

Louisiana Coastal Law

LCL 101, Fall 2026

Sea Grant LOUISIANA | LAW & POLICY PROGRAM

Contents

Bills Passed in the 2026 Regular Session . . . 1
Chevron USA, Inc. v. Plaquemines Parish . . 6
Abandoned Vessels on Private Property . . . 9
Crop Insurance for Oyster Farmers 13
Acknowledgements 15

Bills Passed in the 2026 Regular Session of the Louisiana Legislature Affecting Coastal Resource Use and Conservation

By Marquise Hall[1] and Stevie Robinson[2]

Fisheries and Aquaculture

Act 81; HB 652
Adds one member to the Oyster Task Force to be appointed by the commissioner of the Department of Agriculture and Forestry as a nonvoting member and adds the Department of Agriculture and Forestry as an entity that will receive recommendations from the task force regarding the oyster industry and production. *Amends R.S. 56:421(B)(5)-(15), (C), and (E)(4); Adds R.S. 56:421(B)(16).*

Act 82; HB 653
Specifies that of the two Oyster Task Force members appointed by the United Commercial Fisherman's Association, one member must be a resident of St. Bernard Parish. *Amends R.S. 56:421(B)(10) and (E)(4).*

Act 122; HB 121
This Act gives authority to the Commissioner of Agriculture and Forestry (LDAF) to seize, hold or destroy seafood products in violation of §3:4749.1. *Adds R.S. 3:4749.1(B)(7).*

Act 153; HB 349
Establishes that money in the Imported Seafood Safety Fund shall be used additionally to "administer a program to market and promote Louisiana seafood." *Amends R.S. 40:5.10.1(B).*

Act 168; HB 558
Adds members to the Seafood Safety Task Force to include representatives from the oyster industry, crab industry, crawfish industry, and the finfish industry. *Adds R.S. 40:5.5.3(D)(15)-(18).*

Act 171; HB 669
Authorizes the use of state property near Grand Isle for seafood research. The Grand Isle Port commission is authorized to use water bottoms, water columns and water surfaces of an area of approximately twenty-seven and one-half acres in Bayou Rigard, Jefferson Parish, Louisiana. The sole purpose of the use of these areas shall be for an off-bottom oyster culture project which is undertaken by the Louisiana Sea Grant program.

Additionally, the Commissioner of Administration and the Grand Isle Port Commission

are authorized to enter into agreements, covenants, and stipulations and to execute documents pertaining to this area. The Grand Isle Port Commission, along with the Louisiana Sea Grant program, may participate in a seafood research and economic development program as previously described.

Act 172; HB 725
Establishes that the six-month period begins for the required time frame that retailers must retain invoices when the seafood was purchased and adds a penalty of for those who fail to maintain records or knowingly create or submit fraudulent records of purchase. *Adds R.S. 3:4749.4.*

Act 314; HB 721
Grants an exception to the prohibition on night shrimping. During open shrimping season licensed commercial shrimp harvesters can start trawling at 5:30 a.m. at the following locations: Vermilion Bay, East Cote Blanche Bay, and West Cote Blanche Bay. *Amends R.S. 56:499.4.*

Act 316; HB 757
Prohibits any person from knowingly and intentionally authorizing, directing, or having control or ownership of an agent or vessel involved in taking menhaden for commercial purposes from fishing within the area designated by the Department of Wildlife and Fisheries. The Act sets forth the penalties as follows: $2,500 fine for the first violation, $5,000 fine for the second violation, and $7,500 fine for the third violation. *Adds R.S. 56:320(J).*

Act 321; HB 835
Allows charter boat fishing guide licensees, that are performing for-hire, to purchase a Charter Guide Wildlife Management Area Access permit. The permit grants the charter fishing guide and his clients access within the wildlife management area. The fee is $100. The permit is valid for one year, starting of the first of January and ending on December thirty first. *Amends R.S. 56:302.9(H)-(J); Adds R.S. 56:302.9(K).*

Act 323; HB 857
Adds to the labeling requirement for imported seafood to include commingled seafood as well, which is a mix of imported and domestic seafood. Commingled seafood must be labeled that it is commingled and not solely domestic. *Amends R.S. 3:4749.2(B)(intro. para.) and (1) and (D)(intro. para.).*

Act 324; HB 889
Requires the Department of Louisiana Department of Health and the Department of Wildlife and Fisheries to create a bulk tagging process specifically for alternative oyster cultivation. The bulk tag would then represent all the oysters on board, instead of tagging the oysters individually. The tag should include all information required by the Louisiana Department of Health, office of public health, and the Department of Wildlife and Fisheries. *Amends R.S. 56:449(C).*

Act 376; SB 257
Removes the requirement that a strike net tagholder's social security number be displayed on the tag and allows tags to be issued to people without social security numbers. Strike net tags are official, waterproof identification labels to prove owner ship of gear and link the equipment directly to a licensed individual. *Amends R.S. 56:325.4(B)(4), 333(B)(5), and 406(A)(3)(e).*

Act 443; HB 872
Requires all vessels involved in commercial menhaden fishing to have on board an automatic identification system (AIS) projecting each vessel's precise GIS location to enforce buffer boundaries, effective April 19, 2027. *Adds R.S. 56:8(160) and 325.5(D).*

Act 444; HB 886
Provides that any annual menhaden harvest report received by the legislative committee shall not be confidential. *Enacts La. R.S. 56:325.5(D) and repeals La. R.S. 56:325.5(A)(1)(c).*

Act 460; SB 111
Provides daily limits for black bass of genus Micropterus (minimum size limit of 12 inches and take limit of 5) and crappie of genus Pomoxis (minimum size limit of 8 inches and take limit of 25) within a specified geographic area including the Atchafalaya Basin and surrounding tributaries and distributaries. *Adds R.S. 56:325(A)(13).*

Act 475; SB 203
Establishes that possession limits for largemouth bass, red drum and spotted sea trout taken south of U.S. Highway 90 shall be three times the daily limit when the fisherman is in possession of a valid fishing license and can "demonstrate to the department's satisfaction that the fisherman has been actively on the water or at a remote camp that can be accessed only by water for two days or more." This law removes the need for showing a landing receipt from a public boat launch that was located south of U.S. Highway 90. *Amends R.S. 56:325(B)(4) and 325.1(A)(4).*

Act 527; HB 9
Designates Shreveport as the Stuffed Shrimp Capital of Louisiana. *Adds R.S. 49:170.26.*

Act 562; HB 665
Prohibits hoop nets and seines from being used in North Pass and Manchac Pass from May 1st to August 31st each year. *Adds R.S. 56:322.3; Repeals R.S. 56:322.3*

Act 903; SB 480
Allows boats to anchor in Oyster Bayou as long as the boat is not anchored in an oyster lease and one person remains aboard while anchored. *Adds R.S. 56:499.3(D).*

Waters, Waterways, Drainage

Act 341; HB 1232
Changes the "waterway dredging and deepening priority program" to the "Waterway Assistance program." Adds parishes, municipalities, port authorities or levee districts to the list of governmental entities who may submit applications for funding any waterway project. This Act also changes the number of times when applications are to be submitted from quarterly to annually on September 1. Projects must have the required local, state, and federal permit from the Department of Transportation and Development. The permits are determined by the project and the laws that apply for the project.

