

NOVEMBER 28, 2006
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, NOVEMBER 28, 2006 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. Brent Callais, Chairman, who then stated that the Lafourche Parish Council was ready for the transaction of business at 6:02 p.m.

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

PRESENT: Mr. Michael Matherne Mr. Lindel Toups
Mr. Phillip Gouaux Mr. Brent Callais, Chairman
Dr. Tommy Lasseigne Mr. Michael Delatte
Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer, Vice-Chair
Mrs. Charlotte Randolph, Parish President
Mr. Daniel Lorraine (*left at 10:28 p.m.*)
Mr. Tyrone Williams (*left at 10:32 p.m.*)

ABSENT:

APPROVAL OF COUNCIL MINUTES

The next item (1) on the agenda was a motion to accept the minutes of the November 14, 2006 Regular Session meeting. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Michael Delatte and seconded by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer to accept the November 14, 2006 minutes. The minutes were **approved** by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays.

The next item (2) on the agenda was a motion to accept the minutes of the November 15, 2006 Special Session meeting. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and seconded by Mr. Michael Delatte to accept the November 15, 2006 minutes. The minutes were **approved** by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays.

The next item (3) on the agenda was a motion to accept the minutes of the November 16, 2006 Special Session meeting. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and seconded by Mr. Phillip Gouaux to accept the November 16, 2006 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 wishing to address the Council.

Mr. Maurice Robichaux, a resident of Raceland, Louisiana, addressed the Council and voiced

in detail his concerns regarding garbage disposal and recycling, as well as an alternative to the current disposal and recycling system. Mr. Matherne asked Mr. Robichaux if he was in favor of recycling, to which Mr. Robichaux responded in the affirmative.

Mrs. C. Cathy Norman, Secretary/Treasurer of Edward Wisner Donation, next addressed the Council regarding the Lafourche Beachfront Development District. She began by stating that she managed 35,000 acres in South Louisiana in south Lafourche Parish for a trust that included beneficiaries for the City of New Orleans Charity Hospital, which she said was the State of Louisiana, the Salvation Army and Tulane University. Ms. Norman stated that that included most of the beachfront from Belle Pass to Bayou Thunder. She said that she was aware that the Council was considering the new Beachfront Development District and that she wanted to reiterate more than what she had handed out at the last meeting regarding this matter. Ms. Norman then explained the problems had on the beach as well as the progress on the beach. She stated that Wisner had participated in quite a few projects to restore the beach, including NOAA (National Oceanic & Atmospheric Administration) community based project that was an \$800,000 project that put up 7,000 linear feet of beach fencing and planted 2,500 plants on the beach. Ms. Norman stated that also, in the past two (2) years she had formed the Fourchon Region Restoration Initiative (FRRI) with stakeholders in the area that include Louisiana Offshore Oil Port (LOOP), Shell, Chevron, the Greater Lafourche Port Commission and the Edward Wisner Donation. She stated that other members of the FRRI organization included Mr. Wendell Curole and Mr. Kerry St. Pe. Ms. Norman stated that the goal for FRRI was to push forward the Caminada Headland Project, which she stated was shown on the map included in the packet she had supplied the Council with. She explained that it was a restoration project that had been in the works for several years and had been moving up the list. Ms. Norman explained that in the past two (2) years they had been working with contractors to do cores, collect scientific data, and stated that archeological studies had been done on the property. She then informed the Council that the new project manager from the Corps of Engineers was present at the meeting. Ms. Norman stated that this project was a billion dollar project to restore and maintain the beach for fifty (50) years, saying that construction was \$285 million with the balance of the money for maintenance. She stated that they were of the belief that the final project report should be completed by the end of next year. Ms. Norman stated that her concern with the formation of the Beachfront Development District was that there would be some type of "land grab" in the area that could potentially create litigation that would make the project spoken of earlier untouchable by the federal government. Ms. Norman stated that she was very concerned about it. She said that she did not think that the goals they had in the area were dissimilar from anyone on the Council and that she believed that the Council had the well being of a natural resource and the economic well being of lower Lafourche in mind. Ms. Norman stated that was what they were trying to do. She then invited the Council to the next Fourchon Region Restoration Initiative meeting, stating that it would be held at Chevron's office at 10:00 on December 11, 2006. She continued to briefly speak on the matter. Ms. Norman stated that she was aware that there was a public push for access to beach, saying that the only reason that there had not been access to the beach was because the bridge had been out. Ms. Norman stated that as soon as the bridge was repaired there should continue to be access to the beach. She stated that trying to build something else now or do something else now when in fact the entire plan that the Corps had, interrupting herself by saying that she had met with the real estate people with the Corps and that she had been on the beach with

them spending an entire day with DNR (Department of Natural Resources) and the Corps real estate people in May of 2006. Ms. Norman said that part of the project was public access to the beach. She said that this was a large project and would take some time. Ms. Norman stated that she did not want to see the project jeopardized by some different parallel project that may interfere with the progress they were trying to make. She then briefly explained the handout she had given to the Council, speaking of a photograph which showed a “big rig” on the beach, an e-mail received from Mr. Tab Guidry, who she said ran the Chevron Unit that sat on the beach with regards to the problems he has had and also some maps showing what some of the plans and ownerships in the area were. She continued to briefly speak on the matter. Dr. Lasseigne asked Ms. Norman how many acres were had in Lafourche Parish, to which Mrs. Norman stated 35,000. She explained that 22,000 were in the Wisner Wildlife Management Area, which she said was leased to the Department of Wildlife and Fisheries for recreational use by the citizens of the State of Louisiana. Dr. Lasseigne clarified that this was all of Lafourche Parish? Ms. Norman stated that it was all Lafourche Parish. Dr. Lasseigne then asked how much taxes were paid on the property owned? Ms. Norman stated that it was owned by the City of New Orleans. Dr. Lasseigne asked what was the answer to his question, to which Ms. Norman stated none. Dr. Lasseigne clarified that no taxes were paid on the property and that they had 35,000 acres and paid no taxes, to which Ms. Norman stated that was correct. She said that they gave twelve (12%) percent of the revenue to the State of Louisiana. Dr. Lasseigne asked how did that help Lafourche Parish? Mrs. Norman stated that she thought that Lafourche Parish was helped a great deal by the economic development on their property, saying that they lease to the Port and that she thought that the Port created a lot of revenue for the Parish of Lafourche. Dr. Lasseigne stated that it does and that they paid a lot taxes. He said that they leased the property and collected lease money but paid no taxes on the property, to which Ms. Norman stated that that was right.

PRESENTATIONS

The next item (4) on the agenda was Mrs. Beverly Arabie, Lafourche Parish Public Library, who gave a 2007 annual budget presentation. Mrs. Arabie began by informing the Council that she had supplied them with two (2) packets of information, explaining that one (1) was for their budget. She then invited everyone, including the public, to two (2) grand openings on Saturday, December 1, 2006 at 10:00 a.m. for the Raceland Library Grand Opening and at 1:00 p.m. for the Bayou Blue Library Grand Opening. She then went on to explain in detail the contents of the packet containing their budget information and invited the Council to contact her with any questions at the present time or in the future. Mr. Matherne inquired as to the capital outlay process for the Thibodaux site? Mrs. Arabie stated that currently there were three (3) capital outlay projects, naming those as being for Larose, Lockport and Thibodaux. She stated that they were very basic minimum accounts at the present time. Mrs. Arabie stated that they were in the process of transferring funds into those accounts that would be invested and then as money was needed it would go from the investment account into the checking account. Mr. Matherne asked if the land for the Thibodaux site had been procured? Ms. Arabie stated not yet and then said that she had spoken to Mr. Cullen Curole, Parish Administrator, about it and that he would have to answer Mr. Matherne’s question. Mr. Curole stated that he was working on it and that he would like to have something for the next meeting agenda of the Council regarding the matter. Mrs. Arabie then explained that the second packet of

information given to the Council was information that she had given to potential lessees of the coffee shop in Galliano. She said that it may be impossible, with the costs of everything, for the coffee shop to be leased out and that they may have to run it themselves. Mrs. Arabie asked that the Council review the information given on the matter and to advise what they thought of the ideas for the lease and proposal of the coffee shop.

The next item (5) on the agenda was Mr. Kevin Belanger, South Central Planning and Development, who gave a presentation on building codes. Mr. Atzenhoffer mentioned that Item (35) on the November 28, 2006 agenda was a proposed ordinance that may deal with some of the things to be discussed by Mr. Belanger. Mr. Belanger began stating that he had supplied to the Council a brief synopsis of accomplishments over the last seven (7) or eight (8) months. He spoke about Act 12 of the Special Session of 2005 regarding building codes in January 2007. Mr. Belanger explained that they had met with various parishes and municipalities to find out what processes and procedures that they would be putting in place to be able to offset the impact of trying to find the labor and the ability to do what was needed in their own constraints. He said that they had quickly found out that there was not a lot of activity throughout the region, nor throughout the State. Mr. Belanger explained that South Central Planning and Development had put forth, with the help of all of the parishes and municipalities, a model by which they could regionalize the effort to overall bring the costs of building permits to the homeowners down. He continued to speak of the efforts they had expended to reach that goal. Mr. Belanger explained that they had created a cooperative endeavor agreement which he stated was asking for South Central Planning and Development to be able to move forward on behalf of the parishes and be able to apply on their behalf for funding to be able to implement the program. He said that they would need a unified front from all of the parishes and municipalities in order to get this done. Mr. Belanger stated that they were asking that the Council provide a resolution allowing President Randolph to sign the cooperative endeavor agreement which he said would allow them to move forward. He then spoke about another content in the packet, naming that as being the "By-Laws" or Rules of Procedures, saying that this would be how the overall process would function. He continued to speak on the matter briefly. Mr. Belanger then spoke about a third content of the packet supplied, saying that was the permit fees. He said that this had been discussed over a period of four (4) to five (5) months with all the parishes involved and most of the municipalities. Mr. Belanger stated that they had had some constraints and wanted to make sure that this program was a revenue neutral process by which none of the parishes would have to put forth any money for the process and added that they were trying to maintain that. He said that this was not only to start it up but to operate it. Mr. Belanger said that with regards to the permit fees, they had analyzed the amount of residential permits that were being taken regionally and divided it by the man hours that they assumed would be needed and had come to the collective conclusion that forty-six (46¢) cents per square foot was going to be the required fee for any new dwelling. He explained that that meant that if there was a 2,500 square foot home, the permit fee, which he said would include the administration, the plan review and also all of the inspections, would cost approximately \$1,150. Mr. Belanger stated that they knew that this was a large sum of money but that they could not get around the fact that the inspections had to be done on the homes. He continued to speak on the matter in detail, including the number of inspections per home, the types of inspections needed and the certified personnel needed for the inspections and charges being charged for said inspections. Mr. Belanger stated that they felt that the \$1,150 cost was not an

insurmountable amount of money to overcome given the fact that the private sector side had to be able to charge the fees to cover their overhead, etc. He then informed the Council that with regards to the commercial side it would be at sixty (60¢) cents per square foot. Mr. Belanger then explained that the last part of the packet provided included a model ordinance drafted by the Louisiana Municipal's Association, which he said they had reviewed and collectively agreed that it was a model ordinance that should be adopted. He stated that this did not institute the Administrative Code, which he said would be forthcoming to the Council for approval and as well as what it would cover. Mr. Belanger stated that the State had not expended any money but had allocated roughly \$11 million to the most effected parishes, saying Lafourche was one of the most effected parishes initially but was unfortunately taken out. He said that they were working with Senator Reggie Dupre, Jr. and would be working with President Randolph to have Lafourche included, adding that they had no idea why Lafourche had been taken out, saying that Lafourche should not have been taken out as it had been in the Presidential-declared disaster area and there was no reason for Lafourche to be eliminated and Washington Parish to be included. He said that they would be working very hard to try and get Lafourche Parish back included. Mr. Belanger then stated that on November 29, 2006 that the Department of Public Safety would be hearing back from FEMA on the approval of \$14 million allocated statewide for which they would be applying for roughly \$2 million of. He stated that the fire marshals, DPS, and the Uniform Code Council of the State were very much endorsing the model that South Central Planning and Development had produced along with various building officials throughout the region. Mr. Belanger stated that that application would most likely go to DPS in approximately two (2) weeks and for which they hoped to be awarded, adding that from what they were hearing they would get the award. He continued to speak on the matter in detail. Dr. Lasseigne asked if the trade permits were in addition to the square footage issue, to which Mr. Belanger stated yes. Mr. Belanger explained that if someone came in with a new home that the permits were already included in the fee. Dr. Lasseigne clarified that it was included in the forty-six (46¢) cents per square foot for residential structures, to which Mr. Belanger stated that was correct that it was already included. Mr. Belanger then stated that with regards to a rehab on a home which required mechanical or plumbing that was what would have to be paid for the inspectors. Dr. Lasseigne then asked if the structural was included in the main fee, to which Mr. Belanger stated that was correct. Mr. Belanger said that they were not designing houses and that the applicant would have to find a structural engineer if there were structural issues. He said that they would provide the plan review. Dr. Lasseigne clarified the plan review was included in the fee, to which Mr. Belanger stated that was correct. Dr. Lasseigne said that what concerned him was the commercial aspect, mentioning a building he was currently building and saying that the permit fee for the building would cost \$21,600. He said that a Wal-mart at 80,000 feet would be being asked to pay \$48,000 for an inspector. Mr. Belanger stated that was not untypical. Discussions on the matter continued. Dr. Lasseigne stated that for \$48,000 an inspector could be hired for a year. Mr. Belanger said that there would always be the ability to hire a private/third party contractor. Dr. Lasseigne then pointed out that Golden Meadow was not included in the list of parishes and municipalities. Mr. Belanger apologized if they had been left out but that it was not intentional, explaining that as of November 28, 2006 the parishes were not a part of the cooperative endeavor at the request of the City of Thibodaux, saying they had asked that all municipalities be included. Dr. Lasseigne asked if there would not be a redundancy of doing various permits such as fireworks stands and Mardi Gras

viewing stands and Change of Occupancies through South Central Planning and Development, asking if the Parish would be eliminating its department? Mr. Belanger stated that that could still be handled by the Parish. He pointed that they were not saying that by signing the cooperative endeavor agreement that the Parish had to participate in plan review or inspections. Mr. Belanger said that the City of Thibodaux had inspectors at the current time that were certified but that their need was plan reviewers and that was why they wanted to be named a part of this. He said that if the Parish desired to keep its employees involved in a specific issue that that would be able to be done.

ADMINISTRATIVE REPORT(S)

The next item (6) on the agenda was presentation of WOW (Wonderful Outstanding Worker) candidates and the Employee of the Month for October 2006. President Randolph announced that the Ms. Anissa McGuire of Head Start and Ms. Robin Cheramie of Community Action were recipients of the WOW award. She then announced that the Employee of the Month was Mrs. Trudy Tastet the Permit Department.

Mrs. Shannon Chiasson, Finance Director, next gave a visual finance report which she explained in detail and included the following topics:

Finance Report
November 28, 2006

Shannon Chiasson, Finance Director

September 2006 Financials

Electronically

- Royalty Revenue Report
- Road Sales Tax Report
- Operating Statements
- Debt Service Report
- Budget Summary Statement

Link <http://www.lafourchegov.org/lafourchegov/Finance-Reports.aspx>.

Operating Statements

Special Revenue Funds

- _____ 101 thru 111
- 114
- 116 thru 118
- 123
- 127-129
- 181

General Fund

_____ 001

Capital Funds

- 201
- 206
- 299

Royalty Revenues

	<u>2005</u>	<u>2006</u>
July	400,101	341,318
August	378,289	289,439
September	381,713	259,153
October	402,585	346,700
YTD Total	4,412,511	3,103,573

<u>Road Sales Tax District #2</u>	
October 2004	\$348,134
October 2005	\$355,054
October 2006	\$490,846
YTD 2006	\$4,311,002

<u>Road Sales Tax District #3</u>	
October 2004	\$ 59,119
October 2005	\$ 77,946
October 2006	\$ 98,734
YTD 2006	\$930,180

<u>Road Sales Tax District #5</u>	
October 2004	\$ 79,921
October 2005	\$ 80,011
October 2006	\$110,855
YTD 2006	\$ 996,237

<u>Road Sales Tax District #6</u>	
October 2004	\$ 70,304
October 2005	\$ 77,428
October 2006	\$ 104,112
YTD 2006	\$945,402

<u>Solid Waste</u>	
October 2004	\$ 429,158
October 2005	\$ 456,098
October 2006	\$ 596,957
YTD 2006	\$5,409,941

<u>Annual/Monthly Sales Tax Receipts</u>		
	<u>MONTH</u>	<u>YTD</u>
October 2006	\$1,401,506	12,592,468
October 2005	\$1,046,539	9,247,700
October 2004	\$ 986,637	9,519,806
October 2003	\$ 937,330	8,905,818

<u>Annual Debt Service</u>		
2007	\$6,180,043.75	
2008	\$6,178,143.75	
2009-2015	~\$3,682,363.75	
2007 Bond Parity		\$2,974,000
<u>The End</u>		

ENGINEERS/ARCHITECTS REPORT

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. Richard Weimer, Architect, reported on the Animal Shelter. He stated that the Louisiana Technical College was building the office building of the Animal Shelter and further that they were nearing completion. Mr. Weimer said that the official completion date was December 15, 2006 but that they had moved it up to December 11, 2006. He then said that the building would be moved on December 12, 2006 by Nick Martinolich to the permanent site. Mr. Weimer then stated that a few things were remaining, naming some of those as being the installation of the inside doors and interior painting/touch up work, reception counter and restroom cabinet. Mr. Weimer said that once the building was moved that M& H Builders would finish off the building on site, naming such things as the building of a ramp to the building, steps, plumbing work, electrical work, air conditioning work, connecting everything to the utilities and concrete paving work as being the things needing to be done. He said that this work should start on December 18, 2006 and that in the contract the

contractor was given ninety (90) days, saying that officially the completion date would be March 17, 2007. Mr. Matherne asked whether the building butted up against the shelter? Mr. Weimer stated that there was a walkway connection from the office building to the existing building. Mr. Matherne then asked if the office building would be sitting on pillars? Mr. Weimer said that the office building would be sitting on pillars, adding that the foundation was in the ground already and that there would be some pre-cast pillars that would sit on the foundation. Mr. Curole pointed out that the completion of the building at the Technical College was set for December 15, 2006. He said that in a recent newspaper article that it had been stated by the President of the Animal Shelter Advisory Board that the administrative portion of the shelter would be opening on December 15, 2006. Mr. Curole stated that the building still needed to be moved to the permanent site and had to be finished at the site, saying that it was still approximately three (3) months from the opening of that part of the facility. He continued to clarify the fact that the administrative office building would not be opening on December 15, 2006 and that that date was only a contract end date for the technical college to finish it. Mr. Matherne then asked Mr. Weimer how parking would be addressed at the permanent site, to which Mr. Weimer stated that there was presently some parking had for approximately six (6) to seven (7) vehicles. He stated that parking could also be done further into the Detention Center site on the gravel road present. Mr. Atzenhoffer clarified with Mr. Weimer that all of the work on the building would not be completed in the current year, to which Mr. Weimer agreed. Mr. Atzenhoffer then pointed out that he had not found anything in the budget rolling over funds to the 2007 year. Mr. Curole stated that it should, and that that happened by law. He said that the Council would get an update of the section that dealt with rollovers and that they could get it to them after the budget was approved and after the first of the year. Mr. Curole reiterated that the process occurred by law. He stated that this would be an oversight if the rollover was not included as some part of the contract. Mr. Curole continued to briefly speak on the matter. Mr. Weimer then reported on the waterproofing of the Historic Courthouse. He stated that JaRoy Construction Company was the contractor and that they were approximately ninety-seven (97%) percent complete. Mr. Weimer listed a few things remaining to be finished as being cleaning and putting in the windows, coating and painting the north elevation of the building and also a recess on the eastside that needed to be finished off, as well as caulking work on the front entrance, a few areas of rough work that had to be redone and finishing the painting of the exterior doors. He then explained that they had also ran out of materials, saying that the materials would be in Monday, December 4, 2006 and that they should be finished by December 15, 2006.

Mr. Larry J. Picciola, Larry J. Picciola, Inc., next gave an engineering report on Road Sales Tax Districts 3,5 and 6 projects attached hereto as Exhibit 1. Mr. Atzenhoffer inquired as to Project 3J as being Lake Long Drive and asked if this could possibly be added to Project 3F as the area would already be in and that it was only one street in Project 3J? Mr. Picciola stated that he had spoken to the Administration about doing that. President Randolph offered a comment on the subject but it was inaudible. Mr. Toups inquired as to Project 3B, Lower Bayou Blue, and Bouquet Street, asking why the culverts were so bad on the street to equal to \$47,000? Mr. Toups asked if this street was an old street? Mr. Picciola said that the street had been there a while and that all of the culverts had rotted out. Mr. Atzenhoffer informed Mr. Toups that there was no street left. He explained that when one was going from Terrebonne Parish to Lafourche Parish on Texas Gulf Road, the first street on the right would be Bouquet Street. Dr. Lasseigne mentioned something about Parkside and then inquired as to the concrete panels project, pointing out that Mr. Picciola said that it was ninety-five (95%) percent complete. Mr. Picciola said that they still had Brandywine left. Dr. Lasseigne said and Parkside if Mr. Picciola felt that it was appropriate to do something on Parkside.

