

**NON-FLOOD PROTECTION ASSET MANAGEMENT AUTHORITY  
MINUTES OF THE RECREATIONAL / SUBDIVISION  
OBLIGATION COMMITTEE MEETING  
TUESDAY FEBRUARY 5, 2013 – 3:30 P.M.**

The regular monthly meeting of the Recreation/Subdivision Committee of the Non-Flood Asset Protection Management Authority was held on Tuesday, February 5, 2013 at 3:30 p.m., in the Lake Vista Community Center, 2<sup>nd</sup> Floor, 6500 Spanish Fort Blvd., New Orleans, Louisiana after due legal notice of the meeting was sent to each Board member, the news media, and a copy of the call was posted.

Chairman Hassinger called the meeting to order at 3:38 p.m. and led in the Pledge of Allegiance.

The roll was called which constituted a quorum.

**PRESENT:**

Chairman Joe Hassinger  
Commissioner Greg Ernst  
Commissioner Stanley Brien

**ABSENT:**

Commissioner John Trask

**FURTHERMORE PRESENT:**

Chairman Robert E. Smith Lupo

**STAFF:**

Louis Capo - Executive Director  
Sharon Martiny - Non-Flood

**ALSO PRESENT:**

Gerard Metzger – Legal Counsel  
Al Pappalardo – Real Estate Consultant  
Wesley Mills – DEI  
John Holtgreve - DEI  
Nick Asprodites – Lakeview Landings  
Jack Panno – Lakeview Landings  
Mark Hartenstein – Graci Hart Electric  
Joe Spadaro – Manager, Landry's Seafood  
Ray Lanceche - Lakeshore

**APPROVAL OF AGENDA**

Commissioner Ernst offered a motion to adopt the Agenda, seconded by Commissioner Brien and unanimously adopted.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES**

Minutes of the December 6, 2012 Recreation/Subdivision Committee meeting will be presented for approval at the March 7, 2013 meeting.

**REPORT ON CURRENT RECREATION/SUBDIVISION ISSUES**

Mr. Capo reported that Lakeshore Drive is currently closed due to a late night storm that moved through the area and filled the road with mud and debris that washed over the seawall area. The Flood Authority has begun the clean-up of that area. Lakeshore Drive is also closed on the east end between Franklin and the down side of the Ted Hickey Bridge. Originally it was closed due to the Corps reinforcing the gate and levees in that area. The Corps has now completed the work there and as soon as the Flood side can clean up the roadway the old barricades will be removed and also the barricades leading to

the Seabrook Boat Launch and once again that boat launch will be accessible to the public. Also, with Lakeshore Drive, the Authority keeps cleaning the drains and the water and mud keeps washing over and draining back into the drains so this will be an ongoing problem for us until the Flood side can get the areas capped with concrete and the decorative cap on top. It will be an ongoing challenge for the Authority to keep the street open and the drains unclogged.

### **NEW BUSINESS**

#### **1) Discussion and approval of request by Landry's Restaurant to erect a new sign**

Mark Hartenstein, Graci Hart Electric, informed that currently the Landry's pylon sign is tucked away. It is originally back to the left side of the building, with the new construction of the new restaurant it blocks the total view of the sign. We recommend removing the pylon sign and making it a monument sign which is going to lower the sign down to approximately eight feet off of the ground. We will relocate the sign in between the two driveways in the grass area which is part of their lease. Currently, it is approximately 20-40 feet to the top and we are going to lower it down to a monument sign which will put it at eight feet to the top. Chairman Hassinger questioned how far it would be from the driveway entrance on the right. Mr. Hartenstein informed that it would be approximately 70 feet from the first driveway and it is almost centered. It may be four to five feet closer to the first driveway. Chairman Hassinger questioned if this was looked at from different vantage points to make sure that it does not block the site line for oncoming traffic. Mr. Hartenstein informed that there were pictures from both driveway showing that there will be absolutely no obstruction.