Further, there will no longer be a priority list of projects for the joint committee to receive. The list will consist of projects that are qualifying. The Act will also remove several provisions in the present regarding public hearings. It will not require the Office of Multimodal Commerce to publish the appropriate office notice on its website. *Amends R.S. 34:3471(6) and (7), 3472(Section heading), (A), and (D), 3473, 3475(A), 3477(Section heading), (A), and (D), and 3478; Repeals R.S. 34:3474.*

Act 493; SB 331
Allows channelization, clearing and snagging, channel realignment, or dredging operations for drainage purposes in the West Pearl River and its tributaries from Lock 1 to the Rigolets from August 1, 2026, until August 1, 2031. The Act also allows these activities to be done without a permit which is usually required. However, it will not allow new commercial development or clustered residential development along the scenic river while this act is in effect. *Adds R.S. 56:1855(Q).*

Act 667; HB 726
Doubles the penalty assessed for any person found guilty of gross littering by abandoning a boat or other vessel. *Amends R.S. 30:2531.1(A).*

Act 673; HB 802
Establishes regulation for the Watershed Restoration Fund. It gives priority to flood-prone areas and impaired watersheds. *Adds R.S. 38:3310.*

Act 761; SB 367
Establishes the creation of the "Watershed Restoration and Conservation Fund." The purpose of this fund is to support the reclamation, restoration, and long-term stewardship of lands and watersheds within the Amite River Basin Drainage and Water Conservation District. Requires the treasurer to deposit monies transferred, donated, or appropriated to the fund by the legislature, for the Watershed Restoration and Conservation Fund. The legislature has authority to dispense money from the Watershed Restoration and Conservation Fund to the board of commissioners of the Amite River Basin Drainage and Water Conservation District for any purpose authorized. *Adds R.S. 38:3310.*

Minerals, Oil, & Gas

Act 658; HB 621
Requires that the disassembling of renewable energy facilities will include recycling materials or the structure of the facility of in accordance with Dept. of Environmental Quality regulations pertaining to Universal Wastes, Recyclable Materials, and Recycling and Waste Reduction Rules in the La. Admin. Code. *Adds R.S. 30:1121.*

Act 843; HB 804
Declares that the public policy of the state is to support the production and consumption of energy and to protect energy users, producers, and related industries from claims alleging harm from climate change caused by greenhouse gas emissions. The Act states that any covered civil liability action for climate change damages from greenhouse gas emissions is federally preempted and any such action cannot be brought in a Louisiana state court. The Act defines "climate change," "covered civil liability for climate change damages from greenhouse gas emissions," "greenhouse gases," and "person." *Adds R.S. 30:1601-1605.*

Other Agency Matters

Act 83; HB 697
Re-creates the Department of Environmental Quality which would have terminated on July 1, 2026, pursuant to the "sunset law," and designates July 1, 2031, as the new termination date. *Adds R.S. 49:191(3)(b); Repeals R.S. 49:191(1)(j).*

Act 85; HB 758
Adds groundwater protection and underground storage tanks to the list of things over which LDEQ has jurisdiction; repeals the process by which the LDEQ Secretary establishes fees and authorizes the secretary to establish fees through the rulemaking process, providing a maximum fee for each type of permit; provides LDEQ authority to issue expedited permits and reviews; provides that failure to pay fees within 90 days of the due date will result in a violation subject to enforcement actions under the Louisiana Environmental Quality Act (R.S. 30:2001 at seq.) including but not limited to revocation or suspension of the permit, license, registration, or variance. *Amends R.S. 30:2011(A)(1), (D)(22)(b) and*

(c), and (25), 2014(B), (D)(2), (3), (4), and (7), 2063(J), 2195.3(B), 2289.1(D), 2351.59(B), and (C) and R.S. 37:3154(10); Adds R.S. 30:2014(E), (F), and (G); Repeals R.S. 30:2014(D)(5) and (6) and 2044(C).

Act 581; HB 1157
Creates the Louisiana State Infrastructure Bank and the associated fund to finance eligible infrastructure projects for certain entities within the state; creates a board of directors and establishes the membership, power, duties, and authority; and provides rules and regulations of the Bank. Eligible infrastructure projects include activities undertaken to plan, design, construct, repair, maintain, or improve transportation facilities intended to be used by the public. Eligible infrastructure projects must be permitted or approved by the applicable agencies and then selected by the bank's board to receive a loan or other financial assistance for the payment of eligible costs. *Adds R.S. 36:4(B)(39) and R.S. 48:77.3 and 81-87.*

Act 734; SB 56
Provides that the Lafitte Area Levee District will be governed by the board of commissioners of the Southeast Louisiana Flood Protection Authority-West Bank and for four members to be appointed from a list of six nominations submitted by the legislative delegation that would represent the portion of Jefferson Parish the Levee district is located in. The board of commissioners of the Southern Louisiana Flood Protection Authority-West Bank shall be composed of nine members (changed from seven) and one will reside in the territorial jurisdiction of the Lafitte Area Levee District. In any legal proceeding with the Lafitte Area Levee District as a party and the suit has been filed, initiated or pending before any court on August 1, 2026, all documents in or affected by any legal proceeding, shall retain effectiveness and shall be continued in the name of the Lafitte Area Levee District. Also, any district or authority that was not an original party of a suit shall not have liability for actions pending or claims arising prior to August 1, 2026. *Amends R.S. 38:291(Y), 330.1(B)(2)(a), 330.1(C)(1)(b)(intro para), 330.1(C)(1)(b)(iii), 330.3(A), (B)(1), and (C)(1), and 330.10(A).*

