

OCTOBER 25, 2005  
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, OCTOBER 25, 2005, 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 Mr. Michael Matherne, Chairman, who then stated that the Lafourche Parish Council was ready for the transaction of business at 6:06 p.m.

Chairman Matherne announced that the invocation would be led by Mr. Michael Delatte. The Council then recited the Pledge of Allegiance led by Mr. Tyrone Williams. Proceedings of the meeting were called to order with the following:

<b>PRESENT:</b>	Mr. Tyrone Williams	Mr. Michael Delatte
	Mr. Michael Matherne, Chairman	Dr. Tommy Lasseigne
	Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer, Vice-Chair	Mr. Lindel Toups
	Mr. Phillip Gouaux	Mr. Brent Callais
	Mr. Daniel Lorraine	Ms. Charlotte Randolph, Parish President

**ABSENT:** None

**APPROVAL OF COUNCIL MINUTES**

The first item (1) on the agenda was a motion to accept the minutes of the October 11, 2005 Regular Session meeting. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and seconded by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne to accept the October 11, 2005 minutes. The minutes were *approved* by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays.

**PUBLIC WISHING TO ADDRESS THE COUNCIL**

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

Mr. Gerald T. Hebert first addressed the Council stating that he had lived on Floral Street for approximately one (1) year and that he thought that year to be the worst in the history of the street as far as flooding was concerned. He went on to state that he was not sure of the reasons for the flooding, but that there was flooding in the area. Mr. Hebert then informed the Council that his neighbor, who was unable to attend the meeting in person, had written a letter regarding the flooding on Floral Street. He then read the aforesaid letter which described the flooding on Floral Street and her inability to get to her home with her vehicle after Tropical Storm Allison. He went on to read from the neighbor's letter which explained a situation caused by passing her vehicle through water to get to her home. The neighbor's letter went on to say that she was grateful for the construction being done on Lydia Street, but asked that it be done correctly. She concluded her letter with a plea to fix Floral Street. Mr. Hebert said that he felt the same way as his neighbor.

Mr. Nolan Breaux, also a resident of Floral Street, next addressed the Council stating that it was his understanding that a ditch in the area was going to be dug deeper. He went on to say that when the water table of the bayou in the area was normal there was no water in the ditch, but that the ditch located across the street, which had previously been dug deeper, contained water all the time. Mr. Breaux stated that he had been told

that Floral Street would not be elevated, and then expressed that if Floral Street was not elevated that blacktopping the road would be of no benefit because the roads would not be able to driven on if they were flooded. He said that he would like the road to be elevated and the ditches not dug because the ditches were deep enough.

Mr. Al Carter, Chairman of the Head Start Policy Council, thanked everyone for the services they had been providing to the Parish. He went on to say that the ladies and gentleman of the Council had been doing an awesome job and commended them for the same. He went on to say that he had received clarification from Mr. Atzenhoffer in an earlier conversation regarding overtime pay for staff members that had worked during the recent hurricanes. He stated that he had come to understand that what was going to be discussed on the October 25, 2005 agenda dealt only with overtime paid to Department Heads. He then publically thanked everyone who had worked through the hurricanes and encouraged the Council to continue to give it's staff support because he felt that a lot of people who had worked through the storms probably still would have done so if they had been asked to help the people of the Parish.

Mr. Chad LeBoeuf addressed the Council stating that he owned 312 and 314 Lydia Street. He stated that the problem had started twelve (12) years ago, adding that he had purchased the property ten (10) years ago. He stated that either the Parish or the State had built a new bridge which took ten (10') feet of his property. Mr. LeBoeuf said that the bridge was actually five (5') feet on his property at the end of Lydia Street, adding that the problem being had was on his property. He said that the ditch was too deep. Mr. LeBoeuf said that he owned the corner lot of Hollywood Canal and the corner lot of Floral. He said that the street was supposed to be elevated. Mr. LeBoeuf explained that the elevation of the bridge was at code, and that in order to properly elevate the road, it should be taken from the code of the bridge. He said that at present he could stand inside of the ditch on his property and the top of his head would barely be visible. Mr. LeBoeuf said that the only area the ditch drained was the road, explaining that he did not need a ditch. He said that the water did not drain to the Hollywood Canal like it was supposed to. Mr. LeBeouf said that when the water rose, that the ditch would fill up and that the water would stay there for weeks. He said the ditch needed to moved to where it belonged. Mr. LeBoeuf said that he had spoken to Mr. Joseph C. Picciola, II, Picciola & Associates, Inc. and further said that the street would be moved over. He said the road would be eighteen (18') feet of asphalt with a two (2') feet shoulder, saying that from the shoulder of the road to the center of the ditch on his property would be twelve (12') feet four (4") inches of his property taken. Mr. LeBeouf added that the waterline was twenty-five (25') feet too far on his property and that the telephone poles were fifteen (15') feet too far on his property. He said that he was grateful that the road was going to be paved, but that he wanted this matter situated. Mr. LeBoeuf said the problem being had on Floral Street was with two (2) ditches, that some call a bayou, that was really a drainage ditch. He went on to say that an unneeded culvert had been placed under the street approximately four (4) years ago, explaining that there were ditches on either side of the road. Mr. LeBeouf said that he had taken measurements on the new twenty-four (24") inch culvert, which revealed that six (6") inches of the culvert was sticking out the water in the ditch. He asked where that water would go and said that it was a mosquito trap. Mr. LeBoeuf suggested that the culvert be removed, as it had to be the highest point, and that it should be tapered both ways. He advised that he would be meeting with inspectors on Wednesday, October 26, 2005 in order to try and solve the problems. Mr. LeBoeuf ask that the problems he spoke of please be fixed.

#### **PRESENTATIONS**

The next item (2) on the agenda was presentations. Mr. Charles Beasley presented a Hurricane Protection plan. Mr. Beasley read from a handout regarding his proposed plan. (Attached hereto as Exhibit 1).

