



**District Court** – Mr. Doucet stated that the District Court Judges had asked for a 5% increase for all its employees in their budget; thus questioning if they would automatically receive the requested increase or if it had the same clause as the Lafourche Parish Government employees, as to ‘if the funds were available’. President Randolph replied by saying that the District Court supported itself with its own funds; and therefore when they would make such a request, it was per their budget. Mr. Doucet then asked if they were not taking any money from Lafourche Parish Government; in which President Randolph responded to as no. Mr. Doucet further asked if the District Court was hoping that they were going to have an increase of revenue compared to what the Parish was going to have of a foreseen 18% decrease. President Randolph replied that Mr. Doucet was correct; thus explaining that the District Court always had a surplus at the end of the year, in which they would then split with the District Attorney and the Parish. **Judge John LeBlanc** was also present to answer any questions; in which he did. Judge LeBlanc stated, “The Court system is funded through the fines and forfeitures that are collected in the criminal process. We reimburse the Parish for all of our employees. The only employees that are not reimbursed by the Court system, by Statute, are the Court Reporters; but that was not part of the intended raise this year for that. But, all of our funds are put into the Criminal Court Fund and the Judicial Expense Fund; and we fund our operations completely. The Parish is basically our pay master for our employees; so, there is no net loss to the Parish. And, in fact, at the end of the year when there is a surplus in the Criminal Court Fund, after the District Attorney and the Courts reimburse themselves for expenses that we have, like the \$70,000 in security equipment that we have on order, there will be some money remaining in the Criminal Court Fund and the Parish is entitled to withdraw half of that fund. Last year, the Parish was able to withdraw \$193,000; which helped to fund the renovation also, as part of the agreement with Division E. But those funds are available; this is not General Funds that we are taking from the Parish. And, unfortunately, we do expect our fines and forfeitures to keep generating funds sufficient enough to have a surplus.” A very brief discussion then ensued in regards to such.

**District Attorney** - President Randolph commented, “That one hasn’t changed Gentlemen!” Mr. Doucet then questioned such; thus asking if it had not changed from the increase, if the District Attorney did not take an 18% cut like everybody else. President Randolph replied as no; adding “Well actually, my response to him was that if State Statute indicated that we were responsible for all these costs. The State Statute does state that he is the Legal Advisor to many different governing bodies in the Parish and therefore we should share the costs. And, I’ve asked Finance to look into that for the future; that if he is going to serve as the Legal Advisor for many other bodies that we should somehow allocate the costs across the Parish, not just to the Parish Government.” Further comments continued. Mr. Lorraine then asked, “So, like the District Attorney - all the funds throughout the Parish – the Parish is basically liable. But, like your Municipalities, they use that office just like basically we do! What do they participate?” President Randolph responded “None.” Mr. Lorraine further asked, “So, Thibodaux, Golden Meadow, and Lockport doesn’t really participate much; or if any?” President Randolph replied, “They don’t contribute; no!” Mr. Lorraine stated, “And they’re using the services!” President Randolph commented, “That’s correct; just as the School Board and the Port Commission and everyone else! And, I just felt that because everyone falls under this umbrella, that they should pay it as well. I don’t know if it is proportionately or what; but I think it should be a shared expense, beginning next year! And, we’ve had increases in fines and other things through the court system. So, there is opportunity to raise additional money through their system; but the only way we can do it is through taxes. The District Attorney’s been generous; he’s assisted us in renovating the building; but that’s a \$3 million building. I mean, we’re at that point now in Parish Government where we need to analyze each one of these situations: Sheriff’s Office – we pay utilities. We pay all these expenses based on the State Constitution. District Attorney and Sheriff Lobby Groups are much stronger than Police Jury Association.” Mr. Lorraine next commented, “And also, you have three Municipalities that are located inside the Parish and a lot of our tax base goes to them and we get very little!” President Randolph agreed; expressing “Most definitely! You saw Thibodaux’s Budget as \$34 million! I mean less than \$20

million and we're doing 95,000 people and they're doing 18,000. So, I think there is a way of having everyone share in some of these expenses. When we get to the Animal Shelter – same thing! All across the board, we're looking at ways of doing such." Detailed discussion and comments then ensued in regards to what role the District Attorney represented the Parish on for the money spent; and then of what his duties and responsibilities entailed as being the Parish's Legal Advisor.

