



**CHIEF ADMINISTRATIVE OFFICE
MEMORANDUM**

TO: Honorable Members of the New Orleans City Council
FROM: Chief Administrative Office
DATE: August 7, 2025
SUBJECT: Unpaid Judgment Funding Plan

I. Introduction

The Chief Administrative Office of the City of New Orleans herein provides the Unpaid Judgment Funding Plan required by Ordinance Number 30,030 M.C.S., which is being provided because there are judgments on the City’s Unpaid Judgment List (“UJL”) that have not been paid after following the preceding steps required by the ordinance, as described below. As of December 31, 2024, the total principal amount reflected in the list was \$89,287,152.45, reflecting 444 outstanding judgments and an amount roughly equal to eleven percent of the City’s annual General Fund budget. Ord. No. 30,030 M.C.S. requires the Chief Administrative Office to provide a funding plan for satisfying the remaining outstanding principal balance of the UJL in full by the end of 2027. This funding plan proceeds as follows: first, it will examine the provisions of Ord. No. 30,030 M.C.S. and the current state of the UJL. Second, it will highlight the challenges of using the City’s General Fund or Judgment Fund to pay such a high dollar amount with existing recurring revenue sources. Next, it will survey alternative solutions such as issuing new debt or using other funding sources. Then this funding plan will recommend a path forward that enables the City to have the resources available to pay off the UJL, in full, by the end of 2027.

The overarching goal of this funding plan is to provide a path forward that enables the City to pay the UJL in full, with minimal impact on the General Fund. As detailed below, this plan recommends issuing new debt to be repaid using recurring General Fund revenue to no further extent than 2025 appropriations for existing payments of principal and interest on bonds secured by the City’s millage for general municipal purposes and for existing payments in the Judgment Fund directly to the City’s judgment creditors. The plan will recommend that the Council authorize the issuance of revenue bonds sufficient to satisfy the remaining outstanding principal balance of the City’s UJL by 2027, so that an initial bond sale and receipt of the proceeds can occur in 2025. The plan will also recommend changes to the City Code provisions governing the Judgment Fund, to allow the Judgment Fund to function as the payment source for settlements, judgments, and debt service payments on debt issued for the purpose of satisfying settlements and judgments, providing

further transparency. And the plan will provide a tentative timeline for issuing the first tranche of taxable limited tax revenue bonds, if the Council chooses to move forward with the recommendations provided herein.

While it is difficult to project the future judgments to be rendered against the City, it is not difficult to predict that such judgments are likely to occur. To account for this eventuality, the additional cost associated with borrowing a greater amount than the current UJL balance will be addressed. In so doing, this funding plan will conclude by discussing the considerations surrounding the payment of the City's future judgment and settlement obligations.

II. Ordinance Number 30,030 M.C.S.

Ordinance Number 30,030 M.C.S., effective August 27, 2024, required the City's Law Department to take several steps within 30 days. First, the Law Department was required to develop and implement procedures for expediting the processing of payments of outstanding settlement agreements, final judgments, or final court orders, including identification of the documents reasonably necessary to process payments as expeditiously as possible and minimize the administrative burden imposed upon the City's judgment creditors. Second, the ordinance required the Law Department to make written offers of settlement to persons or entities with unpaid judgments dated on or before December 31, 2005, in chronological order (beginning with the oldest), on the following terms:

1. The City must offer the full face value of the judgment, excluding interest and any previous payments applied to principal;
2. The offer must include full settlement of the litigation and all claims arising therefrom, including a waiver of interest by the judgment creditor; and
3. The judgment creditor must have 60 days from the date of the offer letter to accept the terms of the offer in writing.

Third, the ordinance prescribed rules governing the timing and funding source for payments once the initial offers were accepted. The Department of Finance was directed to pay a judgment creditor within 30 days of the Law Department notifying the department of an offer being accepted, and payments pursuant to the ordinance were required to be made from the Judgment Fund. If there were still funds available in the Judgment Fund after the offers and payments were made for unpaid judgments dated on or before December 31, 2005, the ordinance required offers to then be made on newer judgments in the same manner, until the balance of the Judgment Fund was exhausted.

Finally, if there were any judgments that remained unpaid because the balance in the Judgment Fund was exhausted, the ordinance required the CAO and Law Department to provide the Council a funding plan and recommendations for satisfying the remaining outstanding principal balance of the UJL in full by the end of 2027. The ordinance provides that the plan should do two things: (1) identify all potential funding sources and (2) address the feasibility of using bonds and other debt instruments to satisfy any remaining unpaid judgment obligations. Ordinance Number 30,030 M.C.S. is attached as "Attachment 1" for reference purposes.

III. Unpaid Judgment List

The UJL is a spreadsheet maintained by the City Attorney's Office, which provides their aggregated record of outstanding judgments owed by the City to various judgment creditors, as of a particular date. The list includes case identifiers, court-issued case numbers and names, status information, payee names, attorney names, final judgment dates, and principal amounts. As of December 31, 2024, the total principal amount reflected in the list was \$89,287,152.45, reflecting 444 outstanding judgments. A copy of the UJL that was current as of December 31, 2024, is attached as "Attachment 2" for reference purposes.

IV. Funding Options

Because there are judgments in the UJL that remain outstanding and unpaid, Ordinance Number 30,030 M.C.S. requires the creation of this funding plan and recommendations for satisfying the remaining outstanding principal balance of the UJL in full by the end of 2027. Though the total balance will rise and fall as payments to judgment creditors are made and any new judgments are rendered against the City, this funding plan uses \$89.3 million as the current outstanding principal balance and the amount to be paid/financed. For comparison purposes, the City's 2025 General Fund budget as originally adopted was \$817,056,764, so the amount owed on outstanding judgments at the beginning of 2025 (\$89.3M) was equal to 10.93% of the City's 2025 General Fund budget, which is roughly equivalent to the combined 2025 General Fund budgets of the Department of Sanitation (\$71.2M), Emergency Medical Services (\$17.1M), and Historic District Landmarks Commission (\$1.2M).

A. General Fund Appropriations

One option for paying off these outstanding judgments owed by the City is ordinary General Fund appropriations through the ordinary budgeting process. General Fund appropriations are made each autumn for the following budget year, which runs from January 1 to December 31. Home Rule Charter Section 3-115 requires the annual budget for the following year to be adopted by December 1 of each year, and the General Fund is established in Charter Section 6-201 as the default operating fund of the City, in which all taxes, licenses, fees, and other receipts, revenues, and income of the City shall be deposited daily. Thus, the General Fund is the primary Fund in which appropriations for the City's operational expenses are made.

While the General Fund is certainly a funding source that can be used to pay outstanding judgments owed by the City, the General Fund is also the funding source for dozens of offices, departments, courts, agencies, boards, commissions, and programs, reflecting dozens of competing operational priorities. The General Fund is primarily funded by recurring revenues in the form of property taxes, sales and excise taxes, licenses, permits, fines, service charges (like sanitation fees), rents, and other miscellaneous revenues. These revenue sources are generally stable, and the City has historically assumed a roughly 2-3% rate of overall recurring revenue growth from year to year. Each year, various operational expenses may grow slightly, or new programs or initiatives may be funded with any growth in recurring revenues. But the COVID-19 pandemic, resulting

economic slowdown, and eventual recovery have called the 2-3% assumed growth rate into question. Additionally, changes in state legislation can affect local recurring revenues outside the control of local governments. As a result, the General Fund is often the fallback revenue source for all City recurring expenditures, even if some taxes are collected at lower rates than in previous years, if there is an economic downturn that slows taxable economic activity, or if a state law is changed to remove a recurring revenue source.

Sound fiscal policy requires structurally balanced budgets, where recurring expenditures are funded only by recurring revenues. Rare deviations may occur when previous year surpluses or one-time revenue infusions provide reserves that can temporarily fund expenditures beyond the means provided by recurring revenues. Thus, policymakers are routinely presented with tough choices as to how best to appropriate limited recurring General Fund dollars, including pressure applied each year to “stretch” those dollars for unanticipated or new expenses. In times of high inflation, project costs tend to exceed up-front estimates, and cost-of-living increases for City employees are provided more often to keep up with employees’ increased costs of living. Additionally, annual requests for new programs, position allotments, facility and equipment upgrades, and promotions push the total amount requested for expenditure budgets far beyond estimated recurring revenue budgets. This results in dozens of requests and priorities, which would be fully funded if recurring revenues could support them. However, reality dictates that the competition for General Fund revenues makes the funding of all requests and priorities impossible. To maintain a structurally balanced budget, cuts must be made to other General Fund expenditures to make the necessary amount of recurring General Fund revenue available to pay for any unanticipated or new expenses. This makes the General Fund a less preferable option for funding the discharge of the substantial and potentially expanding obligation that the UJL represents.

In previous years, when the amount outstanding was less than it is now, the General Fund was used from time to time to pay judgments directly or pay debt service payments on revenue bonds issued for the purpose of paying judgments against the City. There was no codified policy requiring a certain amount to be appropriated on an annual basis for paying judgments, but previous Councils appropriated General Fund revenue or incurred debt to pay judgments as part of their ordinary annual General Fund budgets. Arguably, the lack of a consistent payment mechanism or appropriation requirement contributed to the accumulation of a sizeable unpaid judgment backlog. But there is little doubt that relying on the General Fund budget as a source of payment also had an effect given the myriad of operational priorities competing for funding. Therefore, this funding plan recommends against relying on the General Fund as the primary funding source to satisfy the City’s unpaid judgment obligations beyond the current reliance on recurring General Fund revenues appropriated for two purposes: (1) the amount appropriated annually in the Judgment Fund for the payment of settlements and judgments, and (2) the amount appropriated for debt service payments on outstanding revenue bonds secured by the City’s millage levied for general municipal purposes. If the recommendations in this funding plan are implemented and current market conditions hold, the amount of recurring General Fund revenue that the City currently appropriates for these purposes can be repurposed and leveraged, such that

the City’s unpaid judgment obligations can be satisfied without a net increase in the use of recurring General Fund revenue.

B. Judgment Fund

Recently, the City began increasing its use of special funds or revolving funds to separately account for expenditures for specific purposes, segregating expenditures for those specific purposes from the voluminous appropriations for various operating purposes in the General Fund. The potential rationales for separate accounting vary, but some funds are created to capture specific activities that generate revenue and dedicate that revenue to a particular related purpose. One such fund is the Judgment Fund.

The Judgment Fund was established as a revolving fund in 2017 by Ordinance Number 27,543 M.C.S., with the express purpose of dedicating certain funds for the payment of certain legal “judgments” rendered against the City, which is defined to include settlement agreements and “any final judgment or order rendered against the city by a state court or by a federal court where the judgment or order is based exclusively under state law.” Section 70-415.272 of the City Code provides that “[t]he Judgment Fund shall be funded by revenues received from state court judgments in favor of the city, excluding those relative to payment of taxes and fees, and the proceeds of insurance settlements, excluding replacement costs and reimbursements. The fund shall be supplemented by other available revenues, as needed, to satisfy the [\$2,000,000] minimum funding threshold established herein.” The Department of Finance has assigned the Judgment Fund number 5139 for accounting purposes.

In practice, the Law Department has been provided at least a \$2,000,000 annual appropriation in the Judgment Fund since the fund was established, but the revenues have been recurring General Fund revenues rather than revenues received from judgments or insurance settlements. In the last two years, appropriations were made for the payment of outstanding legal judgments in the Judgment Fund (Fund 5139) and in the Priority Multi-Year Projects Fund (Fund 1183), which is funded by unassigned fund balance in the General Fund. The following table highlights recent historical appropriations and expenditures by the Law Department in the Judgment Fund and the Priority Multi-Year Projects Fund:

Annual Appropriations and Actual Expenditures to Pay Outstanding Judgments								
Fund	2021 Budget	2021 Actuals	2022 Budget	2022 Actuals	2023 Budget	2023 Actuals	2024 Budget	2024 Actuals
5139	\$6,000,000	\$1,552,984	\$2,000,000	\$1,105,183	\$5,342,817	\$2,000,081	\$5,343,986	\$5,068,727
1183	-	-	-	-	\$7,000,000	\$2,234,178	\$4,765,822	\$37,500

Note: Fund 5139 is the Judgment Fund and Fund 1183 is the Priority Multi-Year Projects Fund.
Source: BRASS data as of April 29, 2025.

While efforts have been made to pay judgment creditors and reduce the total outstanding amount in unpaid judgments, two class action judgments were added to the UJL in 2024. The total ballooned from less than \$28 million to almost \$90 million, due to the finalization of the class action judgments in *John Johnson, et al v. Orleans Parish School Board, et al.* (\$37.66M) and *Joseph R. McMahon III, et al v. City of New Orleans* (\$25.61M). With the total principal amount

reflected in the UJL at \$89.3M as of December 31, 2024, the use of the General Fund or the Judgment Fund to pay the full total principal amount becomes more challenging. If the historical pattern of General Fund revenues being the only revenue source for the Judgment Fund continues, the same issues will continue, with myriad operational priorities competing for General Fund revenues that cannot fully fund all requests and priorities. In other words, the Judgment Fund may currently provide a better accounting mechanism than the General Fund for the purpose of tracking and reporting the payment of judgments, but revenue sources outside the General Fund are needed to distinguish the Judgment Fund from the General Fund from a revenue (or funding source) perspective. Particularly, the Judgment Fund's enabling legislation includes language specifically contemplating revenue being received from state court judgments in favor of the City (excluding those relative to payment of taxes and fees) and the proceeds of insurance settlements (excluding replacement costs and reimbursements).

The City's Risk Manager maintains several insurance policies on behalf of the City, but the City is self-insured outside the scope of those specific insurance policies. Historically, the City has received insurance proceeds, but the proceeds have not exceeded replacement costs and reimbursement for losses sustained. The primary type of insurance proceeds received by the City over the past few years have been property damage claim payments, which are based on damage to City-owned property that is repaired or replaced. An example of such insurance claims is property damage from Hurricane Ida, for which the City received insurance proceeds that did not exceed the extent of the City's losses. Another recent example of insurance proceeds received by the City was in response to the cyber-attack in 2019, but the City's costs in response to the attack again exceeded the payments received following the City's insurance claim. Thus, the only other Judgment Fund revenue source outside the General Fund with a chance of recovery is revenue from state court judgments in favor of the City.

The City Attorney and Law Department manage the legal affairs of the City, including pursuing legal claims when appropriate. But the vast majority of litigation in which the City is a plaintiff would fall within one of four categories: (1) a lawsuit seeking to collect taxes owed to the City; (2) a lawsuit seeking to confirm an administrative judgment to collect something else owed to the City, such as a fine or fee; (3) a lawsuit seeking reimbursement for property damages that the City has incurred; or (4) a lawsuit seeking reimbursement for workers' compensation benefits paid to a City employee. Lawsuits in those four categories would either recover General Fund revenue that was due from the defendant who contested it or recover a reimbursement for damage or loss. Additionally, Section 70-415.272 of the City Code contains explicit exclusions for payments of taxes and fees and replacement costs and reimbursements. Accordingly, the categories of potential revenue included in the Judgment Fund's enabling legislation have not historically resulted in revenue collected beyond the extent of the City's losses because the City is seeking, through an insurance claim or lawsuit, reimbursement for damages that the City incurred. Therefore, the Judgment Fund is, in practice, indistinguishable from the General Fund from a revenue (or funding source) perspective.

Nevertheless, the funding plan cannot ignore the \$2 million in General Fund revenue that is currently appropriated for the payment of judgments in the Judgment Fund. Instead of using the Judgment Fund as the primary funding source to satisfy the City's accumulated unpaid judgment obligations, thereby increasing the reliance on General fund revenue, this funding plan recommends maintaining the current amount appropriated annually in the Judgment Fund but expanding the allowable uses for the annual appropriation in the Judgment Fund to include debt service payments. As explained below, the existing annual appropriation can be leveraged to provide a cash infusion through a new debt issuance, by borrowing money to be used to pay the judgments directly and using the existing annual appropriation to repay the lender.

C. New Debt Issuance

When the City issues debt, the basic premise of the transaction, regardless of the instrument used, is that the City receives an infusion of cash up front and in return repays the debt over time, including interest on top of the principal amount borrowed. Because ordinance number 30,030 M.C.S. says that this funding plan should address the feasibility of using bonds and other debt instruments to satisfy any remaining unpaid judgment obligations, that begs two questions: (1) whether the City may issue debt for the purpose of paying judgments, and (2) whether it is financially feasible for the City to do so.

Legal Authorization for Revenue Bonds

One type of debt the City is authorized to incur is a pledge of the City's property tax revenues as security for the debt, guaranteeing to the lender that certain property tax revenues will be dedicated to repaying the debt each year until the debt is paid off. This type of transaction is authorized by Louisiana Revised Statute 39:1430, which allows the City to issue revenue bonds to be repaid by various revenue sources when the revenue is received.¹ Revenue streams available for general municipal purposes, such as sales tax revenues or ad valorem tax revenues, may be leveraged to provide upfront funds for paying judgments. The City may issue revenue bonds for the authorized purposes of a tax, receiving an infusion of cash when the bonds are sold, and pledge and dedicate the revenues of the tax to repay the debt.

In fact, the City is currently repaying two series of limited tax bonds that were issued for the purpose of paying judgments and Workers' Compensation claims against the City, in which the City borrowed \$10 million in 2016 and \$10 million in 2017, to be fully repaid in 2026 and 2027, respectively. The revenue pledged as security for these limited tax bonds is realized from the City's ad valorem tax for general municipal purposes, currently levied in 2025 at 12.23 mills in Section 1 of the City's 2025 tax levy ordinance, number 30,144 M.C.S. Paying judgments against the City is an allowable general municipal purpose, so the City has borrowed money for a general municipal purpose and pledged revenues generated by an ad valorem tax for general municipal purposes to

¹ These revenue bonds are different from general obligation bonds, which will not be discussed in this funding plan. Historically general obligation bonds have been used primarily for capital expenditures, and paying outstanding judgments against the City is not a capital expenditure.

repay the debt. Thus, this type of debt transaction is authorized by law and not uncommon, answering the first question raised above.

Financial Feasibility of Issuing Revenue Bonds

To determine whether issuing new revenue bonds for the purpose of paying judgments is financially feasible, the City must first consider whether the ad valorem tax for general municipal purposes is anticipated to generate sufficient revenue to repay the new debt and any existing debt secured by the same millage. From a technical standpoint, it is financially feasible for the City to issue debt if the tax dedicated to repaying the debt will generate enough revenue to repay the debt, in that the City will technically have the money to repay the debt. However, because those revenues are recurring General Fund revenues, the City must also consider how taking on new debt will impact General Fund expenditures, in the form of additional principal and interest payments due each year (often referred to as “debt service” payments) to repay the new debt, and whether it is cost-effective to issue and pay off the debt.

Debt service payments can vary from year to year depending on how the debt is structured, but the debt service schedule for the City’s existing debt is known and shows how much the City must pay each year until the debt is fully repaid. Thus, the financial feasibility determination largely depends on the specific details of the new debt issuance being considered and whether the City can afford to absorb the additional borrowing costs, either through revenue growth or reductions in expenditures.

