

APRIL 24, 2007
RACELAND, LOUISIANA

STATE OF LOUISIANA
PARISH LAFOURCHE

A REGULAR MEETING OF THE LAFOURCHE PARISH COUNCIL, PARISH OF LAFOURCHE, STATE OF LOUISIANA, WAS SCHEDULED FOR TUESDAY, APRIL 24, 2007 AT 6:00 P.M., AT THE LAFOURCHE PARISH COUNCIL BARRIOS CENTER, 1612 HIGHWAY 182, SUITE 100, RACELAND, LOUISIANA.

The Lafourche Parish Council was duly convened as the governing authority of said Parish by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne, Chairman, who then stated that the Lafourche Parish Council was ready for the transaction of business at 6:04 p.m.

Chairman Lasseigne announced that the [invocation](#) would be led by Mr. Michael Matherne. The Council then recited the [Pledge of Allegiance](#) led by Mr. Phillip Gouaux. Proceedings of the meeting were called to order with the following:

PRESENT: Mr. Tyrone Williams
Mr. Michael Delatte
Mr. Michael Matherne
Dr. Tommy Lasseigne
Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer
Mr. Lindel Toups
Mr. Phillip Gouaux
Mr. Brent Callais
Mr. Daniel Lorraine
President Charlotte A Randolph

ABSENT: None

APPROVAL OF COUNCIL MINUTES

[The first item \(1\) on the agenda was a motion to accept the minutes of the April 10, 2007 Regular Session meeting.](#) A **motion** was made by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and seconded by Mr. Brent Callais. Mr. Lorraine stated that there was an error on page 3 of the April 10, 2007 Lafourche Parish Council meeting minutes. He explained that where President Randolph had stated that they had also discussed with the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development the overlay of Louisiana Highway 308 from Cut Off to Galliano, which she said was scheduled for letting in the current fiscal year, that it had included both Districts 8 and 9. He stated that District 9 was not included in the area being spoken of as it stopped by South Lafourche High School. He requested that District 9 be stricken from the abovementioned specified paragraph in the April 10, 2007 minutes. The motion *carried unanimously* by a vote of (9) yeas, (0) nays, (0) absent, and (0) abstentions.

Mr. Brent Callais offered a motion to deviate to Item (10) on the April 24, 2007 agenda and seconded by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer. The motion *carried unanimously* by a vote of (9) yeas, (0) nays, (0) absent, and (0) abstentions.

The next item (10) on the agenda was a status report regarding derelict structures; including reports from Ms. Tracey Martinez and Mr. Henry Lafont. Ms. Martinez informed the Council that she had previously supplied the Council with a report on derelict structures. She explained that they had contacted thirty-seven (37) but stated that only eight (8) had been completed and further that they had been completed by the property owners. She then explained in detail the aforementioned report on derelict structures, including explaining that each had a status of each individual situation, its progress and what the status verbiage meant. She then spoke about an individual whose status was “1ST LETTER” and explained that that meant the person involved had been served his or her first notification and letter and further that the letter gave the individual fifteen (15) days to complete what needed to be done. She went on to explain that if the individual did not comply with the first letter that a second letter would be sent, which she said included a citation and would be sent certified mail. Ms. Martinez stated that if the individual did not accept the certified letter that a publication would have to be done. She then continued to speak in detail and explain the meaning of the status given on various individuals listed on the report. Mr. Williams sought clarification as to the status on an individual listed on page 2 and its content. Ms. Martinez explained that the individual inquired about as well as another individual had been served with a first notice, adding that she had received one back as it was not a correct address. She explained that because of this, that individual’s first notice would be published in the newspaper. Ms. Martinez explained that the other individual inquired about had received her first letter but had not accept the certified letter sent, saying that that individual’s second notice would be published in the news paper. Mr. Williams inquired as to what happened after the second notice, to which Ms. Martinez responded that estimates would be gotten and that the structure would be torn down. Chairman Lasseigne inquired about a call he had received regarding Sandy Lane and Ms. Martinez explained the issue involved with the area, mentioning tall grass and the falling apart of the trailer located there. She spoke briefly on the matter, including commenting on the bankruptcy involved with the area and the property still being in a gentleman’s name and therefore the reason why the publication notice would have to be in the gentleman’s name even though he no longer owned the property. Mr. Gouaux then asked about a particular house located in Larose, voicing his understanding that the State had purchased the servitude. He then clarified the area he was speaking about and a brief discussion as to its location began. Mr. Gouaux explained the condition of the home there as well as reiterating that he thought that the State had purchased the servitude there. He then spoke of a mobile home that had half of its roof off and gave specifics as to its location. Mr. Gouaux then mentioned that he thought the owners of the mobile home had been contacted previously. Ms. Martinez stated that there were approximately thirty (30) structures that a report had to be done on, explaining that it had been found out that according to the ordinance a particular parish employee could do the reports and state the issues with the property as well as his recommendations. She continued to speak on the matter. Mr. Gouaux then inquired about derelict structures that bordered on State servitudes, asking if the State was being contacted to move the matter forward, to which Ms. Martinez responded no and then elaborated on the same. She stated that according to assessments done the properties were owned by the property owners, adding that she would not know at what point the assessment would show ownership by the

State. Mr. Gouaux clarified that part of the derelict structure was on a State servitude and part of it was on a Parish servitude. He stated that he thought the State needed to be contacted in order to get input on the matter. [Mr. Henry Lafont](#) addressed the Council and began by stating that if a building was partly on a servitude of the State that the only thing needed was permission from the State to go onto the property and remove it or whatever needed to be done. He stated he thought that Ms. Martinez had been doing a great job and spoke in detail of some of her accomplishments. Mr. Lafont reiterated that with regards to Mr. Gouaux's concern, that the State would give permission. Mr. Gouaux stated that what his goal was whether the Parish would be contacting the State if the particular situation he had described occurred. A brief discussion ensued. Mr. Callais then inquired as to the process after the first publication notices were done. Mrs. Martinez explained in detail that since the individuals involved could not be contacted that the second notice would also be published as well. She stated that first notice was for fifteen (15) days and the second notice for ten (10). Ms. Martinez said that from that point the Parish could then get estimates to have the derelict structures torn down. Mr. Callais then asked how long had to be waited for structures that estimates were done on, to which Ms. Martinez stated that as soon as estimates were obtained and funds were available that the structures could be torn down. A brief discussion ensued on the topic. Mr. Williams then inquired about a particular individual listed on the report and Ms. Martinez explained that the individual had been served with a first notice. Mr. Williams informed Ms. Martinez that the individual being spoken of had passed away and that he thought that the property belonged to a bank but that he was not aware as to what bank it was. Ms. Martinez stated that that situation was incurred frequently and explained that the assessment was still under the property owner's name and that that person still needed to be served. Mr. Lafont explained that sometimes the Assessment Office took a little longer to change the name on the rolls. He explained that in his discussions with Ms. Martinez that he had informed her that anytime that situation was incurred that if the Council so wished, he could go to the Conveyance Office and see where it had been adjudicated and who was the proper owner and then contact whoever needed to be contacted. Mr. Gouaux then asked what was the time period after the second notice if a resident refused to comply, to which Ms. Martinez responded that the first notice was fifteen (15) days and the second was ten (10). Mr. Gouaux then asked what was the time frame given after estimates, to which Ms. Martinez elaborated on. Mr. Gouaux mentioned his concern with the upcoming hurricane season and these derelict structures.

Mr. Brent Callais made a **motion** to deviate to the Two-Thirds Agenda concerning the renewal of Mr. Henry Lafont's contract with the Parish with regards to derelict structures and the Nuisance Abatement program, seconded by Mr. Daniel Lorraine and **carried** by a vote of (9) yeas, (0) nays, (0) absents and (0) abstentions.

TWO-THIRDS AGENDA

[The first item discussed on the Two-Thirds Agenda was a resolution approving the retaining of Henry Lafont to provide legal services and consultation associated with the Lafourche Parish Nuisance Abatement Program.](#) A **motion** was made by Mr. Brent Callais and seconded by Mr. Daniel Lorraine. Mr. Callais clarified the resolution. The motion **carried** by a vote of (8) yeas, (0) nays, (1) absent, that being of Mr. Michael Matherne and (0) abstentions.

RES. NO. 07-105 LEGAL SERVICES; NUISANCE ABATEMENT PROGRAM

The first item (1) on the Two-Thirds agenda was a resolution approving the purchase of two (2) John Deere Tractors with Tiger Rear and Side Mowers and one (1) John Deere Tractor with Tiger Boom Mower for the Department of Public Works field offices. A **motion** was made by Mr. Michael Delatte and seconded by Mr. Phillip Gouaux. Mr. Callais asked Mr. Ray Cheramie what the tractors would be used for, to which Mr. Cheramie explained that one (1) of the tractors with the side and rear mower would be located in the Chackbay Field Office area and the other tractor with the side and rear mower would be located in the Raceland Field Office area. He stated that the tractor with the boom mower would be an extended boom that would reach thirty (30') feet out and would be marked as working parish-wide and could be used to catch wide outfalls canals that they were presently unable to catch with the nineteen (19') feet boom mowers had. Mr. Atzenhoffer stated that at the previous meeting of the Council pump stations had been discussed and he recalled that he had brought up that the Council needed to look and reassess capital expenditures as to whether they were an absolute necessity or not. He went on to say that with the current item that the Parish would be spending \$244,549.63, adding that it would be nice to have a new piece of equipment in Raceland but that he would ask that the current item not be done so that reassessment could be done on all of the capital outlay projects. Mr. Atzenhoffer continued to voice his feelings on the matter. Mr. Delatte voiced that he respected Mr. Atzenhoffer's feelings on the subject and then voiced how old the tractor at his district's field office was. He voiced that the machine was always being worked and then spoke of the amount of grass that was cut in his area and the regularity of the same. Mr. Delatte continued to voice in detail how bad of shape the district's tractor was in. Mr. Cheramie stated that Mr. Delatte's statements were true, stating that tractors had had to have been brought into Mr. Delatte's area. He said that the three (3) requested tractors were dearly needed, adding that the Department was currently behind schedule on keeping up with levees and outfall canals. Mr. Cheramie said that if these tractors were not purchased and helped to catch up with what was being lagged on that small trees would be taking over the levees that the Parish had cleared in the current Administration. He continued to briefly speak on the matter. The motion *carried* by a vote of (7) yeas, (1) nay, that being of Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer, (1) absent, that being of Mr. Michael Matherne and (0) abstentions.

RES. NO. 07-106 PURCHASE JOHN DEERE TRACTORS FOR FIELD OFFICES

A **motion** was offered by Mr. Brent Callais, seconded by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer to *close* the Two-Thirds Agenda and *return* to the regular agenda. The motion *carried* by a vote of (8) yeas, (0) nays, (1) absent, that being of Mr. Michael Matherne and (0) abstentions.

After a brief discussion regarding having Ms. Martinez discuss street lights, Ms. Martinez reported on the same. Mr. Lorraine stated that he had spoken to Ms. Martinez on April 24, 2007 and then clarified the meaning of "PENDING ENTERGY" on the report previously given to the Council regarding street lights as meaning that Entergy was being waited on to install the street light, to which Ms. Martinez agreed. He then clarified that the meaning of "PENDING AUTHORIZATION" on the report meant that authorization was being waited on, to which Ms. Martinez agreed. Ms. Martinez explained that the reason for those currently marked "PENDING AUTHORIZATION" was because Mr. Cullen Curole, Parish Administrator was out of town and the request had not been signed. She went on to say that she would be sending them into Entergy anyway as Mr. Curole had instructed her to do so. Mr. Lorraine then mentioned several street lights that had been requested and commented on the longevity of the waiting for same. He

asked that Ms. Martinez look into and straighten out the street light request he had mentioned. Detailed discussions ensued, including Ms. Martinez giving Mr. Lorraine a status on the street light request he had inquired about and an approximate time that street light should be installed. Mr. Callais clarified the "EVALUATION" meant that a parish employee would be sent out to double check the matter. Ms. Martinez stated that "EVALUATION" meant that either the parish employee had already evaluated the street light request or would be, mentioning that there were not very many of those on the reports. Mr. Toups stated that on the report his name was listed for street lights requested and that District 6 had been listed but clarified that the street lights requested were actually in the Leeville and Golden Meadow area. Ms. Martinez stated that she would change it on the report. Mr. Toups then asked the meaning of "PENDING AUTHORIZATION" and Ms. Martinez reiterated that Mr. Curole authorized the street light requests and that he was currently out of town. She stated that Mr. Curole had advised her to send the requests in and that he would approve them when he returned. A brief discussion ensued regarding the street light requests called in by Mr. Toups.

PUBLIC WISHING TO ADDRESS THE COUNCIL

The next item on the agenda was the Public to address the Council.

[Mr. Robert Benoit, a resident of Vickey Lane, addressed the Council in detail regarding the permit system.](#) He explained in detail the non-dating and initialing of permits and the problems he was currently incurring with the same. Mr. Benoit continued voice his complaints with regards to the permitting system and it being in "limbo" with regards to elevations. Chairman Lasseigne asked if Mr. Benoit had addressed this problem with the Permit Department, to which Mr. Benoit stated yes and explained that he would only receive from the department what the elevation was. He voiced that he was the one that would have to advise his clients that the elevations were not correct and that he did not feel that was his job. Detailed and lengthy discussions continued regarding elevations, as well as Mr. Benoit's concern with the same. Mr. Travis Chiasson, next addressed the Council and clarified what Mr. Benoit was complaining about, saying that he thought the issue was with when the packets were issued and the time the permits were approved. He then elaborated on same giving an example. President Randolph and Chairman Lasseigne both voiced that the elevation that would be required would be the elevation for when the permit was issued. Discussions continued. Mr. Benoit then spoke of another problem that was being incurred and the responses he was being given by the Permit Department. Discussions ensued.

[Mr. Travis Chiasson, a Choctaw Road resident, then addressed the Council and explained that had had a permit packet delivered and stated his reasons for the delay of his project.](#) He explained that when calling the Permit Office the week of April 23, 2007 to re-confirm the requirements of the permit application process and the fees associated with it he had been shocked because the packet he had received had stated \$40.00. He then spoke about and calculated in detail the costs that would be involved and the process that he would have to go through, which he calculated would be \$4,368. He explained that he had paid \$13,000 for the building he was building, saying that the permit amount was 36% percent of the costs of the building. Mr. Chiasson stated that he understood there were rules and compliancy, but that this was a storage shed and he would not be living in it. He continued to voice his concerns with regards to the costs involved and not having anything in writing to the effect of who he could go to and what his choices and options would be on the matter. President Randolph explained that

this was building code regulations that had come from the Legislature and added that South Central Planning and Development's involvement should reduce the costs less because they would have pool engineers, pool workers, and compliance officers who could do the services requested for less money than independent contractors. She stated that the issue was a State issue when they had adopted the building codes, adding that it was something that had been mandated by the Legislature. Mr. Chiasson asked if any construction project regardless of the scope required a building permit, to which President Randolph stated especially when dealing with something with electricity in it. Mr. Chiasson asked if a permit was still needed if he did not have power in the structure, nor plumbing or air conditioning, and it was not for occupancy, to which President Randolph responded that the intent had been to build structures strong enough to withstand storms not just for the homeowners' protection and investment but also as not to create flying debris during storms. Chairman Lasseigne stated that he thought there was a 200 foot minimum, saying that sheds could be built smaller than 200 feet or approximately that footage. Mr. Gouaux stated that was a FEMA regulation. A brief discussion then ensued as to whether that had been included in the ordinance or not. After a brief discussion, President stated that that was included in the ordinance. Detailed and lengthy discussions continued on the matter with Mr. Atzenhoffer, Mr. Delatte and Mr. Toups voicing their thoughts and feelings as well as facts and suggestions on the topic. **After explaining a particular situation with one a member of the public who had been trying to obtain a building permit, Mr. Toups asked that the Administration look into the reason for the delays in permits in the Permit Office.** President Randolph responded but it was inaudible. Mr. Lorraine explained that with regards to the member of the public who Mr. Toups was referring that he had called the Permit Office and had been told the packet had been brought and that everything had been ready to go. He went on to say that he had been told that South Central Planning and Development had picked it up. Mr. Lorraine stated that he had called South Central Planning and Development and had been told who the person in charge was and then commented on the non-returning of his phone calls to the individual. He continued to speak on the matter in detail, including commenting that the building codes had been put on by the State and Federal Government but that the associated charges and fees had not been. Detailed discussions ensued, including President Randolph explaining how the costs had been derived and the reasons for the same.

