

NOVEMBER 14, 2005  
RACELAND, LOUISIANA

**STATE OF LOUISIANA  
PARISH LAFOURCHE**

**A SPECIAL MEETING OF THE LAFOURCHE PARISH COUNCIL, PARISH OF LAFOURCHE, STATE OF LOUISIANA, WAS SCHEDULED FOR MONDAY, NOVEMBER 14, 2005, AT 6:00 P.M., AT THE LAFOURCHE PARISH COUNCIL BARRIOS CENTER, 1612, HWY. 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 6:01 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. Daniel Lorraine. Proceedings of the meeting were called to order with the following:

**PRESENT:** Mr. Tyrone Williams (*arrived at 6:11 p.m.*)  
Mr. Michael Delatte  
Mr. Michael Matherne - Chairman  
Dr. Tommy Lasseigne  
Mr. Daniel Lorraine  
Mr. Phillip Gouaux  
Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer - Vice Chairman  
Mr. Brent Callais

**ABSENT:** Mr. Lindel Toups  
Ms. Charlotte Randolph, Parish President

Chairman Matherne stated that the purpose of the special meeting was to have discussions regarding the 2006 Maintenance and Operations Budget for Lafourche Parish. He then informed the audience that Public Wishing to Address the Council forms were available in the rear of the room and then asked three (3) times if anyone from the public wished to address the Council. Hearing none, Chairman Matherne moved to the next item on the agenda.

**ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT AND DISCUSSION REGARDING THE 2006 MAINTENANCE AND OPERATIONS BUDGET FOR THE LAFOURCHE PARISH COUNCIL**

Mrs. Shannon Chiasson, Lafourche Parish Finance Director, next gave a visual presentation regarding an outline of the budget process and different funds, including different questions that had been received regarding the budget. She went on to explain that the time line for the budget was determined by the District Attorney's office based on the Home Rule Charter. Mrs. Chiasson said that the budget had been hand delivered to each Councilman on September 30, 2005. Mrs. Chiasson's presentation is attached hereto as Exhibit 1.

Discussions then began regarding the funds listed below.

1) *Fund No. 112 Criminal Jury Fund*

Dr. Lasseigne inquired about Fund No. 112, the Criminal Jury Fund, stating that it seemed to be a "wash-through" account. Mrs. Chiasson said that she too had a question regarding the fund, and stated that it was a "wash-through" account. She said that Fund 112 was where jurors were paid from. Mrs. Chiasson

elaborated and said that actually the jurors were paid out of the General Fund and then the Parish was reimbursed through Fund 112.

2) *Fund No. 113 Criminal Court*

Mrs. Chiasson said that Fund 113, Criminal Court, were not funds of the Parish, but were funds between the District Attorney and Judges. She said that the District Attorney and the Judges decided how the money was spent, and how much was spent. Mrs. Chiasson said that all of the funds being discussed were contained in the audit starting on page 62, which gives a brief description of each fund and what that fund could and could not be used for. Mrs. Chiasson reported that the increases in Fund No. 113 pertained to State health insurance and retirement. She said that State health insurance and State retirement were gone by, and added that they were considerably greater than Parish health insurance and retirement costs. Dr. Lasseigne asked if the payroll checks of the Criminal Court were written by the Criminal Court? Mrs. Chiasson stated no. Dr. Lasseigne pointed out that the Parish did not receive the revenue for the Criminal Court, asking why should the Parish handle the account? Mrs. Chiasson then spoke of Fund 112, Criminal Jury Fund and a character code which she said caused an amount to be pulled into Salaries, which she corrected by saying it was not a salary. Dr. Lasseigne said that what he was asking was why did the Parish administer the two (2) accounts? Mrs. Chiasson stated that she thought the accounts were administered by the Parish because it was mandated. Dr. Lasseigne then yielded some of his time to Judge Jerome J. Barbera, III to explain the matter further. Judge Barbera began by stating that he appreciated the opportunity to answer any questions there may be. Dr. Lasseigne asked Judge Barbera why the Parish was administering the fund for the Courts. Judge Barbera explained that the Criminal Court Fund, Fund 113, had been contained in the law for some time. He said that the money in the fund was derived from fines and forfeitures. Judge Barbera said that when the Sheriff collected fines and court costs money he was mandated on what he had to do with it. He said that certain people had to be paid out of certain funds. Judge Barbera said that the Judges, the Sheriff, the District Attorney and others received money as mandated by the Legislature. He went on to say that with regards to fine monies collected, that the Sheriff and the District Attorney received a certain percentage of the amount. Judge Barbera explained that the balance remaining, once the Sheriff and the District Attorney were paid, became the Criminal Court fund. He said that the law stated that the Parish Governing Authority, in this case the Parish Council, was the custodian of the fund. Judge Barbera said that money was paid out of the fund by consent of the Judges and the District Attorney's office. He went on to say that at the end of the year if there was a balance in the account that the Parish was permitted by law to take one-half (½) of the balance to deposit into the Parish's General Fund. Judge Barbera said that the reason that the Parish administered the fund was because the Legislature, approximately 60 years ago, had decided that the Parish would do that. Dr. Lasseigne then asked if the Criminal Court had a deficit of \$33,000? Judge Barbera explained that what had happened was that at the end of the year, the District Attorney and the Judges get together and review the fund and the balance in the fund and then take money out of the fund in order to reimburse themselves for things that they had done through-out the year for which they had used other funds to pay. He said that in 2004 too much money had been taken out. Judge Barbera said that in 2005 it would be made sure that everything was corrected. He said that the Judges and the District Attorney would meet again, but that it would be made sure that the deficit was wiped-out and that they would not let it happen again. Judge Barbera then explained that the Criminal Jury Fund, Fund 112, was just done by the Legislature two (2) years ago. He said that in the past, the governing authority was paying for juror fees in criminal cases, adding that when citizens were summoned for jury duty, the Parish Council would have to pay \$12.00 a day in Lafourche Parish, along with witness fees. Judge Barbera said that no money was collected from a defendant in a criminal case, whereas in a civil case who ever requested a jury trial had to put up the money for the jurors. He said that approximately two (2) years ago the Legislature mandated more court costs so that every time some paid a traffic ticket or went to court for some other reason, they would pay an extra \$5.00 which would go into the fund. Judge Barbera stated that hopefully within two (2) to three (3) years a balance could be built up to where the parish governing authority would not have to pay any money for the jurors fees in criminal cases. Dr. Lasseigne then asked if Fund 121, Drug Court, was a State grant? Judge Barbera said that the Drug Court funds came from the