#### **ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT(S)**

The next item on the agenda was an administrative report from President Randolph. President Randolph began by explaining to the Council that before them was a resolution which had been submitted after the normal twenty-four (24) hour required time for a Two-Thirds Agenda item submission. She stated that as the Parish was still in a partial emergency situation, the Administration would ask their consideration of the resolution. President Randolph stated that FEMA had approached them on October 25, 2005 to sign a document for a community disaster loan. She went on to explain that Parishes through out coastal Louisiana were submitting applications for this assistance. President Randolph pointed out that the application was nothing more than an application, and in no way indebted the Parish or borrowed any money as of the present time. She explained that this may be the best opportunity to get projects that had been previously talked about for the Parish achieved. President Randolph pointed out that the interest rate on the loan would be extremely low, saying that the last quote was approximately 2%. She went on to say that pump stations and other projects that had been considered could be done. President Randolph said that there was also talk regarding Congressional leaders from Louisiana pushing FEMA to consider these loans as a forgiveness, in that the Parish would not owe any money on the loan. She stated that there was no guarantee of that forgiveness, but thought that she should mention that to the Council. President Randolph stated that she wanted to present the resolution of support to the Council, adding that it was only a resolution supporting the signing of the application. She reiterated that it was only an application, and that no steps were being taken to put the Parish into indebtedness. President Randolph ask that the Council consider the resolution on the Two-Thirds Agenda, and further advised the Council that the application had already been signed. She said that they wanted to have the Council be aware of the matter.

Dr. Tommy Lasseigne questioned whether the Administration had already applied for the assistance, to which President Randolph stated that she had already signed the application. President Randolph stated that this resolution was a formality. Dr. Lasseigne asked whether, in accordance with the attachment to the resolution, if a substantial loss (greater than 5%) of tax and other revenues for the current or succeeding year as a result of a major disaster and that the disaster must have adversely affected the level of essential municipal services previously provided had been shown? President Randolph stated that what had been asked for was the current budget, which she said FEMA would review. She went on to say that with the current situation, FEMA was being very flexible with the requirements listed on the attachment. She said that she understood Dr. Lasseigne's question but that sales tax revenues from September and October, 2005 had not yet been received. Dr. Lasseigne asked how the money borrowed would be paid back. He then said that given that it would be a ten (10) year loan, the rate of pay back would be high, adding that the interest rate was not much lower than what was obtained on the road bond issues. Dr. Lasseigne said that it could be ran out for a bond issue for fifteen (15) years, instead of five (5) or ten (10) as stated in the attachment to the resolution, and that the Parish's cash flow would be more adversely affected by taking the FEMA loan then buy not taking it. President Randolph stated that this was a way of alerting the Council that they had made the application to FEMA and that of course, all of the details would be looked at when they were received. Dr. Lasseigne then asked why this was being done, if the application had already been signed. Chairman Matherne stated that he thought it to be for the Council's pledge to support the application. Mr. Lorraine said that with the large number of people now present in the Parish that sales taxes would better than it had ever been before. He said that with the extra people living in the Parish from other parishes, that the sales tax would not be down but greater than ever before. Mr. Lorraine said that Lafourche Parish was not hit like other parishes, adding that there had been wind damage and power outages. He said that the Parish had not had homes destroyed with water up to their roofs like in other parishes. Mr. Lorraine reiterated that the sales taxes would be good. Mr. Curole said that the application would help determine the Parish's eligibility. He said that if the Parish was not eligible then they would not apply for assistance, but added that he did not think it would hurt to determine whether the Parish was eligible or not. Mr. Curole said in the meantime that what the assistance could be used for and the amount of assistance needed could be determined in case assistance was offered.

Mr. Seth Holloway, Risk Manager next gave a visual presentation regarding homes that were damaged

in the Parish and also expenses incurred by the Parish due to Hurricane Katrina. He began his presentation by stating that there had been an assessment team that had traveled through out the Parish, assessing damage. Mr. Holloway reported that there was 50% to 75% of the homes in the Parish that were affected by Hurricane Katrina. He said that 15% to 20% of those homes had sustained major damage, and that 30% to 55% of the homes had sustained minor to minimal damage. Mr. Holloway said the assessment team was unable to get into all homes, as the residents were not present. He then reported that 39 of the homes assessed were insured, 62 were not insured and 418 homes that they were not aware if they were insured or not. Mr. Holloway said that there were some areas they could not get to because of road blockages and other damages. He then showed various pictures of homes through out the Parish that had sustained damages from the storm, including damages sustained in various areas. Mr. Holloway then said that the Parish had been allotted monies from FEMA for Category B work, which he explained was emergency work. He then listed the entities under the Parish who had incurred costs that the Parish would be helping out with Category B funds. Mr. Holloway said that Lafourche Parish Government had incurred approximately \$450,000 emergency work. He then reported that South Louisiana Emergency Council (SLEC) had helped out with sheltering at Nicholls State University with coordination of both shelter areas there because there had been no one there to coordinate it. Mr. Holloway said that SLEC had brought evacuees into the shelters when Nicholls was not actually a shelter area. He then reported that the Fire Districts, Juvenile Justice, Sheltering, Head Start, the Sheriff's Office, and the Lafourche Parish School Board had all incurred costs considered Category B work, and then he expanded on same. Mr. Holloway explained that Category B work was considered emergency protection measures, saying that it was actions taken by applicants before, during, and after a disaster to save lives, protect public health and safety and to prevent damage to properties. He went on to say that those measures could consist of warning devices, barricades, signs, announcements, search and rescue, security forces, construction of temporary levees, shelter and emergency care, sandbagging, bracing, assuring damage of structures removal, of health and safety hazards, along with other measures. Mr. Holloway then spoke of equipment accounts, which he explained were forms with FEMA that were used for equipment used during the storm to remove debris or any other emergency protective measures, including shoring up levees, material costs, rented equipment, contract work and also overtime labor. He then showed debris thought out the parish and reported that the Corps of Engineers had picked up 200,000 cubic yards of debris at a costs of approximately \$3 million dollars, sparing the Parish from having to pay for it. Mr. Holloway said that after Category B, there was permanent work, which included construction to the Parish facilities with damages, stating that the Sondra Barrios Building and the Golden Meadow Library had received damage. He said that he was aware that there was an issue with the Golden Meadow Library not being insured during the hurricane, but that it would be eligible through FEMA for assistance. Mr. Holloway said that the Golden Meadow Library would be eligible through FEMA with a stipulation that the library would be insured, adding that if there was another storm and it was not insured FEMA would not reimburse the facility. Mr. Holloway then showed various slides of the Port Fourchon area, Bayou Lafourche, and other areas, along with slides of damages and debris incurred. Mr. Holloway concluded his presentation by asking if there were any FEMA or insurance type questions from the Council that he could answer.