[Mr. Charlie Callais, a resident of Cut Off, next addressed the Council in detail regarding elevations on the road from Leeville to the Fourchon, as well as coastal erosion.](#) He voiced in details his concerns and posed several questions regarding that topic. Mr. Callais offered a newspaper clipping to President Randolph for her viewing and then asked various questions about it. A brief discussion ensued. Mr. Atzenhoffer called a point of order. Chairman Lasseigne explained why Mr. Atzenhoffer had called for a point of order. Mr. Callais then spoke of the responsibilities of President Randolph with regards to coastal erosion. He continued to speak at length of his concerns.

PRESENTATIONS

Chairman Lasseigne read and then presented a [proclamation](#) to Mr. Atzenhoffer for his recent aiding in the rescue of dog trapped in a culvert.

[The next item \(2\) on the agenda was Ms. Martha Babin, Head Start, who gave a quarterly report.](#) Ms. Babin began by stating that she had supplied the Council with a report before the beginning of the Council meeting. She then presented a plaque to the Council and explained that

it was from Washington, DC from the Office of Head Start Bureau and that it was a Certificate of Excellence for the Lafourche Parish Council's Head Start. Ms. Babin commented that this award was not something that was easy to come by but that the Parish was in 100% compliance with all 1,700 regulations and obligations. Ms. Babin continued to speak on the award, mentioning where copies would be erected at. Ms. Babin then explained her report in detail, mentioning that the two (2) new school buses ordered would be arriving over the summer. She went on to report that Congress had appropriated a 1.5% cost of living increase raise to be submitted June 15th. Ms. Babin informed the Council that also included in the report she had furnished was the results from the annual self-assessment and then explained it in detail. She then explained that also included in the report was a standard status report which she explained showed a break down at every Head Start site. Ms. Babin continued to elaborate on the report and also commented on other matters briefly. President Randolph issued her congratulations to Head Start with regards to the perfect score received and then elaborated on same.

The next item (3) on the agenda was Ms. Carolyn Cheramie, Lafourche Parish Tourist Commission, who presented an annual report. Ms. Cheramie began her report by stating that the State and the industry faced new challenges the biggest of which, she said, was negative media. She said that they had been challenged to become more aggressive in their pursuit of attracting more visitors to Lafourche Parish both as a meeting/convention and tourist destination. She continued to elaborate in detail on the tourism industry and its importance to Lafourche Parish. Ms. Cheramie informed the Council that the industry statistics for 2006 would not be available until the later part of July but stated that she currently had the 2005 statistics. She then explained in lengthy detail the 2005 statistics. She then spoke about the location of the Tourism Center, displays there, as well as other things housed and/or offered at the center. She continued to speak in detail on the matter. She explained that in 2006 people from all fifty (50) states and twenty-nine (29) foreign countries had signed the guest registry at the Welcome Center, adding that the amount had been 8,246. Ms. Cheramie went on to report that the top five (5) states visiting the Parish were Texas, Mississippi, Florida, California and Alabama and that the top foreign countries were Canada, Germany, France, United Kingdom, Denmark and Belgium. She stated that in 2006 the Welcome Center had provided people in forty (40) states and four (4) foreign countries with printed information on the Parish and that they had also prepared 13,258 packets with information on the Parish for 33 organizations. She then reported on the financial condition of the Tourist Commission as that of being financially sound as she said could be seen from its financial statements. Ms. Cheramie stated that in 2006 local occupancy tax collection had been \$317,139 and State collections had been \$194,209, an increase she said of \$171,285 over the previous years. Ms. Cheramie reported the Tourist Commission's assets exceeded its liability by \$935,023 representing a 45.58% increase from the last fiscal year. She continued to report on the matter. Mr. Lorraine inquired about the hotel/motel tax. Ms. Cheramie elaborated on the same. Mr. Lorraine then asked what amount was brought in by the hotel/motel tax yearly, to which Ms. Cheramie stated she was not aware, adding that their collections had increased a lot because of the storms because of the increased activities in the area. Mr. Matherne inquired as to what new hotels would be being built in Lafourche Parish, to which Ms. Cheramie responded that there were two (2) to be built in the Thibodaux area that they were aware of, as well as possibly two (2) in the South Lafourche area. Mr. Matherne asked if Ms. Cheramie was aware of what types of motels were to be built in Thibodaux, to which Ms. Cheramie stated it was her understanding that the hotels were to be a Hampton Inn and a Days Inn. Chairman Lasseigne asked if the tax was still collected in the municipalities, to which Ms. Cheramie responded yes.

The next item (4) on the agenda was Ms. Amanda Granier, South Central Louisiana Human Service Authority Board, who presented a board update. Ms. Granier, after making a brief introduction, explained that the Board had had their first meeting on May 5th, and that they were the 5th authority established in Louisiana. She reported that Senator Reggie Dupre had been in attendance at the meeting and that there had been three (3) things he had wanted to discuss and that the Board wanted to share with the Council concerning provisions of the Act of 449. Ms. Grainer stated that one thing was that the Act would not go into effect until the Board received funding from legislators, which she said they were anticipating not being until July 2008. Ms. Cheramie stated that the governing board, which she said was the authority, would be an advisory board to the three (3) departments until funding was received. Ms. Cheramie stated that to date they were the only region that had mandated that they may give recommendations regarding the inpatient psychiatric services within the region. Ms. Cheramie reported that at the previously mentioned meeting they had elected officers and further that Mr. Bob Duet was the Interim Chairman and that Mr. Doug Hallway from Terrebonne Parish was the Vice-Chair. She explained that at their second meeting they had had presentations from all three (3) departments in which they were given services that were being provided and salaries and staffing. Ms. Granier then spoke about the major concerns of the Authority, saying that was that they were awaiting until July 2008 for funding for an executive director to be hired, saying that everything would start flowing better at that point. She said that another concern was that for the Office of Mental Health that there were no inpatient beds in Region 3 at the present time which she said was a big concern. She informed the Council that “Chabert” may be getting funding for ten (10) inpatient beds but that was to be decided and may be from surplus from State funds. Ms. Granier went on to state that there was presently no social detox units in Region 3, commenting that Fairview had a medical detox which she said had ten (10) beds but at the end of the fiscal year would be losing five (5). She continued to elaborate on the issue. Ms. Grainer spoke about future goals of the Board and expanded on the same. She concluded by stating that the Authority’s meetings were held on the first Thursday of every month and are public if anyone wished to attend and further that they were trying to have their July meeting in Lafourche Parish as they would be rotating meeting places from month to month. Mr. Matherne thanked Ms. Granier for serving on the Board and then asked for the boundaries of District 3 and what parishes it included. Ms. Granier responded that it was inclusive of Lafourche, Terrebonne, Assumption, and continued to name other parishes involved but due to technical difficulties it was not recorded. Mr. Matherne commented on the concern for the lack of inpatient psych beds, saying that he worked at the University and many times they had been trying to find facilities for young people who needed that type of help. He said that there was no place and that if someone needed a psych bed they had to go far away at an expense. Mr. Matherne stated that he was not sure how the Authority when making their annual goals would be prioritizing that concern but that he would ask that they make it a high priority. Ms. Chauvin stated that it was definitely a high priority and that another issue was that in the Region there were no juvenile detox inpatient anything. She stated that for inpatient mental health that there was only one (1) clinic in the State of Louisiana, adding that there were only six (6) clinic all together but only one (1) was for juveniles. Discussions continued.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT(S)

The next item (5) on the agenda was Mr. Jerome Danos, Solid Waste Manager, who presented a March 2007 monthly report. Mr. Jerome Danos, Solid Waste Manager, informed the Council that a March report had been included in their packet, as well as at their seat were copies of an April 4th press release and e-mail that had been sent out which advised of the present situation with trash collection and the delays that many residents were experiencing. He reported that some of the adjustments being made at the present time was the adding of more trash trucks and stated that by early May they should have up to an additional five (5) trucks online to assist with the situation. Mr. Danos stated that by the end of the week of April 23, 2007 there should be at least three (3) pickup stations set up which would allow the trash trucks from having to travel all the way to River Birch to dump, as they were currently doing, adding that was taking a lot of time to make a round trip. He continued to elaborate on the issue. He said that SWDI had also started working seven (7) days a week until a handle was gotten on the current situation, explaining that they would be working a half-day on Sundays if they could find workers to work. Mr. Danos then expanded on the same. He said with the adjustments being made they were planning on being back on a more regular schedule by about mid May in time for hurricane season. He continued to report on the matter. Mr. Atzenhoffer then explained a problem he was incurring and asked if there was an enforcement mechanism in place or did something need to be changed in the ordinance to have an enforcement mechanism put in place? He continued to elaborate on problems being incurred. Mr. Danos explained that he thought that it would fall under the nuisance abatement ordinances, either littering or accumulation of junk on property. Mr. Lorraine voiced that he thought that one of the biggest problems had previously in the Parish, which he said had been taken care of for a while but had gotten back out of hand, was tree cutters. He explained that some of the tree cutters hauled the trees away but that most of them did not haul away the trees they cut. Mr. Lorraine recalled the sending of letters to all tree cutters of the Parish and then voiced that he did not think it right that a contractor be paid and the Parish pick up the trees. Discussions then began on the contract had by the Parish and its contents. Mr. Lorraine continued to speak in detail on the problems being incurred with tree cutters and gave various examples. President Randolph stated that it was the same with contractors in that contractors were supposed to encourage the residents to rent a disposal container so that it could be hauled away but that often that was put on the side of the road and stayed too long, commenting that she was aware that it added an expense but that was part of the contract. President Randolph continued to speak on the issue. Mr. Callais informed Mr. Danos that they had been incurring the skipping of streets or of not going down cross streets. He asked what could be done to prevent this in the future. Mr. Danos stated that it was difficult to keep track of that situation with the changeover in drivers, adding that they did have a route foreman that stayed on the drivers in the South Lafourche area and one was also in the North Lafourche area. He said that it was basically a matter of training new drivers and getting them used of the routine of going down some of the streets that had unusual nooks and crannies. Mr. Callais then inquired about the recycling process amendment in the past budget and then asked for a status on the matter. Mr. Danos explained the problems being incurred with reinstating the curbside recycling contract, saying that the storms had heavily impacted recycling, especially curbside. He informed the Council that St. James had discontinued their curbside program as well as St. Charles Parish. Mr. Danos stated that the only curbside program he was aware of was the City of Thibodaux, adding that Terrebonne Parish did not have curbside. He went on to say that they

were trying to identify contractors that would be interested in possibly coming into the Parish and doing curbside, saying that he had asked SWDI to supply a rough estimate of what the costs may be to reinstate the program at a once a week service with possible carts to contain recycling but that he had yet to receive an estimate from them.

The next item (6) on the agenda was a status report regarding pump stations.

- a. the Parr Pump Station-
- b. the Upper Larose Pump Station.

Mr. Callais asked for a status and update, mentioning that he was aware that the Council had approved at its prior meeting monies for the projects. President Randolph stated that she had signed the ordinance pertaining to the issue three (3) working days prior. Mr. Cheramie stated that he had received specifications from someone and that in the next two (2) weeks they should be able to go out to bid on the project. Mr. Callais clarified that the projects would not be being done in-house and that Parish would be going out to bid on them, to which Mr. Cheramie explained that the projects were too big and that a dragline on a barge would be needed to do the projects. Mr. Toups then inquired as to the status of the Jessie Dufrene Pump Station and asked for an update on the same. He explained that he had met with the engineer and that it had been looked at but that he had not heard anymore on it. Mr. Cheramie stated that “Duplantis Engineering” was the engineer. He said that their contract had been reviewed and that it should be being presented to the Council shortly. Mr. Cheramie said that with regards to the Larose pump station that an engineer contract should be being presented to the Council by the next Council agenda. He then commented on the name of the engineering firms that would be performing the pump stations projects. Mr. Delatte asked for an update on the Leighton Pump Station, to which Mr. Cheramie stated that they had received drawings from Mr. David Waitz on April 24, 2007 and that as soon as he was able to review them with Mr. Waitz that they would try and get it put out to bid as well. He then spoke about the Manchester Manor pump station saying that Mr. Joseph Picciola had sent a draft of a contract pertaining to it. Mr. Cheramie said that they would review it and also attempt to have it on the next Council agenda. He continued to briefly speak on the matter. Mr. Delatte then inquired about the Sugar Ridge West pump station, and asked if it was complete or not. Mr. Cheramie stated that the pump had been installed and had been completed but that he was not sure if it was working. He explained that he had sent an employee to take pictures of it. Mr. Cheramie stated that the engine would be operated automatically with a float, saying that would hopefully curb any kind of expenses of having a designated pumper, even though they would have someone to check on it. Mr. Delatte asked if anyone had more information regarding the Choupic levees, to which President Randolph stated that everything had been signed and that someone was on the job trying to get the permit done. She went on to say that the person hired had also been charged with trying to reduce the Parish’s mitigation because it was being heard that the EPA and similar people were talking about significant fines for it. President Randolph then went on to clarify that the Leighton Pump Station was approximately \$350,000, to which Mr. Cheramie and Mr. Delatte corrected her by stating that it \$260,000. Mr. Cheramie said that the pump station would be designed for two (2) “48s” even though only one (1) was had, explaining that while the design was being done that he felt that in the future it would be being looked at to install another pump. He said that it would be designed for two (2) and would also put discharge pipes on the dig that would be being built on top of the crossing in anticipation to add another “48 inch” in the future, commenting that there was a lot of development in the area and that he felt that it would be needed. Mr. Lorraine asked why was the North Lafourche Levee District not as involved as the South Lafourche Levee

District, mentioning that the Parish paid for the fuel for the South Lafourche Levee District, which he said was not \$200,000 a month. He said that to date in 2007 the amount was \$35,100. Mr. Lorraine said that when an engine broke “down the bayou” that the Levee District paid for it. He continued to question why the North Lafourche Levee District did not get involved with the pump stations. He continued to voice his feelings on the matter in detail. Mr. Delatte stated that in response to Mr. Lorraine’s comments he pointed out that there had been a Levee District change in January. He explained that the Lafourche Levee Basin previously represented Lafourche and the North which they no longer did. Mr. Delatte stated that the North Lafourche Levee District now represented the northerly part of Lafourche. He said that the Levee District had provide some equipment and had done a tremendous amount of work in the Choupic, Chackbay, Choctaw and Bayou Bouef areas, as well as the Raceland area within the last couple of weeks and months. Mr. Delatte stated that the District had done some work but asked that time be given to them as they had only been in for three (3) months. He continued to speak in detail on the matter. Detailed discussions ensued.

