

SPECIAL MEETING
OFFICIAL PROCEEDINGS
ST. JOHN THE BAPTIST PARISH COUNCIL
WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 6TH, 2013
CHAIR JACLYN HOTARD
VICE CHAIR LENNIX MADERE

The Council of the Parish of St. John the Baptist, State of Louisiana, met in a Special Meeting in the Joel McTopy Chambers, LaPlace, Louisiana on Wednesday, November 6th, 2013, at 3:00 PM.

CALL TO ORDER:

PRESENT AT ROLL CALL: Art Smith, Ranney Wilson, Lennix Madere, Marvin Perrilloux, Jaclyn Hotard, Michael Wright, Larry Snyder, Cheryl Millet, Lucien Gauff

ABSENT: None

Councilman Perrilloux led the Prayer. Councilman Snyder led the Pledge.

Legal Counsel Jeff Perilloux and Tom Daley were present.

There was no one present from the administration.

Budget Hearings

Councilwoman Hotard stated, *"The purpose of this item is to have open public discussions about the budget. We don't have any members from the administration present at this time however if the council would like to engage in any discussion, dialogue or offer any motions at this time that still can be accepted. So I will open the floor up to any council members who would like to share anything at this time or have any of their dialogue, questions or motions made part of the public record."*

Councilman Perrilloux stated, *"I would like to make a motion I know we are going to be discussing the raises for the parish president and directors but at this time no one is present from there but I would like to make a motion that we freeze the raise on the parish president and non-classified workers for 2014. That is my motion."*

Councilwoman Hotard stated, *"I have a motion from Councilman Perrilloux that we freeze the salaries at their current rate going into 2014 and I will accept a second at this time. The civil service employees are covered under a separate ordinance. Councilman Snyder seconded the motion is there any discussion?"*

Councilwoman Millet stated, *"My only comment in this situation is I understand that we have certain ordinances and items in place to prevent this from happening anyways so I know that we are probably doing this as a backup type of thing. I am asking the question while we are doing this because we do have things in place to prevent this from happening already. Am I correct?"*

Councilwoman Hotard stated, *"I think we should defer to legal counsel*

Jeff or Judge Daley to answer that question. I know we have had some discussions on it."

Councilwoman Millet stated, "I just want to make sure where we are."

Jeff Perilloux, Legal Counsel, stated, "The current state of affairs is that the salaries are what the salaries are and until the salaries are changed they remain where they are. That is the answer."

Councilwoman Hotard stated, "Alright so I think what Cheryl is asking you is are the ordinances that are in place would they prevent something like this from happening and I know we have had some discussions earlier and it wasn't really clear on whether or not the ordinances would have the same effect as what Councilman Perrilloux's motion is having. So I think that is kind of where she is going and I think she was right in her assumption that it is kind of like a backup to make sure that the wishes of the council are met."

Jeff Perilloux stated, "I don't know exactly what ordinance you are referring too but according to the charter in order for the parish president to receive a raise it requires a 2/3 vote of the entire council until that happens then the parish president's salary remains at the number it has been currently."

Councilwoman Hotard stated, "The ordinance she is referring to is the ordinance regarding the parish president raise and the one more recently that was passed for non-classified employees that states that the raises can't be given by mere budget adoption but the question had been presented to Judge Daley and to yourself about if we do adopt the budget the way that it is submitted with those raises could those raises still be activated even if we haven't voted on them separately and I believe there was not really a clear answer so this sounds like another measure to make sure that we are not automatically giving raises to employees by mere budget adoption which is what the ordinance says but there were some other things that you spoke of."

Jeff Perilloux stated, "You all have an ordinance that was passed that was actually introduced by Mr. Snyder a couple of months ago I believe and that ordinance was specific to non-classified parish employees and the ordinance states that in order for non-classified employees to receive a raise it is necessary for the council to vote outside of the normal budget process and that is what the ordinance said, now assuming the ordinance stands as valid that would be necessary in order to accomplish a raise for non-classified employees which is in fact non civil service employees."