Financial Feasibility: Technical Calculation

In practice, the City uses a consistent method to calculate whether the ad valorem tax securing the debt will generate enough revenue each year to pay the debt service payments due each year on its existing and proposed debt. Whether required by state law or the existing outstanding debt agreements, the typical calculation is that the estimated tax revenue in the year the new debt is proposed must be at least 1.35 times the combined principal and interest due in any calendar year on the City’s existing and new debt that is secured by the tax. If the revenue estimate meets the threshold in this calculation, then it is assumed that the City can technically afford to issue the new debt.

For example, consider Council Resolution R-16-399, in which a “whereas” paragraph confirmed that the estimated revenue to be realized from the levy of the 13.91-mill ad valorem tax levied by the City for general municipal purposes in 2016 was approximately \$49,176,780.46, and that such amount was at least 1.35 times the combined principal and interest due in any calendar year on the City’s debt being authorized in the resolution as well as the City’s other existing debt (Outstanding Parity Bonds) that was secured by the same millage. Resolution R-16-399 confirmed the financial feasibility of issuing the new debt (without regard to General Fund impact) by confirming that the 13.91-mill ad valorem tax was estimated to generate more than 1.35 times the maximum annual debt service payment that would be due on the City’s existing and new debt secured by the tax.

The calculation above is dependent on three factors: (1) estimating the revenue to be realized from the levy of the tax securing the City’s existing debt and the new debt being issued, (2) calculating the total combined principal and interest due in any calendar year on the City’s existing debt secured by the tax, and (3) estimating the principal and interest that will be due on the new debt being issued. The principal and interest due to repay the City’s existing debt secured by the ad valorem tax levied for general municipal purposes is known, but the other two factors in the calculation must be estimated.

Financial Feasibility: Revenue Estimate

For the purposes of this funding plan, it is assumed that the new debt will be proposed and authorized in 2025, so the first factor in the calculation is the estimated tax revenue to be realized from the levy of the ad valorem tax for general municipal purposes in 2025. This estimate is calculated by multiplying the millage rate by the value of one mill, based on the 2025 Tax Assessment Rolls for Orleans Parish. The City’s Chief Economist has provided the value of one mill that was used in the 2025 Budget, which was \$5,316,926.88, based on the certified 2025 Tax Assessment Rolls. The ad valorem tax for general municipal purposes was levied in 2025 at 12.23 mills in ordinance number 30,144 M.C.S., which is the City’s annual ordinance for levying all ad valorem taxes for the year 2025. Multiplying 12.23 mills by \$5,316,926.88 results in an estimate that the 12.23-mill tax would generate \$65,026,015.77 in revenue in 2025.

Financial Feasibility: Existing Debt Service

The debt service payments due to repay the City’s existing debt secured by the ad valorem tax levied for general municipal purposes are known quantities, included in the documents accompanying each debt transaction when it occurred. But the total combined principal and interest due each calendar year must be calculated, and the maximum amount due in any calendar year must be used in the calculation above. The table below provides the remaining principal and interest due each year for the three outstanding bond series that comprise the City’s existing debt secured by the ad valorem tax levied for general municipal purposes.

Year	Series 2016 ²	Series 2017 ³	Series 2021 (Refunding) ⁴	Total
2025	\$1,157,440	\$1,280,131	\$15,681,546	\$18,119,117
2026	\$1,164,170	\$1,307,315	\$15,679,750	\$18,151,234
2027	\$0	\$1,342,380	\$15,676,952	\$17,019,332
2028	\$0	\$0	\$15,674,605	\$15,674,605
2029	\$0	\$0	\$15,672,975	\$15,672,975
2030	\$0	\$0	\$15,670,308	\$15,670,308

The existing annual debt service shown above must be used in conjunction with the estimated new debt service in the calculation of whether the millage is estimated to generate sufficient revenue to repay the combined debt service.

² Taxable Limited Tax Bonds, Series 2016, dated October 12, 2016.

³ Taxable Limited Tax Bonds, Series 2017, dated November 30, 2017.

⁴ Taxable Limited Tax Refunding Bonds, Series 2021, dated October 26, 2021.

Financial Feasibility: New Debt Service Estimate

The remaining unknown in the calculation above is an estimate of the principal and interest that will be due on the new debt being considered, for which the City consults its legal and financial advisors. The City currently engages PFM Financial Advisors LLC and CLB Porter, LLC as co-financial advisors and Foley & Judell, L.L.P. and Auzenne & Associates, L.L.C. as co-bond counsel. The team advises the City to put guardrails on legal authorization and financial feasibility of debt transactions, from preliminary discussions through execution and delivery.

In preparing this funding plan, the City's legal and financial advisors first assisted with identifying potential debt issuance solutions for paying the City's unpaid and outstanding judgments, which was necessary before they could estimate the principal and interest that would likely be due on the debt being considered. As noted above, issuing limited tax revenue bonds is a straightforward debt issuance solution for the City, so the City's advisors identified limited tax revenue bonds as a potential solution straight away. However, there are several options available to the City for such a debt issuance, which the advisors helped the City evaluate by initially discussing a few hypothetical debt issuances using \$90 million as the hypothetical amount to be financed.

The City's financial advisors initially provided an illustrative set of financing scenarios to aid in working group discussions, showing what the City's interest rates, principal amounts, total cost, and repayment schedules could look like under various scenarios. Each scenario factored in the City's existing debt service schedule for its existing debt secured by the millage for general municipal purposes, and scenarios were initially presented to estimate the new debt service payments that would be due on a hypothetical \$90M financed via one revenue bond sale in 2025. Using estimated market interest rates, the financial advisors provided estimated principal amounts, total cost, and repayment (debt service) schedules for multiple potential revenue bond solutions for paying off \$90M in unpaid judgments. Following multiple group discussions between the legal and financial advisors and representatives of the Chief Administrative Office, Department of Finance, and Budget Chair's office, revised sets of financing scenarios were provided to the group to guide discussions about whether the City can afford to absorb the additional borrowing costs of issuing new limited tax revenue bonds.

Each of the revised scenarios resulted in roughly equivalent estimates of the principal and interest that would be due on the new debt being considered, with one bond sale occurring in 2025 and a second bond sale occurring in 2027. The City would receive the infusion of cash and be able to satisfy the remaining outstanding principal balance of the UJL in full by the end of 2027, but the debt would be structured so that the City would only pay interest on the debt until 2031 and would then pay roughly equal payments for principal and interest until the full amount from the first sale is paid off in 2045 and the full amount from the second sale is paid off in 2047.

Each revised scenario estimated roughly \$2 million per year in interest to be paid on the first tranche of new bonds in 2026 and 2027, with the total in interest payments increasing to roughly \$5 million per year from 2028 until 2031 following the sale of the second tranche of new bonds, at which time the total in principal and interest payments would increase to roughly \$8.6

million per year until 2045. Then the final two payments for the second tranche would be paid in 2046 and 2047 and would depend on the scenario chosen. Employing the estimates provided by the City’s financial advisors, combined with the principal and interest due on the City’s existing debt secured by the tax, the maximum due in any calendar year is estimated to be less than \$21 million.

The table below illustrates the technical calculation to determine whether the estimated tax revenue in 2025 will be at least 1.35 times the combined principal and interest due in any calendar year on the City’s existing and new debt that is secured by the tax.

Question: once the new revenue bonds are issued, will the estimated tax revenue in 2025 be at least 1.35 times the combined principal and interest due in any calendar year on the City’s existing and new debt that is secured by the 12.23-mill tax?	
Estimated tax revenue in 2025 =	\$65,026,015.77
Annual debt service payments =	MAX of (EXISTING debt service payments + NEW debt service payments)
Annual debt service payments =	\$21,000,000.00 (overestimate)
1.35 x Annual debt service payments =	\$28,350,000.00
Answer: even using an overestimate for the maximum annual debt service payments, the estimated 12.23-mill property tax revenue in 2025 will be at least 1.35 times the combined annual debt service payments on the new and existing bonds secured by the tax in any calendar year. \$65 million is more than \$28.4 million.	

Sources:

The estimated tax revenue calculation is included above, using estimated revenue per mill. Existing debt service payments were provided on a “Combined Debt Service Schedule” by bond counsel. New debt service payments were provided by the financial advisors, but the amount shown above is a simplified overestimate for illustrative purposes. Actual amounts can be provided upon request.

As illustrated above, the revenue generated by the ad valorem tax for general municipal purposes is estimated to exceed by a substantial amount the combined principal and interest due in any calendar year on the City’s new debt being considered as well as the City’s other existing debt that is secured by the same millage. In other words, it is financially feasible for the City to incur the new debt, since the City will have the money to repay the debt.

Financial Feasibility: General Fund Impact

The financial feasibility of taking on new debt to be repaid by the ad valorem tax for general municipal purposes, which is General Fund revenue, is also dependent on how that General Fund revenue is currently being used and whether the City can afford to dedicate that revenue source to repaying new debt. In 2025, the ad valorem tax for general municipal purposes is estimated to generate \$65,026,015.77 in General Fund revenue, and this funding plan will assume that both the value of one mill based on the City’s certified Tax Assessment Rolls and millage rate will stay the same in the years being considered herein (conservatively assuming 0% growth in property tax). Of that ~\$65M in General Fund revenue, \$18,119,117 in principal and interest on the City’s existing debt must be paid. Of that ~\$18M, \$2,437,571 is debt service for bonds issued for the purpose of paying legal judgments and Workers’ Compensation claims against the City, with \$1,157,440 for Series 2016 bonds and \$1,280,131 for Series 2017 bonds. Adding the existing appropriation of \$2 million in the Judgment Fund for payments directly to judgment creditors provides the total in General Fund revenue being used for paying judgments at \$4,437,571. The remaining \$15,681,547 of existing debt service is for the Series 2021 bonds. The needs of the community in New Orleans are substantial, and there are several important priorities competing for General Fund revenue. It is therefore vital to the City, its residents, and its visitors that this

funding plan consider the financial feasibility of any debt issuance from the perspective of General Fund impact.

Fortunately, the City's debt service schedule for repaying bonds secured by the millage for general municipal purposes is nearing the end; the Series 2016 bonds will be fully repaid at the end of 2026, the Series 2017 bonds will be fully repaid at the end of 2027, and the Series 2021 bonds will be fully repaid at the end of 2030. In other words, the City will no longer have to dedicate up to \$18.15 million of the General Fund revenue generated by the ad valorem tax for general municipal purposes to the repayment of that debt. This provides an opportunity for the City to issue new debt for the purpose of paying judgments without having to cut some General Fund expenditures in order to afford the new debt service payments. In fact, using the overestimate of \$9 million used in the financial feasibility calculation above, the City could borrow \$90 million via revenue bonds, repaying them at less than \$9 million per year over twenty years, and still see a reduction in General Fund expenditures because of the City's existing revenue bonds being fully repaid in 2030. But that savings does not materialize to such an extent until 2031. The following amounts are due in the following years to repay the City's existing debt secured by the millage for general municipal purposes: \$18,119,117 in 2025, \$18,151,234 in 2026, \$17,019,332 in 2027, \$15,674,605 in 2028, \$15,672,975 in 2029, and \$15,670,308 in 2030.

Until the City's existing revenue bonds are fully repaid, taking on new debt will require an additional dedication of the same revenue source to repaying new debt, which is a net negative impact on the General Fund. To mitigate this impact, the new debt can be structured such that revenue bonds can be sold in multiple tranches and interest-only payments can be made until the City's existing revenue bonds are fully repaid in 2030. Additionally, the current appropriation in the Judgment Fund for direct payments to judgment creditors can be repurposed to pay debt service payments on the new debt, if the City Code provisions governing the Judgment Fund are slightly amended. These strategies will be spelled out in detail in the recommendations section below, but it is feasible to engineer the negative General Fund impact to be minimal or possibly to even have a net positive impact, if debt service payments can be funded using a combination of the \$2 million annual appropriation in the Judgment Fund and the savings (or capacity) generated by the Series 2016 and Series 2017 being fully repaid in 2026 and 2027, respectively.

Based on the advice of the City's co-financial advisors and co-bond counsel, it is possible that the City's current UJL can be paid off via the issuance of new revenue bonds, employing strategies to have a minimal impact on current General Fund expenditures, spending no more than the City currently is for the purpose of paying judgments and existing debt obligations. Therefore, the issuance of new debt is likely the best funding source for satisfying the remaining outstanding principal balance of the UJL in full by the end of 2027.

D. Other Potential Funding Sources

In addition to the General Fund, Judgment Fund, and a new debt issuance, there are two additional potential funding sources that could be considered. First, revenues generated by existing millages for specific purposes could potentially be used to pay outstanding judgments. This would require a determination that the judgment being paid legally fits the use of the millage revenue for

the specified purpose in the voter proposition. Many of the millages that the City collects are dedicated to and must be used for specific purposes, so it is possible that paying a related judgment could be a compliant use of the millage revenues. But doing so would require research into each judgment and each millage's enabling legislation, and any millage revenue rededicated to paying a related judgment would have to be replaced with other General Fund revenue or the related cost reduced to offset the rededication of revenues. So dedicated millage revenue would likely confront the same challenges as the General Fund and Judgment Fund, if it were used as a funding source for paying unpaid judgments.

Another potential funding source for paying unpaid judgments against the City is a new dedicated millage specifically for this purpose. Any such millage would have to be approved by voters in New Orleans, and significant voter populations tend to oppose new taxes or increases in property taxes. Some recently proposed dedicated taxes have been approved by voters, but the most recent example of voter reluctance to approve dedicated property taxes was the very narrow approval of a renewal of the millage dedicated to the Orleans Parish Law Enforcement District, which passed by two votes on May 3, 2025. If a new dedicated millage were proposed to fund the payment of judgments against the City, it could provide a new, dedicated funding source that could prevent the accumulation of a large outstanding principal balance like the current UJL. Or it could provide a dedicated funding source for repaying revenue bonds issued for the purpose of paying judgments against the City, if the proposition were worded to allow for such. But proposing a new millage dedicated to paying judgments is not a guaranteed solution for paying off the current UJL, so this funding plan does not recommend doing so at this time.

Finally, it should be noted that the savings highlighted above, due to the full repayment of existing revenue bonds by the end of 2030, provides another potential funding source for paying unpaid judgments, but on a longer timeframe. Ordinance Number 30,030 M.C.S. requires this funding plan to provide recommendations for satisfying the remaining outstanding principal balance of the UJL in full by the end of 2027, which could not be accomplished using only the savings generated by no longer paying debt service payments after existing revenue bonds are repaid. But the capacity generated from the retiring debt could be used to pay judgments at a much lower cost to the City, without paying the costs of borrowing.

In a high-interest economic environment, the least costly way to pay down the UJL would be to use this capacity to make payments directly to judgment creditors, which would be in addition to the \$2 million annual appropriation in the Judgment Fund. The additional capacity is \$1.13M in 2027, \$2.5M in 2028-2030, and an additional \$15.7M starting in 2031. Rather than issuing new debt and paying relatively high interest rates compared to just a few years ago, the additional capacity could be used to pay judgment creditors at a rate of \$18M per year starting in 2031, satisfying the remaining outstanding principal balance of the Unpaid Judgment Fund by 2034 at a much lower cost without any General Fund impact compared to appropriations for this purpose in 2025. This will not be the path forward recommended by this funding plan because of the requirements in 30,030 M.C.S., but it is a viable path forward at a lower cost.

V. Recommendations

The central goal of this funding plan warrants repeating: paying off the City's current UJL expeditiously while simultaneously preparing to meet the City's future judgment and settlement obligations with minimal reliance on the General Fund. Considering the competing priorities angling for General Fund revenue, it is crucial that this funding plan limit the General Fund impact of any recommended solution. The recommendations provided herein seek to accomplish that goal by leveraging the City's existing annual appropriation in the Judgment Fund and the savings generated as existing revenue bonds are repaid, rather than using additional General Fund revenue.

A. Funding Source for Satisfying the UJL: Revenue Bonds

First and foremost, this funding plan recommends issuing new revenue bonds to use as the funding source for satisfying the remaining outstanding principal balance of the UJL by the end of 2027. Due to the balance being so high (~\$89.3M), it is highly unlikely that existing General Fund revenue sources could be used on this timeframe without significant cuts to other General Fund expenditures, creating an unfortunate competition between many important budget priorities for scarce General Fund revenues. Revenue bonds issued for the purpose of paying judgments and claims against the City are authorized by law and not uncommon, as evidenced by the fact that the City is currently repaying two series of limited tax bonds issued for this purpose. The bonds can be authorized for the full amount of the outstanding debt and then sold in multiple tranches based on market conditions, need, and money available to pay debt service payments. The City would receive an infusion of cash when each tranche of bonds is sold, allowing the Law Department to tackle the UJL more quickly than in past years (when annual appropriations were no more than \$10 million per year). If circumstances remain the same or substantially similar, the City could sell revenue bonds in 2025 and 2027 and satisfy the outstanding principal balance on the UJL by the end of 2027.

The City's co-financial advisors and co-bond counsel have advised a working group of City representatives from the Chief Administrative Office, Department of Finance, and Budget Chair's office by discussing options available to the City and developing hypothetical financing scenarios showing what the City's interest rates, principal amounts, total cost, and repayment schedules could look like in each scenario. Knowing that the outstanding principal balance on the UJL was \$89,287,152.45 as of December 31, 2024, the advisors used \$90 million as the hypothetical amount to be financed and created hypothetical financing scenarios with hypothetical repayment schedules for the City working group to consider. Based on the assumption that as little General Fund revenue as possible should be used to repay the new revenue bonds, without overinflating the costs of financing, the financial advisors provided financing scenarios that allowed annual debt service payments to remain as low as possible until the City's existing revenue bonds are fully repaid in 2030. Beyond the question of whether the City's millage for general municipal purposes brings in enough revenue to repay the debt in accordance with the law and market expectations, the advisors helped the City determine whether the City could realistically afford to take on the long-term obligations being considered.

To afford the additional borrowing costs of new revenue bonds, the primary consideration is the amount due each year in new debt service payments (principal and interest). If the City were to simply issue \$90M in revenue bonds and change no other current practices, additional General Fund revenue would be needed for the debt service payments on the new revenue bonds, which would be problematic for the reasons highlighted above. Accordingly, the City’s advisors provided the following additional strategies to be considered by the working group:

1. Pressure on the General Fund could be reduced by paying interest only on the new debt until the debt service payments on the existing revenue bonds end (in 2030).
2. Pressure on the General Fund could be reduced by using the annual appropriation of \$2M in the Judgment Fund for debt service payments on new revenue bonds rather than paying judgment creditors directly.
3. Interest owed immediately on new revenue bonds could be reduced by selling multiple tranches of revenue bonds instead of selling a single tranche of revenue bonds in 2025, thereby reducing the total cost of borrowing.

The hypothetical scenarios provided by the financial advisors used consistent assumptions for the amount needed (\$90M to pay off unpaid judgments), the timeframe for the cash infusion (\$90M to be received by the City and paid to judgment creditors by the end of 2027), duration of repayment (20 years), and existing debt service schedule (for Series 2016, 2017, and 2021, being repaid by the same millage for general municipal purposes). Then, by employing the strategies above and adjusting the amounts to be sold in each tranche of new revenue bonds, the City’s advisors provided the working group a consensus path forward that the City could realistically afford.⁵ Therefore, this funding plan recommends that the Council authorize the issuance of \$90 million in new revenue bonds, issue the first tranche of \$40-45 million in 2025, and issue the remaining \$45-50 million in a second tranche in 2027.