Legislature and added that they used to come from a federal grant. He said that the Drug Court no longer had any federal monies and that the Legislature was appropriating money and sending it to Drug Courts through the Louisiana Supreme Court. Judge Barbera said that the Parish Council had been the paying agent for all of the Courts' employees for years, adding that the courts did not have the capacity, nor the manpower to run a payroll system. He said that with the exception of Court Reporters, some of the court employees' salaries were reimbursed and that he had been working on getting the Council reimbursed for all monies, including fringe benefits. Judge Barbera said that Court Reporters were the only court employees that were mandated by law to be paid by the Parish Governing Authority out of its general appropriated funds. Judge Barbera stated that there had been a very good relationship with the Parish throughout the years and added that the Finance Department had been very cooperative.

3) *Fund No. 118 Planning Commission*

Mr. Callais inquired as to the \$100,000 in Professional Services as being for the Master Plan and also asked where the money was from? Mr. Curole responded that it was a fund balance that had been built up in the Planning Commission over the years. Mr. Callais then stated that Operating Services had gone from \$15,800 to \$0.00, and then asked if that had been moved somewhere else. Mr. Curole said that he thought that the Operating Service item was what had been used in the past to pay Mr. Michael St. Martin and since had been better classified as a Professional Service. Chairman Matherne mentioned that Mr. St. Martin had stopped coming to the meetings, to which Mr. Curole said that Mr. St. Martin had been asked to come to the Council meetings when needed, adding that Mr. St. Martin was paid by the hour. Mr. Atzenhoffer asked why the salaries for the Planning Department was not included in this fund. He said he realized that the salaries were in the General Fund, but again asked why they wouldn't be in Fund No. 118. Mr. Curole said that other than the fact of the fund balance, which was agreed to be used for the Master Plan, the fund did not have enough annual money to cover the salaries of the Planning Department. He said that the annual revenues could cover a percentage of a salary, but that it was not enough to cover any of the salaries, so they were covered in the General Fund. Mr. Atzenhoffer said that he realized that the money would have to be transferred but stated that it would be easier to see what the Planning Department costs if it was included in this fund. Mr. Curole asked if Mr. Atzenhoffer meant a transfer from the General Fund to the Fund No. 118 to cover the salaries of the Planning Department? He went on to say that the only down side to doing that would be that if for some reason someone would quit during the year and they would not be replaced, there would be a fund balance that could not be transferred back. Mr. Curole said that this was a special revenue fund for Planning services and that once money was sent there, it could not really be taken out in the middle of the next year as it would be hard to identify the source of the funds. Mr. Atzenhoffer then asked if funds from the derelict structure program would go into the Fund No. 118 or the General Fund? Mr. Curole said that was a good question, but that he did not know the answer, and further that it would have to be figured out. Mr. Atzenhoffer said that may be a way to offset some of the other costs. Mr. Curole said that his first thought would be that it would be put back into Special District No. 1 or the originating fund in order to supplement those costs. Mr. Callais asked if the \$100,000 for the Master Plan was not used if it would have to stay in Fund No. 118, Planning Commission because it had been built up with Planning Commission money. Mr. Curole stated that Mr. Callais was correct.