Commissioner Ernst addressed the driveway that was both an exit and entrance and questioned if you were coming from the Lake would the sign obstruct people coming out of the driveway. Mr. Hartenstein advised that if the people coming out of the driveway stopped they would see that they have plenty of clearance because there is a lot more driveway than where the sign is. It would not be in the line of sight for oncoming traffic. Chairman Lupo questioned if the site lines have been approved by City Planning and Streets Department. Chairman Hassinger questioned what was required from the City. Mr. Hartenstein informed that he did not have the exact distances with him. The gentleman that heads the sign divisions had a doctor's appointment and he could not make it. Commissioner Ernst questioned if there was a process by which you are supposed to apply to the City to get approval and is it likely to receive approval from the City that is in compliance with their requirements. Mr. Harenstein confirmed and stated that there was a preliminary meeting and everything looks good, but we had to get it passed by the Authority before we get the final permit. The City is waiting for the Authority before they will grant approval. Commissioner Ernst stated that assuming the full Board approves this at the next meeting, is there some way you can come back and verify that the City has issued the permit? Mr. Hartenstein agreed to come back once the City issued a permit.

Mr. Metzger informed that the process is where they first come to the Authority and get a Letter of No Objection and they take that and go to the City to receive the permit. We have gone over the City ordinance where we have dealt with that with the building restrictions a while back. This is their first stopping point, this is not their last.

Mr. Jack Panno, Lakeview Landings, noted that he was under the impression that the limit on the sign is four feet. We were told when we made a similar application to the City. While I don't have any particular objection to the sign or the size or where it is, we need to all play by the same rules. I urge the Commission to make sure that the requirements and the No Action letter from the Authority does not automatically mean approval from the City. I would not want to get in a situation where the City would say if the Authority is happy then we are

okay with it and when I go back to them it will change. We all want to be by the same rules. I appreciate the time that the Landry's people are taking and the consideration for keeping the sign not as big and not as tall as the existing sign. With that caveat, we just ask you to check this out before it is approved.

Commissioner Ernst clarified that Mr. Panno's concern is that his sign was not at large. Mr. Panno stated that when Lakeview Landings went through the sign process to see what would be available to us as we finished our project up we were told that the limitation was 4-4½ feet and this one appears to be eight feet so I wanted to have the Committee check on that before you give the approval.

Chairman Lupo noted that there is a Lakeview Overlay District that comes into play here on what you can and cannot do for signage. With all due respect, going to the City and getting them to say something to you means absolutely nothing as you know. Going to the City and getting approval is a whole different thing. I don't want to see the Authority be putting the cart before the horse. If we run the risk of the City saying that the Levee Board is okay with it, it is really not our jurisdiction, it is Lakeshore Drive, we don't want to do that. We don't want to get Lakeshore or Lakeview upset with us. Whatever you all decide to do we need to make sure that it comes from the City first, whatever the requirements and limitations are before we decide where we stand on it and then I have to warn you. We took the photo and everything looks fine. I can take a photo in front of a dumpster at a certain position and make something look very different. We have to make sure that the City said that the site lines are correct, not you standing with a camera at an opportune place saying that it is safe.

Chairman Hassinger noted that the process that the Committee had to go through is that this entity (the Authority) issues a No Objection Letter before the City decides whether to issue a permit. Mr. Capo advised this was the process for building restrictions. Chairman Lupo added that this is not about building restrictions. There is a set of parameters and rules. This Authority has no parameters and rules. It has to be the City first, not the Authority saying that it is okay if the City approves, but we will okay only if the City approves.

Commissioner Ernst questioned if there was any condition in the lease that speaks of the sign requirements and how big the sign can be with respect to Landry's or the other restaurant. Mr. Pappalardo advised there were no restrictions regarding the sign. Mr. Metzger added that there is a provision dealing with the fact that they have to obtain the lessor's approval on any displaying of a sign and the lessor's approval is unconditional. If the lessor considers the sign to be dangerous, unsightly or detrimental he cannot give you a consent.