Insurance

Act 416; HB 1187
Creates a pathway for "excess emergency assessment monies" from the Louisiana Citizens Property Insurance Corporation (LCPIC) to be allocated to the Louisiana Fortify Homes Program which provides financial assistance to help homeowners reinforce their homes against storm damage. The Act also allows "excess emergency assessment monies" to be retained for the payment of future debt. *Amends R.S. 22:2297(D)(2), 2307(G), and 2317; Adds R.S. 22:2292(A)(13).*

Wildlife Resources

Act 33; HB 767
Creates an alligator harvest lottery, establishes the fee for the lottery, and dedicates the fee to the Conservation Fund. For alligator hunting, this Act adds a residential recreational hunting license with a $25 annual fee and nonresidential recreational hunting license with a $150 annual fee *Adds R.S. 56:268 and 3002(A)(7) and (B)(9).*

Act 37; SB 244
Authorizes the commission to establish a special recreational alligator hunting season and retains present law pertaining to commercial alligator hunting season. The Act provides that the season may allow for taking and possession of alligators by area, provides for creation of quotas and tag allotments, authorizes the commission to modify the length of the season by area, authorizes creation of residency requirements, and authorizes the methods, and hours of taking. The Act prohibits the taking of alligators out of season, by persons without licenses or tags, and by illegal methods. The Act provides that a violation of the statute will be classified as a class three violation. *Adds R.S. 56:256*

Act 108; HB 631
Allows recreational bear hunting licenses for nonresidents and allows the establishment of a fee of $100 to obtain the license. *Adds R.S. 56:3002(B)(9).*

Act 181; HB 858
Exempts any global positioning data on wildlife or aquatic life collected by or in the possession of the Department of Wildlife and Fisheries that would reveal the location of individual animals from being considered public records. *Adds R.S. 44:4(65).*

Act 339; HB 1177
Exempts information that personally identifies an individual that applies for a lottery hosted by the Department of Wildlife and Fisheries during the season for which the lottery is held. *Adds R.S. 44:4(65).*

Act 509; SB 419
Pre-charged pneumatic devices, also known as airsoft guns, will now be allowed for hunting deer but they must fire a projectile of at least .30 caliber diameter, 150 grains weight, and 800 feet per second muzzle velocity, or any combination of weight and velocity that produces 215 ft-lb minimum energy. *Amends R.S. 56:116(C).*

Act 725; HB 1248
Prohibits rehabilitating white-tailed deer that originated outside of Louisiana. Rehabilitation of white-tailed deer that originated from a Chronic Wasting Disease (CWD) Management Zone within the state is allowed. However, the white-tailed deer would

be limited to the boundaries of the CWD Management Zone, from where they originated. Those who are involved in rehabilitating a white-tailed deer in CWD Management Zone are responsible for monitoring and maintaining a "diligent watch" for symptoms consistent with CWD. Failure to do so may result in revocation of one's rehabilitation permit.

Animals that display abnormal neurological symptoms are to be euthanized and a CWD sample is to be submitted to the Wildlife and Fisheries Department. Additionally, all other deer shall be quarantined until a negative test result is submitted to the Wildlife and Fisheries Department. If any deer from a rehabilitation facility tests positive for CWD, all live white-tailed deer shall then be euthanized, and CWD samples shall be collected. That rehabilitation facility would then be prohibited from participating in deer rehabilitation in the future. *Adds R.S. 56:129.*

Act 730; HB 1258
Provides for the relocation of sick, injured or orphaned wildlife species seized because of unlawful possession, establishes a preference for release, rehabilitation, and placement with a wildlife rehabilitator or license facility, and provides for euthanasia only when no feasible alternatives exist. *Adds R.S. 56:126.1.*

Endnotes

1. Marquise Hall is a second-year law student at Southern Law Center.
2. Stevie Robinson is a third-year law student at Louisiana State University Paul M. Hebert Law Center.



A landscape view of the Louisiana State Capitol building across the water of Capitol Lake. Photo courtesy of Louisiana Sea Grant.

Chevron USA, Inc. v. Plaquemines Parish

Federal Officer Removal and Louisiana Coastal Litigation

An Analysis of the Supreme Court's Decision and Its Implications for Coastal Restoration Lawsuits Against Oil and Gas Producers

By Jazmine Brannon[1]



An aerial view of canals that carve through coastal Louisiana. Photo courtesy of Louisiana Sea Grant.

Introduction

On April 17th, 2026, the Supreme Court of the United States released its decision[2] for *Chevron USA, Inc. v. Plaquemines Parish*. The decision has potential implications for Louisiana's ongoing coastal restoration litigation against oil and gas producers. This article examines the background of the litigation, analyzes the Supreme Court's reasoning, and discusses the implications for Louisiana coastal law and the broader framework of environmental enforcement through state statutory schemes.

Background

The Chevron litigation became the first case to proceed to trial, making it a catalyst for dozens of pending actions involving similar factual allegations and legal theories. In 2025, a Plaquemines Parish jury returned a landmark verdict against Chevron, awarding approximately $575 million for land loss, $161 million for contamination, and $8.6 million for abandoned equipment, the total award exceeding $744 million.[3] Chevron appealed the lower court's decision by claiming the case should be removed from state court to federal court under the federal officer removal statute because two of Chevron's predecessors were federal contractors who contracted with the federal government during World War II to produce aviation gasoline, requiring them to refine crude oil and "[t]here is thus a close and direct connection between the challenged oil production and refining activities taken under federal direction."[4] The appeal ultimately reached the United States Supreme Court, who ruled unanimously in Chevron's favor, vacating the Fifth Circuit's judgment and remanding the case, effectively transferring the litigation from Louisiana state court. The Supreme Court's decision regarding federal officer removal has implications extending far beyond this single lawsuit.