4) *Fund No. 121 Drug Court*

This matter was previously discussed by Judge Barbera in Fund No. 113 Criminal Court. Mr. Atzenhoffer said that he had spoken with Judge Larose on November 14, 2005. He said that the Drug Court program came through the Supreme Court and that they had less than a ten (10%) percent recidivism rate, adding that the national average was 20%. Mr. Atzenhoffer said that this program was the model program for the nation as far as drug courts were concerned, and said that it was right here in Lafourche Parish.

5) *Fund No. 123 Civil Defense*

Mr. Callais asked if this fund was OEP (Office of Emergency Preparedness)? Mr. Curole said that he

wanted to mention that the Salaries line item figure did not match with what was in segment 8. He went on to explain that the difference was that a portion of a salary for a proposed Assistant for Mr. Chris Boudreaux, Director of the Office of Emergency Preparedness. Mr. Curole said that the assistant would be someone who could be present during the storms so that Mr. Boudreaux would not have to be sitting at his desk, adding that the assistant could tend to his directions and not have Mr. Boudreaux having to make every single phone call. Mr. Curole said that a full salary could not be afforded. He said that the position could be applied for in house and further that he was not sure where to put the other half of the position. Mr. Callais inquired about grants and them being intergovernmental, and then mentioned the purchasing of the televisions located in the Council chamber. Mr. Curole said that intergovernmental was monies that were received from the State for OEP. He then advised that the funds that paid for the televisions in the Council chamber was paid from a grant that was sent to South Central Planning. Mr. Callais said that he thought that with the Emergency Preparedness monies that had been received a boat had been purchase and other things would be purchased. He then stated that those funds would not go into Fund No. 123. Mr. Curole said that the funds did not come into the Parish, but into South Central Planning, and that they would do the purchasing. He then spoke of seven (7) different parishes getting together in order to determine how the monies would be spent and added that South Central Planning would do the spending. Mr. Curole then explained that sometime at the end of the year South Central Planning may ask if there was anything that the Parish would like or need, such as the televisions mentioned previously. Mr. Callais said that the Parish had nothing to do with the funds because South Central Planning handled the funds. Mr. Curole said that it was group of OEP Directors, like Mr. Chris Boudreaux, from several parishes that got together regionally and determined what First Responder monies were to be used for initially. He reiterated that once the money was spent on what they thought was needed regionally, they would sometimes inquire as to what the Parish may be interested in obtaining. Mr. Atzenhoffer asked why not hire someone in the assistance position that was already being paid and would already be available. Mr. Atzenhoffer said that there had been a lot of employees present for the recent hurricanes. Mr. Curole agreed that there had been a lot of employees present during the recent hurricanes, but added that eventually everyone had to go back to their regular jobs. He said that he did not think the position to be a full time one, but that a present employee could be tasked with being the assistant and to implement and oversee grants. Mr. Callais asked if Mr. Windel Curole was still the assistant to Mr. Chris Boudreaux? Mr. Curole said that Mr. Windel Curole was the assistant during the storms. Mr. Callais then asked if the \$15,000 in Assistance was Mr. Curole's salary, asking if the money would be for the position to be filled. Mrs. Chiasson said no, and explained that the fiscal year for the department ran from October 1<sup>st</sup> to September 30<sup>th</sup>. She said that if it was reviewed it would be noticed that every line item was split by 06 and 07 because the department's budget year was different from that of the Parish. Mr. Curole said that the \$14,000 to \$15,000 was for Mr. Windel Curole. Mr. Callais clarified that in the detail of the Civil Defense Fund, there was \$44,000 in Salaries, and the next line was \$14,000 in Salaries. Mrs. Chiasson said that it also said CD for 06 and 07, explaining that CD meant Civil Defense and 06 meant the 06 year and that 07 meant the 07 year. She went on to say that it would be noticed that with a lot of the grants two (2) years would be shown. Chairman Matherne clarified that the grants would be on a split fiscal year. Mrs. Chiasson said that this particular fund was on a October 1<sup>st</sup> through September 30<sup>th</sup> fiscal year. Mr. Lorraine asked how much Mr. Curole was paid per year? Mr. Curole stated that Mr. Windel Curole received approximately \$21,000, which was split between Coastal Zone Management and Civil Defense. Mr. Lorraine said that Mr. Windel Curole's main job was with the Levee District, and added that his \$21,000 salary was not a bad side salary. Mr. Lorraine said that he was not against Mr. Curole's salary, but asked why hire someone else when he was employed, adding that maybe he could put in a little more time for the amount of money he was receiving. Dr. Lasseigne asked if Mr. Windel Curole filled out time sheets, to which Mr. Curole stated yes. Dr. Lasseigne then asked how many hours Mr. Curole worked annually. Mr. Curole said that he could not recall. Dr. Lasseigne said that Mr. Curole had a full time job that he would assume was more than a 45 or 50 hour a week job. Mr. Curole said that the answer was yes, Mr. Curole did do a time sheet, but that he was paid a lump sum. He said that the process that was currently in place was in place before the current term, but stated that the Attorney General's office had been checked with in order to assure that there was no type of violations. Mr. Curole stated that he had had the same questions

