



Council Proceedings of the City of Shreveport, Louisiana

May 22, 2012

The regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana was called to order by Chairman Sam Jenkins at 3:06 p.m., Tuesday, May 22, 2012, in the Government Chambers in Government Plaza (505 Travis Street).

Invocation was given by Pastor Rick Edmonds.

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Councilman Joe Shyne.

On Roll Call, the following members were Present: Councilmen Rose Wilson-McCulloch, Jeff Everson, Michael Corbin, Oliver Jenkins, Ron Webb, Joe Shyne, and Sam Jenkins. 7. Absent: None.

Motion by Councilman O. Jenkins, seconded by Councilman Shyne to approve the minutes of the Administrative Conference, Monday, May 7, 2012 and Council Meeting, Tuesday, May 8, 2012. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 7. Nays: None.

Awards, Recognition of Distinguished Guests, Communications of the Mayor relative to city business, and Required Reports

Councilman S. Jenkins: What we're going to try to do is make a few accommodations here today if we can, with our agenda we've got quite a bit to cover. Mr. Mayor, we're going to let you come first and deal with your awards, and recognition of distinguished guests.

Councilman Shyne: Mr. Mayor, you're not giving an award to Joe Walker back there are you for the longest tennis player in the City of Shreveport?

Mayor Glover: That'll be a different meeting Mr. Shyne.

Awards and recognition of distinguished guests by the Mayor, not to exceed fifteen minutes.

Mayor Glover: Thank you Mr. Chairman, members of the Council. It is my great pleasure to join you all today and all the City of Shreveport in recognizing our second Championship Tuesday here for the City of Shreveport. This is an effort that we started on last year and decided it would be appropriate at the second meeting of May of every year before the school year officially wraps up, for us to take a moment to collectively recognize all the young people who have achieved athletic excellence over the course of this last academic year. As some of you all will remember, it was just a few weeks ago that we held once again, our annual Seniors Honors Luncheon up in the Skybox at Independence Stadium a chance for us to be able to recognize those seniors here throughout Caddo and Shreveport who have achieved excellence and leadership in the classroom, but we also think it's appropriate to make sure that we recognize the young folks who have distinguished themselves on the various courts and playing fields across the city, this region and this state. And Mr. Chairman, members of the Council, that is what accounts for why it is that we have such a full room here with us. Because without question, Shreveport, Caddo Parish accomplished a great deal, yet again this year. We're going to start today's proceedings off with groups from the Caddo Magnet High School. Would ask that they would come and join me now. Sports teams from Caddo Magnet High won two state titles this year in Olympic style competitions. The Mustangs once again won the State Championships in Girls Gymnastics. The girls took top honors Mr. Chairman and members of the Council in Division I and again were led by perennial all star, (Inaudible) Sims. She finished second this year in the all round competition. But the gymnasts Mr. Chairman and members of the Council, shared the spotlight this year also with the Archers, who won their 4th State Championship. (Inaudible) Hall was the top all round male at the tournament, but received plenty of support from his teammates. Julie Anderson coaches both squads and she's here today to accept the awards. So, join me in congratulating Coach Anderson and all of the Mustangs from Caddo Magnet. Now our first recognition of the wonderful folks from Calvary Baptist. Calvary wins Baseball and Golf titles again yet this year. (Inaudible) always say that they want their teams to get hot at the right time. Well the Calvary Baseball Team is living proof of just how valid that theory is. The Cavaliers started the season with a shaky 3-11 record, but went on a hot streak relay off 10 wins in a row, including a 3-1 victory over Riverside in the title games. In golf, the dominance continued for the Calvary Boys, who won the Division IV Tournament for the third straight year. The top scorer for Calvary was Freshman Sam Burns who closed with a 68. That score was two shy from better than his opening day's 70. By the way, Sam was also the top scorer at this tournament last year, so he might have to reserve a seat for him on the front row.

Councilman Shyne: Where is Sam, who is Sam?

Mayor Glover: Their coach is Rusty Ward. Let's give the boys from Calvary a round of applause. Now Mr. Chairman and members of the Council, join me in welcoming up the outstanding folks from Loyola Prep. Loyola Prep managed to pull off two State Championships this year, Loyola Prep Tennis Coach (inaudible) about leading his boys to another State Championship. They Flyers had to endure two tie breakers to secure their third straight title. But that's exactly what they did. The duo of Conner Winkler and Christian Spano led the way with straight set victories in double competition. This is the Flyers' 8th State Championship in Tennis. Coach (inaudible), congratulations. Now, Girls Basketball. This is the second State Championship for Loyola. This was a fantastic season for the girls basketball team, and they sealed the deal with an impressive 54-41 victory over Albany in the State Championship game. The Lady Flyers were led by Jasmine Anderson, raise your hand Jasmine with 18 points. And Alexis Martin, raise your hand Alexis. Not here? Alright. Who scored 13 points, grabbed 18 rebounds, and was named the Tournament MVP. The coach is Hal Turner. Let's give the Boys a round of applause along with the Girls Basketball team. And Boys Golf. But can't certainly talk about Loyola Sports without talking about Golf. So we're talking about the Flyers who last year collected their 6th State title this year, this year, they got their lucky number 7th. The Loyola Boys dominated the competition winning by a staggering 42 stroke margin. Eric Riccard, raise your hand Eric, led three Flyers at the top of the leader board by posting scores of 67 and 68. He was followed by teammates Kirk Thomas and Ryan Chrisman. Their coach is Steven Cheater, where are you coach? Coach is unable to be here. Alright, let's give all three of the Loyola (inaudible). And we have certificates for - - - whose representing the Golf Coach? Girls Basketball and Tennis. Alright. Now we have our Track and Field Champions. And those will come - - - there's a couple of groups. This year, we wanted to include our State Track and Field performers, although we didn't have any team titles to brag about, we had several outstanding individual performances and here are the highlights. BTW, make your way up. First up is Alexis Hewitt from Booker T. Washington. Alexis was a double winner in Baton Rouge taking 1st place in the 100 Meter Dash as well as the 400 Meter Dash. C. E. Byrd, come on up C.E. Byrd if you're here. Boys from Byrd have dominated the sprint all season. So their success at the State Meet probably didn't surprise, but the competition was stiff, and the Yellow Jackets responded like Champions. Led by their outstanding Senior, help me with the pronunciation. Hanaj Carter. Come on up Hanaj if you're here. He's in Spain? Wow! Quartet of Christian Willis, Nicholas People, Tony Griffin, and Carter won the 4 x 100 relay and finished 2nd in the 4 x 200 relay. Are any of the State Championship 4 x 100 relay team members here? Alright. Carter wrapped up an undefeated season by blowing the competition away in the 100 and 200 Meter Dashes on his way to being named the