B. Recommended Timeframe and Repayment Plan for new Revenue Bonds

The financial feasibility of issuing new revenue bonds for the purpose of paying judgments is dependent on whether the City can afford to absorb the additional borrowing costs of the new revenue bonds while continuing to pay the borrowing costs of the City’s existing revenue bonds. To illustrate this determination, the table below provides an annual debt service schedule provided by the City’s co-financial advisors corresponding to a hypothetical sale of \$40 million in revenue bonds in 2025 and \$50 million in revenue bonds in 2027, combined with the debt service schedule for the City’s existing revenue bonds.

⁵ It should be noted that General Fund expenditures are expected to grow due to the usual economic inflationary pressures and thus, the affordability determination assumes the City is able to realize revenue growth and/or make budgetary decisions to keep up with those inflationary pressures.

Annual Debt Service Schedule: Existing CNO Revenue Bonds Plus Hypothetical \$90M in New Revenue Bonds, Sold in Two Tranches						
Year	Debt Service Series 2016	Debt Service Series 2017	Debt Service Series 2021	Debt Service New \$40M	Debt Service New \$50M	Total: Existing and New Debt Service
2025	\$1,157,440	\$1,280,131	\$15,681,546			\$18,119,117
2026	\$1,164,170	\$1,307,315	\$15,679,750	\$1,731,356		\$19,882,591
2027	-	\$1,342,380	\$15,676,952	\$2,179,330		\$19,198,662
2028	-	-	\$15,674,605	\$2,179,330	\$2,128,301	\$19,982,236
2029	-	-	\$15,672,975	\$2,179,330	\$2,697,846	\$20,550,151
2030	-	-	\$15,670,308	\$2,179,330	\$2,697,846	\$20,547,484
2031	-	-	-	\$4,024,330	\$4,637,846	\$8,662,176
2032	-	-	-	\$4,025,216	\$4,637,054	\$8,662,270
2033	-	-	-	\$4,024,821	\$4,635,223	\$8,660,044
2034	-	-	-	\$4,023,930	\$4,637,586	\$8,661,516
2035	-	-	-	\$4,026,365	\$4,637,647	\$8,664,012
2036	-	-	-	\$4,026,229	\$4,636,349	\$8,662,578
2037	-	-	-	\$4,028,062	\$4,637,371	\$8,665,433
2038	-	-	-	\$4,026,374	\$4,634,759	\$8,661,133
2039	-	-	-	\$4,025,434	\$4,638,026	\$8,663,460
2040	-	-	-	\$4,024,734	\$4,636,426	\$8,661,160
2041	-	-	-	\$4,028,204	\$4,639,156	\$8,667,360
2042	-	-	-	\$4,027,790	\$4,635,440	\$8,663,230
2043	-	-	-	\$4,026,954	\$4,639,402	\$8,666,356
2044	-	-	-	\$4,024,689	\$4,638,134	\$8,662,823
2045	-	-	-	\$4,025,646	\$4,634,906	\$8,660,552
2046	-	-	-	-	\$4,638,647	\$4,638,647
2047	-	-	-	-	\$4,638,474	\$4,638,474

The total amount due in debt service payments on the City’s existing revenue bonds is currently \$18,119,118 in 2025, and the hypothetical total will increase once the first interest payment on the new revenue bonds sold in 2025 is due in 2026. The second tranche sold in 2027 will have a similar effect, increasing the total debt service payment up to \$20,550,151 in 2029, but then the total drops dramatically once the City’s existing revenue bonds are fully repaid in 2030, hovers around \$8.67M until 2045, and drops to \$4.64M for the final two payments.⁶

Ordinarily, such a table would show a negative impact on the General Fund, in that the total amount due in debt service payments on revenue bonds will increase once the new debt service payments become due in the year following each sale. However, \$2,000,000 in General Fund revenue is currently appropriated on an annual basis for payments in the Judgment Fund directly to the City’s judgment creditors, and the cash infusion from the sale of the new revenue bonds will be available to replace that General Fund revenue source for the direct payments. Thus, the \$2,000,000 Judgment Fund appropriation can be repurposed to pay debt service payments for the new revenue bonds, absorbing \$2,000,000 of the increase. In 2026, that would result in a net

⁶ The full financing scenario provided by PFM Financial Advisors LLC for \$40M issued in 2025 and \$50M issued in 2027 is attached as “Attachment 3” for reference purposes.

savings of General Fund revenue versus what is currently planned to be spent in 2025 for the payment of debt service and the direct payment of judgments.⁷

Additionally, the City’s Taxable Limited Tax Bonds, Series 2016 and Series 2017, will be fully repaid by the end of 2026 and the end of 2027, respectively. As the existing bonds are repaid, savings will be generated, meaning those debt service payments will no longer need to be made and that General Fund revenue can be repurposed to pay debt service payments on new revenue bonds. Compared to the City’s planned expenditures of General Fund revenue for debt service payments and direct payments to judgment creditors in 2025, there would be an annual net savings (or increase) equal to the amounts in the last column of the following table.

Annual Expenditure Comparison (\$90M): 2025 Planned Expenditures vs. Future Years				
Year	Judgment Fund Direct Payments	Existing and New Debt Service	Total	Savings (increase), Compared to 2025
2025	\$2,000,000	\$18,119,117	\$20,119,117	
2026	\$0 (repurposed)	\$19,882,591	\$19,882,591	\$236,526
2027	\$0 (repurposed)	\$19,198,662	\$19,198,662	\$920,456
2028	\$0 (repurposed)	\$19,982,236	\$19,982,236	\$136,882
2029	\$0 (repurposed)	\$20,550,151	\$20,550,151	(\$431,033)
2030	\$0 (repurposed)	\$20,547,484	\$20,547,484	(\$428,366)
2031	\$0 (repurposed)	\$8,662,176	\$8,662,176	\$11,456,942
2032	\$0 (repurposed)	\$8,662,270	\$8,662,270	\$11,456,848
2033	\$0 (repurposed)	\$8,660,044	\$8,660,044	\$11,459,074
2034	\$0 (repurposed)	\$8,661,516	\$8,661,516	\$11,457,602
2035	\$0 (repurposed)	\$8,664,012	\$8,664,012	\$11,455,106
2036	\$0 (repurposed)	\$8,662,578	\$8,662,578	\$11,456,540
2037	\$0 (repurposed)	\$8,665,433	\$8,665,433	\$11,453,685
2038	\$0 (repurposed)	\$8,661,133	\$8,661,133	\$11,457,985
2039	\$0 (repurposed)	\$8,663,460	\$8,663,460	\$11,886,691
2040	\$0 (repurposed)	\$8,661,160	\$8,661,160	\$11,457,958
2041	\$0 (repurposed)	\$8,667,360	\$8,667,360	\$11,451,758
2042	\$0 (repurposed)	\$8,663,230	\$8,663,230	\$11,455,888
2043	\$0 (repurposed)	\$8,666,356	\$8,666,356	\$11,452,762
2044	\$0 (repurposed)	\$8,662,823	\$8,662,823	\$11,456,295
2045	\$0 (repurposed)	\$8,660,552	\$8,660,552	\$11,458,566
2046	\$0 (repurposed)	\$4,638,647	\$4,638,647	\$15,480,471
2047	\$0 (repurposed)	\$4,638,474	\$4,638,474	\$15,480,644

Rather than paying \$2 million per year directly to judgment creditors via the Judgment Fund, this funding plan recommends leveraging that annual appropriation by using it for debt service payments on a much larger infusion of cash in short order, allowing the City to sell \$40-45M in revenue bonds in 2025 without using more General Fund revenue to repay the debt. Assuming the current circumstances continue and the City still intends to satisfy the remaining

⁷ In 2025, the City plans to spend \$18,119,117 on debt service payments for existing revenue bonds and \$2,000,000 for the direct payment of judgments, for a total of \$20,119,117. If revenue bond proceeds will be used to pay judgments and the \$2,000,000 in the Judgment Fund is available to pay debt service in 2026, the total in General Fund revenue needed for debt service payments in 2026 is \$19,882,591, which is \$236,526 less than what is planned to be spent in 2025.

outstanding principal balance of the UJL by the end of 2027, a second tranche of revenue bonds can be issued in 2027, and the \$2 million annual appropriation can be combined with the savings generated by the Series 2016 and Series 2017 being fully repaid in 2026 and 2027, and the Series 2021 being fully repaid in 2030, to pay the combined debt service for the full \$90 million in revenue bonds.

The table immediately above illustrates the possibility that the City's current UJL can be paid off via the issuance of new revenue bonds, employing strategies to have a minimal impact on current General Fund expenditures, spending roughly the same amount that the City currently is for the purpose of paying judgments and debt service on revenue bonds. Notably, the table shows a savings of a total of \$1,293,864 for 2026-2028 and a net increase of \$859,399 for 2029-2030, so the initial savings may need to be set aside to fund the increases in 2029 and 2030, if the actual debt service schedules result in roughly the same scenario. The financing scenarios provided by the City's financial advisors are intended to illustrate a hypothetical issuance of \$90 million in taxable limited tax bonds, but the actual transactions will result in different debt service schedules (which difference cannot be reasonably estimated given the duration of the financing plan), savings, and principal amounts, due to the variability inherent in debt markets, options available to the City, and variables associated with financial feasibility determinations. In sum, absent a significant change in the City's finances or in general market conditions, the City can afford to absorb the additional borrowing costs of new revenue bonds issued in 2025 and 2027 while continuing to pay the borrowing costs of the City's existing revenue bonds. Should circumstances change substantially, the financing plan can be adjusted to limit any effects on the General Fund. Therefore, this funding plan recommends that the Council authorize the issuance of \$90 million in revenue bonds so that an initial bond sale and receipt of the proceeds can occur in 2025.

C. Revenue Bond Issuance Procedures and Timing

To issue \$90 million in new revenue bonds and begin satisfying the remaining outstanding principal balance of the UJL by 2027, the City Council will need to first adopt a resolution to authorize the bond issuance and application to the State Bond Commission for approval of the bond issuance. The initial resolution, historically referred to as a "Preliminary Resolution," will precede a second resolution, historically referred to as a "Parameter Sale Resolution," which will prescribe the specific details of the new revenue bonds and their repayment.⁸ In order to deliver the bond proceeds to the City by mid- to late-October and allow the Law Department to begin paying down the UJL in 2025, the second, more detailed resolution will likely need to be adopted at the Council's August 21 Regular Meeting, as shown in the tentative, partial timeline in the table below.

⁸ The preliminary authorization resolution, R-25-366, was presented to and approved by the Council on July 10, 2025, and the second, more detailed resolution will be similar in form to Resolutions R-16-399 and R-17-549.

TENTATIVE TIMELINE: \$45,000,000 Taxable Limited Tax Revenue Bonds, Series 2025 of the City of New Orleans, Louisiana	
07/10/2025	City Council adopts Preliminary Resolution.
07/23/2025	State Bond Commission application deadline.
08/21/2025	State Bond Commission meeting to approve the bond issue.
08/21/2025	City Council adopts Parameter Sale Resolution.
Week of 09/08/25	City receives bond rating(s).
09/24/2025	Sell Bonds and execute Bond Purchase Agreement.
10/15/2025	Deliver Bonds.

The Administration, Council, co-bond counsel, and co-financial advisors will need to continue to collaborate to seek the best terms and quickest execution for the City, as the team completes the procedural steps required for the sale of the new revenue bonds. Legislation will be drafted by bond counsel, assisted by the Law Department and CAO’s office as needed, and ultimately provided to the City Council in accordance with its legislative calendar and deadlines. Co-bond counsel have already completed and filed the Louisiana State Bond Commission application and will manage the approval process with the Bond Commission. The entire team will participate in bond rating discussions with the rating agencies, answering any inquiries they may have regarding the City’s finances or operations. The details of any specific responsibilities will be described in the Preliminary Resolution and Parameter Sale Resolution, but, in general, co-bond counsel will advise and perform work of a traditional legal nature throughout the process of issuance and sale of the bonds, and the co-financial advisors will advise and perform work of a traditional financial nature.

As noted above, the City’s co-financial advisors have estimated that, under current market conditions, the City can afford to issue revenue bonds in roughly the amount outstanding on the Unpaid Judgment List as of January 1, 2025, without an increase in the use of General Fund revenues over what is planned to be spent in 2025 for revenue bond debt service and direct payments to judgment creditors in the Judgment Fund. The co-financial advisors have provided financing scenarios based on hypothetical sales of \$40M issued in 2025 and \$50M issued in 2027, preparing to pay off the existing UJL by the end of 2027. Assuming current market conditions continue, this funding plan recommends Council authorization of up to \$90M in revenue bonds via a Preliminary Resolution and an initial sale as soon as possible of \$45M (which results do not vary substantially from the analysis described herein) so that the work of satisfying the City’s current UJL can begin. But there are three legislative steps that would be required to do so in compliance with the Charter and with simplified transparency.

D. Additional Legislative Steps

As soon as the bonds are sold, ideally in September 2025, budget amendment ordinances will need to be adopted to appropriate the bond proceeds so that offers and payments to judgment creditors can be made as soon as the proceeds of the first tranche are received. The Administration recommends appropriating the bond proceeds to the Law Department’s “Other Operating” budget in the Judgment Fund, to simplify the accounting of deposits and payments made to judgment

creditors. The adoption of such budget ordinances would allow the Law Department to begin making payments to judgment creditors using revenue from the revenue bond sale (i.e., bond proceeds).

Additionally, the Administration recommends that the Council amend the City Code as soon as practical to allow for debt service payments to be made from the Judgment Fund, such that the payments of principal and interest due to repay the new revenue bonds can be made from the Judgment Fund. This will simplify the tracking of these judgment-related transactions, allowing all payments for the purpose of paying state court judgments and settlements, including debt service payments on revenue bonds issued for that purpose, to be made via the Judgment Fund.

Attached to this funding plan as “Attachment 4” is a draft ordinance to amend City Code Section 70-415.272, which governs the funding and purpose of the Judgment Fund, to allow for “the payment of principal, interest, and/or the costs of issuance of bonds issued for the purpose of paying in whole or in part judgments and/or workers’ compensation claims against the City.” The term “judgment” is defined in that section, and the draft ordinance would slightly amend the definition of “judgment” to mean “any settlement agreement to which the city is a party, or any final judgment or order rendered against the city by a state court.” Otherwise, the ordinance would merely clean up some terminology and responsibilities to ensure compliance with the Home Rule Charter. If these additional legislative steps are taken by the time that the revenue bond proceeds are received, the Law Department could proceed with payments as soon as the bond proceeds are received.

In future budget years, annual appropriations will need to be made to allow the Law Department to make payments to judgment creditors and allow the Finance Department to make debt service payments on the new revenue bonds. The Administration recommends appropriating for both purposes in the Judgment Fund, which would include a “200-Other Operating” appropriation to the Law Department and a “600-Debt Service” appropriation to the Finance Department. Revenue bond proceeds should be appropriated to “200-Other Operating” for direct payments to judgment creditors, and General Fund revenues (generated by the millage for general municipal purposes) should be appropriated to “600-Debt Service” for the debt service payments on the revenue bonds.

Each year, the City’s debt service schedules must be consulted for the proper amount to be appropriated for debt service, and all unspent revenue bond proceeds should be appropriated for the direct payments. Due to the City’s annual budget calendar, which now requires the Mayor’s Executive Budget to be submitted to the City Council by October 1, an estimate will likely be needed for the next year’s Executive Budget. Then an amendment may be needed to adjust the budget and allow all unspent bond proceeds to be spent by the Law Department in each budget year. The Finance Department and Budget Office will coordinate with the City Council going forward, ensuring the proper payment of the required debt service payments and an appropriate budget for direct payments to judgment creditors.

E. Future Judgments

These recommendations provide a path forward to eliminate the current backlog of unpaid judgments by 2027, but future legal liabilities cannot be predicted with certainty. It is likely that more judgments will be rendered against the City, so the working group asked the City’s co-financial advisors to estimate the additional cost of borrowing a higher amount than the current outstanding amount on the UJL, with a hypothetical additional amount of \$20 million. The tables below are very similar to those presented above for a hypothetical issuance of \$90 million in revenue bonds in two tranches, but these tables present numbers for a hypothetical issuance of \$110 million in revenue bonds in two tranches (in 2025 and 2027), for illustrative purposes.

The first table, “Annual Debt Service Schedule,” provides a hypothetical annual debt service schedule, including the City’s current outstanding revenue bonds and two new tranches of revenue bonds:

Annual Debt Service Schedule: Existing CNO Revenue Bonds Plus Hypothetical \$110M in New Revenue Bonds, Sold in Two Tranches						
Year	Debt Service Series 2016	Debt Service Series 2017	Debt Service Series 2021	Debt Service New \$50M	Debt Service New \$60M	Total: Existing and New Debt Service
2025	\$1,157,440	\$1,280,131	\$15,681,546			\$18,119,118
2026	\$1,164,170	\$1,307,315	\$15,679,750	\$2,259,043		\$20,410,278
2027	-	\$1,342,380	\$15,676,952	\$2,843,551		\$19,862,883
2028	-	-	\$15,674,605	\$2,843,551	\$2,657,905	\$21,176,061
2029	-	-	\$15,672,975	\$2,843,551	\$3,369,176	\$21,885,702
2030	-	-	\$15,670,308	\$2,843,551	\$3,369,176	\$21,883,035
2031	-	-	-	\$5,123,551	\$5,669,176	\$10,792,727
2032	-	-	-	\$5,122,515	\$5,666,996	\$10,789,511
2033	-	-	-	\$5,122,537	\$5,667,277	\$10,789,814
2034	-	-	-	\$5,119,778	\$5,669,553	\$10,789,331
2035	-	-	-	\$5,122,494	\$5,671,774	\$10,794,268
2036	-	-	-	\$5,124,587	\$5,670,272	\$10,794,859
2037	-	-	-	\$5,120,759	\$5,668,140	\$10,788,899
2038	-	-	-	\$5,120,435	\$5,669,509	\$10,789,944
2039	-	-	-	\$5,122,785	\$5,668,849	\$10,791,634
2040	-	-	-	\$5,121,303	\$5,670,276	\$10,791,579
2041	-	-	-	\$5,120,037	\$5,667,956	\$10,787,993
2042	-	-	-	\$5,121,549	\$5,670,596	\$10,792,145
2043	-	-	-	\$5,122,934	\$5,666,632	\$10,789,566
2044	-	-	-	\$5,123,508	\$5,669,282	\$10,792,790
2045	-	-	-	\$5,121,732	\$5,670,132	\$10,791,864
2046	-	-	-	-	\$5,668,520	\$5,668,520
2047	-	-	-	-	\$5,667,838	\$5,667,838

The second table, “Annual Expenditure Comparison (\$110M),” provides a comparison of hypothetical annual expenditures based on the hypothetical annual debt service schedule table above, with the annual Judgment Fund appropriation in 2025 dedicated to direct payments to judgment creditors and future years’ \$2M appropriations repurposed to pay debt service payments on the new revenue bonds, as described above.