Councilwoman Millet asked, "Excuse me Ms. Landeche do you have the copy of the one regarding the parish president as well?"

Jackie Landeche, Council Secretary, stated, "I have the one that we just passed but not the resolution."

Councilman Gauff stated, "My comment was the same as Mrs. Millet that we already had an ordinance in place that actually stated what we are voting on now so this would just only be a backup."

Councilman Wilson stated, "Does this also eliminate the 5%? Is that

also in there?"

Councilwoman Hotard stated, "What the motion is doing is actually freezing the salaries for the parish president and the non-classified employees at the 2013 rates. That is what it is doing so that we are going to freeze them at 2013 so that if we do make any other changes or adopt the budget we have already said that we are keeping those salaries at the 2013 rates that we are not going to put that 5% increase in there automatically."

Councilman Madere stated, "I think what Mr. Perrilloux said that this would just eliminate any type of possibility if any kind of loop hole would develop concerning the other ordinance that we had in place so I think by just freezing this it would eliminate any possibility of some of the problem that you may have been talking about so I think that is exactly what it is more of a backup like you said just to make sure. So I think that is exactly what we are trying to do and accomplish so that we won't have that backlash or have to have this discussion again."

Councilman Wright stated, "That is just what I was going to say. If we are uneasy with the ordinance then just go through with the motion and vote. It is better to be safe than sorry."

Councilman Snyder asked, "This is our second year voting on this budget and last year at the beginning of 2012 we voted on the budget that gave the parish president and all of the directors raises and we did the same thing at the end of 2012 at the start of 2013. Now there is an ordinance that states that the parish president can only get a raise every two years and I think it is only once every four years so I was just wondering if that would apply in this case?"

Tom Daley, Legal Counsel, stated, "Councilman Snyder I will attempt to answer your question and I apologize for coming in late I just came from court. I know there is a motion on the floor but I am not sure what the motion is from the discussion the motion seems to be to freeze salaries. I have with Mr. Perilloux we have reviewed the applicable ordinance and resolutions and I will speak to them if I can I think it might help to clarify. What has been referred to as Mr. Snyder's ordinance is Ordinance 13-28 which very clearly states that directors and/or non-civil service employees are not to receive a raise through just budget adoption but there should be specific authority for those raises. That ordinance currently is on the books and I will recommend to administration that they follow that ordinance. I have recommended that there be some clarity in this budget if it is administration's intent to seek council authority to give directors raises or raises to non-civil service employees that that be clearly specified and spelled out. I do think that there is a way that it may be so clear and transparent in the budget proposal that a separate ordinance might not be mandatory. In the current budget as proposed I would agree that it is not clear there are some general numbers and I believe many of you are trying to reach for the backup documentation to establish how those numbers were generated but I am of the opinion that without specific council authority administration just can't find the money. They should present it in a clear picture to this council raises for directors and/or non-civil service employees, specify what they are and if the council approves them by a majority vote either in a specific budget item or with a clear budget proposal that is crystal clear to everyone