Chairman Lupo informed that the Authority was sued when a woman walking out of the Hong Kong restaurant inebriated walked in between a car and got hit. The Levee District got sued because the Levee District designed the roadway. I want to make sure that everybody is aware that we like to put the wholeness of making mistakes on the people who know what is safe and what is not safe. Commissioner Ernst questioned if the only concern was safety or is it also that there is disparate treatment. Chairman Lupo stated that treatment is treatment. Whatever the City says for one tenant they are going to say for the next, but we don't know what that is. Commissioner Ernst pointed out that it sounds like the City may not because this tenant is saying that their sign may not be as large. Mr. Panno stated that Lakeview Landings does not have a sign. We approached the City about signage in general and we were told there is a 4½ foot limit. Commissioner Ernst suggested finding out what the City requirements are. We need to find that out. Mr. Hartenstein noted that the more roadway frontage you have, the more square footage you are allowed. Chairman Hassinger questioned if anyone has applied for a permit with the City. Mr. Hartenstein noted that they have not applied for the permit because they have not been given

final approval. We are not going to get a permit until everything is finalized. Landry's has to agree with the price, the Levee Board has to agree with the sign being moved and we are not going to go through that because it is a long process. It is several trips to City Hall. You have to sit with them at their office and show them all of the plans and they have to come out and inspect the sign. This is not something we are going to slide in under the line.

Chairman Hassinger questioned if the City approves the sign safety-wise and it conforms and is appropriate as far as the other tenants go with what their rules are and it is safe, this Authority is not going to stand in the way of it. We need to know that the City has inspected the sign and it is good to go. Commissioner Ernst stated that in terms of what Mr. Lupo is saying; does it make better sense to before we recommend to approve to the full Board that we ask them to report back to the Committee and tell us what the City says.

Chairman Hassinger requested that they go to the City and get the permit and it will not be a problem here because we know the City will do the inspection and make sure it is safe and conforms.

Ray Landeche, Lakeshore resident, stated that he is here representing the Lakeshore Association. We would like to properly vet this in front of the full Board. What is happening at the City is there are two sets of rules on the books. There is a draft CZO, which are the new rules for signage and there is already zoning in place. We would like to know which is the City going to approve on, the ones that are going to be approved with the new CZO later in 2013 or does the sign meet the current zoning. That is our concern and we want to review it with the issue with the full Board because this draft CZO has been out there for 1½ years and is waiting for a final vote from City Council. My opinion on the sign does not matter, I'm just representing the Board so we have 11 people and I am taking all of our concerns and I would like if all 11 people on our Board to see the sign. I am asking the Committee to defer the issue and give us a little time to at least have a Board meeting with the drawings in front of us.

Chairman Lupo advised that Landry's directive was to get authorization for their sign from the City and then bring it back to this Committee and this Committee will let Lakeshore Property Owners take a look at the sign and then the Committee will make a decision.

## **2) Discussion regarding Lake Terrace Fountain repair**

Wesley Mills, Design Engineering, reported that a cost estimate was prepared in February of 2012 for the Lake Terrace Fountain repairs. The estimate followed the Damage Assessment Report which is dated December 13, 2011. In December of 2011 the Board requested that DEI assess damages at the fountain to determine what maintenance items needed to be done to bring it back into daily operation. On December 13<sup>th</sup> a report was prepared that outlined the damages we found, improvements that need to be made and several maintenance items along with photographs of the damages with recommendations and a cost estimate. The fountain in the current condition has approximately 50 lights within the fountain base as well as 10 or so area lights underneath the basin. The cost estimate is just a laundry list of maintenance items and they all add up to a base total of \$32,000 and that is no lights. That is to handle some of the day-to-day maintenance issues and do some replacements to get the nozzles and the actual pumps working and back in operation. There are two significant items in the estimate that make up for half of the \$32,000 and that is to clean and plaster the concrete basin and to paint the exterior of the fountain and that adds up to approximately \$15,000. Also, in this Cost Estimate we are working out two alternatives. One is to go back with 10 lights. There are 10 existing lights within the second tier or the center of the fountain and that total is \$39,250 just for the lighting so that would be in addition to the base total so that would give you a total project amount of \$71,635. I also