Annual Expenditure Comparison (\$110M): 2025 Planned Expenditures vs. Future Years				
Year	Judgment Fund Direct Payments	Existing and New Debt Service	Total	Savings (increase), Compared to 2025
2025	\$2,000,000	\$18,119,118	\$20,119,118	
2026	\$0 (repurposed)	\$20,410,279	\$20,410,278	\$(291,160)
2027	\$0 (repurposed)	\$19,862,883	\$19,862,883	\$256,235
2028	\$0 (repurposed)	\$21,176,061	\$21,176,061	\$(1,056,943)
2029	\$0 (repurposed)	\$21,885,702	\$21,885,702	\$(1,766,584)
2030	\$0 (repurposed)	\$21,883,035	\$21,883,035	\$(1,763,917)
2031	\$0 (repurposed)	\$10,792,727	\$10,792,727	\$9,326,391
2032	\$0 (repurposed)	\$10,789,511	\$10,789,511	\$9,329,607
2033	\$0 (repurposed)	\$10,789,814	\$10,789,814	\$9,329,304
2034	\$0 (repurposed)	\$10,789,331	\$10,789,331	\$9,329,787
2035	\$0 (repurposed)	\$10,794,268	\$10,794,268	\$9,324,850
2036	\$0 (repurposed)	\$10,794,859	\$10,794,859	\$9,324,259
2037	\$0 (repurposed)	\$10,788,899	\$10,788,899	\$9,330,219
2038	\$0 (repurposed)	\$10,789,944	\$10,789,944	\$9,329,174
2039	\$0 (repurposed)	\$10,791,634	\$10,791,634	\$9,327,484
2040	\$0 (repurposed)	\$10,791,579	\$10,791,579	\$9,327,539
2041	\$0 (repurposed)	\$10,787,993	\$10,787,993	\$9,331,125
2042	\$0 (repurposed)	\$10,792,145	\$10,792,145	\$9,326,973
2043	\$0 (repurposed)	\$10,789,566	\$10,789,566	\$9,329,552
2044	\$0 (repurposed)	\$10,792,790	\$10,792,790	\$9,326,328
2045	\$0 (repurposed)	\$10,791,864	\$10,791,864	\$9,327,254
2046	\$0 (repurposed)	\$5,668,520	\$5,668,520	\$14,450,598
2047	\$0 (repurposed)	\$5,667,838	\$5,667,838	\$14,451,280

Based on this comparison, additional General Fund revenue would need to be rededicated to pay the increased debt service payments in 2026, 2028, 2029, and 2030, if \$50M in new revenue bonds were sold in 2025 and \$60M in new revenue bonds were sold in 2027. This additional need for General Fund revenue would require cuts to other, unidentified expenditures in the amounts in red in the table above, assuming current circumstances hold. For example, the City would need to cut an estimated \$1,056,943 from the budget of some department, agency, or program in 2028 in order to be able to afford this hypothetical increase in debt service payments for 2028.

Without knowing whether additional judgments will be rendered against the City or if the City will agree to settle additional litigation in the near future, it is hard to justify incurring the additional \$20M in debt and the associated borrowing costs and making corresponding budget cuts. It is possible that the benefits of using revenue bond proceeds to pay off the existing UJL and future judgments on an ongoing basis could outweigh the costs of borrowing and opportunity costs associated with the necessary budget cuts. But it is also possible that market conditions, budget

priorities, or financial realities could change between the sale of the first tranche of revenue bonds and the date on which those revenue bond proceeds are spent.

The path forward recommended by this funding plan provides flexibility, in that the initial Council authorization for \$90M in new revenue bonds does not lock the City into a particular timeframe for selling those bonds. This funding plan recommends selling \$45M in 2025 to begin paying down the UJL as soon as possible with the infusion of cash from the \$45M revenue bond sale. But the initial Council authorization for \$90M provides the flexibility to decide how to proceed in 2026 and 2027 based on the City's experiences using the first tranche of revenue bonds, the status of the UJL after the first tranche of revenue bonds has been used, and the market conditions at the time.

Finally, it should be noted that the debt service schedules above all show that 2026 will be the final year of payments for the City's Series 2016 revenue bonds, 2027 will be the final year of payments for Series 2017, and 2030 will be the final year of payments for Series 2021. The City will no longer have to dedicate the revenue generated by the ad valorem tax for general municipal purposes to the repayment of that existing debt, and this savings can be repurposed as it becomes available. The largest debt service payments, for Series 2021, do not end until 2030, but the least expensive option for paying future judgments, in terms of borrowing costs, would be to use the savings from the repayment of the Series 2021 bonds to pay judgments and settlements as they accrue. Therefore, this funding plan recommends Council authorization to sell up to \$90M in revenue bonds, an initial sale of \$45M in 2025, and a sale of \$45M in 2027. As the UJL is paid off over time, the Administration and Council can determine if an additional revenue bond sale is needed or if the savings from the repayment of the Series 2021 revenue bonds can be used as the funding source for paying any future judgments and settlements, beginning in 2031.

VI. Conclusion

This Unpaid Judgment Funding Plan, as required by Ordinance Number 30,030 M.C.S., provides a path forward to satisfy the remaining outstanding principal balance of the UJL by the end of 2027, which was \$89,287,152.45, as of January 1, 2025. Due to the challenges of using the City's General Fund or Judgment Fund to pay such a high dollar amount with existing recurring revenue sources, this funding plan recommends issuing new revenue bonds, to be repaid over time by using recurring General Fund revenue to no further extent than 2025 appropriations for existing payments of principal and interest on bonds secured by the City's millage for general municipal purposes and for existing payments in the Judgment Fund directly to the City's judgment creditors. Based on the advice of the City's co-financial advisors, current market conditions would allow the City to sell \$45 million in 2025 and \$45 million in 2027, paying off the City's current UJL expeditiously by using roughly the same amount of General Fund revenue being used in 2025.

If the City Council chooses to move forward with this funding plan, the Administration, the Council, and the City's legal and financial advisors will need to coordinate each step of the funding plan to ensure everyone, including the public, understands what is being put in place, the timing, and the future obligations being taken on by the City. Based on the tentative timeline

provided by co-bond counsel, the City could move forward with an initial bond sale and receive the proceeds in 2025. The Council would first approve a Preliminary Resolution to authorize the issuance of the full \$90 million, so that an application could be made to the State Bond Commission, both of which have occurred. Then the Council would approve a Parameter Sale Resolution for the amount to be sold in 2025, recommended herein to be \$45 million based on market conditions, so that those bond proceeds could be received in mid-to-late October.

Meanwhile, the Administration and Council would collaborate on a couple of additional legislative steps to allow the bond proceeds to be paid out to judgment creditors on the UJL as soon as they are received. As the Law Department pays judgment creditors with the new bond proceeds in accordance with Ordinance Number 30,030 M.C.S., the next Administration and Council can monitor progress and market conditions. With this Council's approval of the Preliminary Resolution and State Bond Commission approval of the full \$90 million, the next Council and Administration can decide on the timing of the next revenue bond sale and adopt another Parameter Sale Resolution when the timing is right.

The debt service schedule for that series of revenue bonds will have to be considered and compared to commitments of General fund revenue at that time, but current estimates show that the City should be able to afford a second \$45 million revenue bond sale in 2027 by dedicating roughly the same amount of General Fund revenue to repay those bonds as the City is currently dedicating in 2025. Having sold \$90 million total, the City should be able to satisfy the current outstanding principal balance of the UJL by the end of 2027. Going forward, if no revenue bond proceeds remain unspent, the savings from the repayment of the Series 2021 revenue bonds can be used as the funding source for paying any future judgments and settlements as they accrue, by continuing to set aside \$2 million or more per year for that purpose in the Judgment Fund.

Attachment 1

Ordinance Number 30,030 M.C.S.

Adopted on August 22, 2024

ORDINANCE

CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

CITY HALL: August 8, 2024

CALENDAR NO. 34,769

NO. 30030 MAYOR COUNCIL SERIES

**BY: COUNCILMEMBERS GIARRUSSO, MORENO, MORRELL, HARRIS, KING,
GREEN AND THOMAS**

AN ORDINANCE to provide relative to the payment of unpaid legal judgments; and otherwise to provide with respect thereto.

WHEREAS, the City has a legal obligation to pay its legal judgments once all judicial remedies have been exhausted and the judgments become final; and

WHEREAS, previous attempts to pay down the debt of the unpaid judgments list have been slowed by a lack of political commitment and inadequate funding; and

WHEREAS, the City Council believes it is in the best interest of the City to end the costly legacy of unpaid judgments so that future leaders can focus on the City's other pressing needs; and

WHEREAS, Article XII, Section 10(C) of the Louisiana Constitution provides that "[n]o judgment against the state, a state agency, or a political subdivision shall be eligible, payable, or paid except from funds appropriated therefor by the legislature or by the political subdivision against which the judgment is rendered"; and

WHEREAS, the City Council, pursuant to its constitutional and charter authority to direct and control the payment of judgments, has appropriated nearly \$11 million dollars to the City's Judgment Fund for the purpose of significantly reducing the City's unpaid judgments; and

WHEREAS, the City Council further desires to use its legislative authority to provide an equitable and efficient framework for paying outstanding judgments and for resolving the unpaid judgments list with finality; **NOW THEREFORE**

SECTION 1. THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NEW ORLEANS HEREBY

ORDAINS, That the Law Department is hereby requested and directed to execute the following steps:

A. Within 30 days of the date on which this Ordinance becomes effective, the Law Department shall develop and implement procedures for expediting the processing of payments of outstanding settlement agreements, final judgments, or final orders, hereinafter referred to as "judgment". The foregoing procedures shall identify the documents reasonably necessary to process payments as expeditiously as possible and shall, to the fullest extent allowable under applicable law, minimize the administrative burden imposed upon judgment creditors.

B. Within 30 days of the date on which this Ordinance becomes effective, the Law Department shall make written offers of settlement to the persons or entities with valid, unpaid money judgment dating on or before December 31, 2005. Offers shall be made to such judgment creditors in chronological order corresponding to the date of the judgment, oldest judgments first. Offers shall be made on the following terms and shall incorporate any other provision the City Attorney deems necessary or advisable to implement the terms of this Ordinance:

1. The City shall offer to pay the full face-value of the judgment, excluding interest and any previous payments applied to principal.

- 20 2. The judgment creditor shall agree in writing to waive any past, current, or future
21 interest on the judgment and shall further agree that the acceptance of payment
22 fully compromises and satisfies the judgment and all claims arising therefrom.
- 23 3. The judgment creditor shall have 60 days from the date of the offer letter to
24 accept the terms of the offer in writing.

25 C. Upon receipt of the judgment creditor's written acceptance per Part B, above, the
26 Law Department shall immediately notify the Finance Department that the offer
27 was accepted, and that the judgment should be paid. The Finance Department shall
28 issue the payment in accordance with the terms of the written offer and acceptance
29 within 30 days of receipt of the notice from the Law Department, and receipt of any
30 documents required per with the policy adopted pursuant to Part A, whichever is
31 later.

32 D. Payments made pursuant to this Ordinance shall be paid from the "Judgment Fund"
33 codified in Sections 70-415.271 through 70-415.274 of the Code of the City of New
34 Orleans.

35 E. At the conclusion of the period for accepting offers for the settlement of judgments
36 dated on or before December 31, 2005, as set forth in Part B of this Section 1, the
37 Law Department shall calculate the balance of the Judgment Fund. If any balance
38 remains, the Law Department shall immediately make written offers of settlement
39 to the persons or entities with valid, unpaid money judgments dating on or after
40 January 1, 2006, on the same terms and in the same manner set forth in Part B, until
41 the balance of the Judgment Fund is exhausted.

1 **SECTION 2.** That, if any judgments dated on or before the effective date of this Ordinance
2 remain unpaid following execution of the process established in Section 1, the Chief
3 Administrative Officer is hereby requested and directed to coordinate with the Law Department
4 and provide the Council, on or before January 1, 2025, with a funding plan and recommendations
5 for satisfying the remaining outstanding principal balance of the City's unpaid judgments list,
6 exclusive of any accrued or accruing interest, in full by the end of the 2027 fiscal year. The plan
7 should identify all potential funding sources and address the feasibility of using bonds and other
8 debt instruments to satisfy any remaining unpaid judgment obligations.

ADOPTED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NEW ORLEANS AUG 22 2024

JP Morrell

VICE PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL

DELIVERED TO THE MAYOR ON AUG 23 2024

APPROVED:

AUG 27 2024

LATOYA CANTRELL

MAYOR

RETURNED BY THE MAYOR ON AUG 27 2024 **AT** 4:30 PM

Aisha R. Collier

ASSISTANT CLERK OF COUNCIL

ROLL CALL VOTE:

YEAS: Giarrusso, Harris, King, Morrell, Thomas - 5

NAYS: 0

ABSENT: Green, Moreno - 2

RECUSED: 0

THE FOREGOING IS CERTIFIED
TO BE A TRUE AND CORRECT COPY

Aisha Collier

ASSISTANT CLERK OF COUNCIL

Attachment 2

City of New Orleans Unpaid Judgment List

Dated December 23, 2024, and Current as of December 31, 2024

Current Queue Position	Case ID	Case Number	Case Name	Payee	Judgement Date	Interest Start Date	Principal
1	102	90-12148	Alberta Mussari v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Alberta Mussari	9/4/1996	1/14/1993	\$4,800.00
2	103	92-20628	Kurt Coates v. Paul Leitzelar, et al.	Kurt Coates	12/6/1996	4/5/1997	\$347.50
3	104	89-2759	Edwin Harrison, Sr. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Ed Harrison, Et Al	12/23/1996	5/20/1994	\$7,379.00
4	105	96-00388	Margaret McKeen v. 730 Bienville Partners, Ltd.	730 Bienville Partners	1/24/1997	12/30/1996	\$500.00
5	106	96-7619	Raquel Foxworth v. Evelyn Sentino, et al.	Racquel Foxworth	3/3/1997	6/3/1997	\$1,000.00
6	107	94-4102 c/w 94-4103	Wilbert McClendon v. Marcus Jackson et al.	Wilbert McClendon	5/23/1997	3/16/1994	\$14,221.50
7	109	94-4102 c/w 94-4103	Wilbert McClendon v. Marcus Jackson et al.	Patricia Anderson	5/23/1997	3/16/1994	\$13,690.25
8	110	95-14563	Phoebe Johnson v. Lower Nine Health Clinic, et al.	St. Paul Fire And Marine Ins.	6/24/1997	6/24/1997	\$1,000.00
9	111	96-16504	Minerva Jackson v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Minerva Jackson	12/3/1997	10/4/1996	\$2,774.72
10	112	93-12798 c/w 93-12874	Diane Hunter, et al. v. Roosevelt Bell, et al.	Highlands Ins. Co.	1/22/1998	3/23/1998	\$1,000.00
11	113	93-12798 c/w 93-12874	Diane Hunter, et al. v. Roosevelt Bell, et al.	Roosevelt Bell	1/22/1998	3/23/1998	\$150.00
12	114	93-12046 c/w 93-12797	Diane Hunter, et al. v. Roosevelt Bell, et al.	Jeanetta Smith	1/22/1998	3/23/1998	\$850.00
13	115	86-4491	Shirley Payton v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Shirley Payton	3/11/1998	6/9/1997	\$26,120.47
14	116	96-18201	Danna M. McKinley v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Danna Marie Mckinley	8/14/1998	12/12/1998	\$250.00
15	117	87-23038	Lorraine Riley, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Lorraine Riley	8/25/1998	12/23/1998	\$520.93
16	120	93-15791	Tona Butler, et al. v. Automotive Casualty, et al.	Tona Butler	8/11/1999	12/9/1999	\$500.00
17	121	97-16791	Donshekia Mercadel v. Patrick Conaghan, et al.	Donshekia Mercadel	11/18/1999	9/24/1997	\$20,000.00
18	122	98-16100	Jackie D. Boggs v. Joyce C. Wautlet, et al.	Jackie Boogs	4/27/2000	6/30/2002	\$10,000.00
19	124	96-6289	Lenet Smith v. Regional Transit Authority, et al.	Lenet Smith	8/9/2000	11/7/1999	\$532.00
20	126	89-11274	Leatha Groomes, et al. v. Ronald Recasner, et al.	Leatha Groomes	8/31/2000	10/30/2000	\$100,000.00
21	127	89-11274	Leatha Groomes, et al. v. Ronald Recasner, et al.	Leatha Groomes O/N/O Evanda Groomes	8/31/2000	10/30/2000	\$1,700,000.00
22	128	97-9438 c/w 97-16834	Terrance Holmes, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Betty Thomas O/B/O Abdul Thomas	11/8/2000	7/19/1999	\$500.00
23	129	97-9438 c/w 97-16834	Terrance Holmes, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Terrance Holmes	11/8/2000	7/19/1999	\$500.00
24	131	96-794 c/w 96-1975 c/w 96-4607 c/w 96-6289	Carlos Anthony v. Regional Transit Authority, et al.	Carlos Anthony	3/6/2001	1/23/2000	\$317.00
25	132	98-504	Robin Ann Leflore v. Louis Orduna, et al.	Robin Leflore	7/13/2001	1/12/1998	\$6,389.63
26	133	95-4967	Elton Parks v. Leaval Fraklin, et al.	Transit Management Of Louisiana	7/23/2001	7/23/2001	\$11,000.00
27	134	99-788	Consulea Millro v. Sewerage and Water Board of New Orleans	Consulea Millro	9/13/2001	11/12/2001	\$500.00
28	137	87-23422	Dorothy Santacruze v. City Of New Orleans, et al.	Dorothy Santacruze	1/29/2002	2/17/2002	\$1,500.00
29	138	98-02510	Sharon McNeil v. New Orleans Police Department, et al.	Sharon Mcneil	4/17/2002	6/17/2002	\$21,200.00
30	139	00-8820	Henry Davis v. Sidney P. Nunez, et al.	Henry Davis	4/23/2002	6/22/2002	\$3,000.00
31	141	97-14212	Jude Reaux, et al. v. City of New Orleans	Jude Reaux Ind And O/B/O Ranada And Nikisha Reaux	6/14/2002	8/13/1997	\$1,029,833.65
32	142	97-14212	Jude Reaux, et al. v. City of New Orleans	Jude Reaux	6/14/2002	8/13/1997	\$17,569.50
33	143	97-14212	Jude Reaux, et al. v. City of New Orleans	Jude Reaux O/B/O Ranada Reaux	6/14/2002	8/13/1997	\$8,797.50
34	144	97-14212	Jude Reaux, et al. v. City of New Orleans	Charity Hospital And Medical Center Of LA	6/14/2002	6/14/2003	\$93,381.55
35	145	98-7998	Keith Nolan v. Melissa Heno, et al.	Keith Nolan	6/24/2002	6/24/2002	\$10,000.00
36	146	89-03413	Shirley Oalman, et al. v. City of New Orleans	Shirley B. Oalman, O/B/O Rebekah Oalman	7/3/2002	9/1/2002	\$720.00
37	147	89-3413	Shirley Oalman, et al. v. City of New Orleans	Shirley Oalman	7/3/2002	9/1/2002	\$16,910.95
38	148	89-3413	Shirley Oalman, et al. v. City of New Orleans	Allstate Insurance Co.	7/3/2002	9/1/2002	\$2,066.00
39	149	98-08150	James Alexis v. City of New Orleans	James Alexis	7/29/2002	7/29/2002	\$9,670.00
40	150	00-7995	Mary Jane Francois v. Walgreen Louisiana, et al.	Mary Jane Francois	9/12/2002	11/11/2002	\$1,750.00

