STATE OF LOUISIANA
STREAM CONTROL COMMISSION
P.O. DRAWER FC
UNIVERSITY STATION
BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA 70803

January 5, 1968

Chevron Oil Company
The California Company Division
1111 Tulane Avenue
New Orleans, Louisiana 70112

Attention: Mr. H. E. Denzler, Jr.

Gentlemen:

Re: Application for disposal of salt water produced in Stella Field in Plaquemines Parish

This will officially confirm approval by the Louisiana Stream Control Commission at its meeting December 5, 1967, of your above reference proposal. However, any change in either the quality or quantity of this discharge will require submission of a new proposal.

Very truly yours,

[Signature]
Robert A. Lafleur
Executive Secretary

RAL/fbr
May 17, 1971

Oil Field Brine Discharge
Stella Field

Mr. R. A. Lafleur, Executive Secretary
Louisiana Stream Control Commission
P. O. Drawer PC, University Station
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70803

Dear Mr. Lafleur:

As a prerequisite to securing a U. S. Corps of Engineers discharge permit, we are herewith applying for State Certification of the discharge of approximately 9,990 barrels per day of oil field brine into Louisiana coastal waters from our Stella Field. This discharge flows through primary and secondary retention pits into privately dug drainage ditches and then into a larger drainage ditch which is pumped into the Intracoastal Canal in Plaquemines Parish.

An analysis conducted by Analysis Laboratories, Inc., on May 13, 1971, is attached which indicates that the chloride content at the point of discharge is 87,941 mgs/l. The chloride content of the canal water 100' upstream from the discharge is 52 mgs/l, and 100' downstream from the same point it is 52 mgs/l while the chloride content of the Intracoastal Canal itself is 52 mgs/l. The temperature of the discharge from the retention tank is 109° F. Temperature of the receiving waters 100' in each direction is 77° F and the temperature of the water in the Intracoastal Canal is 77° F. The average oil content of the discharge is 12.8 mgs/l, and we are not aware of any free or floating oils present in sufficient quantities to interfere with the designated uses of the receiving waters.

A copy of the official approval of the Louisiana Stream Control Commission dated January 5, 1968, is attached. To our knowledge, there has been no change in either the quality or quantity in the discharge since this permit was issued.

Your favorable consideration of this application for State certification will be appreciated.

We will be happy to supply any other information you may desire or answer any questions you may have.

Yours truly,

H. E. Denzler, Jr.

HED:MC
Attachments
STATE OF LOUISIANA
STREAM CONTROL COMMISSION
P. O. Drawer FC
UNIVERSITY STATION
BATON ROUGE, LOUISIANA 70803

June 15, 1971

Chevron Oil Company
The California Company Division
1111 Tulane Avenue
New Orleans, Louisiana 70112

Attention: Mr. H. E. Denzler, Jr.

Gentlemen:

Subject: Lake Long Field, Lake Long Production Facilities
         Marrero Field, Marrero Field Tank Battery
         Stella Field, Stella Field Combined Facilities

Reference is made to your letters dated May 14 and May 17, 1971,
requesting State Certification from this agency for the above subject
operations.

Under the Provisions of:

Order issued by the Louisiana Stream Control Commission
July 1968

Amendment to Statewide Order No. 29-B, Louisiana Department
of Conservation dated October 19, 1967

and, Regulation promulgated by the Louisiana Stream Control
Commission January 1953,

it is the opinion of the Stream Control Commission that these discharges
will be conducted without violating water quality standards of the State
of Louisiana, provided the chemical characteristics of the discharges
are as described in your letters of application. Therefore, in accordance
with Louisiana Revised Statutes of 1950, Title 56, Section 1439(5)—
this is your Certification from the Commission that these installations
Chevron Oil Company
The California Company Division
June 15, 1971

comply with Section 21(b) of the Federal Water Quality Improvement Act of 1970.

Attached hereto is copy of a public notice to be run by you one (1) time in the official State Journal, THE BATON ROUGE STATE TIMES, at your expense.

Very truly yours,

Robert A. Lafleur, Executive Secretary
Louisiana Stream Control Commission
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of the
LOUISIANA STREAM CONTROL COMMISSION
Baton Rouge, Louisiana
December 5, 1967

Meeting of the Louisiana Stream Control Commission at 9:30 A.M., Tuesday, December 5, 1967, in the International Room of the Student's Union Building, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, Louisiana; Dr. Leslie Glasgow, Chairman, presiding.
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DR. LESLIE GLASGOW, Wildlife and Fisheries Commission, Chairman

ARNOLD CHAUVIERE, Department of Conservation

JOHN E. TRYGG, State Department of Health
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Anthony J. Bonfanti, Representing State Attorney General's Office
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Ed Anderson, Brown & Root, Inc., Engineers

Charles Jones, Project Manager, United
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ASSOCIATED REPORTERS

OFFICIAL COURT REPORTERS

822 PERDIDO STREET

NEW ORLEANS, LA. 70112
DR. GLASGOW: The meeting will now come to order.

I'll ask Mr. La Fleur to introduce the members that are present.

MR. LA FLEUR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. On the far end of the table on my right is Mr. Bonfanti, from the Attorney General's office, sitting next to him, Dan Cresap, from the Department of Public Works, Dr. Glasgow, representing Louisiana Wildlife and Fisheries, next to him Mr. John Trygg, Department of Public Health, next to him, Mr. Charles Smith, from the Department of Commerce and Industry, and on the end of the table Mr. Arnold Chauviere from the Department of Conservation.

DR. GLASGOW: Thank you, Bob. The first item on the agenda today is the adoption of the minutes of the October meeting.

MR. TRYGG: I move for the adoption of the minutes.

DR. GLASGOW: Is there a second?

MR. SMITH: I'll second it.

DR. GLASGOW: The motion has been made and seconded to adopt the minutes of the meeting of October 4th, 1967.

All those in favor say, aye.
All opposed say, no.
The motion is carried.
Mr. La Fleur, will you introduce the first item of business this morning.

MR. LA FLEUR: Mr. Chairman, from the Jefferson Lake Sulphur Company comes a proposal for the discharge of bleedwater from their mining operation, sulphur mining operation located in Plaquemine Parish, Louisiana, display will be known as the Lake Hermitage Plant. It is proposed that the water which will be used or pumped into the dome will be drawn from the Mississippi River at the rate of two thousand and eighty gallons a minute and withdrawn there from at the rate of about fourteen hundred and fifty-six gallons a minute, and the bleedwater to contain chemicals as listed on page 2 of the proposal including such things as Chlorides, at the rate of, in concentrations of forty-two thousand eight hundred parts per million, total hardness thirty-seven hundred, sulfate four thousand, a total alkalinity of calcium carbonate twenty, suspended solids is ninety, with a PH of 6.8 and sulfides in the amount of five hundred parts per million.

The bleedwater from this operation will be received in a reservoir of approximately a hundred and
sixty acres, some fourteen inches deep, which will
provide for a retention time of thirty days. The
intention or the purpose for which this reservoir will
serve will be that of removing the sulfides contained
therein and then the bleedwater after retention and
dissipation of the sulfides will be drained to Wilkin-
son Bayou and finally to Barataria Bay.

Each of you have a copy of a letter that was
requested from Dr. T. B. Ford of the Division of
oysters, water bottoms, indicating what he felt his
position would be with regard to the effect of this
brine on the shrimp and nursery grounds and oyster
growing areas that might in the area, and with us this
morning is Mr. Stephen Broussard.

Steve, would you have any added comments,
please?

MR. BROUSSARD: No, other than, Mr. La
Fleur, that we have looked over the area as far as
oysters are concerned, we have looked over the area
with oyster growers of the area and we feel like this
effluent will not be detrimental to the leases since
there are no leases in the immediate area and we're
depending on quite a bit of dilution before this water
reached the oysters, which is shown on this little
plaque incidently.
MR. LA FLEUR: Would you have any comment, Steve, with respect to the increase of concentration of the inorganic salts in Wilkinson Bayou from the discharge at the reservoir site?

MR. BROUSSARD: I would like to call on our consultant, Brown & Root, who is represented here by Ed Anderson, if he would have any comments on that.

MR. ANDERSON: We have tried on Page 5 and 6 to estimate the approximate increase in solids with respect to salinity in the Wilkinson area and out into the Bay. We have based this strictly on what we found in the area to be predicted flows in the Bayou and the best we can do at this time was to make some educated guesses as to what our prediction would be as to the increase.

We say on Page 6 the Bayou would experience a predicted 500 to 800 parts per million increase in salinity in its fresh condition and in the event that the tide was relatively higher when the salt water was in there we shouldn't find any change at all.

I might add that our salinity and inorganic salt content of the bleedwater is strictly a guess and we don't expect it to be this high, however, we feel that this might be our maximum condition and we should get a permit at this time, so we have no idea what will
be produced out of that. It's possible that we might find a little more hardness than the predicted thirty-seven hundred parts but as far as chlorides we think certainly this is the maximum.

This is based on looking at many of the other sulphur producing companies and in Jefferson Lake's own experience with bleedwater products into their reservoirs.

MR. LA FLEUR: I should like, Mr. Chairman, to read into the record a portion of Dr. Ford's letter in commenting on this proposal.