The Supreme Court's Decision

Chevron removed the suit to federal court under the federal removal statute, 28 U.S.C. § 1442(a)(1), which authorizes removal to federal court of state-court suits against federal officers or persons "acting under" them "for or relating to any action under color of such office."[5] Chevron's theory of removal centered on its wartime

role as a military contractor during World War II. During the war, Chevron refined crude oil into aviation gasoline, avgas, for the U.S. military under federal contract. Chevron argued that the parish suit, which challenged crude-oil production during the same period, "related to" these federal refining duties.[6] In an 8-0 opinion authored by Justice Thomas, the Court held that state court environmental suits challenging crude-oil production during World War II "relate to" the defendant's wartime refining of crude oil aviation gasoline for the U.S. military, thereby satisfying the federal officer removal statute, 28 U.S.C. § 1442(a)(1).[7]

"Chevron has plausibly alleged a close relationship between its challenged conduct and the performance of its federal duties—not a tenuous, remote, or peripheral one. This suit implicates Chevron's wartime efforts to produce and supply avgas' essential feedstock, so it is closely connected to Chevron's wartime avgas refining for the military."[8]

Analysis: The "Relating To" Standard

The opinion began with an analysis of the ordinary meaning of "relating to," which the Court described as "a broad term" expressing "a logical or causal connection." Citing decades of precedent interpreting similar language in other statutory contexts, Justice Thomas emphasized that the phrase "relating to" does not require a "particularly close relationship" between the suit and the federal acts. Rather, the statute requires only that the connection not be "tenuous, remote, or peripheral."[9] The Court emphasized that one thing can relate to another even if the connection is "indirect," even if it was "not specifically designed to affect" it, and even without a "strict causal relationship."[10] However, the Court also acknowledged that "relating to" is not "so broad that it is meaningless."[11]

The Court's insistence on the ordinary meaning of the phrase being broad, combined with its rejection of more restrictive interpretations requiring specific authorization or direct causation, signals that removal under Section 1442(a)(1) could be accepted by the court in a wide range of cases where there is a plausible logical or causal connection between the state suit and the defendant's federal activity. Citing *Morales v. Trans World Airlines, Inc.*, the Court noted that "relating to" means "to stand in some relation; to have bearing or concern; to pertain; refer; to bring into association with or connection with."[12]

Importantly, the Court held that a removing defendant "need not show that his federal duties specifically required or strictly caused the challenged conduct."[13] This holding directly rejected the Fifth Circuit's approach, which had required a tighter connection between the federal contract and the challenged conduct.

Implications for Louisiana Coastal Law

For practitioners in Louisiana coastal litigation, this decision establishes that oil and gas companies with a credible connection to federal wartime activities may have a viable removal theory. The court's reasoning suggests that the critical inquiry is not whether the federal contract specifically required the challenged conduct, but whether there is a logical or causal relationship between state-law claims and the defendant's federal duties.

The transfer of this case from state court to federal court may affect both procedural and substantive aspects of the litigation. Federal courts may apply different standards for retroactive application of the Coastal Zone Management Improvement Act, which went into effect in 1980 but governs activities alleged to have commenced decades earlier. Moreover, the federal forum may provide defendants with access to additional federal defenses not available in state court, including potential immunity arguments based on federal contractor status. As Professor Blaine LeCesne of Loyola University New Orleans College of Law observed, companies in federal court may seek



An aerial view of oil field canals in the Atchafalaya Basin. Photo courtesy of Louisiana Sea Grant.

to invoke the federal contractor immunity defense, which could provide immunity from judgment even if liability is established on the merits.[14] For Louisiana's coastal communities, the decision represents a procedural setback but not necessarily the end of the litigation campaign. As Louisiana Attorney General Liz Murrill stated following the decision: "It doesn't matter whether this case is in state court or federal court—I am confident the outcome will be the same."[15]

Conclusion

To conclude, *Chevron USA Inc. v. Plaquemines Parish* clarifies the scope of federal officer removal under 28 U.S.C. § 1442(a)(1) and could substantially affect the trajectory of Louisiana's coastal restoration litigation. By holding that a state's environmental suit challenging wartime crude-oil production "relates to" the defendant's concurrent federal aviation gasoline refining contract, the Court established a broad interpretation of the statutory phrase that favors removal in cases with plausible connections to federal activities.[16]

Depending on the facts of each case, the decision could possibly transfer more than forty pending coastal lawsuits from Louisiana state courts, where parishes have a stronger possibility of securing a substantial jury verdict, to the federal court system. While the ruling does not resolve the merits of the parishes' claims under the Coastal Resources Management Act, it alters the litigation landscape in ways that may affect both the procedural posture and substantive outcomes of these cases. Federal courts will now be called upon to interpret the scope of the Coastal Zone Management Improvement Act's pre-1980 exemption and determine whether decades of oil and gas production activities were "legally commenced" within the meaning of the statute.

From a policy perspective, the decision may raise questions about the appropriate balance between federal interests in protecting wartime contractors and state interests in remedying environmental harm. The Supreme Court's decision in *Chevron* does not address the merits of this statutory scheme or the underlying environmental claims. Rather, it determines only the forum in which those claims will be heard. Ultimately, the resolution of whether oil or gas companies are liable under the Coastal Zone Management Improvement Act of pre-1980 activities still remains for the federal courts to decide on remand.

Endnotes

1. Jazmine Brannon is a third-year law student at Southern University Law Center.

2. The slip opinion is a preliminary version of the Court's decision and may be revised before official publication. The officially published opinion, when released, will be the controlling and authoritative version.

3. The verdict was subsequently appealed and is now subject to the federal removal discussed in this article. See Amy Howe, *Court Unanimously Sides with Oil and Gas Companies in Suit over Damage to Louisiana Coast*, SCOTUSblog (Apr. 17, 2026); *See also* Sean Moriarty, *Louisiana Parish Takes on Chevron for Coastal Damage—and wins*, State Energy & Environmental Impact Center (uploaded May 8, 2025).

4. *Chevron U.S.A. Inc., et al., v. Plaquemines Parish, et al.*, No. 24-813, On Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, Brief for Petitioners, page 3, https://www.supremecourt.gov/DocketPDF/24/24-813/373666/20250904122406188_24-813_Brief%20for%20Petitioners.pdf (09/04/2025).

5. 28 U.S.C. § 1442(a)(1). The statute provides: "The United States or any agency thereof or any officer (or any person acting under that officer) of the United States or of any agency thereof, in an official or individual capacity, may remove any action, suit, or proceeding commenced in a State court against such officer or person for or relating to any act under color of such office."

6. Chevron *supra* note 12.

7. *Chevron USA, Inc. v. Plaquemines Parish*, No. 24-813, slip op. at 1 (U.S. Apr. 17, 2026).

8. *Id*. at 2.

9. *Id*. at 6-7.

10. *Ingersoll-Rand Co. v. McClendon*, 498 U.S. 133, 139 (1990); *See also Ford Motor Co. v. Montana Eighth Judicial District Court*, 598, U.S. 351, 362 (2020).

11. *Chevron USA Inc. v. Plaquemines Parish*, No. 24-813, p. 9 (U.S. Apr. 17, 2026).