Current Queue Position	Case ID	Case Number	Case Name	Payee	Judgement Date	Interest Start Date	Principal
41	151	99-11221	Ricky Wilson, et al. v. Albertine Reed, et al.	Ricky Wilson	12/4/2002	12/4/2002	\$1,500.00
42	152	98-12809	Candise Sullivan v. Charles Clayton, et al.	James E. Uschold PLC as Subrogee Of Candise Sullivan	12/16/2002	12/16/2002	\$700.00
43	154	01-06168	Pamela M. Taylor v. Derrick J. Eagleton, et al.	Pamela Taylor	2/13/2003	3/15/2003	\$1,500.00
44	155	84-20520, 86-2079, 88-8240	Irvin Magri v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Darleen Jacobs	2/19/2003	2/19/2003	\$12,000.00
45	834	1986-14197	Bertha Mae Adams v. Boh Brothers Construction Co., Inc.	Bertha Mae Adams	2/28/2003	3/17/2003	\$5,000.00
46	156	00-18274	Deborah Jackson, et al. v. Calvin Prevost, III, et al.	Deborah Jackson O/B/O Janel Jackson	3/3/2003	5/2/2003	\$11,115.25
47	157	98-16457	Eugene Day, Jr. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Eugene Day And Steven M. Koenig	3/17/2003	6/15/2003	\$1,200.00
48	158	00-14989	Kenneth Aumuller, v. Entergy Corporation, et al.	Kenneth Aumuller	4/16/2003	6/15/2003	\$1,000.00
49	161	95-16117	Gilbert Davis v. Katz Besthoff, et al.	Gilbert Davis	6/12/2003	9/10/2003	\$500.00
50	164	03-1207	New Orleans Brass, L.L.C. v. City of New Orleans	New Orleans Brass L.L.C.	8/1/2003	8/1/2003	\$5,066.95
51	165	00-17396	Ronald J. Mercadel v. Lynn W. Ashley, et al.	Ronald J. Mercadal	10/20/2003	12/19/2003	\$31,183.00
52	166	00-5123	Dudley Sullivan v. Dorothy Johnson, et al.	Dudley Sullivan	10/21/2003	2/17/2004	\$1,500.00
53	167	95-00567	Christian Brothers Risk Pooling Trust v. Guy Hill, et al.	Christian Bros	11/12/2003	11/12/2003	\$3,500.00
54	168	99-06574	Betty Wright v. Sewarage and Water Board of New Orleans	Estate Of Betty Wright	12/12/2003	2/10/2004	\$5,000.00
55	169	2000-12606	Shawn M. James, et al. v. Dwayne Schureman, et al.	Shawn James	1/13/2004	3/21/2004	\$1,500.00
56	170	2000-12606	Shawn M. James, et al. v. Dwayne Schureman, et al.	Delilah Franklin	1/13/2004	3/21/2004	\$1,955.00
57	171	2000-12606	Shawn M. James, et al. v. Dwayne Schureman, et al.	Courtney White	1/13/2004	3/21/2004	\$2,695.00
58	172	00-17468	Ronald Lemon, Jr. and Lawsel Mitchell v. Joseph Orticke, Jr., et al.	Ronald Lemon, Jr And Lawsel Mitchell Through Their Attorney Of Record Rene D. Lovelace, Esq.	1/16/2004	1/16/2004	\$5,665.90
59	175	00-9900	Alfredo Saenz, et al v. New Orleans Police Department, et al.	Medical Center Of New Orleans	2/17/2004	5/17/2004	\$14,000.00
60	176	00-1866	Robert Johnson, et al. v. Melvina Hills, et al.	Robert Johnson	3/12/2004	4/11/2004	\$1,100.00
61	178	00-1866	Robert Johnson, et al. v. Melvina Hills, et al.	Cathleen Johnson	3/12/2004	4/11/2004	\$1,700.00
62	179	02-10016	Eartha Charles, et al. v. City Of New Orleans, et al.	Eartha Charles	6/14/2004	9/12/2004	\$7,530.00
63	180	02-10016	Eartha Charles, et al. v. City Of New Orleans, et al.	Eartha And Lars Charles	6/14/2004	9/12/2004	\$347.00
64	181	02-10016	Eartha Charles, et al. v. City Of New Orleans, et al.	Lars Charles	6/14/2004	9/12/2004	\$6,800.00
65	185	01-00363	Gloria Jones, et al. v. Olivia Fontenot, et al.	Osby Jones, Gloria Jones And Their Attorney J. Keith Hardie, Jr.	9/27/2004	12/8/2017	\$11,772.53
66	186	04-12867	Michael G. Riehlmann v. Edwin P. Compass, III, et al.	Michael Riehlmann	9/27/2004	12/8/2017	\$532.81
67	187	95-17183	Jerome Myles v. Sewerage and Water Board of New Orleans, et al.	Jerome Myles And His Attorney J. Nelson Mayer	10/6/2004	1/4/2005	\$1,000.00
68	188	01-21030	Gerald R. Comeaux v. City of New Orleans Police Department	Gerald Comeaux	10/12/2004	12/8/2017	\$5,367.41
69	189	01-18695	Aisha Pichon v. Kevin Cooper, et al.	Aisha Pichon	10/20/2004	12/8/2017	\$22,871.52
70	190	02-07713	Bridget Ann Price, et al. v. Kathy Bush, et al.	Bridget Ann Price And Her Attorney Of Record Geri Broussard-Baloney	10/25/2004	10/25/2004	\$1,000.00
71	194	01-09694	Johnnie Ray, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Keoka Washington O/B/O Charles Washington	10/29/2004	12/28/2004	\$2,600.00
72	205	24th JDC 560-843	Neola Riggins, et al. v. Carolyn Fields, et al.	Neola Riggins	11/29/2004	11/9/2004	\$2,990.00
73	206	01-657	Carolos E. Zeledon v. Anthanese Boissier, et al.	Carlos Zeledon	12/1/2004	1/30/2005	\$3,300.00
74	208	2000-12361	Irmelda Bradley, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Irmelda Bradley	12/8/2004	3/8/2005	\$3,790.00
75	209	2000-12361	Irmelda Bradley, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Anthony Bradley	12/8/2004	3/8/2005	\$3,685.00

Current Queue Position	Case ID	Case Number	Case Name	Payee	Judgement Date	Interest Start Date	Principal
76	210	2000-12361	Irmelda Bradley, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Shantell Bradey	12/8/2004	3/8/2005	\$3,990.00
77	211	2000-12361	Irmelda Bradley, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Connie Bradley	12/8/2004	3/8/2005	\$4,275.00
78	217	03-03269	Darryl Joseph Carter v. Amiri Quillens, et al.	Darryl Joseph Carter	1/14/2005	5/14/2005	\$2,900.00
79	218	04-05692	Peter Armstrong, Jr. v. Don A. Kinney, et al.	Peter Armstrong, Jr.	1/19/2005	12/7/2017	\$11,335.84
80	219	93-22027	Sharon Giangrosso v. Tracey Fulton, et al.	Sharon Giangrosso	1/19/2005	12/8/2017	\$22,806.40
81	221	00-14888	Michael Martin v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Michael Martin	1/20/2005	5/20/2005	\$3,500.00
82	223	99-15346	Mary Rush, et al. v. Wallace C. Drennan, Inc., et al.	Clarence LaFrance	1/26/2005	10/10/2004	\$923.08
83	224	99-15346	Mary Rush, et al. v. Wallace C. Drennan, Inc., et al.	Gerard Johnson	1/26/2005	10/10/2004	\$923.08
84	225	99-15346	Mary Rush, et al. v. Wallace C. Drennan, Inc., et al.	Gladys Knatt & Kenneth Knatt	1/26/2005	10/10/2004	\$923.08
85	226	99-15346	Mary Rush, et al. v. Wallace C. Drennan, Inc., et al.	Lois Isadore	1/26/2005	10/10/2004	\$923.08
86	227	99-15346	Mary Rush, et al. v. Wallace C. Drennan, Inc., et al.	David Johnson	1/26/2005	10/10/2004	\$923.08
87	228	99-15346	Mary Rush, et al. v. Wallace C. Drennan, Inc., et al.	Neoma Coleman	1/26/2005	10/10/2004	\$923.08
88	229	99-15346	Mary Rush, et al. v. Wallace C. Drennan, Inc., et al.	Clarence Thorton	1/26/2005	10/10/2004	\$923.08
89	230	99-15346	Mary Rush, et al. v. Wallace C. Drennan, Inc., et al.	Cagey Harris	1/26/2005	10/10/2004	\$923.08
90	231	99-15346	Mary Rush, et al. v. Wallace C. Drennan, Inc., et al.	Harry Coleman	1/26/2005	10/10/2004	\$923.08
91	232	99-15346	Mary Rush, et al. v. Wallace C. Drennan, Inc., et al.	Michael Kiper	1/26/2005	10/10/2004	\$923.08
92	233	99-15346	Mary Rush, et al. v. Wallace C. Drennan, Inc., et al.	Dolores Smith	1/26/2005	10/10/2004	\$923.08
93	234	99-15346	Mary Rush, et al. v. Wallace C. Drennan, Inc., et al.	Mary Coleman	1/26/2005	10/10/2004	\$923.08
94	235	99-15346	Mary Rush, et al. v. Wallace C. Drennan, Inc., et al.	Mary Rush	1/26/2005	10/10/2004	\$923.08
95	236	03-14917	Senecia Carter, et al. v. Jeffrey Walls, et al.	Harwood Humes	2/2/2005	6/2/2005	\$6,885.00
96	237	03-14917	Senecia Carter, et al. v. Jeffrey Walls, et al.	Senecia Carter	2/2/2005	6/2/2005	\$8,000.00
97	239	02-07991	Mae Guillaume v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Mae Guillaume	2/14/2005	3/15/2005	\$4,483.00
98	242	03-2877 C/W 03-03874	State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co., et al. v. Frank J. Nelson, et al.	Jimmie Porter	2/22/2005	5/23/2005	\$2,745.00
99	244	01-09284	Jerry Simmons v. Gregory Hamilton, et al.	Jerry Simmons	2/28/2005	12/8/2017	\$15,715.93
100	250	04-02244	Irene B. Hawkins v. Rosalind M. Patterson, et al.	Irene B. Hawkins	3/4/2005	6/2/2005	\$10,021.14
101	252	03-08511	Raazaan Muhammad v. State Farm Mutual Ins. Co., et al.	Raazaan Muhammad	3/17/2005	7/15/2005	\$9,183.00
102	254	96-7758	Rotem Dahan v. Teresa Miller, et al.	Rotem Dahan	3/29/2005	7/27/2005	\$1,000.00
103	257	88-4087	Regina Felton v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Regina Felton	4/18/2005	12/7/2017	\$18,663.11
104	258	00-08916	Ella Satcher v. City of New Orleans	Ella Satcher	4/20/2005	6/19/2005	\$6,500.00
105	259	02-17893	Haley Smith v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Haley Smith	4/26/2005	7/25/2005	\$6,500.00
106	262	02-19325/03-3645	Allstate Insurance Co., et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Michael Mulligan	5/23/2005	9/20/2005	\$7,000.00
107	264	86-22748	Mary Parker v. Sewerage and Water Board, et al.	Mary Parker	6/15/2005	10/13/2005	\$3,750.00
108	269	99-02845	Deneshia Bastian, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Deneshia Bastian and Kwami Franklin	7/27/2005	8/26/2005	\$786.54
109	270	2002-3444	Cynthia Gaunichaux v. City of New Orleans	Cynthia Gaunichaux And Atty Steven M. Koenig	7/28/2005	10/26/2005	\$8,500.00
110	273	04-02483	Miliki Tapp v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Miliki Tapp	8/8/2005	11/6/2005	\$7,500.00
111	274	01-11656	Tyaywana Moody, et al. v. Len Major, et al.	Patricia Moody O/B/O Preston Moody	8/8/2005	12/8/2017	\$3,804.59
112	278	03-01534	Wendell Wells v. Calvinc Issac Braley, Jr., et al.	Wendell Wells	8/24/2005	12/8/2017	\$14,705.69
113	281	02-08180	Simon L. Jones Jr., et al v. Jason K. Allen, et al.	Simon L. Jones, Jr. O/B/O Simon Bazile	1/9/2006	5/23/2002	\$21,840.10
114	283	96-15751	Gus Rico v. Sewerage and Water Board of New Orleans, et al.	Gus Rico	3/8/2006	12/1/2004	\$89,741.00

Current Queue Position	Case ID	Case Number	Case Name	Payee	Judgement Date	Interest Start Date	Principal
115	284	95-01947	Carol Mitchell v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Carol Mitchell	4/17/2006	4/17/2006	\$80,000.00
116	285	03-13410 C/W 03-13638	State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Co., et al. v. John Moore, et al.	Laniya Sanchez	4/25/2006	1/1/2006	\$16,500.00
117	288	03-11433	Rodney Tumblin v. Derek A. Smith, et al.	Rodney Tumblin	6/14/2006	9/12/2006	\$500.00
118	289	00-03600	Ronald Toussaint, Sr., v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Ronald Toussaint	6/16/2006	10/14/2006	\$5,000.00
119	294	2001-07875	Ronnie Null v. Jeffrey Alexander, et al.	Ronnie Null	7/18/2006	11/15/2006	\$7,500.00
120	295	92-17557	Shirley Bentley, et al. v. Malbrue Elphamous, Jr., et al.	Tammy Mcfarland O/B/O Paulette Mcfarland	7/24/2006	8/23/2006	\$4,145.00
121	296	92-17557	Shirley Bentley, et al. v. Malbrue Elphamous, Jr., et al.	Shirley Bentley O/B/O Jevette Bently	7/24/2006	8/23/2006	\$3,029.25
122	298	03-1504	Deshawn E. McMillian v. City of New Orleans	Deshawn E. Mcmillian	8/22/2006	12/20/2006	\$30,000.00
123	300	03-08159	Riley Moore v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Riley Moore	9/15/2006	1/13/2007	\$21,380.55
124	301	98-1292	Elaine Stewart, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Elaine Stewart	9/18/2006	9/18/2006	\$400,000.00
125	302	98-1292	Elaine Stewart, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Elaine Stewart O/B/O Lance Stewart	9/18/2006	9/18/2006	\$3,600,000.00
126	303	01-02450	Hay Brothers, Inc., et al. v. City of New Orleans	Hay Brothers Incorporated	10/25/2006	2/22/2007	\$12,625.87
127	304	2000-495	Marion Dooley, et al. v. George Wichser, II, et al.	Lakisha Dooley	10/26/2006	1/23/2007	\$2,000.00
128	308	97-14394	Eileen Renfroe, et al. v. RTA, et al.	Tequilla And Tekisha Renfroe	12/1/2006	12/1/2006	\$1,043.00
129	311	05-02966	Daniel Bourgeois, et al. V. John Burtlett, et al.	Daniel And Brandie Bourgeois	12/6/2006	4/5/2007	\$1,500.00
130	312	04-17502	USAA, et al. v. Jeffery Brown, et al.	U.S.A.A.	12/8/2006	4/7/2007	\$6,000.00
131	314	00-16361	Walter J McDowell v. Donald Gratia, et al.	Walter Mcdowell	1/23/2007	2/23/2007	\$12,500.00
132	822	2002-05964	Marvin Lebovitz v. Sheraton Operating Corp. d/b/a Sheraton New Orleans, et al.	Marvin Lebovitz	3/1/2007	6/29/2007	\$2,500.00
133	319	05-04923	Iona Williams v. City of New Orleans	Iona Williams	3/7/2007	7/5/2007	\$3,885.75
134	321	03-06857	Carolyn Watson v. Sean C. Kevany, et al.	Carolyn D. Watson	3/7/2007	7/5/2007	\$8,674.98
135	323	02-14858	Darlene LeBlanc, et al. v. City of New Orleans	Darlene Leblanc And Melanie Webster	3/21/2007	7/19/2007	\$2,000.00
136	327	05-00956	Vivan Sterling, et al. v. Robert Collignon, et al.	Vivian Sterling	3/22/2007	7/20/2007	\$9,000.00
137	329	00-02262	Latoya Gaines v. City of New Orleans	Latoya Gaines	3/27/2007	7/25/2007	\$10,980.00
138	330	05-4263 C/W 05-7720	State Farm Mutual Auto Ins Co., et al. v. Jason Gagliano, et al.	Shirley Honore	4/4/2007	8/2/2007	\$9,000.00
139	331	05-04263 C/W 05-7720	State Farm Mutual Auto Ins Co., et al. v. Jason Gagliano, et al.	Shirley Honore And Annea Honore O/B/O Sabra Honore	4/4/2007	8/2/2007	\$6,500.00
140	333	04-17706	Londia Bradstreet, et al. v. Alton Jones, et al.	Terrance Bertrand	4/4/2007	8/2/2007	\$7,300.00
141	334	04-17706	Londia Bradstreet, et al. v. Alton Jones, et al.	Londia Bradstreet	4/4/2007	8/2/2007	\$7,732.00
142	335	03-10951	Gerry Celestine v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Gerry Celestine	4/5/2007	8/3/2007	\$25,000.00
143	342	02-6632 C/W 02-7661	Cynthia Banks v. Glenell Blatcher, et al.	Cynthia Banks	5/29/2007	8/27/2007	\$40,000.00
144	346	02-18893	Kristy Scott Donaldson v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Kristy Scott Donaldson	6/25/2007	10/23/2007	\$50,000.00
145	347	03-11735	State Farm Mutual Automobile Ins Co, et al. v. George Jackson, et al.	Malcolm Thompson	7/18/2007	10/17/2006	\$15,000.00
146	348	02-18428	Yolanda Loving, et al. v. David Lane, et al.	Ramona Pitre	7/18/2007	10/16/2007	\$3,674.05
147	349	02-18428	Yolanda Loving, et al. v. David Lane, et al.	Raeon Loving	7/18/2007	10/16/2007	\$2,086.66
148	351	93-13522 c/w 94-11411	Marlene Durel, et al. v. Clarice James Conerly, et al.	Clarice Conerly Thomas	7/23/2007	11/20/2007	\$29,000.00
149	352	02-08571	Felicia Doyle v Uchenna Vincent, et al.	Felicia Doyle	7/26/2007	10/24/2007	\$10,500.00
150	359	02-02576	Victoria Age v. Winston Harbin, Jr., et al.	Victoria Age	8/27/2007	12/25/2007	\$11,437.57