He then asked about Lefort By-Pass Road, and mentioned that there had been an issue between Mr. David Heck and "Mr. Duplantis" and asked if that was proceeding? Mr. Curole said that it was proceeding in that he had an idea and elaborated and stated the would like to sit with Mr. Heck and then Mr. Duplantis regarding the matter. He said that he was saying that it was proceeding but that it was not proceeding because of a disagreement between Mr. Heck and Mr. Duplantis. Mr. Curole reiterated that he had an idea on the matter and that he would like to speak to Dr. Lasseigne about it, as well as Mr. Heck and Mr. Duplantis. He continued to briefly speak on the matter. Mr. Gouaux then asked if there was something that the Council needed to do with regards to new development and concrete panels to try and avoid the repairs that were currently being had? He voiced that the concrete panels were very expensive to replace and continued to voice his concerns in detail with concrete panels. Mr. Picciola stated that concrete panels were concrete and that they would crack. He stated that he would think that the only thing that could be done would be that in the process there was certification from the engineer saying that that panel was put in according to design. He said that there were design parameters that the Planning Commission required be done. Mr. Picciola said that in lieu of having more inspections from the Department of Public Works, that before the concrete panels were poured that there be soil testing for base density, and concrete testing for the strength of the concrete. He said that maybe those could be strengthened and increase inspections. Mr. Gouaux inquired as to whether Mr. Picciola thought in his opinion that excessive problems were being had with concrete streets, to which Mr. Picciola stated no, saying that some of the concrete streets had were just old streets and that eventually they would crack. He said that in the newer subdivisions better control was had at the current time then in previous time, saying that Fantastic Acres was probably one of the first concrete streets in the area and that probably it had not had the same requirements that were had at the present time. Mr. Toups then asked how much a mile of concrete street cost versus blacktop? Mr. Picciola stated that concrete streets cost approximately forty (40%) percent more. Mr. Toups mentioned the proposing of an ordinance that stated that when new streets were built that they were blacktopped. He voiced his concerns for future council members when these concrete streets would need to be redone. Mr. Toups then asked what authority stated that concrete streets had to be used? Mr. Picciola stated that it was the developer's choice and further that the Council had in an ordinance an asphalt option and concrete street option. Discussions on the matter continued, with Mr. Picciola stating that he would think that there would be more problems with blacktop as it would be harder to control. Dr. Lasseigne asked Mr. Picciola if six (6") inches was currently required in concrete streets, to which Mr. Picciola stated that it was six (6") inches of concrete, 4,000 psi without any reinforcement and ninety-five (95%) percent density on the base. Dr. Lasseigne stated that it was obvious that if the density was increased that a better product would be had. Discussions then began on having eight (8") inch dense concrete streets.

Mr. Joseph Caillouet, JBC/AIA, next reported on the Health Unit project and the parish library projects. He stated that of the four (4) parish libraries that were under construction, each one had reached a substantial completion and had been occupied, naming those as being the Galliano, Raceland, Bayou Blue and Choctaw/Six Ward libraries. Mr. Caillouet stated that the Choctaw/Six Ward library was completed approximately a few weeks prior with the fire marshal approval. He went on to say that all four (4) projects had been given a punch list and that was being worked on with the contractor to finish the punch list items. Mr. Caillouet stated that they had retainage money held back on each of the projects and then stated that the one that would be the most difficult one would be the Choctaw/Six Ward where there was a lot of discussions on the time frame that the project was completed. He stated that he had notified the Administration that some type of meeting

with Gen-Con, Inc. was needed to discuss payments of the Choctaw/Six Ward project in particular. Mr. Caillouet said that overall the projects were at a good stage and that he was pleased at where they were at. He said that it seemed that it was just human nature with contractors when it came to punch lists to get them present to complete it. He said that steps were being made to do so. Mr. Caillouet then informed the Council that work had begun on the Larose facility and the design drawings were presented to the Library Board on November 27, 2006 which he said had been approved. He then spoke about at an agenda item on the November 28, 2006 meeting agenda that would authorize him to proceed on the Lockport facility. Mr. Caillouet stated that with regards to the Health Unit project, that he was pleased to say that the second phase of the Health Unit had been accepted by the fire marshal on Monday, November 27, 2006 and that there were no additional changes. He said the entire project, the new addition which had been approved by the fire marshal several months prior, as well as the renovation to the project, was concluded. Mr. Caillouet said that the whole building was substantially complete and they were currently compiling a punch list on the project. He said that there were no additional change orders, saying that he had mentioned and indicated to the Council a few months previously when the fire marshal walk through had been done that the fire marshal had come down on them for some fire stops in the attic that were not in the original drawing and were not in the fire marshal's review letter, adding that basically when the fire marshal had done his review and had said that fire stops needed to be put. He said that a price had been obtained from BETCO in the amount of approximately \$8,000, saying that was the only change order barring the work that was done with Hurricane Katrina. Mr. Caillouet said that he was pleased to say that on a \$1.6 million project to only have an approximate \$8,000 change order said a lot about the contractor and their ability to communicate what the project was about. He invited the Council to view the Health Unit, adding that he thought that they would be pleased to see what had been concluded there. Dr. Lasseigne asked if the fire stops had been put between the new building and the addition, to which Mr. Caillouet stated that they were in the attic every 3,000 square feet and that there was one (1) that had been put between the existing building and the new addition. He said that had been none in the old part of the building and that they had never been asked for. Mr. Caillouet stated that they had not put them in the new addition either and that they had not been asked for. Dr. Lasseigne asked if one (1) had been put in the new building, to which Mr. Caillouet stated approximately one (1) or two (2), just to separate them into a maximum of 3,000 square feet. Dr. Lasseigne then asked how many days the Choctaw/Six Ward project was over, to which Mr. Caillouet stated that they would be sitting down to discuss that and would do so with anyone who wanted to be involved. Dr. Lasseigne clarified that the building was currently being occupied, to which Mr. Caillouet responded that building was being occupied. Mr. Atzenhoffer mentioned a notice to proceed which was on the November 28, 2006 agenda and then asked Mr. Caillouet to explain the process involved and whether it would give a notice to proceed to Mr. Caillouet with the actual design from concept? Mr. Caillouet clarified that Mr. Atzenhoffer was speaking of the Lockport facility, to which he said yes. He said that the resolution would authorize the Administration to correspond with him and then went on to say that before any project was undertaken he had to receive a letter from the Administration to proceed on the project. Mr. Caillouet said that the Lockport project was the next one. Mr. Atzenhoffer asked if the Council would be able to view the plans before the project was bid? Mr. Caillouet said that if the Council wanted to see them that could be done. He went on to say that the plans for the project had been presented on November 27, 2006 and further that the Larose project had also been presented to the Library Board, as well as the schematic type plan had for the Lockport facility. Mr. Curole stated that he would like to see the notice to proceed on the Larose project as the resolution on the November 27, 2006 agenda was for

Lockport and Larose because he could not find anything from the Council. He went on to say that the contract stated a notice to proceed from the Administration and the Council. A brief discussion ensued.

Mrs. Heather Klingman, Duplantis Design Group, next reported on the Marydale Waterline Improvements project. She stated that the contractor was moving along and was about sixty (60%) percent complete at the present time. Mrs. Klingman said that the substantial completion was on December 6, 2006. She said that the contractor had “rain days” coming to them, saying that they had incurred problems early on in the project with a lot rain that had delayed them. Mrs. Klingman stated that the contractor would be sending a request for the “rain days” which she said would possibly be coming to the Council at the next meeting of December 12, 2006. She went on to say that the project was going fine and that it was kind of slowing going as it was congested work, saying that there were a lot of driveways, fences and shrubbery and that the contractor was taking time and care in order to not damage a lot of things.

LEGAL ADVISOR REPORT

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

2007 BUDGET AMENDMENTS

Dr. Tommy Lasseigne made a **motion** to deviate to Section F, Other Amendments, specifically Amendments 8 through 26, seconded by Mr. Lindel Toups and *carried* by a vote of eight (8) yeas and one (1) nay, that being of Mr. Michael Matherne.

The next item was an amendment entitled:

AMENDMENT 2007-8-CALLAIS-OPERATIONS BUDGET

001 – General Fund – Legislative – 00141100

- 1. Decrease the Audit line of the Legislative – Professional Services fund by \$15,000.*
- 2. Decrease the Legal line of the Legislative – Professional Services fund by \$3,000.*
- 3. Decrease the In State Travel line of the Legislative – Other Services fund by \$5,000.*
- 4. Decrease the Out of State Travel line of the Legislative – Other Services fund by \$15,000.*
- 5. Increase the General Fund Balance of the General Fund by \$28,000*

A **motion** was offered by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and seconded by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne. Mr. Matherne called a point of order, stating that the budget amendments should be submitted in writing three (3) days before the meeting, and then said that he had not received any of these amendments three (3) days before the current meeting. Chairman Callais informed Mr. Matherne that according to the Home Rule Charter that under extraordinary circumstances there could be a simple majority of the Council or by the Chairman to allow the amendments to go forward. He said

that since the Parish Council office was closed half a day on Wednesday, November 22, 2006, and closed on Thursday and Friday for Thanksgiving and also Saturday and Sunday he would allow the amendments to go forward. Chairman Callais said that the Council would vote on them. Mr. Matherne said that he knew that the Home Rule Charter stated that the Chairman could approve them or that the Council could go to a Two-Thirds, but said that his concern was not whether it could be done but whether it should be done. He said that at 11:30 a.m on November 28, 2006, he received \$4.4 million in amendments. Mr. Matherne said that was only six (6) hours prior to the current meeting and that he thought it unreasonable to ask someone to vote for \$4.4 million amendments when only having looked at it for six (6) hours. He said that he thought the Home Rule Charter was there for a reason, so that there was time to digest the amendments and view their appropriateness.. Mr. Matherne went on to say that he was not saying that the amendments were not needed but that he would question the timing of the amendments. He continued to briefly speak on the matter, including when the budget would be adopted. A lengthy discussion ensued with various council members and President Randolph voicing their opinions in detail on the matter. After the lengthy discussion Chairman Callais reminded the Council that there was a motion and second on the floor to discuss Amendment No. 8 and then asked if there was any discussion on Amendment No. 8. Hearing none, Chairman Callais called for a vote. The motion *carried* by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays.

AMENDMENT 2007-8-CALLAIS-OPERATIONS BUDGET

The next item was an amendment entitled:

AMENDMENT 2007-9-LASSEIGNE-OPERATIONS BUDGET

001 – General Fund – Judicial – District Court – 00141202

- 1. Decrease the Guards line of the Judicial – District Court – Miscellaneous fund by \$30,000.*
- 2. Increase the General Fund Balance of the General Fund by \$30,000*

A **motion** was offered by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne and seconded by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer. Dr. Lasseigne explained that this was the matter that had been discussed at a previous Council meeting with Judge Barbera regarding \$60,000 for guards at the Courthouse coming out of the Parish's funds. Dr. Lasseigne stated that he thought the total costs to be \$80,000, with the judges paying \$20,000. He stated that he had spoken to Judge Barbera and had found out that there was possibly \$5,000 from another party. Dr. Lasseigne said that it was not clear as to what and who had to pay for this, so he said he agreed that it was the Parish's building and that the Parish should pay part of it and that the judges wanted it so they had agreed to pay part of it. He said that the Sheriff was the law enforcement and protection division and further that he thought that he should pay part of it. Dr. Lasseigne then informed the Council that he had a resolution to that effect on the November 28, 2006 agenda. Dr. Lasseigne continued to explain his reason for the amendment. The motion *carried* by a vote of eight (8) yeas and one (1) nay, that being of Mr. Phillip Gouaux.

AMENDMENT 2007-9-LASSEIGNE-OPERATIONS BUDGET

The next item was an amendment entitled:

AMENDMENT 2007-10-LASSEIGNE-OPERATIONS BUDGET

001 – General Fund – Executive – 00141502

- 1. Decrease the In State Travel line of the Executive – Other Services fund by \$14,000.*
- 2. Decrease the Out of State Travel line of the Executive – Other Services fund by \$5,000.*
- 3. Decrease the Out of State Lodging line of the Executive – Other Services fund by \$2,000.*
- 4. Increase the General Fund Balance of the General Fund by \$21,000.*

A **motion** was offered by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne and seconded by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer. Mr. Curole expressed his concerns and stated that if a reduction in the amount was wanted, why not reduce the amount back to the 2006 level, which he said would be a \$6,000 decrease instead of cutting \$21,000 out of a \$30,000 line item. He stated that he thought that the travel had produced well for the Parish, commenting on such conferences as NACO and Washington trips as being beneficial. Mr. Curole continued to briefly speak on the matter. President Randolph asked Chairman Callais if she could address Dr. Lasseigne, to which Chairman Callais responded yes. President Randolph asked Dr. Lasseigne “why”? Dr. Lasseigne said that for In State Travel, that he did not understand why that was even had since the Parish President had a vehicle and for a trip to Baton Rouge or New Orleans, that President Randolph could go and come back. He continued to speak on the matter in detail. President Randolph asked if what Dr. Lasseigne has said was an answer, to which Dr. Lasseigne stated it was to save money. President Randolph asked Dr. Lasseigne if he had not seen any benefit from the travel? Dr. Lasseigne said that he stated that he did not understand In State Travel. President Randolph told Dr. Lasseigne that the Police Jury convention had been in Alexandria and that that was a long drive to make everyday. Dr. Lasseigne said that President Randolph had a vehicle. President Randolph asked Dr. Lasseigne if he wanted her to sleep in the vehicle? Mr. Atzenhoffer inquired as to whether the Council could amend an amendment, to which Chairman Callais responded in the affirmative. Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer stated that he had a problem with the decrease the In State Travel line of the Executive – Other Services fund by \$14,000 when the amount shown was \$11,000. A brief discussion then ensued between Mr. Atzenhoffer and Dr. Lasseigne with regards to the proper place the amount of \$14,000 was being shown. President Randolph interjected and stated that the amounts shown were not only for her travel but for the entire Executive Department, which included every department head and the personnel under them. She reiterated that this was not just a one person budget but was for the entire Executive Department. After a continuing conversation with regards to the correct place of the amount being spoken of was located, Dr. Lasseigne clarified that there was In State Travel on page 11, as well as In State Mileage, In State Meals, In State Travel, Out Of State Travel, Out Of State Meals and Out Of State Lodging. He said that those items calculated to be \$31,000. He said that instead of taking smaller amounts from each individual line item, he had just taken \$14,000 from In State Travel. Dr. Lasseigne said that President Randolph could put it back and that everyone knew that she could put all of it back into In State Travel. He said that it was just something coming

out of the total amount and that was the reason it was the was it was. The motion *carried* by a vote of five (5) yeas and four (4) nays, that being of Mr. Michael Delatte, Mr. Michael Matherne, Mr. Phillip Gouaux and Mr. Tyrone Williams.

AMENDMENT 2007-10-LASSEIGNE-OPERATIONS BUDGET

The next item was an amendment entitled:

AMENDMENT 2007-11-CALLAIS-OPERATIONS BUDGET

001 – General Fund – Finance – 00141501

- 1. Decrease the Consulting line of the Finance – Professional Services fund by \$26,400.*
- 2. Increase the General Fund Balance of the General Fund by \$26,400.*

A **motion** was offered by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and seconded by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne. Mr. Matherne inquired as to what this line item was usually used for? Mrs. Chiasson stated that this was for some of the MUNIS training. She stated that when new modules were added that the company had to be paid to come and set it up and train personnel on it. President Randolph said that some of the particular modules were getting the permits online so that people could do the permits online rather than having to visit the Permit Office. Dr. Lasseigne stated that this was part of the information that they had not had and that it was some of the questions that the Council had asked such as why amounts had increased dramatically. He stated that the Parish had had MUNIS for two (2) years and that for \$38,000 a MUNIS expert could be hired to work for the Parish. The motion *carried* by a vote of seven (7) yeas and two (2) nays, that being of Mr. Phillip Gouaux and Mr. Michael Matherne.

AMENDMENT 2007-11-CALLAIS-OPERATIONS BUDGET

The next item was an amendment entitled:

AMENDMENT 2007-12-CALLAIS-OPERATIONS BUDGET

001 – General Fund – Information Technology – 00141512

- 1. Decrease the Consulting line of the Information Technology – Professional Services fund by \$35,600.*
- 2. Increase the General Fund Balance of the General Fund by \$35,600.*

A **motion** was offered by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and seconded by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne. Mr. Atzenhoffer explained that the 2006 Budget had been \$7,200 and that it had gone to \$45,600. He said from his understanding that the explanation for that was because it was for web posting. A brief discussion ensued over web posting. Mrs. Chiasson stated that this was for the network, saying that the Parish had a person that handled the network which she said was different from Information Technology. President Randolph said that it was difficult to answer these questions being asked as quickly when they had had less than five (5) hours to review them. She said that they knew the

budget pretty well but that it was things that were difficult to explain. President Randolph then stated that she and Mr. Curole had actually gone over the amendments while traveling to a meeting. She continued to reiterate that to answer some of the questions at the present time would be difficult. Mr. Atzenhoffer stated that this was part of the special meetings had on the budget. Mrs. Chiasson stated that that was part of it, an explained that there was \$300 that was paid to South Central Planning for hosting the Parish's website, monies paid for the Parish's information system package, annual hardware maintenance, annual software licenses, and the network administration. She advised Mr. Atzenhoffer if that was done away with then the Parish would not have any licenses for any of the software used. Mr. Atzenhoffer asked how did the amount go from \$7,000 to \$45,000? Mr. Curole stated that the difference was that the network administration contract was contained in Finance in 2006 but was now being put in Information Technology. He said that was the biggest difference of the costs, an expense that was formally in Finance being put in Information Technology. Dr. Lasseigne said that he thought that if the Council would have gotten clear explanations on any of the items, that they would have been fine with them. Dr. Tommy Lasseigne **removed** his second and Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer **removed** his motion. Mr. Atzenhoffer requested a detail list of the items contained in the \$45,600 budget regarding this matter. This was withdrawn.
BUDGET AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

The next item was an amendment entitled:

AMENDMENT 2007-13-ATZENHOFFER-OPERATIONS BUDGET

001 – General Fund – Corrections – 00142300

- 1. Decrease the Service Contract line of the Corrections – Operating Services fund by \$10,000.*
- 2. Increase the General Fund Balance of the General Fund by \$10,000.*

A **motion** was offered by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and seconded by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne. Mr. Curole stated that the explanation that he had gotten regarding this matter had to do with the variety of service contracts like the “bug man”, the service contract with whatever entity allowed the video camera service that allowed the Detention Center to not have all inmates to have to be driven to the Courthouse and a variety of other contracts similar to those named that occurred at the Detention Center. Mr. Atzenhoffer commented on the lack of information given by the Sheriff on this matter. Dr. Tommy Lasseigne **removed** his second and Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer **removed** his motion. This amendment was withdrawn.

BUDGET AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

The next item was an amendment entitled:

AMENDMENT 2007-14-ATZENHOFFER-OPERATIONS BUDGET

001 – General Fund – Public Works – 00143500

1. *Decrease the Salaries line of the Public Works – Salary & Wages fund by \$90,000.*
2. *Decrease the Life/Health line of the Public Works – Employee Benefits fund by \$30,000.*
3. *Decrease the Legal line of the Public Works – Professional Services fund by \$90,000.*
4. *Decrease the Weed Control line of the Public Works – Professional Services fund by \$200,000.*
5. *Decrease the Equipment <\$15,000 line of the Public Works – Capital Outlay fund by \$10,000.*
6. *Increase the General Fund Balance of the General Fund by \$420,000.*

A **motion** was offered by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and seconded by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne. President Randolph asked what was the purpose of this amendment? Mr. Atzenhoffer stated that it had gone from \$175,000 to \$315,000 for Salaries, which he said had doubled. He said that there had been a sixty (60%) percent increase in benefits. Mr. Atzenhoffer said that there was weed control and that that was a contract that the Council had not seen. He said that with regards to the Equipment, he had not gotten an explanation on that part, so he was guessing that it was computers. President Randolph said that they were able to determine that the Salaries increase was because of the moving of fifty (50%) percent of the mechanics from the Road and Bridges Fund into Drainage. Mr. Atzenhoffer clarified if fifty (50%) percent of the mechanic personnel had been moved, to which Mr. Curole stated fifty (50%) percent of the three (3) mechanics salaries. He said that mechanics had been being paid by Road & Bridges one hundred (100%) percent. Mr. Curole said that yes the mechanics worked on Public Work's equipment but that they also worked on President Randolph's vehicle or other pool vehicles. He said that he thought it awkward that all of the costs of the mechanics were being paid by the Road and Bridges fund which he said had only limited funds. Mr. Curole stated that Tab 12 of the budget showed what positions it covered. He said that Mr. Terry Arabia's salary was included in there and then elaborated on same. President Randolph said that with regards to the Weed Control line, that that was a projected costs for 2007 and that they would like to get a service contract in place so that with proper chemicals and spraying the ditches and servitudes could be maintained. She said that it was a proposed suggested price but that they had based it upon research from people who did that type of service. President Randolph said certainly the service would have to be bid out and that any contract would certainly have to be presented to the Council. She said that they had put it in the budget so that it could be done there. President Randolph said that she was not aware as to what the Equipment was. She inquired as to whether Mr. Ray Cheramie, Department of Public Works was aware of what it was. Mr. Cheramie stated that the department had some equipment that had been requested by various field offices and by some of the councilmen to keep up some of the grass in the right-of-ways and streets. He said that the

department still had some equipment that was old and obsolete that needed replacement. President Randolph clarified that she was speaking of the \$15,000 line. Mr. Cheramie stated that he was not sure. Dr. Lasseigne said that the Weed Control line was a perfect example of what he was speaking about, saying that the Council had asked at the budget meetings what it was and Mr. Cheramie had advise them of the same. He said that there was no problem and that there would probably be a nine(9) and zero (0) vote when the Council was come to with a weed control contract but that at the present time if the money was in the budget as it was it could be used for anything. Dr. Lasseigne reiterated that if the Council was come to with a weed control contract that he would vote for it and that once it was in the budget as it was shown it could go anywhere. He said that this amendment would just put it back into the fund balance and then the Council could be came back to with a contract, adding that he would vote for it and would sponsor that. President Randolph pointed out that doing so would take a much longer time to get the process through, listing the process it would have to go through. She said that they were just trying to cut the time of the process so that some of the projects could get done. Mr. Matherne clarified that Dr. Lasseigne's concern was that if there was \$200,000 in weed control that it was in the Parish President's authority to change it within in the fund and put it anywhere that was in the fund. Mr. Gouaux said that he would think that the Administration would be crucified if they did not do weed control and spend that kind of money on weed control. He said that the Council had to have a little faith and trust in the Administration. The motion *carried* by a vote of eight (8) yeas and one (1) nay, that being of Mr. Phillip Gouaux.