then it may not be necessary to have a duplicate independent ordinance but Councilman Snyder's ordinance 13-28 suggests that is the preferable way to do it. So today that is the law and I am requesting that administration follow that law or challenge it if they want to but I am recommending that in their budget proposal that they not seek to give raises clearly based on a lump sum dollar amount that when divided how many ways gives them some additional money for some additional employees, directors and non-civil service. With regards to the parish president the charter is clear that the parish president can only get a raise if it is approved by 2/3's of the council and then only once every two years. A resolution, not an ordinance, was adopted by the council it is R08-09 establishing that the compensation of the parish president shall be calculated in that and it kind of mimics the charter language that is the one that said it should be based on the sheriff salary. Then the subsequent resolution R10-20 authored by Councilwoman Millet was that any further increases by the parish president shall be in accordance with the provisions of the Home Rule Charter and they not be automatic based on the sheriff or some other salary adjustment. I believe that resolution stands and it takes 2/3 vote of this council before the parish president can receive a pay increase. I do think that it is possible that the budget proposal be so clear as to what the parish president's salary is and if it is very clear that it includes an increase and if it has been not more often than two years then a line item that is crystal clear as to what the new salary is might suffice if 2/3's of the council approves it. In the past it has been the position of my office that the unanimous budget adoption with a very clear line item for the parish president's salary was sufficient to comply with the 2/3's charter requirement. So the resolution R10-20 doesn't require a separate ordinance, it just states it is not automatic and it needs to be approved by 2/3's of this council. The other ordinance that I want to bring to the attention of the council that has some affect with regards to salary increases is MM1-77 and this has been a long standing ordinance that has been on the books authorizing a pay increase not greater than 3% or not greater than 3.5% based on the US CPI for civil service employees. That ordinance is on the books and pursuant to that ordinance the annual budget has included increases for payroll salary and staff based on that authorized increase but that increase says 3 or 3.5% not to exceed 3.5% and so administration currently has legislative authority assuming that the budget is approved with those numbers in it to make that pay raise for its civil service employees."

Councilwoman Hotard stated, "Any further discussions for Judge Daley or if you want to just stay right there if there are any more questions for you from the council."

Councilman Snyder stated, "He didn't answer the second part of my question, the last question I just asked about the 2% that every two years and not more than once every four years I read that some place."

Councilwoman Hotard stated, "No the parish president is not more frequent then once every two years that is what is says in the charter."

Councilman Snyder asked, "It doesn't mention the fact that it can only happen every four years?"

Councilwoman Hotard stated, "It says no more frequent than once every two years that is what is says in the charter."

Councilman Snyder asked, "It doesn't mention the fact that and that can only include once every four years?"

Councilwoman Hotard stated, "It says no more frequent than once every two years. It doesn't mention the four year part."

Councilman Snyder stated, "I read it somewhere."

Tom Daley stated, "The charter language Councilman Snyder it may be increased by 2/3's vote of the entire council not more frequently than every two years."

Councilman Wilson stated, "It states that we don't have to give the parish president a raise period it just says that it can only come up every two years and be approved by 2/3 vote it doesn't say that you have to wait two years to give a raise. You don't have to do anything."

Tom Daley stated, "It is very clear that the parish president cannot give herself a raise. The council has to approve any raise and it can't be any more frequently than every two years."

Councilman Snyder stated, "Okay that goes back to my question will we be in violation if we give a raise because we voted on a budget twice since we have been in office and both times it included a raise for the parish president and the directors."

Councilwoman Hotard stated, "Last year it didn't include a raise for the parish president it only included the department heads."

Councilman Snyder stated, "We voted on it two years ago the first time we got into office. I think that is when it went to \$143,000.00 so that gives us two years and this would be the year that she could get another raise that is my question thank you."

Councilwoman Hotard asked, "Any further discussion from the council?"

Councilman Perrilloux asked, "So what Judge Daley is saying then I could withdraw my motion - okay I will leave it on."

Tom Daley stated, "Just one quick comment, a resolution does not have the authority to override an ordinance. I just want to make sure that everyone understands that."

MOTION: Councilman Perrilloux moved and Councilman Snyder seconded the motion to freeze the salaries at the current rate for the parish president and non-classified employees going into 2014. The motion passed unanimously.

Councilman Snyder stated, "I am concerned with the car allowances, not only for the parish president, I think everybody has a car allowance but it looks like everybody has a car so which is it? Are they going to have access to a car or are we going to pay the allowance? If we are paying allowances to the people who have access to a car then we need to get rid of the car and give it to the code enforcement or something

and that is my question. I would like to know how the board feels and what they think about car allowances plus having access to cars also."