#### **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. reported on projects Road Sales Tax Districts 3, 5, and 6. (Attached hereto as Exhibit 2) In addition to his report, he stated that Project 3A (Bayou Blue) would have a change order for a deduction of approximately \$21,000. Mr. Picciola then informed the Council that Project 5A (Choupic/Kramer), the milling of the road, had been started and that the overlay would done approximately within one (1) week. He stated that they were waiting on a cost estimate from the contractor to prepare the bridge, adding that they had some alternates, but that he had not heard from them but would be contacting them

on October 26, 2005.

Chairman Matherne inquired as to whether on Project 5G, Concrete panels, if there were any advantages to doing a design build or if there was a costs saving by releasing all of them at once? Mr. Picciola said that he thought there would be an advantage to releasing all of the streets at one time because if design build was gone to there would have to be specs which all of the contractors could come back with and that it would be harder to control. Dr. Lasseigne then asked when Project 3D would be finished, to which Mr. Picciola stated that it was shown on the handout given to the Council. After reviewing same, Mr. Picciola stated that he would check into the matter. Mr. Toups asked if all of the concrete streets were being done at the same time. Mr. Picciola stated no, and that there were two (2) sections of concrete streets to be done. Mr. Toups asked in which section was the concrete streets for Fantastic Acres contained, to which Mr. Picciola responded that Mr. John Plaisance would be handling that project area and that they had not met with him to date. Mr. Toups asked when Mr. Picciola thought that would be done. Mr. Picciola said that he thought that the meeting with Mr. Plaisance had been scheduled. President Randolph reminded Mr. Picciola that was the project that had been delayed because they were waiting for the pump station to be completed in order that heavy loads were not still using the roads. Mr. Toups then asked about the Farm to Market Road that had been left out in the Raceland area, which was now included on the Letting Sheet as 3I, as being done sometime in 2006. Dr. Lasseigne stated that he had asked the Laurel Valley Road be included and asked what was the reason it had not been included. Mr. Picciola said that they were not instructed to add it to the list.

Mr. Ray Cheramie informed Mr. Toups that there would be a pre-construction meeting on the Fantastic Pump on Thursday, October 27, 2005. Mr. Toups asked the location of the meeting, to which Mr. Cheramie responded that he was not sure where the meeting would occur. Mr. Toups asked that Mr. Cheramie inform him of the location of the meeting because he would like to attend.

Mr. John Plaisance, J. Wayne Plaisance, Inc., then spoke about the Oakridge Park Levee Road overlay project in Golden Meadow. He stated that the contractor's time had began and further that he had been issued a notice to proceed but that he had not moved on site yet. Mr. Plaisance stated that the contractor was expected to be on site by the week of October 31, 2005 but added that he had not yet verified that with the contractor. Mr. Lorraine asked how many days the contract was for, to which Mr. Plaisance responded either 90 or 120 days. He added that the work itself on the project should only take 30 days.

Ms. Heather Klingman, Duplantis Design Group, next addressed the Council. She first reported on the Marydale Waterline Improvements, stating that they would be meeting with the City of Thibodaux on October 26, 2005 to work out an agreement with the tying of the waterline. Ms. Klingman reported on a second project, that being the Tom Foret Outfall Canal. She said that at this point in the project, they were currently awaiting feedback from the Department of Public Works in order to finalize the design.

Chairman Matherne recognized Golden Meadow Councilman Lawrence Mounic, Mr. Sterling Diaz, Lafourche Parish Registrar of Voters, and Mr. Camille Morvant, District Attorney as being present.

#### **LEGAL ADVISOR REPORT**

The next item on the agenda was to relinquish time to the Lafourche Parish Legal Advisor. Mr. Camille Morvant advised the Council that he had supplied the Council with packets which included an opinion regarding relatives serving on parish boards, the Quarterly Status of Lawsuits, copies of Motions and Applications for Rehearing filed by Mr. Charles Banta in the court case of Lafourche Parish Council, et al versus Charles Banta, et al, copies of the reply to Mr. Banta's Motion for Rehearing, and copies of the Original Brief of Appellants, Mr. Charles Banta, Mr. Jerry Jones and Mr. Rhebb Rybiski in the First Circuit Court of Appeals. He explained that at present there were 32 lawsuits pending against the Parish, some of which were being handled by insurance companies, some by his office and others by outside attorneys. Mr. Morvant said that they had attempted to give the Council a summary on the lawsuits. He said that if the Council had any questions regarding particular lawsuits that they could call or write him regarding any questions they may have. Mr. Morvant said that the opinion included regarding relatives serving on parish boards, should be the last

pending opinion that he had in his office. He added that he believed that there was still an opinion being waited on from the Attorney General that had been requested several months ago. Mr. Morvant then explained the latest actions on the Banta lawsuits, stating that one (1) action was a re-hearing. He explained that the re-hearing was on two (2) appeals that Mr. Banta had filed, and added that these were the ongoing lawsuits his office had been handling for the last two (2) years, since the current Council took office. Mr. Morvant stated that as the Council, they had prevailed in the District Court case, which was then appealed, and subsequently again prevailed in the appellate court. He went on to say that Mr. Banta had recently filed for a re-hearing in the appellate court on two (2) of the lawsuits. Mr. Morvant informed the Council that with regards to the lawsuit that Mr. Rhebb Rybiski was involved in, that there had not been a filing for a re-hearing and further that they had approximately eight (8) or nine (9) days from October 25, 2005 in which to file a writ to the Louisiana Supreme Court. He said that if a writ was not filed, that the Rybiski lawsuit would come to an end. Mr. Morvant then spoke about an appeal regarding a lawsuit filed by Mr. Banta, Mr. Rybiski and Mr. Jones against some of the members of the current sitting Council. He then reminded the Council that he had tried the case personally in District Court and had prevailed and further that included was an appeal filed by Mr. Banta, Mr. Rybiski and Mr. Jones to the 1<sup>st</sup> Circuit Court of Appeals. He concluded that the reply brief had been drafted and that he would be reviewing the same and that it should be mailed to the Court of Appeals on October 26, 2005 or October 27, 2005.