"In previous discussions with Mr. Broussard, I pointed out to him that this general area of the marsh was considered an important shrimp nursery and, accordingly, we would be concerned about the influence which their effluent had on the biota of this area. Furthermore, I advised Mr. Broussard that I was not in a position to anticipate all of the possible effects which might result from this mining operation. Nevertheless, if any undesirable biological effects do arise, then I would expect that this firm take whatever action is necessary to correct it. Therefore, I recommend that the Stream Control Commission include this above stated condition in the permit if this body acts favorably upon this request."
DR. GLASGOW: Are there any comments from the members:

I think Doc Ford's request is one that the Commission would expect whether he made it or not so -

MR. TRYGG: That's the only comment I had to make is whether a motion to approve this thing required inclusion of this or not inasmuch as we have that authority anyway.

DR. GLASGOW: Well, I think if detrimental effects showed up later we would review your application, require corrective action.

MR. ANDERSON: I think Jefferson Lake is aware of the fact that you can not predict all that's going to happen in the area and if it comes to the point where the salinity might be detrimental, we might have to go to injection in the deep aquifer or heavy dilution or some method of aeration in toxicity due to sulfides comes up but they are prepared to go the next step if the problem arises.

MR. LA FLEUR: I would ask one question. How does the possibilities present themselves in using essentially a closed system, in other words, introducing your heated water in there producing your molten sulphur, bringing it out and then sending that same water down there.
MR. BROUSSARD: There's no economical way of doing it now to our knowledge, it's being looked into, not for use in areas like this particularly but for use in areas where there's no water available but it's not practical right now to do it. We treat this bleedwater so to speak.

MR. ANDERSON: Our preliminary studies did involve looking at the brackish water and use it rather than pump from the Mississippi and this process as the flow sheet shows is a direct contact with fire on one end of the tube, this water on the other, we can't find people in the industry with enough confidence in the scaling properties with high salines even though in all the text you can find that the solubilities greatly exceed these they still won't, they won't make any statements with respect to this and for this reason we turned down treating brackish water and the brackish water we looked at was approximately the same water because we have looked at the maximum condition, we was really looking at sea water.

DR. GLASGOW: Do you have a motion?

MR. TRYGG: I move that we grant the permit keeping in consideration Mr. Ford's letter.

DR. GLASGOW: Is there a second?

MR. SMITH: I'll second it.
DR. GLASGOW: The motion has been made and seconded to approve the permit.

All those in favor signify by saying aye.

Opposition same.

Motion carried.

MR. TRYGG: Mr. Chairman, I made that motion but I'm not sure that their domestic waste is being taken care of down there; had nothing to indicate that it's not, but I don't have anything to indicate it is.

MR. BROUSSARD: This is not part of our permit. In other words, the domestic waste is coming to you from another channel, so to speak, from the Houston office, a proposal for domestic treatment.

MR. TRYGG: Our acceptance of your proposal will also be conditioned on this approval we have given here today, is that right?

DR. GLASGOW: Well, that is subject to approval of your other waste disposal.

Mr. Chairman, will you introduce the next item, please.

MR. LA FLEUR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Chairman, from United States Rubber Company or what's commonly known as UNIROYAL, Geismar, Louisiana, comes the proposal for the discharge of waste from the CELOGEN, FLEXZONE, HYDRAZINE and ROYALENE unit of the
Geismar Plant. This involves an expansion or an additional chemical plant that this facility which will use an additional twelve gallons per minute of clarified water.

Contained on Page 2 of the proposal are the present chemical characteristics of the waste discharge both what is presently approved by past submission to the Commission along with the new additions what was represented by this expansion and the combined effluents.

At the bottom of the page you will find the result in increase in concentrations of the Mississippi River of the various materials based on a hundred thousand second feet of flow in the Mississippi River.

And with us this morning is Mr. Charles Jones, Project Manager from Uniroyal.

Mr. Jones, would you have any comments, please?

MR. JONES: We have nothing to add to this, Mr. La Fleur, at this time. Our application pretty well covers what we plan to do. We have no further comments to add to it at this time.

MR. LA FLEUR: Does any of your waste that you are proposed to discharge, either what you presently are proposing in this proposal and in the previously
approved materials approved for discharge in the Mississippi River, are they amenable to any treatment that you are not now giving it?

MR. JONES: We are currently investigating this, Mr. La Fleur. We have retained the consulting engineering firm and they're doing both laboratory and tests on the waste to see if there is any further treatment.

MR. LA FLEUR: Does this have any particular reference to the organic materials that are contained in your effluence or not?

MR. JONES: Beg your pardon?

MR. LA FLEUR: Does this have any particular reference to the organic materials that are contained in your effluence?

MR. JONES: Yes, sir.

MR. TRYGG: Are any of these taste and odor producers?

MR. JONES: No, sir.

DR. GLASGOW: Are there any other questions from the members?

If not, do I have a motion?

MR. CHAUVIERE: I move acceptance.

DR. GLASGOW: Is there a second?

MR. CRESAP: I'll second it.
DR. GLASGOW: The motion has been made and
seconded to approve the permit.

Is there any further discussion.
If not, all those in favor say aye.
Opposition same.
Motion carried.

I think it's time that we sort of add up the
total chemicals that we're dumping into the Mississippi
River and begin to figure out the total load that
we're putting in that river, so I'm going to make a
request that you try to determine this for us, Bob,
if you can.

MR. LA FLEUR: I have quite a bit of that
homework done, Dr. Glasgow. The only ones that I have
not added up or put on the list are those that have
come in since about April or May of this year but I
have a whole laundry list put together now.

DR. GLASGOW: Well, I think it's time that
this Commission begin to study this seriously because
I don't think we can go on approving permits to dump
in the river forever, and we're going to reach a point
where we'll have nothing but a sewer out here.

MR. LA FLEUR: I might add, Dr. Glasgow,
this will be necessary information to have, so it's
not a matter of if I want to or comply with your
request, it will be necessary information to have when we began and hopefully shortly after the first of the year to review all of the permits that have been granted by this Commission, and this a commitment that was made by the Stream Control Commission in complying with the provisions of the Federal Water Pollution Control Act of 1965.

DR. GLASGOW: I would like to make a further request and this one may be more difficult to probably seek from the Federal people the amount of pollution that's dumped in above us. I would like to have a short report on that if you could, Bob.

MR. LA FLEUR: You have particular reference to the Mississippi River in this case, I assume, Dr. Glasgow?

DR. GLASGOW: Right, I think the Federal people might have it.

MR. LA FLEUR: Okay.

DR. GLASGOW: Thank you.

Mr. Secretary, will you introduce the next item.

MR. LA FLEUR: Has this one been approved?

DR. GLASGOW: Yes, it was.

MR. LA FLEUR: The next proposal involves a matter of the actions or practices of Chevron Oil
Company, subsidiary of the California Company in the Stella Field in Plaquemines Parish in which there is and has been for quite some time a discharge of some six thousand barrels of brine through a system of ditches. This brine flows through these ditches and finally is pumped to the Intracoastal Canal.

This, Mr. Chairman, is the situation where we are what might be best described I suppose as a transition zone. I will bring this transition zone situation out in further detail for the reason that the Department of Conservation recently issued an order banning on a statewide basis the discharge of oil field brines to fresh water streams, and it went on to add, however, that the discharge of this brine would be condoned in those areas not being used for agricultural irrigation or for municipal water supplies.

This discharge of brine of the Intracoastal Canal is either in or comes awfully close to being in this transitional zone which is neither fish nor fowl, it's certainly not extremely salty as the Gulf water might be and by no means is it fresh and the information supplied to us by the company and the President, Mr. Ed Denzler, who is with us this morning indicates that the chloride concentrations in the Intracoastal Canal at the site which this brine is pumped out of
the drainage ditches into the Intracoastal runs about
two thousand parts per million. The brine discharge
I repeat is in the amount of six thousand barrels per
day going to the Intracoastal.

With us this morning as I indicated earlier
is Mr. Ed Denzler. Ed, would you have any further
comments, please?

MR. DENZLER: I brought an aerial picture
which shows this a little better if you gentlemen
would like to see it. This letter writing doesn't
quite convey the whole picture truthfully. The field
is right here, the water comes down here, back here
across here and down here into -- they call this
Bayou Barriere but actually it's only a ditch to drain
the airfield and it goes over here to the pumping
station. We sampled here and here on the side and
got about two thousand parts per million. We sampled
here and here and somewhere, I don't know precisely
where, and got about three thousand. It starts out
here about a hundred, so we got a drop out of the
salt content back in here somewhere. Now, this is all
wood as you can see. The only access is around back
here and it doesn't go very far, all this property
except for a little piece right in here belongs to
the Hero interests.
Now, the elder Mr. Hero, years ago, told me that he was glad to have that in there because it kept the weeds from growing in the ditches and he didn't have to have them cleaned out.

We think that we are in compliance with your Paragraph 7, and also with the Department of Conservation orders, but we'd like to be sure, so the fact that we come to you people would clear ourselves and be sure that we are in accord with your regulations. The water originally went back here somewhere into Bayou Barataria. So when this was dug, of course, they leveled it off, and Mr. Hero, of course, dug this canal and leveled this off so that, of course, the blue is all the area where it has to be pumped out.

MR. CHAUVIERE: Mr. Denzler, the ditches and canals which were dug and in which the brine for the well emptied into does not eventually reach any fresh water bayou or any other --

MR. DENZLER: No, sir, not to my knowledge. It all goes to the pumping station.