Current Queue Position	Case ID	Case Number	Case Name	Payeee	Judgement Date	Interest Start Date	Principal
151	360	2003-17567	Michele Doughty, et al. v. Stephen Mortell, et al.	Michele Doughty	9/5/2007	11/4/2007	\$9,000.00
152	364	95-18650	Norman Williams v. Board of Commissioners for the Port of New Orleans	Norman Williams	9/18/2007	1/16/2008	\$3,000.00
153	367	2004-5693	Dionne M. Winfield v. Lary P. Hesdorffer, et al.	Dionne Winfield	9/21/2007	11/20/2007	\$6,000.00
154	369	2004-5693	Dionne M. Winfield v. Lary P. Hesdorffer, et al.	Government Employees Ins Co	9/28/2007	9/28/2007	\$1,882.34
155	374	04-15075	Gregory Jackon v. EMS, et al.	Gregory Jackson	9/28/2007	10/28/2007	\$15,715.24
156	376	2000-8781	Tyruss Lynn v. Edward Ellis, Jr., et al.	Tyruss Lyn	10/3/2007	10/3/2007	\$220,000.00
157	377	04-15067	Karen Andrews v. Don G. LeDuff, et al.	Karen Andrews	10/17/2007	2/14/2008	\$3,900.00
158	379	02-02700	Donald Carter v. Delicia Morgan, et al.	Donald Carter	11/8/2007	2/20/2002	\$25,111.65
159	380	01-11849	Barbara Stewert, et al. v. City of New Orleans	Barbara Stewart O/B/O Ashley Stewart	11/8/2007	3/7/2008	\$25,000.00
160	394	00-02294	Herbert L. Green, Sr., et al. v. City of New Orleans	Herbert L. Green	12/18/2007	4/16/2008	\$15,625.00
161	395	00-02294	Herbert L. Green, Sr., et al. v. City of New Orleans	Queen Green	12/18/2007	4/16/2008	\$1,500.00
162	397	06-3779 C/W 06-4108	Laurie Brooks, et al. v. Alexander Goldberg, et al.	Akira Smith	1/10/2008	5/9/2008	\$1,015.00
163	398	06-03779 C/W 06-4108	Laurie Brooks, et al. v. Alexander Goldberg, et al.	Arlette Jupiter	1/10/2008	5/9/2008	\$2,256.00
164	399	06-03779 C/W 06-4108	Laurie Brooks, et al. v. Alexander Goldberg, et al.	Laurie Brooks	1/10/2008	5/9/2008	\$3,858.00
165	400	06-3779 C/W 06-4108	Charles Ruth v. U.S. Agencies Casualty Insurance Company, et al.	Charles Ruth	1/10/2008	5/9/2008	\$5,000.00
166	402	02-09670 C/W 03-01683	Carolyn Bauduc v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Carolyn R. Bauduc	1/14/2008	5/13/2008	\$50,000.00
167	404	03-16087	Edwin Arzu, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Sandra Gonzales	1/24/2008	5/23/2008	\$10,000.00
168	405	92-18347	James Darby, Jr., et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	James Darby, Sr	2/11/2008	2/11/2008	\$5,000.00
169	407	01-08800	Karen Smith, et al. v. Randall Knight, et al.	Karen Smith O/B/O Shatynna Smith	2/12/2008	6/11/2008	\$1,000.00
170	408	01-08800	Karen Smith, et al. v. Randall Knight, et al.	Karen Smith O/B/O Vernell Smith	2/12/2008	6/11/2008	\$1,000.00
171	821	2001-08800	Karen Smith, et al. v. Randall Knight, et al.	Karen Smith	2/12/2008	6/11/2008	\$5,000.00
172	409	05-02222	Craig Zimmer v. Rodney Bailey, et al.	Craig Zimmer	2/20/2008	6/19/2008	\$1,000.00
173	414	2001-2720	Derrick Christian v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Derrick Christian	3/31/2008	7/29/2008	\$3,200.00
174	416	2004-00099	Hamp's Construction, LLC v. The City of New Orleans	Hamp's Construction, L.L.C.	4/18/2008	5/18/2008	\$140,000.00
175	418	04-13915	Barry Williams v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Barry Williams	5/2/2008	7/31/2008	\$10,500.00
176	419	01-09782	Leroy Smith v. the City of New Orleans, et al.	Leroy Smith	5/8/2008	9/5/2008	\$23,000.00
177	420	99-09431	Glenda Register v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Glenda Register	5/13/2008	9/10/2008	\$2,500.00
178	427	99-00143	Roy LePage v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Roy LePage	7/9/2008	11/6/2008	\$130,000.00
179	428	02-14406	Paul Baddoo, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Paul Baddoo	7/22/2008	11/19/2008	\$17,500.00
180	429	02-14406	Paul Baddoo, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Raymond Whaley	7/22/2008	11/19/2008	\$17,400.00
181	435	99-08046	Mary Love, et al. v. Robert M. Larry, et al.	Mary Love O/B/O Keila Love	9/16/2008	1/14/2009	\$10,000.00
182	436	04-01353	Linda Bonney v. Wyndham International, et al.	Linda Bonney	9/17/2008	11/16/2008	\$25,000.00
183	441	04-04855	Michelle Adams, et al. v. the City of New Orleans, et al.	Lisa Vezzani	10/7/2008	2/4/2009	\$1,000.00
184	445	05-12392	Gabrielle Gibson v. Jennifer Goodenough, et al.	Gabrielle Gibson	10/27/2008	11/19/2008	\$11,400.00
185	449	01-15508	Thelma Dickerson v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Thelma Dickerson individually and O/B/O Lajuana Dickerson	12/11/2008	9/21/2001	\$1,500.00
186	463	99-17102 C/W 99-17196	Sherlyn Galle, et al. v. Nationwide Furniture, et al.	Estate of Virgie Caston	3/16/2009	6/14/2009	\$2,220.00
187	467	02-03214	Jill Readeau Glorioso v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Jill R. Glorioso	4/2/2009	7/31/2009	\$83,000.00
188	469	04-12155	Wardell Carter, et al. v. Carlos Christina, Jr., et al.	Wardell Carter	4/8/2009	8/6/2009	\$71,000.00

Current Queue Position	Case ID	Case Number	Case Name	Payee	Judgement Date	Interest Start Date	Principal
189	470	98-09278	Selma Beverly v. Sewerage and Water Board, et al.	Selma Beverly	4/22/2009	8/20/2009	\$10,000.00
190	474	2004-5005	Chasity Jackson v. AIG Insurance Company, et al.	AIG Insurance Co.	5/29/2009	5/29/2009	\$10,000.00
191	477	01-20244 C/W 02-04979	Karen Lindsey v. Claude Delone, et al.	Ronald Morris	6/8/2009	10/6/2009	\$2,500.00
192	490	08-13277	Raymond Canzoneri & Associates, Inc. v. the City of New Orleans, et al.	Raymond Canzoneri & Associates, Inc.	10/9/2009	12/21/2011	\$2,507,040.00
193	492	03-15047	Barbara Hamilton, et al. v. Vincent S. Harris, et al.	Barbara Hamilton	10/21/2009	1/19/2010	\$14,182.00
194	493	03-15047	Barbara Hamilton, et al. v. Vincent S. Harris, et al.	Errol Hamilton	10/21/2009	1/19/2010	\$7,615.00
195	508	02-07791	Jonathan Carroll v. New Orleans Police Department	Jonathan Carroll	1/5/2010	3/6/2010	\$20,000.00
196	509	02-07791	Jonathan Carroll v. New Orleans Police Department	Rita Akehurst Beckett	1/5/2010	3/6/2010	\$15,000.00
197	511	04-10297	Lori Rowell v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Lori Rowell	1/12/2010	3/13/2010	\$10,000.00
198	516	02-05733	Gwendolyn Lee, et al. v. Orleans Parish School Board, et al.	Gwendolyn Lee	4/6/2010	8/4/2010	\$61,918.50
199	517	02-05733	Gwendolyn Lee, et al. v. Orleans Parish School Board, et al.	Steven A. Francis	4/6/2010	8/4/2010	\$2,616.30
200	518	02-05733	Gwendolyn Lee, et al. v. Orleans Parish School Board, et al.	Lakeisha Lee	4/6/2010	8/4/2010	\$2,616.30
201	519	02-05733	Gwendolyn Lee, et al. v. Orleans Parish School Board, et al.	Kelly Lee	4/6/2010	8/4/2010	\$2,616.30
202	520	02-05733	Gwendolyn Lee, et al. v. Orleans Parish School Board, et al.	Robin Taylor	4/6/2010	8/4/2010	\$2,616.30
203	521	02-05733	Gwendolyn Lee, et al. v. Orleans Parish School Board, et al.	Germar Taylor	4/6/2010	8/4/2010	\$2,616.30
204	525	USDC 09-6598	Nat'l. Union Fire Ins. Co. of Pittsburgh, PA, et al. v. City of New Orleans	Republic Ins. Co.	4/8/2010	9/30/2008	\$134,657.09
205	526	92-17031	Lillie Causey, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Donetta Causey	4/12/2010	6/11/2010	\$3,000.00
206	527	92-17031	Lillie Causey, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Carlene Causey	4/12/2010	6/11/2010	\$3,000.00
207	528	08-03798	Joan Heather Huey v. Met. Prop. and Cas. Ins. Co., et al.	Joan Heather Huey	4/26/2010	8/24/2010	\$10,000.00
208	531	08-08130	Cathy Reinhardt v. Warren J. Riley, et al.	Cathy Reinhardt	4/28/2010	7/27/2010	\$20,000.00
209	532	03-15371	Rodriguez Lomax, et al. v. Than U. Nguyen, et al.	Rodriguez Lomax	5/24/2010	9/21/2010	\$15,400.00
210	533	03-15371	Rodriguez Lomax, et al. v. Than U. Nguyen, et al.	Cedric Winn	5/24/2010	9/21/2010	\$23,780.00
211	534	07-6461 c/w 07-7364	State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co., et al. v. Robert Lubrano, et al.	Robert Lubrano	6/3/2010	10/1/2010	\$3,000.00
212	541	40th JDC #55242	Gary Russo, Jr., et al. v. Eddie Thompson, et al.	Gary Russo, Jr. and Michelle Mims Russo	10/13/2010	10/13/2010	\$3,700.00
213	543	97-14212	Jude Reaux, et al. v. City of New Orleans	Allen Borne	11/5/2010	8/13/1997	\$250.00
214	544	2009-2139	Shirlonda Jackson v. City of New Orleans	Shirlonda Jackson	11/10/2010	2/8/2011	\$19,522.76
215	548	2005-2667	Indoyola White, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Indoyola White and Jerome Signal	12/22/2010	4/21/2011	\$5,000.00
216	550	04-10892 C/W 00-12888	John Orgon v. City of New Orleans, et al.	John Orgon	1/4/2011	5/4/2011	\$16,000.00
217	553	91-17917	Rhonda Mollow Kendrick v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.	Rhonda Mollow Kendrick	2/2/2011	2/2/2011	\$120,000.00
218	552	07-13425	Renata Kotokowska v. City of New Orleans	Renata Kotokowska	2/7/2011	6/7/2011	\$14,800.00
219	554	02-12600	Thomas Andrew Flenner, Jr. v. Sewerage & Water Board of New Orleans, et al.	Thomas Andrew Flenner	2/10/2011	6/10/2011	\$45,000.00
220	557	00-13621	Mona Lisa White v. City of New Orleans	Mona Lisa White And The Rawlings Company [Medical Lien]	2/23/2011	6/23/2011	\$8,000.00
221	559	04-05242	Jamal Richie, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Jamal Richie	3/1/2011	7/29/2011	\$3,000.00
222	561	95-10613	Lana Lamothe v. Sewerage & Water Board of New Orleans	Lana Lamothe	3/24/2011	7/20/2011	\$4,000.00
223	563	03-02660	Isam Mousa v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Isam Mousa	4/15/2011	8/13/2011	\$40,000.00
224	567	10-11443	James D. Bercaw v. City of New Orleans	James D. Bercaw	5/20/2011	11/12/2010	\$731.50

Current Queue Position	Case ID	Case Number	Case Name	Payee	Judgement Date	Interest Start Date	Principal
225	568	2001-00012	William Hester, et al. v. State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co., et al.	William Hester	5/25/2011	9/22/2011	\$5,000.00
226	569	2006-04685	Johnny Washington v. City of New Orleans	Johnny Washington	5/25/2011	6/24/2011	\$1,750.00
227	571	04-13978	Courtney Zimmer, et al. v. Roderick Rick, et al.	Courtney Zimmer	6/3/2011	10/1/2011	\$13,086.00
228	572	04-13978	Courtney Zimmer, et al. v. Roderick Rick, et al.	Craig Zimmer	6/3/2011	10/1/2011	\$11,798.93
229	573	2002-10507	Samarran Coleman v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Samarran Coleman Royal	6/7/2011	7/3/2002	\$5,000.00
230	577	05-13566	John Redmann, et al. v. City of New Orleans	John Redmann	7/6/2011	4/1/2011	\$17,879.64
231	578	05-13566	John Redmann, et al. v. City of New Orleans	Amanda Redmann	7/6/2011	4/1/2011	\$53,638.92
232	579	06-4770 c/w 06-5866	Allstate Ins. Co. v. Curtis Moore	Misty Lee	7/13/2011	11/10/2011	\$6,000.00
233	581	2003-08461	Frank Batiste, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Frank Batiste,Lavinzale Batiste, Atty W. Gregory Merritt	7/27/2011	6/1/2011	\$175,000.00
234	584	11-0235 / U.S.E.P.A. ID: LAD98105776	Marine Shale Processors Site Potentially Responsible Parties Group (MSP Site PRP Group) de minimis Cash-Out Settlement	Kean Miller Trust Account	8/16/2011	1/26/2010	\$4,000.00
235	585	U.S.D.C. 08-05065	Patrick Levy, et al v. Phillips and Jordan, Inc., et al	Eagle Veteran Construction Services, LLC / Zurich American Ins.	8/19/2011	12/17/2011	\$14,000.00
236	587	2010-11638	Colby Patterson v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Colby Patterson	8/25/2011	12/23/2011	\$19,393.00
237	588	2007-08497	Carlos Escobar v. New Orleans Police Department, et al.	Carlos Escobar, Sr.	8/29/2011	12/27/2011	\$8,000.00
238	589	2009-12298	Louisiana Capital Assistance Center v. Warren Riley	Louisiana Capital Assistance Center	9/7/2011	9/7/2011	\$11,000.00
239	595	09-10068	Homegrown Gardens and Lawns, LLC v. City of New Orleans	Homegrown Gardens and Lawns, LLC	10/7/2011	9/23/2009	\$25,000.00
240	606	2004-15572	Jane Sumner v. Kimberly Mathes, et al.	Jane Sumner	12/13/2011	12/13/2012	\$900,000.00
241	607	05-910 C/W 09-63 & 09-132	Terri J. Hines v. Alvarez M. Peters, Sr.	James Logan, Atty For Barbara Yochum, Jack Wittenbrink	12/20/2011	1/31/2012	\$47,500.00
242	608	05-910 C/W 09-63 & 09-132	Terri J. Hines v. Alvarez M. Peters, Sr.	Brian Begue Atty For Holly Sarre	12/20/2011	1/31/2012	\$80,000.00
243	609	2010-06631	Lenard Reese v. Brittany Gorman, et al.	Lenard Reese	2/7/2012	6/7/2012	\$500.00
244	615	10-5155 C/W 10-8013	Anthony Lumkins v. Emerson Picou, III, et al.	Anthony Lumkins	4/24/2012	8/22/2012	\$3,000.00
245	616	USDC 11-758	Matthew Watson v. City of New Orleans	Matthew Watson	5/4/2012	5/4/2012	\$6,500.00
246	617	10-5155 C/W 10-8013	Anthony Lumkins v. Emerson Picou, III	Emerson Picou, III	5/15/2012	9/12/2012	\$4,000.00
247	621	2002-00580	Kimmichael Augustine, et al. v. New Orleans Theatre of Performing Arts, et al.	Kimmichael Augustine	7/23/2012	11/20/2012	\$3,500.00
248	623	2003-17210	Abigail Ferguson v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Abigail Ferguson	8/24/2012	12/22/2012	\$9,000.00
249	628	03-11814	Dorothy Peterson, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Tammy Matthews	8/24/2012	11/22/2012	\$10,000.00
250	631	2012-08590	State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company v. Joseph Edwards, et al.	State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company	10/3/2012	1/31/2012	\$3,610.12
251	634	2009-00727	Rene Herring v. Sewerage & Water Board of New Orleans	Rene Herring	10/15/2012	2/12/2013	\$9,000.00
252	636	2005-13061	Taffany Dixon, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Taffany Dixon	10/18/2012	2/15/2013	\$8,500.00
253	637	2005-13061	Taffany Dixon, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Creal James, Sr. o/b/o Creshell James	10/18/2012	2/15/2013	\$600.00
254	638	2005-13061	Taffany Dixon, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Tracey James	10/18/2012	2/15/2013	\$14,000.00
255	639	2005-13061	Taffany Dixon, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Creal James, Sr. o/b/o Cre'Shaun James	10/18/2012	2/15/2013	\$600.00
256	640	2001-03416	Stella Lee v. Harrah's New Orleans Investment Company, et al.	Stella Lee	10/22/2012	12/21/2012	\$2,000.00
257	641	1999-15270	Daniel Czajkowski v. City of New Orleans	State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company	10/22/2012	1/20/2013	\$6,000.00