Next a **motion** was offered by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer, seconded by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne, to open the budget public hearing and **carried** by a vote of nine (9) yeas, and zero (0) nays.

The next item (3) on the agenda was a public hearing for public comments on the proposed 2006 Maintenance and Operations budget for the Lafourche Parish Council. Chairman Matherne asked three times if anyone from the public wanted to address the Lafourche Parish Council regarding the 2006 Maintenance and Operations Budget. Hearing none, Chairman Matherne then recognized Mr. Atzenhoffer who made a motion to **amend** to add the summary page of the budget, which was inadvertently omitted, and also a list of unclassified employees as required by the Home Rule Charter, (See attached), seconded by Mr. Brent Callais, and **carried** by a vote of nine(9) yeas and zero (0) nays.

Next a **motion** was offered by Mr. Brent Callais, seconded by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer, to close the public hearing and **carried** by a vote of nine (9) yeas, and zero (0) nays.

Next, a **motion** was offered by Mr. Lindel Toups, seconded by Mr. Phillip Gouaux to **open** the Public Hearing & Ordinances for Ratification, and **carried** by a vote of nine (9) yeas, and zero (0) nays.

#### **PUBLIC HEARING AND ORDINANCES FOR RATIFICATION**

The next item (4) on the agenda was an ordinance providing for a supplemental appropriation for the Lafourche Parish 2005 Operation and Maintenance Budget as provided for by Article VI of the Lafourche Parish Home Rule Charter as it pertains to Morrystown Project and Civil Defense. Chairman Matherne asked three times if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Chairman Matherne moved for a motion. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer, seconded by Mr. Tyrone Williams and **carried** by a vote of eight (8) yeas, zero (0) nays, and one (1) absent, that being of Mr. Brent Callais, who was not present in the Council Chambers at the time of the vote.

#### **ORD. NO. 3683 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION, 2005 OPERATION AND MAINTENANCE BUDGET**

The next item (5) on the agenda was an ordinance approving a servitude agreement between Andy and Brandy Loupe and the Lafourche Parish Council to operate and maintain a fifteen (15') foot plus the width of

a ditch maintenance servitude of a drainage canal in the Choctaw/Kraemer area of Ward 6, District 2. Chairman Matherne asked three times if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Chairman Matherne moved for a motion. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Michael Delatte, seconded by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne and **carried** by a vote of eight (8) yeas, zero (0) nays, and one (1) absent, that being of Mr. Brent Callais, who was not present in the Council Chambers at the time of the vote.

**ORD. NO. 3684 APPROVE SERVITUDE AGREEMENT; ANDY AND BRANDY LOUPE**

The next item (6) on the agenda was an ordinance approving a servitude agreement between Eddie P. Hebert and the Lafourche Parish Council to operate and maintain a fifteen (15') foot plus the width of a ditch maintenance servitude of a drainage canal in the Choctaw/Kraemer area of Ward 6, District 2. Chairman Matherne asked three times if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Chairman Matherne moved for a motion. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Michael Delatte, seconded by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne and **carried** by a vote of eight (8) yeas, zero (0) nays, and one (1) absent, that being of Mr. Brent Callais, who was not present in the Council Chambers at the time of the vote.

**ORD. NO. 3685 APPROVE SERVITUDE AGREEMENT; EDDIE P. HEBERT**

The next item (7) on the agenda was an ordinance approving a servitude agreement between Heloise, LLC, et al and the Lafourche Parish Council to clean a drainage ditch in the Valentine area of Ward 9, District 6. Chairman Matherne asked three times if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Chairman Matherne moved for a motion. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Lindel Toups, seconded by Mr. Phillip Gouaux and **carried** by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays.

**ORD. NO. 3686 APPROVE SERVITUDE AGREEMENT; HELOISE, LLC**

The next item (8) on the agenda was an ordinance amending Ordinance No. 3512 as it pertains to the creation of the Subdivision Regulation Subcommittee in order to extend the deadline to present their plan by ninety (90) days. Chairman Matherne asked three times if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Chairman Matherne moved for a motion. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and seconded by Mr. Lindel Toups. Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer made a motion to **amend** to have a Recreational Vehicle (RV) section added to the regulations, seconded by Mr. Phillip Gouaux, and **carried** by a vote of nine (9) yeas, and zero (0) nays. The ordinance **carried** by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays.

**ORD. NO. 3687 AMEND ORDINANCE NO. 3512, SUBDIVISION REGULATION SUBCOMMITTEE, EXTEND DEADLINE TO PRESENT PLAN**

The next item (9) on the agenda was an ordinance establishing a twenty-five (25) miles per hour speed limit on Peltier Drive, Ward (3), District (2) of Lafourche Parish; requiring the installation of necessary signs; and providing for penalties of violators thereof. Chairman Matherne asked three times if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Chairman Matherne moved for a motion. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Michael Delatte, seconded by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne and **carried** by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero(0) nays.

**ORD. NO. 3688 TWENTY-FIVE (25) MP H SPEED LIMIT ON PELTIER DRIVE**

The next item (10) on the agenda was an ordinance establishing a "Dead End" on Avenue "B" and "C" off of East 25<sup>th</sup> Street, Ward 10, District 7 and 8; requiring the installation for necessary signs; and providing for penalties of violators thereof. Chairman Matherne asked three times if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Chairman Matherne moved for a motion. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Brent Callais, seconded by Mr. Daniel Lorraine and **carried** by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays.