MVP of the Meet. Rounding out the Boys stellar showing was Jeremy Elliott who placed 6th in the 3200 Meter Run. The Byrd Girls also represented State by the team of Caroline Campbell, Jeneshia Strong, Leandrae Brossett and Alexis Young finished 7th in the 4 x 400 relay. Strong also took 2nd place in the 800 meter run. Do we have any of our Byrd Girls here? Alright.

Councilman Shyne: Mr. Mayor, we got somebody here from Byrd.

Mayor Glover: Absolutely. Calvary Track Team, come on up. Girls from Calvary had outstanding trip to Baton Rouge, wining five events. Hailey Hesterman was a double winner taking first in the 800 and 1600 Meter runs. By the way, Hailey was a Freshman. So we know we've got three more years of outstanding success to look forward to. Excellent. For the Boys, Josh Lamers led the way with a victory in 110 Meter Hurdles and a 3rd place finish in the 300 Meter Hurdles. Josh then teamed up with Orlando Radford, raise your hand Orlando, Melvin Brown and Brandon Wilson to sweep the 4 x 100 and 4 x 200 Relay events. The Girls team of Kendall Bonnet, Leneisha Wilson, Kelly Wildes and Caroline Toast took 3rd place in the 4 x 200 Relay. Alright. Now, Captain Shreve. The Captain Shreve Boys, are you here? The Captain Shreve Boys shocked the house by placing 1st in one of the most exciting races of the day. The quartet of Everett Payne, raise your had Everett if you're here. Victor Ingram, Tyler and Jerry Shepherd won the 4 x 400 Relay by an eyelash. Nipping Zachary at the tape by 1/100th of a second. That's pretty much as close as you can get. The Shreve Girls and guys lets kinda double up a little bit. There you go. The Shreve Girls have success in the relays as well. The team of Ashley Robinson, Letia Brown, Jennifer Pickens, and Jaquoya Samuels took 1st Place in the 4 x 200 Relay and Brittany Walker swapped places with Letia and helped the Shreve Girls to a very close 2nd Place finish in the 4 x 100 Relay. Walker and Samuels both ran well in the 200 Meter Dash, finishing 3rd and 7th respectively. Samuel completed her sprinting by taking 5th in the 100 Meter Dash. Jacobs and Walker competed well in the 100 Meter Hurdles with Jacobs taking 3rd Place and Walker finishing 4th. Now, lets bring up Evangel. The Evangel Girls saved their best race of the season for the biggest meet of the year. The team of Kim Sasser, Coriana Parham, Ciara Snelling and Hope Benetello had no problem in the 4 x 400 Relay, winning 1st by nearly 8 seconds over the rest of the field. Now, Northwood. Do we have our Northwood folks here? Our final school had a qualify in the Long Jump, the Triple Jump, and the High Jump. Jeneisha (inaudible) not only competed well, but she won the Long Jump, the Triple Jump, and finished 3rd in the High Jump. Almost reminded me of a Jim Thorpe movie where he was a one man track team. Excellent, but Jeneisha then joined her team mates, Jamesha LeJay, Courtney (Inaudible) and Catora Milling to place 7th in the 4 x 100 Relay. Catora also scored in the 100 Meter Dash finishing 6th. Are there any of the other team mates here with you? Lets give them all a round of applause. Now we do not present any of them

certificates of excellence, but we do give them all individually a Mayor's official pin. Thank you Mr. Chairman. It looks as if we're finished here before we even get to half hour. I will take the last remaining seconds and express great appreciation to Bonnie Moore and Marcia Nelson and all of the 1200, 1700 - - - ? How many volunteers this year? All 1300 volunteers who came out and helped us paint almost 40 houses this year as we celebrated the 20th Annual Paint Your Heart Out Shreveport, from what I understand, each and every Council Member had an opportunity to go out and at least have a chance to visit one of the teams painting throughout the course of the day on Saturday. So thank you all for your time and for your attention. Know that you have helped to make a significant difference in the lives of one of our seniors. This is an outstanding initiative that we look forward to carrying on for at the very least another 20 years, and again another overwhelming success. So thank you to all of the staff, thank you to all of our volunteers, and thank you to all of our sponsors who helped to make this year's effort again an outstanding success. Mr. Chairman, turn this back over to you and the Council.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Thank you Mr. Mayor. On behalf of the Council, we certainly want to congratulate all of the students and the parents and the schools that are involved for those achievements. We know that those students are our future leaders, not only of our city and governmental areas, but they're leaders in communities and churches and at home. So we certainly like to see them do well and to be recognized and we certainly want to commend the Mayor's office for setting aside some time to note those accomplishments. Mr. Mayor, did you have any other awards or recognitions that you wanted to take up at this time?