MR. CHAUVIERE: We have a report that was filed by one of Mr. La Fleur's men and also one of the Department of Conservation men, and he had a sample, I'm not exactly sure where it's taken, but as I recall it's on the bayou side of the pumping station
which I assume he means Bayou Barataria, Bayou Barriere, excuse me, and their sample showed eighty parts per million.

MR. DENZLER: It sounds pretty good.

MR. CHAUVIERE: Well, I don't where it could be.

MR. DENZLER: It could be possibly in this portion of the ditch. Now, this is also Bayou Barriere, it goes over to Bayou Barriere Country Club over here.

MR. CHAUVIERE: Where does it eventually tie into?

MR. DENZLER: It comes down through here.

MR. CHAUVIERE: It's pumped into the Intracoastal?

MR. DENZLER: Yes.

DR. GLASGOW: Does this water have a chance to get back into the wooded area at all?

MR. DENZLER: No, sir, this is all pretty low, in fact, zero elevation. There is one point on this runway and one on this that is slightly above sea level but most of it is zero, and down in here it's, oh, five and six feet below so it's all pretty low, and as you can see from the picture by the area there --
DR. GLASGOW: Should salt water escape, it might be twenty years, even though you did something else it might be twenty years before we got it out of the soil or something like that, you see, I don't want to take a chance on getting salt water out over land that we might want to use.

MR. DENZLER: No, sir, the flow is pretty good through there and it's pumped out pretty good. You see, this has been going on for twenty some odd years and all this before this airfield was built, all of this belonged to the Hero interests.

DR. GLASGOW: Has the amount of salt water going in there increased in that time?

MR. DENZLER: No, sir, salt water has not increased for about a year, it's on the decline.

DR. GLASGOW: You reached a peak and you're going downhill.

MR. DENZLER: Yes, probably four more years life in the field.

MR. CHAUVIERE: I just have one more question. Is it seasonal relative to the parts per million that may be expected in the Intracoastal Waterway? In your letter you sampled above and below the pumping station and which you say the parts per million were two thousand, is that correct?
MR. DENZLER: Yes.

MR. CHAUVIERE: To your knowledge would that be consistent throughout the year, two thousand or thereabouts?

MR. DENZLER: I would think it would be, in fact, I would think probably since this was done fairly recently that it might be a little bit high because we had so much dry weather recently.

MR. TRYGG: It might be seasonal, certainly not going to be effected by the rainfall.

MR. DENZLER: The rainfall would decrease it, that's why I say now this two thousand may be a little bit high, I don't know, but I would say it would not exceed it because we had such a long dry spell.

MR. TRYGG: Does this brine have a real fixed channel down to there?

MR. DENZLER: We have a lot of difficulty in tracing this after we get beyond this point. We think it comes down this way but we're not absolutely positive but, however, at these points, we went on each side to be sure we got about three thousand parts.

MR. TRYGG: Is this a levee here?

MR. DENZLER: I'm not certain on that, I
think it is on the airfield side. The airfield
fence runs right along this side of the ditch. It
may well be but, you see, it's pierced because --

MR. CRESAP: Does this land that's inside
the levee flood during heavy rainfall? I understand
there's a levee all around it, and these ditches are
pumped out into the Intracoastal. What happens when
you have a big drain that causes flooding in the
lower areas? Does this take the salt and spread it
over these areas?

MR. DENZLER: No, it does not.

MR. CRESAP: Does the lower area flood?

MR. DENZLER: This portion might in here
might to a certain slight degree but not too much
because this is not a very large area and they've
got a good size pumping station and pump it out real
good. What we're doing, Ed, these boys have been
in the area and they recorded at the time we were
down there eleven hundred and five parts per million
just before it went into the Intracoastal, in the
pumping station and he was recording eighty in the
Intracoastal, eleven hundred and fifty was just
before it got through and, of course, the ditch is
right near your discharge.

MR. BRADLEY: This was in the airport, it's
the main flow through here.

MR. LA FLEUR: This is essentially your brine.

MR. DENZLER: You must have been down in here, through here.

MR. BRADLEY: Right.

MR. DENZLER: Then your figures are even better than ours.

MR. BRADLEY: Now, I made another sample a week and a half ago and this figure had risen to approximately two thousand five hundred.

MR. LA FLEUR: That's in line with your two thousand.

MR. DENZLER: That's in line with the two thousand.

MR. LA FLEUR: It is definitely a tightly influenced area, that's all it is.

I might add that in order to track the Department of Conservation, we work very closely here, we've been working here, and I met both with the representative of Mid-Continental Oil and Gas Association Conservation's Committee and was with the members of our Division of Oyster and Water Bottom and the Fur Division for discussing this matter as to what indeed will be the verbage con-
tained in this suggested order, if you will, that
the Stream Control Commission is going to be submitted
a copy of for its consideration, and where I'm
running into a question here is what indeed will we
write into this thing with respect to this transition
zone.

We have not made up our minds on what the
verbage will be in this new order that we are talking
about. It might well be that much of the language
that's in that order is already contained in the
regulation which the Commission promogated in 1952.
I think each of the Commission members have a copy
of this regulation.

In effect, however, what it will amount to
is that the Commission would take each of these
cases similar to this and pass on each one on its
own merit.

MR. TRYGG: Do we assume that this is
somewhat of a brackish area that we have gone to?

MR. LA FLEUR: It's tightly influenced,
Mr. Trygg, and we do have a variation of chloride
concentration in the Intracoastal Canal and that
varies from a low of what we have recorded of eighty
here and my field man just came in a minute ago and
said that he recorded something like twenty-five
hundred. Mr. Denzler reported two thousand in his letter, so you have quite a variation here of chloride concentration in the Intracoastal Canal and into which this brine is being discharged.

MR. TRYGG: Well, if there was a direct conduit to the Intracoastal Canal there appeared to be no question as to our acceptance of this thing. What we're evaluating is whether or not this conduit is good enough to carry the brine to this brackish area.

DR. GLASGOW: Are there any further questions from the Commission members?

If not may I have a motion?

MR. SMITH: I move that we second it.

MR. TRYGG: I second it.

DR. GLASGOW: The motion is made and seconded that we approve the application.

Is there any further discussion.

If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

All those opposed same sign.

Motion carried.

Mr. Secretary, will you call up the next item on the agenda, please.

MR. LA FLEUR: The next item, Mr. Chairman,
we come to the Freeport Sulphur Company's proposal for their new mine to be known as the Caminada Mine located approximately seven miles southwest of Grand Isle and six miles off the west tip of Grand Isle. The waste water is well known to the Commission, it's recognized as a high salinity effluent in many respects closely resembling sea water. The similarity lies in the fact that all the important constituents involved in sea water are also recorded for bleedwater, and the firm has submitted in their proposal on Page 2 analytical report containing the inorganic constituents of sea water as compared to the typical waste formation from the wells. Lead water will be pumped from seven to nine bleedwater wells to a manifold on the platform and then the bleedwater will be discharged to the Gulf at a selected depth which will effect the greatest distribution of the effluence. This depth will be determined by preliminary sampling after commencement of mining operations, I might add that this installation will be very similar to, almost identical I suppose to the presently operating and that's been there for some eight or ten years, the Freeport installation some seven miles off Grand Isle.

And with us this morning are two gentlemen,
Mr. Fred Deiler and Mr. Roy Sessums. Would either of you gentlemen care to add to comment, please?

MR. SESSUMS: I believe that the application depicts the operation quite completely, and most of you are familiar with Grand Isle's operation over the past eight years and the manner in which it has been operating there. This is a similar one. If you have detailed questions Mr. Deiler is with me and is probably more capable of answering some of those then I would be.

DR. GLASGOW: Do the Commission members have questions you would like to request answered from Mr. Sessums or Mr. Deiler?

You have done a good job of presenting it. No one has any questions. It was really well written. May I have a motion?

MR. CRESAP: I make the motion.

DR. GLASGOW: The motion has been made. Do I have a second?

MR. SMITH: I'll second it.

DR. GLASGOW: Is there any discussion? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

Those opposed same sign.

Motion carried.
Mr. Trygg had reviewed the application and indicated his approval before he left.

Would you call up the next item, please.

MR. LA FLEUR: The next item, Mr. Chairman, from United States Plywood Corporation with a plant now in operation at Holden, Louisiana, submits this proposal primarily to comply with regulations promuluated by the Commission a number of years ago.

The processes which produce industrial waste discharges to the waters of the State include Phenolic Resin Glue used in the manufacture of exterior grade plywood. Wash down each day of the two glue mixers, three glue spreaders, and associated equipment, results a one hundred to one diluted effluent which flows into a screen, three compartment settling pit, which flows into a three and one half million gallon fire water reservoir for a further dilution of four thousand to one.

Contained in the proposal is a chemical breakdown of materials that are being discharged after this waste has been routed through the retention pond, it's three and a half million retention time, three and a half million gallon retention time, thence to a drainage ditch and finally to the big branch of Tickfaw River at the rate of some thirty-
four hundred gallons a minute.

And with us this morning, I hope he's here, he called my yesterday from Atlanta, Mr. Merle Dodd.

Mr. Dodd.

MR. DODD: Here.

MR. LA FLEUR: Welcome to Louisiana. Do you have any additional comments?

MR. DODD: I don't believe I have any additional comments. I'll be happy to clarify to the best of my ability any questions the Board members might have on that. I'm from the Atlanta office, I am familiar with all of the operations here at Holden.