President Randolph then asked Chairman Callais when they took the Salaries line out of Public Works, who would they lay off? Mr. Atzenhoffer said that this could be fixed at the next meeting of the Council. He said that a lot of these questions had been asked already and no answers had been given. A brief discussion ensued as to whether questions had been asked of the Administration.

The next item was an amendment entitled:

AMENDMENT 2007-15-CALLAIS-OPERATIONS BUDGET

001 – General Fund – TRANSFERS OUT

- 1. Decrease the \$113,500 Transfer Out to Capital Fund 299 by \$113,500.*
- 2. Decrease the \$79,325 Transfer Out to Costal Zone Management Fund 181 by \$10,000.*
- 3. Decrease the \$350,000 Transfer Out to Building Maintenance Fund 102 by \$175,000.*
- 4. Increase the Fund Balance of the General Fund by \$298,500*

A **motion** was offered by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and seconded by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne. Chairman Callais explained that the \$113,500 being transferred out was two (2) projects funded in the Capital Outlay budget by the General Fund and that the projects were one at \$28,500 for a plotter/scanner, computers and archives center and the other project was for a voice over IP phone upgrade in the \$85,000. He then explained that the decrease of \$10,000 in the Coastal Zone Management Fund was because there was a \$70,000 fund balance and so he had cut the \$10,000. Chairman Callais said that he had decreased the \$350,000 transfer out to Building Maintenance Fund

by \$175,000, saying that was \$50,000 for sealing the windows at the Government Complex and \$125,000 for the renovations of the field offices. Mr. Gouaux asked what was the feelings of the Administration with regards to this amendment? President Randolph said that she knew that the people who worked in the field offices would be very disappointed that the buildings they worked in were not being updated. Chairman Callais then spoke about the field office in Galliano and spoke about the state of the field office, pointing out that this money was to go toward Thibodaux and Lockport field offices. He said that Bayou Blue probably did not even have \$125,000 worth of equipment and a building. Chairman Callais said that if this would have been split between all the field offices it would be different, but that this was designated for two (2) field offices. Mr. Cheramie stated that yes it was designated for two (2) field offices. He explained that part of the money was going to be used to change the doors at the Galliano field office. Mr. Cheramie went on to say that he did not see spending anything more on the Galliano Field Office because his goal was to move that field office in the back section of the library. He said that he had already spoken to Mr. Atzenhoffer regarding the Bayou Blue field office and the possibility of moving it back where the recreation area was because it was too small and congested and in the wrong location. Mr. Cheramie said that with regards to the Lockport Field Office they had started doing a lot of in house overhauling of engines and then elaborated on same. He said that these overhauls were hard to when they were being done outside where there was rain, wind and it was cold and sand was blowing everywhere. Mr. Cheramie stated that the employees needed a place to actually do mechanic shop work. He went on to say that the department had built their own pump stations. Mr. Cheramie said that the welders had to wrap what they were working with tarpaulins as well as working with the wind and outside in the cold. He said that he thought the department could continue to build pump stations but that the Parish needed to be realistic about it. Mr. Cheramie continued to speak on the matter in detail. He said that these were the three (3) major field offices that did the most mechanic and welding work and that he felt like they deserved to be out of the weather and treated as anyone who did that type of work. Dr. Lasseigne said again, he would be the first to vote for improvements, saying that he knew the state of the Choctaw and Bayou Blue field offices and that the Council knew that all of the field offices needed improvements. He commented on if the Council was come to with discrete proposals telling what would be done. Dr. Lasseigne then gave an example of what he was asking for and then began speaking on the state of the Choctaw Field Office. Dr. Lasseigne said that the Council would vote for it but that this would give the Council a way to have a little more input into the process. Mr. Cheramie said that they had already gotten the costs estimates that Dr. Lasseigne was speaking of. He said that was why they had worked so hard on putting the items on the budget but that evidently the Council did not trust what they were trying to do. Mr. Cheramie stated that he did not know why time was being wasted on the presenting of the budget with the backup of people that had come and gave costs estimates. The motion *carried* by a vote of five (5) yeas and four (4) nays, that being of Mr. Michael Matherne, Mr. Tyrone Williams, Mr. Phillip Gouaux and Mr. Michael Delatte.

AMENDMENT 2007-15-CALLAIS-OPERATIONS BUDGET

The next item was an amendment entitled:

**AMENDMENT 2007-16-CALLAIS-
OPERATIONS AND CAPITAL BUDGETS**

001 – General Fund

1. *Decrease the Fund Balance \$10,000*
2. *Increase the Capital Outlay Line Item \$10,000*

Amendment 16 2007 Operations Budget	Amendment 16 2007 Capital Budget
Decrease Fund Balance in General Fund 001	PROJECT: Update of Technology for the Ward 10 Emergency Preparedness Command Center
\$10,000	JUSTIFICATION: Cost sharing of an Updated Emergency Preparedness Command Center in Ward 10. This project will be a joint venture with the South Lafourche Levee District, the Greater Lafourche Port Commission, Lady of the Sea Hospital, Lafourche Ambulance District, and Fire District No. 3.
Increase Capital Outlay in Fund 001 (GENERAL FUND)	ESTIMATED COSTS: \$10,000
UPDATE OF TECHNOLOGY FOR THE WARD 10 EMERGENCY PREPAREDNESS COMMAND CENTER	METHOD OF FINANCING: General Fund Budget combined millage – 2.83 and .76 parish wide millage.
\$10,000	ESTIMATED TIME SCHEDULE: February, 2007
	ANNUAL MAINTENANCE/OPERATION COSTS: Included in annual maintenance costs.

A **motion** was offered by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and seconded by Mr. Daniel Lorraine. Mr. Curole pointed out that a \$10,000 item would not be a capital expenditure. He said that even though it was a variety of things that totaled \$10,000 it would not be a capital expenditure. Mr. Curole said that one would put the money in an equipment line item or in a grant or something else. He said that he did not understand why this was being considered a capital project at a rate of \$10,000. Chairman Callais stated that this was a project that wanted to be done and that that had to be done in the Capital budget, adding that was why almost everything at the current meeting that was being amended was being placed in the Capital Budget. Mr. Gouaux said that he would vote for this and then asked if this would create a problem, passing the current amendment at the current meeting? Mr. Curole stated that he did not have a problem with the project but that he thought that it needed to be in a different line item. President Randolph voiced that she thought that it should be in Emergency Preparedness. A brief detail discussion ensued as to where this item should be and whether the budget would be voted on at the current meeting. Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer offered an amendment to delete ~~Increase the Capital Outlay Line Item \$10,000~~ and replace it with Increase the Civil Defense-Equipment Other Line Item \$10,000, seconded by Mr. Phillip Gouaux and **carried** by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays. The budget amendment as amended **carried** by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays.

AMENDMENT 2007-16-CALLAIS-OPERATIONS AND CAPITAL BUDGETS

The next item was an amendment entitled:

AMENDMENT 2007-17-CALLAIS-OPERATIONS BUDGET

102 – Building Maintenance

- 1. Decrease the Consultant line of the Building Maintenance – Professional Services fund by \$5,000.*
- 2. Decrease the Maintenance Building line of the Building Maintenance – Operating Services fund by \$100,000.*
- 3. Decrease the Professional Development line of the Building Maintenance – Other Services fund by \$2,000.*
- 4. Decrease the Supplies line of the Building Maintenance – Supplies fund by \$25,000.*
- 5. Increase the Fund Balance of the Building Maintenance Fund by \$132,000*

A **motion** was offered by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and seconded by Mr. Daniel Lorraine. Mr. Curole stated that only having seen the amendments on November 28, 2006 he had not had the chance to speak to Mr. Brennan Matherne, Department of Parks, Recreation and Public Facilities, about this. He then asked whether Chairman Callais had been able to speak to Mr. Matherne about it? Chairman Callais said that they had spoken about it. He said that maintenance of building in 2006 had been \$553,000 which he said, in speaking to Mr. Matherne, was the renovations the Council Chambers at \$100,000. Chairman Callais said since that renovation would not be done again in 2007 and it was complete that was why the amendment was being done. Mr. Curole stated that it was his understanding that the line item was a “set aside” for the never ending unseen problems at the Detention Center. He then gave an instance wherein they had been called in on Saturday, November 25, 2006 to deal with a sewer problem at the Detention Center. Mr. Curole said that it was incidental building repairs and maintenance and it may at one time have included the renovations to the Council Chambers but that it needed to be considered that there were unknowns with a thirty (30) year old detention center, adding that that was where a good portion of the amount came from. He went on to say that there were now a couple of new buildings that were not had in the past. He continued to briefly speak on the matter. Mr. Atzenhoffer stated that there was already \$80,000 under the Correction Center for maintenance of the building. A brief discussion ensued, including as to where the Director of the Department of Parks, Recreation and Public Facilities was, as he was not present at the meeting. The motion *carried* by a vote of seven (7) yeas and two (2) nays, that being of Mr. Phillip Gouaux and Mr. Michael Matherne.

AMENDMENT 2007-17-CALLAIS-OPERATIONS BUDGET

The next item was an amendment entitled:

**AMENDMENT 2007-18-CALLAIS-
OPERATIONS AND CAPITAL BUDGETS**

102 – Building Maintenance Fund and Capital Budget

1. *Decrease the \$170,000 Transfer Out to Capital Fund 299 by \$170,000.*
2. *Increase the Fund Balance of the Building Maintenance Fund by \$170,000.*
3. *Decrease the Fund Balance of the Building Maintenance Fund by \$200,000.*
4. *Increase the Capital Outlay line item of the Building Maintenance Fund by \$200,000.*

Amendment 18 2007 Operations Budget	Amendment 18 2007 Capital Budget
Decrease Fund Balance in Building Fund 102 \$200,000	PROJECT: Galliano Annex JUSTIFICATION: Centralization of services in the South Lafourche area ESTIMATED COSTS: \$330,000 (Roll-over) Plus \$200,000
Increase Capital Outlay in Fund 102 (BUILDING FUND) GALLIANO ANNEX \$200,000	METHOD OF FINANCING: Building and Maintenance Budget – 2.49 parish wide millage. ESTIMATED TIME SCHEDULE: December 31, 2007 ANNUAL MAINTENANCE/OPERATION COSTS: Minimal increase because offices will be consolidated.

A **motion** was offered by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne and seconded by Mr. Daniel Lorraine. Mr. Matherne asked to the centralization of which services and why was this not put in the original budget? Chairman Callais stated that it was in the original budget and that it was a roll-over of \$330,000. He explained that bid had been gone out to and monies had were short, adding that this would allow the project to get done. Chairman Callais said that this would centralize the Assessor’s office, Clerk of Court, Registrar of Voters and all of the other districts that were in separate offices in the 10th Ward into one (1) building and hopefully one day, the field office. Mr. Atzenhoffer voiced his concerns with having over \$500,000 in the budget for this item in that he felt that the project would be designed to go over that amount since it would be known what was available. He stated that he wished that there was a different way of doing this, saying that he knew that this project needed to happen but the Parish would not be getting realistic building costs if it kept telling what was available for spending. Mr. Curole clarified that Chairman Callais had said that the decrease of the \$170,000 was being cut from what project, to which Chairman Callais stated that it was \$120,000 for the field offices and the \$50,000 for the sealing of the windows at the Government Complex. A brief discussion ensued on the matter. President Randolph stated that if Mr. Atzenhoffer’s concern was with having the money in the budget dedicated to the particular fund, it could always be left in the fund balance, bidded out and then when and if additional funds were needed they could come back to the Council and ask for additional funds. She said if some areas can be focused on particular projects and others can not, it would be a little confusing. President Randolph said that she understood Mr. Atzenhoffer’s concern about having too much money in the fund. The motion **failed** by a vote of three (3) yeas and six (6) nays, that being of Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer, Mr. Michael Matherne, Mr. Lindel Toups, Mr. Tyrone Williams, Mr. Michael Delatte and Mr. Phillip Gouaux.

BUDGET AMENDMENT FAILED

The next item was an amendment entitled:

AMENDMENT 2007-19-LASSEIGNE-OPERATIONS BUDGET

103 – Roads and Bridges Fund

1. *Decrease the Salaries Over-Time line of the Roads and Bridges – Salaries & Wages fund by \$300,000.*
2. *Decrease the Legal line of the Roads and Bridges – Professional Services fund by \$20,000.*
3. *Decrease the Maintenance Equipment line of the Roads and Bridges – Operating Services fund by \$40,000.*
4. *Decrease the Maintenance Vehicles line of the Roads and Bridges – Operating Services fund by \$10,000.*
5. *Decrease the Maintenance Bridges line of the Roads and Bridges – Operating Services fund by \$25,000.*
6. *Decrease the Gravel line of the Roads and Bridges – Supplies fund by \$60,000.*
7. *Increase the Fund Balance of the Roads and Bridges Fund by \$455,000.*

A **motion** was offered by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne and seconded by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer. Mr. Curole said that with regards to the decrease the Salaries Over-Time line of the Roads and Bridges – Salaries & Wages fund by \$300,000, that since the new Administration had arrived in 2004 there had been what he called a hefty overtime line. He said that that money had been used to do a lot of catch up work of things that had been neglected in the past. Mr. Curole said that a decision had been made in 2006 to try and/or cut the overtime and that they had not put much, if any, in the budget and that over the year they had needed some. He said that if the complaints on drainage were listened to that in 2004 and 2005 everyone was happy about how things were better and were getting better. Mr. Curole said that the complaints had started in 2006 and that he thought that as they had settled back into not putting out as much public works work, the Parish was getting back into a circumstance where people were complaining about drainage items. PLEASE NOTE THAT THE INFORMATION FOLLOWING THIS SENTENCE WHICH APPEARS IN A LIGHT GREY COLOR AND IS ITALICIZED WAS SUMMARIZED FROM THE MINUTE CLERK'S NOTES DUE TO A TECHNICAL DIFFICULTY WHEREIN THE RECORDER DID NOT RECORD THE ENTIRE CONVERSATION AS IT TOOK PLACE. *He then spoke about employee moral, saying that yes, \$300,000 could be taken to hire a few more employees. Mr. Curole informed the Council that the Parish was having trouble finding people to work for Parish wages. He said that overtime was good for morale and for getting work done. Dr. Lasseigne commented on the "phenomenal" increase in the overtime line item. He then stated that he did not know what the Legal line in the amount of \$25,000 was for. Dr. Lasseigne stated that some monies had been taken out but that not all the funds had been taken out and that it was still more than the previous year. President Randolph inquired as to whether any of these questions had been asked at the previous meetings held for the budget? Mrs. Chiasson spoke of a new chart of accounts and that looking at 2005 was only looking at a half of a year. Mr. Curole commented that Roads and Bridges was a Department of Public Works function. Dr. Lasseigne then spoke about the Gravel line on the amount left in after the amendment being proposed and stated that he could not believe that there would be a need for gravel because more and more of the streets had been and continued to be paved. Mr. Cheramie commented that they had not used a lot of limestone in the current year*

because they had received recycled material from Louisiana Highway 90 but that that material would be running out. Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer offered an amendment to delete ~~Decrease the Salaries Over-Time line of the Roads and Bridges – Salaries & Wages fund by \$300,000.~~ and replace it with Decrease the Salaries Over-Time line of the Roads and Bridges – Salaries & Wages fund by \$200,000. and to delete ~~Increase the Fund Balance of the Roads and Bridges Fund by \$455,000.~~ and replace it Increase the Fund Balance of the Roads and Bridges Fund by \$355,000., seconded by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne and *carried* by vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays. The budget amendment as amended *carried* by a vote of seven (7) yeas and two (2) nays, that being of Mr. Michael Matherne and Mr. Phillip Gouaux.

AMENDMENT 2007-19-LASSEIGNE-OPERATIONS BUDGET

The next item was an amendment entitled:

**AMENDMENT 2007-20-LASSEIGNE-
OPERATIONS AND CAPITAL BUDGETS**

103 – Roads and Bridges Fund – Capital Budget

1. *Decrease the \$336,500 Transfer Out to Capital Fund 299 by \$336,500.*
2. *Increase the Fund Balance of the Roads and Bridges Fund by \$336,500.*

Amendment 20 2007 Operations Budget	Amendment 20 2007 Capital Budget
Decrease the \$336,500 Transfer Out to Capital Fund 299 by \$336,500	PROJECT: Automobiles/Machinery JUSTIFICATION: For purchase of 2 trucks, 3 tractors with side and rear mowers, 1 boom tractor, 1 side mower tractor and 1 tandem dump truck
Increase the Fund Balance of the Roads and Bridges Fund by \$336,500	ESTIMATED COSTS: \$336,500 METHOD OF FINANCING: Roads and Bridges Budget 4.32 parish wide millage expiring in 2008 ESTIMATED TIME SCHEDULE: December 31, 2007 ANNUAL MAINTENANCE/OPERATION COSTS: Included in the annual maintenance contract cost.

A **motion** was offered by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne and seconded by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer. Dr. Lasseigne said that this was another one that the Administration could come to the Council with the equipment as needed and he would support every one of them. He said that he knew that some of the councilmen were expecting equipment in their districts, but that he would like to at least, interrupting himself by saying that he knew that when equipment was bought that they could not have it go into a specific district, be told that it was going into a district. Dr. Lasseigne said that each councilmen would know and would be able to inform their field office that they had a piece of equipment that would be forthcoming. He continued to briefly speak on the matter, including stating that he would not have any trouble with the whole \$336,500 and that everyone would be aware of where it was going. Mr. Toups asked Mr. Cheramie if he could inform the Council where the equipment would be going to? President Randolph stated that it was going to Lafourche Parish and wherever it was needed in Lafourche Parish. A brief discussion ensued. Mr. Cheramie stated that he would be able to answer Mr. Toups’ question if he would be allowed to retrieve his notes from his office. He then said that at the present time there was an excavator that worked out of the Lockport field office that was working in West Thibodaux using the “drum mulcher” and had been

there for approximately three (3) weeks and would probably be there for another three (3) weeks. Mr. Cheramie stated that there was also a long reach excavator that worked out of the Lockport field office that was presently working in the Chackbay area. He said that they just identified where the equipment was at via an operator but stated that he used the equipment all over the Parish. Mr. Toups asked if Mr. Cheramie could tell the Council whether two (2) trucks and three (3) tractors were needed? Mr. Toups asked again if the equipment being asked for was needed and whether it would be used? Mr. Cheramie said yes, that they would be using the equipment. Mr. Toups asked if all of the equipment would be used in the year, to which Mr. Cheramie stated that it would definitely be used. Mr. Cheramie stated that when it had been decided to do the farm to market roads in Thibodaux, they had pulled all of the trucks through out the Parish. He said the same thing would be done when work to fill in a reservoir and rebuild levees in the Mobily and Serigny areas was done, saying that they would be pulling as many trucks as possible from each field office. Mr. Cheramie commented that the Parish still had some old trucks and that if the Parish was going to do the job, the equipment was needed. He continued to briefly speak on the matter. The motion **failed** by a vote of four (4) yeas and five (5) nays, that being of Mr. Michael Matherne, Mr. Michael Delatte, Mr. Tyrone Williams, Mr. Lindel Toups and Mr. Phillip Gouaux.