Mayor Glover: In the interest of time Mr. Chairman, we shall yield.

Awards and recognition of distinguished guests by City Council members, not to exceed fifteen minutes.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Does any Council Member have any awards, recognitions or distinguished guests?

Councilman Shyne: In the interest of time, we shall yield Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Everson: I just wanted to make a couple of brief comments. First of all to thank some neighborhood groups that put on some really good events in my district recently. The Highland Restoration Association held their second annual Highland Experience, which invited members of outside communities to come and enjoy what it's like to live in Highland. This year their team was the Garden Tour that was sort of an off, left to center garden tour, kinda non traditional and it was really popular, called

Highland Blends and it was great turnout for that so I wanted to thank all the members of the neighborhood association who made that happen. I also wanted to thank the folks involved in Paint Your Heart Out, the Paint Your Heart Out event this weekend which I'm sure we may focus on a little bit more, but I think it was wonderful work, and obviously great volunteers from the community that show up for that. Also want to just remind everybody that Mudbug Madness starts this week, another great festival in Shreveport, and a great chance to get out and enjoy this early part of the summer. And lastly, just wanted to recognize the passing of five time Mayor of Natchitoches, Joe Sampite` who was also a long time officer and active member in the Louisiana Municipal Association. Many of us probably met and worked with him over the years. And was just a fantastic guy, and really sort of became a character of what its like to care for your community, and to really speak about how great it is to be from Louisiana to enjoy the Louisiana culture, and really was a great salesman for his city. So wanted to recognize his passing and that's all I have to say.

Councilman Corbin: Thank you Mr. Chair. Is John Settle here? I have not seen him. I will speak in this instance instead of John then, the Shreveport Bicycle Club last week held a ride of silence memorial service at the Stoner Skate Park. It's a national event that recognizes people - - - cyclist who had been struck by cars or lost their lives while cycling. And I think it's a good time for us to remember as we enter the summer season a lot of people out training, both those of us who may be cyclist and those of us who are driving, to watch out for one another and remember the three foot rule. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Alright, anyone else? I want to recognize and I think she may have stepped out of the room, when she comes back, Sharon Pilkinton. There she is. I understand that this may be Sharon's last meeting with us on the City Council side. So we certainly appreciate your service to the Council. You've certainly been helpful to many of us. We were new to the Council, and we just didn't want the day to get away without saying thank you for what you do, and we certainly wish you well as you move forward. We think anybody that could put up with Art Thompson deserves some recognition. So I'd just like to give Sharon a hand. I'd like to extend an invitation to those who can this coming Thursday, May 24th at 11:00 at Bill Cockrell Park, West Shreveport Alliance is going to have a press conference. We're going to be talking about their vision for West Shreveport. Both on the economic standpoint as well as community buildup, safety, all those type issues. And I think it's a good thing for communities and neighborhoods to come together and to talk about what they would like to see in their community. No matter how much planning you do, and I think Master Planning is important. I also think planning that comes from our Metropolitan Planning Commission is important. I think we should not forget at the end of the day we are affecting people, their lives, and where they live. So, it's very good to go out and

engage them and give them an opportunity to talk about what they would like to see in their community and in their neighborhoods. So, those of you who can, please stop by. Bill Cockrell Park is off Pines Road, and we'll be over there from 11:00 this Thursday, which is May 24th. So that invitation has certainly been extended to those who wish to come by.

Councilman Shyne: Mr. Chairman, they need to give you credit for making sure that there's no more beer sold out in that area hear?

Councilman S. Jenkins: You know on a serious note though Councilman Shyne, just a week later we had a shooting take place in the apartment complex right next door to the store that was the subject of discussion. It cost someone their life. It was some very serious injuries to another person. I believe an arrest was made. Certainly want to commend the Shreveport Police Department on the way that they handled everything. But on a serious note, I think we need to really think about what we're bringing in the neighborhoods, what the impact of that would be. It's not to single out that store or that location, certainly not trying to do that. But I'm just saying thought needs to go into what we're bringing into these communities and what we're bringing into the neighborhoods and we need to start thinking a little bit more long range. Safety in our homes is very important. People want to feel safe in their communities. And if we allow the wrong things to continue to come into the communities, then the right things are not going to come. You know for the right things to come into these communities, they're going to look at housing, they're going to look at population, Councilwoman. They're going to look at safety issues, those are economic issues that any company is going to consider when they're located and investing money in our neighborhoods. So once again,

Councilman Shyne: And I give you credit for the position that you took on that matter.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Well I think this is going to be a press conference. I think its going to be something that other communities may follow up on. Because people want to be heard. They don't want certain things in their neighborhoods. They don't want certain things going on out there that they have to live with. We just can't make all those decisions down here at Government Plaza that are affecting people out there and not taking the time, not to say that these things are not being done. And not taking time to give them an opportunity to have their input. So we certainly want to extend that invitation to persons who would like to come by. Does any other Council Members have any awards, recognition or distinguished guests? Okay Mayor Glover, do we have any communications relative to city business?

Communications of the Mayor relative to city business other than awards and recognition of distinguished guests.

Mayor Glover: Again Mr. Chairman, in the interest of time, we shall defer.