as Dr. Lasseigne. Dr. Lasseigne asked for clarification as to whether Mr. Curole had a vehicle. Mr. Cullen Curole said that no, Mr. Curole did not have a Parish vehicle. Dr. Lasseigne asked if there would be another person hired, to which Mr. Curole stated that it was a thought. Dr. Lasseigne added that the budget also showed that they would be getting another vehicle. Mr. Curole said that the idea of the assistant would be to mainly be in the office. Dr. Lasseigne stated that there were two (2) line items for maintenance and then realized that the line items were actually for one (1) vehicle but had been split into two (2) line items for the 06 and 07 split fiscal year. Dr. Lasseigne then asked how was \$10,700 worth of gas being spent? He stated that was a lot of gas for one (1) vehicle. Mr. Curole stated that amount was for maintenance of equipment. Dr. Lasseigne stated that he was speaking about 462600-Gas 06 and Gas 07 and that they added up to \$10,700. Mrs. Chiasson said that part of what was happening was that the Department of Public Works had been paying for all of the fuel costs that were not allocated to the departments in the funds, which she stated had since started to be implemented. She went on to say that the departments and funds that had vehicles would be charged for fuel usage. Mr. Curole said that he noticed the amounts that Dr. Lasseigne was speaking of and said he would check into the matter, as it did seem high. Dr. Lasseigne said that what he was getting at was that the Parish had one and one-eighth (1 1/8th) of an employee that costs \$115,000 year. He said that the Parish better be prepared when there was a hurricane. Mr. Atzenhoffer inquired as to Tab 8 of the budget asking if that was Mr. Chris Boudreaux' current salary or proposed salary, stating that amount as being \$39,150 annually and \$18.75 hourly. Mr. Atzenhoffer clarified his question by asking if there was only one (1) employee, to which Mr. Curole responded, one (1) and a portion. Mr. Atzenhoffer then asked if Mr. Curole's current salary was \$39,150, to which Mr. Curole stated that he was correct. Mr. Atzenhoffer said that according to the budget, \$58,712 was budgeted for salaries. He asked if approximately \$11,000 was being paid to Mr. Windel Curole. Mr. Curole said that he saw \$6,000. Mr. Atzenhoffer then asked if the \$13,000 was to hire another person. Mr. Curole said that the \$13,000 was there to potentially hire a portion, or to assume a portion, of another salary. Mr. Atzenhoffer then asked what equipment was had that the Parish maintained, other than a vehicle? Mr. Curole said that the OEP fund through South Central Planning had allowed the Parish to purchase many things, including video equipment, and All Terrain Vehicles. Mr. Atzenhoffer said that in the budget there was \$10,000 for equipment maintenance. Mr. Curole said that there was a first responder trailer, which he added the Sheriff's Office had used during the recent storms, and a lot of other equipment. He said that if Mr. Atzenhoffer would like a list could be compiled of the equipment, which would include the boat that arrived in August of 2005. Mr. Curole said that had been something that each Parish had received from South Central Planning approximately a week or so before the recent storms. He said that it was basically a several \$100,000 grant that South Central Planning administered for the Parish. Dr. Lasseigne said that \$91,000 from the General Fund was being transferred in and asked if the Parish was required to match that amount? Mr. Curole said that he thought it to be a 50/50 match. He said that the difference was what the Administration had decided to do to "beef up" the department. Mr. Callais asked if there were guideline regarding the use of the ATVs by the Department of Public Works if they had been purchased by OEP funds? Mr. Curole then recalled a question he had asked regarding a vehicle that was said could only be used in emergencies, saying that it had been found out from South Central Planning that the vehicle could be used as long as it was available when it was needed for an emergency.