12. *Morales v. Trans World Airlines, Inc.*, 504 U.S. 374, 383 (1992).

13. *Chevron v. Plaquemines*, No. 24-813, at 2.

14. Coastal Damage Cases Move to Federal Court, Living on Earth (May 8, 2026) (interview with Blaine LeCesne, Associate Dean and Distinguished professor, Loyola University New Orleans College of Law).

15. Greg LaRose, *Supreme Court rules Plaquemines coastal lawsuit against Chevron belongs in federal court*, The Louisiana Illuminator (Apr. 17, 2026).

16. Amy Howe, *Court unanimously sides with oil and gas companies in suit over damage to Louisiana coast*, SCOTUSblog (Apr. 17, 2026).

Abandoned Vessels on Private Property: A Louisiana Landowner's Path to Removal

By Wyatt Hayes[1]



A shrimp boat washed ashore by Hurricane Laura (2020) in Cameron Parish, LA. Photo courtesy of Louisiana Sea Grant.

Introduction

Abandoned boats are a ubiquitous feature of the Louisiana coast. Hulls left to rot at a dock, shrimp boats pushed into the marsh, and pleasure craft sunk at their moorings sit for years on property that does not belong to them, and every tropical storm season adds to that number. Storm surges lift loose and poorly secured vessels from their moorings and leave them stranded on banks, in canals, and against camps and docks miles from where they started. When the water recedes the vessel remains, and its owner often proves to be insolvent, unreachable, or simply unwilling to help.

Louisiana Revised Statutes section 34:843 has long provided a procedure for clearing abandoned vessels from the waters of this state and its banks, and Act 216 of the 2025 Regular Session, effective August 1, 2025, made some significant changes to the benefit of affected landowners.[2] The Louisiana Department of Wildlife and Fisheries (LDWF) has since adopted a rule implementing those amendments. The most pivotal change grants a private party the ability to carry out the removal once the statutory notice periods have run, by a route that requires no lawsuit, no defendant, and no cooperation from the vessel's owner. [3]

What the Statute Covers

Section 34:843 applies to any tug, towboat, barge, watercraft, ship, vessel, equipment, machinery, or object of any kind left unattended, stored, junked, or abandoned in a canal, coulee, drainage ditch, outfall canal, bayou, bay, lake, or any other waterway, whether navigable or not, or on the banks of one.[4] The scope of the statute is vast, meaning a vessel resting on a bank or tied to a private dock is covered as fully as one blocking a shipping channel, and the express inclusion of waterways that are non-navigable forecloses any argument that the statute reaches only obstructions to navigation. A landowner need not show that the vessel is in anyone's way as its presence in or beside the water is enough.

The LDWF rule then supplies the working definition of an abandoned vessel as one that has remained on or immediately adjacent to private property without the consent of the property owner, agent, lessee, or assigns, one that is found adrift or unattended on the land or waters of the state for more than thirty days and constitutes a hazard or presents a potential health or environmental hazard, or one that is in a wrecked, submerged, inoperative, or partially dismantled condition.[5] The first of these categories ordinarily controls. A vessel sitting on private property without permission satisfies the definition on its own, without proof of hazard, obstruction, or elapsed time.

The Removal Process

Step One: Identify the authority, and document the vessel.

The statute assigns the notice function to the "authority," meaning the federal, state, or local governing body having jurisdiction over the waterway or its banks.[6] It does not say which of the three applies in a given case, and jurisdiction over Louisiana waterways is layered. A parish, a municipality, a levee district, a drainage or navigation district, LDWF, and, on navigable waters of the United States, the Corps of Engineers and the Coast Guard may each have some claim. The waterway and the responsible body should be identified before any correspondence goes out, as a request directed to the wrong entity can cost weeks.

The rule then allows a private party to obtain vessel information from LDWF. The request must: 1) describe the vessel by make, model, and any identifying number; 2) fix its location by parish, waterway, or address; 3) include photographs of the vessel and of its numbers; and 4) attest in writing that the vessel is abandoned as the rule defines that term.[7] The response will establish who the last registrant was and whether a lienholder appears on record, both of which the authority needs in order to give proper notice.

Step Two: Give notice to the owner and to lienholders or publication where the owner cannot be found

The vessel owner must remove it within thirty days after receiving written notice sent by certified mail from the authority or, when the vessel poses no immediate danger, present a removal plan within the same thirty-day window for the authority's approval.[8] Act 216 added a concurrent obligation of some importance. When the authority notifies the owner, it must at the same time send certified-mail notice to the holder of any properly filed and perfected ship mortgage on the vessel, as reflected in an Abstract of Title from the National Vessel Documentation Center, and to the holder of any security interest encumbering it.[9] The Act also supplied a rebuttable presumption of ownership: when the vessel carries neither a Coast Guard certificate of documentation nor a certificate of title from LDWF, its owner is presumed to be the last known registrant. That spares the authority the task of proving who owns a vessel whose papers cannot be obtained.[10] The notice itself must describe the vessel and its numbers, give its location, advise the owner and any lienholder of the right to reclaim within thirty days, and state that a failure to claim waives all right, title, and interest in the vessel.[11]

If the owner or registrant cannot be identified or located, the authority publishes in the official journal of the parish in which the vessel is located a notice that it will be removed at any time after thirty calendar days from publication, at the cost of the owner, and thereafter disposed of.[12] When the owner is insolvent or unreachable, this is usually the operative path. The thirty-day period is the only required wait. No judicial proceeding, no search beyond a good-faith effort, and no consent from anyone is necessary.[13] LDWF's rule is the more demanding of the two. It calls for publication when the authority cannot determine the last registered owner or identity of any lienholder, or when the certified-mail notice described above is returned undeliverable. It further requires that the notice run at least one day a week for three consecutive weeks; when the mail notice comes back, the first publication must occur within fifteen days of that return.[14]

Step Three: Removal, disposal, and title.

