Lisbon	LI NEP RE SU; Enloe C	015	039595
MA-SI, Inc.	Lisbon	LI NEP RE SU; W J Wilson	005	039740
MA-SI, Inc.	Lisbon	LI NEP RE SU; Henry D	002	039839
MA-SI, Inc.	Lisbon	LI NEP RE SU; Kinder B	007	039966
MA-SI, Inc.	Lisbon	LI NEP RE SU; Henry E	003	040050
MA-SI, Inc.	Lisbon	LI NEP RE SU; Enloe D	004	040142
MA-SI, Inc.	Lisbon	LI NEP RE SU; M E Wilson	006	040202
MA-SI, Inc.	Lisbon	LI NEP RE SU; Tanner	001	040293
MA-SI, Inc.	Lisbon	LI NEP RE SU; Fowler D	013	040355
Mideast Gas Systems, Inc.	Big Lake	VUC; Iris Magee	001	158143

Mideast Gas Systems, Inc.	Chalkley	Katherine Brewer	001	210587
Mineral Equipment Co., Inc.	Caddo Pine Island	J Barlow	001	156762
Mineral Equipment Co., Inc.	Caddo Pine Island	J Barlow	002	156763
Mineral Equipment Co., Inc.	Caddo Pine Island	J Barlow	003	156764
Mineral Equipment Co., Inc.	Caddo Pine Island	J Barlow	004	156765
Mineral Equipment Co., Inc.	Caddo Pine Island	Cecil Barlow	001	157648
Mineral Equipment Co., Inc.	Caddo Pine Island	Cecil Barlow	002	157649
Mineral Equipment Co., Inc.	Caddo Pine Island	Cecil Barlow	004	157651
Mineral Equipment Co., Inc.	Caddo Pine Island	Biedenharn	001	205999
Mineral Equipment Co., Inc.	Caddo Pine island	Biedenharn	002	206586
Mineral Equipment Co., Inc.	Caddo Pine Island	Biedenharn	003	206819
Mineral Equipment Co., Inc.	Caddo Pine Island	Biedenharn	004	206929
Mineral Equipment Co., Inc.	Caddo Pine Island	Biedenharn	005	207247
Mineral Equipment Co., Inc.	Caddo Pine Island	Biedenharn	007	207475
Mineral Equipment Co., Inc.	Caddo Pine Island	Biedenharn	008	207476
Mineral Equipment Co., Inc.	Caddo Pine Island	J R Barlow	001	202872
Omega Energy Inc.	Caddo Pine Island	Hemperly	002	174190
Omega Energy Inc.	Caddo Pine Island	J SU 4; Hemperly	003	177972
Omega Energy Inc.	Caddo Pine Island	J SU 30; Hemperly	004	182023
Omega Energy Inc.	Caddo Pine Island	J SU 31; Hemperly	005	186037
Omega Energy Inc.	Caddo Pine Island	J SU 5; Hemperly	006	194511
Omega Energy Inc.	Caddo Pine Island	Hemperly A	001	196371

Omega Energy Inc.	Caddo Pine Island	Murray James	003	050872
Omega Energy Inc.	Caddo Pine Island	Murray James	006	064692
Omega Energy Inc.	Caddo Pine Island	Murray James SWD	002	049002
Omega Energy Inc.	Caddo Pine Island	Hemperly A	002	196372
Omega Energy Inc.	Caddo Pine Island	Bussa A	001	158217
Phoenix Operating Co. of Texas	Frisco	Frank Ringo	001	210289
Stratco Operating Co., Inc.	Bethany Longstreet	HOSS SU49; Talbert Heirs A	001	207945
W. H. Talbot	Charenton	Mrs D Boudeaux	005	023123
W. H. Talbot	Charenton	LeBlanc	010	062392
Tola Production Company	Logansport	JETER SUR; Alston	001	042022
Tola Production Company	Gahagan	Campbell	001	188892
Tola Production Company	Gahagan	Campbell	002	181005
Tola Production Company	Bayou Ferblanc	Lafourche Realty	002	146920
Tola Production Company	Bayou Ferblanc	Lafourche Realty	001	162784
Tola Production Company	Bayou Ferblanc	Lafourche Realty	003	165857
Tola Production Company	Bayou Ferblanc	Lafourche Realty	004	168555
Tola Production Company	Bayou Ferblanc	Lafourche Realty	005	175341
Tola Production Company	Bayou Ferblanc	Lafourche Realty	006	190412
Tola Production Company	East Haynesville	VUB; Jones Baucum	001	046506
Westen Oil & Gas, Inc.	Section 28	St Martin	003	070489
Westen Oil & Gas, Inc.	Section 28	St Martin	004	072656
Westen Oil & Gas, Inc.	Section 28	St Martin	001	153531
Westen Oil & Gas, Inc.	Section 28	St Martin	002	153532