BUDGET AMENDMENT FAILED

The next item was an amendment entitled:

AMENDMENT 2007-21-ATZENHOFFER-OPERATIONS BUDGET

104 – Drainage Maintenance Fund

1. *Decrease the Salaries Over-Time line of the Drainage Maintenance Fund – Salaries & Wages fund by \$110,000.*
2. *Decrease the Legal line of the Drainage Maintenance Fund – Professional Services fund by \$10,000.*
3. *Decrease the Maintenance Equipment line of the Drainage Maintenance Fund – Operating Services fund by \$30,000.*
4. *Decrease the Maintenance Vehicles line of the Drainage Maintenance Fund – Operating Services fund by \$20,000.*
5. *Decrease the Rental Equipment line of the Drainage Maintenance Fund – Operating Services fund by \$5,000.*
6. *Increase the Fund Balance of the Drainage Maintenance Fund by \$175,000.*

A **motion** was offered by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and seconded by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne. President Randolph inquired as to when the employees questioned about the decrease in overtime, which she said many were dependent upon, and when constituents were concerned about work being delayed because there were not sufficient employees to do the jobs, what answer should be given? Mr. Atzenhoffer stated that for 2006 services had been done for \$40,000 of overtime and that for 2007 overtime was budgeted for \$160,000. President Randolph pointed out the Parish was working with less employees and further they could not hire more people. A heated discussion ensued regarding the hiring of new employees. Mr. Atzenhoffer pointed out that there were reductions but that the reductions were still an increase over what had been spent in the 2006 revised budget. He

said that the reduction was going into the fund balance so if something needed to be moved it could be moved by supplemental appropriation. Mr. Atzenhoffer said that if the fund started to get low in overtime, it was okay to come back to the Council and say that more overtime money was needed and the reason for its need. Dr. Lasseigne stated that there would be an increase in Salaries of approximately eight (8%) percent and that the increase in overtime was a twenty-five (25%) percent increase over the previous year with this amendment. He said that without out the amendment being offered there would be a four hundred (400%) percent increase. Dr. Lasseigne said that the benefits were increasing by \$76,000 and that that was not even addressed in the current amendment. He said that was money that could be used for overtime, which he said President Randolph could move freely. Dr. Lasseigne stated that there was still a lot of money being left in the fund. He continued to speak on the matter. The motion *carried* by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays.

AMENDMENT 2007-21-ATZENHOFFER-OPERATIONS BUDGET

The next item was an amendment entitled:

**AMENDMENT 2007-22-ATZENHOFFER-
OPERATIONS AND CAPITAL BUDGETS**

104 – Drainage Maintenance Fund – Capital Budget

1. *Decrease the \$728,210 Transfer Out to Capital Fund 299 by \$426,000.*
2. *Increase the Fund Balance of the Drainage Maintenance Fund by \$426,000.*

Amendment 22 2007 Operations Budget	Amendment 22 2007 Capital Budget
Decrease the \$728,210 Transfer Out to Capital Fund 299 by <div style="text-align: right;">\$426,000</div>	PROJECT: Automobiles/Machinery JUSTIFICATION: For purchase of mini excavator, dump truck, 2 tractors, dozer, tree shredder and 2 trucks: ESTIMATED COSTS: \$426,000 METHOD OF FINANCING: 4.80 parish wide millage ESTIMATED TIME SCHEDULE: December 31, 2007 ANNUAL MAINTENANCE/OPERATION COSTS: Included in the annual maintenance contract cost.
Increase the Fund Balance of the Drainage Maintenance Fund by <div style="text-align: right;">426,000</div>	

A **motion** was offered by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and seconded by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne. Mr. Toups asked why in Amendment 20 the Parish was looking to buy two (2) trucks, three (3) tractors, one (1) boom tractor, one (1) side mower tractor and one (1) tandem dump truck and in this current project there was a mini excavator, interrupting himself saying that he knew it was for drainage and would be parish wide. He said he would support if it was for equipment and then commented on running the equipment himself if extra help was needed. Dr. Lasseigne commented that by not passing Amendment 22 there would \$426,000 for equipment and that with the \$336,500 it would make it a total of \$780,000 worth of equipment. He suggested holding off on the current amendment and buying the equipment and that if additional equipment was needed they could come back with the \$336,500 for more equipment later to be voted on by the Council. The motion *carried* by a vote of five (5) yeas and four (4) nays, that being of Mr. Michael Matherne, Mr. Michael Delatte, Mr. Lindel Toups and Mr. Phillip Gouaux.

AMENDMENT 2007-22-ATZENHOFFER-OPERATIONS AND CAPITAL BUDGETS

The next item was an amendment entitled:

AMENDMENT 2007-23-LASSEIGNE-OPERATIONS BUDGET

109 – Board of Health Fund

1. *Decrease the Renovate line of the Board of Health Fund – Operating Services fund by \$60,000.*
2. *Decrease the Equipment Other line of the Board of Health Fund – Supplies fund by \$15,000.*
3. *Increase the Fund Balance of the Board of Health Fund by \$75,000.*

A **motion** was offered by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne and seconded by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer. Mr. Matherne asked a question but it was inaudible. Dr. Lasseigne explained that it had never been explained what was the Renovate line under Operating Services for and also that there was \$25,000 for Equipment-Other, which he believed to be video conferencing equipment, and that he did not believe that the Parish should pay the \$25,000 for video conferencing for the Board of Health. He stated maybe if the parish accessible video conferencing facility was in the central office or somewhere else, but that for the Board of Health to spend that amount on video conferencing was not responsible. A brief discussion ensued regarding the combining of Amendment 23 and Amendment 24. Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer offered an **amendment** to *combine* the budget amendment entitled:

AMENDMENT 2007-24-LASSEIGNE-OPERATIONS AND CAPITAL BUDGETS

109 – Board of Health Fund – Capital Budget

1. *Decrease the \$25,000 Transfer Out to Capital Fund 299 by \$25,000.*
2. *Increase the Fund Balance of the Board of Health Fund by \$25,000.*

Amendment 24 2007 Operations Budget	Amendment 24 2007 Capital Budget
Decrease the \$25,000 Transfer Out to Capital Fund 299 by \$25,000	PROJECT: Video Conferencing Equipment
Increase the Fund Balance of the Board of Health Fund by \$25,000	JUSTIFICATION: Video conferencing equipment
	ESTIMATED COSTS: \$25,000
	METHOD OF FINANCING: 2.38
	ESTIMATED TIME SCHEDULE: December 31, 2007
	ANNUAL MAINTENANCE/OPERATION COSTS:

with the amendment entitled: **AMENDMENT 2007-23-LASSEIGNE-OPERATIONS BUDGET**, seconded by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne and **carried** by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays. Chairman Callais informed the Council that Amendment 23 and Amendment 24 were now combined and had become one (1) amendment. He then read Amendment 24. Mr. Matherne inquired as to who had requested the video conferencing equipment and whether they had elaborated on as to what it was needed for? Mr. Curole stated that Mr. Ron Folse, Director of the Health Unit, had requested the same. He informed the Council that in the renovated Health Unit there was a back room that he was creating as conference facility. Mr. Curole continued to elaborate on the conference facility. A brief discussion ensued. The budget amendment as amended **carried** by a vote of seven (7) yeas and two (2) nays, that being of Mr. Michael Matherne and Mr. Michael Delatte.

AMENDMENT 2007-23-LASSEIGNE-OPERATIONS BUDGET

The next item was an amendment entitled:

**AMENDMENT 2007-24-LASSEIGNE-
OPERATIONS AND CAPITAL BUDGETS**

109 – Board of Health Fund – Capital Budget

1. *Decrease the \$25,000 Transfer Out to Capital Fund 299 by \$25,000.*
2. *Increase the Fund Balance of the Board of Health Fund by \$25,000.*

Amendment 24 2007 Operations Budget	Amendment 24 2007 Capital Budget
Decrease the \$25,000 Transfer Out to Capital Fund 299 by \$25,000	PROJECT: Video Conferencing Equipment
Increase the Fund Balance of the Board of Health Fund by \$25,000	JUSTIFICATION: Video conferencing equipment
	ESTIMATED COSTS: \$25,000
	METHOD OF FINANCING: 2.38
	ESTIMATED TIME SCHEDULE: December 31, 2007
	ANNUAL MAINTENANCE/OPERATION COSTS:

This item was previously combined with Amendment 23 via an amendment made and *carried* by the Council.

The next item was an amendment entitled:

**AMENDMENT 2007-25-CALLAIS-
OPERATIONS AND CAPITAL BUDGETS**

128 – 2004 Rededication Fund

1. *Decrease the \$1,323,361.25 Transfer Out to the Sr. Citizens Activities Fund 127 by \$750,000.*
2. *Decrease the \$1,141,960.50 Transfer Out to the Health Activity Fund 129 by \$500,000.*
3. *Increase the Fund Balance of the 2004 Rededication Fund by \$1,250,000.*

A **motion** was offered by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and seconded by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne. Mr. Curole explained that he was not aware of what the \$750,000 and \$500,000 would mean but that he could explain what the entries were for. He explained in detail that the Attorney General opinion regarding the 2004 Rededication Fund had stated that the balances had to be used fifty (50%) percent for health activities, twenty-five (25%) percent for senior citizens and that the other twenty-five (25%) percent could have been used in one (1) of four (4) ways, that being health units, health activities, senior citizens or buildings. Mr. Curole continued to speak on the matter and explained that the entries were designed to take the fund balance that was sitting in the newly created Fund 128 and give out the percentage proportions. He stated that that did not have to be done but that he thought it to be cleaner to do it that way. Mr. Curole said that he did not want the temptation of having a large fund balance in Fund 128 and have it said to pay off the Whitney Building, saying that the Attorney General had said that could not be done. He continued to speak on the matter.

Chairman Callais said that this amendment was to take it out the fund balance and keep the money in the Rededication Fund. Mr. Curole said that the problem would be having the amount in the Rededication Fund and that it would have to be kept track of, saying that just because it was sitting in another fund that it could not be spent on other things. He then stated that the law had said that twenty-five (25%) percent of the fund balance at the end of 2004 had to be used for senior citizens and it had to be used that way. Mr. Curole stated that if the funds were kept in a “mixed pot” it would be more confusing to keep track of how it could be spent. Mr. Atzenhoffer clarified whether it was twenty-five (25%) percent or up to twenty-five (25%) percent? He said that he knew that it was a definite fifty (50%) percent to health units and that the remainder of that had been split. Mr. Curole then asked for an answer from Mrs. Charlene Rodriguez, Council On Aging, Inc. to the question asked. A response of “at least” was given. Dr. Tommy Lasseigne **removed** his second and Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer **removed** his motion. This item was withdrawn.

BUDGET AMENDMENT WITHDRAWN

The next item was an amendment entitled:

**AMENDMENT 2007-26-CALLAIS-
OPERATIONS AND CAPITAL BUDGETS**

104 – Drainage Maintenance

1. *Decrease the Fund Balance \$80,000*
2. *Increase the Capital Outlay Line Item \$80,000*

Projects:

Cut Off Elementary Drainage Project \$25,000

Amendment 26 <i>2007 Operations Budget</i>	Amendment 26 <i>2007 Capital Budget</i>
Decrease the Fund Balance of Fund 104 (Drainage Maintenance) by \$25,000 Increase the Capital Outlay line Item in Fund 104 by \$25,000	PROJECT: Cut Off Elementary Drainage Project JUSTIFICATION: Continue of Drainage Project I area ESTIMATED COSTS: \$25,000 METHOD OF FINANCING: 4.80 parish wide millage ESTIMATED TIME SCHEDULE: June, 2007 ANNUAL MAINTENANCE/OPERATION COSTS: To be absorbed by the Drainage Fund

Larose – Cut Off Middle School Project (West 23rd – West 26th) \$40,000

Amendment 26 <i>2007 Operations Budget</i>	Amendment 26 <i>2007 Capital Budget</i>
Decrease the Fund Balance of Fund 104 (Drainage Maintenance) by \$40,000 Increase the Capital Outlay line Item in Fund 104 by \$40,000	PROJECT: Larose-Cut Off Middle School Project (West 23 rd – West 26 th) JUSTIFICATION: Continue of Drainage Project in Area ESTIMATED COSTS: \$40,000 METHOD OF FINANCING: 4.80 parish wide millage ESTIMATED TIME SCHEDULE: January, 2007 ANNUAL MAINTENANCE/OPERATION COSTS: To be absorbed by the Drainage Fund

Cut Off Park Culverts (West 79th) -- \$5,000

<p>Amendment 26 2007 Operations Budget</p>	<p>Amendment 26 2007 Capital Budget</p>
<p>Decrease the Fund Balance of Fund 104 (Drainage Maintenance) by \$5,000</p> <p>Increase the Capital Outlay line Item in Fund 104 by \$5,000</p>	<p>PROJECT: Cut Off Park Culverts Project</p> <p>JUSTIFICATION: To install culverts along the new Cut Off Park along West 79th</p> <p>ESTIMATED COSTS: \$5,000</p> <p>METHOD OF FINANCING: 4.80 parish wide millage</p> <p>ESTIMATED TIME SCHEDULE: March, 2007</p> <p>ANNUAL MAINTENANCE/OPERATION COSTS: To be absorbed by the Drainage Fund</p>

East 74th Drainage Improvements -- \$10,000

<p>Amendment 26 2007 Operations Budget</p>	<p>Amendment 26 2007 Capital Budget</p>
<p>Decrease the Fund Balance of Fund 104 (Drainage Maintenance) by \$10,000</p> <p>Increase the Capital Outlay line Item in Fund 104 by \$10,000</p>	<p>PROJECT: East 74th Drainage Improvements</p> <p>JUSTIFICATION: To relieve flooding problems throughout the subdivision</p> <p>ESTIMATED COSTS: \$10,000</p> <p>METHOD OF FINANCING: 4.80 parish wide millage</p> <p>ESTIMATED TIME SCHEDULE: March, 2007</p> <p>ANNUAL MAINTENANCE/OPERATION COSTS: To be absorbed by the Drainage Fund.</p>

A **motion** was offered by Mr. Daniel Lorraine and seconded by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne. Chairman Callais explained in detail what each project listed was for. After a brief discussion, Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer offered an **amendment** to delete ~~Decrease the Fund Balance \$80,000~~ and replace it with Decrease the Fund Balance \$65,000 and delete ~~Increase the Capital Outlay Line Item \$80,000~~ and replace it with Increase the Capital Outlay Line Item \$65,000, and further that the Cut Off Park Culverts (West 79th) -- \$5,000 and the East 74th Drainage Improvements -- \$10,000 projects would be pulled, seconded by Mr. Phillip Gouaux. Chairman Callais explained that the Cut Off Park Culverts (West 79th) -- \$5,000 and the East 74th Drainage Improvements -- \$10,000 projects would be pulled out and that he would work with the Administration to get the projects done on something else since they were under \$15,000. The amendment to the budget amendment *carried* by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays. Mr. Matherne clarified that the budget amendment was now worth \$65,000 and not \$80,000. The budget amendment as amended *carried* by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays.

AMENDMENT 2007-26-CALLAIS-OPERATIONS AND CAPITAL BUDGETS

The next item was an amendment entitled:

AMENDMENT 2007-27-LASSEIGNE-OPERATIONS BUDGET

001 – General Fund

- 1. Decrease the Finance (00141501) Salaries and Wages line item by \$914.00.*
- 2. Decrease the Executive (00141502) Salaries and Wages line item by \$913.00.*
- 3. Decrease the Public Works (00143500) Salaries and Wages line item by \$1,004.00.*
- 4. Decrease the Community Services (00144400) Salaries and Wages line item by \$913.00.*
- 5. Decrease the Economic Development (00146400) Salaries and Wages line item by \$914.00.*
- 6. Increase the Fund Balance of the General Fund by \$4,698.00*

PROPOSED AMENDMENTS TO SALARIES
PERSONNEL SUMMARY
SECTION 12 OF BUDGET

1. Reduce Finance Director (-\$914) from \$42,277 to \$41,363
2. Reduce Parish Administrator (-\$913) from \$57,788 to \$56,875
3. Reduce Public Works Director (-\$1,044) from \$48,608 to \$47,565
4. Reduce Economic Development Director (-\$914) from \$41,071 to \$40,157
5. Reduce Community Service Director (-\$913) from \$37,706 to \$36,193

A **motion** was made by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne and second by Mr. Daniel Lorraine. Mr. Atzenhoffer stated that the Council had approved a fifty (50¢) cent raise for everyone and that he had specifically asked the question whether that raise was for everyone to which he said the answer had been yes. He said that he did not think that the Council should be taking money from the department heads that had been given to everyone else. Mr. Atzenhoffer continued to speak on the matter. Dr. Lasseigne said that the Council had not given it to the department heads because the Council could not give the raise to them until it was approved by ordinance. He then recalled that the Council had voted six (6) yeas and three (3) nays to fire the Finance Director, and that Mr. Curole was directly responsible for the Council not knowing about a \$5 million dollar liability. Chairman Callais interrupted Dr. Lasseigne. Dr. Lasseigne said that the point was that he did not see where the department heads were justified in getting a raise. He pointed out that the councilmen had not received a raise nor had the Parish President received a raise. Dr. Lasseigne continued to briefly speak on the matter. The motion **failed** by a vote of three (3) yeas and six (6) nays, that being of Mr. Phillip Gouaux, Mr. Tyrone Williams, Mr. Brent Callais, Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer, Mr. Michael Matherne and Mr. Michael Delatte.

BUDGET AMENDMENT FAILED

The next item was an amendment entitled:

AMENDMENT 2007-28-LASSEIGNE-CAPITAL BUDGET

102 – Building and Maintenance Fund – Capital Budget

1. *Decrease the Fund Balance of Fund 102 by \$80,000.*
2. *Increase the Capital Outlay line item by \$80,000.*

Projects:

Bowie Fire Station generator \$20,000

<p style="text-align: center;">Amendment 28</p> <p><i>2007 Operations Budget</i></p> <p>Decrease the Fund Balance of Fund 102 (Building and Maintenance) by \$20,000 Increase the Capital Outlay line item by \$20,000</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Amendment 28</p> <p><i>2007 Capital Budget</i></p> <p>PROJECT: Emergency generator Lafourche Crossing Hwy. 308 Volunteer Fire Department JUSTIFICATION: Provide emergency power at parish owned building to assist fire department during power outages and/or emergency situations to provide public protection ESTIMATED COSTS: \$20,000.00 METHOD OF FINANCING: Building and Maintenance fund 2.49 parish wide millage ESTIMATED TIME SCHEDULE: June 30, 2007 ANNUAL MAINTENANCE/OPERATION COSTS: To be paid by fire district</p>
---	--

Lafourche Crossing Hwy 308 Fire Station generator \$20,000

<p style="text-align: center;">Amendment 28</p> <p><i>2007 Operations Budget</i></p> <p>Decrease the Fund Balance of Fund 102 (Building and Maintenance) by \$20,000 Increase the Capital Outlay line item by \$20,000</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Amendment 28</p> <p><i>2007 Capital Budget</i></p> <p>PROJECT: Emergency generator St. Charles Fire Station #4 Fire District #1 JUSTIFICATION: Provide emergency power at parish owned building to assist fire department during power outages and/or emergency situations to provide public protection ESTIMATED COSTS: \$20,000.00 METHOD OF FINANCING: Building and Maintenance fund 2.49 parish wide millage ESTIMATED TIME SCHEDULE: June 30, 2007 ANNUAL MAINTENANCE/OPERATION COSTS: To be paid by fire district</p>
---	---

Fire District No. 1 Station No. 4 generator \$20,000

Amendment 28	Amendment 28
<p><i>2007 Operations Budget</i> Decrease the Fund Balance of Fund 102 (Building and Maintenance) by \$20,000 Increase the Capital Outlay line item by \$20,000</p>	<p><i>2007 Capital Budget</i> PROJECT: Emergency generator St. Charles Fire Station No. 3 Fire District No. 1 JUSTIFICATION: Provide emergency power at parish owned building to assist fire department during power outages and/or emergency situations to provide public protection ESTIMATED COSTS: \$20,000.00 METHOD OF FINANCING: Building and Maintenance fund 2.49 parish wide millage ESTIMATED TIME SCHEDULE: June 30, 2007 ANNUAL MAINTENANCE/OPERATION COSTS: To be paid by fire district</p>

Fire District N. 1 Station No. 7 generator \$20,000

Amendment 28	Amendment 28
<p><i>2007 Operations Budget</i> Decrease the Fund Balance of Fund 102 (Building and Maintenance) by \$20,000 Increase the Capital Outlay line item by \$20,000 Fund 102 (Building and Maintenance) by \$20,000 Increase the Capital Outlay line item by \$20,000</p>	<p><i>2007 Capital Budget</i> PROJECT: Emergency generator Bowie Fire Station JUSTIFICATION: Provide emergency power at parish owned building to assist fire department during power outages and/or emergency situations to provide public protection ESTIMATED COSTS: \$20,000.00 METHOD OF FINANCING: Building and Maintenance fund 2.49 parish wide millage ESTIMATED TIME SCHEDULE: June 30, 2007 ANNUAL MAINTENANCE/OPERATION COSTS: To be paid by fire district</p>