The most consequential of the 2025 amendments is the new Subsection E. If the vessel is not removed by the owner within the periods the statute provides, any third party may remove it at their own expense and junk, discard, or otherwise dispose of it, or sell, exchange, or transfer ownership of it for any price or consideration.[15] Before August 1, 2025, a landowner depended upon the authority to carry out the removal as well as to give the notice. Now, once the notice and publication periods have run, a landowner may engage a salvor on their own schedule, without waiting for an agency to appropriate funds or reach the matter on its agenda. The rule says the same in the agency's own words, providing that private property owners, or their designees, may act independently of the authority when an abandoned vessel is on or moored to their private property.[16] One joint provision deserves mention. Subsection G of the same rule provides that nothing in the statute authorizes entry onto private property without the consent of the property owner, so a landowner should document affirmative consent at the outset of removal efforts, lest the question become a reason for delay.[17]

When the authority carries out the removal, it may junk, discard, sell, or transfer the vessel for whatever consideration it deems advisable or none at all, applying any proceeds to the cost of removal, and it is not liable for damage to or destruction of the vessel.[18] Once the vessel is off the property, any person in lawful possession may apply to LDWF for registration and title in accordance with the procedures set forth in the same rule.[19] If the intent is only to scrap the vessel, titling may be unnecessary as the rule only requires title before a recovered vessel is operated upon the waters of the state, and a hull sent to a salvage yard will not be operated.[20]



A capsized boat creates a mirrored reflection laying on its side after being pushed over by Hurricane Ida (2021) in Golden Meadow, LA. Photo courtesy of Louisiana Sea Grant.

The Faster Route: Immediate Danger

When the vessel poses an immediate danger to life or property, it must be removed by the owner immediately upon written or oral notice, and the authority may cause its removal at once if the owner does not comply or cannot be located, with the same powers of disposition as the ordinary case.[21] A vessel that is leaking fuel or is otherwise hazardous should be reported to the authority in writing, with photographs. Invoking this provision eliminates the thirty-day publication delay altogether and is the single most effective means of accelerating removal.

Practical Considerations

Expect to fund the removal. The statute places the cost on the owner, but that cost is usually uncollectible against a person who is insolvent or missing, and Louisiana has no dedicated fund for vessel removal. One exception is worth pursuing. If fuel or oil remains aboard, the vessel may fall within the Louisiana Oil Spill Prevention and Response Act and the Oil Spill Coordinator's abandoned-vessel program, which supplies both a removal mechanism and, for vessels designated as oil pollution hazards whose owners cannot be located, access to the Oil Spill Contingency Fund.[22] That is one of the few routes to removal at public rather than private expense.

Clear any lien before disposal. A marina or dock owed money for letting the vessel tie up will usually hold a maritime lien.[23] Such a lien is unusual in two respects: it arises automatically, without any filing in a public record and without the lienholder ever taking possession, and it is enforced by having a federal court seize the vessel itself. Because the claim attaches to the hull rather than to the owner, it survives removal, and a person who later buys or scraps the vessel may find it seized to satisfy a debt they had no part in. Two considerations temper this concern. The statute and the rule both require notice to lienholders and provide that a failure to claim within thirty days waives all right, title, and interest, and a derelict vessel is often worth less than the claims against it, so a lienholder may prefer a nominal release to the cost of a seizure and sale.[24]

Confirm the rule's reach for commercial vessels. The rule is captioned "Abandoned and Salvaged Recreational Vessel Registration and Titling" and sits in a chapter styled "Boating Safety," which raises a question about the rule's application to shrimp boats and other working craft.[25] However, the enabling statute directs LDWF to establish a process for vessels subject to Coast Guard documentation requirements, which is the commercial category, and for identifying holders of preferred ship mortgages, which are instruments of commercial vessel finance.[26] The consequence is even limited to some degree because the removal right arises from the statute rather than from LDWF's rule. A narrow reading would cost the regulatory apparatus, not the underlying right to remove. As such, a call to LDWF's Enforcement Division remains worthwhile before relying on those procedures.

Alternatives Routes and Why They Are Seldom Better

Three alternatives exist in theory. Acquisition by occupancy under the Civil Code would permit a landowner to take possession of a truly abandoned movable if they have the intent to own it, but abandonment requires that the vessel owner have relinquished possession while intending to give up ownership, and that intent must be proven rather than assumed.[27] Occupancy also does nothing to extinguish a maritime lien. Possessory and injunctive relief would allow a landowner to seek a judicial order compelling removal, but that route requires a defendant, and against an owner who is insolvent or missing, it offers no conceivable remedy.[28] A tort claim offers damages rather than removal and is uncollectible for the same reasons.[29] Set against a statute that requires no defendant, no judicial proceeding, and no cooperation from the owner, each is slower and more expensive with no corresponding advantage.

Conclusion

Act 216 of the 2025 Regular Session and the rule adopted under it have not made abandoned vessels cheaper to remove, and the landowner will most often be the one paying. What they have done is end the landowner's dependence on a public body's willingness and budget. For the landowner who finds a derelict hull on the bank after the next storm, the sequence is now reasonably clear: photograph the vessel and its numbers, identify the waterway and the body with jurisdiction over it, request LDWF's records, ask the authority to send notice and, if the owner cannot be found, to publish notice. When the periods have run, engage a salvor to remove the vessel. The wait could be measured in weeks rather than years.

Endnotes

1. Wyatt Hayes is a third year law student at Louisiana State University Paul M. Hebert Law Center.
2. La. R.S. 34:843; Act No. 216, 2025 La. Acts (H.B. 676, 2025 Leg., Reg. Sess. (La. 2025)) (eff. Aug. 1, 2025).
3. LAC 76:XI.311; see La. R.S. 34:843(F); see also La. R.S. 34:852.23.
4. La. R.S. 34:843(A)(1).
5. LAC 76:XI.311(A).
6. La. R.S. 34:843(A)(1); LAC 76:XI.311(A).
7. La. R.S. 34:843(A)(1); LAC 76:XI.311(A).
8. La. R.S. 34:843(A)(1).
9. Id.
10. Id.; see also La. R.S. 34:852.1 et seq. (Vessel and Motor Titling Act).
11. LAC 76:XI.311(B)(2)(a), (B)(3).
12. La. R.S. 34:843(A)(1).
13. Id.
14. LAC 76:XI.311(B)(4).
15. La. R.S. 34:843(E).
16. LAC 76:XI.311(B)(8); see also id. at 311(B)(5)(a).
17. La. R.S. 34:843(G).
18. Id. at 34:843(B)(1), (C).
19. LAC 76:XI.311(B)(6)(a), (B)(7)(a).
20. Id. at 311(B)(7)(c).
21. La. R.S. 34:843(A)(2); id. at 34:843(B)(2).
22. See La. R.S. 30:2451 et seq. (Louisiana Oil Spill Prevention and Response Act).
23. 46 U.S.C. § 31342; see Equilease Corp. v. M/V Sampson, 793 F.2d 598, 603 (5th Cir.), cert. denied, 479 U.S. 984 (1986).
24. LAC 76:XI.311(B)(2)(a), (B)(3)(c)–(d); see also La. R.S. 34:843(A)(1).
25. The rule is captioned "Abandoned and Salvaged Recreational Vessel Registration and Titling," and is placed in Part XI, Chapter 3 ("Boating Safety"). Cf. La. R.S. 34:843(F) (containing no recreational-vessel limitation).
26. La. R.S. 34:843(F)(1)–(2); see also 46 U.S.C. § 12105 (commercial fishery endorsement); 46 U.S.C. §§ 31321–31322 (preferred ship mortgages); La. R.S. 34:852.1 et seq. (Vessel and Motor Titling Act).
27. La. C.C. art. 3418; see also La. C.C. art. 3412.
28. La. C.C.P. art. 3663; see also La. C.C.P. art. 3601.
29. La. C.C. arts. 2315, 2317.1.