MR. LA FLEUR: I should like to observe that contained in the proposal submitted is the statement that the firm at its plant at Holden, presently has fish thriving and these are Gambusia in the settling of dilution pond and is indictive of the absence of the harmful waste constituents and to my knowledge I must tell you we have had no complaints from your operation.

DR. GLASGOW: Have you tried any other fish?

MR. DODD: No.

MR. GLASGOW: I recommend you try Blue Gills.
MR. DODD: Well, I think probably Blue Gills may get in there again, I prefer they didn't, that's a fire water form and fish and the fire pumps and nozzles don't mix very good.

DR. GLASGOW: But you will find that the Gambusia is much heartier and there might be some detrimental influence to other species.

MR. DODD: I see.

DR. GLASGOW: So that you picked the toughest fish to use.

MR. DODD: I think that they probably got in there just around the flooding season because we didn't purposely put them in there.

DR. GLASGOW: They're found almost everywhere.

MR. LA FLEUR: Is your pond subject to inundation during the rainy season?

MR. DODD: That whole area during the torrential rains, it just floods out the whole countryside there but the pond doesn't overflow except it increases the flow considerably from the flood ditch and we do have a minor problem during that period of time, the culvert that's been provided under the state highway 190 and under the Illinois Central Railroad is rather inadequate during those torrential
rains because it's quite a bit of water to back up in there and eventually drains out.

DR. GLASGOW: Were there any other questions or comments from the Commission members?

If not, may I have a motion.

MR. SMITH: I'll make the motion.

DR. GLASGOW: Is there a second?

MR. CHAUVERIE: I'll second it.

DR. GLASGOW: The motion has been made and seconded to approve the permit.

Is there any further discussion.

If not, all those in favor say aye.

All those opposed same sign.

The motion is carried.

Mr. Secretary, would you please call up the next item on the agenda.

MR. LA FLEUR: The next item, Mr. Chairman, is the Stauffer Chemical Company proposal for the construction of its industrial chemical manufacturing plant near St. Gabriel, Louisiana. The effluent from this plant must be discharged and Stauffer petitions the Commission for a permit to discharge this effluent into the Mississippi River which contains the following materials as listed on Page 1 of your proposal. They include sodium chloride in the amount...
of normal flow, some twenty-two hundred pounds per hour; sodium hydroxide in the amount of eighty; sodium hypochloride three hundred and fifty; calcium sulfate three hundred seventy-five; calcium carbonate one eighty-five, barium sulfate four hundred twenty-five; water eighty-two thousand pounds per hour; chlorine, one tenth of a pound per hour; and the filter aid which is eighty pounds per hour.

The result in increase in concentration of the chloride, the calcium, the barium and the sulfate are indicated assuming a hundred thousand second feet of flow in the Mississippi River on Page 2 of your proposal. They range from chloride in the amounts of two tenths per part per million, calcium .011, that's vermilion, barium .013 and sulfate .025.

And with us this morning is Mr. Guillory. Mr. Guillory, would you have any additional comments?

MR. GUILLORY: Mr. Morgan, my partner, and I, also Bruce Lester of Stauffer Chemical.

MR. LA FLEUR: Would either of you two have any additional comments?

MR. GUILLORY: We have no further comments.

MR. LA FLEUR: You will note, members of the Commission, that the third column contains some rather large figures in comparison to the maximum in
normal flows which are indicated as being emergency
flow of one hour maximum duration and there will be
emergency showing maximum for this one hour period
because of malfunction of equipment and things of
that nature.

DR. GLASGOW: Is this emergency flow
something that you might anticipate having frequently
or what intervals would you expect?

MR. GUILLORY: No, sir, this emergency
flow is in case of vessel drop some weight after this
material coming in our collection pits and have to
be disposed of, we would say this would be a cata-
s trophe.

DR. GLASGOW: Are there any questions from
the Commission members?

This again, gets back to the point that I
raised originally that sooner or later we're going
to have to look at these more critically when we're
dumping into the river.

MR. LA FLEUR: I might ask, Mr. Chairman,
for example, in the case, and this is just an example,
in the case of sodium chloride stream, and I don't
know that this stream would contain sodium chloride
only, but it the event it does or that this sodium
stream could be isolated from the balance of the
effluent could these materials be handled in some
other way as an alternative method to do discharging
to the river.

MR. GUILLORY: As far as practical handling
them another way I would say no. Our process is
designed for full treatment of our brine which
eliminates the large problem of purging and the best
of our technology we think our process is designed
for a very low effluent for the size of the plant
we're considering.

MR. TRYGG: There's no possibility of
separation of flow?

MR. GUILLORY: This stuff I would say no, sir.

DR. GLASGOW: Are there any other
questions?

If not, may I have a motion?

MR. CHAUVIERE: I move that we accept it,
approve it rather.

DR. GLASGOW: Is there a second?

MR. SMITH: I'll second it.

DR. GLASGOW: A motion has been made and
seconded to approve the application. Is there any
further discussion. If not -- Mr. Trygg.

MR. TRYGG: I came in a little late, where
does this effluent actually discharge, into the river?

MR. LA FLEUR: Into the river.

MR. GUILLORY: Yes, sir.

MR. CHAUVIÈRE: St. Gabriel.

MR. TRYGG: There's no chance of it disinfecting the river too much. That's all.

DR. GLASGOW: Any other comments or questions?

If no further discussion, all those in favor say aye.

Those opposed same thing.

Motion is carried.

Mr. Secretary, will you please call up the Laurens Glass application.

MR. LA FLEUR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

The next proposal Laurens, Glass Inc., located some seven mile west of Ruston on Interstate 20 at the intersection of Interstate 20 and Route 563. The plan to produce glass bottles, the processes that discharge waste include the bottle washing in which malformed labels are removed from the bottle, lubricating and quench water from molding machines, and by the way, the first discharge had a rate of thirteen hundred gallons per day at maximum plant
expansion, lubricating and quench water from moulding machines five hundred gallons per day and sanitary wastes, one hundred employees initial, six hundred at the maximum.

The waste discharge characteristics are indicated on Page 2 of your proposal. This waste will be discharged through a small ditch leading to Madden Creek and finally to the Dugdemora River.

I'll try to locate this on the map for you; just below this highway here and leading into Madden Creek and finally winding up into the Dugdemon River.

The various wastes have been given analysis and they are indicated on Pages 2, well, two copies of Page 2 in your proposal, also the sanitary waste discharge.

I would assume that your sanitary waste discharge has been cleared or will be cleared with the State Health Department, am I correct on that?

MR. SWEITZER: Yes.

MR. LA FLEUR: And I think with us is Mr. Sweitzer representing Laurens Glass. Would you have any added comments?

MR. SWEITZER: No, I'll be glad to answer any questions you might have.

DR. GLASGOW: Does your water come from
MR. SWEITZER: Yes, sir.

DR. GLASGOW: Are there any questions from the Commission members? Any comments?

MR. TRYGG: We had an opportunity to discuss this with the company, and a matter of dual treatment, and we decided that whenever we can accomplish dual treatment to reduce costs we ought to go ahead and do it, that's industrial waste and domestic waste, and you'll notice that in their application on Page 3-A, they have given this consideration and indicating that if they do run into any trouble on this dual treatment they will take the necessary action. I think they have pretty well covered the ground and I would move for the issuance of the permit.

MR. CHAUVIERE: I'll second it.

DR. GLASGOW: The motion has been made and seconded that we approve the permit.

Is there any further discussion.

If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

The opposition same sign.

The motion is carried, the application is approved.
Mr. Secretary, will you announce the next item on the agenda.

MR. LA FLEUR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman, and from the Geigy Chemical Corporation, the proposal for the construction of a plant and the discharge of effluents therefrom to be located in the Parish of Iberville. This plant will produce agricultural and industrial organic chemicals, specifically herbicides, and optical brightening agents.

The total maximum river water consumption will be approximately two hundred million gallons per day and the river water will be used for once through cooling process and fire protection.

The waste discharge will be of seven types, one, cooling water consisting of clarified river water; reactor wash water containing dilute hydrochloric acid, the vent gas scrubber water containing calcium chloride, calcium hydroxide, and traces of organics, solvent decanter waste containing traces of soluble organic compounds, crystalizer waste water containing sulfuric acid, trisubstituted triazine separator water containing sodium chloride and traces of water soluble organics and sanitary wastes.
You'll find on Page 2 of the proposal the total amount of water used and to be discharged, and also on the Page 3 of the proposal the chemical description or breakdown of materials contained therein and the concentrations of it and the pounds per day of this material to be discharged to the river.

We also note that this plant intends to provide I think it was thirty day oxidation or retention time for the handling of its organic wastes and reducing the organics to be discharged, breaking down of organics to be discharged to the river from its plant effluent.

Representing Geigy this morning is Mr. John Ferguson. I should like to add before Mr. Ferguson adds his comments, this is one of the first Petro Chemical units I looked at that has provided waste treatment for its effluents.

Mr. Ferguson, would you care to add comments to this?

MR. FERGUSON: Well, about the only thing, Mr. La Fleur, on Page 3 you'll find we have made an error in typing the application on the sulfates in the first column. This should be zero, 0.085 rather than 0.85.
MR. LA FLEUR: Down at the bottom of the page?

MR. FERGUSON: This was a typographical error, other than that I have no comment, would be happy to answer any questions to clarify the application to the Commission.