Councilman Wilson stated, "Along with what Mr. Snyder is saying if we have one of those in administration that has their title or name or whatever on a vehicle he or she should be using that vehicle and getting no vehicle allowance or vice versa get the allowance and don't use the parish vehicle. Is that what you are referring to? You can have both."

Councilman Snyder stated, "Yes I feel it is double dipping. If you look on this there are a lot of people that we are giving car allowances to, I didn't add them all up but I looked at this budget and they have quite a few in there and I think some of these people have vehicles that they have access to."

Councilman Wilson stated, "It is time to take care of that."

Councilwoman Hotard stated, "I will just add a comment. Councilman Snyder you bring up a really good point I have had conversations with Judge Daley about this that we have a situation where we do pay a car allowance and then we also allow people who receive car allowances to use parish vehicles which is kind of double dipping if you will and it is a problem. It is definitely a problem. It should be one or the other. Also I have had residents bring up the situation where we also pay car allowances to employees who never do any traveling. They never get on the road once they leave the building so I definitely think it is something to look at. If you have a car allowance and you are using a parish vehicle and in some cases we have multiple employees who receive car allowances and all of those employees are in that one parish vehicle I think is something that needs to be looked at to say either you have a car allowance, you have a vehicle or you don't have a set car allowance and everybody takes mileage because you receive a car allowance and you use the parish vehicle and the parish gas and all of that to conduct parish business you are not subtracting that from the car allowance so you are receiving both so either having a situation where you take mileage so that you are being compensated for actual parish business and not have a set car allowance or an either or situation but I definitely think you are spot on with your logic that it has become a problem."

Councilwoman Millet stated, "My concern with the car allowance is also in the listing in the budget how it says salaries/car allowance so you are increasing their salary by giving an allowance. So your numbers are skewed. I am not sure why that is done that way but it's one or the other but it shouldn't be listed as a salary."

Councilwoman Hotard stated, "The reason why I will tell you that is because it is a set amount it is not a reimbursement the way it is looked at for accounting purposes is that it needs to be taxed because it is not something you have to provide reimbursement for so I think at one point the auditor said you have to actually call it..."

Councilwoman Millet asked, "So is it a salary or a car allowance? I mean if you are taking taxes out it is a salary. It is listed in the budget as a salary and I understand what the auditors are saying but as a public entity is it a salary or is it a car allowance because it

can't be both."

Councilwoman Hotard stated, "And at that point I would lean on the attorney we can't ask finance but I would definitely lean on legal for that part. I just remember at one point the auditor stated that because it was a flat set amount that it had to be taxed and so they started actually taxing."

Councilwoman Millet stated, "But this is a salary that is my concern did the auditors require that as well?"

Councilwoman Hotard stated, "I am not the administration I can't answer that."

Councilwoman Millet stated, "I know but that is discussion amongst us I am just concerned."

Councilman Wilson stated, "Me personally I don't care what they want to call it they should only have one or the other and that is not rocket science you have one or the other. If they want to use their own vehicle then they get allowance if they have a parish vehicle out there with their name on it and they have use of it 24/7 then they use the parish vehicle but they don't get the allowance it is either one of the two so one of these line items has to go away period."

Councilman Gauff stated, "Okay just because Mr. Wilson said something about having their names on a vehicle suppose they don't have their names on the vehicle and are using the vehicle or at certain times that they are only using the vehicle to go certain places or during hurricanes driving through high water. At what point does it change their use of the vehicle and is that double dipping then? Should they not get to use the parish's vehicles to go certain places? I am asking the question because I am not sure and at what point during that month or during that time is it a violation or is it double dipping that anyone gets into a parish vehicle because they get a car allowance. At what point would you say okay this is double dipping now that you got into a parish vehicle to go take a ride to check canals, to go behind the levee or anywhere like that is that double dipping or is that using a parish vehicle for the purpose of taking a trip that you may not want to take your vehicle on. I mean I am fortunate enough that I have a truck at my disposal and I have a car. If I am going behind the levee, on the levee or to check canals or wherever I may use my truck so someone that doesn't have a truck or during the hurricane my car stays parked I am going to use my truck because I know there is high water so at what point is that double dipping or would someone be looked at as double dipping when they are using a parish vehicle to access certain areas or certain parts of the parish?"