A **motion** was offered by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne and seconded by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer. Dr. Lasseigne stated that these buildings were public buildings owned by the Parish and that with emergency back up generators they could be used in case of an emergency for parish residents. He said that this was a small price to pay and that a lot of the districts were near broke and that in speaking with individuals it was stated that this would be a big help. Dr. Lasseigne said that it was something that was a capital outlay item that the Parish would still own and would be improving the property and serving the people of the Parish as a whole. He stated that he thought it to be a good idea and asked the Council for their support. President Randolph asked if the Parish owned the buildings or whether the individual fire districts owned them? She said that the fire districts were independent districts. Dr. Lasseigne stated that they were parish entities. Mr. Gouaux asked if there was another way that this could be done, saying like as in a grant? He said that he thought this to be a noble concern and that the Parish should furnish them if they were part of the parish system but questioned taking the money out of Building and Maintenance funds without knowing the impact. Mr. Gouaux stated that this should have been to include every one of the fire stations in the Parish and not just a few. Dr. Lasseigne voiced that people paid a millage and it went to the fire districts and they would in turn by the fire station. He continued to briefly speak on the matter, including that one of the districts collected 15 mils and that it did not even have enough money to pay its bills. Dr. Lasseigne said that this was a way to help the districts and then continued to elaborate on the same. Mr. Toups inquired as to whether grants could be gotten in order to get all of the fire stations a

generator? Dr. Lasseigne informed Mr. Toups that an attempt had been made. Mr. Toups then suggested an amendment to include Lockport and a lengthy discussion ensued as to whether some districts had generators already and some did not and with Mr. Curole expressing his concern that not all of the buildings were public buildings. He suggested making this a grant. Mr. Atzenhoffer asked whether the Larose Civic Center was owned by the Parish? President Randolph stated no and that all that was being said was to amend this to make it a grant rather than a capital project. Mr. Atzenhoffer said that then the Council would amend the capital outlay line item to a grant line item on all of the amendments. President Randolph said that way there would be a cooperative endeavor agreement in what Dr. Lasseigne was suggesting if the public needed to use them, then there would be a cooperative endeavor agreement and it would be cleaner doing it as a grant. Mr. Atzenhoffer stated that he agreed that it could be done in that manner and that if the Council did it as a grant then Ordinance 3565 should be included, providing financials. He stated that he needed to make sure that there was a grant item line or whether one could be created with no problems, to which Mr. Curole responded yes. Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer then offered an **amendment** to change in the projects the Capital Outlay line item to a Grant line item, seconded by Mr. Phillip Gouaux. Dr. Lasseigne stated that he disagreed and stated that once the money was in a grant it could be a grant to anyone and could go anywhere. He said that he wanted it in Capital Outlay. Discussions then began as to whether it could be made to a capital outlay grant line item and other suggestions. After a brief discussion, Mr. Phillip Gouaux *removed* his second to Mr. Atzenhoffer's amendment and Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer *removed* his motion on his amendment. Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer *removed* his second to the original budget amendment and Dr. Tommy Lasseigne *removed* his motion. Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer made a **motion** to take a five (5) minute recess, seconded by Mr. Michael Matherne and **carried** by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Phillip Gouaux, seconded by Mr. Lindel Toups to return to the regular session and **carried** by a vote of six (6) yeas, zero (0) nays and three (3) absent, that being of Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer, Mr. Tyrone Williams and Mr. Michael Matherne. Dr. Tommy Lasseigne offered an **amendment** to *combine* budget amendments No. 29, 31, 32, 33 and 34, entitled respectively as follows:

AMENDMENT 2007-29-WILLIAMS-CAPITAL BUDGET

102 – Building and Maintenance Fund – Capital Budget

- 1. Decrease the Fund Balance of Fund 102 (Building and Maintenance) by \$20,000*
- 2. Increase the Capital Outlay line item by \$20,000*

PROJECT:

St. John Volunteer Fire Department (Talbot Avenue) generator \$20,000

Amendment 29	Amendment 29
<p><i>2007 Operations Budget</i> Decrease the Fund Balance of Fund 102 (Building and Maintenance) by \$20,000 Increase the Capital Outlay line item by \$20,000</p>	<p><i>2007 Capital Budget</i> PROJECT: Emergency generator St. John Volunteer Fire Department (Talbot Avenue) JUSTIFICATION: Provide emergency power at parish owned building to assist fire department during power outages and/or emergency situations to provide public protection ESTIMATED COSTS: \$20,000.00 METHOD OF FINANCING: Building and Maintenance fund 2.49 parish wide millage ESTIMATED TIME SCHEDULE: June 30, 2007 ANNUAL MAINTENANCE/OPERATION COSTS: To be paid by fire district</p>

AMENDMENT 2007-31-ATZENHOFFER-CAPITAL BUDGET

102 – Building and Maintenance Fund – Capital Budget

1. Decrease the Fund Balance of Fund 102 (Building and Maintenance) by \$20,000
2. Increase the Capital Outlay line item by \$20,000

PROJECT:

Bayou Blue Fire Protection District generator \$20,000

Amendment 31	Amendment 31
<p><i>2007 Operations Budget</i> Decrease the Fund Balance of Fund 102 (Building and Maintenance) by \$20,000 Increase the Capital Outlay line item by \$20,000</p>	<p><i>2007 Capital Budget</i> PROJECT: Emergency generator Bayou Blue Fire Protection District JUSTIFICATION: Provide emergency power at parish owned building to assist fire department during power outages and/or emergency situations to provide public protection ESTIMATED COSTS: \$20,000.00 METHOD OF FINANCING: Building and Maintenance fund 2.49 parish wide millage ESTIMATED TIME SCHEDULE: June 30, 2007 ANNUAL MAINTENANCE/OPERATION COSTS: To be paid by fire district</p>

AMENDMENT 2007-32-ATZENHOFFER-CAPITAL BUDGET

102 – Building and Maintenance Fund – Capital Budget

1. Decrease the Fund Balance of Fund 102 (Building and Maintenance) by \$20,000
2. Increase the Capital Outlay line item by \$20,000

PROJECT:

Fire District No. 1 (Raceland) generator \$20,000

Amendment 32	Amendment 32
<p><i>2007 Operations Budget</i> Decrease the Fund Balance of Fund 102 (Building and Maintenance) by \$20,000 Increase the Capital Outlay line item by \$20,000</p>	<p><i>2007 Capital Budget</i> PROJECT: Emergency generator Fire District No. 1 (Raceland) JUSTIFICATION: Provide emergency power at parish owned building to assist fire department during power outages and/or emergency situations to provide public protection ESTIMATED COSTS: \$20,000.00 METHOD OF FINANCING: Building and Maintenance fund 2.49 parish wide millage ESTIMATED TIME SCHEDULE: June 30, 2007 ANNUAL MAINTENANCE/OPERATION COSTS: To be paid by fire district</p>

AMENDMENT 2007-33-DELATTE-CAPITAL BUDGET

102 – Building and Maintenance Fund – Capital Budget

1. Decrease the Fund Balance of Fund 102 (Building and Maintenance) by \$20,000
2. Increase the Capital Outlay line item by \$20,000

PROJECT:

Bayou Bouef Fire Department generator \$20,000

<p align="center">Amendment 33</p> <p><i>2007 Operations Budget</i> Decrease the Fund Balance of Fund 102 (Building and Maintenance) by \$20,000 Increase the Capital Outlay line item by \$20,000</p>	<p align="center"><i>2007 Capital Budget</i></p> <p>PROJECT: Emergency generator Bayou Bouef Fire Department JUSTIFICATION: Provide emergency power at parish owned building to assist fire department during power outages and/or emergency situations to provide public protection ESTIMATED COSTS: \$20,000.00 METHOD OF FINANCING: Building and Maintenance fund 2.49 parish wide millage ESTIMATED TIME SCHEDULE: June 30, 2007 ANNUAL MAINTENANCE/OPERATION COSTS: To be paid by fire district</p>
---	--

AMENDMENT 2007-34-DELATTE-CAPITAL BUDGET

102 – Building and Maintenance Fund – Capital Budget

1. Decrease the Fund Balance of Fund 102 (Building and Maintenance) by \$20,000
2. Increase the Capital Outlay line item by \$20,000

PROJECT:

Choctaw Fire Department generator \$20,000

<p align="center">Amendment 34</p> <p><i>2007 Operations Budget</i> Decrease the Fund Balance of Fund 102 (Building and Maintenance) by \$20,000 Increase the Capital Outlay line item by \$20,000</p>	<p align="center">Amendment 34</p> <p><i>2007 Capital Budget</i> PROJECT: Emergency generator Choctaw Fire Department JUSTIFICATION: Provide emergency power at parish owned building to assist fire department during power outages and/or emergency situations to provide public protection ESTIMATED COSTS: \$20,000.00 METHOD OF FINANCING: Building and Maintenance fund 2.49 parish wide millage ESTIMATED TIME SCHEDULE: June 30, 2007 ANNUAL MAINTENANCE/OPERATION COSTS: To be paid by fire district</p>
---	---

with the amendment entitled: **AMENDMENT 2007-28-LASSEIGNE-CAPITAL BUDGET**, seconded by Mr. Tyrone Williams. President Randolph inquired as to if the price exceeded the necessary amount for the generators would there be an opportunity to add additional fire stations? Mr. Toups stated that he wanted to add Lockport. Dr. Lasseigne stated that he thought this was a good project that would help the whole parish and that all of the fire stations could be added but that some fire stations already had generators, using St. John for an example. He continued to speak on the matter in detail. Mr. Atzenhoffer stated that with regards to Amendment No. 32, the fire station receiving the generator could be changed to Lockport. Mr. Delatte asked if this would be able to be

amended to add an additional fire station? Chairman Callais stated that the Council should combine all the amendments first. The **motion carried** by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays. Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer offered an **amendment** to Amendment 32, to change if from Raceland to Lockport, seconded by Mr. Lindel Toups and **carried** by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays. Mr. Michael Delatte offered an **amendment** to Amendment 34 to add Chackbay Fire District 8-C, seconded by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and **carried** by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays. Chairman Callais asked if there were any questions on the combined amended budget amendment? Mr. Atzenhoffer stated that he envisioned this as someone calling to inquire as to what the requirements were for each one and knowing that it was up to \$20,000 they would get a much better deal buying ten (10) as opposed to one (1) and coming back with cooperative endeavor agreements or intergovernmental agreements for property that were not owned by the Parish. He continued to speak on the matter, including saying that whatever was left over would go back into the fund balance. President Randolph said that if the fire districts were surveyed for their particular needs and then combine it into a bid, the Parish would probably get a much cheaper price and therefore left over monies could be returned to the fund balance, because now \$200,000 was being looked at. Mr. Curole said in that described process the “Capital” would be gone to and then instead of a cooperative endeavor a donation to the various fire department could be done. The amendment as amended **carried** by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays.

AMENDMENT 2007-28-LASSEIGNE-CAPITAL BUDGET

The next item was an amendment entitled:

AMENDMENT 2007-29-WILLIAMS-CAPITAL BUDGET

102 – Building and Maintenance Fund – Capital Budget

- 1. Decrease the Fund Balance of Fund 102 (Building and Maintenance) by \$20,000*
- 2. Increase the Capital Outlay line item by \$20,000*

PROJECT:

St. John Volunteer Fire Department (Talbot Avenue) generator \$20,000

Amendment 29	Amendment 29
<p><i>2007 Operations Budget</i></p> <p>Decrease the Fund Balance of Fund 102 (Building and Maintenance) by \$20,000</p> <p>Increase the Capital Outlay line item by \$20,000</p>	<p><i>2007 Capital Budget</i></p> <p>PROJECT: Emergency generator St. John Volunteer Fire Department (Talbot Avenue)</p> <p>JUSTIFICATION: Provide emergency power at parish owned building to assist fire department during power outages and/or emergency situations to provide public protection</p> <p>ESTIMATED COSTS: \$20,000.00</p> <p>METHOD OF FINANCING: Building and Maintenance fund 2.49 parish wide millage</p> <p>ESTIMATED TIME SCHEDULE: June 30, 2007</p> <p>ANNUAL MAINTENANCE/OPERATION COSTS: To be paid by fire district</p>

This item was previously combined with Amendment 28 via an amendment made and *carried* by the Council.

The next item was an amendment entitled:

AMENDMENT 2007-30-WILLIAMS-CAPITAL BUDGET

104 – Drainage Fund – Capital Budget

- 1. Decrease the Fund Balance of Fund 104 (Drainage) by \$15,000*
- 2. Increase the Capital Outlay line item by \$15,000*

Project:

104 and 106 Michelle Place repairs to faulty drainage

Amendment 30	Amendment 30
<p><i>2007 Operations Budget</i></p> <p>Decrease the Fund Balance of Fund 104 (Drainage) by \$15,000</p> <p>Increase the Capital Outlay line item by \$15,000</p>	<p><i>2007 Capital Budget</i></p> <p>PROJECT: 104 and 106 Michelle Place</p> <p>JUSTIFICATION: Repair faulty drainage situation created by Parish</p> <p>ESTIMATED COSTS: \$15,000.00</p> <p>METHOD OF FINANCING: 4.80 Parish wide millage</p> <p>ESTIMATED TIME SCHEDULE: June 30, 2007</p> <p>ANNUAL MAINTENANCE/OPERATION COSTS: Minimal as this only impacts shoulder/driveway area</p>

A **motion** was made by Mr. Tyrone Williams and seconded by Mr. Lindel Toups. Mr. Toups inquired as to the location of the area being spoken of and a brief discussion ensued. Dr. Lasseigne explained that he, as well as the Department of Public Works, had looked at this matter and that they had recognized that something needed to be corrected in the area from a situation the Parish had created in the past. He said that putting it in capital outlay had been talked about for over the last year and that maybe this would get it done. Mr. Toups asked if this was a street, to which Dr. Lasseigne stated that it was public street. The amendment *carried* by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays.

AMENDMENT 2007-30-WILLIAMS-CAPITAL BUDGET

Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer pointed out to Chairman Callais that a motion on Amendment 28 had not been offered prior to the amendment to combine Amendment 28, with amendments 29, 31, 32, 33 and 34, and preceding amendments. Dr. Tommy Lasseigne offered a **motion** on Amendment 28, as well as recognizing all motions, amendments and votes made thereon, seconded by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and *carried* by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays.

The next item was an amendment entitled:

AMENDMENT 2007-31-ATZENHOFFER-CAPITAL BUDGET

102 – Building and Maintenance Fund – Capital Budget

1. *Decrease the Fund Balance of Fund 102 (Building and Maintenance) by \$20,000*
2. *Increase the Capital Outlay line item by \$20,000*

PROJECT:

Bayou Blue Fire Protection District generator \$20,000

Amendment 31	Amendment 31
<i>2007 Operations Budget</i>	<i>2007 Capital Budget</i>
Decrease the Fund Balance of Fund 102 (Building and Maintenance) by \$20,000	PROJECT: Emergency generator Bayou Blue Fire Protection District
Increase the Capital Outlay line item by \$20,000	JUSTIFICATION: Provide emergency power at parish owned building to assist fire department during power outages and/or emergency situations to provide public protection
	ESTIMATED COSTS: \$20,000.00
	METHOD OF FINANCING: Building and Maintenance fund 2.49 parish wide millage
	ESTIMATED TIME SCHEDULE: June 30, 2007
	ANNUAL MAINTENANCE/OPERATION COSTS: To be paid by fire district

This item was previously combined with Amendment 28 via an amendment made and *carried* by the Council.

The next item was an amendment entitled:

AMENDMENT 2007-32-ATZENHOFFER-CAPITAL BUDGET

102 – Building and Maintenance Fund – Capital Budget

1. *Decrease the Fund Balance of Fund 102 (Building and Maintenance) by \$20,000*
2. *Increase the Capital Outlay line item by \$20,000*

PROJECT:

Fire District No. 1 (Raceland) generator \$20,000

Amendment 32	Amendment 32
<i>2007 Operations Budget</i>	<i>2007 Capital Budget</i>
Decrease the Fund Balance of Fund 102 (Building and Maintenance) by \$20,000	PROJECT: Emergency generator Fire District No. 1 (Raceland)
Increase the Capital Outlay line item by \$20,000	JUSTIFICATION: Provide emergency power at parish owned building to assist fire department during power outages and/or emergency situations to provide public protection
	ESTIMATED COSTS: \$20,000.00
	METHOD OF FINANCING: Building and Maintenance fund 2.49 parish wide millage
	ESTIMATED TIME SCHEDULE: June 30, 2007
	ANNUAL MAINTENANCE/OPERATION COSTS: To be paid by fire district

This item was previously combined with Amendment 28 via an amendment made and *carried* by the Council.

The next item was an amendment entitled:

<u>AMENDMENT 2007-33-DELATTE-CAPITAL BUDGET</u>
<i>102 – Building and Maintenance Fund – Capital Budget</i>
1. <i>Decrease the Fund Balance of Fund 102 (Building and Maintenance) by \$20,000</i>
2. <i>Increase the Capital Outlay line item by \$20,000</i>

PROJECT:

Bayou Bouef Fire Department generator \$20,000

Amendment 33	Amendment 33
<i>2007 Operations Budget</i>	<i>2007 Capital Budget</i>
Decrease the Fund Balance of Fund 102 (Building and Maintenance) by \$20,000	PROJECT: Emergency generator Bayou Bouef Fire Department
Increase the Capital Outlay line item by \$20,000	JUSTIFICATION: Provide emergency power at parish owned building to assist fire department during power outages and/or emergency situations to provide public protection
	ESTIMATED COSTS: \$20,000.00
	METHOD OF FINANCING: Building and Maintenance fund 2.49 parish wide millage
	ESTIMATED TIME SCHEDULE: June 30, 2007
	ANNUAL MAINTENANCE/OPERATION COSTS: To be paid by fire district

This item was previously combined with Amendment 28 via an amendment made and *carried* by the Council.

The next item was an amendment entitled:

<p><u>AMENDMENT 2007-34-DELATTE-CAPITAL BUDGET</u></p> <p><i>102 – Building and Maintenance Fund – Capital Budget</i></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Decrease the Fund Balance of Fund 102 (Building and Maintenance) by \$20,000</i> 2. <i>Increase the Capital Outlay line item by \$20,000</i>
--

PROJECT:

Choctaw Fire Department generator \$20,000

<p style="text-align: center;">Amendment 34</p> <p><i>2007 Operations Budget</i></p> <p>Decrease the Fund Balance of Fund 102 (Building and Maintenance) by \$20,000</p> <p>Increase the Capital Outlay line item by \$20,000</p>	<p style="text-align: center;">Amendment 34</p> <p><i>2007 Capital Budget</i></p> <p>PROJECT: Emergency generator Choctaw Fire Department</p> <p>JUSTIFICATION: Provide emergency power at parish owned building to assist fire department during power outages and/or emergency situations to provide public protection</p> <p>ESTIMATED COSTS: \$20,000.00</p> <p>METHOD OF FINANCING: Building and Maintenance fund 2.49 parish wide millage</p> <p>ESTIMATED TIME SCHEDULE: June 30, 2007</p> <p>ANNUAL MAINTENANCE/OPERATION COSTS: To be paid by fire district</p>
--	---

This item was previously combined with Amendment 28 via an amendment made and *carried* by the Council.

The next item was an amendment entitled:

<p><u>AMENDMENT 2007-35-TOUPS-OPERATIONS AND CAPITAL BUDGETS</u></p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. <i>Decrease Royalty Fund-Transfer Out by \$100,000</i> 2. <i>Increase Drainage-Transfer In by \$100,000</i> 3. <i>Decrease Drainage-Transfer Out by \$100,000</i> 4. <i>Increase Capital Outlay -Transfer In by \$100,000</i> <p><i>Purpose-\$100,000 to supplement an existing 2006 capital pump station project (Jessie Dufrene). Will improve drainage in the Gheens area.</i></p>

A **motion** was made by Mr. Lindel Toups and seconded by Mr. Daniel Lorraine. Mr. Atzenhoffer stated that the last budget contained \$60,000 in Capital and then asked if that had already been spent and if this amount was additional? President Randolph said that it was not already spent but that this was to supplement. Mr. Atzenhoffer clarified that the \$60,000 was not already spent. A brief discussion ensued regarding the rolling over of \$60,000. Dr. Lasseigne stated that he thought that the Capital Outlay budget needed to be amended and then elaborated on same. Mr. Curole explained that would happen automatically. The budget amendment *carried* by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays.

AMENDMENT 2007-35-TOUPS-OPERATIONS AND CAPITAL BUDGETS

The next item on the agenda was a budget amendment entitled:

AMENDMENT 2007-36-ATZENHOFFER-OPERATIONS BUDGET

001 - General Fund-Economic Development - 00146400

- 1. Decrease the Consulting line of the Economic Development Professional Services fund by \$7,500*
- 2. Decrease the Dues line of the Economic Development-Other Services fund by \$40,000*
- 3. Increase the General Fund Balance of the General Fund by \$47,500.*

A **motion** was made by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and seconded by Mr. Daniel Lorraine. Mr. Curole asked which items within the funds were being cut? Dr. Lasseigne asked Mr. Atzenhoffer if this was were he had talked about decreasing the Dues line item and having the Administration come back with a recommendation? After a brief inaudible explanation by Mr. Atzenhoffer, Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer offered an **amendment** to delete ~~1. Decrease the Consulting line of the Economic Development Professional Services fund by \$7,500, and delete 3. Increase the General Fund Balance of the General Fund by \$47,500.~~ and replace it with 3. Increase the General Fund Balance of the General Fund by \$40,000., seconded by Mr. Daniel Lorraine and *carried* by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays. Mr. Atzenhoffer stated that there was \$25,000 for South Louisiana Economic Council (SLEC), \$30,000 for LA 1 Coalition and also \$7,500 for South Central Planning and Development Commission that the Parish had not been charged for the past several years. He voiced in detail that his thoughts that \$103,000 in Dues to other organizations when cutting everyone else, and that he was trying to be fair. Mr. Matherne asked what would be the balance be if the fund was decreased by \$40,000? Mr. Atzenhoffer said that the balance in the specific line item would be \$63,620, adding that that would be a true cut because the Parish had paid \$97,820 in the previous year. Mr. Matherne then asked the Administration what was normally paid out of the fund? Mr. Atzenhoffer stated that the majority of the funds went to SLEC, LA 1 Coalition and South Central Planing and Development Commission. Mr. Matherne then asked what was Bayouland RC&D? Mr. Curole explained that Bayouland RC&D was an orginazation that handled brown field type areas, adding that it was related to soil and water conservation services. Mr. Matherne then asked if BIG was Bayou Industrial Group, to which Mr. Curole responded yes. Mr. Matherne continued to ask about various organizations listed, to which repsonses were given. The budget amendment

as amended *carried* by a vote of seven (7) yeas and two (2) nays, that being of Mr. Michael Matherne and Mr. Phillip Gouaux.