The next item (7) on the agenda was a status report regarding speed bumps. Mr. Callais recalled that in the previous year the Council had passed an ordinance to begin the installation of speed bumps on streets, adding however that there was no money in any line item to install these speed bumps. He stated that at a meeting last year that the Sheriff had stated that he would split the costs by fifty (50%) percent. Mr. Callais informed the Council that there were currently three (3) streets that had been approved for installation by the Sheriff’s Office. He explained that before the process to install speed bumps could be started money needed to moved and a cooperative endeavor signed with the Sheriff’s Office would be needed. **Mr. Callais stated that he was asking that the Administration put up a supplemental appropriation and begin the process of obtaining a cooperative endeavor agreement with the Sheriff’s Office so the process of installing the speed bumps could begin.** Mr. Cheramie explained that one of his area supervisor had been in contact with the Sheriff’s Office and stated that the only thing that had been given was an indication of how many speed bumps per street and where the location would be. He went on to say that an area supervisor was presently talking to one of the road contractors and obtaining prices of materials it would take, what it would costs to install in-house or have a contractor install, as well as what recommendations as to what type of speed bump would be the best to install. Mr. Cheramie stated that he thought it premature to put into the budget before it was actually known how much the costs would be. Mr. Callais stated that according to the Sheriff’s Office it would be estimated costs of \$2500 a piece per individual speed bump, adding that he did not have documentation evidencing that. He continued to briefly speak on the matter.

The next item (8) on the agenda was discussion concerning progress on 104 and 106 Michelle Place. Mr. Williams explained that he had received a call from Mr. Craig Stanga and the commented on getting permission for something from Mr. Cheramie. Mr. Cheramie explained that an employee was in the process of purchasing the needed culverts and also the catch basins so that the job could be done. He commented on the job being done in-house, adding that it would entail cutting cement. Mr. Cheramie said that they were capable of doing the job in-house and trying to cut some of the expenses to have it done. He went on to say that the footage had been measured and that it was known how many catch basins would be needed, adding that the culverts had actually been ordered so that the Department could do the job. Mr. Williams then asked who was responsible for this job, to which President Randolph stated that

the Parish would fix it. Mr. Cheramie stated that there was money in the budget to cover it, saying that it had been dedicated for that particular project.

Mr. Callais stated that he had e-mailed Mr. Cheramie and President Randolph in the previous week regarding East 44th Street, explaining that was where neighbors have ran a water line in the roadside ditch in the area. He asked what were the Parish's plans, commenting that the street had had drainage problems and that the ditch could not be dug because a waterline had been ran in the middle of a ditch. Mr. Cheramie stated that he and President Randolph had spoken on the matter and then stated that they had signed affidavits from the two (2) landowners who had ran the waterline in the ditch where they would not hold the Parish liable if maintenance was done and the lines were broken. He went on to say that the landowners were under the assumption that Water District No. 1 would be running a more permanent waterline and burying it. Mr. Cheramie stated that his thoughts were that if the Parish went and did the work and broke the lines then the Parish get sued from disrupting waterlines going to the homes. He said that the waterline was in a Parish right-of-way and was lying in the ditch. Mr. Cheramie then asked if a legal opinion should be gotten, saying that would be his thoughts. He continued to briefly speak on the matter. Mr. Cheramie suggested the obtaining of a legal opinion on the issue. Mr. Callais stated that he had spoken to the Water District and informed Mr. Cheramie that the Water District would only go up to the last meter on the street if they were to replace a waterline, saying the meter was at the beginning of the street and that 1,300 feet of PVC pipe had been ran. He said that the Water District had no plans on running a meter all the way down the street. Mr. Callais then commented that if the waterlines being spoken about were buried in the ditch it would be one thing but that these waterlines in question were lying in the ditch. He continued to explain that the waterline was lying in the ditch. He said that the grass in the ditch could not be cut anymore as the last time it was cut the waterline had been broken. **He continued to speak on the matter, adding that he would put together a resolution to ask for a District Attorney opinion on the issue.**

The next item (9) on the agenda was an ABFE/LRA Update:

- a. The number of residents that have applied for Hazard Mitigation Funds.
- b. List of projects submitted by Lafourche Parish.
- c. List of projects approved.
- d. List of Projects funded.
- e. Total dollars of funded projects.
- f. Total number of building permits year to date with a comparison of same time last 2 years.

Upon Mr. Atzenhoffer's request the discussions held on this agenda item will be reported in verbatim.

Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer:

Thank you Mr. Chairman. Uhm I see part of it is in there, uh in the packet. The part that's missing is just don't have the comparison of uh, building permits to see where we were over the last 2 years. Uh, so.

President Randolph

We'll get that to you.

Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer

I'd liked to get that information, please. Mr. Chairman, uh, in reference to this ABFE/LRA uh issue. Uh I have to admit at this point that I didn't know everything. And uh, I missed something after over a 100 hours of research on this issue. And I think, I wanna bring it up to your attention because Ima ask for an agenda item after this. Chapter 5, Lafourche Parish Building Code of Ordinances, Section 5:1, Statutory Authorization. The Legislature of the State of Louisiana has in Revised Statues 33:1236 dele- delegated the responsibility of local governmental units to adopt regulations designed to minimize flood losses, therefore the Lafourche Parish Council, Parish of Lafourche, State of Louisiana does hereby ordain the regulations set out in this Sub-Chapter. In reading Revised Statue 33:1236, Sub-Chapter 38, Section A, to pass zoning ordinances, subdivision regulations, building codes, health regulations and other applications in, in extension of the normal police power to provide standards and effective enforcement provisions for the prudent use and occupancy of flood prone and mud slide areas. Section B, the provision of Sub-Paragraph A of this paragraph shall apply only in so far as it is necessary for a parish to use such powers and authority to qualify for the National Flood Insurance Act of 1968 as amended 42 United States Code 4001 into 4127. So, uhm, I would like to ask that we ask the District Attorney's opinion. **You can put it on the next agenda to see if Lafourche Parish was in violation of Louisiana Revised Statute 33:1236, Sub-Chapter 38.B by adopting the ABFEs when it was against the State law to do so.** And I uh, apologize for missing that Mr. Chairman. I should have spent 101 hours I guess. But, um, that's come up and uh, I'd appreciate if I could get the building permit comparison so it can complete this agenda item.

The next item (10) on the agenda was a status report regarding derelict structures; including reports from Ms. Tracey Martinez and Mr. Henry Lafont. This item was previously discussed via a deviation from the regular agenda.

The next item (11) on the agenda was a discussion concerning a report listing everything done from 2004 to present within each Councilmatic District whether on-going or completed, including but not limited to street lights, roads, drainage, derelict structures, recreation projects, water lines, pump stations, levees, etc. This item was pulled.

Mr. Lorraine stated that he had tried to set up a meeting with the Mayor of Golden Meadow and added that he understood that President Randolph was busy on that day. He explained that the Mayor was concerned about a boat launch in Golden Meadow. He stated that a grant had been received and that matching funds were needed for the obtaining of a grant for repairs to a boat launch. Mr. Lorraine stated that the Town was in need of assistance from the Parish. He stated that he had asked that the assistance be put in the current year's budget but it had not been included. Mr. Lorraine stated that the Mayor had been trying to contact Mr. Curole as he needed some type of paperwork so that it could be sent off and the grant would not be lost. He continued to speak on the matter in detail. President Randolph stated that the complication involved with this issue was that there was no long term agreement between the Town and the landowner for the park and that until that long term agreement was signed the Parish could not put up any money to match what was had for a project that could possibly not take place. She reiterated that until that long term agreement was signed by all parties involved the Administration could not ask the Council to vote on monies for the project. President Randolph stated that they needed documentation signed, adding that the Mayor had told her that he had spoken to the gentleman who represented the land company but that there was still no document. Mr. Lorraine clarified that what President Randolph was saying was that the lease was trying to be settled, to which President Randolph agreed. Mr. Lorraine stated that the Mayor would like to get some type of cooperative endeavor agreement from the Parish, adding not spending any money, but that they would participate, saying that would help keep the grant intact. President Randolph stated that what she was saying was that the Parish could not commit money for the grant on property, at which Mr. Lorraine interrupted her by saying that money was not being committed and that only a letter was being written. Discussions continued. Mr. Lorraine then spoke about the Galliano Bridge arm, adding that he knew it was in bad shape and was about to break. He inquired as to whether it would be allowed to break or if the Parish would pre-fab another arm before it broke? Mr. Lorraine voiced the bind that the area would be put in with the outage of this bridge and other bridges, as well as the loss of income that may be incurred by the restaurants in the area. He then spoke about the mentioning by President Randolph of the involvement of the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development with regards to the bridge. He asked that the arm not be allowed to break and asked that another be pre-fabbed and have it ready in case it broke so time was not lost. He continued to speak on the matter in detail. President Randolph stated that she and Mr. Cheramie had spoken about this matter for a month and had considered the engineering of it but explained that the engineering costs would be more than the costs of doing it, adding that had been why the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development had been asked to get involved in case there were any spare parts in their warehouses. She said that they were searching at the present time to see if anything comparable could be found. President Randolph stated that it would be done but that they would not do it to have an engineer do it because it would be an exorbitant price. Mr. Lorraine informed President Randolph that the last arm put on the bridge had been done from a pattern from the old arm. He

continued to question why would the arm be allowed to break and then commented on having to wait on the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development. Discussions ensued. Mr. Cheramie stated that the arm had already broke and they had fixed it. He then informed Mr. Lorraine that the welder at the Lockport Field Office was in the process of building a new one that they would be installing as soon as it was finished. He explained that they would try to do what was right and was trying to get an engineer to design something that may not have broken, explaining that it was a very wide bridge and needed an extended arm when it opened. Mr. Cheramie said that there was a lot of stress on the arm and that it opened often and then elaborated on the same. He said that they were attending to it. Mr. Lorraine clarified that Mr. Cheramie stated that they were currently pre-fabbing an arm at the present time, to which Mr. Cheramie stated that they had ordered the material and that it would be built in approximately two (2) weeks. A brief discussion ensued. Mr. Brennan Matherne, Director of Parks, Recreation and Public Facilities, advised Mr. Lorraine that they were on top of the situation pertaining the Golden Meadow Boat Launch. He said that he been in talk with the Mayor, adding that late in the afternoon on April 24, 2007 the Mayor had sent a copy of the cooperative endeavor agreement that Mr. Lorraine had mentioned. Mr. Matherne stated that he would be looking at the agreement on April 25, 2007 and would contact the Mayor regarding it.

[Mr. Brennan Matherne, in the absence of Mrs. Shannon Chiasson, Finance Director, presented a visual finance report which he explained in detail and included the following:](#)

Finance Report, March 27, 2007
Shannon Chiasson, *Finance Director*

March 2007 Financial Reports

Royalty Revenue Report
Sales Tax Revenue Report
2007 Budget – Final
RSTD 3,5,6 Combined Revenue & Debt

Financial Information

Link

<http://www.lafourchegov.org/lafourchegov/finance-reports.aspx>

<u>Royalty Revenues</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>
•January	313,701	312,692
•February	300,115	365,704
•March	343,926	
Total	3,761,050	678,396
<u>Road Sales Tax District #2</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>
•January	357,572	451,256
•February	306,777	415,054
•March	337,403	
Total	5,046,602	866,310
<u>Road Sales Tax District #3</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>
•January	87,387	108,345
•February	62,720	108,371
•March	9,231	
Total	107,535	216,716

<u>Road Sales Tax District #5</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>
•January	94,898	88,988
•February	102,335	80,121
•March	82,917	
Total	1,270,156	169,109
<u>Road Sales Tax District #6</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>
•January	91,800	103,752
•February	69,465	75,547
•March	72,176	
Total	1,070,140	179,299
<u>Solid Waste</u>	<u>2006</u>	<u>2007</u>
•January	489,556	571,734
•February	413,379	512,088
•March	443,915	
Total	6,476,908	1,083,822
<u>Millage Rate Hearings</u>		
•Advertisement:	March 7, 2007 March 8, 2007	
•Public Hearings:	April 10, 2007 (Introduction) April 24, 2007 (Adoption)	

The End

He informed the Council that he had supplied the Council with a paper copy of the power point finance report. Mr. Callais inquired about the Solid Waste collection increase, commenting that it was up dramatically from the last couple of months. **He inquired as to what was the “cushion” or the money left in the bank had by the Parish with regards to this fund and asked that information be gotten to him at the next meeting.** President Randolph told Mr. Callais that Mr. Lorraine had been correct in previously stating that the taxes continued to come in. Chairman Lasseigne sought clarification as to a particular millage to which President Randolph explained.

ENGINEERING AND ARCHITECT REPORT(S)

[The next item on the agenda was a presentation of planned, presently on going, recently completed or other projects by appropriate engineering firms engaged by the Parish.](#)

Mr. Larry Picciola, Larry Picciola, Inc. next reported on Road Sales Tax District 3, 5 and 6 projects. (*Attached hereto as Exhibit 1*) Mr. Callais inquired as to list that had been previously provided with Mr. Picciola’s report on the letting schedule and asked that it be included again. Mr. Picciola stated that the list could be gotten and explained the reason for it not being included as he had been out of town for several weeks. A brief discussion ensued. Mr. Delatte then inquired about the Choupic/Chackbay project, saying that Mr. Picciola had stated that it was about ninety-five (95%) percent complete and that the punch list was being worked on but that he thought there were one (1) or two (2) roads that there was concerns about. He asked if Mr. Picciola had checked into those concerns, to which Mr. Picciola informed Mr. Delatte that they had traveled all of the streets on April 24, 2007 and that he thought there was three (3) in the

back section that they were concerned about. He stated that they had not yet gotten with the contractor about the concerns as they had just traveled the streets on the current day. Mr. Picciola stated that he thought the streets could possibly be heated up and re-rolled or place something in them. Mr. Delatte stated that he wanted to make sure that they were done right. He then stated that he had noticed that Legendre Estates had not been being worked on and stated that he was aware that they had an additional time period to work on it but asked that Mr. Picciola make sure that it was understood that if the next thirty (30) days were taken off and waited until the last five (5) days to do the project that an extension of time should not be come for as it would not happen. Mr. Picciola stated that he would notify the contractor of that. Mr. Delatte stated that there was an abundance of good weather at the time and that he could not see a large of amount days go by and no work be done. He continued to speak on the matter. Mr. Atzenhoffer then inquired as to Meadow Lane, saying it had been in the original settlement with Mr. David Heck and added that it should be pretty much done. Mr. Picciola stated that was correct and explained that he thought some streets had been pulled and that the area had been pulled out of another project, saying that they were waiting on the sewer program. He stated that the sewer program would not be being built and then elaborated on the same. Mr. Atzenhoffer then asked if Project 3J would be a separate project, to which Mr. Picciola agreed and stated that it would be a stand-alone. Mr. Atzenhoffer then asked as to when Meadowland would be going to bid to which Mr. Picciola responded that he would think it could be but that only a certain amount of staff was had. Mr. Atzenhoffer then inquired as to the concrete being dug up on concrete streets, to which Mr. Picciola explained that in the Lockport area it would be brought to the Lockport Field Office and that in the Bayou Blue area it would be brought to the Shooting Range. Mr. Atzenhoffer voiced his agreement with Mr. Callais' early statement that he too would like to see the total dollar value of what had been done on the projects. Mr. Picciola stated that they would have that for the next meeting of the Council. Mr. Toups then inquired about Project 3G and clarified that would be on May 1st, to which Mr. Picciola agreed. Mr. Toups then asked why Project 3I had been skipped, to which Mr. Picciola explained that Project 3I was the Farm Market to Road and other roads and that he thought it had been added on when the whole project started. He went on to say that he thought it had been placed at the end and had not been awarded to an engineer to do any work on it. Mr. Gouaux inquired as to Project 5F and the verbiage stating that the design firm estimated plans, asking if the engineer was not designing it and if there was another firm doing it? Mr. Picciola stated that he had just used that term "design firm". Mr. Gouaux clarified that he was clarifying that he thought maybe the Parish was having to pay for both a design engineer and an engineer to which Mr. Picciola stated no. Chairman Lasseigne stated that he was aware that the contract had just been signed for Lefort By-Pass but asked to what degree was the engineering work done, to which Mr. Picciola stated that the survey was done some time back and that it would have to be updated. He went on to inform Chairman Lasseigne that they were scheduled to meet on the matter at the end of the week of April 30th. Mr. Picciola stated that he would give the engineer a week or so to review the matters and bring it back in order to see what would be done with the alignment issue. He said once that was known and a direction was known as to what to do, the engineer could proceed.

