

City of Mansfield
MINUTES OF *SPECIAL* PUBLIC MEETING
May 26, 2015

In a *special meeting* called pursuant to the provisions of R.S. 42:19, the Mayor and Board of Aldermen met on Tuesday, May 26th, in Mansfield City Hall located at 705 Polk Street. Mayor McCoy called the meeting to order at **4:30 p.m.**, after which an Invocation was offered by **Alderman Mary L. Green**. The Pledge of Allegiance was led by **Alderman Joseph Hall, Jr.** Following the pledge, the roll was called, and the following officials were recorded as **Present:** Hon. Curtis W. McCoy, **Mayor**, Mary L. Green –District **A**, Mitchell L. Lewis – District **C**, Joseph Hall, Jr. –District **D** and Kervin D. Campbell –District **E**. **Absent:** Roy R. Jones –District **B**. **Other City Personnel Present:** Gwendolyn Jones (Deputy Clerk) and James “*Jim*” Ruffin (Public Works Director). **Others Present:** None **Press Present:** Julie Morris –editor of *The Enterprise*.

It was MOTIONED by **MITCHELL L. LEWIS** and SECONDED by **KERVIN D. CAMPBELL** to approve the minutes of the **May 11, 2015 *regular*** City Council meeting and to dispense with the reading. Motion Passed Unanimously.

The City Clerk next opened the floor to hear public comments from those in attendance to any item outlined on the meeting agenda. When no comments were offered from the floor, the **Public Comments Period** was then closed.

Old Business:

Item A: A public hearing was conducted to hear and discuss any comments related to the adoption of proposed **Ordinance No. 5 of 2015**, which if adopted, would rezone property municipally known as **905 Mary Jane Boulevard** from an R-1 District (Single-Family Residence District) to a B-3 District (Community and Central Business District). Petitioners Jeremy and Kalisha Burton were present at the City Council’s April 27th regular meeting, and stated that their intentions are to utilize a portion of their residence for commercial purposes (sell beauty supply products). No comments were offered from the floor on this issue.

Item B: It was MOTIONED by **JOSEPH HALL, JR.** and SECONDED by **MARY L. GREEN** to adopt **Ordinance No. 5 of 2015** to rezone property municipally known as **905 Mary Jane Boulevard** from an R-1 District (Single-Family Residence District) to a B-3 District (Community and Central Business District). Motion Passed Unanimously. (Full Ordinance recited below):

CITY OF MANSFIELD
ORDINANCE NO. 5 of 2015

BE IT ORDAINED by the Mayor and Board of Aldermen of the City of Mansfield, in special session convened for:

AN ORDINANCE TO REZONE FROM AN R-1 DISTRICT (SINGLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE DISTRICT) TO A B-3 DISTRICT (COMMUNITY AND CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT) THE FOLLOWING DESCRIBED PROPERTY:

BEG 225 FT E OF INTERSECTION OF E/L OF MYRA ST WITH N/L MARY JANE BLVD IN MFLD, FOR BEG, RUN E 105 FT, N 175 FT, W 25 FT, N 65 FT, W 79 FT, S 240 FT TO BEG, (219-183)(668-370)(674-515) IN SEC 9 T12 R13,(692-817)(692-800)(735-6)(1241-468,470). **(905 Mary Jane Boulevard)**

WHEREAS, a petition to the Mansfield Planning/Zoning Commission was properly filed requesting that the property described here-in-above be rezoned and all proper notices and procedures have been followed:

AND WHEREAS, the Mansfield Board of Aldermen has recommended that said property be rezoned:

SECTION 1. The property shall be rezoned from an R-1 District (Single-Family Residence District) to a B-3 (Community and Central Business District) said property being described as herein above.

SECTION 2. All parts of ordinance in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.
The effective date of this Ordinance shall be: June 15, 2015.

UPON MOTION OF Alderman Joseph Hall, Jr., and SECONDED BY Alderwoman Mary L. Green, the above and foregoing ordinance was adopted on this the 26th day of May, 2015, with the votes as follows:

Yeas: 4 (M. Green, M. Lewis, J. Hall, Jr., K. Campbell)
Nays: 0
Absent: 1 (R. Jones)
Abstain: 0

Item C: No other old business discussed.

New Business:

Item A: Proposed **Ordinance No. 6 of 2015** was introduced, which if adopted, would declare certain city-owned equipment as surplus and disposed of same by private sale after public notice. The City owns a total of six (6) items which will later be declared as surplus and are no longer

needed. The items will be advertised in our local journal (*The Enterprise*) on June 18th, June 28th and July 2nd and later sold to the highest bidder, with the City reserving the right to refuse/reject any and all bids received. Items must be removed from city property within ten (10) days of acceptance of bid by City Council action. The minimum bid price will be stated next to each item and will be accepted in cash or money orders only. Finally, a “*Bidder’s Bond*” payable to the City of Mansfield must accompany each bid equal to ten percent (10%) of the total bid submitted. This bond will act as a guarantee that, if awarded the bid, the Bidder will promptly honor the bid and remove the surplus item. Further details regarding bid requirements for the surplus items advertised are recited in the body of the Ordinance. Without further discussion, it was MOTIONED by **JOSEPH HALL, JR.** and SECONDED by **KERVIN D. CAMPBELL** to authorize the advertisement of the title of the Ordinance in the June 4th edition of *The Enterprise*, and set the public hearing of same for the June 8th regular meeting of the Board of Aldermen. Motion Passed Unanimously.