included a second option which is to go back and restore the fountain with all of the lights that are included (50 lights) and that would come out to a total of \$131,835. At this point we have prepared a proposal to prepare bidding documents to either have three contractors provide quotes to repair the fountain either just the base total or one of the alternates, whichever the Committee would like to do. That is the point where we are now is to prepare the bidding documents. We would just like to know what direction the Committee would like to proceed. Commissioner Ernst questioned if there was any FEMA reimbursement for this project. Mr. Mills advised that for the fountain repair there is no FEMA funding. This is different from the Mardi Gras Fountain in that the Mardi Gras Fountain was damaged because of Hurricane Katrina and the Lake Terrace Fountain was not. Chairman Hassinger noted that the Authority tried to have some of the funds reimbursed by FEMA, but FEMA declined. Since Katrina the Lake Terrace Fountain worked for a short period of time, but then they discovered that the electrical system is too dangerous and is not safe to operate so the fountain was turned off. The water would work, but not the lighting.

Chairman Lupo questioned the cost of engineering, design, plans, specs and bid documents. Mr. Holtgreve advised that DEI provided the proposal to do this project on a cost plus basis in conformance with the ID/IQ contract. An estimate on the worst case situation doing all of the lights and whatever other issues were found at the site and that was \$26,000. Depending on what the Board decides what they want to do, that number should not go up. If you only want to paint it and demolish what is there and clean it up and get it painted that is one issue. If you want to put a certain 10 lights in that is another issue. Bear in mind that if you want to go back with lights there will have to be some electrical work done in the vault that is adjacent to the fountain. The pumps need to have some electrical work to get the electricity set up to code to run the pumps even if we don't do anything with the lights. There is a combination of things that have to be done regardless of which option is selected.

Chairman Lupo noted that if the Authority chose the 10 light scenario, base work and design work the cost is approximately \$97,000. Mr. Holtgreve stated this was the top cost, but it could be slightly lower. If you do the total it would be another \$40,000. The 10 light option is \$71,000 plus another \$26,000 for bid documents. It may be somewhat less than that but certainly in that range. The budget is somewhere between \$90,000-\$96,000. Mr. Capo reported that the Lake Terrace Fountain last worked in 2009. The last time the fountain was repaired was approximately 15 years ago. The fountain worked before and after Katrina. The Lake Terrace Property Owners wanted to do some minor refurbishing. They wanted to paint it and clean it up so we had shut it down then. When it was started back up there was a crack and a leak or two and due to the electrical system it was shut down due to safety reasons.

Commissioner Ernst questioned how often and recurring of an expense is the fountain. Mr. Capo informed that this is a fountain and a pool and it is expensive. Chairman Lupo added that the Four Winds Fountain at Lakefront Airport can be justified because it is a beautiful sculpture and it stands on its own, you really don't need it to be a fountain. The Lake Terrace Fountain is not a sculpture so how do you justify not putting it back in working condition. Commissioner Ernst noted to get the Lake Terrace Fountain repaired would be great, but this is a huge expense to the Authority which we don't have funds for at the present time based on the budget. I would love to have the fountain back and running for everyone's enjoyment, particularly Lake Terrace residents and everyone that goes along Lakeshore Drive, shouldn't the budget be a concern. Chairman Hassinger noted that the money was budgeted to do the \$26,000 part of the fountain project which is everything but the lights. Chairman Lupo added that is not only the Authority's obligation to repair the fountain, but it is an eyesore that needs to be repaired. Chairman Ernst suggested that this issue be brought to the Finance Committee so we can vote in the Recreation/Subdivision Committee

to recommend the approval, but also ask the Finance Committee to consider the repair of the fountain. Mr. Metzger advised that the Committee would not have to adopt a motion recommending anything to the Board if you just wanted to go out and secure quotes because we are below and there will be no public bidding on this project. If you were going to go forward with the repair, you would be approving a project, but it would have to be in the budget that the Finance Committee has already or it would have to be on an amended budget. Chairman Lupo added that DEI's fees would have to be approved to move forward. Chairman Hassinger noted that DEI's fees were definitely in the budget. Mr. Capo added that Thursday staff would be coming to the Finance Committee with a grass cutting proposal and the Lake Terrace Proposal as far as the engineering services. The Finance Committee will hear the engineering costs on Thursday, but there is already some money in the budget for some physical work. It will not cover the total amount.