AMENDMENT 2007-36-ATZENHOFFER-OPERATIONS BUDGET

The next item was a budget amendment entitled:

AMENDMENT 2007-37-ATZENHOFFER-CAPITAL BUDGET

110 - Recreation - Capital Budget

1. *Decrease the \$200,000 Transfer Out to Capital Fund 299 by \$80,000*
2. *Increase the Fund Balance of the Recreation Fund by \$80,000*
3. *Delete the following project from the Capital Budget:*

Amendment 37	Amendment 37
2007 Operations Budget	2007 Capital Budget
Decrease The \$200,000 Transfer Out to Capital Fund 299 by	PROJECT: Larose Civic Center
\$80,000	JUSTIFICATION: To do necessary repairs
Increase the Fund Balance of the Recreation Fund by	ESTIMATED COSTS: \$80,000.00
\$80,000	METHOD OF FINANCING: 1.65 parish wide millage
	ESTIMATED TIME SCHEDULE: December 31, 2007
	ANNUAL MAINTENANCE/OPERATION COSTS:

A **motion** was made by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and seconded by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne. Mr. Atzenhoffer stated that this project had been being heard about for two (2) years and that if it was that serious of a problem the project would have already been done. He continued to speak on the matter. Mr. Atzenhoffer stated that he understood that it was thought that this project was a necessity but that it was going to Capital Outlay and further that the Parish did not own the building. He said that he did not think this project to be a necessity and that the Parish used the building as a shelter and that other services were provided. Mr. Atzenhoffer then spoke about the longevity of the project in detail. Mr. Atzenhoffer pointed out there was other monies in the recreation fund that was being given by the Parish for other things. Dr. Lasseigne said that he agreed with Mr. Atzenhoffer in that the building was used as a shelter but that it was private property and that he did not mind funding them because it was used for recreation. He said that he would rather fund a generator that would run the complex for a storm instead of putting it towards a repair. Dr. Lasseigne continued to speak on the matter, including saying that he did not know if the Council should even be doing what was being asked to be done and that the Parish should receive a benefit equal to the amount of monies paid, adding that he did not see where the public would get an \$80,000 benefit to the improvement of re-mortaring a building. Mr. Gouaux said that this building was a shelter that was used in the time of a need or hurricane. He said that last year he had witnessed first hand the amount of water that was coming from blowing rain and that if the building was to continue to be used as a shelter that something had to be done. Mr. Gouaux said that if the building would have had the money to do the project that he was sure they would have done the project. He said that he did not think that this was asking too much to protect the building and protect the people that utilize it. Mr. Gouaux continued to speak on the effects to the building with high winds and blowing rain. President Randolph then spoke about her first hand knowledge of the effects to the building with Hurricane Katrina and the water on the floor, as well its non-use during Hurricane Cindy. President

Randolph pointed out to the Council that the Administration was currently working on a grant for the project and that the outlook was good, which she said could replace the current money later on if the grant was received before the project was started. She said that the facility had been good to the people of the Parish, particularly in the 10th Ward. Mr. Curole suggested changing this item to a grant if the amendment failed and the project was not “killed”. He said that the building was owned by a non-profit but that there was a residual ownership had by the Parish, saying that meant that if the non-profit ever went out business that the building was for the Parish. Mr. Curole continued to briefly speak on the matter. He then reminded everyone that the facility was also used for recreation and that from his prospective, this project was a recreation project. Mr. Curole said that recreation was very dangerous when there was a water situation in a building. He then elaborated on his statement. Mr. Curole said that the civic center did have some money to do the project but that they had not been able to generate enough money to complete the project. He then spoke in detail regarding a generator which had been donated to the center by British Petroleum and the hardness of trying to find a company to donate to the re-mortaring of the building, as well as the use of the building for recreation and not only in emergencies. Dr. Lasseigne then inquired as to whether the center had tried silicone sealing the bricks and then elaborated on the same. President Randolph pointed out that there was also some settling of the building and that it was not just a matter of the bricks not being properly mortared. She said that the settling of the building was causing the mortar to crack. Mr. Atzenhoffer asked what would be done when the center would come back and say that the project could not be done for \$80,00 and that they needed additional funds? A brief discussion ensued. Mr. Atzenhoffer asked if a physical estimate had been done with regards to the project, to which a response of yes was given. He then asked what was the amount of the estimate? President Randolph stated that she believed that it was between \$130,000 and \$140,000, adding that the current amount was a match to what the center was willing to pay. Mr. Gouaux said that \$80,000 was cut and dry and then a lengthy discussion ensued regarding the center coming back to the Council for funds. Mr. Atzenhoffer then spoke on detail regarding that if this project was done that numerous other buildings the Parish used would be requesting the same assistance, as well as the various approving of various projects such as basketball courts, lights, and dirt. He continued to elaborate on the matter. Mr. Atzenhoffer stated that recreation should not be in the business of a re-build to a building that was not owned by the Parish, saying that if it was owned by the Parish then the monies could be taken out of Building and Maintenance and the job could be done. He continued to speak on the matter. Mr. Gouaux stated that if the project was being done for recreation that he would agree but because of the fact that it was a shelter and it housed people during hurricanes and storms, he thought that the Parish owed those people to give them a facility they could stay dry and comfortable in. President Randolph then spoke about contributing through out the Parish, mentioning Holy Savior Gym and saying that the Parish did not own it but had improved the lighting there. The amendment *failed* by a vote three (3) yeas, that being of Mr. Michael Matherne, Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and Dr. Tommy Lasseigne and six (6) nays.

BUDGET AMENDMENT FAILED

The next item was a budget amendment entitled:

AMENDMENT 2007-38-ATZENHOFFER-OPERATIONS BUDGET

181 - Coastal Zone Management Fund

1. *Decrease the Coastal line of the Coastal Zone Management Fund - Miscellaneous fund by \$10,000*
2. *Increase the Fund Balance of the Coastal Zone Management Fund by \$10,000*

A **motion** was offered by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and seconded by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne. Mr. Atzenhoffer explained that this was Restore and Retreat. The motion *carried* by a vote seven (7) yeas and two (2) nays, that being of Mr. Michael Matherne and Mr. Phillip Gouaux.

AMENDMENT 2007-38-ATZENHOFFER-OPERATIONS BUDGET

The next item was a budget amendment entitled:

AMENDMENT 2007-39-GOUAUX-OPERATIONS BUDGET

110 - Recreation Fund

1. *Decrease the Fund Balance of Fund 110 (Recreation) by \$38,000*
2. *Increase Grants, Line Item # 11045101486004, by \$38,000*

Purpose: For Lafourche Parish Recreation District No. 1

A **motion** was offered by Mr. Phillip Gouaux and seconded by Mr. Lindel Toups. Dr. Lasseigne asked for an explanation of the amendment. Mr. Gouaux explained that this was a reimbursement for a boat launch in Lockport, monies he said, that had been put forth by recreation. He said that by resolution the Council had stated that they would keep the recreation district whole on the monies. Mr. Gouaux said that the amount was actually \$41,000. He continued to briefly speak on the matter. Mr. Atzenhoffer stated that he thought that this had already been paid and a brief discussion ensued. Mr. Gouaux clarified that the monies would only be paid with corresponding receipts from recreation. The motion *carried* by a vote of eight (8) yeas and one (1) nay, that being of Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer.

AMENDMENT 2007-39-GOUAUX-OPERATIONS BUDGET

A **motion** was made Mr. Michael Matherne to return to the regular agenda, seconded by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and *carried* by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays.

The next item (7) on the agenda was Amendments to the 2007 Operations and Capital Budgets.

The next item (7)(a) was an amendment entitled :

AMENDMENT 2007-1-CALLAIS-OPERATIONS BUDGET

001-GENERAL FUND

1. *Decrease Fund Balance of General Fund No. 001 by \$1,233.93*
2. *Increase Salary and Wages line item in the Legislative Fund No.100 by \$1,233.93*

Purpose is to correct the salary and wage line item in the Legislative Department to total \$208,350.93 instead of \$207,117.00.

A **motion** was offered by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and seconded by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne. The motion *carried* by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays.

AMENDMENT 2007-1-CALLAIS-OPERATIONS BUDGET

_____The next item (7)(b) on the agenda was an amendment entitled:

AMENDMENT 2007-2-CALLAIS-CAPITAL BUDGET

Project: *Cut Off Youth Center Park Walking Track*

Justification: *To create a walking trail for the citizens within the area*

Estimated Cost: *\$40,000*

Method of Financing: *1.65 parish wide millage*

Estimated Time Schedule: *December 31, 2007*

Annual Maintenance/Operation Costs: *Maintenance costs will be absorbed by the recreation district.*

Purpose is to change the project name from Cut Off Youth Center Walking Track to Cut Off Park Walking Track due to the fact that it will be built on a parish owned park.

A **motion** was made by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and seconded by Mr. Michael Matherne. Chairman Callais gave a brief explanation of the amendment and a brief discussion ensued. The motion *carried* by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays.

AMENDMENT 2007-2-CALLAIS-CAPITAL BUDGET

The next item (7)(c) on the agenda was an amendment entitled:

**AMENDMENT 2007-3-CALLAIS & LORRAINE-
OPERATION & CAPITAL BUDGETS**
106-ROAD SALES TAX DISTRICT NO. 2 FUND
~ Decrease Fund Balance of RSTD#2-Fund 106 by \$500,000

Amendment 3 <i>2007 Operations Budget</i>	Amendment 3 <i>2007 Capital Budget</i>
Decrease Fund Balance in Fund 106 (RSTD 2)	PROJECT: RSTD2 PROJECT 5-A-ROAD IMPROVEMENTS ON FOURCHON BEACH JUSTIFICATION: to make roadway improvements to existing road right-of-way on Fourchon Beach to facilitate beach access for residents of Parish ESTIMATED COSTS: \$750,000 METHOD OF FINANCING: Proceeds from RSTD 2 & funding from the Greater Lafourche Port Commission ESTIMATED TIME SCHEDULE: Give Engineering Notice to Proceed March 1, 2007 ANNUAL MAINTENANCE/OPERATION COSTS: N/A
\$500,000	
Increase Capital Outlay in Fund 201 (RSTD 2-CONSTRUCTION) RSTD2 PROJECT 5-A-ROAD IMPROVEMENTS ON FOURCHON BEACH	
\$500,000	

A **motion** was made by Mr. Daniel Lorraine and seconded by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer. The motion **carried** by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays.

AMENDMENT 2007-3-CALLAIS & LORRAINE-OPERATION & CAPITAL BUDGETS

The next item (7)(d) on the agenda was amendment entitled:

**AMENDMENT 2007-4-CALLAIS & LASSEIGNE-
OPERATION BUDGET**
107-SOLID WASTE FUND
~ Decrease Fund Balance of Solid Waste Fund No.107 by \$300,000
~ Increase Operating Services of Solid Waste Fund No.107 by \$300,000

Purpose is to reinstate the recycling program back into Lafourche Parish.

A **motion** was made by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne and seconded by Mr. Michael Matherne. Mr. Atzenhoffer voiced that it had already been agreed to take recycling out by contract and that that had been part of the negotiations of the contract. He then voiced his reasons for stating that he did not see the reason for reinstating this service. Mr. Atzenhoffer spoke of the fight to try and raise the .03 cents sales tax and that this amendment would decrease the fund balance to approximately \$100,000. He said that the approximate \$400,000 fund balance should be left alone for another year and then the tax would not have to be raised until a later time. Mr. Atzenhoffer asked that the Council not to vote to reinstate recycling. Dr. Lasseigne said that this was something that was

wanted by the public and that that was who the Parish worked for. He said that he did not think it to be that expensive especially considering that tax revenues were steadily increasing. Dr. Lasseigne said that if the tax needed to be raised it would not be because of this program but because it would need to be raised. He continued to voice his support of this service in detail. Mr. Gouaux asked whether anyone had conferred with SWDI regarding the bringing back of the recycling program and whether the amount being shown was a negotiated amount? Chairman Callais stated that this was an effort to bring back recycling, saying that the approving of the current budget amendment would not bring back recycling immediately but was only to put the money in the line item so that negotiations could be started after the 1st of the year. He said that there were several companies that offered different types of recycling programs. Chairman Callais stated that this amendment did not state that this was regarding SWDI or any other company but was just putting the money in the fund in case it was decided to be done. Mr. Gouaux said that as the previous Chairman of the Solid Waste Committee, he knew that when renegotiations were done that one of the dilemmas ran into was that the new contract price was much higher than what was currently being paid. He said that in order to reduce the contract price there had been negotiations done and services left out. Mr. Gouaux stated that there was only five (5%) percent utilization of the recycling program. Mr. Gouaux said that in taking out some of the services, that he would think that it would be more acceptable to the Parish to bring those back before bringing back recycling, saying that he was a big supporter of recycling but that he did not believe that the Parish could afford it nor was it something that the general public would utilize and get their monies worth from. Mr. Gouaux then relinquished some of his time to Mr. Jerome Danos, Solid Waste Manager. Mr. Danos reiterated what Mr. Gouaux and Chairman Callais had stated. He explained that they had reduced the costs of the contract when it was re-negotiated several years prior to get away from what was a “take all” contract. Mr. Danos said that costs had been cut and that now residents were somewhat restricted in what the Parish would pick up. He said that a lot of tree debris and construction and demolition debris costs was having to be incurred by the residents. Mr. Danos said that he would reiterate that services, as a matter of priority, and would suggest to the Council that some of those services be reinstated prior to looking at recycling which was a very costly program to the Parish and was not very effective. He continued to speak in detail on the matter including costs and effectiveness of the recycling service. Mr. Atzenhoffer stated that the discussions go beyond whether or not recycling was something that was needed because there currently was no recycling and everyone’s trash was still being picked up. Mr. Atzenhoffer was corrected by someone stating that the Parish still had recycling. Mr. Atzenhoffer said that there was a limited recycling program to those who really wanted to recycle. He said that he realized that this would not take the \$300,000 out but that it would dedicate \$300,000, adding that the fund balance would go down to \$100,000. Mr. Atzenhoffer said that that was an invitation to have to raise the taxes. He continued to speak on the matter in detail, including saying that if there would be bids or proposals received from companies outside of the current collector that may specialize in recycling then the Council could be come back to with a dollar value and that they could look at it then. Mr. Atzenhoffer stated his reasons for saying that this amendment should be defeated. Dr. Lasseigne stated to look at the financial information that Mrs. Chiasson, Finance Director, had just supplied earlier in the meeting, which he then read over briefly. He said that more revenue was being generated. Dr. Lasseigne said that he thought this program to be possible to do. He said that this amendment did not spend any monies and that by passing the amendment it showed the public that the Parish was willing to do the right thing. Dr. Lasseigne said that the Administration could negotiate with various entities and that there would be options. He continued

to voice his support of the matter and further that he did not think that the tax would have to be raised. Mr. Gouaux stated that he thought the increase in revenue to be a direct reflection of the storms and the additional monies that had been spent as a result of the storms. He informed the public that Lafourche Parish still had recycling and that there were bins at the field offices, and that the Parish recycled tires, steel and oil. Mr. Gouaux said that it was not like the Parish was opposed to recycling or did not have any recycling in the Parish. He continued to speak on the matter. Mr. Matherne stated that he would be supporting the amendment, saying that he thought it to be a great way to get “seed money” in the fund and get negotiations about the matter. He stated that no one was mandating that the same solid waste contractor be gone with. Mr. Matherne said that the interest in recycling had gone down when recycling was started regularly. He continued to speak on the matter, including saying that the current program was at best, a “token program”. Mr. Matherne asked that the Council support this matter and stated that he thought the people deserved recycling and that the Parish needed to be good stewards of the environment. The motion *carried* by a vote of six (6) yeas, two (2) nays, that being Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and Mr. Phillip Gouaux and one (1) abstention, that being of Mr. Daniel Lorraine.

AMENDMENT 2007-4-CALLAIS & LASSEIGNE-OPERATION BUDGET

_____The next item (7)(e) on the agenda was an amendment entitled:

<p><u>AMENDMENT 2007-5-WILLIAMS & MATHERNE</u></p> <p><i>299-CAPITAL FUND</i></p> <p><i>~ Decrease Road Sales Tax District No. 3 Fund No. 111 by \$8,888.34</i></p> <p><i>~ Decrease Road Sales Tax District No. 5 Fund No. 116 by \$8,888.33</i></p> <p><i>~ Decrease Road Sales Tax District No. 6 Fund No. 117 by \$8,888.33</i></p> <p><i>~ Increase Capital Fund-DPW Roads-Professional Services-Fund No. 299 by \$25,000</i></p> <p><i>Purpose for part of the seed money for the East /West Corridor Project in conjunction with the MPO, South Central Planning and the City of Thibodaux.</i></p>

A **motion** was made by Mr. Tyrone Williams and seconded by Mr. Michael Matherne. An **amendment** was offered by and seconded by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer to delete :

~~299-CAPITAL FUND~~

- ~~~ Decrease Road Sales Tax District No. 3 Fund No. 111 by \$8,888.34~~
- ~~~ Decrease Road Sales Tax District No. 5 Fund No. 116 by \$8,888.33~~
- ~~~ Decrease Road Sales Tax District No. 6 Fund No. 117 by \$8,888.33~~
- ~~~ Increase Capital Fund-DPW Roads-Professional Services-Fund No. 299 by \$25,000~~

and replace it with:

1. Increase Fund No. 299 Capital Fund (DPW Roads) Professional Services by \$25,0000.
2. Decrease Fund No. 111 RSTD #3 by \$8,333.34
3. Decrease Fund No. 116 RSTD #5 by \$8,333.33
4. Decrease Fund No. 117 RSTD #6 by \$8,333.33

seconded by Mr. Michael Matherne and *carried* by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays. Mr. Toups asked if what was being done was legal, saying that the tax being used did not come from Thibodaux? Mr. Curole stated that Parish Road went to the By-Pass and that the road being proposed goes in and out of the Parish. He said that there was a part of the road that was in the Parish. President Randolph clarified what part of the road was in the Parish. Mr. Toups reiterated that part of the road was in Thibodaux and that the legality should be checked into. Mr. Curole stated that this was part of a cooperative endeavor agreement with the City of Thibodaux. Mr. Toups said that money was being taken out from Districts 3, 5 and 6 and was being spent outside the districts. Mr. Curole stated that the Council had voted to consolidate the three (3) districts. Mr. Toups said that where the road was being done was not in the taxing district. A detailed discussion ensued regarding the consolidation of the road sales tax districts, the majority of the work being done in Road Sales Tax District 5 and that the people had not voted yet on the consolidation of the three (3) road sales tax districts. Dr. Lasseigne stated that the people had not voted on the consolidation and that all the work was being done in Road Sales Tax District 5. Discussions on the matter continued. Dr. Lasseigne then stated that the Parish was helping fund a study on a potential road for property that was privately owned and he then asked whether the Parish was planning on expropriating? President Randolph stated that this was all part of the Houma/Thibodaux MPO and that the packet she had supplied them with earlier regarding the State Transportation Fund, was about a \$4 million dollar project and that it was not even allotted yet. She said that this was the beginning stages of the project. President Randolph said that the State was going to do most of the engineering on the project. Mr. Atzenhoffer asked how much Thibodaux was putting up? President Randolph stated that Thibodaux was putting up \$25,000 as well. Mr. Atzenhoffer then clarified that this was only in Road Sales Tax District #5. Mr. Atzenhoffer offered an amendment to delete ~~2. Decrease Fund No. 111 RSTD #3 by \$8,333.34, 3. Decrease Fund No. 116 RSTD #5 by \$8,333.33, and 4. Decrease Fund No. 117 RSTD #6 by \$8,333.33~~ and replace it with Decrease Fund No. 116 RSTD #5 by \$25,000, seconded by Mr. Michael Matherne and *carried* by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays. The budget amendment as amended *carried* by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays.

AMENDMENT 2007-5-WILLIAMS & MATHERNE

ORDINANCES FOR DISCUSSION AND RATIFICATION

Chairman Callais stated that the next item (8) on the agenda was an ordinance to adopt the 2007 Operations and Capital Budgets for the Lafourche Parish Council as well as setting the salaries of unclassified employees as provided for by Article V of the Lafourche Parish Home Rule Charter. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Michael Matherne and seconded by Mr. Phillip Gouaux. After a brief discussion it was noted that budget amendments 6 and 7 had not been done. Mr. Phillip Gouaux **removed** his second and Mr. Michael Matherne **removed** his motion. A **motion** to reconsider budget amendments number 6 and 7 was offered by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer, seconded by Mr. Michael Delatte and *carried* by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays.

The next item (7)(f) on the agenda was other budget amendments.

The next item was an amendment entitled:

**AMENDMENT 2007-6-GOUAUX-
OPERATIONS AND CAPITAL BUDGET**

1. *Decrease Royalty Fund Transfer Out by \$100,000*
2. *Increase the Drainage Fund Transfer In by \$100,000*
3. *Decrease the Drainage Fund Transfer Out by \$100,000*
4. *Increase Capital Outlay Transfer In by \$100,000*

Purpose: \$100,000.00 proposed match with the North Lafourche Levee District for improvements to the Bayou LeBleau levee in the section from Lockport to Larose. This is the most critical area of the levee and was temporarily protected during Hurricane Rita. North Lafourche Levee District will pay for engineering and contribute up to \$100,000 in actual construction costs. Corps permits and mitigation are in place.