**ORD. NO. 3689 ESTABLISH "DEAD END" ON AVENUE "B" AND "C", EAST 25<sup>TH</sup> ST.**

The next item (11) on the agenda was an ordinance rescinding Lafourche Parish Ordinance No. 3535 as it pertains to the ownership of rights the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development may own in and to the aforesaid portion of Louisiana Highway 656 (known as Lake Long Drive) as a binding

agreement between the State and Parish, due to the parish already owning said property. Chairman Matherne asked three times if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Chairman Matherne moved for a motion. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer, seconded by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne and **carried** by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays.

**ORD. NO. 3690      RESCIND ORDINANCE NO. 3535, OWNERSHIP OF RIGHTS OF AFORESAID PORTION OF LOUISIANA HIGHWAY 656**

Next, a motion was offered by Mr. Phillip Gouaux, seconded by Mr. Lindel Toups, to **close** the Public Hearing and Ordinances for Ratification, and **carried** by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays.

**PROPOSED ORDINANCES**

The next item (12) on the agenda was a proposed ordinance amending Section 24:503(A) of Sub-Chapter “K” of Chapter 24 of the Code of Ordinances to amend the boundaries of Lafourche Parish Recreation District No. 4 to include the Corp Limits of the City of Thibodaux. A motion was offered by Mr. Michael Matherne to introduce the above stated proposed ordinance.

**PROPOSED ORDINANCE      AMEND CODE OF ORDINANCES, LAFOURCHE PARISH RECREATION DISTRICT NO. 4**

The next item (13) on the agenda was a proposed ordinance accepting the subdivision known as the “Allen and Gail Gaudet Subdivision”, Ward 4, District 7. A motion was offered by Mr. Phillip Gouaux to introduce the above stated proposed ordinance.

**PROPOSED ORDINANCE      ACCEPT “ALLEN AND GAIL GAUDET SUBDIVISION**

The next item (14) on the agenda was a proposed ordinance accepting into the parish system the subdivision known as “Kenneth Constant Subdivision”, Ward 1, District 3. A motion was offered by Mr. Michael Matherne to introduce the above stated proposed ordinance.

**PROPOSED ORDINANCE      ACCEPT “KENNETH CONSTANT SUBDIVISION”**

The next item (15) on the agenda was a proposed ordinance accepting into the parish system the subdivision known as “Pineridge Estates, Phase I”, Ward 1, District 1. A motion was offered by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne to introduce the above stated proposed ordinance.

**PROPOSED ORDINANCE      ACCEPT “PINERIDGE ESTATES, PHASE I”**

The next item (16) on the agenda was a proposed ordinance approving a servitude agreement between Hugh Caffery and the Lafourche Parish Council to operate and maintain a fifty feet plus the width of the ditch maintenance servitude of a drainage canal in the Valentine area of Ward 9, District 6. A motion was offered by Mr. Lindel Toups to introduce the above stated proposed ordinance.

**PROPOSED ORDINANCE      APPROVE SERVITUDE AGREEMENT, HUGH CAFFERY**

The next item (17) on the agenda was a proposed ordinance providing for a supplemental appropriation (No. 6) for the Lafourche Parish 2005 Operation and Maintenance Budget as provided for by Article VI of the Lafourche Parish Home Rule Charter. A motion was offered by Mr. Michael Matherne to introduce the above stated proposed ordinance.

**PROPOSED ORDINANCE      SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION (NO. 6), 2005 BUDGET**

The next item (18) on the agenda was a proposed ordinance rescinding and repealing Ordinance No. 2455 and reinstate the levy and collection through out the boundaries of Sales Tax District No. 4 of the Parish of Lafourche, of the one percent sales and use tax for solid waste collection and disposal purposes. A motion was offered by Mr. Phillip Gouaux to introduce the above stated proposed ordinance.

**PROPOSED ORDINANCE      RESCIND ORD. NO. 2455, REINSTATE 1% SALES & USE TAX**

**RESOLUTIONS**

The next item (19) on the agenda was a resolution requesting those administrative Department Heads who received overtime pay that was determined to be inappropriate be required to reimburse the parish such funds as described. A **motion** was made by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne and seconded by Mr. Brent Callais. The motion **carried** by a vote of eight (8) yeas, zero (0) nays and one (1) absent, that being of Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer, who was not present in the Council Chambers at the time of the vote.

**RES. NO. 05-245      REQUEST REIMBURSEMENT OF OVERTIME PAY**

The next item (20) on the agenda was a resolution approving Change Order No. 1 to Sealevel Construction Co. as an increase in the contract time by fourteen days for the Lafourche Parish Animal Shelter; authorizing the Parish President to sign said Change Order. A **motion** was made by Mr. Michael Matherne and seconded by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne. Mr. Atzenhoffer asked for the reason for the change order and was advised by Chairman Matherne that he was not sure why, but that when he had driven in front of it on October 25, 2005, work was still being done to it. President Randolph and Mr. Lindel Toups offered that they recalled that t problems had been incurred due to the storms. The motion **carried** by a vote of eight (8) yeas, and one (1) nay, that being of Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer.

**RES. NO. 05-246      APPROVE CHANGE ORDER NO. 1, SEALEVEL CONSTRUCTION CO.,  
LAFOURCHE PARISH ANIMAL SHELTER**

The next item (21) on the agenda was a resolution approving a Cooperative Endeavor Agreement between the Lafourche Parish Council and the Cut Off Youth Center, Inc. to provide continued recreational services in exchange for funding covered recreational area; and authorizing the Parish President to sign, execute and administer said contract(s).. The resolution was pulled from consideration at this time.

**RESOLUTION PULLED**

The next item (22) on the agenda was a resolution approving a Cooperative Endeavor Agreement between the Lafourche Parish Council and the Bayou Civic Club, Inc. (Larose Civic Center) to provide continued recreational and emergency preparedness services in exchange for funding assistance in the construction of a canopy over the entrance and the regrouting of the facade; and authorizing the Parish President to sign, execute and administer said contract(s). The resolution was pulled from consideration at this time.