MR. LA FLEUR: The retention by the way, instead of the thirty I indicated was ten days in this shallow air oxidation pond. Also that the plant plans to collect and sell, if possible, the waste hydrochloric and waste sulfuric acids. There's likely a good sale for these sulfuric, I don't know about the hydrochloric.

MR. TRYGG: I noticed in the matter of sanitary wastes there's a rather unusual statement, fourth line, this on Page 6, where you state, "Solids not digested in the treating unit will be removed for disposal outside the plant property." What do you mean by that?

MR. FERGUSON: We assume that we contract with some contracting firm to haul out undigested waste for disposal.

MR. TRYGG: What I don't understand, what undigested waste would you have at a package plant of this kind?
MR. FERGUSON: Don't expect any, however, the digestives sometimes get fouled up.

MR. TRYGG: Have you satisfied my man on this point yet?

MR. FERGUSON: We don't have enough detail on the plant to submit this to you, this will come later.

MR. TRYGG: I would suggest that you consider omitting that sentence unless you have a reason to have it in there. Now you may be talking about excess sluge, if that's the case, it would be one thing.

MR. FERGUSON: That's what we're thinking of.

MR. TRYGG: Thank you.

DR. GLASGOW: Are there other questions from Commission members?

MR. LA FLEUR: This sulfate is calcium sulfate, Mr. Ferguson?

MR. FERGUSON: Part of it is sodium sulfate and part of it is sulfuric acid.

MR. CRESAP: May I ask a question?

DR. GLASGOW: Yes, sir.

MR. CRESAP: Our first meeting here. Had this body attempted to arrive at a maximum chloride...
that they would refuse or is this on the basis of each individual request? I noticed that this is an increase of almost three parts per million. This couldn't be too many plants before the chloride begins to be really affected.

DR. GLASGOW: You have any comment, Bob?

MR. LA FLEUR: We have taken each individual on its own merits here, Mr. Cresap, and there has not been reached yet a time or a date or a cutoff place where if another plant wanted to discharge an added amount of chloride or sulfate either, particularly the calcium sulfate, the one we're most concerned with, no, we have not reached that judgement yet.

MR. TRYGG: In the consideration of standards earlier in the sessions of the Commission several months earlier we did attempt to adopt some chloride standards and it was the will of the Commission that we shouldn't not adopt them at this time, but I think it was agreed that we would use those that were proposed as somewhat of a guideline for our action on new plants, and as I recall we had suggested seventy-five parts per million with the maximum chloride in the river being considerably below this giving us some room. This in my mind
certainly is in the middle ground area where it's not big but it's not small and wouldn't take many of these to run us up.

MR. CRESAP: All right.

DR. GLASGOW: I think it is a point that we're all concerned with and it's for that reason that I asked Bob to get this report and I think we need to keep it current.

MR. CRESAP: Correct.

DR. GLASGOW: Are there any questions?

MR. TRYGG: Is there any possibilities for you to discharge to handle these chlorides, have you any idea?

MR. FERGUSON: Well, there is a possibility that in the future that this could be injected into a disposal --

MR. TRYGG: Is there a possibility of separating the streams?

MR. FERGUSON: The streams will be separated so that it can receive individual treatment.

MR. LA FLEUR: Which of your streams contains this amount of chloride, Mr. Ferguson?

MR. FERGUSON: The reactor wash water which is the second stream I believe.

MR. LA FLEUR: And that one could be
isolated you feel?

MR. FERGUSON: That will be isolated.

DR. GLASGOW: I would certainly recommend that you explore that possibility and use it if possible.

MR. FERGUSON: We expect to.

MR. LA FLEUR: What's the nearest town to this site location?

MR. FERGUSON: St. Gabriel.

DR. GLASGOW: Are there any other questions from the Commission members?

May I have a motion?

MR. CHAUVIERE: I move that it be approved.

DR. GLASGOW: The motion has been made to approve the application.

Is there a second?

MR. SMITH: I'll second the motion.

DR. GLASGOW: The motion has been seconded.

Is there any further discussion?

If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

Those opposed same sign.

Motion is carried.
Mr. Secretary, what is our next item?

MR. LA FLEUR: The next item, Mr. Chairman, is the proposal from Sun Oil Company for a
gas processing plant located in St. Mary Parish, the cooling water which would be, by the way, the only
discharge from this plant will be secured from Doctors Bayou in the amount of fourteen million
fourteen hundred thousand gallons per day, and it's indicated in the proposal this water will not come
in contact with any of the process or processing hydrocarbons in the plant. This is, of course, brackish water, this source is. He's indicating that he's going to drink cistern water or rain water, I assume.

A discharge of this waste will flow into Belle Isle Lake, the immediate receiving water body, and then into the Atchafalaya basin and from there into the Gulf of Mexico. It is also indicated since the temperature will be the only factor here with which we will probably be concerned, that he's not going to increase it more than three degrees centigrade.

For an idea as to where this location of this plant will be, we are very close to the Atchafalaya Bay, perhaps three or four miles on Air-
line or maybe six miles out, it would be right in
here and into Belle Isle Lake which is right on the
Coast.

And with us this morning are the two
gentlemen that saw me yesterday afternoon. Their
names are --

MR. BEYT: I'm Bernard Beyt, I'm the one
filed the application. With me is W. S. Oxford, who
is our Division Research Coordinator and Mr. Lynn
Stallings, who is the engineer in charge of the
construction of the plant. We will be glad to answer
any questions you have in connection with this.

DR. GLASGOW: Are there any questions from
the Commission members?

Apparently there are no questions.

May I have a motion?

MR. CRESAP: I'll make the motion.

DR. GLASGOW: Is there a second?

MR. CHAUVEIRE: I'll second it.

DR. GLASGOW: The motion has been made and
seconded to approve the permit.

Is there any further discussion?

If not, all those in favor signify by say-
ing aye.

Those opposed same sign.
The application is approved.

Mr. Secretary, would you please announce the next item.

MR. LA FLEUR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

And from Wyandotte Chemicals Corporation at Geismar, Louisiana, proposal which involves the expansion of their chlorine production unit at Geismar by some seventy percent. The source of the water supply involves some thirty-one hundred gallons per minute from the Mississippi River and three hundred gallons per minute of well water.

Contained on Page 2 of this proposal is an indication of the number of pounds per day of the various chemicals to be included in the waste discharge and both from the existing plant, added to it the chlorine plant expansion and in the final and total column out on the right of your proposal.

Now, down at the bottom of the page you will find there's a calculated increase of the various materials in the river -- no, I'm sorry, this is on Page 3 of the proposal, calculated increase in concentration of the various materials to be added to the river are based on a hundred thousand second feet. There is also an indication as to waste streams from the individual plants are ponded for mixing, for
control of pH, and removal of suspended solids before entering the main discharge sewer, and the main sewer discharges into the Mississippi River below the lowest water level with suitable dispersion.

Sanitary wastes are handled through a septic tank system including sand filters before entering the main stream.

And with us this morning is Mr. Phil Armstrong. Phil, would you have any added comments, please?

MR. ARMSTRONG: I don't have any added comments but I'm here to answer any questions you may have.

MR. LA FLEUR: One point, members of the Commission, that I did omit here in the rapid review of the proposal is an indication that the proposed plant expansion includes a complete redesign of their waste collection system to assure none of the waste can enter the Bayou Francois drainage basin, it's supposed to drain back into the Amite Basin.

We have had some difficulty in years past with this thing, so it's good to have that assurance.

MR. TRYGG: I'd like an explanation on the figures on the top of the Page 3 regarding the existing plant and the expansion and the total effluent.
It appears that the dilution volumes in there might
give you these figures but they are rather hard to
read.

As an example, you have an existing plant,
chloride of fourteen thousand two hundred and the
expansion is eleven thousand five hundred twenty-eight,
and your total effluent is thirteen thousand one
hundred seventy-six.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Oh, these are not pounds,
these are in concentration units.

MR. TRYGG: I recognize that too but then
when you go down to the concentrations and parts per
million on your total waste stream you actually, in
the case of chlorides, you show an increase of twenty-
four hundredths to seventy-one where actually in your
chloride is CL and your upper table you don't show
any appreciable increase.

MR. LA FLEUR: Look on Page 2, John.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Well, let me see if I can
back up. Let's go back up to the top of the page,
chlorides existing plant, the concentration in the
effluent of the existing plant is fourteen thousand
parts. The concentration in the new plant expansion
would be eleven thousand parts. The two streams
mixed would be thirteen thousand parts but there is
more total flow in the combination of the two plants than there is in either of the two individually, you see. So the total effluent in terms of pounds is up but the concentration of the effluent is about the same because the volume is higher. Does that help?

MR. TRYGG: That's what I thought the explanation was. In other words, actually your parts per million in your plant discharge has actually been lowered but there's actually more of it so therefore your chloride content contribution to the river is higher.

MR. ARMSTRONG: Yes.

MR. TRYGG: That's what I thought. One other question on your sanitary waste, how many people are served by this sewerage plant?

MR. ARMSTRONG: There are three hundred and fifty approximately now.

MR. TRYGG: And you have a septic tank sand filter that is working all right?

MR. ARMSTRONG: It appears to be working fine, yes, we've have very little difficulty. You mean as far as keeping biologically active?

MR. TRYGG: Yes. I knew that we accepted this but this is a pretty good sized one and we're no longer getting requests to accept these kind of
things.

MR. ARMSTRONG: We have very little maintenance, you know, had to pump out and that sort of thing.