[Mr. Gouaux commented on the longevity of the April 24, 2007 meeting thus far and voiced possible solutions to make the meetings shorter, such as sending of e-mails and quick request to the Administration and the making of phone calls.](#)

LEGAL ADVISOR REPORT

The next item on the agenda was to relinquish time to the Lafourche Parish Legal Advisor. The legal advisor was not present.

ORDINANCES FOR DISCUSSION AND RATIFICATION

The next item (12) on the agenda was an ordinance amending Chapter 24 of the Code of Ordinances of the Lafourche Parish Council to create Sub-Chapter "Z", Sections 24:1400 through 24:1406, as it pertains to the South Lafourche Beachfront Development District and provide for related matters. A **motion** was made by Mr. Brent Callais and seconded by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer. An **amendment** to add the verbiage **Any proposed expropriation shall be submitted to the Lafourche Parish Council for ratification by ordinance.** was made by Mr. Phillip Gouaux and seconded by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer. Mr. Lorraine voiced his thoughts on the amendment, rhetorically asking that if this was to be done then why have a board. He asked why should the Council have to make that decision, saying to let the Board do what it needed to do. Mr. Lorraine stated that recently there had been barriers and that Mr. Gouaux had taken out the Council making the decision on the barriers and had sent it to Coastal Zone Management but that in the current situation he wanted the Council to make the decision. He stated that he did not understand it, saying to let the Board make the decision. Mr. Lorraine stated that the Council did not make the decisions for the hospital boards or fire district boards, so why should the Council make the decisions for this Board. He continued to briefly speak on the matter. Mr. Gouaux stated that Mr. Lorraine had forgotten about issues involving a previous Library Board and what had happened wherein Mr. Lorraine and a few other councilmen had made the decision as to what the Board would do. He explained his main reason for the amendment was because this was very serious and that when property started to be expropriated it was serious. Mr. Gouaux stated that the persons to be put on the Board were not elected officials and would be coming from the 10th Ward. He said that this would be affecting the whole Parish and that he thought it such a severe and important part of developing the beach that the Council should be part of it and then voiced that he hoped that this amendment would be supported. Mr. Callais stated that there were numerous boards under the Council and the proceeded to name several and then added that every Board had the same verbiage as in the current ordinance. He said that yes, this Board would have the power to expropriate but voiced that it could not be done quickly. Mr. Callais stated that it was language that was included and was like every other board had in the Parish, commenting that if this amendment was to be done to the current Board then it would need to be done every board. He asked why was this being done directly to the current board because of the power expropriation, answering himself it was because of who the landowners were, saying that was why this amendment would be being done. Mr. Callais stated that if that was the one reason the amendment was to be done that he thought it to be ridiculous. He continued to briefly speak on the matter and asked that the amendment be voted against. Mr. Toups stated that he was against the whole thing, asking what happened with the Recreation Board, saying that he thought that Recreation would take the matter over. He asked why was this being given to the Port Commission? A brief discussion ensued as to Mr. Toups' comment being off of the subject. Chairman Lasseigne clarified that the discussions were just on the amendment. Mr. Toups then voiced his recurring hearing of the "10th Ward". He stated that this was a chance for the Recreation District to develop the beachfront property and that the people of the 10th Ward wanted it that way. He stated that some of the Councilmen had not gone to their constituents and speak to them about developing the beach through the Recreation District, adding that money

was had already but that another millage would be wanted to be put on. Chairman Lasseigne clarified once again that the amendment was what was being discussed. Mr. Lorraine stated that they had met occasionally with some of the landowners and that it had started well but that it had not ended well. Chairman Lasseigne again clarified that the amendment was being spoken about. The motion on the amendment **failed** by a vote of (4) yeas, (5) nays, that being of Mr. Michael Delatte, Dr. Tommy Lasseigne, Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer, Mr. Brent Callais and Mr. Daniel Lorraine, (0) absent, and (0) abstentions. Chairman explained that there was another proposed amendment that pertained to Section 24:1403 where five (5) commissioners were assigned and explained that one (1) was to be assigned by District 8, one (1) was to be assigned by District 9, one (1) was to be assigned by the Parish President as an At-Large member, one (1) was to be assigned by The Greater Lafourche Port Commission and one (1) was to be assigned by the Town of Golden Meadow. He stated that the proposed amendment would delete Council District 9 and replace it with Council District 7. He then asked Mr. Gouaux if that was correct, to which he agreed. Discussions then began as to the proposed amendment not being included in the Council's packets. Upon questioning Chairman Lasseigne again explained the amendment in detail, explaining that in Section 24:1403(a) it would be seen that one (1) member would come from District 8, Mr. Callais' District, one (1) member from District 9, Mr. Lorraine's District, one (1) member by the Parish President as an At-Large member, one (1) member by The Greater Lafourche Port Commission and one (1) member by the Town of Golden Meadow. He explained that Mr. Gouaux was proposing to delete Council District 9's appointment and replacing it with a Council District 7 appointment. Chairman Lasseigne stated that it would replace the appointment from Council District 9 with an appointment from Council District 7, saying that Mr. Gouaux's District would have an appointment but that Mr. Lorraine's District would not. Mr. Gouaux stated that Mr. Lorraine's District would have an appointment with the Town of Golden Meadow. A **motion** was made by Mr. Phillip Gouaux and seconded by Mr. Lindel Toups. Mr. Gouaux explained the reason for his amendment, saying that this was the 10th Ward and if in fact he did not have anyone from his district, adding that he was part of the 10th Ward, then that would be taxation without representation. He said by changing this and taking out District 9 that District 9 would not have actually been taken out as the Town of Golden Meadow is located in District 9, saying that the District would still have someone to represent the area. Mr. Gouaux stated that his area had been left out on hospital boards and that he thought it to be unconstitutional that people were paying taxes into a district for something that they had no representation on. He continued to speak on the matter. Mr. Gouaux stated that the Town of Golden Meadow by state statute had to be part of the Board. He said that it would be fair that all three (3) Councilmen would have someone from their districts serving on the Board. Chairman Lasseigne stated that he believed that there was no taxation involved. Discussions then began on if there was to be taxation and the Board not having the power to tax. Mr. Callais stated that he understood Mr. Gouaux's concerns but explained that there would be adequate chances for the residents to have representation because the Parish President would have an At-Large opening and The Greater Lafourche Port Commission would have an At-Large opening, so someone from Mr. Gouaux's District could still be appointed, saying that the area would not be excluded. He stated that he was all for giving Mr. Gouaux an appointment to the Board but would think to take away that At-Large appointment and give it to District 7, saying that he did not think District 9 should be punished because it included the Town of Golden Meadow. He reiterated that the At-Large seat could be taken away from the Parish President and given to District 7. Mr. Callais explained in detail that technically all four (4) of the appointments could be from Golden

Meadow as it did not state that the appointments by the Parish President and The Greater Lafourche Port Commission had to be from anywhere in the 10th Ward. He continued to voice his being in favor of taking the At-Large appointment and giving it to District 7. Mr. Callais asked that this amendment be voted down and that he would propose an amendment to give the At-Large appointment to Councilmatic District 7. Mr. Lorraine stated that he would hate to see the taking out of District 9 when the beach was in District 9 and then continued to voice his feelings on the matter. Detailed discussions continued on the matter with Mr. Lorraine, Mr. Gouaux and Mr. Callais voicing their thoughts on the amendment. Chairman Lasseigne once again clarified the proposed amendment. Mr. Toups asked why the Town of Golden Meadow needed an appointment when the beach was in Fourchon, to which numerous council members responded because of state statute. Mr. Matherne asked if the appointments were ratified by the Council to which a positive response was given by Mr. Callais who explained that it was the same process as other boards. Mr. Matherne clarified that that residency requirement was to be within the Councilmatic Districts, to which Mr. Callais responded that was right. A brief discussion ensued. Mr. Toups then stated that he saw that the board members would be being paid to attend meetings and then asked where the funding would be coming from. Mr. Callais stated that he could address that when the original ordinance was discussed. The amendment *failed* by a vote of (2) yeas, (7) nays, that being of Mr. Tyrone Williams, Mr. Michael Delatte, Mr. Michael Matherne, Dr. Tommy Lasseigne, Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer, Mr. Brent Callais and Mr. Daniel Lorraine, (0) absent, and (0) abstentions. Mr. Brent Callais offered an **amendment** to delete the At-Large representation and give it to Councilmatic District 7. Chairman Lasseigne explained the proposed amendment. A second was made by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer. Mr. Atzenhoffer asked if all of the members could be At-Large members? He then explained his reasons for stating the same. Chairman Lasseigne stated that the appointments could not all be At-Large appointments because the Town of Golden Meadow had to have an appointment. Discussions then began on why the Town of Golden Meadow had to have an appointment. Mr. Lorraine then explained that it was a similar situation with the appointments of members to the Fire District in the area, saying there were five (5) appointments but that by law the Town of Golden Meadow had to have two (2) out of the five (5) appointments. Discussions continued. [The](#) motion *carried* by a vote of (7) yeas, (1) nay, that being of Mr. Michael Matherne, (0) absent, and (1) abstention, that being of Mr. Lindel Toups. Discussions then began on the original motion as amended. Mr. Brennan Matherne asked with regards to the actual ordinance that in Section 24:1407 the Finance Section, Letter C said that the Finance Department would create a fund within the Parish Budget specifically for this board. He then asked if this would be under his Recreation Budget or would be a separate budget? Mr. Brennan Matherne stated that along with that, who would be overseeing the Board especially since they were basically a recreation board and asked if they would fall under him, specifically he said for capital projects and the like which he did for normal recreation districts? He then stated that another concern he had was that this was called “Lafourche” and not “South Lafourche”, saying that with the passage of the last amendment only South Lafourche would be represented and his concern was that the Board was called the Lafourche Beachfront and that there had been concerns in the past about “Greater Lafourche Port Commission” and similar things. He said that basically what it amounted to was that the question falls about the recreation district. Mr. Brennan Matherne stated that Lafourche Recreations District No. 3’s tax base extended all the way to the area being spoken of. He continued to speak on the matter, including saying that the area being spoken of was technically already represented as it was under Lafourche Recreation District No. 3. Mr.

Brennan Matherne continued to speak at length on the matter as well as giving an example of a similar situation being incurred. Mr. Callais explained that the ordinance was the exact replica of a recreation district and any other entity. He said that the finance portion referred to by Mr. Matherne would be a separate fund, but added that there were no funds. Mr. Callais stated that the Board would be just like the Commission On Women, that they had money in a checking account and it was a separate account under the Parish. He reiterated that it would be the exact same thing but that the Board would have the authority to collect a tax just as the North Lafourche Revitalization District and every other Board. Mr. Callais stated that passing this ordinance was not putting a new tax on the books, saying that if that was wanted it could be done but that would not be for years to come. He then informed Mr. Brennan Matherne that he did not know if it would fall under his Department and voiced the reasons for same. Mr. Callais said that it was a separate board and that they would be doing their own thing. He continued to speak in detail on the matter. Mr. Callais stated that this item had come up before and that it was something very, very important regarding the Fourchon Beach. He recalled that this matter had been delayed approximately two (2) months to meet with both landowners and that they had set up six (6) meetings. He said that at each one of the six (6) meetings Parish representation had been present but that neither one of the landowners had been present. Mr. Callais stated that they had tried countless times to work the matter out and possibly swap right-of-ways and move forward, adding that nothing had been moved forward. He said that within in the previous two (2) weeks more pilings had been planted on Fourchon Beach and as of the morning of April 24, 2007 chain had been delivered to rope off an area. Mr. Callais stated that the Fourchon Beach was a public beach and then commented on the number of audience members who were from the 10th Ward and Grand Isle area. He continued to speak at length on the matter and voice reasons for the Board being requested. Mr. Matherne voiced that the same arguments would be heard as had been heard at previous meetings, such as Mr. Toups speaking about it being a responsibility of recreation and it was the duplication of services. He said that at the previous meetings at which the item had been discussed that he had put together a series of amendments to try and create it as a parish entity and include the entire parish, saying that there were people in his area which utilized the beach and would probably own property there as wells as in the other council members' areas. Mr. Matherne voiced that he still thought that it needed to be parish-wide, saying that he knew that there was an argument that the state statute said that it could not be parish-wide and then asked why cite the statute to make the Board. He said that the Council had the Home Rule Charter power to do it on their own. Mr. Matherne voiced his support of developing the beach being discussed and that he thought it should be made parish-wide. He said that he thought that all of the Council members needed appointments as well as the Council approving all of the appointments and that eventually if there was a tax needed that it should be parish-wide and not just a small section of the parish. Mr. Matherne stated that he would support this matter if it did not cite state statute and if the appointments were parish-wide because we are one Lafourche. Mr. Toups recalled that this matter had been spoken about previously at meetings in October and November where just the people of the 10th Ward would be taxed, saying that a millage had to be done. He said that money was currently had in recreation and then stated that it was being talked about to develop the area, saying it should be developed as a Parish and not just the 10th Ward. He then spoke about an airport and the taking over of it by The Greater Lafourche Port Commission in detail. He said that this land could be developed and something would be had for all of Lafourche Parish. He continued to speak on the matter in detail, including stating that he would ask that this matter be voted down and the matter be done