**RESOLUTION PULLED**

**DISCUSSIONS**

The next item (23) on the agenda was a discussion concerning instituting a policy that the parish controls all water levels flowing into the parish drainage system. Mr. Lindel Toups began discussions regarding this matter by stating that there was land that culverts were being ran through, going to drainage canals. He went on to say that an area in the Gheens used as a reservoir, was still being pumped out. Mr. Toups stated that the levees were bad. He said that what needed to be done was to pump out the residential areas before pumping out the wetlands. Mr. Toups stated that the Parish should be in charge of the valves on the pumps. He said that Mr. Cheramie had received calls informing him that someone was opening the valves, which would cause flooding because it would fill up the drainage ditch quickly. Mr. Toups reiterated that the Parish should control the water levels, and asked whether that had to put into the form of an ordinance or not. He added that he though it should be law. Mr. Toups said that the wetlands were trying to be drained before the residential areas. Mr. Gouaux said that in Lockport the culverts were set at a level enabling the area used as a retention area not to drain until the 40 dropped down to a certain point. He said that maybe something similar could be done to the areas being spoken about. Mr. Toups said that the water would go into the areas but because of the setting of the culverts, mentioning the height, those area would not drain until the 40 or the areas drain to a point where the homes in the area were not be threatened with flooding. Mr. Toups said that for a month they had just been circulating water. Mr. Toups then said that Dufrene Street had stopped being pumped four (4) days after the hurricane, but in another area they were still pumping water. He reiterated that they were circulating water, and asked why would that be done when that would only be wasting fuel. Mr.

Toups said that he needed to know how to accomplish having only the Parish controlling the water levels, asking if it needed to be put in the form of an ordinance or by motion, adding that he thought it should be done as an ordinance. Mr. Cheramie stated that he was not sure how it should be done, but that he thought Mr. Toups to be right, that the Parish should have control of the culverts so that a valve with a lock could be put on. Mr. Toups asked the Administration to work on this matter. President Randolph questioned if there was still water in the area, pointing out that it had not rained in sometime. Mr. Toups explained that the levee district had built up the levees and some of them were still low and that the water was still circulating over the levee into a pasture and back into the system.

The next item (24) on the agenda was a discussion concerning the Bourg/Larose (Highway 24) in regards to its benefit in the evacuation process and the problems with flooding during flood events. Mr. Gouaux said that the State or the Department of Transportation and Development had recently resurfaced and elevated Highway 24. He explained that with the two (2) recent storms the road was a crucial evacuation route that was needed but that could not be used because there was at least of one (1') foot of water on top of it. Mr. Gouaux said that he would like the Administration to research building a levee along the Intracoastal, stating that it would not have to be a very high levee, simply high enough to keep flood waters from overtopping Highway 24 during a tidal surge event. He said his second preference would be to elevate the road. Mr. Toups said that he hoped that the Administration could come back with ideas on how this problem could be fixed because the road could mean the difference between life and death in an evacuation.

President Randolph asked about a morganza to the Gulf as being a solution and continued to discuss same but it was inaudible. Mr. Gouaux said that he thought with the Intracoastal and the spoils that could be derived from it, a levee could be built possibly along the Intracoastal fairly inexpensively. He pointed out that there was not a lot of industry in the area but that the road was very crucial to evacuations. Mr. Gouaux said that not only the Parish, but also the State, should be looking at the road as a means of evacuation.

The next item (25) on the agenda was a discussion concerning drainage on Freeman's lot extensions. Mr. Gouaux said that this was a very serious problem. He explained that there had been various complaints about the drainage. Mr. Gouaux said that he was not certain how to fix the problem, but that the area had been turtle-backed and cross roads had been installed. He explained that rain water use to flow to the back, but that now with the three (3) crossroads it was being blocked. Mr. Gouaux said that there were culverts there but that the culverts seemed to be at the highest point in the road, adding that several homes had been flooded since the crossroads were added. He said that he was aware that the problem of the drainage should have been looked at before accepting the lot extensions, but that it hadn't been done and that now there was a problem. Mr. Gouaux said that he would like the Administration to look into the matter and come up with a solution.

A brief discussion ensued regarding the location of the area being spoken about. Mr. Cheramie informed the Council that the Parish only had a temporary maintenance fifteen (15') feet right-of-way located in the middle of the extensions. Mr. Cheramie said that he had addressed this potential problem in the future with the Planning Department, and that they had been reviewing this matter, adding that they would advise that the Council not allow this to happen again. Mr. Gouaux stated that in the meantime, a solution needed to be found, because homes that had never flooded, were now being flooded. Mr. Cheramie said that he had spoke to the Planning Department and that he felt that Mr. Gouaux and himself could go to the area and speak to Mr. Ed Freeman in order to see how much of the property he had already sold. He added that once they were aware of the property owners, the property owners could be contacted in order to see if they would give the Parish a permanent type right-of-ways so that a "V-ditch" could be made in the middle, which would help the situation. Mr. Gouaux said that he hated the thought of putting a ditch behind someone's property because of accessibility and right-of-ways, but if what was being suggested was done, then it should be policed and made sure that it could be accessed for maintenance purposes.

The next item (26) on the agenda was a discussion concerning parish insurance. Chairman Matherne advised Mr. Lorraine that item (26) and item (29) were duplicate. Mr. Lorraine advised that item (26) could be deleted and that he would speak on the matter on item (29).

The next item (27) on the agenda was a discussion concerning the District Attorney's opinion regarding the payment of overtime wages to department heads. Mr. Daniel Lorraine stated that an opinion was issued on October 17, 2005, and further that at the October 25, 2005 Council meeting the Council had taken action on the opinion given. He added that the resolution regarding the matter on the October 25, 2005 agenda had passed unanimously.

The next item (28) on the agenda was a discussion concerning the Lafourche Parish Communications District. Mr. Lorraine said that he had spoken to some board members regarding 911. He began by saying that people had voted on this communications district, that there was bonding indebtedness and further that there was money still owed. Mr. Lorraine said that the communications district had always been a board and that director, Ms. Katie Zeringue, had done and continued to do a real good job. He said that there had never been any problems with the Board, but that the Board had been looking for property for sometime to build a building, but to date had been unsuccessful. Mr. Lorraine said that some of the members had spoken to him about the Sheriff possibly taken over 911. He stated that in his opinion, the Sheriff did not need to take over 911, and further that the Board was doing a great job. Mr. Lorraine said that he thought the way it had been voted and done by ordinance, should stay as it was. He said that hopefully they would get a building one day and possibly merge everyone, which he added he would not have a problem with. Mr. Lorraine reiterated that he had been told that there may be an attempt by the Sheriff to take over 911, saying that he was only one vote and only one voice and that it was up to the Board and possibly the Council, but that he thought it should stay the way it was.