MR. TRYGG: We'd like to stop and take a look at it sometime.

MR. ARMSTRONG: All right.

MR. LA FLEUR: Phil, this ponding that you're proposing here which will serve as mixing area and also for control of pH and also for removal of suspended solids before entering the main sewer discharge, would you care to speculate on what this might do for your oil and grease, for your toluenes and your amines that are listed in the discharge, both in the -- well, particularly in the existing plant, that you are not adding much if anything.

MR. ARMSTRONG: No, I think for settling solids they're doing a reasonable job but as a holding base that would be required for oxidation I don't anticipate much reduction from this.

MR. LA FLEUR: What's the retention time on this ponding?

MR. ARMSTRONG: Oh, they vary depending on which unit we're speaking of. The largest perhaps two days and the smallest perhaps four or five hours.
MR. LA FLEUR: One other question I think it's a fair one to ask and that has been asked of others this morning here, the possibilities of the isolation of your high chloride streams by alternate means of disposals and the discharge from the river.

MR. ARMSTRONG: This is one alternate that's in the engineering department, engineering design, they're looking at this alternate as compared to the avoidance of bringing the impurities up from underground with the salt. The second scheme will be tested as a part of this plant. We don't know how successful it will be so I have not included it in these figures. These figures are assuming that what's in the basic design of the plant is what's going to work and the engineering improvements are not demonstrated and therefore not included in this permit.

DR. GLASGOW: Are there any further questions from the Commission members?

If not, may I have a motion?

MR. SMITH: I make a motion.

DR. GLASGOW: Is there a second?

MR. TRYGG: I'll second it but then I want to ask another question if I may.

DR. GLASGOW: Motion has been made and
seconded.

Is there further discussion.

MR. TRYGG: Under this matter of the chromates on your form plant expansion, I notice that you're using, you're showing a pretty high chromate content here. Here again, is this a matter of small stream with a high concentration?

MR. ARMSTRONG: No, it's not. We have attempted in the past to operate a treated water system with the six parts per million chromates. Our maintenance contractors have been very unhappy with it and we are now in a position where we're forced into a chromate treating system for the cooling water tower, this is reused water and at a much higher chromium level to insure lack of corrosion on the equipment on the water side, so this is an engineering change in an attempt to reduce the equipment damage within the plant. We have been operating or attempting to operate at a very low chromate range which has been proven unsatisfactory.

MR. TRYGG: Have you given any consideration to treating your chromate waste? I would hate to have all the plants along the Mississippi River make the same decision you made.

MR. ARMSTRONG: The numbers I show are the
makeup, we cannot find -- we find that in the process we get about a fifty percent reduction of chromate, in other words, it disappears, all that we add to the process we cannot find the effluent, I'm sure it also disappears rapidly, I feel it probably disappears rapidly also in the Mississippi River but I'm -- this was an attempt over the long term to run it as low a chromate level as possible. We finally can do it and keep a reasonable maintenance cost.

MR. TRYGG: That's all I have.

DR. GLASGOW: Is there any other discussion?

If not, all those in favor of approval signify by saying aye.

Those opposed.

There is no opposition, therefore the permit is approved.

Mr. Secretary, will you please announce the next item on the agenda.

MR. LA FLEUR: The next item, Mr. Chairman, the matter of Sohio Oil Company brine discharge to the Mississippi River from the Sunshine Field in Iberville Parish, Louisiana.

A matter of review here, this situation was brought before the Commission, well, first the firm
sought and received approval for the discharge of brine to this river in June of 1952. It was reviewed again in 1964 and once more in 1967. Approximately thirty days ago the Department of Conservation issued an order which banned this discharge of brine to our fresh water streams in the State, and it is then for this reason that I have been asked to bring this matter before the Commission once more.

With us this morning is Mr. Preston Rennie of Sun Oil. Mr. Rennie, would you have any comments, please?

MR. RENNIE: No, I have no additional information, and it's probably appearing in your file. Have a letter to you dated June 2nd, setting out certain data on the field, won't take your time to rehash this unless there is some specific questions relative to it that you would like to ask.

DR. GLASGOW: Are there questions from the Commission members?

MR. CHAUQUIERE: Well, I would just like to reiterate what Mr. La Fleur said that the Department of Conservation has written an order relative to not discharging any oil field brine in any fresh water stream and this is sort of contrary to the Department's order even though the Board did
grant an extension to your discharge in the Mississippi River.

MR. RENNIE: I believe the Department had agreed that they would so to keep themselves to any actions of existing permits or orders of another control body of the State such as the Stream Control Commission.

MR. CHAUVERE: Well, I think that may be true but as I appreciate it it would be primarily concerned with this body as to whether it be discharged into a brackish body of water which is not suitable for human consumption or agricultural purposes.

DR. GLASGOW: I would like to point out that we have issued an order to a neighboring field that they must inject theirs instead of discharging it into a fresh water stream, and that I see no difference between their disposal and yours, very little. Of course, you have more dilution but at the same time it's discharged into a fresh water stream and I feel that this agency here must follow the guidelines of the Conservation Commission.

MR. RENNIE: Of course, I've been reading the material here relative to the other consideration that came before the Stream Control Commission and...
the surface conditions are somewhat quite dissimilar between the two, are they not? We are discharging into the Mississippi River below the surface of the river. We have not let any oil into the river to my knowledge or has come to my knowledge from any other source, the Stream Control Commission or the Conservation Commission of which I'm aware and this other consideration I believe there were approximately twelve thousand barrels of water per day which a lot of it over a 25 year period and had been discharged into ditches which eventually got to coulees and bayous which eventually drained into the river and what I take to be a semi-residential area which is quite different than our situation.

DR. GLASGOW: Well, I think that this salt flow to the Mississippi River is reaching a proportion that we have to reduce it if we possibly can, and this is considerable volume, it is not in accord with the Conservation Commission ruling and I feel that we should follow that ruling.

MR. RENNIE: In this other situation being as it was discharged into a surface drainage system to the quantity of water would be depended upon the amount of actual rainfall largely in that immediate area or not a very distant area, it's
certainly nothing like the drainage system in the Mississippi River, well, it would be easily possible that twelve thousand barrels a day to see those surface drainage systems getting severly polluted with salt water, no like situation do we have in our Sunshine operation.

DR. GLASGOW: Yes, I agree with you on that.

MR. RENNIE: It's quite a striking difference between the two.

MR. TRYGG: Mr. Chairman, I don't think the issue is whether or not the other company is worse than you or you're better than the other company, the issue, as I see it, is whether or not we permit brine to be discharged from our wells to surface or surface stream, and in the earlier considerations of this Commission we did not have the backing of the Conservation Commission in the present form and therefore we did accept some compromises along the way, we were doing the best we could, we really didn't have the mechanism to do it. I think what the Commission is faced with now is that we better make a decision since now we do have the tools to keep brine from going into our surface streams and I remember your case very well, I think you had
some very good points certainly in comparison. I also remember that as I recall in about three years your production would be down to maybe a couple of wells but the question then was what will happen with these two wells and although it's a small amount we're faced with treating everybody alike, so I would think eventually even if we did allow you to go at this rate we would have required you to get rid of that brine some place along the line or else stop your production.

MR. RENNIE: It's possibly not a matter for consideration, this treating everyone alike and I think I heard information here this morning of quantities of effluent going into the river that contain probably more tons of materials discharged into it then what we're putting into it and those are plants that are going to be there for 20 or 30 years and probably get expanded, just an increasing thing, where we are a self eliminating type of thing. We agreed at the last meeting here that we don't think there are any possibilities of new production in this field but that if there were any new production in the field we would make other provisions for disposal of any water from it, in other words, we would guarantee to the Board that these wells would be it and
when they were depleted, well, we would quit, that we wouldn't ask for any relief relative to any new production if such occurred.

MR. TRYGG: I often tell my kids that the world is unfair no matter how you try to treat them equally you can't do it. I can't leave this go on the record without making a comment on your statement about the other discharges. Actually, a part of the guidelines that was handed to us from the Federal Government and a part of our plan is going to indicate that waste amenable treatment or handling, I don't think we used the word handling, control, must be controlled. You'll notice we pointedly asked each individual here if they could separate their flows with the thought in mind they may not be able to treat this material but they can control it by, for instance, injection underground, so we are thinking that way too. I think we're going to have to take some other action on the industry as Dr. Glasgow has indicated but right now if we told Wyandotte, for example, that no, you can't do this, we don't know what they can do, we don't know an answer but then we do know if we tell you you can't do this, at a cost you can do it. This is the problem we're in.
MR. LA FLEUR: Mr. Rennie, I should comment here for the information of the Board and all concerned, but since 1954 the Commission has not approved any discharge of oil field brine in the Mississippi River and they done by the way, the same thing in the case of domestic waste. In any event your initial approval of a brine discharge to the river came in 1952, and I also must observe that the amount of brine as best the records that I could find indicated back in 1952 indicated that you are requesting some two thousand barrels of brine a day, and as I recall you're well above that level at this time.

MR. RENNIE: What our application said, a maximum quantity would be twelve, that was in our original application.

MR. LA FLEUR: In 1952?

MR. RENNIE: Yes, sir. I corrected my statement, it is estimated that the maximum volume of salt water that will be produced by this field will be approximately four hundred eighty-seven thousand two hundred gallons per day or eleven thousand six hundred barrels per day or 7.5 4 cubic feet per second. The chemical analysis of salt water is given in Paragraph 7 and that is our
application dated February 27th, 1952, and to my knowledge I don't think we even really came close to that quantity mentioned in that letter.