6) *Fund No. 124 IV-D*

Mrs. Chiasson explained that this fund was a grant, and that it was a pass-through account. She said that this was the District Attorney's grant and added that the Parish could not do anything with it.

7) *Fund No. 125 Veterans' Memorial*

Mrs. Chiasson said that this was the Veterans' budget. Mr. Lorraine asked why the Veterans' funding was in the budget? Mrs. Chiasson said because the Veterans' Memorial District had debt and that the Parish was responsible for it. Mr. Lorraine said that there were numerous boards in the Parish, listing some as being the Ambulance Service District 1, Central Lafourche Ambulance Service Districts and several others, saying that they were not contained in the budget. Mr. Lorraine said that the Commissioners of the Veteran's

Memorial District was the Parish Council but that had been changed by Senate Bill 79. He said that the Veteran's Memorial District would have their board, and further that their money should not have been put in the 2006 Budget. Mr. Lorraine said that he would be coming forth with an amendment to transfer the money out of the budget because it should not be included. He said that it should be included for 2005 but not for 2006. Chairman Matherne asked if the appointments had been made to the new board, to which Mr. Lorraine responded yes, that had been done when the ordinance was passed. Chairman Matherne clarified that just like any other board, the Veterans' Memorial District Board would take care of its own debt service and other things. Mr. Lorraine said that they would have to report to the Council like everyone else. Mr. Gouaux said that the Council would have to approve their budget. Mr. Curole said that the money was included because the funds still came through Finance but said that as that changed there would be no problem with it not being in the budget. He said that Mr. Lorraine was right in that the other agencies and districts that did not come through Finance, did not have their money included. Mr. Curole said that there had never been action taken to transfer the money to the district. Mr. Lorraine said that he wanted the district to be treated like every other district. Mr. Curole said that he thought it needed to be done by ordinance in order to dictate how the monies should be treated, because until such a time that it was done, the monies were in the hands of the Finance Department. Mr. Lorraine said that he, along with Mr. Callais, had signed some bills and that those bills had never been paid. He said that the Ambulance District that took care of the Veterans and the buses, had recently received payment and further that they had been waiting for a long time. Mr. Curole said yes, they had been waiting for a long time for payment, but informed Mr. Lorraine that Mr. Chester Boudreaux had the bills at his home. Mr. Lorraine said that he and Mr. Callais had signed some bills which he thought had finally been paid, but added that the payment of the bills had taken forever. Mr. Lorraine reiterated that the Veterans needed to be treated the same way as, or better than, other boards. Chairman Matherne asked Mr. Lorraine if he thought an ordinance needed to be introduced at the next meeting in order to have that accomplished. Mr. Lorraine said that he would introduce an ordinance regarding the matter. Chairman Matherne reminded Mr. Lorraine of the deadline to add an item to the meeting agenda.

8) *Fund No. 126* *Commission For Women*

Mr. Atzenhoffer asked why this commission was not handling its own account? Mrs. Chiasson stated that part of the problem with some of the groups was that they wanted to use the Parish's Tax I.D. number. She stated that if the groups were going to use the Parish's Tax ID number, then the Parish would have to maintain the funds. Mr. Gouaux asked if the groups were assessed a finance charge or a charge for the maintaining of their finances, to which Mrs. Chiasson responded no.

9) *Fund No. 130* *Head Start*

Dr. Lasseigne stated that \$75,000 had been transferred from the General Fund and asked if that was something that the Parish was required to do? Mr. Curole answered yes and no, explaining that the Parish was required to have a match. He said that if the Parish could identify enough "in-kind" match then the cash would not be needed. Mr. Curole said that he believed that 2004 was the first time cash had been transferred. He reminded the Council that Mrs. Martha Babin, Director of Head Start, attended some of the Council meetings and approaches the Council to attend policy council meetings because Head Start would get credit for the in-kind hours. He said that when the Head Start program lost Terrebonne Parish, it also had lost a lot of its in-kind hours. Mr. Curole said that in 2005 Head Start was okay with the match but that in 2006 additional match was being looking for to cover the grant. Mr. Gouaux stated that Head Start needed to advise the Council in advance of their meetings.

10) *Fund No. 131* *CACFP-Head Start*

Mr. Curole mentioned Ms. Sonya Ockman was present at the November 14, 2005 meeting and further that if the Council had more specific questions that Ms. Ockman could answer them, as she kept the books for Head Start. Hearing no questions regarding the fund, Chairman Matherne moved on to the next fund to be discussed.