parish-wide or not all. Mr. Toups passionately stated that he was tired of hearing South Lafourche, North Lafourche and Central Lafourche and that everyone needed to start thinking Lafourche Parish. He continued to speak on the matter. Mr. Callais stated that after speaking to the District Attorney that the state statute had to be cited if the force of Beachfront Development District was wanted. He stated that a Beachfront Development District was created by the State of Louisiana, saying that the State Legislature created Beachfront Development Districts, just as the Drainage Districts had been created. Mr. Callais stated that if the Parish was to go forward and create Fourchon Beach Initiative, which he said could be done, it would not have the power that a Beachfront Development District would have, saying that there were certain powers and privileges that Beachfront Development Districts had compared to other boards. He said that the beach was a parish-wide beach, as well as a nation-wide and world-wide beach, saying that everyone used the beach. Mr. Callais stated that he thought that this process needed to be started and moved forward. He said that he would be the first one at the next meeting of the Council to propose legislation to allow the State Legislature in their next session to amend the Beachfront Development District and allow it do other things but as of the present time it could not be done. Mr. Callais voiced that he thought that this process would be held up, asking that this process begin and that things could be changed in the future. He continued to speak on the matter in detail and at length. Mr. Lorraine stated that with regards to The Greater Lafourche Port Commission when it had been created there had been some council members who had wanted to make it parish-wide but that the residents had not wanted it parish-wide so it had been put in the 10th Ward. He said that the residents had paid the millage and stated to look and see what was had. Mr. Lorraine continued to speak on the matter in lengthy detail and also commented on Mr. Toups' statement regarding the airport in the area. Mr. Toups then voiced his thoughts on the matter in detail. Discussions ensued. Chairman Lasseigne voiced that he had heard taxes mentioned, and stated that the Board could not tax without coming before the Council and going before the public for a vote. He said with regards to the statements being made about "one Lafourche" the Council had to approve the members nominated and then elaborated on same. Chairman Lasseigne voiced that he thought it to be a good thing for Lafourche Parish. Mr. Matherne asked for clarification as to the amendments which had passed to which Chairman Lasseigne responded that the only amendment that had been passed was with regards to the At-Large appointment being taken from the Parish President and given to the councilmember from District 7 and then elaborated on the same. Mr. Toups asked Mr. Lorraine and Mr. Gouaux if they had spoken to the people of their area and had asked what they wanted? He said that he was in the area often and that the people he had spoken to wanted the mater recreation wise where it could be developed quickly. Mr. Toups asked if the councilmen had thought about having a meeting in the area to inquire as to what the residents wanted? He said that if that was what the people wanted then it was fine but that he wanted the people to understand that they may be taxed. He continued speak on the matter briefly. Mr. Callais stated that he would fax copy of resolutions passed by The Greater Lafourche Port Commission endorsing the matter, as well as the Town of Golden Meadow and the Bayou Chamber of Commerce. Mr. Toups then asked what was the Administration's thoughts on the matter? President Randolph stated that she thought it was an individual decision. A brief discussion ensued. [The](#) motion as amended *carried* by a vote of (6) yeas, (3) nays, that being of Mr. Tyrone Williams, Mr. Michael Matherne and Mr. Lindel Toups, (0) absent, and (0) abstentions.

ORD. NO. 4039

CREATE BEACHFRONT DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT

Mr. Brent Callais offered a motion to *deviate* to Item 34 on the April 24, 2007 agenda, seconded by Mr. Daniel Lorraine. The motion *carried unanimously* by a vote of (9) yeas, (0) nays, (0) absent, and (0) abstentions.

A five (5) minute *recess* was taken.

The Lafourche Parish Council April 24, 2007 meeting *reconvened* at 8:43 p.m.

The next item (34) on the agenda was a resolution calling for the Louisiana Shrimp Association (LSA) to withdraw its administrative review requests before the U.S. Department of Commerce that will delay the distribution of antidumping duties to the shrimp industry. Mr. Dean Blanchard, Treasurer, Louisiana Shrimp Association, addressed the Council on this matter and supplied to the Council Clerk documentation regarding this topic. He then voiced in lengthy detail his concerns and opposition on the issue. Mr. Atzenhoffer voiced his lack of knowledge of the subject matter and suggested that the item be deferred after discussions were had. Mr. Blanchard then gave a detailed history and explanation on how the current issue had been gotten to. He continued to speak at length of his concerns and his views on the matter, as well as explaining some of the contents of the information he had given to the Council Clerk for the Council's review. Mr. Lorraine inquired as to whether the various groups had begun as one group. Mr. Blanchard explained that Louisiana Shrimp Association (LSA) had been the first group and then explained in detail how the matter had begun. Mr. Toups asked for clarification as to what association Mr. Blanchard belonged to, to which Mr. Blanchard responded the Louisiana Shrimp Association. Mr. Lorraine then sought clarification as to whether the Southern Shrimp Alliance (SSA) was a group that consisted of eight (8) states, to which Mr. Blanchard agreed. Discussions ensued. Mr. Atzenhoffer sought clarification as to what the issue was and reiterated what he thought it to be. Mr. Blanchard explained in detail what he felt was the issue at hand. Detailed and lengthy discussions ensued. President Randolph stated that she had recently attended a Southern Shrimp Alliance meeting and stated that had been why she had asked Mr. Toups to put this item on the agenda. She explained that a concern of many people in attendance at that meeting had been that the administrative review requested by Louisiana Shrimp Association had put a hold on any thing until it could be explored further if there were additional monies. President Randolph then gave an example with the State selling the tobacco money for less than what would come in over twenty (20) years just to have the monies at the present time. She said that the concern of many of the attendees of the meeting was the situation they were in economically, saying that some of them would have a difficult time getting out in the coming summer to do their livelihood and make their living. She said that having this hold put on the situation did not get anyone any money. Mr. Blanchard expressed that he thought President Randolph had a misunderstanding and President Randolph continued to speak on the matter in detail. She explained that what Louisiana Shrimp Association was saying was that they felt that there was more money out there and then elaborated on same. President Randolph continued to speak on the matter in detail. Mr. Blanchard corrected a statement made by President Randolph, saying that with regards to the administrative review only the funds from the companies being reviewed would be held. He continued to explain and then read from documentation he had regarding the matter. Detailed discussions ensued. Ms. Kim Chauvin, a Terrebonne Parish resident and Southern Shrimp Alliance (SSA) member, next addressed the Council and voiced in detail her thoughts, concerns and views on the matter. She explained in detail a lawsuit involving Louisiana Shrimp Association and Southern Shrimp Alliance. Ms.

Chauvin spoke about an ad-hoc committee created to protect the Southern Shrimp Alliance members and explained the reasons for the same. Ms. Chauvin continued to speak passionately on the matter and gave a vast amount of detail on the subject, as well as her concerns on the matter. Mr. Atzenhoffer inquired as to whether deferring this matter for two (2) weeks would cause problem, mentioning that he had had not spoken to the fishermen in his area and that he would like to. Ms. Chauvin explained that they were on a timeline and then elaborated on the same and also commented on what had been done by Terrebonne Parish regarding the matter. She continued to speak at length on the matter. Mr. Matherne clarified what Ms. Chauvin had stated, saying that individual fishermen would be entitled to some sort of financial compensation. Ms. Chauvin explained that the fishermen were entitled to financial compensation, saying that in “2007” fishermen, processors and Mr. Dean Blanchard, dock owner, had received money, as well as many of the Louisiana Shrimp Association members. She continued to speak at length on the matter, including explaining the steps required in order to obtain the compensation. Detailed discussions ensued. Ms. Cathy Blanchard, a Cut Off resident, next addressed the Council and explained the reasoning for the asking of the withdrawal of the Louisiana Shrimp Association’s administrative review request. She passionately voiced in lengthy detail her concerns on the matter, her support of the current resolution, as well as state her various reasons for same. Chairman Lasseigne stated that even if the resolution was to pass it would not have the force of law to request Louisiana Shrimp Association to withdraw their administrative request. A brief discussion ensued. Mr. Callais asked why an administrative review had been asked for? Ms. Chauvin read from documentation regarding the administrative review process. She continued to elaborate on the matter, saying that the Administrative review requested was with companies within the countries, saying that they had not gone to every company within in the six (6) countries but had inquired as to forty-two (42) companies. She said that the Louisiana Shrimp Association has asked for a review with a large amount of companies. Ms. Chauvin continued to passionately speak on the matter. Mr. Lorraine inquired as to whether there was an organization that opposed the matter in the other seven (7) states, to which Ms. Chauvin stated none. Detailed and lengthy discussions on the subject matter ensued. Mr. Blanchard re-addressed the Council regarding the matter. Mr. Roy Thomassie, a Cut Off resident, next addressed the Council and voiced in detail his request for support of this item as well as his concerns on the matter. A **motion** was made by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and seconded by Mr. Brent Callais. Mr. Atzenhoffer and Mr. Toups voiced their feelings on the matter. The motion *carried* by a vote of (8) yeas, (1) nay, that being of Mr. Michael Matherne, (0) absent, and (0) abstentions.

RES. NO. 07-107 LSA WITHDRAW REVIEW REQUESTS

A **motion** was made by Mr. Brent Callais, seconded by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer to return to the regular agenda, and *carried* by a vote of (9) yeas, (0) nays, (0) absent, and (0) abstentions.

A **motion** was offered by Mr. Brent Callais to *open* the Public hearing and Ordinances for Ratification, seconded by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and *carried* by a vote of (9) yeas, (0) nays, (0) absent, and (0) abstentions.

PUBLIC HEARING AND ORDINANCES FOR RATIFICATION

[The next item \(13\) on the agenda was an ordinance amending Ordinance No. 2195 to increase the Fifteen \(15\) miles per hour speed limit to Twenty Five \(25\) miles per hour on all motor vehicles traveling on the Tiger Drive Extension across Talbot Avenue in front of the](#)

[Thibodaux Area Technical Institute, Ward \(2\), District \(3\), Parish of Lafourche, State of Louisiana; providing for the placement of speed limit and speed checked by radar signs; and providing penalties for the violations thereof.](#) Chairman Lasseigne asked three times if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Chairman Lasseigne moved for a motion. A **motion** was made by Mr. Tyrone Williams and seconded by Mr. Lindel Toups. [The](#) motion *carried unanimously* by a vote of (9) yeas, (0) nays, (0) absent, and (0) abstentions.

ORD. NO. 4040 INCREASE SPEED LIMIT; TIGER DRIVE EXTENSION

[The next item \(14\) on the agenda was an ordinance amending Ordinance No. 1123 to reduce the Fifteen \(15\) miles per hour speed limit to Ten \(10\) miles per hour on East 174th Street, Ward \(10\), District \(9\), Parish of Lafourche, State of Louisiana; providing for the placement of Speed Limit Signs; and providing penalties for the violations thereof.](#) Chairman Lasseigne asked three times if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Chairman Lasseigne moved for a motion. A **motion** was made by Mr. Daniel Lorraine and seconded by Mr. Michael Delatte. [The](#) motion *carried unanimously* by a vote of (9) yeas, (0) nays, (0) absent, and (0) abstentions.

ORD. NO. 4041 REDUCE SPEED LIMIT; EAST 174TH STREET

[The next item \(15\) on the agenda was an ordinance amending and re-enacting Sections 5:9 of Sub-chapter "A" of Chapter 5 of the Lafourche Parish Code of Ordinances relative to compliance with building and construction regulations.](#) Chairman Lasseigne asked three times if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Chairman Lasseigne moved for a motion. A **motion** was made by Mr. Phillip Gouaux and seconded by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer. [The](#) motion *carried unanimously* by a vote of (9) yeas, (0) nays, (0) absent, and (0) abstentions.

ORD. NO. 4042 BUILDING & CONSTRUCTION REGULATIONS

[The next item \(16\) on the agenda was an ordinance establishing a "No Parking-Fire Lane" on West 177th Street in Golden Meadow from the intersection of West 176th Street to the end of West 177th Street, on the North Side, Ward \(10\), District \(9\), of Lafourche Parish, State of Louisiana; installing the necessary "No parking-Fire Lane" signs; and providing for penalties for violations thereof.](#) Chairman Lasseigne asked three times if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Chairman Lasseigne moved for a motion. A **motion** was made by Mr. Daniel Lorraine and seconded by Mr. Lindel Toups. An **amendment** to change the wording ~~Golden Meadow~~ to **Galliano** was offered by Mr. Daniel Lorraine and seconded by Mr. Lindel Toups. [The](#) motion *carried unanimously* by a vote of (9) yeas, (0) nays, (0) absent, and (0) abstentions. [The](#) motion as amended *carried unanimously* by a vote of (9) yeas, (0) nays, (0) absent, and (0) abstentions.

ORD. NO. 4043 NO PARKING-FIRE LANES; WEST 177TH STREET

[The next item \(17\) on the agenda was an ordinance amending and re-enacting Section 2:200 \(A\) of Sub-Chapter "C" of Chapter 2 of the Code of the Ordinances for the Lafourche Parish Council by changing the time of the regular meetings from 6:00 pm to 5:00 pm.](#) Chairman Lasseigne asked three times if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the proposed ordinance. Mr. Steve Lirette, a resident of Park Drive, addressed the Council and voiced in detail his opposition to the change of the time of the Council meetings and stated his reasons for the same. Discussions ensued. Chairman Lasseigne again asked if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the proposed ordinance. Chairman Lasseigne moved for a motion. A **motion** was made by Mr. Michael Matherne and seconded by Mr. Phillip Gouaux. Mr. Gouaux

stated that the bottom line was that at the current meeting two (2) hours had been spent on the beginning parts of the agenda, saying that if someone was to arrive at 7:00 p.m. they would not miss much. Discussions ensued. Mr. Lorraine voiced that various times had been had in previous Administrations and then elaborated on same. The motion carried by a vote of (7) yeas, (2) nays, that being of Mr. Brent Callais and Mr. Daniel Lorraine, (0) absent, and (0) abstentions.

ORD. NO. 4044 CHANGE TIME OF COUNCIL MEETINGS TO 5:00 P.M.

The next item (18) on the agenda was an ordinance approving the Servitude Agreement between Ray Callahan and the Lafourche Parish Council; and authorizing the Parish President to sign, execute and administer said agreement. Chairman Lasseigne asked three times if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Chairman Lasseigne moved for a motion. A **motion** was made by Mr. Brent Callais and seconded by Mr. Lindel Toups. A brief discussion ensued regarding whether there were any objections from the Council regarding the right-of-way and the lack of need of Mr. Ray Cheramie's report on the same. The motion *carried unanimously* by a vote of (9) yes, (0) nays, (0) absents and (0) abstentions.

ORD. NO. 4045 SERVITUDE; RAY CALLAHAN

The next item (19) on the agenda was an ordinance approving the Servitude Agreement between Clyston A. Saucier and Anne Lorio Saucier and the Lafourche Parish Council; and authorizing the Parish President to sign, execute and administer said agreement. Chairman Lasseigne asked three times if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Chairman Lasseigne moved for a motion. A **motion** was made by Mr. Brent Callais and seconded by Mr. Michael Delatte. The motion *carried unanimously* by a vote of (9) yeas, (0) nays, (0) absent, and (0) abstentions.

ORD. NO. 4046 SERVITUDE; CLYSTON & ANNE SAUCIER

The next item (20) on the agenda was an ordinance approving the Servitude Agreement between Adeline Peterson Whitney Estate and the Lafourche Parish Council; and authorizing the Parish President to sign, execute and administer said agreement. Chairman Lasseigne asked three times if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Chairman Lasseigne moved for a motion. A **motion** was made by Mr. Brent Callais and seconded by Mr. Michael Delatte. The motion *carried unanimously* by a vote of (9) yeas, (0) nays, (0) absent, and (0) abstentions.