Commissioner Ernst noted that Chairman Hoffman requested Board members to go back to their Committees because it is our responsibility so we can approve it for consideration by the next budget discussion. There is a long laundry list of backlogged items that the Authority cannot pay for. Does the Lake Terrace Fountain go on that list and we can discuss the list by priorities.

Chairman Hassinger requested the best way to move forward with this issue if the Committee wanted to get the fountain fixed. Chairman Lupo advised that the Committee would have to authorize DEI's \$26,000 for design and take a look at what budget you already have already got in there for it and see what that will pay for and in order to bring it up to the first phase what the shortfall is and see where we can maneuver some things, but there is not a whole lot of maneuvering.

Commissioner Ernst questioned if this recommendation would go to the full Board meeting. Chairman Lupo noted that the recommendation would go into the budget that the full Board is going to approve. These changes that are contemplated will go into the new budget for the Recreation/Subdivisions.

Chairman Hassinger noted that the Committee today will make a recommendation to the full Board that DEI go forward with the design and bid package. I will not vote on this item as DEI is a client of my firm. Mr. Capo noted that in the 2013-2014 budget there is \$20,000 for fountain maintenance for the Mardi Gras and Lake Terrace Fountains. This is for maintenance. The budget for 2012-2013 is not looking good because that item may have been pulled at the very end. Currently, what is in the 2012-2013 budget for Fountain Maintenance is \$5,000. Chairman Lupo advised that there is \$25,000 in the budget for Fountain Maintenance. If the Board chooses to go with 10 lights than DEI can get it designed for less than \$26,000. This is going to be for just the design phase which includes design, specs and preparing a bid package. The Committee does not have to specify which option will be chosen.

Mr. Metzger advised that this would be a motion to recommend approval of a contract with DEI to prepare a bid package for repairs to the Lake Vista Fountain with a cap of \$25,000. Mr. Holtgreve informed that this contract is a cost plus contract so DEI can do \$25,000 and if there is anything beyond that DEI will come back. Commissioner Ernst stated that this may not go out to bid if the other part is not approved.

Mr. Holtgreve noted that in a previous meeting there was some discussion by Commissioner Hoffman being concerned about doing work prior to approval with proposals. That was the night that DEI was asking for a \$40,000 or \$50,000 increase to the ID/IQ budget. I believe that \$45,000 was approved. Mr. Capo reported that the original ID/IQ contract was for \$45,000. What we are doing Thursday is requesting an additional \$50,000 if that will be enough. The first

\$45,000 a large sum from FEMA should be reimbursed. Mr. Holtgreve agreed and noted that the Authority should get reimbursed approximately \$40,000 from FEMA out of the original allotment to DEI. This project that we are currently discussing and also the grass cutting that Mr. Capo will address, both of those are going to be a part of the ID/IQ assignment that was given to us. I don't see where the design would run beyond this fiscal year. It is just a question of when construction can start so the entire project may well run in two fiscal years since you may not have the money to actually do any of the construction. Commissioner Ernst noted that all the Authority could do is approve the design because that is all the Authority has the money for. Mr. Capo noted that in the Finance Committee meeting there will be a request for a proposal for the grass cutting on the scope and the RFP for grass cutting.