A **motion** was offered by Mr. Phillip Gouaux and seconded by Mr. Lindel Toups. Dr. Lasseigne inquired as to what houses would this be protecting, stating that he knew where the area was and that it was all prairie/pasture land and then asked why \$200,000 was being spent? Mr. Gouaux stated that it protected all of the houses between Larose and Lockport. He explained that for Hurricane Juan the levee had broke in the back of Lockport and houses in Larose had flooded. Mr. Gouaux said that with the last storm, this area had been the weakest point between Lockport and Larose and was where the most effort had to be expended to prevent overtopping of the levee. He said that this project was in last year's budget and had gone to bid, it but the bids had come in over what had been budgeted. Mr. Gouaux said that project had never been completed. He said that this had been discussed with the North Lafourche Levee District and that they had agreed to pay for the engineering and match \$100,000 for the project. He continued to briefly speak on the matter. The motion **carried** by a vote of six (6) yeas, two (2) nays, that being of Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and Dr. Tommy Lasseigne and one (1) absent, that being of Mr. Michael Matherne.

AMENDMENT 2007-6-GOUAUX-OPERATIONS AND CAPITAL BUDGET

The next item was an amendment entitled:

AMENDMENT 2007-7-ATZENHOFFER-OPERATIONS

1. *Decrease Fund No. 127 Sr. Citizens Activity Fund -Intergovernmental -by \$40,000*
2. *Increase Fund No. 127 Sr. Citizens Activity Fund-Life/Health Ins by \$40,000*

Purpose: \$40,000 to pay for a portion of the Health Insurance for the full time Council On Aging employees. The Council On Aging will pay the difference.

A **motion** was offered by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and seconded by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne. Mr. Curole pointed out that they were asking the Parish's health insurance provider whether the bringing of the Council On Aging employees onto the policy would be allowed. He said that the Parish may not be able to do what was being asked and further that this would pay a portion of the premium and not the full coverage. He continued to speak on the matter. Mr. Toups asked how many employees were had by Council On Aging and how much it would costs the Parish to add them? An audience member, Mrs. Charlene Rodriguez, Council On Aging, Inc., responded but it was in audible. Chairman Callais clarified that there was nineteen (19) full time employees. Mrs. Rodriguez continued to elaborate on the matter but it was inaudible. Mr. Toups clarified that if Blue Cross/ Blue Shield did not allow the employees to be added to the Parish's policy, the employees would be on their own. He then suggested approving the current budget amendment pending Blue Cross/Blue Shield's allowing of the Council On Aging, Inc. employees to be added to the Parish's policy. A brief discussion ensued. Mr. Lindel Toups offered an **amendment** to make the current budget amendment pending the approval of Blue Cross/Blue Shield of the adding of the Council On Aging, Inc. employees to the Parish's policy, seconded by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and **carried** by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays. The budget amendment as amended **carried** by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays.

AMENDMENT 2007-7-ATZENHOFFER-OPERATIONS

ORDINANCES FOR DISCUSSION AND RATIFICATION

The next item (8) on the agenda was an ordinance to adopt the 2007 Operations and Capital Budgets for the Lafourche Parish Council as well as setting the salaries of unclassified employees as provided for by Article V of the Lafourche Parish Home Rule Charter. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Michael Matherne and seconded by Mr. Phillip Gouaux. Mr. Matherne clarified the rest of the budget process in detail. Chairman Callais stated that a budget amendment veto override had the same time period as a regular veto override. The motion **carried** by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays.

ORD. NO. 3949 2007 OPERATIONS AND CAPITAL BUDGETS

Next, a **motion** was offered by Mr. Michael Delatte, seconded by Mr. Michael Matherne to *open* the Public Hearing & Ordinances for Ratification and **carried** by a vote of eight (8) yeas and one (1) nay, that being of Mr. Tyrone Williams.

PUBLIC HEARING AND ORDINANCES FOR RATIFICATION

The next item (9) on the agenda was an ordinance providing for a Supplemental Appropriation for revenue received from FEMA as reimbursement for the rental of dams used during Hurricane Rita within the Lafourche Parish 2006 Operation and Maintenance Budget as provided for by Article VI of the Lafourche Parish Home Rule Charter. Chairman Callais asked three times if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Chairman Callais moved for a motion. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Michael Delatte and seconded by Mr. Phillip Gouaux. Mr. Atzenhoffer offered an **amendment** to increase the Fund Balance by \$4,917,545.00 (as shown in Exhibit 2 attached hereto, seconded by Mr. Phillip Gouaux. He explained that the amendment would increase the Fund Balance by \$4,917,545.00. Mr. Atzenhoffer stated that they Council was in receipt of a letter from Mr. Camille A. Morvant, II, District Attorney, and Mr. James Stark, Director, Louisiana Transitional Recovery Office, which he requested by made part of the record of the current proceedings, and therefore is attached hereto as Exhibit 3. He then read from the letter and stated that according to FEMA, Lafourche Parish should retain \$1,016,400 of the \$4,915,545 and return the balance to the State Smart Link account. Mr. Atzenhoffer said that there was two (2) parts to the \$5 million dollars, saying that there was the \$4,917,545 for the FEMA payment and the remainder was expenditures by the Parish that were approved by FEMA. He explained that by putting the money in the fund balance for the \$4,917,000 if authority was gotten to pay it then a supplemental could be done and the money put where it was necessary and advised of by the legal advisor. Mr. Atzenhoffer said that the amendment also allowed the Parish to recoup its \$300,000 it had in actual expenses that were not in debate. He said that the money needed to be put into an account and could not sit there any longer. Mr. Toups asked why should the Council approve the whole \$5 million when he was sure that \$4 million dollars would be saved. He suggested deferring this matter. Mr. Toups said that once this was approved that the whole billed could be paid. Mr. Atzenhoffer said no, that it would be in the fund balance. Mr. Toups clarified that this matter would have to come back before the Council before it could be paid, to which Mr. Atzenhoffer stated that before it could be paid it had to come back as another supplemental appropriation. Mr. Toups asked if the Parish would have any trouble giving it back to FEMA, to which a response of no was given. President Randolph stated that it had been suggested by FEMA that the Parish return the portion that Mr. Atzenhoffer had suggested and that in order to do so, the Parish wanted to accept the portion of the money that was reimbursement for other expenses. She explained that aside from the 102 tubes that the District Attorney was looking to pay for, the Parish had incurred other expenses and that had been approved. President Randolph stated that if the current amendment was done then it would allow for the return of the additional money and the reimbursement of the Parish at that time. Dr. Lasseigne stated that he did not think that it had been suggested and that he had read that FEMA would not pay for the portable dams which were not used. He continued to read that FEMA remained hopeful that the Parish would negotiate the matter and that the balance of the \$4.9 million advanced to the Parish should be reimbursed to the State and retained in the State's Smart Link account to be available to pay approved projects. Dr. Lasseigne asked why this supplemental appropriation had to be done at the present time as the Parish had had the check for approximately two (2) months. Mr. Curole stated that the reason it was on the current agenda was that when the check had come in it had been on the agenda as an introductory ordinance and that it was the time frame of the ordinance process. President Randolph stated that it had been deferred and that it was now back on the agenda. A brief discussion ensued between Dr. Lasseigne and Mr. Atzenhoffer with Mr. Atzenhoffer stating that he was trying to make a point that in order

to send back \$4 million dollars, the Parish had to accept the \$5.2 first. He said all that was being done was to put it in the fund balance. Detailed and lengthy discussions on the matter continued. After a lengthy discussion, Mr. Phillip Gouaux **removed** his second to Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer's amendment. Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer **removed** his motion on his amendment. Mr. Phillip Gouaux **removed** his second on the motion and Mr. Michael Delatte **removed** his motion. Mr. Phillip Gouaux offered a **motion** to *defer* for two (2) weeks to the next meeting of December 12, 2006, seconded by Mr. Lindel Toups and **carried** by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays. Mr. Atzenhoffer stated that he still wanted the District Attorney's and FEMA's letters to be made part of the record.

ORDINANCE DEFERRED UNTIL DECEMBER 12, 2006 COUNCIL MEETING

The next item (10) on the agenda was an ordinance approving the issuance, sale and delivery of One Million Seven Hundred Fifty Thousand Dollars (\$1,750,000) of Sewer Revenue Bonds, Series 2006, of Sewerage District No. 1 of the Parish of Lafourche, State of Louisiana, and other matters relating thereto. Chairman Callais asked three times if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Chairman Callais moved for a motion. A **motion** was offered by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne, seconded by Mr. Lindel Toups and **carried** by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays.

ORD. NO.3950 SEWER REVENUE BONDS; SERIES 2006; SEWERAGE DIST. # 1

The next item (11) on the agenda was an ordinance amending and re-enacting Section 24:650 paragraph (C) of Sub-Chapter (N) of Chapter 24 of the Code of Ordinance of the Lafourche Parish Council as it pertains to the number of commissioners on the Lafourche Parish Sewerage District No. 1 Board and the terms of said commissioners. Chairman Callais asked three times if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Chairman Callais moved for a motion. A **motion** was offered by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne and seconded by Mr. Daniel Lorraine. A discussion began regarding an amendment that Mr. Daniel Lorraine was to offer. Mr. Curole stated that he would explain the amendment after a motion was made on it. Dr. Lasseigne stated that he would not make a motion on the amendment until he had read it. Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer offered an amendment to

Section 1. Section 24:650, Paragraph C, of Sub-Chapter N of Chapter 24 of the Lafourche Parish Council Code of Ordinance is hereby amended and re-enacted to read as follows:

C. In accordance with the provisions of LRS 33:3887, the Police Jury shall appoint ~~three (3)~~ five (5) property taxpayers within the District to serve as the board of supervisors thereof. The board members shall serve four (4) year staggered terms. Terms shall follow the calendar year and therefore appointees. Seat A shall expire December 31, 2007 and their replacements shall serve four year terms henceforth. Seat B shall expire December 31, 2008 and their replacements shall serve four year terms henceforth. Seat C shall expire December 31, 2009 and their replacements shall serve four year terms henceforth. Seat D shall expire December 31, 2010 and their replacements shall serve four year terms henceforth. Seat E shall expire December 31, 2011 and their replacements shall serve four year terms henceforth. Board members are not term limited as long as the council votes to reappoint and the council reserve the right to replace a board member for just cause. Should a board member resign or be removed for just cause a replacement shall succeed for

the remainder of the designated term. The members of this board shall have all the powers and privileges granted and conferred by the Constitution and statutes of the State of Louisiana during their term of office and until their successors are duly appointed and have qualified.

Transitional provisions: The appointment of the commissioners shall be a follows. Seats A, B, and C shall be appointed from the current members of the District. The member serving the longest term of office shall be appointed to Seat A. The member serving the second longest term of office shall be appointed to Seat B. The member serving the shortest term shall appointed to Seat C.,

seconded by Mr. Michael Delatte. Mr. Curole explained that the amendment staggered the terms or clarified how the terms were staggered, as in the early ordinance it had just been stated that it would be staggered. He continued to elaborate on the explanation of the amendment. Dr. Lasseigne stated that he had not put this item on the agenda. Mr. Curole stated that this item had come from the Administration later and that he apologized if he had not spoken to Dr. Lasseigne. Dr. Lasseigne reiterated that he had not put the item on the agenda and that no one had spoke to him about it. Mr. Curole explained that this was a continuation of what the original ordinance should have said. The amendment *carried* by a vote of seven (7) yeas and two (2) nays, that being of Dr. Tommy Lasseigne and Mr. Michael Matherne. Mr. Matherne asked Dr. Lasseigne why two (2) more commissioners were needed? Dr. Lasseigne stated because there was a problem being had with the acquiring of a quorum. The motion as amended *carried* by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays.

ORD. NO. 3951 NUMBER OF COMMISSIONERS, SEWERAGE DIST. NO. 1 BOARD

The next item (12) on the agenda was an ordinance establishing the Louisiana Technical College Campus located at 1425 Tiger Drive Thibodaux, LA 70302, as a polling place for Ward (1), Precinct (2), (3A) and (3B) and Ward (2), Precinct (9); approving a lease agreement with the Louisiana Technical College; and authorizing the Parish President to sign, execute and administer said agreement. Chairman Callais asked three times if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Chairman Callais moved for a motion. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Tyrone Williams, seconded by Mr. Michael Matherne and *carried* by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays.

ORD. NO. 3952 LA. TECHNICAL COLLEGE CAMPUS; POLLING PLACE

The next item (13) on the agenda was an ordinance approving a Servitude Agreement between Artelise Lafont, Jody Lafont, Dennis Lafont, and Russell Joseph Lafont Testamentary Trust and the Lafourche Parish Council; and authorizing the Parish President to sign, execute and administer said agreement. Chairman Callais asked three times if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Chairman Callais moved for a motion. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Daniel Lorraine and seconded by Mr. Michael Matherne. Mr. Cheramie explained that this was property previously owned by Mr. Hubert Lafont, saying that it would drain approximately 85 acres, 45 to 50 homes and 3 businesses, and West 32nd Street. He said that the project had been being looked at for some time and that in connection with this they were looking at the Harang property that would connect and that they had gotten almost all of the in-state signatures and were currently working on the out-of-state signatures. Chairman Callais asked if this was in conjunction with work being done by the drainage district. Mr. Cheramie stated that they district had it proposed but that the people in the area needed drainage at the present time. The motion *carried* by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays.

ORD. NO. 3953 SERVITUDE; LAFONT TESTAMENTARY TRUST

The next item (14) on the agenda was an ordinance approving a Servitude Agreement between Allain-Lebreton Company and the Lafourche Parish Council; and authorizing the Parish President to sign, execute and administer said agreement. Chairman Callais asked three times if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Chairman Callais moved for a motion. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Daniel Lorraine and seconded by Mr. Phillip Gouaux. Mr. Cheramie explained that this was a ditch that connected to the 20 Arpent Canal and was behind East 93rd and drained the South Lafourche High School and in particular was right behind the baseball diamond. He said that the street and the school system drained there, as well East 94th Street and approximately 40 acres of land, 24 homes and 1 business. The motion *carried* by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays.

ORD. NO. 3954 SERVITUDE; ALLIAN-LEBRETON COMPANY

The next item (15) on the agenda was an ordinance approving a Servitude Agreement between David J. Breaux and the Lafourche Parish Council; and authorizing the Parish President to sign, execute and administer said agreement. Chairman Callais asked three times if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Chairman Callais moved for a motion. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Phillip Gouaux and seconded by Mr. Lindel Toups. Mr. Cheramie explained that this servitude would drain approximately 25 acres, 13 to 15 homes, and would help the whole area into the drainage from Allied Shipyard coming back to the location where the “Old Phillip George Restaurant” was located. The motion *carried* by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays.

ORD. NO. 3955 SERVITUDE; DAVID J. BREAUX

The next item (16) on the agenda was an ordinance approving a Servitude Agreement between the Residents which Names and Signatures are on the attached Servitude Agreement, residing on the East side of Diplomat Way, known as South Peltier Subdivision and the Lafourche Parish Council; and authorizing the Parish President to sign, execute and administer said agreement. Chairman Callais asked three times if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Chairman Callais moved for a motion. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Tyrone Williams and seconded by Mr. Michael Matherne. Mr. Cheramie explained that this servitude was an outfall canal where they had done some clearing and cleaning out approximately two (2) years prior but that the servitude had was only for half of the outfall canal, saying that the other half was owned by the residents. He said that they had acquired signatures from all of the residents so that they could go back and do the proper cleaning of the outfall canal. Mr. Cheramie stated that it was approximately 70 acres of land that would be drained, 200 homes, a retirement home, 24 apartments, 5 businesses, 1 school and further that this was the area where the machine with the “drum mulcher” would be moving into. The motion *carried* by a vote of eight (8) yeas and one (1) nay, that being of Mr. Lindel Toups.

ORD. NO. 3956 SERVITUDE; RESIDENTS, EAST SIDE OF DIPLOMAT WAY

The next item (17) on the agenda was an ordinance providing a Variance from the Lafourche Parish Subdivision Regulations at the Charles T. Wallace Family Division Ward (4), District (7), as recommended by the Lafourche Parish Planning Commission at their October 26, 2006 Meeting. Chairman Callais asked three times if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Chairman Callais moved for a motion. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Phillip Gouaux, seconded by Mr. Lindel Toups and *carried* by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays.

ORD. NO. 3957 VARIANCE; CHARLES T. WALLACE FAMILY DIVISION

The next item (18) on the agenda was an ordinance amending the boundaries of Road Sales Tax District No. 2 of the Parish of Lafourche, State of Louisiana; and providing for other matters in connection therewith. Chairman Callais asked three times if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Chairman Callais moved for a motion. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Daniel Lorraine, seconded by Mr. Michael Matherne and *carried* by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays.

ORD. NO. 3958 AMEND BOUNDARIES; RSTD NO. 2

The next item (19) on the agenda was an ordinance amending Ordinance No. 3896 as it pertains to fixing salaries of unclassified employees. Chairman Callais asked three times if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Chairman Callais moved for a motion. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer, seconded by Mr. Michael Delatte and *carried* by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays.

ORD. NO. 3959 AMEND ORD. NO. 3896; SALARIES, UNCLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES

The next item (20) on the agenda was an ordinance amending Ordinance No. 3704 as it pertains to fixing the salaries of unclassified employees. Chairman Callais asked three times if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Chairman Callais moved for a motion. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Tyrone Williams, seconded by Mr. Michael Delatte and *carried* by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays.

ORD. NO. 3960 AMEND ORD. NO. 3704; SALARIES-UNCLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES

The next item (21) on the agenda was an ordinance amending Chapter 24 of the Code of Ordinances of the Lafourche Parish Council to create Sub-Chapter "Z", Sections 24:1400 through 24:1406, as it pertains to the South Lafourche Beachfront Development District and provide for related matters. Chairman Callais asked three times if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Chairman Callais moved for a motion. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Phillip Gouaux to *defer* this item for two (2) weeks, seconded by Mr. Daniel Lorraine and *carried* by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays.

ORDINANCE DEFERRED TO DECEMBER 12, 2006 COUNCIL MEETING

The next item (22) on the agenda was an ordinance abolishing the Recreation Coalition Board and the North Lafourche Revitalization District Board; and directing all duties and responsibilities of the listed boards to be transferred to the Administrative offices of the Lafourche Parish Government. Chairman Callais asked three times if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Chairman Callais moved for a motion. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Michael Matherne, seconded by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and *carried* by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays.

ORD. NO. 3961 ABOLISH RECREATION COALITION & NORTH LAFOURCHE REVITALIZATION DISTRICT BOARD

The next item (23) on the agenda was an ordinance amending and re-enacting Section 19:334(I) of Sub-Chapter "D" of Chapter 19 as it pertains to Family Subdivision Regulations of Lafourche Parish, State of Louisiana. Chairman Callais asked three times if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Chairman Callais moved for a motion. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Daniel Lorraine and seconded by Mr. Lindel Toups. Mr. Toups asked if this was with regards to letting family subdivisions put a two (2") inch water line if that was what they wanted, to which affirmative responses were given. The motion *carried* by a vote of eight (8) yeas and one (1) nay, that being of Mr. Phillip Gouaux.

ORD. NO. 3962 AMEND FAMILY SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS

The next item (24) on the agenda was an ordinance amending and re-enacting Sub-Chapter “D” of Chapter 19 of the Code of Ordinances of the Lafourche Parish Council as it pertains to amending Section 19:354 Water Facilities of the Lafourche Parish Subdivision Regulations in Lafourche Parish, State of Louisiana. Chairman Callais asked three times if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Chairman Callais moved for a motion. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Phillip Gouaux and seconded by Mr. Daniel Lorraine. Mr. Gouaux asked for an explanation? Chairman Callais explained that this was a recommendation by the Planning Commission regarding waterline sizes. A brief discussion ensued. The motion *carried* by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays.

ORD. NO. 3963 AMEND WATER FACILITIES; SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS

The next item (25) on the agenda was an ordinance to provide for a Supplemental Appropriation for the establishment of the HUD-EDI Special Projects Grant for Waterfront Development along Bayou Lafourche in Ascension, Assumption, and Lafourche Parishes in the Lafourche Parish 2006 Operation and Maintenance Budget and the Capital Project Budget as provided for by Article VI of the Lafourche Parish Home Rule Charter. Chairman Callais asked once if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the proposed ordinance. Mr. Maurice Robichaux inquired as to what was meant by Waterfront Development? Mr. Curole explained that this was the \$495,000 grant from HUD and was basically related to the Bayou Lafourche Corridor project. He said that the idea was that projects would be proposed to enhance recreation and economic development on the bayou. Mr. Curole stated that one project was a wharf near the Tourist Commission. He continued to briefly speak on the matter. Mr. Robichaux then voiced his concerns in detail with regards to the possible effects to this project and the reintroduction of the Mississippi River and detailed and lengthy discussions ensued regarding the current project and the reintroduction of the Mississippi River. Chairman Callais asked twice more if anyone from the public wanted to speak on the proposed ordinance. Hearing none, Chairman Callais moved for a motion. Dr. Lasseigne asked if \$99,000 was being paid for an engineer? President Randolph said that it was a planner and that it was Ascension, Assumption, and Lafourche parishes that would be being studied and that it was to present a master plan. She said that twenty (20%) was not an abnormal figure. Mr. Curole stated that that was a provision of the federal grant, saying that up to twenty (20%) percent could be used toward it. He said that they did not know what the majority of the monies would be used for, so they had just divided it as the grant allowed. Mr. Curole said that it was on the November 28, 2006 agenda because later on the agenda there was a resolution to amend the Shaw contract. He continued to speak on the matter in detail. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Daniel Lorraine and seconded by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer. Dr. Lasseigne asked if the \$495,000 was for the total project for all of the parishes? Mr. Curole stated yes and explained that it was one (1) year’s worth of grant and the expectation was grants would be received for several years. He said that the expectation was that the first \$495,000 would be for the first project in Lafourche Parish. President Randolph stated that Lafourche comprised about eight (80%) percent of the area. Dr. Lasseigne clarified that the whole project was funded within Lafourche Parish Government. President Randolph stated yes, that the monies had to come to Lafourche Parish because that was the cooperative endeavor agreement that the municipalities and parishes had signed off on. Dr. Lasseigne asked if Lafourche Parish negotiated the professional service contract? Mr. Curole said that professional service contract was approved originally by the Council approximately five (5) months previously and in the current agenda it was being amended to work toward the second phase which they could not do previously as all that was had was the parish’s seed money. He said that

now federal money was had and that the paperwork was had that said that the money could be tapped into. Mr. Curole said so now they were bringing it into the budget and asking that it be tapped into so that the master plan could be completed for the three (3) parishes. He reiterated that the expectation was that the remaining monies would be used for a first project in Lafourche Parish and further that it was expected that approximately \$500,000 would come every year to the region. He continued to speak on the matter. The motion *carried* by a vote of seven (7) yeas and two (2) nays, that being of Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and Dr. Tommy Lasseigne.