The next item (29) on the agenda was a discussion concerning automobile insurance. Mr. Lorraine mentioned that certain people took Parish automobile homes and asked who was entitled to those vehicles. Chairman Matherne asked Mr. Cheramie who was in charge of the vehicles, asking if it was the Department of Public Works? Mr. Cheramie said that the parish automobiles that were being driven home were by employees that were on call and that they were the only individuals who should be operating the vehicles, unless they were authorized by another Parish employee. Mr. Lorraine asked who could authorize who operated the vehicles? Mr. Cheramie said that a field office supervisor who utilizes a Parish vehicle should leave the vehicle at the field office if he went on vacation. Mr. Lorraine asked whether an employee could drive home a Parish vehicle and have his wife utilized it to go shopping? Mr. Cheramie stated only if that employee wanted to be fired. Mr. Lorraine stated that what prompted him to bring this matter up was that on August 24, 2005 there was a motor vehicle accident in Bayou Blue involving the Parish President's spouse operating a parish vehicle. He said that he had checked into the insurance and that he had found out that Mr. Randolph was added to the list of authorized drivers on February 17, 2004. Mr. Lorraine said that Mr. Cheramie had just said that an employee could not have his spouse drive a parish vehicle to go to the supermarket, unless he wanted to get fired. He said that he saw nothing different in the current situation, but that according to the insurance paperwork he had obtained, Mr. Randolph had been added to the parish insurance policy for \$10.00 since February 17, 2004. Mr. Lorraine said that as far as he was concerned, it made no difference to him if Mr. Randolph was the Parish President's husband or not. He said that the Council should come up with a policy regarding this matter. Mr. Lorraine then mentioned that he thought that a \$50,000 deductible was very steep. He said that he understood that a \$50,000 deductible per accident would make the insurance premiums lower, but that the insurance carrier would be making a good deal because there were not very many parish vehicles worth \$50,000. Mr. Lorraine said that what really upset him about this entire matter was that that accident had occurred on August 24, 2005 and neither the Parish Administrator nor the Parish President had notified any councilman about it. He said an unnamed councilman had found out about the accident, and added that if that councilman had not found out about the accident, that the Council may have never known about it. He reiterated that he thought the \$50,000 deductible to be high, but that there may be a reason for it. Mr. Lorraine then stated that Mr. Randolph had been cited as being in the wrong for running a red light and further that the damage to the other truck was approximately \$12,000, which he stated the Parish would have to pay. He then commented on what would happen if the occupants had been injured.

Mr. Lorraine said that he thought that the Council should come up with a policy regarding this matter for the future, adding that if someone was not a parish employee, they should not be operating a parish vehicle. Dr. Lasseigne said that documentation stated that Mr. Randolph was added to the driver's list on February 17, 2004, and then asked if there was such a driver's list, and if so, who was on it? He asked if Councilmen were on the driver's list? A response was given but was inaudible. Dr. Lasseigne then asked if the Council could be added to the list? He said that when he had come to the Sondra Barrios Building for the past hurricane, he was told that he could take a public vehicle in order to get needed supplies, but instead took his own vehicle. He said that he would have thought that he would not have been insured in the Parish vehicle. Dr. Lasseigne again asked who was on the list, and then asked why there was a \$50,000 deductible on liability but only a \$1,000 deductible on collision? He said that from a risk management prospective it was easier and more favorable to self-insure the parish vehicles because the vehicles were not worth much. He pointed out that Risk Manager, Mr. Seth Holloway had not been in his position very long, and that this matter probably needed to be looked at. He then calculated that the vehicle damage incurred by the person Mr. Randolph struck was approximately \$11,000, plus a rental unit, which Mr. Holloway advised was costing \$2,000 a month, adding that if the individual sued, \$50,000 could be loss in just one incident. Dr. Lasseigne said three (3) parish vehicles could be totaled and probably not have equaled to \$50,000. Mr. Holloway informed Dr. Lasseigne that this was the only motor vehicle accident that they had that totaled this amount. He said that when a deductible was put on a third party incident, the premium would be a whole lot higher, not only with the automobile, but also with bodily injury, and rental costs. He said from the Parish's side it was only to insure the vehicle, thus the reason for the lower deductible. Mr. Holloway said that the premium would be much higher without a self-insured retention of \$50,000. Dr. Lasseigne said that he was not saying that the \$50,000 deductible should be lowered but that the \$1,000 deductible should be increased. He asked why not self-insure all parish vehicles, to which Mr. Holloway stated that it was a standard in the standard policy. Dr. Lasseigne then again asked who was on the driver's list, adding that for \$10.00 everyone should be on it. Mr. Holloway stated that the Council was not currently on this list, but that if they wanted to be on the list, they could. He said that the \$10.00 paid was to cover the background check on the driving record of the proposed operator. He explained that because of the type of policy, an individual did not necessarily have to be on the list, but that if the individual received permission from the Administration to operate a parish vehicle, that person could do so and it would still be covered. Mr. Toups clarified that the \$1,000 deductible was on the parish owned vehicles and further that they were self insured up to \$50,000 on liability. He said that some of the parish's vehicles were not worth \$1,000 and that it should be looked at dropping vehicles once they were two (2) to three (3) years old. He said a lot of money could be saved by being self-insured up to \$25,000 and \$50,000. Mr. Toups said that the matter should be looked at and quotes should be obtained on \$25,000 and \$50,000. He said that \$50,000 would be high unless it was a new vehicle. He then asked if whether the practice of dropping vehicles once they were old was being done, to which Mr. Holloway stated that it was the same, with a \$1,000 deductible. Mr. Toups said that some of the vehicles could only carry liability. Mr. Holloway said that there were some parish vehicle that only carried liability and not comprehensive. Mr. Lorraine asked who had authorized Mr. Randolph to be added to the insurance policy, to which President Randolph stated she had. Mr. Lorraine then asked if she could do that administratively without Council approval. President Randolph responded to Mr. Lorraine, but it was inaudible. Mr. Lorraine then clarified that President Randolph could add anyone she wished to the policy, because Mr. Randolph was not an employee of the Parish Council. He then clarified that anyone who wanted to be added could ask President Randolph and she could put them on the policy. Mr. Atzenhoffer said that he recalled approximately a year or so ago he had tried to utilize a parish owned boat, but was told he could not because he was not on the insurance. He said that he found it amazing that the Council was not covered on the insurance. Mr. Atzenhoffer said he could give \$10.00 to be on the list and that he had NATO security clearance if that would help, and further that he would add another \$10.00 because his daughter wanted to drive a bulldozer. Mr. Gouaux said that what should be focused on was the purpose and the reason why Mr. Randolph was added to the insurance policy, adding that the Parish President