Mr. Holtgreve added that there would be two items which would be the Lake Terrace Fountain and the Grass Cutting. We worked up a summary sheet to show the costs we had spent as of the date that we prepared it and the estimated reimbursement from FEMA and then the Grass Cutting proposal and also this proposal for the Lake Terrace Fountain. This put us somewhere around \$98,000 and of that we expected to get back approximately \$40,000 from FEMA. The total output would be approximately \$50,000-\$60,000 in terms of when that money does come back. Mr. Mills added that this included the underground storage tank removal, the damage assessment from Hurricane Isaac and work with FEMA and grass cutting.

Mr. Capo reported that there was still money from the \$700,000 that has been funded to the Authority by the Flood Authority. This is the last of the \$700,000 from the Flood Authority and there is still money in there to take care of Lakeshore Drive.

Chairman Lupo suggested that Lake Terrace formed a 501C3, which is Friends of the Fountain and they go out and find somebody like Ronnie LaMarque who lives in the neighborhood who is very philanthropic and does wonderful things and having him make a donation to a 501-C3 that funds the renovation of that fountain. Is that possible under state law? Mr. Metzger stated that he believes that has been done where the legislature appropriated funds for projects on the neutral ground on Harrison Avenue before Katrina. I believe there was a project on West End Blvd. by Mr. Bruno. This was the planting of the trees after the Hibernian monument was erected. I believe that was done and it came from the legislature, but it went to the Homeowners Association that did the work so the Homeowners Association wanted to get funding from a source and then come to the Board to get approval to do the work. I don't believe that is prohibition. Chairman Hassinger noted that several years ago the Homeowners Association was ready to pay half of the \$15,000 to paint the fountain.

Chairman Lupo recommended to go ahead with the design because you have to have the design even to bring it to a philanthropist to let them know what is being done with the fountain. We have the money to do that. After that, we can go the route that is being discussed so we don't go crazy trying to find \$100,000 that the Authority does not have. Commissioner Ernst moved along the lines of what Mr. Metzger just discussed, to approve the design phase, seconded by Commissioner Brien and abstained by Chairman Hassinger. Mr. Metzger noted that this item would either go to the Board with or without a recommendation, but it will go to the Board.

Chairman Lupo questioned if DEI has been approved to finish the bid package on the grass cutting so the Authority can save \$100,000. Mr. Capo advised that this would be addressed Thursday at the Finance Committee meeting. DEI will put together a package of engineering costs for the Lake Terrace Fountain and the Grass Cutting and that will be presented at the Finance Committee meeting. Mr. Holtgreve noted that the proposal that was put together to do the grass

cutting is approximately \$19,000. Chairman Lupo suggested the Recreation/Subdivision Committee also recommend the grass cutting as well. Mr. Capo noted that the engineering cost of \$26,000 and \$19,000 is up to \$45,000 so this will be an increase of \$45,000 for the ID/IQ contract. The Finance Committee directed us to come back with a proposal to the Finance Committee for the grass cutting. Chairman Lupo stated that the grass cutting is this committee and there is an estimate of saving \$100,000. Mr. Capo noted that the acreage has been reduced even though we have not formally gone out for an RFQ, the acreage that DEI has recalculated we are now applying now for the bills so we are reaping the benefits. The Authority will save approximately \$100,000 per year, possibly a little more.

Commissioner Ernst suggested following Chairman Lupo's recommendation and offer a motion to amend. Mr. Metzger advised that a motion to add an item to the Agenda would be needed. Commissioner Ernst moved to add the grass cutting item to the Agenda, seconded by Commissioner Brien and unanimously adopted by a roll call vote.

Commissioner Ernst offered a motion to recommend to the full Board the grass cutting, seconded by Commissioner Brien and unanimously adopted.

### **3) Discussion regarding 2013-2014 budget for Lakeshore Drive**

Mr. Capo stated this item is the projected cost for Lakeshore Drive and non-revenue producing obligations for 2013-2014. The cost to adequately maintain the non-revenue producing obligations is approximately \$3.2 million. This includes funding items on Lakeshore Drive such as the roadway and additional fill material. The \$3.276 million is an optimal budget for the non-revenue producing obligations and Lakeshore Drive. At the budget hearings staff put forth a budget that would get the Authority somewhat balanced this year. That is a budget of \$1.5 million. This is in consultation with DEI and others who are knowledgeable of Lakeshore Drive and what would be the bare minimum to maintain Lakeshore Drive and that is the \$1.5 million.