11) *Fund No. 141 CACFP Program*

Hearing no questions regarding the fund, Chairman Matherne moved on to the next fund to be discussed.

12) *Fund No. 143 Weatherization*

Chairman Matherne asked if the Parish normally ran out of money in the Weatherization fund, to which President Randolph stated yes. He then asked in what month the shortage was usually incurred to which a response was given but was inaudible. Chairman Matherne stated that there was a much greater need than funding. Mr. Callais said that the Council was not aware of what the fund was for. Ms. Denise Hughes, Director of Community Action, explained that Community Action was a community program that reached out to the people of the community to meet their needs. She said that Community Action addressed the needs of the low income citizens of the community. Ms. Hughes then explained that Weatherization was the weatherizing of the low income citizen's homes. She explained that Community Action did not do repairs to the houses, but that they would weatherize the home if there was air leakage through the window or doors. Ms. Hughes said they also weatherized the homes with regards to health and safety issues such as with the flooring or the ceiling of the homes. She said that in 2005 the grant for the program had increased to \$4,200, which she added had not yet been received. Ms. Hughes said that CACFP was the Child Adult Care Food Program and said that with that program assisted people who cared for children in their home with providing nutritious meals. Mr. Curole mentioned that the CACFP was an entitlement program meaning that as many individuals as could be identified who babysit or care for children in their home could be reimbursed for the feeding of the children, if they were willing to follow the menus and complete the necessary paperwork. He said that there was staff members going out to find individuals to do the paperwork because as many as could be identified, could be assisted. Ms. Hughes said that a lot of advertisement had been done with regards to the program. She said that there were currently approximately 70 participants, but that only 55 of those participants were active, explaining that the more menus that were had, the more funding that would be received. Mr. Curole reported that this program at one point had gone down, but that Ms. Stacy Savoie had been hired in 2005, who he said was bringing the program back. He said that the people in the program did not have to be in Lafourche Parish, adding that it could be someone in Terrebonne Parish as long as the paperwork was processed through the program. Ms. Hughes said that a lot of their advertising was done by foot-work..

13) *Fund No. 144 LIHEAP*

Dr. Lasseigne asked what LIHEAP was? Ms. Hughes explained that it was the Low Income Housing Energy Program, saying that help was given to individuals in order to help them pay their energy bills. Mr. Atzenhoffer asked out of what funds the commodities came from? Ms. Hughes said that commodities came out the CSBG (Community Service Block Grant) grant. Mr. Atzenhoffer then asked if someone had been hired for weatherization? Ms. Hughes explained no, that no one had been hired, stating that they did not want to hire anyone in the present year because of past problems. She went on to explain that as the inter-house administration, they were learning the details of the programs so that the next time weatherization was done or a grant was received, a great job would be done with it. Ms. Hughes said that since they were learning the details that they would be able to train someone once someone was hired. Mr. Gouaux inquired as to what was classified as "low-income"? Ms. Hughes answered by saying that would be citizens who were 150% below the income guideline. She said that there was a poverty guideline sheet that the program followed. Ms. Hughes said that the qualification for CSBG was 125% below the poverty level, and that the qualification for LIHEAP was 150% below the poverty level. Mr. Gouaux then asked what was the poverty level, to which a response of \$13,000 for one (1) person in a household for CSBG assistance, and \$14,000 or \$15,000 for LIHEAP assistance, was given.

14) *Fund No. 150 CSBG*

Ms. Hughes explained that CSBG was the Community Service Block Grant, and asked if there were

any questions regarding the program. Mr. Curole stated that CSBG was the “umbrella” for all of the other specific grant programs. He said that CSBG covered the administration and any other projects that the Parish may come up with.