Councilwoman Hotard stated, "I think what we are referencing here thought is in emergency situations. Most of the calls and most of what I have even talked to Tom about was if it was high water or an emergency and you need flashing lights and these types of things but to just use parish vehicles to drive to Baton Rouge or to drive to the Port Guest House or to do these type of things when you are receiving a car allowance when your vehicle could take you to the same place then that is when the attorney general's office will look at that as you being compensated twice for the same thing because you are receiving a

car allowance but you are using that vehicle to take you to these places that you are already being compensated for and if it is an emergency situation that is different. If you can't access an area because of high water and you need access to that area that would be a different situation."

Councilman Gauff stated, "So I guess I am saying that not all situations would be an emergency situation or is it just a common sense thing or at what point does someone decide to police that and I guess it would be the same with the council if I am at Wal-Mart and all of a sudden I meet a constituent that says come to my area I want to show you something and I go does it become me on a personal trip or me on a council trip. I am just throwing that out there to ask and to be mindful of some of those trips and I guess the double dipping part of it is a concern for all of us."

Councilwoman Hotard stated, "That is a good point I know we have had some of those discussions and even more recently because I said that car allowances at set amounts probably aren't the best practice anymore because we have some employees who get vehicle allowances and they drive a mile or two to the building and they don't leave all day then they go home and then we have some employees who do conduct parish business and will use a parish vehicle when they have a car allowance. It is difficult for the council like you said to tract mileage like you said whereas if you were an employee it is more department head non-classified and you come to the building at 8:00 AM and you conduct parish business it is very easy to say okay I went from the Percy Hebert building to the Port House or a chamber meeting and came back at 5:00. From a council stand point we don't have a location that we go to at 8:00 so like you said if you get called out to a sewerage back up in Reserve and you were in Kenner where you start your mileage isn't as clear as a department head who reports to the building at whatever time and you leave at a certain time and when you conduct parish business in between it is easy to document it. So I do think that it is something that we need to get away from. It needs to be submitted for a reimbursement and mileage needs to be documented instead of these set amounts and then we wouldn't have to worry about if we are paying car allowances and people are using parish vehicles and like I said often times it is 3-4 employees in that one vehicle that we give car allowances to who are traveling on non-emergencies or just driving to Baton Rouge or the Port or these type of things. So it is something that we need to look at."

Councilman Wright stated, "Really I think you just hit the nail on the head. I think if you are taking mileage you have the option to the parish vehicle or take the mileage. If you get a car allowance you should not have a vehicle at your disposal unless it is an emergency and that is just my opinion."

Councilwoman Millet stated, "My concern was if you are assigned a vehicle then you should not receive an allowance. It is plain and simple. If you are assigned you shouldn't receive an allowance. Now if you are not assigned a vehicle then I think mileage is the answer because it is getting too confusing to just say I am going to give you this money and let you use your vehicle or the parishes it doesn't matter. We have no way of tracking that and neither does the administration for that matter. Reimbursement is what it is

reimbursement. It is not a salary. It is a reimbursement."

Councilman Madere stated, "I think what Mrs. Millet is saying and I agree with is being reimbursed for money that you actually spent on travel and mileage that is what you are getting back exactly what you put out you are not getting any more or any less when you keep mileage. You see the council ourselves we have \$300.00 for mileage every month and a lot of us I know myself I go way beyond that and I am not even considering asking for another penny or anything else it is what it is. It is \$300.00 for us and I am not even tracking mileage because I go way over \$300.00 as far as mileage and I think what we are trying to get here is that we are spending money actually pennies that we are spending is not a penny wasted that is what we are trying to look at we are not wasting any money by just giving out a car allowance. If you are actually traveling those amount of miles and spending that kind of money then you should be reimbursed. I think that is what we are all trying to get at and not give extra money because there are a lot of other things that we can do with that extra money."