Chairman Lupo explained that this budget cannot obviously be adopted so staff came up with a budget that will get through the fiscal year 2013-2014. At that point we realized that we would not want this to get out that that is okay and that is all we need because obviously what is happening is these items that make the up the balance between the \$1.5 million and \$3.2 million are unfunded yet they are still obligations that need to be done. We want to make sure that this is an addendum to the budget that says we are doing this to balance the budget through fiscal year 2014, but these items are not being taken care of and they are under the purview of the Authority. I want to make sure that the Committee understands it, the Board understands it and the general public understands it. Mr. Capo added that was the key that was missing at the budget hearing when we put forth the entire budget because this is not all we need. This will only get the Authority into next year. Chairman Lupo noted that all of the things that have to do with Lakeshore Drive are unfunded and where to we stand in that light and that is our pitch to the legislature. Commissioner Ernst noted that the Authority does not have much choice but to accept the budget. Chairman Lupo addressed the Lakeshore Drive budget, which is basically what encompasses all of the subdivisions, if you have comments on the actual budget that is being proposed this would be the time to ask those questions.

Mr. Capo noted that the Authority will be out of money come June 30, 2014. Chairman Lupo added that you can't say the Authority is out of money. The Authority is not out of money. The Lakefront Airport will still operate and the Authority will receive income from the real estate, but the quality of the attention that goes to maintaining the non-revenue producing obligations is going to drop from the quality that you see out there currently to something that is going to get phone calls every week at the Executive Director's office. People will ask why

the subdivisions and Lakeshore Drive are not maintained and the reason is that instead of cutting the grass every two weeks with 20 services per year, it may be once time every six weeks.

Chairman Brien questioned how much was left from the \$700,000 that the Flood Authority funded for Lakeshore Drive. Chairman Lupo noted that the \$700,000 that came from the Flood Authority for fiscal year 2012-2013 was received in April of 2012. The money was not touched until July 1, 2012. The auditors had us bring that in as revenue when it was received during the last fiscal year. Currently, we are holding on operational income. The money that we receive from operational income is paying the bills. Occasionally, we need to pull money from that account. During the height of grass cutting we need to move money from the \$700,000 and put it into the payroll account to pay the bills. We have drawn down approximately half of that money. Chairman Lupo noted that the money from the Flood Authority is being tracked meticulously so the Flood side does not come have any questions about where the money was spent.

### **PUBLIC COMMENTS**

#### **Ray Landeche – Lakeshore Resident**

Mr. Landeche stated that he was completely confused about the difference between the \$3.2 million and the \$1.5 million. I would like to explain this to the Lakeshore Board because I thought we approved \$1.5 million in the future millage starting in 2016 so will that meet all of the obligations. What is the reason the Authority is short right now. Chairman Lupo stated that the Authority is currently short because nothing starts until collection of real estate taxes in 2016. All the Authority was given of the opportunity to ask for was \$1.5 million. The Authority asked for \$3.5 million, but because of many legal ramifications on what millage was collected and what millage was authorized in the original legislation, all that was available was \$1.5 million. Mr. Landeche noted that there is \$1.5 million so unless the other assets start turning a profit to offset part of that \$3.2 million, it is going to get ugly. Chairman Lupo noted that the Authority received a little less than half of what was needed and this does not start until 2016.

### **ANNOUNCEMENT OF NEXT MEETING**

Chairman Hassinger announced the next Recreation/Subdivision meeting is scheduled for Thursday, March 7, 2013 at 2:30 p.m.

### **ADJOURNMENT**

Commissioner Ernst offered a motion to adjourn, seconded by Commissioner Brien and unanimously adopted.

The meeting adjourned at 4:33 p.m.