15) *Fund No. 181* *Coastal Zone Management*

Mr. Lorraine stated that Mr. Jess Curole had been working for the Parish for sometime, and further that he did not believe that Mr. Curole had received a three (3%) percent raise like some of the others had. He then asked why Mr. Curole should not have gotten a raise? Mr. Cullen Curole stated that he should have received a three (3%) percent raise, and stated that he would check into the matter. Mr. Callais said that he thought that Mr. Curole had received the raise being spoken of. Mr. Lorraine said that he would appreciate Mr. Curole checking into the matter. Mr. Curole stated that if Mr. Jess Curole had not received a three (3%) percent raise, that he would, because there was no reason that he should not have received it. Dr. Lasseigne inquired as to who were the employees of CZM, asking if there was a one-half (½) person employed? Mr. Curole stated that Ms. Julia Mayet was the Fisheries Agent, and that at one point there was a secretary. He said that there was not enough work to require a secretary, so that once the secretary quit, several months had passed by without one. Mr. Curole said that Mr. Jess Curole had stated that he was out of the office too often to not have someone to at least answer the phones. He said that Ms. Julia Mayet was answering the phones part-time. Mr. Callais said that there had been a \$849,000 transfer in, explaining that \$750,000 of that amount was for the locks, and \$50,000 was for the small dredge project. He said that it was left in the fund balance. Mr. Curole asked if one (1) of the Councilman would assist him in the preparation of an amendment, because he was not sure why it was not included. Mr. Callais said that it was in the Capital Outlay Budget. Mr. Curole stated that the \$50,000 for the small dredge was seed money, as it was not enough to buy or rent a dredge. He said that it was anticipated that the Energy Bill money would probably supplement it. Mr. Curole said that the \$50,000 would maybe be transferred back to the General Fund once the Energy Bill money materialized. He said that Terrebonne Parish had been spoken to regarding partnering with Lafourche Parish in order to purchase a dredge. Mr. Lorraine explained that the reason that the secretary with CZM was no longer employed, was because she was also handling permits in her off time, which became such a volume of permits being done that it interfered with her job for CZM. Mr. Lorraine said that the Permit office had also been moved to Raceland, which he said he thought was fair, but that there should be a Permit office down the Bayou as previously had. Mr. Curole said that the reason the secretary was no longer there was because she had quit, stating that he did not know if her quitting had anything to do with the permits. Mr. Lorraine said that a service was being done for that area and that if the permits for the whole parish was checked, probably 65% of the permits were from Lockport south. He said that now the people had to travel all the way to Raceland.

16) *Fund No. 183* *Christmas Tree Program*

Mr. Atzenhoffer asked who administered this program, to which Mr. Curole responded Coastal Zone Management. He stated that the Parish had previously contracted with Les Reflections du Bayou to coordinate volunteers for the program. Dr. Lasseigne asked if Les Reflections du Bayou received \$16,200 in Professional Services? Chairman Matherne asked what was done with the Christmas trees? Mr. Curole explained that the trees were put in berths in Leeville and Port Fourchon. Dr. Lasseigne asked again if Les Reflections du Bayou would be getting the \$16,200, to which Mr. Curole responded that he would like to have the organization handle the matter and further that he would have to speak to Ms. Susan Terrebonne about the matter. Mr. Lorraine then explained past experiences had due to the Christmas trees placed and inclement weather.

17) *Fund No. 194* *DOTD/DNR Grants*

Mr. Curole said that appropriate acronym was CIAP, Coastal Impact Assistance Program. He said that what was left of that was the Leon Theriot flood gate.

18) *Fund No. 195* *Morristown Sewerage District*

Dr. Lasseigne inquired as to the schedule of the project. Mr. Curole advised that the contracts had been

signed and that he would find out more on the project. Mr. Lorraine asked if any other grants could be applied for as long as this project was not completed? Mr. Curole said that at the present time, two (2) grants were being applied for.

19) *Fund No. 196 FEMA Acquisition/Elevation*

Mr. Callais asked if the Parish was expecting more of these funds in light of Hurricane Katrina. Mr. Curole stated that he would have thought that the Parish would not have received anymore, but that the Director of Grants and Economic Development had attended a meeting at which it looked like there would be more elevation projects. Mr. Callais asked what was the needed criteria for the elevation projects? Mr. Curole said that he was not aware of the criteria. Mr. Atzenhoffer stated that the area had to have flooded three (3) times and then mentioned one (1) other needed criteria but it was inaudible. Mr. Curole stated that another criteria was the willingness to pay 25% of the costs of the project. Mr. Callais asked Mr. Curole if could get the list of required criteria to him. Mr. Curole reiterated that if the Councilmen were aware of anyone that needed to projects that they should get the information to the Director of Grants and Economic Development. Mr. Atzenhoffer then stated that there was a balance of approximately \$427,000 and then asked where it had been derived from? Mr. Curole stated that he was not exactly sure of the amount, but that there had been an amount of money given to the Parish for Tropical Storm Allison, with which money three (3) or four (4) projects had been done. He said that there would be a remainder of that money that would have to be refunded. Mr. Curole said that the money was left over from Tropical Storm Allison projects. Dr. Lasseigne then asked if that money was not used, if it would have to be returned? Mr. Curole stated that yes, the money would have to be returned. He said that a letter was sent to the Parish relating to the current State indictments, and that the letter from the State had requested documentation on all of the projects. Mr. Curole said that the suggestion that had been heard was that the Parish would owe \$900,000. He said that was not what the letter from the State had said, but that the State was requesting records in order to explain why they had not done their paperwork.