Councilman Wilson stated, "Under normal circumstances if there is something here and one of the administration needs to go and see something they have the right to vehicles out there. They have supervisor's vehicles and I am sure they are not going to have a problem getting a ride to go somewhere. Now if four employees are going in one vehicle and it is a private vehicle to go to a class or whatever there should only be one mileage to the one that owns the vehicle and is spending the money if that is happening then that needs to be fixed and the administration is the one that needs to be fixing it because they are the ones that handle the books. We all know what we are talking about here and you can try to twist it and turn it anyway you want but it is what it is."

Councilwoman Millet stated, "I do think this is good discussion that we are having but I do think that we need to have some kind of a motion or something to be enforced rather than just have discussion with no resolution."

Jeff Perilloux stated, "If I may interject just for a moment we need to be very careful about staying on topic. The topic is the budget discussion and while clearly vehicle allowances and the money appropriated for vehicle allowances I think are related to the budget obviously I think we need to be very careful about expanding that into a discussion about vehicle policies. I think it goes beyond the agenda item for this meeting."

Councilman Wilson stated, "Only just as Mr. Perilloux stated this is a budget meeting these are numbers we can add and we can subtract this is where it happens. We can discuss things today and when we come to vote on it it can be there or not be there."

Councilman Snyder stated, "I had some issues and questions but I don't know if any of you can answer them it may have come from the administration on some line items just what do they mean and things of that nature and why some went so high if you look at the second page of the general fund under general administration but I am looking at professional services and I am sure this isn't accurate because it has almost doubled and what happened to make it double those are the kind

of questions I have."

Councilwoman Hotard stated, "Councilman Snyder I had actually sent some of that information not for your particular question but that was one of the concerns I expressed to Tom was that in the charter it states in Section C under budget message that the president shall submit, shall submit, with a budget a message containing recommendations concerning the fiscal policy of the parish, a description of the important features of the budget and an explanation of all major increases or decreases in budget recommendations as compared with expenditures for the prior year and that is a requirement of the charter and if we had the descriptions of the major increases and decreases you may have that but to my knowledge we received a budget message after I pointed this out with them but not any explanation of major increases or decreases. So hopefully when they provide that to us and choose to participate in a public meeting we will get some of that information."

Councilman Perrilloux stated, "I know we didn't come to a consensus on the car allowance on the budget and I just want to make sure that we leave that open to discuss in the future before we adopt any budget for 2014 and that it is still opened for discussion. We didn't make a vote on it today or tonight but I want to make sure we have that discussion again there was good information from everybody and we need to absorb this and pass forward what we are doing for 2014 as far as the car allowances. I just want to keep that open."

Councilwoman Millet stated, "I just have one other item that I am noticing in the budget and I want to bring it to all of your attention that on our public safety we have no funding sources other than a grant from Entergy and money from the fire department but we have a \$331,000.00 budget and expenses totaling over \$500,000.00 we need to make sure that we find a source of revenue for public safety."

Councilwoman Hotard stated, "It looks like from the previous budget that it does run in a small deficiency before we transfer."

Councilwoman Millet stated, "It limits employees and this is public safety this is what we are here for. I want to make sure that we find a funding source to make sure that we have some type of allocations so that they are not strapped. A grant and the fire department is their source of revenue. I just wanted to bring that to your attention that is all while we have this opportunity."

Councilwoman Hotard stated, "Right it looks like they have been subsidizing from Economic Development they run in a deficiency and it does look like the deficiency is becoming larger so you are right it is probably something to take a look at so that we can eliminate having to do that transfer."

Councilwoman Millet stated, "That just keeps them at that level it doesn't allow them any increases and I had one more question on the public works page and I don't know what this is and maybe Tom or Jeff can help me with this because I am looking at zoning violations is that violations that we have?"