ORD. NO. 3964 SUPPLEMENTAL APPROPRIATION

A **motion** was made by Mr. Daniel Lorraine to deviate to Item (45) on the November 28, 2006 agenda, seconded by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne and *carried* by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays.

The next item (45) on the agenda was a resolution appointing three (3) members to the Veterans Memorial District of the Parish of Lafourche. A **motion** was made by Mr. Daniel Lorraine and seconded by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer. Mr. Lorraine explained that he felt that the current members should be given another year and stated his reasons for saying same. He said that he would like the first members to continue unless they wanted to step down. Mr. Lorraine stated that he would nominate the same three (3) members. An audience member believed to Mr. Chester Boudreaux, informed Mr. Lorraine that Mr. Clyde Orgeron had resigned. Chairman Callais stated that when a letter of resignation was received from Mr. Orgeron a new member would be nominated at that time. The motion *carried* by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays.

RES. NO. 06-314 APPOINT MEMBERS TO VETERANS MEMORIAL DISTRICT

A **motion** was made by Mr. Daniel Lorraine to deviate to Item (52) on the November 28, 2006 agenda, seconded by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne and *carried* by a vote of nine (9) yeas and zero (0) nays.

The next item (52) on the agenda was a discussion regarding the rear (180' X 12') portion of West 135th Street. Mr. Lorraine explained that this issue had been going on for a long time with Mr. Sidney Sanders who was saying that 180 feet beyond the blacktop was taken care of by the Parish. He said that he found a 1985 list in his files which he said stated that the Parish used to grade 104 feet. Mr. Lorraine said that he had spoken to Mr. Louis Davis, who he said had worked for the Parish for years as a grader, who said that there used to be a gate or fence and that the Parish used to go all the way to the fence or gate. He said that he was turning this matter over to the Administration and that he would supply them with documentation and asked that they get with Mr. Sanders to see if something could be done. Mr. Lorraine said that if nothing could be done and according to what Mr. Sanders had told him, he was sure that there would be litigation. He continued to briefly speak on the matter.

Mr. Daniel Lorraine left the meeting at 10:28 p.m.

A **motion** was made by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer to return to the regular agenda, seconded by Mr. Michael Delatte and *carried* by a vote of eight (8) yeas and, zero (0) nays and one (1) absent, that being of Mr. Daniel Lorraine.

Next, a **motion** was offered by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer, seconded by Mr. Michael Delatte, to **close** the Public Hearing and Ordinances for Ratification, and **carried** by a vote of eight (8) yeas, zero (0) nays, and one (1) absent, that being of Mr. Daniel Lorraine.

Chairman Callais turned over the proceeds of the meeting to Vice-Chair Atzenhoffer.

PROPOSED ORDINANCES

The next item (26) on the agenda was a proposed ordinance declaring Property belonging to Lafourche Parish Council, Parish of Lafourche, as Surplus Property. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Michael Delatte to introduce the above stated proposed ordinance.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE PARISH COUNCIL SURPLUS PROPERTY

The next item (27) on the agenda was a proposed ordinance authorizing the Parish President to enter into an Act of Donation to acquire property in Thibodaux Heights Subdivision (Formerly Marydale) belonging to the Housing Authority of Lafourche Parish, in the Facilitation of a Recreational Area, and to execute any and all documents pertaining to said act of donation. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Tyrone Williams to introduce the above stated proposed ordinance.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE DONATION; PROPERTY, RECREATIONAL AREA

The next item (28) on the agenda was a proposed ordinance to provide for a Supplemental Appropriation covering projected increases and decreases for the Lafourche Parish 2006 Operation and Maintenance Budget and Capital Outlay 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

The next item (29) on the agenda was a proposed ordinance to accept the Subdivision known as the Tracts 1 & 2, Redivision of Property of Alvin Baudoin, Et Ux into the Parish System. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Michael Matherne to introduce the above stated proposed ordinance.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE ACCEPT TRACTS 1 & 2, REDIVISION OF PROPERTY OF ALVIN BAUDOIN, ET UX

The next item (30) on the agenda was a proposed ordinance to accept the Subdivision known as the Prairie View Subdivision into the Parish System. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Michael Matherne to introduce the above stated proposed ordinance.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE ACCEPT, PRAIRIE VIEW SUBDIVISION

The next item (31) on the agenda was a proposed ordinance to accept the Subdivision known as Subdivision of Lot 1 of a Subdivision by Javy J. Pertuit into the Parish System. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Michael Matherne to introduce the above stated proposed ordinance.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE ACCEPT, SUBDIVISION OF LOT 1 OF A SUBDIVISION BY JAVY J. PERTUIT

The next item (32) on the agenda was a proposed ordinance to accept the Subdivision known as Madewood Place Subdivision, Phase A into the Parish System. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Michael Delatte to introduce the above stated proposed ordinance.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE ACCEPT, MADEWOOD PL. SUBDIVISION, PHASE A

The next item (33) on the agenda was a proposed ordinance an Ordinance ordering and calling Special Elections to be held in Road Sales Tax District No. 2 of the Parish of Lafourche, State of Louisiana, and Consolidated Sales Tax District A of the Parish of Lafourche, State of Louisiana, to authorize the levy of sales and use taxes therein; making application to the State Bond

Commission in connection therewith; and providing for other matters in connection therewith. Mr. Gouaux inquired as to whether this was a regularly scheduled election or if would be a special election? President Randolph said that it was on the calendar and was also the same date that Thibodaux was holding their election for a councilman they must replace due to his death. She said that this was an election that would be throughout the parish. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Brent Callais to introduce the above stated proposed ordinance.

**PROPOSED ORDINANCE SPECIAL ELECTIONS; RSTD NO. 2 &
CONSOLIDATED SALES TAX DISTRICT A**

The next item (34) on the agenda was a proposed ordinance to accept the Subdivision known as Blue Ridge Pointe Subdivision, Phase "D" into the Parish System. A **motion** was offered by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne to introduce the above stated proposed ordinance.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE ACCEPT, BLUE RIDGE POINTE SUB., PHASE "D"

The next item (35) on the agenda was a proposed ordinance amending Ordinance No. 3790 Creating Section 5:99 and amending Sections 100-110 of Chapter 5, Sub-Chapter B of the Lafourche Parish Code of Ordinance Relative to the Lafourche Parish Building Code and Permit Schedule. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Michael Matherne to introduce the above stated proposed ordinance. Mr. Curole stated that this should be noted as a work in progress. He said that this was still evolving and that the Council should not hesitate to send in any suggestions on the matter. A brief discussion ensued.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMEND BUILDING CODE & PERMIT SCHEDULE

Mr. Tyrone Williams left the meeting at 10:32 p.m.

The next item (36) on the agenda was a proposed ordinance to name the Park adjacent to the Old Lafourche Parish Jail Building at the corner of West 3rd and Green Street as the Ambroise H. Landry Park. A **motion** was offered by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne to introduce the above stated proposed ordinance.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE NAME PARK AMBROISE H. LANDRY PARK

The next item (37) on the agenda was a proposed ordinance approving the Servitude Agreement between Charles Robert Crosby and Dimples Boseman Crosby and the Lafourche Parish Council; and authorizing the Parish President to sign, execute and administer said agreement. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Brent Callais to introduce the above stated proposed ordinance.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE SERVITUDE; CHARLES & DIMPLES CROSBY

The next item (38) on the agenda was a proposed ordinance approving the Servitude Agreement between Michael Ray Crosby and Lacey Pierce Crosby and the Lafourche Parish Council; and authorizing the Parish President to sign, execute and administer said agreement. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Brent Callais to introduce the above stated proposed ordinance.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE SERVITUDE; MICHAEL & LACEY CROSBY

The next item (39) on the agenda was a proposed ordinance approving the Servitude Agreement between residents on the South Side of West 54th St. from Lot HL-28 to Lot HL-72 and the Lafourche Parish Council; and authorizing the Parish President to sign, execute and administer said agreement. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Brent Callais to introduce the above stated proposed ordinance.

**PROPOSED ORDINANCE SERVITUDE; RESIDENTS, SOUTH SIDE, WEST 54TH
ST.**

The next item (40) on the agenda was a proposed ordinance amending and re-enacting Sections 25:152 and 25:154 of Sub-Chapter "C" of Chapter 25 of the Code of Ordinances as it pertains to Street Lights. A **motion** was offered by Mr. Brent Callais to introduce the above stated proposed ordinance.

PROPOSED ORDINANCE AMEND CODE OF ORDINANCES; STREET LIGHTS

Chairman Callais resumed the proceedings of the meeting.

RESOLUTIONS

The next item (41) on the agenda was a resolution stating the Lafourche Parish Council's endorsement of Bourgeois Smokehouse, LLC located at 1453 Tiger Drive, Thibodaux, Louisiana (Enterprise Zone Advance Notification No.061766-0), to participate in the benefits of the Louisiana Enterprise Zone Program. A **motion** was made by Mr. Michael Matherne and seconded by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer. Chairman Callais inquired as to whether anything had been heard back from an attorney regarding these type of matters? The motion *carried* by a vote of seven (7) yeas, zero (0) nays and two (2) absent, that being Mr. Daniel Lorraine and Mr. Tyrone Williams.

RES. NO. 06-315 ENTERPRISE ZONE; BOURGEOIS SMOKEHOUSE, LLC

The next item (42) on the agenda was a resolution approving Change Order No. 3 to Huey Stockstill, Inc. for Roadway and Drainage improvements in Road Sales Tax District No. 3 - Project 3B as an increase in contract price by \$47,498.00 and an increase in contract length by Fourteen (14) days; and authorizing the Parish President to sign, execute and administer said agreement. A **motion** was made by Mr. Phillip Gouaux and seconded by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer. Dr. Lasseigne stated that this contract had increased by \$180,000 from the original contract price, adding that that was almost a road contract. Mr. Atzenhoffer stated that Mazarac Street had been added to the project. Mr. Curole stated that this was the addition of the culverts in Pointe Aux Chenes. A brief discussion ensued. Dr. Lasseigne clarified that it was \$50,000 worth of culverts, to which Mr. Atzenhoffer stated that there was no road and that the vehicles were traveling through the culverts. The motion *carried* by a vote of seven (7) yeas, zero (0) nays and two (2) absent, that being of Mr. Tyrone Williams and Mr. Daniel Lorraine.

RES. NO. 06-316 C.O. # 3; RSTD NO. 3, PROJECT 3B

The next item (43) on the agenda was a resolution approving Change Order No. 1 to Byron E. Talbot Contractor, Inc. For Road Improvements in Road Sales Tax District No. 5 - Project 5G as a decrease in contract price by \$13,816.60; and authorizing the Parish President to sign, execute and administer said agreement. A **motion** was made by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne and seconded by Mr. Michael Delatte. An **amendment** was offered by Mr. Michael Delatte to delete ~~A DECREASE~~ and replace it with AN INCREASE, seconded by Mr. Phillip Gouaux and *carried* by a vote of seven (7) yeas, zero (0) nays, and two (2) absent, that being of Mr. Daniel Lorraine and Mr. Tyrone Williams. The resolution as amended *carried* by a vote of seven (7) yeas, zero (0) nays and two (2) absent, that being of Mr. Daniel Lorraine and Mr. Tyrone Williams.

RES. NO. 06-317 C.O. #1; RSTD NO. 5, PROJECT 5G

The next item (44) on the agenda was a resolution approving the purchase of One (1) Dodge Dakota truck from Thibodaux Chrysler for the Department of Public Works Pool Vehicle and One (1) Ford Freestar Mini Van from Lafourche Ford for the Thibodaux Office Pool Vehicle. A **motion** was made by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and seconded by Mr. Michael Matherne. Mr. Atzenhoffer asked if the vehicles being replaced were being traded in? Mr. Curole stated that the vehicles would have

to be declared surplus, adding that he did not think that they were in the current surplus list and that it would have to be amended. Mr. Atzenhoffer asked the amendment be made at the next meeting. The motion *carried* by a vote of seven (7) yeas, zero (0) nays, and two (2) absent, that being of Mr. Daniel Lorraine and Mr. Tyrone Williams.

RES. NO. 06-318 APPROVE PURCHASE OF TWO POOL VEHICLES

The next item (45) on the agenda was a resolution appointing three (3) members to the Veterans Memorial District of the Parish of Lafourche. This item was previously discussed via a deviation from the regular agenda.

RES. NO. 06-314 APPOINT MEMBERS TO VETERANS MEMORIAL DISTRICT

The next item (46) on the agenda was a resolution accepting a Grant for the Lafourche Parish Government with the Louisiana Department Of Transportation and Development's 2006 Transportation Enhancement Program and certifying responsibility for the project. A **motion** was made by Mr. Lindel Toups and seconded by Mr. Phillip Gouaux. President Randolph stated that this was exciting. She said that this was \$130,000 from the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development to do a wharf project near the tourist center in Raceland, Louisiana. President Randolph said hopefully that project could be expanded upon from what had been spoken about earlier regarding the farmer's market and parking lot. She stated that this was something that they had worked on with Chairman Callais in association with the HUD monies. President Randolph said that the project was funded before there was even a plan for the project. Chairman Callais stated that he recalled from a previous meeting that the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development had had some concerns about building something like what was being proposed under a future interstate. He asked if those concerns had been settled? Mr. Curole said that it was an appropriate time to get them to put whatever they decided in writing but that it was interesting that it was the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development that was helping to fund the project. He said that different answers had been heard on the issue. Mr. Curole continued to speak on the matter. Mr. Toups asked if the grant being spoken of had not been applied for three (3) year prior? Mr. Curole stated that yes, it had been a couple of year previous. A brief discussion ensued. President Randolph pointed out that protective barriers had also been put on the highway so people were no longer throwing things off the overpass. Mr. Curole said that that was something they had met with the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development on about a year to a year-and-a-half previously. The motion *carried* by a vote of seven (7) yeas, zero (0) nays, and two (2) absent, that being of Mr. Daniel Lorraine and Mr. Tyrone Williams.

RES. NO. 06-319 ACCEPT GRANT; LA DOTD 2006 TRANSPORTATION ENHANCEMENT PROGRAM

The next item (47) on the agenda was a resolution to provide for a Transfer of Appropriation for the purchase of the Document Management Module of the Enterprise Resource Planning Software, additional Network Security Software Licenses by the Information Technology Office and Two (2) Pool Vehicles within the Lafourche Parish 2006 Operation and Maintenance Budget and the Capital Project Budget as provided for by Article VI of the Lafourche Parish Home Rule Charter. A **motion** was made by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and seconded by Mr. Michael Matherne. A brief discussion ensued regarding the e-mails received by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer. The motion *carried* by a vote of seven (7) yeas, zero (0) nays, and two (2) absent, that being of Mr. Daniel Lorraine and Mr. Tyrone Williams.

RES. NO. 06-320 TRANSFER OF APPROPRIATION

The next item (48) on the agenda was a resolution approving an Intergovernmental Agreement between the Lafourche Parish Council, the Lafourche Parish Sheriff's Office, the Lafourche Parish Clerk of Courts, and the 17th Judicial District Court for Security at the Courthouse and Courthouse Annex in Thibodaux; and authorizing the Parish President to sign, execute and administer said agreement. A **motion** was made by Mr. Michael Delatte and seconded by Mr. Michael Matherne. An **amendment** was offered by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer to reduce the amount from \$60,000 to \$30,000, and seconded by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne. Mr. Matherne asked what was the reason for the decrease and Chairman Callais advised that funding had been cut earlier in a budget amendment. The amendment **carried** by a vote of seven (7) yeas, zero (0) nays and two (2) absent, that being of Mr. Daniel Lorraine and Mr. Tyrone Williams. The resolution as amended **carried** by a vote of seven (7) yeas, zero (0) nays and two (2) absent, that being of Mr. Daniel Lorraine and Mr. Tyrone Williams.

RESOLUTION LATER DEFERRED BY A MOTION TO RECONSIDER

The next item (49) on the agenda was a resolution requesting the Lafourche Parish Sheriff's Office to contribute \$30,000.00 to the Parish to assist with the expenditures for Security Guard Services at the Old Courthouse and Courthouse Annex Buildings in Thibodaux. A **motion** was made by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne and seconded by Mr. Lindel Toups. Mr. Curole inquired as to Item (48) and suggested that the resolution was to change to the amount in the resolution and then asked if they should not instead defer it to the next meeting so that the Administration could come back with a replacement agreement that would include the language of the Sheriff participating or not. He said that it was a procedural question. A brief discussion ensued. Mr. Curole said that technically it was the better way to change the agreement. After a brief discussion, Chairman Callais asked if the Council wanted to make a motion to reconsider Item (48). He was then reminded that there was a motion on the floor with regards to Item (49). The motion **carried** by a vote of seven (7) yeas, zero (0) nays and two (2) absent, that being of Mr. Daniel Lorraine and Mr. Tyrone Williams.

RES. NO. 06-321 REQUEST CONTRIBUTION; EXPENDITURE FOR SECURITY GUARD SERVICES

A **motion** was made by Mr. Michael Matherne and seconded by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne to reconsider Item (48) on the November 28, 2006 regular agenda and **carried** by a vote of seven (7) yeas, zero (0) nays and two (2) absent, that being of Mr. Daniel Lorraine and Mr. Tyrone Williams.

The next item (48) on the agenda was a resolution approving an Intergovernmental Agreement between the Lafourche Parish Council, the Lafourche Parish Sheriff's Office, the Lafourche Parish Clerk of Courts, and the 17th Judicial District Court for Security at the Courthouse and Courthouse Annex in Thibodaux; and authorizing the Parish President to sign, execute and administer said agreement. A **motion** was made by Dr. Tommy Lasseigne and seconded by Mr. Michael Delatte to *defer*, and **carried** by a vote of seven (7) yeas, zero (0) nays and two (2) absent, that being of Mr. Daniel Lorraine and Mr. Tyrone Williams.

RESOLUTION DEFERRED

The next item (50) on the agenda was a resolution to serve as a Notice to Proceed for Joseph Caillouet, Architect (JBC/AIA) from the Lafourche Parish Council for the Lockport Library Site through the negotiation phase and the Larose Library Site through the negotiation phase. A **motion** was made by Mr. Lindel Toups and seconded by Mr. Phillip Gouaux. Mr. Matherne asked what was

meant by “negotiation phase”? Mr. Curole stated that it meant up for bid. The motion *carried* by a vote of six (6) yeas, one (1) nay, that being of Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and two (2) absent, that being of Mr. Daniel Lorraine and Mr. Tyrone Williams.

RES. NO. 06-322 NOTICE TO PROCEED; LOCKPORT/LAROSE LIBRARY SITE

The next item (51) on the agenda was a resolution approving a Contract Addendum to a Contract with Shaw Coastal for the Bayou Lafourche Corridor Master Plan; and authorizing the Parish President to sign, execute and administer said agreement. A **motion** was made by Mr. Michael Matherne, seconded by Mr. Michael Delatte and *carried* by a vote of five (5) yeas, two (2) nays, that being of Dr. Tommy Lasseigne and Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer and two (2) absent, that being of Mr. Daniel Lorraine and Mr. Tyrone Williams.

RES. NO. 06-323 APPROVE CONTRACT ADDENDUM; BAYOU LAFOURCHE CORRIDOR MASTER PLAN

DISCUSSIONS

The next item (52) on the agenda was a discussion regarding the rear (180' X 12') portion of West 135th Street. This item was previously discussed via a deviation from the regular agenda.

ADJOURNMENT

On **motion** by Mr. Mark Atzenhoffer, seconded by Mr. Michael Delatte, and *carried* by a vote six (6) yeas, one (1) nay, that being of Mr. Lindel Toups and two (2) absent, that being of Mr. Daniel Lorraine and Mr. Tyrone Williams, and with no further business, the Lafourche Parish Council Meeting of November 28, 2006 **adjourned** at 10:44 p.m.

BRENT CALLAIS, CHAIRMAN
LAFOURCHE PARISH COUNCIL

SHEILA B. BOUDREAUX, COUNCIL CLERK
LAFOURCHE PARISH COUNCIL