Westen Oil & Gas, Inc.	Section 28	St Martin	005	155658
Westen Oil & Gas, Inc.	Section 28	St Martin	007	157467
Westen Oil & Gas, Inc.	Section 28	St Martin	006	157614
Westen Oil & Gas, Inc.	Section 28	St Martin	008	159102
Westen Oil & Gas, Inc.	Section 28	St Martin	009	159103
Westen Oil & Gas, Inc.	Section 28	St Martin	010	159104
Westen Oil & Gas, Inc.	Section 28	St Martin	011	167131
Westen Oil & Gas, Inc.	Section 28	St Martin	012	167132
Westen Oil & Gas, Inc.	Section 28	St Martin	013	170132
Westen Oil & Gas, Inc.	Section 28	St Martin	014	170529
Westen Oil & Gas, Inc.	Section 28	St Martin	015	173554

Warren A. Fleet
Commissioner of Conservation

9805#083

POTPOURRI

**Department of Public Safety and Corrections
Board of Parole**

**Sexually Violent and Child
Predator—Public Hearing**

In accordance with the laws of the State of Louisiana and with particular reference to the provisions of LSA-R.S. 15:574, notice is hereby given that the Louisiana Board of Parole will conduct public hearings in all municipalities with a population of not less than 50,000. At such hearing, the Board of Parole will receive information and input from the public relative to sex offenders, sexually violent predators and child predators. The Board of Parole will consider which rules, regulations, policies and guidelines they should adopt, and what information regarding sex offenders, sexually violent predators and child predators should be disclosed and/or released to the public.

The hearing for the City of Alexandria will be held on Monday, June 1, 1998, from 5 p.m. to 6 p.m. in the Alexandria Probation and Parole District Office, Training Room, 1534 Lee Street, Alexandria, Louisiana.

The hearing for the City of Shreveport will be held on Monday, June 1, 1998, from 5 p.m. to 6 p.m. in the Shreveport City Hall, Room 211, 1234 Texas Street, Shreveport, Louisiana.

The hearing for the City of Baton Rouge will be held on Tuesday, June 2, 1998, from 5 p.m. to 6 p.m. in the Governmental Building, Room 348, 222 St. Louis Street, Baton Rouge, Louisiana.

The hearing for the City of Monroe will be held on Tuesday, June 2, 1998, from 5 p.m. to 6 p.m. at the Ouachita Parish Courthouse, Courtroom No. 1, 300 St. John, Monroe, Louisiana.

The hearing for the City of New Orleans will be held on Wednesday, June 3, 1998, from 5 p.m. to 6 p.m. at New Orleans City Hall, Council Chambers, Room 104, 1300 Perdido Street, New Orleans, Louisiana.

The hearing for the City of Houma will be held on Wednesday, June 3, 1998, from 5 p.m. to 6 p.m. in the Terrebonne Courthouse, Annex Building, Second Floor, Division "E" Courthouse, 7856 Main Street, Houma, Louisiana.

The hearing for the City of Lafayette will be held on Thursday, June 4, 1998, from 5 p.m. to 6 p.m. at the Lafayette City Hall, Council Chambers, 705 University Street, Lafayette, Louisiana.

The hearing for the City of Lake Charles will be held on Friday, June 5, 1998, from 5 p.m. to 6 p.m. in the Lake Charles Council Chambers, 320 Pujot Street, Lake Charles, Louisiana.