Councilwoman Hotard asked, "Is it under revenue or expenditure?"

Councilwoman Millet stated, "Expenditure, it says zoning violations and I have no clue what that means."

Councilwoman Hotard stated, "We can add that to the list and hopefully when we have another public meeting we will have some administrative participation so those questions can be answered."

Councilwoman Millet stated, "And again our professional services under that area have also increased another \$25,000.00 and that might be in that same list of increases that we are seeking?"

Councilman Perrilloux stated, "I just want to make sure that our next meeting and I think Judge Daley stated that administration is to make this budget crystal clear, break it down, make little notes in it and when we come back to discuss it crystal clear so that we and the public understands where this budget is going and what we spent it on because I don't want to come back and say you found money oh money was just hiding in the bag and we pulled it out of there. I don't want to hear that. I do not want to hear that for 2014 and give salaries a big increase to somebody because you just found money. So I want to make sure this is crystal clear that we will go over every item line by line break it down put notes in it and make it crystal clear where all this money is going to exactly what we know they are going to do with it before I vote on this budget for 2014."

Councilman Wright stated, "Mr. Perrilloux I will actually offer up a motion for all non-classified employees to be line itemed out in the budget individually, if I can get a second."

Councilman Wilson stated, "We were discussing one thing and then we made this motion and all of what Mr. Perrilloux was saying is that we need to get an order. We need to get together and say this is what we are going to discuss this night and then go to the next thing but all of this flipping back through these pages let's just try to get some order on how we are going to do this so that we can get through it."

Councilwoman Hotard stated, "I would agree and I would think that we can only ask the questions we can't provide the answers as well that is something that administration needs to do and obviously we are not going to get any answers from administration right now because they are not present. We have a meeting Tuesday night and I did place an item on the agenda for budget so that we can answer questions there but I do anticipate us scheduling other public workshops so that we can ask the questions and get the answers so that the department heads can come to the council and validate their budgets and their request. We have to approve the expenditures you need to come to the council and tell us why you need these funds and what you plan on spending them on and that is the way that we can handle it."

Councilman Wilson stated, "There are a lot of new people on the council. This council is accountable for this budget not the administration. If something goes wrong we are accountable and the ink pen and these numbers we can change at any point in time."

MOTION: Councilman Wright moved and Councilman Perrilloux seconded the motion that non-classified employees be line itemed out separately in the budget and not included in a lump salary line item. The motion

passed unanimously.

Councilman Snyder stated, "You mentioned something that you have the budget on the next agenda is it possible that we can get this agenda reprinted and line itemed out and page numbered?"

Councilwoman Hotard asked, "The budget you mean?"

Councilman Snyder stated, "Yes the physical budget that we are looking at and get it line itemed out and page numbered so that we can reference that."

Councilwoman Hotard stated, "I believe in the original budget submission it actually had an index with page numbers this was a copy that we ran off today this was from the ordinance but the original had a table of contents with page numbers so that we could easily reference for those discussions."

Councilman Wright stated, "I know we talked about making some changes to some other line items just remember that it is our responsibility when we make that adjustment that we have control of where that money goes what other line items so just keep that in mind if you decide to make any changes."

INTRODUCTION OF ORDINANCES:

There were no ordinances to be introduced at today's meeting.

EXECUTIVE SESSION:

There was no executive session.

Property/Casualty Insurance Agent - 1) Claims, any/all property, casualty, and Workman comp claims 2) Claims, procedures and disposition 3) Coverage's, any/all material changes

Parish Building - Security

St. John the Baptist Parish vs. Roussel Welding and Metal Works, Inc., et al. Case No. 64187 Div. B

Any and all pending legal matters

ADJOURNMENT:

At 3:48 PM, Councilwoman Millet moved and Councilman Perrilloux seconded the motion to adjourn. The motion passed unanimously.

/s/Jaclyn Hotard
COUNCIL CHAIRMAN

/s/Jackie Landeche
Council Secretary