20) *Fund No. 601 Internal Service Fund-Workers' Comp*

Dr. Lasseigne asked if this was self-insured Workers' Compensation? Mrs. Chiasson stated that the Parish had an actuary come in review the matter and that the way the money was allocated was based on an amount per person, per job description, as stated by the State. She said that the State provided a job description and a percentage that the Parish had to maintain for each particular position. Mrs. Chiasson said that the actuary had set up a five (5) year plan because at one time the Workers' Comp fund had a larger fund balance than what had been needed. She said that the amount had been being decreased in order to get the fund balance in line. Mrs. Chiasson said that the actuary came in annually to re-evaluate the status of the fund. Dr. Lasseigne asked where the revenues from the Charges For Services was derived from, asking if the Parish billed itself for it? Mrs. Chiasson responded yes. Dr. Lasseigne asked if this fund helped offset regular Workers' Compensation or if it was the only Workers' Compensation that the Parish had? Mrs. Chiasson said that this fund was the Workers' Compensation that the Parish had. Dr. Lasseigne then said that if there was an \$800,000 claim, money would have to be found. He then asked if there was a rider for a claim that would be over \$100,000 or \$200,000? Mr. Curole said that he believed that there was an insurance type policy that was similar to the liability policy, in that the Parish was responsible for a deductible. He said that Mr. Seth Holloway, Risk Manager, could attend the meetings in order to explain the matter further. Mr. Atzenhoffer then inquired as to the amount of \$42,412 for Salaries, noting that on Tab 8, page 22 of the budget the amount was \$50,584.41. Mr. Curole said that he would check into the matter.

Dr. Lasseigne noted that the 2005 projected Capital Outlay projects that had not yet commenced, were not in the 2006 Capital Outlay. He said that it was his interpretation that the projects should be either commenced or rolled over into the 2006 Capital Outlay. Dr. Lasseigne asked how that issue would be approached before the end of the 2005 year? Mr. Curole stated that he had spoken to President Randolph and the Department Heads, and that a list of projects that the Parish did not think could be gotten to would be brought to possibly the first Council meeting in December 2005. He said that the Home Rule Charter provided

that other projects automatically rolled over, but that at looking at the document at hand, he noted that not every one of the rolled over projects were listed. Mr. Curole said that the 2005 listing would have to be looked at in order to determine which projects would not be done, so that a resolution could be done on each project. He then asked if the Council would prefer the resolutions to be done separately or as a list. Dr. Lasseigne inquired if Mr. Curole was asking if the resolution would say that the projects had not started but that they would be continued or cancelled? Mr. Curole said he meant that a decision would be made on the project one way or another. Mr. Lorraine stated that if newer projects were decided to be done, then the 2005 projects would be pushed aside. Mr. Curole stated that the idea was that the projects should either be started, or have them come back to the Council. Mr. Lorraine said that if the projects had been included, then there had been a reason and purpose for having them. Mr. Curole stated that he agreed. He said that he hoped that a lot of the projects would be started before the end of the year, adding that there had been a lot of projects in the budget that there was not enough time to get to. Mr. Curole said that one (1) of the line items that he thought to be problematic was the \$202,000 in Recreation, which he said a certain amounts of dollars were not specified for certain projects. He said that he was trying to figure out what to do with that particular line item. Chairman Matherne advised Mr. Lorraine that the Council would either roll the project over, or cancel it. Dr. Lasseigne said that if nothing was done until the first meeting of December 2005, that it would be too late to amend the budget and have it included in Capital Outlay for 2005. He said that he understood that the amount would automatically be included, to which Mr. Curole said he was right.

Mr. Brennan Matherne noted to Chairman Matherne that on the next two (2) special meeting agendas that Recreation was scheduled for discussion. Dr. Lasseigne said that the reason for Recreation being scheduled that way was because some of the Rededication Funds went to buildings and/or public health, which he stated Recreation had some with buildings and public health. Mr. Matherne stated that his concern was that directors from the various districts had been invited to the November 15, 2005 special meeting in order to discuss the formula used for distribution of funds to the recreation districts.

Mrs. Chiasson requested that if the Council had any questions regarding the next set of funds to be discussed at the November 15, 2005 special meeting, that they be e-mailed to her so that they could be prepared for.

Mr. Curole stated that he wanted to thank everyone, and added that he thought the meeting had gone well.

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

On **motion** by Mr. Phillip Gouaux, seconded by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne, and with no further business, the Lafourche Parish Council Special Meeting of November 14, 2005 **adjourned** at 7:28 p.m.

---

**MICHAEL MATHERNE, CHAIRMAN  
LAFOURCHE PARISH COUNCIL**

---

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