Reports

Property Standards Report (*Res. 7 of 2003*)

Councilman S. Jenkins: Okay, does any member have any concerns relative to property standards?

Revenue Collection Plan & Implementation Report (*Res. No.114 of 2009*)

Surety Bond Forfeitures Report (*Res 238 of 2010*)

EMS Transports Report (*Res 239 of 2010*)

Councilman S. Jenkins: I believe our revenue collection plans, our Surety Bond Forfeiture reports, our EMS Transports reports, all of those are being sent to us electronically, and hopefully all the council members are getting those at the appropriate times, and certainly raise those concerns whenever you're in the meeting, or whenever you need to make contact with those persons who are responsible for that. At this point, I think Councilman Corbin, you had a motion you wish to make.

Councilman Corbin: Yes Mr. Chair, I would like to make a motion that we suspend the rules and to take up Resolution No. 97 and the MPC Appeal of Larkin Development and associated public comments.

Motion by Councilman Corbin, seconded by Councilman O. Jenkins to suspend the rules to take up Resolution No. 97 and the MPC Appeal of Larkin Development and associated public comments.. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 7. Nays: None.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Okay, what we'll do at this particular point, is I believe we have some people who wish to speak. Now we'll be talking on the MPC Appeal as well as Resolution No. 97, which are on the agenda today. We talked a little bit yesterday. I know that there are people on both sides of the issue. What I wanted to do today in some respects is allow persons who want to speak to speak on it. But we know there may be some primary persons who need to speak on both sides of these issues. So what

we wanted to do today is allow each side as far as a primary person who wants to lay out the case at least 15 minutes, so they will not be interrupted to lay it out. Other persons who will be coming in and speaking, we're going to try to impose the 3-minute rule as best we can. Now we know sometimes it can become something more than that. We'll try to give it some more time, but we're hoping that we can impose the 3-minute rule. Is there, let me ask this. As far as persons who are supporting the appeal, do we have a primary person here to speak on that? Alright sir. Come forward and give us your name and address.

Mr. Timothy Larkin: (221 Evangeline Brook, Bossier City, LA) Good afternoon Council, I'm before you to appeal the decision rendered at the MPC meeting held earlier this month. Just a bit of background, The Larkin Development purchased two tracts of land to build a neighborhood community called Esplanade. One is a 100-acre tract from a private landowner, and the other was a 36.99-acre tract from Shreveport Development Corporation. I'll point to the - - - this is the 100-acre tract, and this is the 36.99-acre tract. When we purchased the 100-acre tract, it needed to be planned and zoned. It fronted only Railsback Road, and had a narrow private driveway for its access. The 36.99-acre tract we purchased had zoning of R-1-D PUD, residential zoning on it. It had frontage only along Flournoy Lucas Road with an existing driveway access permit. Council, an ordinance zoning the 100-acre tract of land owned by Larkin Development was signed into law in January of 2008. Now the zoning was granted with stipulations and conditions. The one that we have focused on is the one that a provision requires that we build a bridge, a gated entrance on Railsback Road with controlled ingress and egress. A roadway connection from Railsback Road to the bridge, and a roadway connection to Flournoy Lucas Road from the bridge. Additionally, of course implicit in zoning and platting is the expectation that the builder constructs water, sewer, roadway, sidewalks, street lights, utility services all to city standards required by the city engineer's office and inspected under their authority. Since the passage of that ordinance, we have filed four plats and street right of ways. To date, we have presented four plats to the MPC. They were approved. Unit 1 was approved with two home sites. Unit 2 was approved with 017 home sites, Unit 3 approved with 23 residential home sites, and Unit 4 approved with 18 residential home sites. All of these plats have been through your typical process at the MPC, the engineer's office, this council. All of the plats are now in the city limits, all of the plats are recorded. Additionally we dedicated a water line servitude from the bridge to Flournoy Lucas Road, and that was to comply with a requirement by the City of Shreveport to install a large water line (inaudible) that would stretch from Ellerbe Road to Flournoy Lucas Road, and supplement the Ellerbe Road with the pressure and the volume that is so high at Flournoy Lucas Road. We built a 12-inch water line that entire distance. We dedicated a sewer line servitude from the bridge to Flournoy Lucas Road to comply with a design requirement to transmit

wastewater in the entire community to the existing major city line located on the north side of Flournoy Lucas Road. And we dedicated the road right of way from the bridge to Flournoy Lucas Road. The first construction that we undertook after the filing of the plats was to construct a bridge over Bayou Pierre. That was to provide for the delivery of construction materials from Flournoy Lucas Road and avoid the Railsback Road. That bridge construction among many agencies sees the most major ones that were required permits and approvals were Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development, Federal Emergency Management Agency, Caddo Parish Engineers office, the Caddo Levy Board and U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. The bridge permits and (inaudible) fees and consultant fees paid to the agencies within access of \$75,000 including payments to Caddo Parish Engineers Office for inspections of the work in the amount of \$45,848. The Parish Engineers Office certified in a letter dated February 1, 2011 that the bridge was built to be approved plans and specifications, and it was built with our private funds of approximately \$1.4 (million). Following construction of the bridge, we constructed a stabilized base road to it so that construction materials could be delivered to the site as we began the construction of each of the platted units. Our consulting civil engineers then produced plans for all of these improvements. They were all built and satisfied requirements by the Federal, State and local authorities. And so today, completed and in place after that permitting process and as we speak, the following improvements are in place in approximate quantities. Approximately 4,000 lineal feet of residential street in place. 8,000 lineal feet of sidewalks, 2,000 feet of community trails, 4,000 lineal feet of underground storm drain pipe, 8,000 lineal feet of water mains, 6800 lineal feet of sewer mains, 2,000 lineal feet of gas mains. An independence sewer lift pump station is built to the city standards and requirements. A 9-acre lake, an entrance at the Railsback Road fitted for the required gates in the ordinance that is called out in the ordinance, that a complete electrical infrastructure system for the community is in place and operating a complete street lightening system for the community in place and operating. These improvements were built requiring more than 56 different permits, authorizations, all duly executed under the supervision of our planning and engineering consultants, and all of the agencies involved. Permits and Inspections expenses to date to these agencies are more than \$475,000. The estimated total investment in that we have in the property at this time is approximately \$10,000,000. Our consultants designed a roadway recently to connect the bridge and Flournoy Lucas Road. The plans for the roadway have been certified in the letter from DOTD that they don't conflict with the extension of LA 3132. We believe the letter to be accurate. Those plans are ready for construction. So there was one very important thing that we felt like we really wanted to know before we began the construction of that road, and that was that upon completing the road designed by our consultant and engineers, and reviewed by the DOTD and permitted by the DOTD and reviewed by the Shreveport Engineers Office. We put the question to the MPC, once built, would the