**Registrar of Voters** - *Ms. Tammy Wendelschaefer, Deputy Registrar*, was present to answer any questions and to basically address three different accounts in their budget. She began with the Communications Account; explaining that when the new office was made in Galliano, they had to upgrade the phone systems, allowing the Commissioners to be able to reach them during elections and heavy phone calling. Ms. Wendelschaefer further explained such; then stated that was why they were asking for additional funds, to cover said costs. Another account she mentioned was of postage; explaining that they did not anticipate the moving of the Bayou Blue Polling place, which was not in turn considered. She informed that would cost an additional \$700; in that mailing out Voter ID Cards and such come out of their budget. Ms. Wendelschaefer then requested that said account be reviewed and be reconsidered for such additional expenses. The third thing she reported on was of the election expenses; saying that there were certain election expenses that the State mandates that the Parish pay: extra election help if they were short, security if they felt it was needed for electioneering or sorts, etc. Ms. Wendelschaefer said what had basically had happened this year was that they had elections, in which the account was not used in 2009. She went on to say that the Association required that the Parish fund more on their retirement, so they had to move monies into that account to cover said expenses. Ms. Wendelschaefer expressed that they could have used extra election help; but they couldn't afford to get any. Further stating that they were currently one person short; being that Ms. Mary Doucet was appointed as Registrar and she had not appointed a Chief Deputy as of yet, in which she wanted to wait due to the economic times of the State, the Parish, and such. She said that the Parish was responsible for a portion of the non-classified employees in the office; so without a Chief Deputy being appointed, it would save the Parish around \$6,000 for not doing so. Ms. Wendelschaefer added that what they were basically asking the Parish for was actually under the amount it would cost the Parish by not appointing a Chief Deputy. She said she was not saying that a Chief Deputy would not be appointed; but she was told that Ms. Doucet wanted to wait at least a year and review everybody's qualifications and see how they could do without such. Ms. Wendelschaefer explained that they were basically asking for the \$2,500 back because they were not hiring that extra person, being that the Parish could not afford to do so; asking for such in case they needed early voting Commissioners or anything of that nature. Ms. Wendelschaefer then requested that said account be reconsidered as well. Discussion ensued in regards to next year's elections, of redistricting, and of retirement and insurances. Ms. Wendelschaefer explained they had the option to keep their insurances when they retire; in that they had a Registrar of Voters Association that they have their retirement with. Mr. Toups expressed his disappointment with the Parish employees not having any retirement, when the Registrar of Voters, the School Board, and such do; further saying that he had been talking about it for 16 years now. He then said maybe they should cut their retirements out, to make the budget. Ms. Wendelschaefer suggested that the Parish consider talking to the head of the Association for the Registrar of Voters, and they may be able to recommend what they did to get that started. Discussion and clarification next ensued in regards to the amount of people working at the polls during elections. Mr. Fertitta commented that Administration could do a Supplemental Appropriation after the first of the year, thus recouping the money as stated, since they were saving the Parish \$6,000. *Mr. Ryan Friedlander, Finance Director*, clarified that they did not cut any positions; saying that the six positions still did indeed exist. So, if one of those positions would not be filled in 2011, that would then give them an option for the elections and/or postage, thus having some leeway there. Brief discussion again continued.

**JPS/Constables** - Mr. Toups questioned the amount of money charged by the Justice of the Peace to serve papers to someone and how it was handled; with discussion ensuing in regards to such.