Current Queue Position	Case ID	Case Number	Case Name	Payee	Judgement Date	Interest Start Date	Principal
258	643	24th JDC 674-365	Reyna Geuvara, et al. v. Ramiro Farciert, Jr., et al.	Reyna Geuvara	10/30/2012	2/27/2013	\$4,500.00
259	644	2012-09981	State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co., et al v. Allen Bellow, et al.	State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. as Subrogee of Donald Barrilleaux	11/20/2012	3/20/2013	\$1,234.50
260	655	2006-00655	Tiba Hankton v. City of New Orleans	Recco Schneckenburg	2/5/2013	6/5/2013	\$700.00
261	835	1986-14197	Bertha Mae Adams v. Boh Brothers Construction Co., Inc.	Robert W. Drouant (Attorney's Fees)	2/26/2013	2/26/2013	\$350.00
262	658	2009-2507	Alfred Menesses v. Jerry Stapler, Jr., et al.	Alfred Menesses	3/13/2013	7/11/2013	\$30,000.00
263	661	1988-23810	Harold W. Whorton v. United States Fidelity and Guaranty Insurance Co., et al.	Harold W. Whorton	4/23/2013	8/21/2013	\$40,000.00
264	663	24th JDC 668-760	Brittanie Leblanc, et al. v. Geroge T. Bourgeois, et al.	State Farm Ins. Co. Insurer For George T. Bourgeois	4/23/2013	8/20/2013	\$35,000.00
265	666	06-11839 C/W 07-1318	Allstate Ins. Co., et al. v. Marc Hedgemon, et al.	Allstate Insurance Co.	5/6/2013	9/3/2013	\$5,757.45
266	668	00-11710	Trinette Clay-Peters, et al. v. George Lee, III, et al.	Trinette Clay-Peters	6/5/2013	8/4/2013	\$200,000.00
267	674	2008-12491	Julie C. Ricca v. Christopher Najberg, et al.	Julie Ricca	8/1/2013	12/5/2008	\$8,744.80
268	675	2008-12491	Julie C. Ricca v. Christopher Najberg, et al.	State Farm Insruance Company, as Subrogee of Julie Ricca	8/1/2013	12/5/2008	\$3,755.20
269	676	2003-00670	Talisha May v. Mark Green, et al.	Talisha May	8/19/2013	8/19/2013	\$40,000.00
270	678	2011-5742 cw 2011-5860	Sherrel White v. Joseph Scanio, et al.	Sherrel A. White	9/5/2013	1/3/2014	\$70,000.00
271	679	2009-13483	Daniel Graham v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Daniel Graham	9/24/2013	1/22/2014	\$3,067.00
272	680	2005-05527	Sarah Ballay v. Raymond Gaines, et al.	Sarah Ballay	10/24/2013	2/21/2014	\$2,500.00
273	681	2006-5719	Merlin Parfait, et al. v. Ronald Pursell, et al.	Merlin and Christy Parfait	10/24/2013	2/21/2014	\$500.00
274	683	2007-13336	Herman Adam, Jr. v. Aaron Cronk, et al.	Herman Adam, Jr.	11/8/2013	3/8/2013	\$30,000.00
275	685	2008-10029	Allstate Insurance Company, as partial subrogee to the rights of/and Brad Harrsion v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Allstate Ins. Co. as partial subrogee to the rights of/and Brad Harrison	12/2/2013	4/1/2014	\$5,750.00
276	686	2012-8851	Allstate Ins. Co. v. City of New Orleans	Allstate Ins. Co. as Subrogee of Michelle May	12/3/2013	4/2/2014	\$3,500.00
277	687	1995-6648	Robert Graves v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Robert Graves	12/16/2013	4/15/2014	\$1,000.00
278	688	2005-11901	Angela Peters v. Mahalia Jackson Theatre of Performing Arts, et al.	Angela Peters	12/18/2013	4/17/2014	\$14,000.00
279	690	2012-445	State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. as subrogee of/and Rachel Lyons v. City of New Orleans, et al.	State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. as subrogee of Rachel Lyons	1/14/2014	4/14/2014	\$2,750.00
280	691	2003-6413	Ronald Tilley v. Christopher Martin, et al.	Ronald Tilley	1/23/2014	5/23/2014	\$12,500.00
281	692	2005-04029	Jaime Gomez, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Bianca Gomez	1/27/2014	5/27/2014	\$3,200.00
282	693	2005-04029	Jaime Gomez, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Mercedes Gomez	1/27/2014	5/27/2014	\$3,300.00
283	694	2005-04029	Jaime Gomez, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Alma Gomez	1/27/2014	5/27/2014	\$9,700.00
284	698	2012-9158	Brittany Monteleone v. Tristan Carter, et al.	Brittany Monteleone	3/17/2014	7/15/2014	\$7,820.00
285	700	2006-5614	Wanda Solano, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Entergy New Orleans	4/2/2014	7/31/2014	\$1,876.20
286	884	2008-12371	Reola Jackson v. Ernest Pollock, et al.	Reola Jackson	4/8/2014	8/6/2014	\$12,500.00
287	703	2010-9644	Russ Lewis v. Max Gregory Schuler, et al.	Russ Lewis	4/10/2014	8/8/2014	\$7,000.00
288	879	2010-10332	Romeka Henderson v. William E. Pendleton, et al.	Romeka Henderson	4/24/2014	8/22/2014	\$3,500.00
289	708	2003-7528	Catherine Guerra v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Catherine Guerra	7/29/2014	11/26/2014	\$2,000.00
290	709	2009-03713	Karen Maher, et al. v. City of New Orleans	Karen Maher	8/4/2014	12/21/2011	\$2,000.00
291	710	2009-03713	Karen Maher, et al. v. City of New Orleans	Marie Mckay	8/4/2014	12/4/2011	\$50,000.00
292	711	2009-03713	Karen Maher, et al. v. City of New Orleans	Monique Nolan	8/4/2014	12/21/2011	\$20,000.00

Current Queue Position	Case ID	Case Number	Case Name	Payee	Judgement Date	Interest Start Date	Principal
293	817	2011-12029	Gabriela Thompson, et al. v. Jason Samuel, et al.	Gabriela and Jason Thompson ind. and o/b/o Sebastian Thompson, Lucian Thompson, Jason Thompson, Jr., and Giabella Thompson	8/27/2014	8/27/2014	\$3,333.00
294	713	2012-11914	State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. as Subrogee of Damian Emetuche v. City of New Orleans	State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co. as Subrogee of Damian Emetuche	9/3/2014	1/1/2015	\$1,500.00
295	714	2008-07161 cw 2008-07162 cw 2008-07291 cw 2008-11108 cw 2009-00006 cw 2009-01560 cw 2009-02214 cw 2009-02727 cw 2009-03755 cw 2009-10922	Janice Puckett v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Janice Puckett	9/8/2014	3/16/2009	\$32,500.00
296	715	2008-07161 cw 2008-07162 cw 2008-07291 cw 2008-11108 cw 2009-00006 cw 2009-01560 cw 2009-02214 cw 2009-02727 cw 2009-03755 cw 2009-10922	Edwin Jones, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Edwin and Delores Jones	9/8/2014	10/14/2009	\$27,500.00
297	717	2009-01083	Patrice T. Johnson, et al. v. Blaine Kern Artists, Inc., et al.	Patrice Taylor Johnson and Edward K. Johnson and Atty. Kevin Katner (lien)	10/15/2014	2/12/2015	\$35,000.00
298	839	2009-10483	Chaney v. City of New Orleans	Michael Chaney	10/16/2014	10/2/2009	\$20,000.00
299	718	2014-02782	Cammie Maturin v. Ronald Serpas	Cammie Maturin	10/20/2014	10/20/2014	\$1,684.49
300	719	2004-09007	Clarence Youngblood v. New Orleans Fire Dept., through City of New Orleans, et al.	Clarence Youngblood	10/21/2014	2/18/2015	\$6,000.00
301	720	2008-07161 cw 2008-07162 cw 2008-07291 cw 2008-11108 cw 2009-00006 cw 2009-01560 cw 2009-02214 cw 2009-02727 cw 2009-03755 cw 2009-10922	Sylvester Myles v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Sylvester Myles	10/23/2014	4/13/2009	\$12,500.00
302	721	2008-07161 cw 2008-07162 cw 2008-07291 cw 2008-11108 cw 2009-00006 cw 2009-01560 cw 2009-02214 cw 2009-02727 cw 2009-03755 cw 2009-10922	Julia Overstreet Sathler, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Julia and Carlos Sathler	12/10/2014	7/10/2008	\$85,000.00
303	722	2008-07161 cw 2008-07162 cw 2008-07291 cw 2008-11108 cw 2009-00006 cw 2009-01560 cw 2009-02214 cw 2009-02727 cw 2009-03755 cw 2009-10922	Kelly Voight, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Kelly Voight and Gregory Voight	12/10/2014	7/10/2008	\$30,000.00
304	723	2008-07161 cw 2008-07162 cw 2008-07291 cw 2008-11108 cw 2009-00006 cw 2009-01560 cw 2009-02214 cw 2009-02727 cw 2009-03755 cw 2009-10922	Trina Williams v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Trina Williams	12/10/2014	10/22/2008	\$20,000.00
305	724	2008-07161 cw 2008-07162 cw 2008-07291 cw 2008-11108 cw 2009-00006 cw 2009-01560 cw 2009-02214 cw 2009-02727 cw 2009-03755 cw 2009-10922	Frank Webb, Jr. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Frank Webb, Jr.	12/10/2014	1/5/2009	\$30,000.00

Current Queue Position	Case ID	Case Number	Case Name	Payee	Judgement Date	Interest Start Date	Principal
306	725	2008-07161 cw 2008-07162 cw 2008-07291 cw 2008-11108 cw 2009-00006 cw 2009-01560 cw 2009-02214 cw 2009-02727 cw 2009-03755 cw 2009-10922	Doris Bell v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Doris Bell	12/10/2014	2/11/2009	\$18,000.00
307	726	2007-14003	Bobby Morales v. New Orleans Police Department, et al.	Bobby Morales	12/12/2014	4/11/2015	\$32,000.00
308	728	2006-13668	West End Tennis & Fitness Club, et al. v. Board of Commissioners for the Levee District, et al.	Trust Acct. McCranie, Sistrunk, Anzelmo, Hardy, McDaniel & Welch, LLC	12/30/2014	12/30/2014	\$20,000.00
309	730	2013-05233	Joseph Albe v. Richard's Disposal, Inc., et al.	Joseph Albe	1/29/2015	12/3/2014	\$3,500.00
310	731	1997-04002	Derek Smith, et al. v. Charles Winslow, et al.	Derek Smith	2/5/2015	6/5/2015	\$2,000.00
311	732	1997-04002	Derek Smith, et al. v. Charles Winslow, et al.	Philomena Johnson	2/5/2015	6/5/2015	\$2,000.00
312	733	24th JDC 729-877	Deborah Van Norman, et al. v. Mario Fernandez, et al.	Deborah Van Norman	2/6/2015	8/22/2012	\$8,130.00
313	734	2014-02152	Xiomara Alvarez v. Marlon Mejia, et al.	Xiomara Alvarez	2/26/2015	6/26/2015	\$4,000.00
314	735	2009-12738	Nael Musa v. Anthony Mitchell, et al.	Nael Musa	3/13/2015	1/11/2015	\$6,953.00
315	737	2012-09613	Patricia Harris v. William Mullaly, et al.	Patricia Harris	5/4/2015	9/1/2015	\$12,500.00
316	738	21st JDC 2011-3511	Damaion Taylor, et al. v. US Agencies Cas. Ins. Co., Inc., et al.	Clairsha Marshall Through Trina Tyler, Jamar Tyler, Damaion Tyler, And Trina Tyler O/B/O Lakedra Tyler, Takedra Tyler, Authur Tyler Iii,	5/13/2015	9/10/2015	\$15,000.00
317	739	2001-20422	Frederick Singleton, et al., as the Sole Heirs of the Deceased Frederick Singleton v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Chanelle Singleton and Fred Singleton	5/20/2015	6/19/2015	\$6,845.20
318	740	2012-08802	Thu Can v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Thu Can	6/5/2015	10/3/2015	\$13,500.00
319	744	13-04509	Encompass Insurance as Partial Subrogee of/and Henry Lapeyre v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Encompass Insurance as Partial Subrogee of Henry Lapeyre	9/14/2015	1/12/2016	\$2,000.00
320	745	2009-13291 c/w 2009-13436	Peter Mueller, et al. v. Allstate Ins. Co., et al.	Peter Mueller and Patricia Mueller	9/16/2015	1/14/2016	\$75,000.00
321	747	11-10128	Jacqueline Dillon, et al. v. James Cannon, et al.	Charles Stokes	9/21/2015	1/19/2016	\$10,500.00
322	749	2014-10950	James Willeford, as Administrator of the Succession of Anthony C. Batiste, et al. v. City of New Orleans	James Willeford	10/14/2015	10/14/2015	\$913.00
323	751	2009-12868	Kesia McKenzie, et al. v. Odie Moore, et al.	Kesia McKenzie and Cyran McKenzie	10/20/2015	2/17/2016	\$40,000.00
324	885	2014-04183	Trina Tinsley v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Trina Tinsley	11/10/2015	3/9/2016	\$20,000.00
325	752	2011-13149	Le Parc Apartments of New Orleans v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Antoine Saacks, Dvm And The Humane Society Of No	1/7/2016	5/6/2016	\$9,800.00
326	753	2012-3819	Le Parc Apartments of New Orleans v. City of New Orleans, et al.	State Farm Mutual Automobile Ins Co. (Naomi Cosey)	2/18/2016	6/17/2016	\$4,041.60
327	754	2000-03523	Brent Trosclair v. Damond S. Harris, et al.	Brent Trosclair	2/22/2016	6/21/2016	\$4,500.00
328	757	2014-06769	Larry Brown, et al. v. Carol Leggett, et al.	Larry Brown	4/11/2016	8/9/2016	\$5,000.00
329	758	2016-00786	Allstate Property & Casualty Ins. Co as Subrogee of Dianna Causey v. Ivan Vavilov, et al.	Allstate Property & Casualty Ins. Co as Subrogee of Dianna Causey	5/3/2016	9/2/2016	\$200.00
330	760	2015-07465	Tirrell Roche v. Gabriel D. Favaro, et al.	Tirrell Roche	8/8/2016	12/8/2016	\$7,387.00
331	762	2012-04214	Natalie Lewis v. City of New Orleans	Natalie Lewis	8/17/2016	11/16/2016	\$10,000.00
332	764	24th JDC 718-788	State Farm Mutual Automobile Ins. Co. as Subrogee of/and Grace Spencer v. Charles M. Schultz, et al.	State Farm Mutual Automobile Ins. Co. as Subrogee of Grace Spencer	9/7/2016	1/5/2017	\$8,000.00
333	767	2015-05891	Michelle Byrd v. City of New Orleans	Michelle Byrd	10/7/2016	2/3/2017	\$27,500.00

Current Queue Position	Case ID	Case Number	Case Name	Payee	Judgement Date	Interest Start Date	Principal
334	768	2015-01164	Donald Bacot, et al. v. Zachary Smith, et al.	Donald Bacot	10/13/2016	2/10/2017	\$12,000.00
335	769	2015-01164	Donald Bacot, et al. v. Zachary Smith, et al.	Maylois Bacot	10/13/2016	2/10/2017	\$16,000.00
336	771	2011-13149	Le Parc Apartments of New Orleans v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Ana Zorilla And The Louisiana Society For The Prevention Of Cruelty To Animals	11/10/2016	3/10/2017	\$48,000.00
337	773	2014-06584	Nationwide Prop. & Casualty Ins. Co., et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Terry and Carol Legget	11/10/2016	3/10/2017	\$4,817.86
338	774	2014-08730	Frischhertz Electric Company, Inc. v. F.H. Paschen, et al.	F.H. Paschen, S.N. Nielsen & Associates, LLC	11/12/2016	2/10/2017	\$145,000.00
339	775	2015-00021	F.H. Paschen, S.N. Nielsen & Associates, LLC v. City of New Orleans	F.H. Paschen, S.N. Nielsen & Associates, LLC	11/15/2016	2/13/2017	\$265,000.00
340	777	2012-08831	Klausner, Kaufman, Jensen & Levinson, APLC v. Dr. Edgar Chase, in his Official Capacity as Chairman of Bd. of Trustees of City of New Orleans Municipa	Klausner, Kaufman, Jensen & Levinson, APLC	12/20/2016	9/17/2012	\$27,335.31
341	790	2012-08831	Klausner, Kaufman, Jensen & Levinson, APLC v. Dr. Edgar Chase, in his Official Capacity as Chairman of Bd. of Trustees of City of New Orleans Municipa	Klausner, Kaufman, Jensen & Levinson, APLC (Attorney's Fees)	12/20/2016	9/17/2012	\$2,500.00
342	778	2014-10721	Harold J. Bosworth, Jr. v. City of New Orleans	Harold J. Bosworth, Jr.	1/20/2017	1/20/2017	\$618.00
343	779	2016-03806	Edward & Gail Tyson v. Detective Mason Spong, et al.	Edward Tyson	1/27/2017	1/27/2017	\$14,500.00
344	791	2016-03806	Edward & Gail Tyson v. Detective Mason Spong, et al.	Gail Tyson	1/27/2017	1/27/2017	\$14,000.00
345	792	2005-04923	Iona Williams v. City of New Orleans	A. Patrich Dehon (Attorney's Fees)	2/6/2017	3/7/2017	\$450.00
346	782	2014-03250	Lori Beth Jackson v. HGI Insurance, et al.	Lori Beth Jackson	3/29/2017	7/27/2017	\$13,000.00
347	796	2003-15221	Louey Walker v. Frank Rizzuto, et al.	Louey Walker	4/7/2017	8/5/2017	\$18,000.00
348	797	2007-14096	Russell Schane v. SMG, et al.	Russell Schane	4/18/2017	8/16/2017	\$25,000.00
349	798	1993-14333 c/w 1994-5446, 1994-12996, 1995-13271	John Johnson, et al. v. Orleans Parish School Board, et al.	First Flight Class Members (and their attorneys)	4/26/2017	8/31/1993	\$728,247.00
350	786	2014-11462	Dorthea Maslo, et al. v. Hilton Riverside, LLC, et al.	Dorthea Maslo and John Maslo	5/26/2017	9/22/2017	\$5,000.00
351	787	2014-06530	Oscar Poydras v. Grace Mena, et al.	Oscar Poydras	5/30/2017	7/6/2014	\$6,000.00
352	789	2010-04702	Jacqueline Bolden, et al. v. Roderic A. Carey, et al.	Jacqueline Bolden and Jasmine Hampton	8/17/2017	12/15/2017	\$12,253.70
353	800	2011-09519 c/w 2011-13058, 2012-00044	Daria Youngblood v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Daria Youngblood	9/18/2017	9/18/2017	\$425,000.00
354	801	2004-11908	Janelle Henderson v. Lawrence Gates, Jr., et al.	Janelle Henderson	10/31/2017	2/28/2018	\$10,400.00
355	802	2014-01778	Jose Rodriguez-Castillo v. Peter Cazalot, et al.	Jose L. Rodriguez-Castillo	12/21/2017	4/20/2018	\$8,600.00
356	803	2016-05554	Charmaine Johnson, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Chiquitha Johnson	1/10/2018	5/10/2018	\$3,000.00
357	804	2016-05554	Charmaine Johnson, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Charmaine Johnson	1/10/2018	5/10/2018	\$3,000.00
358	825	2012-05431	Octavia Muse v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Octavia Muse	1/31/2018	5/1/2018	\$30,000.00
359	899	2010-2196 c/w 2010-9732 c/w 2011-8553	Joseph R. McMahon III, et al v. City of New Orleans	Class Plaintiffs Subclass 1	2/21/2018	2/21/2018	\$25,612,690.32
360	805	2004-15679	Elizabeth Winslow v. Marcello Mejia, et al.	Elizabeth M. Winslow	3/16/2018	7/14/2018	\$25,000.00
361	806	2008-13277	Raymond Canzoneri & Associates, Inc. v. City of New Orleans	Raymond Canzoneri & Associates, Inc. (Attorney's Fees)	3/20/2018	3/20/2018	\$15,000.00
362	807	2001-13442	Thomas Williams, et al. v. Theophilous Rainer, Jr., et al.	Thomas Williams	3/28/2018	7/26/2018	\$5,500.00
363	808	2000-07578	Susan Cosner v. City of New Orleans	Susan Cosner	4/2/2018	7/31/2018	\$30,000.00
364	809	2012-01671	Anh Phung Cindy Tran, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	State Farm Mut. Auto. Ins. Co.	4/6/2018	8/4/2018	\$1,750.00
365	810	2015-03428	Monwell Frazier v. Pamela Jordan, et al.	Monwell Frazier	4/12/2018	8/10/2018	\$10,500.00