Crop Insurance for Oyster Farmers

By Bailey Moss[1]



A view of an oyster hatchery field on Grand Isle, LA. Photo courtesy of Louisiana Sea Grant.

Introduction

Oyster farms may be eligible for crop insurance from the U.S. Department of Agriculture (USDA). The USDA offers crop insurance for shellfish such as oysters under three insurance programs discussed below. Those three insurance program options are: the Shellfish Crop Insurance Program, the Group Risk Plan for Oysters, and Whole-Farm Revenue Protection. All three programs are managed by the Risk Management Agency (RMA), a division of the USDA created to manage the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation (FCIC) and provide crop insurance products to U.S. farmers and ranchers through approved crop insurance agents.

Shellfish Crop Insurance Program

The Shellfish Crop Insurance Program is an insurance plan designed for container-grown oysters cultured commercially for the fresh, half-shell market.[2] To qualify for the shellfish crop insurance program, oysters must be grown in open water by containerized methods (e.g., mesh bags, trays, or cages). Oysters grown in nurseries, hatcheries, and producer nursery systems are not insurable under this program.[3] The Shellfish Crop Insurance Program is available in the following parishes: Iberia, Jefferson, Lafourche, Plaquemines, St. Bernard, St. Mary, Terrebonne, and Vermilion.[4]

For a farmer to insure their oysters, they must: have at least partial ownership in the oysters being insured, submit an application for shellfish insurance through an approved insurance provider, grow their oysters in containers using oyster seed that meets the minimum seed size (4mm) at the time of purchase as proven by seed purchase receipts, purchase their oyster seed from a private or commercial shellfish nursey or hatchery, produce their oysters using generally acceptable production methods in an operation considered acceptable to the approved insurance provider and they must have grown or participated in growing oysters in the same parish for at least four crop years.[5] The Shellfish Crop Insurance Program does not allow for coverage of bottom culture oysters, however, USDA and RMA are researching how the Program may be tailored to also insure the bottom culture of oysters.[6]

Under this program, coverage includes protection against qualifying storms (e.g. hurricanes and nor'easters), excessive heat during a low tide event, a freeze during a low tide event, or low salinity caused by excessive rainfall when the county loss trigger is met.[7] A county loss trigger is the occurrence of an insurable cause of loss as determined in accordance with the Commodity Provisions and Shellfish Data Provisions. However, unless actual physical damage to the crop occurs from a cause deemed to be insurable, a farmer's inability to harvest their oysters after facing damage or loss of production is not covered. For example, an insurance provider will not pay if the farmer is unable to harvest due to a quarantine or harvest season closure. Coverage levels are available in five percent increments from 50 percent to 75 percent.[8]

Group Risk Plan for Oysters

The Group Risk Plan (GRP) for Oysters is another federal crop insurance program available in Louisiana specifically for wild-caught or seed-raised bottom-culture oysters, providing insurance coverage in case of widespread loss of oyster production in a parish. The GRP program was created with the intention that it be used by farmers whose oyster landings tend to follow the average parish oyster landings, since that parish average is used as the basis for determining if a loss has occurred within a parish.[9] This plan is available in nine parishes of Louisiana: Cameron, Iberia, Lafourche, Plaquemines, St. Bernard, St. Mary, Terrebonne, and Vermillion.[10] To have oysters insured through the GRP, one must be a producer with an ownership interest in oysters, which are for fresh market sale, from their leased or owned oyster beds, and which are not grown for experimental or research purposes. To be considered a producer, one must have active involvement in the oyster farming, and you may be required to provide proof of that active involvement, such as records of oyster landings or evidence of workman-like care, which includes actions like laying cultch material, planting seed oysters, moving oysters, or rehabilitating reefs after storm damage.



Oyster shells from Grand Isle, LA. Photo courtesy of Louisiana Sea Grant.

However, this insurance plan only covers "unavoidable loss of oyster landings directly caused by drought, flood, hurricane, and other natural disasters."[11] Coverage levels for the GRP are available from 60 to 100 percent, in five percent increments, with Catastrophic Risk Protection Endorsement (CAT Coverage) also being available.[12] CAT coverage pays a percentage of the price of the commodity, as established by the RMA, on crop losses in excess of 50 percent.[13] If you choose to add CAT coverage, the coverage level is 65 percent.

For example, say a farmer with 100 percent ownership in their oyster landings buys 90 percent coverage level and selects 80 percent of the maximum price election per pound of oyster meat. If the maximum price election shown on the actuarial documents is $4.50, the farmer's dollar amount of insurance is calculated to be $3.60 ($4.50 x .80) per pound. The farmer's apportioned landings are 30,000 pounds of oyster meat while the expected county landings are 2,200,000 pounds of oyster meat—meaning trigger landings is 1,980,000 pounds (2,200,000 pounds x 90% level)—and the unsubsidized premium rate for 90 percent coverage is $6.00 per hundred dollars of policy protection. Therefore, the farmer's policy protection is $108,000 (30,000 pounds x 100% share x $3.60 dollar amount of insurance per pound) and the total premium due is $6,480.00 ($108,000 at $6.00 per $100 of coverage). Of that premium amount, FCIC pays $3,564 (55% subsidy at the 90% level). The farmer's net premium is $2,916 plus $30 administrative fee.[14]