**Community Services** - President Randolph briefly stated that this was all Federal funding.

**Legislative** - Specific discussion and detailed explanation ensued in regards to what the Budget was actually based on, as to Road Royalty at a certain price of oil and such; and then as to what the Budget was decreased by to show the cuts, with President Randolph explaining that it was by an 18% reduction and also a 20% increase in Healthcare costs.

**Purchasing** - Discussion and explanation ensued in regards to salaries and wages of such.

- 2) **Fund 106 - Road Sales Tax District No. 2**
- 3) **Fund 112 - Criminal Jury Fund**
- 4) **Fund 113 - Criminal Court Fund**
- 5) **Fund 114 - Special District No. 1**
- 6) **Fund 115 - Off Duty Witness Fund**
- 7) **Fund 121 - Drug Court**
- 8) **Fund 124 - IV-D**
- 9) **Fund 130 - Head Start**
- 10) **Fund 131 - CACFP-Head Start**
- 11) **Fund 141 - CACFP Program**
- 12) **Fund 142 - OCA General Fund**
- 13) **Fund 143 - Weatherization**
- 14) **Fund 144 - LIHEAP**
- 15) **Fund 150 - CSBG**
- 16) **Fund 154 - TANF**
- 17) **Fund 160 - Road Sales Tax District A**
- 18) **Fund 161 - Road Sales Tax District No. 2**
- 19) **Fund 181 - Coastal Zone Management**
- 20) **Fund 183 - Christmas Tree Program**
- 21) **Fund 184 - CIAP Funds**
- 22) **Fund 185 - Beachfront Development**
- 23) **Fund 195 - Morristown Sewerage District**
- 24) **Fund 196 - FEMA Acquisition /Elevation**
- 25) **Fund 197 - ARRA**
- 26) **Fund 201 - Road Sales Tax District No. 2 Construction**
- 27) **Fund 206 - Road Sales Tax District A Construction**

- 28) **Fund 299 - Capital Projects Fund**
- 29) **Fund 302 - Sinking Fund - Building and Road Sales Tax, Districts 3,5,6 (Old)**
- 30) **Fund 311 - Sinking Fund-Series 2003**
- 31) **Fund 313 - Reserve-Road Sales Tax District No. 3, 5, 6 (2005 Bonds)**
- 32) **Fund 314 - Sinking Fund-Road Sales Tax District No. 3, 5, 6 (2005 Bonds)**
- 33) **Fund 317 - Sinking Fund-RSTD A**
- 34) **Fund 318 - Sinking Fund - RSTD 2 (2008 Bonds)**
- 35) **Fund 501 - Marydale Sewerage**
- 36) **Fund 502 - Brocatto Sewerage**
- 37) **Fund 503 - Dugas Sewerage**
- 38) **Fund 504 - Rita Sewerage**
- 39) **Fund 505 - Morristown Sewerage District**
- 40) **Fund 506 - Sewerage District No. 2**
- 41) **Fund 601 - Internal Service Fund - Workers' Comp.**
- 42) **Fund 801 - BP Oil Spill**

## **QUESTIONS/DISCUSSION REGARDING THE 2011 BUDGET**

Councilmen asked various questions in regards to particular items in the Budget, requesting more details and clarifications; in which President Randolph obliged in answering and explaining such.

Next, a **motion** was offered by Mr. Gouaux, seconded by Mr. Doucet, to *close* the *Budget Public Hearing*, and *carried* by a vote of (7) yeas, (0) nays, and (2) absent.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

On **motion** by Mr. Gouaux and seconded by Mr. Fertitta, and with no further business, the **Lafourche Parish Council Special Meeting of November 8, 2010 adjourned 6:10 p.m.**

DANIEL LORRAINE, CHAIRMAN  
LAFOURCHE PARISH COUNCIL

CARLEEN B. BABIN, COUNCIL CLERK  
LAFOURCHE PARISH COUNCIL