Current Queue Position	Case ID	Case Number	Case Name	Payee	Judgement Date	Interest Start Date	Principal
366	811	2008-12537	Brent Thomas v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Brent Thomas	5/21/2018	11/9/2017	\$19,000.00
367	812	2016-00958	State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	State Farm Mut. Automobile Insurance Company	5/23/2018	9/20/2018	\$2,000.00
368	813	2016-00958	State Farm Mutual Automobile Insurance Company, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Elvis Hyde	5/23/2018	9/20/2018	\$500.00
369	814	2012-01671	Anh Phung Cindy Tran, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Anh Tran and Truc Tran	5/23/2018	9/20/2018	\$5,000.00
370	123	2017-02888	Dwann Winfield, et al. v. Byron Miller, et al.	Dwann Winfield	5/24/2018	3/28/2017	\$63,000.00
371	788	2017-02888	Dwann Winfield, et al. v. Byron Miller, et al.	Issih Buckles	5/24/2018	3/28/2017	\$15,815.00
372	815	2014-07524	Esther Joseph v. Sewerage & Water Board of New Orleans, et al.	Esther Joseph	7/26/2018	11/23/2018	\$1,000.00
373	816	2017-04186	Lori Darby v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Lori Darby	11/28/2018	11/28/2018	\$75,000.00
374	820	2017-11295	Thea Calvin v. State Nat'l. Insurance Co.	Thea Calvin	1/3/2019	5/3/2019	\$10,000.00
375	826	2013-00843	Fred Reimonenq v. Shannon J. Evans, et al.	Fred Reimonenq	1/8/2019	5/8/2019	\$1,972.00
376	824	2011-00950	Terry Pineda Marullo v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Terry P. Marullo	1/14/2019	5/14/2019	\$35,000.00
377	818	2007-06216	Jayna Washington, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Jayna Washington and Latresia March	1/18/2019	9/21/2018	\$250,000.00
378	819	2017-01114	Beverly Branfman, et al. v. Waste Management of Louisiana, LLC, et al.	Beverly and Eric Branfman	1/24/2019	5/24/2019	\$350,000.00
379	823	2008-12836	Stephen Caserta v. Warren Smith, et al.	Stephen J. Caserta	2/4/2019	6/4/2019	\$50,000.00
380	828	2015-07212	Nestor James v. Police Officer Anita McKay, et al.	Nestor James	3/20/2019	7/18/2019	\$10,000.00
381	829	24th JDC 735-850	Brittany Jarreau v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Brittany Jarreau	3/25/2019	3/25/2019	\$35,000.00
382	830	2015-00152	Jean Hill v. Burris Investment Group, Inc., et al.	Jean Hill	4/4/2019	8/2/2019	\$45,000.00
383	831	2017-10694	Tomas Caballero Cabrera v. Jeffrey Carradine, et al.	Tomas Caballero Cabrera	6/12/2019	10/10/2019	\$6,000.00
384	832	2015-01482	Schanette Hebert, et al. v. New Orleans Emergency Medical Services, et al.	Schanette Hebert, individually and obo Guillarne Bazzle Leary	8/26/2019	12/24/2019	\$10,000.00
385	833	2017-02850	Joseph Troia v. City of New Orleans	Joseph Troia	8/30/2019	12/28/2019	\$30,000.00
386	836	2013-09290	Lisa Alfonso, et al. v. Troy Williams, et al.	Lisa Alfonso	10/28/2019	2/25/2020	\$27,500.00
387	837	2013-09290	Lisa Alfonso, et al. v. Troy Williams, et al.	Nicholas Alfonso	10/28/2019	2/25/2020	\$1,000.00
388	840	2017-02208	Cynthia Scott v. Raymond Smith, et al.	Cynthia Scott	10/28/2019	2/25/2020	\$9,500.00
389	853	2019-06184	Jack B. Harper Electrical, LLC v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Clerk of Civil District Court	11/15/2019	11/15/2019	\$1,000.00
390	854	2019-06184	Jack B. Harper Electrical, LLC v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Jack B. Harper Electrical, LLC	11/15/2019	11/15/2019	\$12,449.13
391	850	2016-03463	Charles Brockmeier v. Georgia Pacific, LLC, et al.	Robin Hennessey and Rachel Ransom	11/20/2019	3/19/2020	\$60,000.00
392	841	22nd JDC 2010-10683	Glenn LeBlanc, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Glenn LeBlanc	1/3/2020	3/3/2020	\$20,000.00
393	842	22nd JDC 2010-10683	Glenn LeBlanc, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Jennifer LeBlanc	1/3/2020	3/3/2020	\$17,000.00
394	849	2002-00992	William Maag, Sr. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	William D. Maag, Sr.	4/22/2020	8/20/2020	\$140,000.00
395	851	2014-02882	Gam Truong v. Edward A. Lambert, Jr., et al.	Gam Truong	5/18/2020	9/15/2020	\$5,875.00
396	845	2016-10965	Latoya Lomax, et al. v. Robert Ponson, et al.	Latoya Lomax	5/19/2020	9/16/2020	\$70,000.00
397	846	2016-10965	Latoya Lomax, et al. v. Robert Ponson, et al.	Latoya Lomax & Harrison Lomax obo Beaux Lomax (Minor Child)	5/19/2020	9/16/2020	\$250.00
398	847	2016-10965	Latoya Lomax, et al. v. Robert Ponson, et al.	Latoya Lomax & Harrison Lomax obo Daja Lomax (Minor Child)	5/19/2020	9/16/2020	\$250.00

Current Queue Position	Case ID	Case Number	Case Name	Payee	Judgement Date	Interest Start Date	Principal
399	848	2016-10965	Latoya Lomax, et al. v. Robert Ponson, et al.	Latoya Lomax & Harrison Lomax obo Leah Lomax (Minor Child)	5/19/2020	9/16/2020	\$250.00
400	843	2016-01415	Charlita Parker, et al. v. John Doe, et al.	Charlita Parker	5/21/2020	9/18/2020	\$2,500.00
401	844	2016-01415	Charlita Parker, et al. v. John Doe, et al.	Deshrieka Wagner	5/21/2020	9/18/2020	\$2,500.00
402	852	04-10892 C/W 00-12888	John Orgon v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Gerald C. de Launay (Attorney's Fees)	6/2/2020	6/2/2020	\$250.00
403	860	2019-01916	Laura Bixby v. Collin Arnold	ACLU Foundation of Louisiana & Southern Poverty Law Center	8/26/2020	4/28/2021	\$30,677.00
404	855	2019-00217	Catrice Cowart, et al. v. New Orleans Police Department, et al.	Catrice Cowart	10/9/2020	1/8/2019	\$2,255.00
405	856	2019-00217	Catrice Cowart, et al. v. New Orleans Police Department, et al.	Ronald Cowart	10/9/2020	1/8/2019	\$14,550.00
406	857	2019-00217	Catrice Cowart, et al. v. New Orleans Police Department, et al.	Borne Law Firm	10/9/2020	1/8/2019	\$828.80
407	858	2020-03560	Dominique Howard v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Dominique Howard	1/25/2021	5/25/2021	\$4,000.00
408	859	2019-03845	Creath Townsend v. City of New Orleans	Creath Townsend	3/3/2021	7/1/2021	\$25,000.01
409	869	2019-02763	Asia Abdullah v. David Fleming, et al.	Asia Abdullah	3/25/2021	7/23/2021	\$10,000.00
410	861	2018-09782	Robert Merrell v. Corey Blue, et al.	Robert Merrell	4/21/2021	8/19/2021	\$28,710.00
411	862	2018-09981	Larry Spencer, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Larry Spencer	4/21/2021	8/19/2021	\$15,697.00
412	863	2018-09981	Larry Spencer, et al. v. City of New Orleans, et al.	Marquita Brown o/b/o her minor child Sydney Mackel	4/21/2021	8/19/2021	\$4,000.00
413	865	2004-11931	Brenda Johnson, on behalf of her minor child Sildaja Johnson v. Officer Van Ballard, et al.	Sildaja Johnson	4/23/2021	4/23/2022	\$30,000.00
414	864	2019-07176	Glenn Taylor, et al. v. Devin Ashmore, et al.	Glenn Taylor and Gleniesha Elliot, individually and o/b/o her minor daughter Eva Elliot	5/4/2021	5/4/2021	\$18,000.00
415	866	2017-08343	Caufman Talley, et al. v. GEICO Casualty Company, et al.	Caufman Talley	5/18/2021	9/15/2021	\$6,500.00
416	867	2017-08343	Caufman Talley, et al. v. GEICO Casualty Company, et al.	Karli McGilone	5/18/2021	9/15/2021	\$8,000.00
417	870	2018-06557	Wendell Frazier v. Torrey Hackett, et al.	Wendell Frazier	5/18/2021	8/16/2021	\$20,000.00
418	868	2015-09450	Kemper Construction Company, Inc. v. Mitchell J. Landrieu, Mayor of the City of New Orleans	Kemper Construction Company, Inc.	5/26/2021	9/23/2021	\$60,000.00
419	871	2017-11521	Harrison Champagne, et al. v. Trahan John, et al.	Harrison Champagne and Jane Champagne	5/28/2021	9/25/2021	\$12,500.00
420	876	2016-08104	Darlynn C. Alexius, et al. v. Colette M. Booth, et al.	Darlynn C. Alexius and Marlon Smith	7/8/2021	8/12/2016	\$25,000.00
421	872	2019-02083	Joseph Ross, et al. v. Hubert McCarthy, et al.	Joseph Ross	10/22/2021	12/21/2021	\$22,000.00
422	873	2019-02083	Joseph Ross, et al. v. Hubert McCarthy, et al.	Ashley Brooks	10/22/2021	2/19/2022	\$24,000.00
423	874	2019-02083	Joseph Ross, et al. v. Hubert McCarthy, et al.	Joseph Ross and Ashley Brooks, individually and on behalf of Jayden Brooks	10/22/2021	2/19/2022	\$500.00
424	875	2013-01064	Sylvia Warner v. Charles Adams, et al.	Sylvia Warner	11/5/2021	2/1/2013	\$50,000.00
425	877	1999-09931	Latate Smith, et al. v. Johnny Treadaway, et al.	Latate Smith	1/27/2022	1/27/2022	\$50,000.00
426	878	1999-09931	Latate Smith, et al. v. Johnny Treadaway, et al.	Gary Swanson, Jr.	1/27/2022	1/27/2022	\$1,750,000.00
427	880	2018-10958	Enrique Garcia, et al. v. Blake Grioir, et al.	Enrique Garcia	3/21/2022	7/19/2022	\$25,000.00
428	881	2018-10958	Enrique Garcia, et al. v. Blake Grioir, et al.	Miguel Ramos	3/21/2022	7/19/2022	\$20,000.00
429	882	2018-10958	Enrique Garcia, et al. v. Blake Grioir, et al.	Michael Ramos	3/21/2022	7/19/2022	\$5,000.00
430	883	2017-01961	Cornelius Singleton, Jr. v. Karl Seyler, et al.	Cornelius Singleton, Jr.	4/26/2022	8/24/2022	\$36,000.00

Current Queue Position	Case ID	Case Number	Case Name	Payeee	Judgement Date	Interest Start Date	Principal
431	890	CS-8444 c/w 8467 &8486	Edmonds v. DPW	Bret J. Prendergast	5/5/2022	5/5/2022	\$4,309.50
432	902	1993-14333 c/w 2011-05733	John Johnson, et al v. Orleans Parish School Board, et al.	John Johnson Class (and Their Attorneys)	6/10/2022	4/10/2021	\$37,661,727.86
433	889	2019-2436	Roberts v. CNO and Robert Kreeger	Brandon Roberts	6/14/2022	10/12/2022	\$80,000.00
434	888	2020-4428	Villars v. CNO	Frederick Michael Villars	6/29/2022	10/27/2022	\$50,000.00
435	887	2018-6087	Wallick v. Hard Rock, et al	Elaine Wallick	7/22/2022	7/22/2022	\$100,000.00
436	891	CS-8444 c/w 8467 &8486	Edmonds v. DPW	Bret J. Prendergast	11/4/2022	5/5/2022	\$429.00
437	886	2018-4322	Bricelyn Moore v. Calvin Banks. et al	Bricelyn Moore	11/23/2022	3/23/2023	\$29,999.50
438	892	23-02597	Geico v. Pacillas and CNO	Geico	7/20/2023	11/17/2023	\$2,277.00
439	897	18-05459	Guidry v.CNO	Joseph Guidry	1/26/2024	5/25/2024	\$18,500.00
440	893	21-02422	Gremillion V. CNO	Ashley Gremillion	2/26/2024	6/25/2024	\$16,922.25
441	894	1996-14613	Proffit v. CNO	Jude Proffit	3/28/2024	7/26/2024	\$8,750.00
442	898	22-cv-04731	Terranova v.Dauenhaurer, et al	Katherine Terranova	5/2/2024	5/2/2024	\$250,000.00
443	895	23-cv-02768	Cristea v. Arborpro, et al	Victor Cristea and Jennifer Cristea	5/30/2024	5/30/2024	\$1,336,000.00
444	896	23-cv-02768	Cristea v. Arborpro, et al	GC Cristea Reversionary Trust	5/30/2024	12/30/2026	\$3,500,000.00

Attachment 3

PFM Financial Advisors LLC

City of New Orleans Hypothetical \$90 Million Financing Scenario 2

Taxable Revenue Bonds: \$40M issued in 2025, \$50M issued in 2027



Scenario 2 – Taxable Bonds: \$40M issued in 2025; \$50M issued in 2027

- Interest only until the existing debt service is paid off in 2030.

	Existing DS	Capacity Generated from Retiring Debt	Plus: Judgement Appropriations	Total Revenues / Capacity	Debt Service - \$40M	Debt Service - \$50M	Budget Impact (Positive/Negative)
12/31/2025	18,119,117						
12/31/2026	18,151,234	-	2,000,000	2,000,000	1,731,356		268,644
12/31/2027	17,019,332	1,131,902	2,000,000	3,131,902	2,179,330		952,573
12/31/2028	15,674,605	2,476,629	2,000,000	4,476,629	2,179,330	2,128,301	168,999
12/31/2029	15,672,975	2,478,259	2,000,000	4,478,259	2,179,330	2,697,846	(398,917)
12/31/2030	15,670,308	2,480,926	2,000,000	4,480,926	2,179,330	2,697,846	(396,250)
12/31/2031		18,151,234	2,000,000	20,151,234	4,024,330	4,637,846	11,489,059
12/31/2032		18,151,234	2,000,000	20,151,234	4,025,216	4,637,054	11,488,964
12/31/2033		18,151,234	2,000,000	20,151,234	4,024,821	4,635,223	11,491,191
12/31/2034		18,151,234	2,000,000	20,151,234	4,023,930	4,637,586	11,489,719
12/31/2035		18,151,234	2,000,000	20,151,234	4,026,365	4,637,647	11,487,223
12/31/2036		18,151,234	2,000,000	20,151,234	4,026,229	4,636,349	11,488,657
12/31/2037		18,151,234	2,000,000	20,151,234	4,028,062	4,637,371	11,485,801
12/31/2038		18,151,234	2,000,000	20,151,234	4,026,374	4,634,759	11,490,101
12/31/2039		18,151,234	2,000,000	20,151,234	4,025,434	4,638,026	11,487,774
12/31/2040		18,151,234	2,000,000	20,151,234	4,024,734	4,636,426	11,490,075
12/31/2041		18,151,234	2,000,000	20,151,234	4,028,204	4,639,156	11,483,875
12/31/2042		18,151,234	2,000,000	20,151,234	4,027,790	4,635,440	11,488,005
12/31/2043		18,151,234	2,000,000	20,151,234	4,026,954	4,639,402	11,484,879
12/31/2044		18,151,234	2,000,000	20,151,234	4,024,689	4,638,134	11,488,412
12/31/2045		18,151,234	2,000,000	20,151,234	4,025,646	4,634,906	11,490,682
12/31/2046		18,151,234	2,000,000	20,151,234		4,638,647	15,512,587
12/31/2047		18,151,234	2,000,000	20,151,234		4,638,474	15,512,760

Summary of Assumptions (preliminary, subject to change):

- Tranche 1: Dated/delivery date of November 15, 2025; Tranche 2: Dated/delivery date of November 17, 2027.
- Estimated market rates as of March 18, 2025 based on a limited tax pledge rated in the "A" category.
- Cost of issuance at \$10 per bond (per \$1,000 of principal).

Attachment 4

Draft "By Request" Ordinance to Amend City Code Section 70-415.272

ORDINANCE
CITY OF NEW ORLEANS

CITY HALL: _____

CALENDAR NO.: _____

NO. _____ **MAYOR COUNCIL SERIES**

BY: COUNCILMEMBER _____ **(BY REQUEST)**

AN ORDINANCE to amend and reordain Section 70-415.272 of the Code of the City of New Orleans, Louisiana, relative to the funding and purpose of the Judgment Fund, to adjust the terminology therein and allow the fund to be used for the payment of principal, interest, and the costs of issuance of bonds issued for the purpose of paying in whole or in part judgments and workers' compensation claims against the City; and otherwise to provide with respect thereto.

1 **SECTION 1. THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NEW ORLEANS HEREBY**
2 **ORDAINS**, that Section 70-415.272 of the Code of the City of New Orleans, Louisiana, is hereby
3 amended to read as follows:

4 **“Sec. 70-415.272. Funding and purpose.**

5 (a) When used in this division, the term “judgment” means any settlement agreement to which
6 the city is a party, or any final judgment or order rendered against the city by a state court.

7 (b) The Judgment Fund shall be dedicated and used exclusively for the following:

8 (i) the payment of judgments, and

9 (ii) the payment of principal, interest, and/or the costs of issuance of bonds issued for the
10 purpose of paying in whole or in part judgments and/or workers' compensation claims
11 against the City.

12 (c) Notwithstanding any law to the contrary, the Judgment Fund shall receive an annual
13 appropriation of not less than \$2,000,000. The Judgment Fund shall be funded by revenues
14 received from state court judgments in favor of the city and insurance settlements, excluding the
15 replacement costs and reimbursements for damages incurred and revenues from judgments relative
16 to payment of taxes and fees. The fund shall be supplemented by other available revenues, as
17 needed, to satisfy the minimum funding threshold established herein.

18 (d) Expenditures from the fund for the payment of judgments shall be made at the direction of
19 the city attorney, who shall ensure and document that expenditures are made only for the purposes

20 set forth herein and as required by law. Expenditures related to the payment of principal, interest,
21 and/or the costs of issuance of bonds issued for the purpose of paying in whole or in part judgments
22 and/or workers' compensation claims against the city shall be authorized by the director of the
23 department of finance.”

ADOPTED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NEW ORLEANS _____

PRESIDENT OF THE COUNCIL

DELIVERED TO THE MAYOR ON _____

APPROVED:

DISAPPROVED: _____

MAYOR

RETURNED BY THE MAYOR ON _____ **AT** _____

CLERK OF COUNCIL

ROLL CALL VOTE:

YEAS:

NAYS:

ABSENT:

RECUSED:

REDLINED VERSION

Sec. 70-415.272. - Funding and purpose.

(a) When used in this division, the term “judgment” means any settlement agreement to which the city is a party, or any final judgment or order rendered against the city by a state court ~~or by a federal court where the judgment or order is based exclusively under state law.~~

(b) The Judgment Fund shall be dedicated and used exclusively for the following:

(i) the payment of judgments, and

(ii) the payment of principal, interest, and/or the costs of issuance of bonds issued for the purpose of paying in whole or in part judgments and/or workers’ compensation claims against the City.

(c) ~~Notwithstanding any law to the contrary,~~ the Judgment Fund shall receive an annual appropriation of not less than \$2,000,000. The Judgment Fund shall be funded by revenues received from state court judgments in favor of the city and insurance settlements, excluding the replacement costs and reimbursements for damages incurred and revenues from judgments those relative to payment of taxes and fees, and the proceeds of insurance settlements, excluding replacement costs and reimbursements. The fund shall be supplemented by other available revenues, as needed, to satisfy the minimum funding threshold established herein.

(ed) ~~The Judgment Fund shall exist as a funding unit within the law department.~~ Expenditures from the fund for the payment of judgments shall be made at the direction of the city attorney, who shall ensure and document that expenditures are made only for the purposes set forth herein and as required by law. Expenditures related to the payment of principal, interest, and/or the costs of issuance of bonds issued for the purpose of paying in whole or in part judgments and/or workers’ compensation claims against the city shall be authorized by the director of the department of finance.