could have gotten someone from the Sheriff's Office to chauffeur her while she was conducting parish business on the phone. He stated that would have cost the tax payers' money and a lot of overtime money, but instead he thought it to be wise on her part to utilize someone that the parish would not have to pay. Mr. Gouaux said that yes, it was unfortunate that he had an accident but that if a parish employee would have been driving the vehicle, the accident would have still probably occurred. Mr. Gouaux said that the effort to look at the number of people that some of the Councilmen wanted to add to the parish's insurance was absurd. He stated that as Parish Councilmen they were not supposed to be operating parish vehicles to perform ordinary day-to-day chores. Mr. Gouaux said that if the job description of a parish councilman wanted to be changed, then possibly that would be the way to have them put on the parish's insurance. He said that the councilmen were paid mileage and that they had their own vehicles. Mr. Gouaux said he did not see the purpose of the Parish spending \$10.00 to put them on the policy. President Randolph then recalled to Dr. Lasseigne that he had gone to Washington with her and her husband, to the airport and back, and had not questioned the situation at that time. She stated that obviously Dr. Lasseigne had not had a problem with the situation at that time. President Randolph stated that it concerned her, that now Dr. Lasseigne was bringing this up. Dr. Lasseigne stated that he had not brought the matter up. Mr. Lorraine said that he had brought this matter up. President Randolph stated that Dr. Lasseigne may not have brought up this matter at the meeting but that he had brought it up in the newspaper, to which Dr. Lasseigne said that he had not brought this matter up in the newspaper either. Dr. Lasseigne said that when he had spoken to the newspaper, they had inquired as to whether he was aware of the accident. He said that he found out about it, and thought it was pertinent. He rhetorically asked if he thought it was a bad that Mr. Randolph was driving a Parish vehicle, and answered himself no, and added that he had never said that. Dr. Lasseigne said that it was the job of the Council to find out what was right. A brief heated discussion ensued regarding the opinion received from the District Attorney regarding overtime pay.

The next item (30) on the agenda was a discussion concerning the Golden Meadow Library. Mr. Lorraine said that as everyone was aware the Parish had purchased a building in Golden Meadow as a library, explaining that the previous one had been rented. He said that he had not voted on the issue, but that he would speak about it. Mr. Lorraine said that on July 5, 2005 President Randolph had received the paperwork regarding the library, which was returned to the Council Clerk on July 12, 2005, published on July 20, 2005 and became effective July 30, 2005. He added the Hurricane Katrina hit the area on August 29, 2005 and Hurricane Rita hit the area on September 24, 2005. Mr. Lorraine said that no damage had been incurred with Hurricane Katrina but that when Hurricane Rita hit the building purchased had been damaged. He said unfortunately there was no insurance put on the purchased building. Mr. Lorraine stated that when the Library purchased a building that it was immediately turned over to the Parish, and that he thought it to be the responsibility of the Parish to put insurance on the building and not the responsibility of the Library Board. He said that in a two (2) month period insurance had not been put on the building, and explained that the reason it was found out that there was no insurance was because there had been an attempt to file an insurance claim. Mr. Lorraine stated that he would hope that things like this would not happen in the future, adding that it was similar to buying a vehicle, in that the vehicle would not leave the lot until it was insured. He said that it had always been that when the Library Board purchased a building it was automatically turned over to the Council and that it should be its' responsibility to make sure that it was insured. Mr. Lorraine said that someone must have dropped the ball, but that fortunately FEMA was still present and that he thought that they would assist the Parish with it. He added that if FEMA did not give assistance on the matter, then he would think that it would have to be paid by the Library Board.

### **TWO-THIRDS AGENDA**

A **motion** was offered by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer, seconded by Mr. Phillip Gouaux, to open a Two-Thirds Agenda regarding the resolution supporting the Community Disaster loan, and **carried** by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays, to **open** the Two-Thirds Agenda.

Chairman Matherne then read from the resolution stating that it was a resolution supporting the Community Disaster Loan (CDL) Program Application for certification of eligibility for a loan amount and authorizing the Parish President to sign all necessary documents regarding said application. A **motion** was made by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and seconded by Mr. Phillip Gouaux. Mr. Toups asked President Randolph whether this matter would come back before the Council before any money was borrowed and that this was just an application. Dr. Lasseigne again asked why the Council was approving the application when it had already be done and could have been done without Council approval. He said that the issue was moot. The motion **carried** by a vote of six (6) yeas and three (3) nays, that being of Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer, Mr. Daniel Lorraine, and Dr. Tommy Lasseigne.

**RES. NO.: 05-247**

A **motion** was offered by Mr. Brent Callais, seconded by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer, and **carried** by a vote of nine (9) yeas, and zero (0) nays, to **close** the Two-Thirds Agenda and **return** to the regular agenda.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

On **motion** by Mr. Phillip Gouaux, seconded by Mr. Lindel Toups, and with no further business, the Lafourche Parish Council Meeting of October 25, 2005 **adjourned** at 7:29 p.m.

---

**MICHAEL MATHERNE, CHAIRMAN  
LAFOURCHE PARISH COUNCIL**

---

**SHEILA B. BOUDREAUX, COUNCIL CLERK  
LAFOURCHE PARISH COUNCIL**