existence of this road then satisfy the requirement of the law that was passed in 2008. And the reason we did that is because of the improvements (inaudible) and a lot of money. And we just really felt like that if we asked them and they said well no, this wouldn't comply, we'd probably follow that up with a 'what would you like us to do' so it does the logic in it. We ran into just a terrible meeting, just upset, a very long opposition by the LA 3132 Coalition, and they just vehemently objected and we came away and we did not learn whether the roadway would satisfy the ordinance. And so, we would like to know that. We'd like to build a road, and that's the story.

Councilman Webb: Mr. Larkin, where is the bridge at on the map, and where is Railsback?

Mr. Larkin: The bridge is right there. By the way, this is an aerial photograph with our site superimposed over it, drawn on it and I'll point out some things that I mentioned. Here they are. This is Railsback Road right here. That of course is Flournoy Lucas Road. This drawing has a - - -

Mayor Glover: Mr. Chairman, just out of point of caution, are we making sure we're capturing that audio for the record.

Ms. Johnson: That'll be hard.

Councilman Webb: You got another microphone.

Ms. Johnson: I'm going to need him to speak up.

Mr. Larkin: Lets see. The bridge, first of all, this is superimposed over an aerial photograph, and I want to point out a few things and make sure that nothing is misrepresented to you here right now. Okay? And so let me clearly show that this is an aerial photograph, and this is our 100-acre tract and this is the Railsback Road right down there at the bottom. And this is the 36.99-acre tract right here, and that his the existing entrance at the Flournoy Lucas Road. Now, this is the existing bridge there right now that goes over Bayou Pierre, and it is by constructing that bridge that it makes the roadway connection required in the ordinance from here (inaudible) I'm going to just approximate for you the different units of development that have been recorded. And so, this would be Unit 1 right here. It only consists of two lots. Unit 2 consists of 17 more lots that approximately go like this to this area right in here. Unit 3 is an area that goes from Railsback Road down around the lake that we built that is in place, and it consists of 23 lots I believe. And this is Unit 4 right here that sits right near the bridge. And now, here's something that I think is very important that I want to make real clear so if someone listening, so you'll know exactly what the purpose of it is. The existing

property that the city owns right now is a 16+ acre tract. That tract does not have a roadway in it of course. But it is right here. I'm running my finger around that tract, and you will see that what we did here, this is an artist's conception and it does not represent anything that any engineer has studied. It is our speculation on how the roadway might appear if it were built there. And it's done by some assumptions and by some geometric conjecture, but this is not something that DOTD or anybody has done. This is an artist's conception. So, it is our assumption that the intersection would have that appearance because that is somewhat standard. It is our assumption that the intersection would utilize the property that the city has bought for that purpose. It is our assumption that the geometry would be such that the highway would head in that direction as opposed to this direction. Our assumption for that of course is the logic that is the direction of I-69 (inaudible). So, you might show that highway right there, that's the (inaudible) highway right there. But what we're doing is when we - - - if this (inaudible) right here met this (inaudible) and we asked DOTD would the presence of that roadway alignment impede the extension of 3132.

Councilman Webb: Do you have the entry way to Railsback built right now?

Mr. Larkin: Yes sir, I do.

Councilman Webb: So there's nothing stopping you from building your houses and using the Railsback entry and exit?

Mr. Larkin: What's stopping me is I must comply with the ordinance, the law and the ordinance state that until I put that roadway in right there, I may not, I can't get a building permit. That's what my understanding is and seems there doesn't seem to be any conflict with that.

Councilman Webb: Well let me have somebody from the MPC come up because I want to ask you about that. If he has a just like Twelve Oaks only has one entry in and one entry out, why would he not be allowed to have his one entry in and one entry out on Railsback?

Mr. Jambor: (Inaudible) existing Railsback Drive into - - -

Councilman Webb: I have not.

Mr. Jambor: It's a very narrow precarious with a very odd configuration which tees into Norris Ferry and Ellerbe. The original application that he made was to correct those things and not have a Flournoy Lucas entry at all. (Inaudible) the owners were not willing to sell, and that became of situation of it not being available to him, and he

withdrew that and subsequently filed this application, but yes, I'm speaking for Mr. Larkin now, but that was in fact his original design to improve the Railsback, what I might call you know inadequacies if you will and that was not pursued because of the opposition of people who owned the property that it would be necessary to make those corrections.