ORD. NO. 4047 SERVITUDE; ADELINE PETERSON WHITNEY ESTATE

The next item (21) on the agenda was an ordinance levying and imposing Taxes for Underlying Units of Lafourche Parish for 2007 and rolling forward those Taxes on all the property subject to taxation in the Parish of Lafourche. Chairman Lasseigne asked three times if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Chairman Lasseigne moved for a motion. A **motion** was made by Mr. Lindel Toups and seconded by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer. The motion *carried unanimously* by a vote of (9) yeas, (0) nays, (0) absent, and (0) abstentions.

ORD. NO. 4048 LEVY/IMPOSE TAXES; UNDERLYING UNITS

The next item (22) on the agenda was an ordinance levying and imposing Taxes for 2007 on all the property subject to taxation in the Parish of Lafourche. Chairman Lasseigne asked three times if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Chairman Lasseigne moved for a motion. A **motion** was made by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and seconded by Mr. Lindel Toups. Mr. Callais inquired as to why there was a roll-over pertaining to the Library? Mr. Callais was informed that his question dealt with the next agenda item (23.)

The motion *carried unanimously* by a vote of (9) yeas, (0) nays, (0) absent, and (0) abstentions.

ORD. NO. 4049 LEVY/IMPOSE TAXES; PROPERTY SUBJECT TO TAXATION

The next item (23) on the agenda was an ordinance levying and imposing Taxes for 2007 and rolling forward those Taxes on all the property subject to taxation in the Parish of Lafourche.

Chairman Lasseigne asked three times if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Chairman Lasseigne moved for a motion. A **motion** was made by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and seconded by Mr. Lindel Toups. President Randolph stated for a point of clarification and then asked if this would reflect that this was not from Administration. A brief discussion ensued regarding the matter. Mr. Toups asked if this was the agenda item dealing with the library, to which Chairman Lasseigne stated it was with regards to drainage, health unit and the library. Mr. Callais inquired as to why the library was asking that their millage be rolled over? Mr. Atzenhoffer asked if the Council had anything from the Library Board asking for the millage to be rolled, to which President Randolph and Chairman Lasseigne stated yes. President Randolph explained that the next year would be a re-assessment year and that most entities were asking that their millages be at the maximum level so that when the assessment came through they would not necessarily assess at the highest level but would have the opportunity to do so if needed. She stated that she was not speaking for the library in particular but said that was a reason why some entities asked for a roll over. Chairman Lasseigne explained that it had been previously explained to the Council that if an entity did not renew their millage within the assessment period one time to the maximum amount then they could never renew to the maximum again. President Randolph stated that was where the Parish was with the General Alimony and Criminal Tax, saying that the State had allowed the Parish to collect 4 mills on that and it had been rolled back through the years and that now the Parish had lost the opportunity for the maximum of the 4 mills. Mr. Toups inquired as to whether anyone from the Library Board was present at the meeting, saying that the Library was not saying why the money was needed. It was then brought to Mr. Toups' attention that Mrs. Charlene Hotard a member of the Library Board was present in the audience. Mrs. Hotard approached the Council and stated that she could not speak for the Library Board, explaining that as a board member their by-law prohibited her from speaking on behalf of the Board. She explained that she could speak on her on behalf as a board member. Mrs. Hotard stated that she could state that this issue had never been an agenda item on their agenda. President Randolph stated that it was signed, to which Mrs. Hotard stated she did not know who had signed it and that as a board member the issue had never come as an agenda item. Chairman Lasseigne stated that he had the resolution present at the current meeting, saying that it was Resolution No. 07-01 and then briefly read the same, and mentioned an absentee. Mrs. Hotard stated that she may have not been present at the meeting and also that the matter was not in nor reflected in the minutes of the Library Board. She then pointed out that the Library liaison was present on the Council and that he may be able to reflect some light on the matter. A brief discussion ensued regarding which meeting the resolution had been passed at. Chairman Lasseigne explained that the Library received 18% of the millage, saying that a millage was approximately \$420,000, and then asked for clarification as to how much one mil was. He then did a brief calculation of 18% of \$420,000. saying that would be approximately \$72,000. Mr. Toups voiced that for that amount of money the Library Board should have had someone present at the meeting and voiced that he would be voting against the matter. Chairman Lasseigne explained that other entities were involved and would also be being cut. Mr. Callais stated that a Water District had rolled their millage forward but had prepared a numerous page plan as to what they would be doing and how they would do it.

He said that not knowing what the Library wanted this for, and then interrupted himself by recalling that the Library had cut two (2) mills one year ago. Mr. Callais stated that he agreed with Mr. Toups in that he would not support the matter. Chairman Lasseigne stated that he wanted to point out that if item (23) was looked at and item (22) was looked at again, the adjusted maximum was 4.69 and the maximum authorized was 5.17, saying that what he believed was trying to be done was to raise it to 5.17. He said that the item was apparently typed wrong because it stated 4.69 for item (23). Chairman Lasseigne stated that if it was to be voted one it would have to be amended to go to 5.17. President Randolph stated that she still had it as a proposed ordinance, to which Chairman Lasseigne stated that it would have to be proposed 5.17 and not 4.69. President Randolph then asked the Council Clerk if there had not been corrected ordinances for the millages that had been handed out at the last meeting of the Council. The Council Clerk explained that it was not an amendment but was a substitute wherein Mr. Curole had recopied. Discussions ensued. Mr. Matherne suggested the removal of the motion and second on the matter and the deferral of the item. A brief discussion ensued regarding the timeline had on this item and the matter in general. Mr. Callais relinquished some of his time to Mr. Donovan Toups, a resident of Cut Off, who addressed the Council and inquired as to a point of clarification as to whether this millage was also for the health unit and other entities? Chairman Lasseigne stated drainage and health units. Mr. Donovan Toups stated that he agreed that he thought the Library had plenty of money but said that he did not think the Council could just vote against the Library but had to vote for all of them. Detailed discussions ensued. Mr. Atzenhoffer stated that he did not mind the item being deferred but that he would like to see a break down in the ordinance of how it was broken down and what the adjustments up were. **He continued to briefly speak on the matter and was then interrupted by President Randolph and Chairman Lasseigne who both voiced that it was already known what the percentages were and that the Council Clerk could get a copy of the same to Mr. Atzenhoffer.** Mr. Lindel Toups **removed** his second and Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer **removed** his motion. Mr. Phillip Gouaux made a motion to *defer* this item for two (2) weeks and seconded by Mr. Michael Matherne. The motion *carried unanimously* by a vote of (9) yeas, (0) nays, (0) absent, and (0) abstentions.

ORDINANCE DEFERRED FOR TWO (2) WEEKS

The next item (24) on the agenda was an ordinance levying and imposing Taxes for 2007 on all the property subject to taxation in the Parish of Lafourche. Chairman Lasseigne asked three times if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Chairman Lasseigne moved for a motion. A **motion** was made by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and seconded by Mr. Lindel Toups. President Randolph stated that the group involved in this item was doing the same thing as had been requested in item (23), rolling to the maximum authorized. The motion carried unanimously by a vote of (9) yeas, (0) nays, (0) absent, and (0) abstentions.

ORD. NO. 4050 LEVY/IMPOSE TAXES; PROPERTY SUBJECT TO TAXATION

The next item (25) on the agenda was an ordinance amending the 2007 Operation and Maintenance Budget as it pertains to fixing salaries of unclassified employees. Chairman Lasseigne asked three times if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Chairman Lasseigne moved for a motion. A **motion** was made by Mr. Lindel Toups and seconded by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer. The motion *carried unanimously* by a vote of (9) yeas, (0) nays, (0) absent, and (0) abstentions.

ORD. NO. 4051 FIX SALARIES; UNCLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES

Next, a **motion** was offered by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer, seconded by Mr. Michael Delatte, to *close* the Public Hearing and Ordinances for Ratification. The motion *carried unanimously* by a vote of (9) yeas, (0) nays, (0) absent, and (0) abstentions.

PROPOSED ORDINANCES

The next item (26) on the agenda was a proposed ordinance approving the Servitude Agreement between the Estate of Lawrence Barrilleaux and the Lafourche Parish Council; and authorizing the Parish President to sign, execute and administer said agreement. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Brent Callais to introduce the above stated proposed ordinance.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE SERVITUDE; LAWRENCE BARRILLEUAX

The next item (27) on the agenda was a proposed ordinance accepting the Subdivision known as the "Elmwood Estates, Addendum No. 3, Phase 2 " into the parish system. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer to introduce the above stated proposed ordinance.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE ACCEPT; ELMWOOD ESTATES, ADD. 3, PHASE 2

The next item (28) on the agenda was a proposed ordinance amending Ordinance No. 1123 to increase the Fifteen (15) miles per hour speed limit to Twenty-Five (25) miles per hour on Lydia Street, Ward (11), District (5), Parish of Lafourche, State of Louisiana; providing for the placement of Speed Limit Signs; and providing penalties for the violations thereof. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Tyrone Williams to introduce the above stated proposed ordinance.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE INCREASE SPEED LIMIT; LYDIA STREET

RESOLUTIONS

The next item (29) on the agenda was a resolution requesting the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development (LADOTD) to create a "No Truck" route on the stretch of Louisiana Highway 24 from Louisiana Highway 3235 to Louisiana Highway 1, not allowing commercial trucks to travel in either a northerly or southernly direction. A **motion** was made by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and seconded by Mr. Lindel Toups. Mr. Gouaux explained that he had been in discussions with Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development and that they had erected some signs and would be taking the matter under review and would try to figure out something that would work. He said that the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development had stated that just prohibiting trucks would not work on a public highway. Mr. Gouaux continued to briefly speak on the matter. Mr. Atzenhoffer explained the reason for this matter being brought up, explaining that in trying to make the left turn underneath the Louisiana Highway 1 bridge he had had a near accident experience with the front tire of an eighteen wheeler. He stated that there was no need for trucks to be in that area as there was plenty of room to go around on Louisiana Highway 657 or Louisiana Highway 3235. Mr. Atzenhoffer continued to speak on the matter, stating that there had been some public outcry on this. He continued to briefly speak on the matter. The motion *carried unanimously* by a vote of (9) yeas, (0) nays, (0) absent, and (0) abstentions.

RES. NO. 07-108 LADOTD; CREATE NO TRUCK ROUTE

The next item (30) on the agenda was a resolution requesting the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development (LADOTD) to consider ways that would allow the storing or keeping of spare parts on hand for the Highway No. 316 bridge crossing the Intercoastal Waterway in order to speed up the completion of the repairs and the re-opening of the bridge in case of bridge failure. A **motion** was made by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and seconded by Mr.

Phillip Gouaux. The motion *carried unanimously* by a vote of (9) yeas, (0) nays, (0) absent, and (0) abstentions.

RES. NO. 07-109 LADOTD; STORING SPARE PARTS FOR BRIDGE

The next item (31) on the agenda was a resolution addressed to FEMA stating the Lafourche Parish Council does not condone the storing of FEMA mobile homes or modular type homes in Lafourche Parish including those currently being stored along Louisiana Highway 90. A **motion** was made by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and seconded by Mr. Lindel Toups. The motion carried by a vote of (8) yeas, (1) nay, that being of Mr. Michael Matherne, (0) absent, and (0) abstentions.

RES. NO. 07-110 STORING FEMA HOMES IN LAFOURCHE PARISH

The next item (32) on the agenda was a resolution requesting that the United States Coast Guard and other necessary entities establish maritime curfews on the following bridge in the Bayou Blue community: Highway 316 bridge over the Intercoastal Waterway from 7:00 am - 8:30 am, 2:00 pm - 4:00 pm, and 4:30 pm - 5:30 pm from Monday through Friday during the regular school year to enhance vehicular traffic flow and allow maritime traffic to be informed of established curfews to assist them in traveling up and down the Intercoastal Waterway. A **motion** was made by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and seconded by Mr. Lindel Toups. Mr. Atzenhoffer stated that this needed to be done, saying the Prospect Bridge was about to be replaced in about five (5) years and that this bridge was about the only other way around to alleviate some traffic in the area. The motion *carried unanimously* by a vote of (9) yeas, (0) nays, (0) absent, and (0) abstentions.

RES. NO. 07-111 ESTABLISH MARITIME CURFEWS; HIGHWAY 316 BRIDGE

The next item (33) on the agenda was a resolution requesting Lafourche Parish Recreation District No. 11 transfer ownership of existing land under the one half mile walking track to the Lafourche Parish Government, and the Lafourche Parish Government will assume all associated duties and responsibilities of said track. A **motion** was made by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and seconded by Mr. Phillip Gouaux. A brief discussion ensued as to the amending of this item to include the Lockport pool. Mr. Toups asked if the Parish did not own the property any way since it was owned by the Recreation District. Mr. Atzenhoffer stated that the Parish technically owned the property but that they did not have any ownership rights to it unless the district went defunct. He said that legally the Parish could not even maintain it although the field office in the area occasionally mowed the grass. Mr. Toups inquired as to why the Parish would want to take the matter over. Mr. Atzenhoffer explained that this was a one-half (1/2) mile walking track that the residents of Bayou Blue have asked to have maintained. He said that the recreation district refuses to do any maintenance on the walking track. Mr. Atzenhoffer went on to say that it was the only one-half (1/2) mile track in the area. He continued to briefly speak on the matter. Mr. Brennan Matherne stated that in speaking to Mr. Atzenhoffer he had voiced that he had mixed feelings about this item, saying that on one hand he was not “crazy” about the Parish taking it over because it was the responsibility of the recreation district. He said that another side to it was that by taking over the land, the Parish was basically only cutting the grass to maintain it. Mr. Matherne stated that was all that was being asked of the Parish and added that apparently the recreation district did not want to have to cut what he called a large area. He said that he would think that ultimately the question would almost reside to the Department of Public Works as they had the means to cut the grass. Mr. Matherne stated that he would think that the question would be to the Department of Public Works as if they had the means to cut the area on a normal basis. He said that if Mr. Cheramie did not have a problem with it, then he did

not see a problem with the Parish taking over the property. Discussions ensued regarding the purchasing and/or non-purchasing of a tractor. Mr. Gouaux stated that he thought that a can of worms was to be open if the Parish got the Department of Public Works to cut the grass that, saying that all of the recreation districts would say they wanted the Department of Public Works to cut their grass. Mr. Atzenhoffer stated that the Parish did a good bit of maintenance in the area in the middle of the track, saying there was a pond in the middle of the track which the Parish currently used to put spoils from ditch digging or whatever in the area. He said some maintenance was already being done in the area. Mr. Atzenhoffer stated that there were also people on their own that would maintain it, explaining that there was one gentleman who walked with his grass trimmer. He continued to briefly speak on the matter and discussions ensued. [The motion *carried*](#) by a vote of (6) yeas, (3) nays, that being of Mr. Michael Matherne, Mr. Lindel Toups and Mr. Phillip Gouaux, (0) absent, and (0) abstentions.