And you made mention a while ago that one of your primary concerns in the river is calcium sulfate and I would point out to you the analysis of the water that was presented in that application, the calcium content is seven hundred and seven parts per million and the sulfate content is a hundred and sixty-seven parts per million. The sulfate content is practically nonexistent. We would be adding very little in the way of hardness to the river.

We would be glad to take additional samples, this is old data. I wouldn't -- If I were going to make a decision on that I would want something a little newer than that myself, we would be glad to take additional samples and present to you if you want the current analysis of the water, I don't think it would be different material but at least we would have a current check as to what the present analysis is relative to the calcium sulfate.

This water probably comes close to having a little bit of barium in it and when you have barium in it why you don't have sulfate in it.
Relative to the hardness, we could present some additional data for the Board's consideration.

MR. CHAUUVIERE: I'd like to add a little something to what the members of the panel have said. Apparently you're the only one that had permission to discharge, produce brine into the Mississippi River. Now, if you would look at a map that indicates the oil and gas fields along the Mississippi River there are numerous fields. Just about all of them are producing salt water. Now, all these other companies have found other means which is discharging the produced salt water into salt water sand below the surface except you. Now, we have the two groups, the Conservation Department which set up special rules and regulations to help, we think that's the way we did it, to help the industry get rid of their salt water in the proper manner.

MR. RENNIE: Of course, I would ask you, how close are those fields to the river. We are on the river. We have wells whipstocked under the river.

MR. CHAUUVIERE: Well, these are too.

MR. RENNIE: Of course, you can't build pipelines very cheaply either, the same as you can't drill disposal wells very cheaply.
MR. CHAUVIERE: It's hard to take the salt out of the fresh water too.

MR. LA FLEUR: Would you by any chance have a dry hole down there which this water could be taken?

MR. RENNIE: No, sir. If I have to make disposal I'll have to take a currently producing well out of service and convert it to disposal. I do not have a temporary abandoned well that has not been plugged that's available for conversion.

MR. CHAUVIERE: Well, we have in this order that doesn't necessitate abandoning a producing well, discharge the salt water through the annulus which will permit it to be discharged if you're protecting the fresh brine water which will permit the well to be used for one year.

MR. RENNIE: That's close to the levee there, and the Corps of Engineers, I don't know whether they would approve it, whether I would want to stick my neck out.

MR. CHAUVIERE: They're doing it along the river at all these other fields.

MR. RENNIE: You see, we're right next to that levee and the Corps of Engineers is real proud of that levee.
MR. CHAUVIERE: You're not going to be affecting the levee, prefer putting it between your producing string and your casing and the annulus.

MR. RENNIE: We can certainly investigate that, I would be concerned about it, but we could certainly investigate it.

DR. GLASGOW: I would like to point out it's very likely that many previous approvals will be renewed in the next year or two years and there will of necessity be considerable modifications of the original permits and this I don't think is going to be any exception to what this Commission will carry out in the immediate future. We realize this will cost you money but if we don't do it, it's going to cost us more in the long run to take care of it.

MR. RENNIE: Yes, sir.

DR. GLASGOW: So it's really cheaper to take care of it then to dispose of it.

MR. RENNIE: Of course, we're so close to the end here and we operated so long and we're on such a thin thread now, our life in the field exists by such a thin thread that it - sincerely and genuinely works a severe hardship on us and the royalty owners in the area, at this time, but, of course, that's perhaps something that can't be done.
DR. GLASGOW: I have no reason to doubt your statement but I have heard this from other oil interests that they would close their wells and have to abandon them if they were required to reinject and as far as I know none of them have abandoned them.

MR. RENNIE: I haven't made that statement now.

DR. GLASGOW: I know.

MR. RENNIE: I said I have to take one well out of service and convert it to a disposal well which I will have to do, which I will have to see if I could convince the royalty owners to let me which will take some time.

MR. TRYGG: The royalty owner really doesn't have any choice if you can't produce.

MR. RENNIE: Well, that's right, he gets shut in, I can coerce him.

MR. CHAUVIERE: I don't think you need much coercing.

MR. TRYGG: I sat through a session in Alexandria about two or three years ago that I never want to sit through again, and this concerned not one of these cases but many, many, so I'm not
as sympathetic as I might have been.

DR. GLASGOW: Is there any further questions from the Commission?

May I have a motion on the --

MR. BROOKSHIRE: May I interrupt and ask a question about this, if I may?

DR. GLASGOW: Yes, Mr. Brookshire.

MR. BROOKSHIRE: I'm Bob Brookshire with the Mid-Continental Oil & Gas Association. There was a statement made here that I would like for my own information to get clarified. In connection with the plant discharge of brine or chloride, I guess, I'm not a chemical man to know what we're talking about but are we talking about here a situation where a plant is discharging chlorides of a similar quantity in an area that is the same area in which the applicant has applied for discharge from the brine, is that the way I understood you, John?

MR. TRYGG: What I was trying to say was that one of the prime considerations of this Commission is as long as I can remember to require treatment when it appears that treatment is a practical thing, and on the other end of the spectrum where it was not at all practical, I say
practical this time, we didn't have much of a choice but to go ahead, so when many of these industries came along with high chlorides and with reference to Wyandotte which is really not very high if they could separate their stream then the Commission is going to start feeling pretty strongly that they get rid of this in the same way the producing wells but then at the moment we don't have the clear cut answer that you do in the oil well situation where we can get rid of it, there it is, the brine, it's separated, and we can't get rid of it by injecting, and the industrial waste discharge we have tremendous quantities with brine in it and it's difficult to sort them out, this is why the Commission was asking each of these companies whether or not they could sort them out, and if they could sort them out --

MR. BROOKSHIRE: I understand that, John, but don't we come back to the same thing, if you have a plant, this is what I understood you to say, if we have a plant which has no other way to do it, it's all right for them to dump it, but if we have an oil field which has a way to do it, we're not going to allow it, is that what you said?

MR. TRYGG: The first statement is not
quite right. We have to make up our mind whether we're going to permit that plant to actually come in or continue operation if they have no way of discharging, I mean, no way of handling, in other words, I think thus far we have accepted them but I think the time is right close that we're going to have to say, well, either you're able to do this without polluting or you don't do it.

MR. BROOKSHIRE: I can understand that.

MR. TRYGG: I'm one man talking.

MR. BROOKSHIRE: Don't we have a situation that exists, if I understand this right, we have a situation where in a sense because of technology perhaps, one person is dumping as much as another but because of technology we're saying the one can't.

MR. TRYGG: That's correct.

MR. BROOKSHIRE: With that in mind, if we have reached that conclusion, I think Arnold understands this order and so does Bob, of the Conservation Order, I think we have a situation in the Conservation Order, which is what brought this up, I don't think we had any complaints or haven't heard any if we had about this, isn't there an exception to the Conservation Order for particular problems and hardship cases?
MR. CHAUVIERE: In all our orders there are exceptions of hardship.

MR. BROOKSHIRE: What I'm trying to see and I'm trying to understand the Conservation Order as much as the work of the Commission in regard to this, isn't this a situation, I'm not trying to take up Sohio's fight, I'm just trying to see because we have been fiddling around with that order for a long time you know, trying to see what it means and what its ramifications will be insofar as the Stream Control Commission is concerned, I don't think it was the intention of those people in Conservation when they wrote the order to absolutely eliminate some isolated instances that you can't cover by a general order.

MR. CHAUVIERE: Well, I don't see any reason why we should single out Sohio, put him in a hardship case, I don't see where it's hardship at all, he can discharge his salt water underground like everyone else, and I don't see why you should be classified as a hardship case. I understand what you mean.

MR. BROOKSHIRE: I'm not saying a hardship case because I don't think they have a hardship case, maybe they do. When you talk about a
hardship and all you're talking about, some way in which you're trying to be fair and equitable in a sense, and if I got a plant on one side of a river that's -- because it's a plant and can't separate it that's dumping a whole lot of chlorides in there, I got something over here that can and neither one of them apparently causing any problems at this point of the game, I think you're really working a hardship in this thing.

MR. CHAUVIERE: Well, along those lines --

MR. BROOKSHIRE: Not because of the economy involved or anything like that --

MR. CHAUVIERE: Along those lines Brookshire is talking about, we discussed the same thing briefly about plants discharging chloride into the Mississippi River. We are aware of it, as I appreciate it and as Mr. Trygg explained and as Dr. Glasgow asked Mr. La Fleur to conduct a survey to see, as I understood his request to Mr. La Fleur, is to determine how much is being dumped into the Mississippi River from all these plants. I think there will come a time when you just have saturated the river and you can't dump any more in it, I don't know when it's going to be but we realize that --

MR. RENNIE: Here's the Paragraph 11 Mr.
Brookshire refers to, the Paragraph 11 of the order, "exception to this order may be granted without a public hearing upon written request by an operator to the Commission of Conservation and upon showing that good cause therefore exists. Such exceptions may be granted administratively provided that inspection of the disposal facilities does not disclose any salt water damage or pollution. If pollution or surface damage is detected, production from the well or wells shall cease upon compliance with provisions of this order." With the inspection of our facilities indicate that salt water damage or pollution is occurring from our operation and, of course, getting back to what Mr. Brookshire said any more so than what is happening in other effluent streams going into the river.