Councilman Webb: Okay. I don't have any further questions for you.

Councilman Corbin: If you would stay up there for a second. And Tim, I think you answered the first part of my question, and then Units 1 through 4, the 50 approved home sites, all of those home sites are between the bridge and Railsback Road?

Mr. Larkin: Yes they are.

Councilman Corbin: And the parcel of property that you bought from Shreveport Development from the bridge to Flournoy Lucas Road, whether you improved the road there or not, no homes could be built on that property? And I guess that's a question to both. Without additional MPC action - - -

Mr. Larkin: That is correct. We definitely intend to build homes on the property and we definitely intend to plan it and we definitely intend to plan it with the extension of 3132 in mind. And with that being a mobile thing, we have not planned that. But we definitely intend to put homes there at a time when the plan that we present works for that, and let me take that a little further. We cannot - - - that land is not subdivided and in order for us to subdivide it, or build a home - - - might be a technicality but it possibly you could build one home on that, and we wouldn't want to, but anyway in order to build homes, we would bring another plat to the MPC after we had given them a revised master plan for that area. And after they had approved the revised master plan for that area and of course that would be done coordinating with all the other planned improvements that are going to happen or not happen. And so,

Mr. Jambor: (Inaudible) be a rezoning.

Mr. Larkin: So in, I guess summary, the process that would have to go is we would have to file a plat that would make it through all the public hearings and (inaudible) and the reasoning that goes behind those things, and we're not - - - we're not asking about that, and we don't want that and when we do, we understand that until these other things are in place, certainly from a standpoint of everything that is on that side of the road, its going to be a while until we hear about the highway alignment. And then as soon as we hear that, then we'll begin to do planning that's based on that.

Councilman Corbin: And that's what I wanted to do was clarify that for other members of the Council, because I think some - - - there was some information yesterday or some confusion that houses may be built on that northern most tract, and there was also confusion that there was talk of a road or other development that within the 16-acre city tract, and I think we've clarified that.

Mr. Larkin: Not at this time.

Mr. Jambor: This 36.(whatever)-acre, the zoning for that is part of the zoning for Twelve Oaks, and (inaudible) basically the rights that he was given (inaudible) Twelve Oaks was given in exchange for removing the (inaudible) from the 36.whatever-acre tract, because we were preserving that for 3132. And that was very specifically laid out with that in mind. Until that changes, actually there was no reason to entertain a new development.

Councilman S. Jenkins: The state is doing a study to determine the path of the extension, is that my understanding?

Mr. Jambor: I'll defer to Mr. Larkin to tell you stage at which they're at. Stage 0 (inaudible), Stage 1 I think is being (inaudible).

Councilman S. Jenkins: If you don't mind, come up for a minute. What I'm trying to determine. I understand the State of Louisiana is doing a study to determine the path or the feasibility of the extension of 3132. And I'm trying to get an idea of what can we expect to get back from that study and how long would it take to get some information back.

Mr. Kent Rogers: (*NLCOG*) The feasibility study, y'all had asked a couple of questions yesterday, and I had received an email from Dr. Eric Kalivoda today, and he responded (I'm trying to find the dates), but roughly the feasibility study would be completed by the end of June and available for Public Comment around the end of June.

Councilman S. Jenkins: 2012?

Mr. Rogers: Yes. That's simply the feasibility portion. From there we go into the full blown environmental, which is roughly an 18-month period for the environmental process. But what the feasibility will do is - - - the feasibility is looking at anything and everything within those corridors, which is the requirement for federal highways. The environmental phase would be narrowing those down to some specific alignments.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Would a part of that study be something that would actually tell us a preferred path or a suggested path for 3132?

Mr. Rogers: No, feasibility study will recommend corridors to bring forward into the full blown environmental. At the end of the full blown environmental, that's when you have the preferred corridor or preferred alignment. Preferred alignment literally - - - you know we need 150-300 feet to construct this road. His corridors are roughly a thousand foot wide.

Councilman S. Jenkins: That's another phase of the - - -

Mr. Rogers: Right, and that will begin as soon as they're done. As soon as the Stage 0 is completed, roughly end of June. As soon as everybody signs off on it, buys off on it, we've selected a consulting team to begin the Stage 1 environmental work, and as soon as they say go, we'll provide 'em a notice to proceed and say go. That could take 15-18 months timeframe. But we will have a good idea of where the area where the alignment's going to be at the beginning of that process. If y'all don't mind I would like to read, because y'all asked the question yesterday, request for verification and clarification from DOTD, and I'll give a copy of this to Art after I read it. This is from Dr. Eric Kalivoda, he is the Assistant Secretary for the Department of Transportation and Development. As you know the feasibility study for the southern extension of LA 3132 is nearly complete. The study should be released in late June 2012. The public will have an opportunity to review and comment on the results and the conclusions prior to the study being finalized. Two of the three alternative alignments being evaluated extend south from the current 3132 terminus at Flournoy Lucas Road. Both of these alignments follow the same path until well south of the Larkin Development Corporation (LDC) property. On May 21, 2012, you requested clarification of my letter to Mr. Timothy Larking, dated July 29, 2011 documenting the results of a meeting two days earlier among DOTD, NLCOG, Cith of Shreveport, MPC and LDC regarding access to the LDC property south of Flournoy Lucas. AT issue is the closing statement from that letter. *"The future extension of the Inner Loop from Flournoy Lucas (LA 523) to the south shall not be impeded by the improvements discussed herein or by any DOTD, NLCOG, City, MPC, or LDC actions."* This state means exactly what it says, that no party will take any action that will impede the southern extension of 3132. I have one potential concept of the LDC development that shows cul-de-sac roads extending into the likely path of the LA 3132 extension. I have others that show connections to Flournoy Lucas directly opposite the existing LA 3132 southbound exit ramp. While it is believed that LDC has abandoned these concepts, it is imperative that no party take action that will impede the southern extension of LA 3132. On August 1, 2012, Mr. Larkin responded to my letter acknowledging receipt and attaching a drawing of the Forbing Ridge Drive. At that time, none of the parties believed that the