All interested persons will be afforded an opportunity to present data or views, 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., July 5, 1998, at the Baton Rouge office. Comments should be directed to the Board of Parole, P.O. Box 94304, Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70804-9304, Re: Sexual Predator Law.

Fred Clark
Chairman

9805#033

POTPOURRI

**Department of Revenue
Tax Commission**

Whole Residential Property Ratio Study—1997

Pursuant to R.S. 47:1837 the following is the result of the Tax Commission's measurement of the level of appraisal and/or assessment and the degree of uniformity for Whole Residential Property Ratio Study for the year 1997 (1998 Orleans Parish). This data shall constitute prima facie evidence of the uniformity or lack of uniformity with constitutional and/or statutory requirements of each parish in the state.

Parish	Mean (%)	Median (%)	Coefficient of Dispersion (%)
Acadia	10.6	10.7	14.2
Allen	9.8	9.7	10.4

Ascension	9.1	9.2	13.7
Assumption	9.8	9.7	9.9
Avoyelles	9.1	9.5	7.8
Beauregard	10.2	9.8	17.1
Bienville	8.9	9.2	10.0
Bossier	9.0	9.3	11.1
Caddo	9.9	9.3	9.9
Calcasieu	9.7	9.7	8.5
Caldwell	9.8	10.0	11.5
Cameron	9.9	9.8	4.9
Catahoula	9.7	9.8	8.2
Claiborne	9.9	10.0	8.1
Concordia	9.3	9.7	7.4
Desoto	9.5	9.9	8.7
East Baton Rouge	9.5	9.6	7.8
East Carroll	9.9	9.9	7.7
East Feliciana	9.0	9.0	13.8
Evangeline	9.1	9.7	9.0
Franklin	9.8	9.7	12.2
Grant	9.9	9.9	12.3
Iberia	9.8	10.0	3.7
Iberville	9.0	9.3	12.9
Jackson	11.2	10.8	13.2
Jefferson	10.2	10.3	6.4
Jefferson Davis	9.6	9.3	13.2
Lafayette	9.4	9.3	9.2
Lafourche	9.8	10.0	3.7
Lasalle	9.7	9.8	7.7
Lincoln	9.5	9.5	10.6
Livingston	9.2	9.3	10.5
Madison	9.8	9.8	10.7
Morehouse	9.9	10.0	7.1
Natchitoches	10.5	10.2	13.8
Orleans—			
First M.D.	10.1	9.9	14.4
Second M.D.	9.9	10.0	11.7
Third M.D.	10.2	9.9	11.1
Fourth M.D.	9.9	9.7	13.4
Fifth M.D.	9.8	9.8	8.0

Sixth M.D.	10.3	10.1	17.2
Seventh M.D.	10.1	10.1	14.4
Ouachita	9.0	9.1	7.7
Plaquemines	10.1	10.1	5.1
Pointe Coupee	9.4	9.3	9.4
Rapides	10.0	9.9	7.9
Red River	10.4	10.0	13.0
Richland	10.1	9.8	12.6
Sabine	10.6	10.1	12.7
St. Bernard	10.1	10.0	6.3
St. Charles	10.3	10.2	6.2
St. Helena	9.2	9.1	9.3
St. James	11.0	11.0	8.8
St. John the Baptist	9.7	9.9	10.0
St. Landry	9.9	9.7	8.3
St. Martin	9.6	10.0	18.8

St. Mary	8.9	9.0	17.2
St. Tammany	9.1	9.1	8.3
Tangipahoa	9.3	9.4	9.9
Tensas	10.1	9.9	14.0
Terrebonne	9.0	9.0	9.6
Union	10.1	10.1	9.5
Vermilion	10.2	9.9	11.2
Vernon	10.2	10.1	5.3
Washington	9.1	9.1	7.8
Webster	9.8	9.8	9.2
West Baton Rouge	9.9	9.9	7.2
West Carroll	9.8	9.8	7.1
West Feliciana	8.9	9.1	12.9
Winn	9.4	9.7	18.5

Malcolm B. Price, Jr.
Chairman

9805#022