**RES. NO. 07-112 TRANSFER OWNERSHIP; LAND UNDER REC. DIST. NO. 11
WALKING TRACK**

[The next item \(34\) on the agenda was a resolution calling for the Louisiana Shrimp Association \(LSA\) to withdraw its administrative review requests before the U.S. Department of Commerce that will delay the distribution of antidumping duties to the shrimp industry.](#) This item was previously discussed via a deviation from the regular agenda.

RES. NO. 07- 107 LSA WITHDRAW REVIEW REQUESTS

[The next item \(35\) on the agenda was a resolution requesting that the Lafourche Parish Council contract David Waitz Engineering and Surveying, Inc., to survey and locate the property line corners to establish property boundaries in the upper Bayou Blue area near Bobcat Pump Station; and authorizing the Parish President to sign, execute and administer said agreement.](#) A **motion** was made by Mr. Phillip Gouaux and seconded by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer. [The motion *carried unanimously*](#) by a vote of (9) yeas, (0) nays, (0) absent, and (0) abstentions.

RES. NO. 07-113 CONTRACT; SURVEY AREA NEAR BOBCAT PUMP STATION

[The next item \(36\) on the agenda was a resolution approving Change Order No. 1 for Barriere Construction Company, LLC to decrease the contract price by \\$35,339.90 for the Roadway Project: Road Sales Tax District 6, Project 6B, Four Point to Raceland Highway 1; and authorizing the Parish President to execute change order.](#) A **motion** was made by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and seconded by Mr. Lindel Toups. [The motion *carried unanimously*](#) by a vote of (9) yeas, (0) nays, (0) absent, and (0) abstentions.

RES. NO. 07-114 C.O. NO. 1; RSTD NO. 6, PROJECT 6B

[The next item \(37\) on the agenda was a resolution stating the Lafourche Parish Council's endorsement of Bollinger Fourchon, LLC located at 106 Norman Doucet Drive, Port Fourchon, Louisiana \(Enterprise Zone Advance Notification #062442-0\), to participate in the benefits of the Louisiana Enterprise Zone Program.](#) A **motion** was made by Mr. Daniel Lorraine and seconded by Mr. Phillip Gouaux. Mr. Lorraine asked if these enterprise zones would be similar to others where companies could come in and collect sales tax in certain districts, to which President Randolph stated yes. Mr. Lorraine clarified that President Randolph had stated that it would be similar to what he had described and then added that he would not be supporting any of them. Mr. Atzenhoffer stated that due to the fact that he did business with Bollinger Shipyards he would have to abstain from all the items in the resolutions pertaining to Bollinger Shipyards. President Randolph stated that all of the enterprise zone items on the April 24, 2007 agenda had already been filed. She said that they were currently working with three (3) councilmen at the present time to look into revamping the enterprise zone in a way that may not cost the Parish as

much in the future. She reiterated that she believed that the four (4) entities involved had already been submitted to the Parish. Mr. Callais stated that this was just solid waste, to which Mr. Lorraine asked if it was not for Road Sales Tax District No. 2? Mr. Callais stated that in the resolution it stated only Solid Waste. Discussions ensued. The motion *carried unanimously* by a vote of (8) yeas, (0) nays, (0) absent, and (1) abstention, that being of Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer.

RES. NO. 07-115- ENTERPRISE ZONE; BOLLINGER FOURCHON, LLC

The next item (38) on the agenda was a resolution stating the Lafourche Parish Council's endorsement of Air Logistics, LLC located at 8594 Highway 3235, Galliano, Louisiana (Enterprise Zone Advance Notification #070133-0), to participate in the benefits of the Louisiana Enterprise Zone Program. A **motion** was made by Mr. Daniel Lorraine and seconded by Mr. Brent Callais. The motion *carried unanimously* by a vote of (8) yeas, (0) nays, (0) absent, and (1) abstention, that being of Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer.

RES. NO. 07-116 ENTERPRISE ZONE; AIR LOGISTICS, LLC

The next item (39) on the agenda was a resolution stating the Lafourche Parish Council's endorsement of Bollinger Larose, LLC, located at 1515 Highway 24, Larose, Louisiana (Enterprise Zone Advance Notification #062522-0), to participate in the benefits of the Louisiana Enterprise Zone Program. A **motion** was made by Mr. Phillip Gouaux and seconded by Mr. Lindel Toups. The motion *carried unanimously* by a vote of (8) yeas, (0) nays, (0) absent, and (1) abstention, that being of Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer.

RES. NO. 07-117 ENTERPRISE ZONE; BOLLINGER LAROSE, LLC

The next item (40) on the agenda was a resolution stating the Lafourche Parish Council's endorsement of Workplace Solutions, LLC located at 8365 Highway 308 South, Lockport, Louisiana (Enterprise Zone Advance Notification #062448-0), to participate in the benefits of the Louisiana Enterprise Zone Program. A **motion** was made by Mr. Lindel Toups and seconded by Mr. Phillip Gouaux. The motion *carried unanimously* by a vote of (8) yeas, (0) nays, (0) absent, and (1) abstention, that being of Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer.

RES. NO. 07-118 ENTERPRISE ZONE; WORKPLACE SOLUTION, LLC

The next item (41) on the agenda was a resolution stating the Lafourche Parish Council's endorsement of Bollinger Shipyards, Inc., located at 8365 Highway 308 South, Lockport, Louisiana (Enterprise Zone Advance Notification #062447-0), to participate in the benefits of the Louisiana Enterprise Zone Program. A **motion** was made by Mr. Lindel Toups and seconded by Mr. Phillip Gouaux. The motion *carried unanimously* by a vote of (8) yeas, (0) nays, (0) absent, and (1) abstention, that being of Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer.

RES. NO. 07-119 ENTERPRISE ZONE; BOLLINGER SHIPYARDS, INC.

The next item (42) on the agenda was a resolution stating the Lafourche Parish Council's endorsement of C Five B, LLC located at 8365 Highway 308 South, Lockport, Louisiana (Enterprise Zone Advance Notification #062446-0), to participate in the benefits of the Louisiana Enterprise Zone Program. A **motion** was made by Mr. Lindel Toups and seconded by Mr. Phillip Gouaux. The motion *carried unanimously* by a vote of (8) yeas, (0) nays, (0) absent, and (1) abstention, that being of Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer.

RES. NO. 07-120 ENTERPRISE ZONE; C FIVE B, LLC

The next item (43) on the agenda was a resolution stating the Lafourche Parish Council's endorsement of Chand, LLC, located at 157 Highway 654, Mathews, Louisiana (Enterprise Zone Advance Notification #062445-0), to participate in the benefits of the Louisiana Enterprise Zone Program. A **motion** was made by Mr. Lindel Toups and seconded by Mr. Phillip Gouaux. The

motion *carried unanimously* by a vote of (8) yeas, (0) nays, (0) absent, and (1) abstention, that being of Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer.

RES. NO. 07-121 ENTERPRISE ZONE; CHAND, LLC

The next item (44) on the agenda was a resolution stating the Lafourche Parish Council's endorsement of Bollinger Shipyards Lockport, LLC located at 8365 Highway 308 South, Lockport, Louisiana (Enterprise Zone Advance Notification #062444-0), to participate in the benefits of the Louisiana Enterprise Zone Program. A **motion** was made by Mr. Lindel Toups and seconded by Mr. Phillip Gouaux. The motion *carried unanimously* by a vote of (8) yeas, (0) nays, (0) absent, and (1) abstention, that being of Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer.

RES. NO. 07-122 ENTERPRISE ZONE; BOLLINGER SHIPYARDS LOCKPORT, LLC

The next item (45) on the agenda was a resolution appointing (1) One commissioner to the Housing Authority of Lafourche Parish. A **motion** was made by Mr. Daniel Lorraine and seconded by Mr. Brent Callais. Mr. Brent Callais **nominated** Mrs. Deborah M. Marts, seconded by Mr. Daniel Lorraine. A brief discussion ensued as to how many persons had applied for the position. The motion *carried unanimously* by a vote of (9) yeas, (0) nays, (0) absent, and (0) abstentions.

RES. NO. 07-123 APPOINTMENT; HOUSING AUTHORITY

The next item (46) on the agenda was a resolution approving an agreement between Second Harvest of Greater New Orleans and Acadiana and Lafourche Parish to operate distribution of commodities through Mobile Pantry; and authorizing the Parish President to sign, execute and administer said contract. A **motion** was made by Mr. Lindel Toups and seconded by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer. The motion *carried unanimously* by a vote of (9) yeas, (0) nays, (0) absent, and (0) abstentions.

RES. NO. 07-124 AGREEMENT; MOBILE PANTRY

The next item (47) on the agenda was a resolution authorizing the Administration to submit the Proposed Lafourche Parish Home Rule Charter change as an individual ballot item to a Bond Attorney in order to draft the election call for the October 2007 ballot. A **motion** was made by Mr. Lindel Toups and seconded by Mr. Brent Callais. Mr. Matherne asked if the Council Clerk could explain the timeline process involved on the matter. Chairman Lasseigne stated that regardless, at least one special meeting would be needed and possibly two(2). He explained that the process to be gone through was that the Administration had to get to the Bond Attorney to get it written up for proposal for it to pass the bond commission since it was a Home Rule Charter change. He said then it would come back to the Council in ordinance form as proposed by the Bond Attorney for the Council to vote on whether the changes would go before the voters. A discussion ensued as to this having to be done by ordinance, including Chairman Lasseigne reiterating the process. The Council Clerk stated that June 19, 2007 was the deadline to get onto the Bond Commission's July 19, 2007 agenda. Mr. Callais asked if the Administration would have to come back before the Council with a contract for the Bonding Attorney, to which a response was given unless it was incorporated into the ordinance and a brief discussion ensued. President Randolph voiced her feelings in detail regarding the proposed Home Rule Charter change and the concerns of the Council pertaining to not being able to address anyone at any time. She explained that because there had been abuses in the past was why that particular provision had been added to the Home Rule Charter. President Randolph stated that it was important to continue operating as a Home Rule Charter and not a police jury system. President Randolph stated that she understood that the Administration had set up a

contact list of almost thirty (30) people, saying that they could have said two (2). She then stated that she thought the process to be working when it went through the proper channels. President Randolph continued to speak on the matter at length and in detail. Chairman Lasseigne explained that the change would read as follows:

3. Interference with Officers and Employees of the Executive Branch
Except for the purpose of investigations conducted pursuant to Article III, Section 2, Paragraph I, the voting members of the Council shall have a mandatory duty not to ~~directly or indirectly interfere with, or give any orders or directives to, any officer, department head, employee, or independent contractor of the Parish who is under the direction or supervision of the executive branch. This provision is not intended to prohibit a voting member of the Council from discussing a problem, voicing a concern, asking questions, or transmitting a complaint to the President, the Administrator, ~~or a department heads,~~ or any employee, contractor, board member, or any other provider of goods or services. ~~or his/her designee, if the department head or his/her designee, has been authorized by the President or Administrator to discuss problems, hear concerns, or receive complaints.~~~~

He explained that it would allow questions to be asked and concerns to be voiced. Chairman Lasseigne stated that with regards to the mandatory duty he had spoken to six (6) Charter Commission members who had told him that this had not been their intent and that the word “interfere” was being misinterpreted according to their intentions. He stated that the Council still had the mandatory duty not to give any order or directives to any officer, department heads, employees or independent contractors. Chairman Lasseigne then spoke about what had been said about the matter by the District Attorney at previous meetings of the Council. Mr. Matherne voiced that he was concerned about the passage of the proposed Home Rule Charter change, adding that he understood the prerogative of the council members of wanting to ask questions of employees, contractors and people on professional service contracts but that he thought the changes would put the Council on a “slippery slope” toward Council interference. He went on to say that he was concerned that when a Councilman spoke to an architect or engineer that the Lafourche Parish Government would be billed for that time, saying that when an engineer was called and talked to on the phone for an hour it could be believed that a bill for the phone call would be sent. Mr. Matherne asked that the Council vote against the matter, saying it opened a Pandora’s Box for confusion for contractors and employees. Mr. Atzenhoffer stated that he agreed with Mr. Matherne, saying that he recalled sitting in on the discussion regarding this matter with the Home Rule Charter Commission. He continued to speak but due to technical difficulties it was not recorded in its entirety. Mr. Atzenhoffer voiced that this would slide the Parish back toward a police jury, saying that he realized that it was just to ask questions and discuss. He voiced that in conversations with fellow Councilmen and President Randolph that never just one item was discussed. He said that was where things could get skewed, saying that he would love to speak to an engineer and ask when a project was going to be started but that human nature did not allow people to hang up as soon as an answer was given, adding that something else would then be talked about. Mr. Atzenhoffer continued to speak on the matter, make suggestions and then stated that if the matter could not be amended to vote the item down. Mr. Lorraine stated that he thought it time to move on, saying that he kept hearing about the previous Administration and previous Council, saying to forget about what had happened then

and move forward now. He said that he thought that the Council should have a little more authority in what they had, saying that he had a list and that he called someone recently and had been told that his boss was Mr. Cheramie and that he had to do what Mr. Cheramie told him. He voiced that he had called people on the list and sometimes he would not get a response, adding that he did sometimes get a response. Mr. Lorraine continued to speak on the matter. Mr. Gouaux voiced that at the present meeting an attorney had been present to speak about derelict structures, saying that all of the Council members had derelict structures and that if the Council started calling to inquire as to the status of the matter, that there would be a "hell of a bill". He said that the same thing would go with the engineers, using Mr. Larry Picciola as an example, saying that if he spoke to each councilman in a given day his full day would be occupied with giving information to the Council. Mr. Gouaux said that information could still be gotten by requesting it from the Administration and that he would think that if there were questions that it would be best to go through the Administration to find the answers. He continued to speak on the matter briefly. Mr. Toups voiced his thoughts on the issue in detail regarding a work order he had sent in, saying that field office foremen should be included as being able to be talked to. He voiced that he thought the Council had to talk to the Field Office Foreman, and then inquired as to whether Mr. Gouaux recalled when a constituent had displayed anger toward Mr. Toups regarding getting some thing done. He then stated that Mr. Gouaux had stated that he could get the request done and then asked Mr. Gouaux if he had gotten the request taken care of, to which Mr. Gouaux responded yes. Mr. Toups asked to whom Mr. Gouaux had spoken to, to which Mr. Gouaux responded Mr. Cheramie. A brief discussion ensued. President Randolph stated that if the phrase "asking questions" was added to the area being spoken if the following statement would be considered a question if posed to an engineer, "Can you add East 176th Street to the list?" She asked if that statement would be an order or a question? Mr. Toups stated that he would think it to be a question but that it could be taken both ways. Chairman Lasseigne clarified that this item would only send the matter to the Bond Attorney and was not actually passing the matter. Discussions ensued. [The](#) motion carried by a vote of (6) yeas, (3) nays, that being of Mr. Michael Matherne, Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and Mr. Phillip Gouaux, (0) absent, and (0) abstentions.