construction of Forbing Ridge Drive as shown on the aforementioned drawing would impede the extension of LA 3132. Based on review of preliminary layouts being developed as part of the feasibility study, it appears that the north end of the bridge and approach will be close to or follow within the LA 3132 extension right of way, but not conflict with the 3132 roadway. The engineering on the feasibility study alignments is still very much a work in progress and efforts will continue to increase the separation between the bridge and LA 3132 extension. If a portion of Forbing Ridge does fall ultimately within the 3132 right of way, it can remain via permit; however, driveway connections or connections with other public streets would not be allowed. Regards, Eric Kalivoda.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Okay, I recognize Kent on some of this you're the messenger, and so when I say this make sure you understand where I'm coming from. When we started this discussion, we'll say April 2011, and I may have missed my month, but I think we're in April. We had a Phase 0 thumbnail - - -

Councilman Shyne: Councilman, just one minute. Could you all take those maps down for right now, because I think people in the back are trying to look at us while we're talking and I know if I was out there, it would be - - - there you go, that's a whole lot better. Very impolite. Thank you Councilman, I'm sorry.

Councilman O. Jenkins: And we had a presumed or maybe an expected Phase 0 completion date, initially December 2011 if I'm not mistaken. And we all kinda associated there may be a one or two month delay. We're clearly well beyond the one or two month delay, we're in June at the earliest now. Didn't we start a process that you know looking at that timeline was estimated to take six months for the first, that's taken almost more than a year, you started another phase - - - I'm just going through the timeline to follow my reasoning, that's supposed to take a year and a half. Okay? For our Phase 1. Well if you double back, we'd still be at this three years from now. My point is I think there's some suggestion there could be a misconstrued suggestion that this eminent on the decision here in terms of a pathway or a proposed - - - and I for one am having a little struggle believing there is some eminent decision on this proposed - - -. Maybe it'll be more clear to us in June, but I certainly don't think and correct me if I'm wrong, that we're going to be in January with some idea of where any path is really indicated at that point. Maybe narrowed down is the term you would use?

Mr. Rogers: I think we'll have a very - - - you're saying January, come this January - - -

Councilman O. Jenkins: January 2013.

Mr. Rogers: Yeah, I think we'll have a very, very strong idea. Because the last half of that environmental work is literally, they have to go out and do shovel digs within that 300 foot corridor. Do some very specific environmental work on that 300 foot corridor as to literally are there any Indian artifacts within the area or are there any you know unknown oil tanks in there or what not in there. I mean, they literally - - - the very last portion of that is within that 300 foot corridor. So, yes we should know that 300 foot corridor roughly by January timeframe.

Councilman O. Jenkins: I appreciate your optimism at this point.

Mr. Rogers: I will tell you that I know that the consulting firm that's doing the Stage 0 did not receive their notice to proceed from DOTD until Halloween, because I got a letter that said 'Trick or Treat'.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Well I guess then when could we expect the consulting firm, because the Phase 1, is that a separate contractor, or has that been - - -?

Mr. Rogers: Yes sir, it's a separate contract (inaudible) actually be through NLCOG. We have selected a firm, we're negotiating that scope and contract with them now. Our goal is that we'll have that all finalized and ready to go. And as soon as DOTD and federal highways say yes, we accept this Phase 0, then that day, I'll say here's your notice to proceed, go.

Councilman Shyne: Mr. Chairman, I believe we got two or three things on the table. I believe the main thing is whether we're going to override the decision that was made by the MPC. I happen to be one of those persons that was at that meeting that day. And it was a long meeting, and of course it's noting wrong with having long meetings if you're taking care of business. That's what you sign up for when you sign up for public service. I thought it was a good meeting, and I thought both sides presented their information to the MPC, and the MPC made a decision that there would be no action. And I believe that in your letter that you just got through reading it was indicated that maybe there should not be any action until the state could come up with a corridor. And did you say June? What was it the end of June, around the 18th of June or the 20th of June?

Mr. Rogers: End of June is what this says.

Councilman Shyne: Right, around the end of the June that we would have some idea, and that up until that time, no action should be taking place.

Mr. Rogers; They were - - - I interpreted this letter and I interpreted the original letter as part of what Larkin Development presented. The response letter back from Larkin Development, it included a roadway, which I think was part of the application process and also part of the appeal process.

Councilman Shyne: But did I understand you to also say in that letter that there should not be any action taken?

Mr. Rogers: Correct. I'll read it. *"At issue is the closing statement. The future extension of the Inner Loop from Flournoy Lucas Road to LA 523 to the south, shall not be impeded by the improvements discussed herein or by any other DOTD, NLCOG, City, MPC or LDC actions."*

Councilman Shyne: Okay, that's fine. Okay.

Mr. Rogers: *"Impeded by the improvements discussed herein"*. Those improvements discussed herein were the map that Mr. Larkin presented.

Councilman Shyne: But it say it shall not be impeded.

Mr. Rogers: If you do anything other than what was on that map, that would be impeding or that would be something different than all these parties saw and said, yes, this is okay.