Whole-Farm Revenue Protection

The Whole-Farm Revenue Protection (WFRP) program provides coverage for all commodities on a farm under a single insurance policy. This program protects farmers against the loss of farm revenue that was earned, or expected to be earned, from various aquaculture commodities (i.e., aquatic animals or plants grown in a controlled aquatic environment, including but not limited to alligator, baitfish, clams, fish, oysters, trout, aquatic plants, and watercress) produced during the insurance period, commodities bought for resale during the insurance period, and all commodities on the farm, which does include aquaculture, but not timber, forest (ecosystems comprised of trees, other plants, animals, and surrounding natural resources), forest products (physical goods or raw material derived from a forest, such as paper, wood for furniture, as well as nontimber products like mushrooms, medicinal plants, and Christmas trees), or animals for sport, show or pets. When covered by WFRP if a loss occurs during the insurance period due to an unavoidable natural cause farmers are protected against the loss insured revenue and they will also receive carryover loss coverage if they are insured the following year.[15] Any amount of coverage can be elected but you may only have one coverage level per policy.[16]

Because the WFRP plan is available in all 50 states, any qualifying farm in Louisiana is eligible to apply for this type of policy. Those who lease their farm operation must acquire control of at least 90 percent of the other person's farm operation, which includes the land and facilities such as irrigation equipment and systems, greenhouses and other facilities. To be eligible for a WFRP insurance plan your farm cannot have more than $17 million in insured revenue, this includes farms raising crops or livestock or farms who market their oysters to local, regional, farm-

identity preserved (ensuring your crop stays separate from those produced by other farms all the way from the seed to the final buyer), specialty or direct markets. Farmers can purchase WFRP on its own or purchase supplementary coverage through additional Federal crop insurance policies. If someone chooses to buy both WFRP and a separate federal crop insurance policy, then that person's WFRP premium is reduced due to coverage provided by the other policy. However, CAT coverage is not available under WFRP, which means having other federal crop insurance policies at catastrophic coverage levels disqualifies you from receiving a WFRP insurance plan.

Premium subsidies are also offered for the WFRP insurance plan. Although farms with only one commodity will receive just the enterprise premium subsidy, by having two or more commodities, farms meet the minimum diversification requirements to receive a whole-farm premium subsidy. The premium discount rate is based on the amount of diversification due to the lower risk of revenue loss.[17]

Where to Buy Crop Insurance

All multi-peril crop insurance, including CAT policies, are available from private, registered crop insurance agents. A registered crop insurance agent will be able to provide more detailed information about the documents and various requirements that need to be met to qualify for one of the three crop insurance programs. A list of crop insurance agents is available at all USDA service centers and on the RMA website at: www.rma.usda.gov/tools-reports/agent-locator.

Endnotes

1. Bailey Moss is a third-year law student at Louisiana State University Paul M. Hebert Law Center.
2. Risk Management Agency, Shellfish, U.S.D.A., https://www.rma.usda.gov/about-crop-insurance/highlighted-initiatives-plans/shellfish.
3. SHELLFISH PILOT INSURANCE STANDARDS HANDBOOK: 2027 and Succeeding Crop Years, FCIC-24430 (August 28, 2026), https://www.rma.usda.gov/sites/default/files/2026-08/2027-25980%20Shellfish%20Loss%20Adjustment%20Standards%20Handbook.pdf.
4. SHELLFISH DATA PROVISIONS (SDP) 2027 AND SUCCEEDING CROP YEARS, 27-SDP (August 2026), https://www.rma.usda.gov/policy-procedure/crop-policies/shellfish-data-provisions-27-sdp.
5. FCIC-24430, supra note 3.
6. Risk Management Agency, Shellfish Crop Insurance Program: Frequently Asked Questions, U.S.D.A. (August 2025), https://www.rma.usda.gov/about-crop-insurance/frequently-asked-questions/shellfish-pilot-crop-insurance-program.
7. 27-SDP, supra note 4.
8. FCIC-24430, supra note 3.
9. Risk Management Agency, Seafood, U.S.D.A., https://www.rma.usda.gov/about-crop-insurance/highlighted-initiatives-plans/seafood.
10. FarmersGov, Group Risk Plan (GRP) Oyster Crop Insurance Program Webinar (Youtube, May 29, 2025), https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=_dPPMo6JrRo&t=82s.
11. Group Risk Plan (GRP) Oysters Policy Basic Provisions, 09-GRP-Oysters (2009), https://www.rma.usda.gov/sites/default/files/crop-policies/Group-Risk-Plan-Oysters-Policy-Basic-Provisions-09-GRP-Oysters.pdf.
12. Group Risk Plan (GRP) Oyster Crop Insurance Program Webinar, supra note 10.
13. Risk Management Agency, Policies Overview, U.S.D.A., https://www.rma.usda.gov/legacy/policies/index.html#cat.
14. 09-GRP-Oysters, supra note 11.
15. WHOLE-FARM REVENUE PROTECTION PILOT POLICY, 27-0076 WFRP – Pilot (August 2026), https://www.rma.usda.gov/sites/default/files/2026-08/whole-farm-revenue-protection-pilot-policy-27-0076.pdf.
16. WHOLE-FARM REVENUE PROTECTION PILOT HANDBOOK: 2027 and Succeeding Crop Years, FCIC-18160 (August 31, 2026), https://www.rma.usda.gov/policy-procedure/general-handbooks/whole-farm-revenue-protection-pilot-handbook-13.
17. 27-0076 WFRP – Pilot, supra note 15.

Acknowledgements

Louisiana Coastal Law is an advisory service of the Louisiana Sea Grant College Program (National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce). Its goal is to increase awareness and understanding of coastal issues in Louisiana and across the Gulf region.

Louisiana Coastal Law is a result of research sponsored in part by the National Ocean and Atmospheric Administration, U.S. Department of Commerce, under award NA24OARX4170149, Louisiana Sea Grant, and Louisiana State University.

The statements, findings, conclusions, and recommendations are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of Louisiana Sea Grant College Program or the U.S. Department of Commerce.

To access the LCL or view past editions, visit *www.laseagrant.org/sglegal/publications/lcl*.

To subscribe to the LCL or for other inquiries, visit *www.laseagrant.org/sglegal*. Our address is Louisiana Sea Grant Law & Policy Program, 217 Sea Grant Building, Baton Rouge, LA 70803.

Editors: Jim Wilkins and Niki Pace

Publication Design: Dottie Reid

Contributors:

Jazmine Brannon

Marquise Hall

Wyatt Hayes

Bailey Moss

Stevie Robinson

Grace Parker

Cover Photo: An aerial view of the Wax Lake Delta. Courtesy of Louisiana Sea Grant.

Recommended Citation: Author's Name, Title of Article, 101 Louisiana Coastal Law [Page Number] (2026).