RES. NO. 07-125 SUBMIT PROPOSED HOME RULE CHARTER CHANGE TO BOND ATTORNEY

[The next item \(48\) on the agenda was a resolution authorizing the Administration to submit the Proposed Lafourche Parish Home Rule Charter change as an individual ballot item to a Bond Attorney in order to draft the election call for the October 2007 ballot.](#) A **motion** was made by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and seconded by Mr. Lindel Toups. Mr. Atzenhoffer explained that this was a technical change that stated that the Chair and Council Clerk shall sign each enacted budget because it had been omitted, explaining that it was an ordinance and the Council Clerk had to sign it. Mr. Callais commented on the number of proposed Home Rule Charter changes and then asked if there was going to be five (5) different things the voters had to vote on? He said that there would be approximately twenty (20) amendments, plus the election of Governor, Legislature and other matters. Mr. Callais stated that he did not see why the current item could not be combined with another proposed Home Rule Charter change, saying that a whole amendment would be had to add three (3) words. He continued to briefly speak on the matter. Mr. Atzenhoffer voiced that there would be technical amendments and then listed which ones were considered technical. Mr. Callais stated that items (48) and (49) both pertained to legislative and asked if they could not be merged into one change? He pointed out that the Bond

Attorney would charge the Parish to draft for each document. The Council Clerk stated that it would probably be one document but would be separate propositions. Discussions ensued. [The motion carried by a vote of \(8\) yeas, \(1\) nay, that being of Mr. Brent Callais, \(0\) absent, and \(0\) abstentions.](#)

RES. NO. 07-126 SUBMIT PROPOSED HOME RULE CHARTER CHANGE TO BOND ATTORNEY

[The next item \(49\) on the agenda was a resolution authorizing the Administration to submit the Proposed Lafourche Parish Home Rule Charter change as an individual ballot item to a Bond Attorney in order to draft the election call for the October 2007 ballot.](#) A **motion** was made by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and seconded by Mr. Lindel Toups. [The motion carried by a vote of \(8\) yeas, \(1\) nay, that being of Mr. Brent Callais, \(0\) absent, and \(0\) abstentions.](#)

RES. NO. 07-127 SUBMIT PROPOSED HOME RULE CHARTER CHANGE TO BOND ATTORNEY

[The next item \(50\) on the agenda was a resolution authorizing the Administration to submit the Proposed Lafourche Parish Home Rule Charter change as an individual ballot item to a Bond Attorney in order to draft the election call for the October 2007 ballot.](#) A **motion** was made by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and seconded by Mr. Lindel Toups. Mr. Atzenhoffer explained that this would tell the Civil Service Board that they had to appoint a director within sixty (60) days of a vacancy. A brief discussion ensued on the Civil Service Board and the amount of time the Parish has been without a Civil Service Director due to a vacancy. [The motion carried by a vote of \(7\) yeas, \(1\) nay, that being of Mr. Brent Callais, \(1\) absent, that being of Mr. Tyrone Williams and \(0\) abstentions.](#)

RES. NO. 07-128 SUBMIT PROPOSED HOME RULE CHARTER CHANGE TO BOND ATTORNEY

[The next item \(51\) on the agenda was a resolution authorizing the Administration to submit the Proposed Lafourche Parish Home Rule Charter change as an individual ballot item to a Bond Attorney in order to draft the election call for the October 2007 ballot.](#) A **motion** was made by Mr. Daniel Lorraine and seconded by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer. Mr. Matherne voiced his feelings on the matter and asked that the required amount be left a seven (7). He stated that he thought with a vote of six (6) the Council was more prone to change department heads more often and drive the Administration crazy. Mr. Matherne asked that the Council consider leaving the required amount at seven (7). Mr. Gouaux then voiced his opposition to this proposed Home Rule Charter change, saying that it would not only drive the Administration crazy but that it may cause a problem in finding good people to fill positions, saying the lighter the weight on their shoulders the better it would be for the Administration and for the Parish. He stated that he would recommend that the required amount be left at seven (7), adding that he also wanted to bring the required vote for the termination of the Council Clerk up to seven (7) votes as well. Mr. Toups voiced that he wanted it to be decreased to six (6) and stated his reasons in detail why, saying that if the Parish President “took care” of two (2) people that they would have it made and could run their entire Administration and do what they wanted. He said that the current Administration had some good department heads but that in previous Administrations he had seen where some departments heads had to be gotten rid of. Mr. Toups then recalled an occurrence which had taken place in a previous Administration. He stated that he thought that if there were six (6) Council members against a department head and they were not doing their job then shame on them as they did not deserve the job. President Randolph stated that she thought that if department head was not doing their job that a vote of nine (9) should get rid of them. She

stated that if it was the obvious that a department was doing a bad job then everyone should agree that a bad job was being done. President Randolph voiced that she liked the idea of requiring seven (7) votes simply because there had to be some continuity while attempting to run the Parish. She said that the more the Administrators and department heads changed the more of a learning curve would be had. President Randolph continued to speak on the matter. Mr. Atzenhoffer stated that he was present at the Home Rule Charter Commission meeting and had requested a super majority vote regarding this matter. He said that as being the only one to have ever put a department head up to try and fire them he still thought the required vote should stay at seven (7). He said that this was not overriding a veto and that overriding a veto required six (6) votes, nor was it passing tax law as tax law was passed with six (6) votes. Mr. Atzenhoffer stated that this was a completely different level of a responsibility for the Council and required a larger commitment from the Council. He continued speak on the matter in detail, including asking that the required vote amount be kept at seven (7) votes. Mr. Lorraine stated that he thought that seven (7) votes was almost impossible to obtain and was unfair to the Council as a whole. He said that six (6) votes were hard to get but that seven (7), and then interrupted himself reiterating what Mr. Toups had stated earlier. Mr. Lorraine stated that it was unfair to the Council Clerk that the required vote for termination was five (5). He said that maybe when a request was turned in that respect may be gotten and the request would be done if the required vote amount was six (6). He continued to speak on the matter. Mr. Lorraine stated that the amount should be at six (6) and that had been the amount required previously. He continued to voice that seven (7) was impossible to get. Detailed discussions ensued. [The](#) motion *carried* by a vote of (6) yeas, (3) nays, that being of Mr. Michael Matherne, Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and Mr. Phillip Gouaux, (0) absent, and (0) abstentions.

**RES. NO. 07-129 SUBMIT PROPOSED HOME RULE CHARTER CHANGE TO
BOND ATTORNEY**

DISCUSSIONS

[The next item \(52\) on the agenda was a discussion on Ordinance No. 4015 concerning existing Right of Ways.](#) Mr. Callais stated that approximately a month prior the Council had approved an ordinance that would redefine what a street had to be before the Parish could maintain it and go forward with it. He then asked who the Councilmen needed to refer the constituents calling them to and also what was the process needed to have these streets reviewed in order to be brought into part of the system? President Randolph stated that they had already begun the process of drafting an affidavit, which she said was the first step. She stated that she did have someone who contacted her as well but that they would have to make certain that everything was legal. President Randolph advised Mr. Callais to refer the constituents to the Administration. She continued to briefly speak. Mr. Callais asked if the constituent should be referred to a particular employee or directly to the Administrations' office, to which President Randolph stated that for the current time the constituents could be referred to them. Mr. Callais then asked when an affidavit could be expected, to which President Randolph stated mid-May.

[The next item \(53\) on the agenda was a discussion concerning re-routing of DME Holdings LLC Ditch.](#) Mr. Lorraine presented a visual presentation which depicted the matter being spoken of and which he explained in detail, giving various specifications as to culverts crossing the area, times of submissions for work orders, suggestions on the matter, as well as problems being incurred. President Randolph inquired as to whether there would be power point

presentations at every meeting on projects like this one? A brief discussion ensued regarding the use of visual presentations. Mr. Cheramie, in response to Mr. Lorraine's presentation, stated that there were a couple of reasons of moving the existing outfall canal, saying that he had met with someone pertaining to the matter and that terms had finally be come to regarding moving the outfall canal. He said that that person would probably relieve the Parish of trying to keep the outfall canal clean. Mr. Cheramie stated that when it had first been dug double mats had had to be used, saying that was how bad the area was. He said that it was being looked at to build something next door to the McDonald's in the area, adding that he thought that eventually the outfall canal would be filled in with culverts where they would be moving to, which he said would prevent what Mr. Lorraine's presentation had just showed. He continued to speak on the matter in detail, including that as he had stated for approximately the last three (3) months, that he had been waiting for "Mr. Guidry" to contact him and that then terms would be come to and the outfall canal would be dug next to the Huddle House. Mr. Cheramie reported that Mr. Guidry had called the morning of April 24, 2007 from Mississippi and that terms had been come to on the matter. He explained that he hoped that when Mr. Guidry returned at the end of the week of April 23, 2007 or the middle of the week of April 30, 2007 that a servitude would be ready for him to sign. Mr. Cheramie continued to speak on the matter in detail.

[The next item \(54\) on the agenda was a discussion regarding mobile home elevations.](#)

Mr. Lorraine then gave a visual presentation on the issue depicting several mobile homes that were not at the required elevations and explained each slide in detail. He stated that the base flood elevation in the Leeville area was a plus 13 above main sea level. Mr. Lorraine then described each slide in detail including stating when some of the mobile homes had been placed. He stated that the current Council had never voted for a variance on elevations. Mr. Lorraine stated that he had asked that someone from the Permit Office be present at the meeting but voiced that no one from the Permit Office had attended the meeting. He continued to speak on the issue in detail, explaining the processes gone through by some of the companies. Mr. Lorraine stated that FEMA needed to be contacted regarding this issue, saying that the mobile home being depicted in the current slide was no where 13 feet above main sea level. He continued to show various slides and describe each in detail, including the reasons given for the utility connections which differed from what had been stated on permits and other matters. Mr. Lorraine continued to speak on the matter in detail. He spoke of how this issue could cause the Parish to lose its flood insurance, saying that what was being shown was not good and that it needed to be corrected. He continued to speak on the matter saying that trouble was also being had in the Fourchon area and then elaborated on same. Mr. Lorraine continued to speak on the matter. Mr. Daniel Lorraine made a **motion** to authorize the Council Clerk to gather all the information, including pictures and documents, and send it to FEMA in order to see if what was being done was legal or not, seconded by Mr. Brent Callais. Mr. Toups asked if someone was living in the mobile homes shown in the slides, to which Mr. Lorraine stated that with regards to the mobile homes located under the bridge that they were more than likely people from Baton Rouge and was used for recreational purposes. He explained that some of the others belong to oil field companies. Mr. Lorraine then stated that Chevron had asked to put three (3) mobile homes on the ground until their facility was built but had been denied. He stated that he got questioned frequently by people asking how the mobile homes in question had gotten away with it. Mr. Lorraine continued to voice that what was being depicted was not right and that the law was the same for everyone and everyone should be treated fairly. Mr. Atzenhoffer then inquired as to whether the Parish did not already have an enforcement officer, to which he was informed

that that individual had given his notice on April 24, 2007. He went on to state that he did not see how this was the Council Clerk's responsibility to put this together. Mr. Toups stated that someone had given these individuals or companies permits, to which President Randolph stated that permits were not had. Mr. Atzenhoffer stated that there was an investigative edge, saying to give this issue to the Sheriff or the Permit Department and get them to do the research. He said that the Council Clerk should not be burden with this as this was not a legislative function once a complaint had been made, saying that it was an Administrative function or legal function. Mr. Atzenhoffer stated that he did not want to do this to give it to the Council Clerk, adding that it was not her job. Mr. Lorraine asked who should it be given to, to which Mr. Atzenhoffer stated it should be given to the Sheriff, saying that if it was a criminal act as Mr. Lorraine had previously stated that documents had been falsified, then it was a criminal act and should be investigated by the Sheriff. Discussions ensued on who the issue should be handled by. Chairman Lasseigne asked if the mobile homes in question did not have a permit how were they located where they were at? President Randolph stated that the mobile homes in questions had been brought in right after the storm and Entergy reconnected them right after the storms, adding that the mobile homes in question did not have permits. Mr. Lorraine clarified that what was being said was that the Parish could take a chance of losing its flood insurance. Discussions ensued. President Randolph stated that FEMA was aware of the mobile homes in question because they were attempting to regain the five (5%) percent discount the Parish had lost because of previous variances given in the last term. She went on to say that FEMA was aware of the mobile homes in question because they had asked what should be done about them. President Randolph continued to briefly speak on the matter. Mr. Callais stated that since the mobile homes did not have legitimate permits and had power hooked onto it could not someone from the Administration contact Entergy, to which President Randolph stated that they had sent letters on the issue. President Randolph stated that the next step was to have them disconnected. Mr. Gouaux stated that the last thing that wanted to be done was to go to FEMA and tell them that the Parish had a problem that they could not handle. A brief discussion ensued. Mr. Gouaux stated that if there was a problem and it was known that it was wrong that it should be resolved in the Parish, saying that FEMA should not be gone to to have them do an audit throughout the Parish and bust the Parish for whatever and possibly cancel the Parish's flood insurance. Chairman Lasseigne stated that one thing that concerned him was that if they did not have permits and came in after the storms that the storm was over a year and a half ago, saying that was eighteen (18) months and then asked if the Parish could not get the utilities turned off? He said that the Parish controlled the Water District, and then asked if the Parish could not get the Water District to disconnect the water? Discussions ensued. Mr. Callais stated that he agreed with Mr. Gouaux and Mr. Lorraine, saying that he thought that this issue needed to be corrected but that sending it to FEMA would be the worst thing that could be done. He said that the Administration should be given two (2) weeks and have someone come back with a plan, as well as state they were out of compliance, the water had been disconnected and that this would not be tolerated. Mr. Callais stated that if this issue kept being delayed, and then interrupted himself by saying that they wanted to see the power shut off and the water gone in two (2) weeks, saying that there would be no choice if the water and power was wanted back the mobile homes would have to be elevated. Mr. Brent Callais **removed** his second and Mr. Daniel Lorraine **removed** his motion. **Mr. Daniel Lorraine offered motion to give the Administration one (1) month in which to see that the homes where at the correct elevations or that the water and electricity were disconnected and seconded by Mr. Brent**

Callais. The motion carried unanimously by a vote of (9) yeas, (0) nays, (0) absent, and (0) abstention. Mr. Cheramie explained that even with a compliance officer it only meant that people were confronted about the issues, adding that employees got insulted and threatened. He stated that there was really not anything that could be done about making these individuals change their minds, saying that some did not even answer the doors even though it was known they were home. Mr. Cheramie stated that the compliance officer was not a law enforcement official and could only attempt to have people do what was right. He then stated that with regards to the comment by Mr. Lorraine regarding the falsifying of permits, that people would apply for a permit for a shed and then have a mobile home show up. He stated that if the Permit Office employees felt that someone was not completely telling the truth that before a person's permit was issued that the compliance officer would investigate the matter and had found many people applying for a shed without electricity and then when it was investigated a mobile home already blocked up would be found. He continued to speak on the matter in detail. Mr. Callais recalled a similar situation wherein a family, over the Christmas holidays, had been without electricity which had been cut off due to not having the proper permits. He stated that if Entergy could do that because the proper paperwork was not had that Entergy, by the end of the week of April 23, 2007, could have the electricity cut off to mobile homes in question. Mr. Callais stated that he thought that the Parish needed to put as much pressure on Entergy to have the electricity cut off by the end of the week of April 23, 2007.

ADJOURNMENT

On **motion** by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and seconded by Mr. Daniel Lorraine, and with no further business, the Lafourche Parish Council Meeting of April 24, 2007 **adjourned** at 11:08 p.m.

TOMMY LASSEIGNE, CHAIRMAN
LAFOURCHE PARISH COUNCIL

SHEILA B. BOUDREAUX, COUNCIL CLERK
LAFOURCHE PARISH COUNCIL