DR. GLASGOW: I might add here a comment that we did receive a letter, a copy of a letter to the Governor from Mr. Pete Menefee of the Conservation Commission and in which he was objecting to our previous action in this case, that is not in conformity with their requests, therefore I'm going to call a halt to this discussion and ask for action on the proposal.

May I have a motion?
MR. CHAUVIERE: I move that the application be rescinded, that the permit be rescinded and the applicant be given a reasonable time to find other ways to disposing of the salt water.

DR. GLASGOW: Is there a second?

MR. TRYGG: I'll second it.

DR. GLASGOW: A motion has been made and seconded to rescind the permit and give the Sohio Oil Company a reasonable length of time to find other means of disposal of their salt water.

Is there any further discussion?

If not, those in favor signify by holding up your right hand.

The vote is unanimous.

MR. RENNIE: What will I get on the time, a reasonable period of time, I'm going to proceed with all due concern, I do not -- if this is done to put it off, it ain't going to cost me any less than to do it immediately but I have to obtain a permit from the City Conservation Commission, I also have to get an AFE approval by the working interest partners, I have to get a surface lease and permission from currently producing wells which will have to be temporarily abandoned, I have to buy materials and do the field work, all of which will take some time.
MR. CHAUUVIERE: May we ask you what would you consider reasonable.

MR. RENNIE: Six months. I will try to do it sooner but I think if you give me six months I should be able to accomplish it in that period of time.

DR. GLASGOW: I think that you'll find that this body will be very reasonable and tolerant and I would instruct you to negotiate with the Secretary and keep him informed and I think we will go along with six months.

MR. RENNIE: Well, I'll assure you that I will set out to do it immediately. The Board has taken it's action, we will comply with it, I will not do anything toward dragging feet to comply with this but sometimes you hit individuals and it becomes difficult to deal with them but we will proceed as quickly as possible.

DR. GLASGOW: If you'll keep the Secretary informed and he can periodically present his information to us and then should we think you're dragging your feet we might call you back.

MR. RENNIE: Well, what I wish to do is state that it is our intent and purposes to cooperate with you to the fullest extent, we felt like we had
on this matter, it's all been a matter of public record, and we intend to keep that way in the future.

DR. GLASGOW: We appreciate your attitude.

MR. TRYGG: Dr. Glasgow, before we go into the next item, I notice there's been considerable comment in a number of our meetings as to what constitutes pollution and related comments. It's my feeling that if we're going, in Louisiana, to comply with the spirit of the people of the United States and the antipollution activities, both air and water, we're going to have to attempt to handle all pollution as practicable to handle. We're going to have to be even hard pressed to keep up by doing the best thing we can do within our modern technology, so I think it's not a matter of whether one effluent stream consists of pollution, actually it's a matter of whether a series of these or many of these will give us ultimate pollution which apparently we're getting some, so my feeling and this is not, I'm not speaking for the Commission now, but I speak with another hat on and in the category as State Engineer and also Secretary to the Air Control Commission and I have gotten to the point now that I don't think we ought to fight this treatment, we ought to try to do
the best we can because after all, we're the people
that we're trying to abate the pollution for and
it's going to be a hard jump for anyone in the group
to adopt the philosophy that we no longer use the
sediment into capacities of the air and the streams
to the maximum to do the job. I don't think we can
no longer do this, I think the whole bunch of us
within several years will have adopted that, right
now it's pretty hard to adopt. That's all the
comments I have.

DR. GLASGOW: I would like to point out
a thing that I have said in other meetings and that
is this fact: We are at the lower part of the
Mississippi River and if that river is ever to be
maintained and cleaned up it's going to be the people
who are on the lower side of it, not those in the
upper part, so that if we permit the river to be used
just for a regular sewer, certainly we can expect
everybody above here to want to do the same thing;
and it's only the states at the lower part of the
river that can make it a good river, so we got to
take a stand in it.

MR. LA FLEUR: I would like to remind all
members of the Board too and all parties, interested
parties here, the comments made by Mr. Watts at our
last meeting, and this alludes to the designs or intentions on the part of the State such as Texas and New Mexico, a diversion of perhaps as much as thirty-five thousand cubic feet per second of the Mississippi River water to the high plains of Texas and portions of New Mexico and if and when that should come about the dilution or sedimentation capacity of this stream is reduced by a tremendous factor and so what then do we do, and we are cut down on this business of dilution being the solution to pollution, it's not exactly a neat play on words, it's something we're actually faced with here.

MR. BROOKSHIRE: Dr. Glasgow, if I may say one other thing here --

DR. GLASGOW: Mr. Bob Brookshire.

MR. BROOKSHIRE: I'd like to say and call this Commission's attention that the order of which we speak Conservation has written has been urged and all by the oil and gas industry itself and I think you'll find our membership is very much concerned about this problem, we worked on it for years and years and years and we're really interested in seeing that our streams are kept clean and I think you'll find possibly all the operators in fact, are trying as best they can to keep from polluting, and there
have been some bad situations in the past exist, and
all I rose for a few minutes ago to say we don't
always like to be singled out as the person that's
doing it all, and I want to call to your attention
despite the fact we had this order that affects the
oil industry, the oil industry is willing to go
along with it and wants to go along and encouraging
everybody else to do so, sometimes others aren't,
and are doing just as much, and I'm not trying to
single them out either but I do feel like we're
trying to do as much as possible not only on a
Louisiana level but on a national level. There is
a tremendous amount of money being spent in our
industry all the time, there are in other industries
all the time too but the only reason I asked the
question before was I thought we were getting into
an area where there was some perhaps inequalities
that existed and John explained to me what he had in
mind I think very well with this. It's just not
much you can do about some of these things sometimes.

DR. GLASGOW: I think you will see a
trend very shortly of reviewing permits in which
many people will be called in for review.

MR. BROOKSHIRE: I'm not trying to cause
anybody any trouble.
DR. GLASGOW: No, I realize that, I do appreciate the excellent cooperation from your industry and we'll work with you any way we can, and if anything has appeared here this morning that might seem as though we singled out your industry we certainly have not and we do not want it to appear that way.

MR. BROOKSHIRE: Dr., we have no contrary feeling to the Board, we're just calling an economic venture that we were trying to work our way out from under, we had no cross purposes with your intent and purposes, please be assured.

DR. GLASGOW: No, we realize that.

MR. BROOKSHIRE: With all respects to Sohio, I didn't even know anything about this 'til I came here, I hadn't talked to Sohio about it or anything, I was just listening.

DR. GLASGOW: We must move on. Mr. Secretary, will call up the next item on the agenda, please.

MR. LA FLEUR: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

From First Nitrogen Corporation, Donaldsonville, Louisiana, a proposal for the addition of two hundred gallons per minute of processed condensate effluents from the First Nitrogen Corporation effluent
to be discharged in the Mississippi River. This material will be first treated in an oxidation lagoon to reduce the BOD from the pre-treatment situation of three hundred fifty parts per million down to less than a hundred seventy-five parts per million and further to less than sixty-five parts per million by dilution before it is discarded in the Mississippi River. The total oxygen demand to the river will be twelve hundred fifty pounds per day.

In effect, what is contained in this proposal here is a proposal to treat the waste from First Nitrogen Corporation who is presently operating an installation at Donaldsonville and added to that an effluent from its neighbor who I think partially owned subsidiary. Mr. Otto Stangl, technical manager of the First Nitrogen Corporation is here with us this morning and would you choose to add some comment, please?

MR. STANGL: What we plan to do is just add to our treatment is two hundred gallons per minute and, of course, we're sizing up the equipment and the aerators and the lagoons and so on and so forth.

DR. GLASGOW: Are there any questions
from the Commission members?

MR. TRYGG: These calculated flows under Appendix 3 look pretty good to me, Dr. Glasgow.

MR. LA FLEUR: Mr. Stangl, are we to assume here that you shall no longer from the First Nitrogen Corporation have a discharge or an industrial waste discharge to the St. James Parish drainage canal?

MR. STANGL: This is correct.

MR. LA FLEUR: Very good, I'm so happy.

MR. TRYGG: I'd like to move for issuing the permit.

DR. GLASGOW: The motion has been made. Is there a second?

MR. BONFANTI: I second it.

DR. GLASGOW: Is there any further discussion?

All those in favor signify by saying aye. Those opposed.

The application is approved.

Is there any other business to come before the Stream Control Commission this morning?

If not, may I have a motion for adjournment?

MR. CHAUVERIE: I move to adjourn.

MR. SMITH: I second it.
DR. GLASGOW: The meeting is now adjourned.
PUBLIC NOTICE TO RUN ONE (1) TIME IN THE OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE STATE OF LOUISIANA

Notice is hereby given that Chevron Oil Company, The California Company Division, New Orleans, Louisiana:

Lake Long Field, Lake Long Production Facilities
Marrero Field, Marrero Field Tank Battery
Stella Field, Stella Field Combined Facilities

have received waste disposal permits from the Louisiana Stream Control Commission and is now applying to the Commission for Certification as provided in Revised Statutes 56:1439(5) that there is reasonable assurance that the waste discharges from these installations will be conducted in a manner which will not violate applicable water quality standards. Comments concerning the application can be filed with the Commission or its Executive Secretary within ten days from the date of this notice.

Robert A. Lafleur, Executive Secretary
Louisiana Stream Control Commission