At this time, Mayor McCoy requested an amendment to the agenda to discuss a proposal to increase the water rates charged to customers and to add other water-related user fees by introducing this proposition in the form of an Ordinance. This item was not included on the printed agenda. It was MOTIONED by **JOSEPH HALL, JR.** and SECONDED by **MARY L. GREEN** to approve amendment to the agenda to allow discussion of a proposition to increase water rates and add other water-related user fees. More specifically, the Ordinance introduced would amend Article III – “*Water*”, Sections 21-53 – “*Water Rates*,” of Chapter 21 – “*Water, Sewers and Sewage Disposal*.” Motion Passed Unanimously. The floor was next opened to now allow public comment on this matter in accordance with R.S. 42:14, since it was an item not on the published agenda. No objections were voiced to amending the agenda. To offer explanation for the necessity to propose a water rate increase, Mayor McCoy asked the City Clerk to elaborate. The City Clerk began by stating that the City has three major funds, each of which is considered a separate accounting entity. The major funds are classified into two categories: *Proprietary* and *Governmental*. The proprietary (Enterprise) funds are the **Water Fund** and the **Sewer Fund**. Conversely, the third major fund is one of the governmental funds, under the heading **Corporation (General) Fund**. Included in the **Corporation Fund** are the Police and Fire Departments, Public Works, Sanitation and Recreation. Government resources are allocated to and accounted for in the individual funds based upon the purpose for which they are to be spent and the means by which spending activities are controlled. He further explained that for some time the **Water Fund** has been struggling to meet the ordinary, monthly expenses associated with it. There have been months when it became necessary to tap into other unrestricted reserve funds to satisfy certain, basic expenditures. Since this is a condition that will not remedy itself, we can no longer delay implementing a plan to resolve this recurring deficit. That remedy must come in the form of increased water rates and the implementation of other water related user fees. The last increase to water revenue occurred in January 2004. This action is being necessitated by an annual increase in several areas –employee salaries and benefits,

certain capital expenditures and for the chemicals needed to aid in the production of potable water. While these expenses continued to increase annually, the City did not amend water rates to keep up with these rising costs. The Ordinance introduced proposed a **\$6.00** increase to the monthly minimum bill for the first 2,000 gallons of water used. The bill for persons whose premises are located inside the city limits would increase from \$14.00 to \$20.00, and for premises located outside the city limits from \$16.00 to \$22.00. This increase, if implemented, would generate \$18,216.00 monthly and an additional \$218,592.00 annually. However, the per one thousand gallon rates would remain unchanged for premises inside and outside the city limits, at \$4.50 and \$5.25 respectively. In addition, on those occasions when bulk water is purchased from our water system by the **Village of South Mansfield** or the **East DeSoto Water System**, the bulk rate charged to them would increase from \$1.75 (a rate set in 1998) to \$3.50 per one thousand (1,000) gallons. At the current rate, these water systems are paying less for the water purchased than it costs for the City to produce it. Finally, when a customer requests that their water meter be “*re-read*”, a \$5.00 fee would be charged and required to be paid in advance of performing this service. Still further, for those customers requesting a 90-day water usage “*diagnostic investigation*”, a fee of \$10.00 would be charged, with payment for same remitted before performance of this service. In both of these latter instances, if the reading captured was determined to be incorrect, the fee would be refunded to the customer. The proposed increase and the addition of the other user fees mentioned, would also afford the City a means to replenish some of its reserves. Following a brief discussion it was MOTIONED by **MARY L. GREEN** to authorize advertisement of the title of the Ordinance in the June 4th edition of our local journal (*The Enterprise*), and to set the public hearing for the City Council’s June 8th regular meeting. It should be noted that the vote to approve advertisement of the Ordinance title was not unanimous. Alderman Joseph Hall, Jr. was opposed to implementing the increase and to authorizing advertisement of the title of the Ordinance. Therefore, the vote was three (3) in favor of advertising the Ordinance title and setting the public hearing; specifically, **Alderwoman Green, Alderman Lewis and Alderman Campbell**. **Alderman Hall** voted in opposition to approving to advertise the Ordinance title. If approved, our water customers would first see the rate increase on the water bills received in September.

Item B: No other new business discussed.

With no further business to discuss, the meeting was declared adjourned at **4:55 p.m.** by MOTION from **MARY L. GREEN** and was SECONDED by **MITCHELL L. LEWIS**. Motion Passed Unanimously.

Curtis W. McCoy, *Mayor*
Marvin R. Jackson, *Clerk*