Councilman Shyne: My position at this particular time Mr. Chairman would be to support the ruling of the MPC, because they looked at both positions, and they want to make sure that no action takes place in there that's going to impede the building of 3132. That's my position. And matter of fact, I received a letter from the Shreveport Chamber of Commerce, who I would say is one of our premier organizations in this city, and I know they would not be against the Larkin building his development in there, but in the meantime I think they understand that 3132 is more important. And I would hope Mr. Chairman, and I would hope this council, that we would not do anything that would impede the building of 3132. If I'm not mistaken, I believe that's what the and I see maybe a couple of members of the MPC that's here. And they can tell you, they looked at the information that was presented before them by the 3132 group and by Mr. Larkin. Their decision was that 'hey look, you have a secondary road. Use the secondary road, but we're not going to give you the permission to build a permanent road. And the piece of legislation that's before us is asking us to over rule the decision that was made by the MPC, and give this group the permission to build a permanent road. I think at this time, that would be a mistake on our part. Because I'm hearing that after June, June 18th or lets say at the end of June, then we will have some

more information back from the state. Giving us more information on where 3132 will go. Now, I wouldn't want us to act too fast, do something that the state would come back and say, 'Hey look, I'm sorry, we can't do 3132 because of X, Y, and Z.' 3132 is too important to this city. 3132 is more important to the city than Mr. Larkin's development. And I understand his development is more important to him than 3132. I can understand that. If I was in his position, I'd probably feel the same way. But as a governmental body, we have the legal and the moral obligation to make sure that we look out for what's best for the city. And what's best for the city is to make sure that we build 3132. And this is not a personal decision. I love everybody that's involved in this process, and I understand that we've taken time. But you take time with important processes. If I'm having a heart problem, I don't want to just rush and let somebody operate on me. I want to make sure that I have the best doctor. Even if it takes a while, if it's not a life or death situation. This is really not a life or death situation. But this is a life situation to our city. You can go anywhere and you see where transportation arteries are being built everyday. I don't know a city that has stopped a transportation artery because of a development that's being built, and the transportation artery is going to impact the entire city. So, I don't know what we're asking for when we're asked to - - - I don't know what we're asking for when we ask to remand this back to the MPC. Are we asking them to change their decision, and to give Mr. Larkin the opportunity to build a permanent road there? Because they would present it because - - - Mr. Jagers, could you come back up please for a minute? I think you were at the MPC meeting, right? You were not there? Who, who - - - is there anybody here from your office that was there? Okay. I believe I sat here for maybe 2 ½ or 3 hours, and it seems like to me, each side probably gave their best shot. Was that your understanding?

Mr. Jean: I would say so at the time, yes sir.

Councilman Shyne: Yeah, each side gave their best shot at that particular time. And the MPC looked at it and analyzed the information that was given to them, and the vote was what?

Mr. Jean: It was a unanimous vote.

Councilman Shyne: It was a unanimous vote to hold up. Now if we remand this back to the MPC, what are we telling them? Change your mind? Give Mr. Larkin the opportunity to build the road? And when in June I believe the letter said, you're going to give Art a copy of it right? And could you make some copies and pass it around, that we would have some information on where we need to go? My position instead of remanding it back, and say lets table it at this particular point until we can get some more information on where this road is going to go. Because this is too important. We need 3132. This was the idea started about 20 years ago. Matter of fact, its an economic

because its going to help transportation get to the Port. And the Port is an economic engine. We need to do whatever we can to make is assessable for people to get to the Port. And so, instead of remanding this back to the MPC, because they've made a decision on it. If we're not going to vote it up or down, I think we need to table it. Because I don't know what the MPC could do. It maybe change their minds and say, 'Well yeah, you all remanded it back to us, so we're going to change our minds and make sure that he can build that permanent road.' Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Alright. Let me ask a question. Then I'm going to get to Councilman Everson and hopefully we can - - - I think Mr. Larkin needs to finish his comments if he wasn't and then we're going to let whoever is going to be presenting on the other side present. Building a permanent road also leads to issuing building permits. Are those two things tied together?

Mr. Jean: Yes. The stipulation in the original zoning case required a connection from the bridge that is located over Bayou Pierre, matter of fact, it required the bridge, and it required the connection to Flournoy Lucas Road, before any building permits could be issued.

Councilman Everson: Actually my question is for Kent Rogers actually, and if we get a copy of that letter then I guess it'll probably be answered, but I wanted to make sure. What was the date of the message that you read to us a moment ago?

Mr. Rogers: Today. May 22, 2012. I got it like 1:30 p.m.

Councilman Everson: Okay, and did I understand it to say that the construction of the road as presented and if that's the same that's been presented to us now, does not - - - it would not impede any of the proposed corridors?

Mr. Rogers: Here's the line he has. *"Based on a review of preliminary layouts being developed as part of the feasibility study, it appears that the north end of the bridge and approach will be close to or follow within the LA 3132 extension right of way, but not conflict with the 3132 roadway. The engineering on the feasibility study alignments is still very much a work in progress, and efforts will continue to increase the separation between the bridge and the 3132 extension. If a portion of Forbing Ridge Road does ultimately fall within the 3132 extension right of way, it can remain via permit. However, driveway connections or connections with other public streets would not be allowed within 3132 extension right of way."*

Councilman Everson: Okay, thank you. I just wanted to clarify again, that this was new information you know as of today. And I wanted to better understand that part. Now that we have a copy of this, that's helpful. Thank you.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Mr. Larkin, you have some additional time. If you wanted to use that to make some further comments.

Mr. Larkin: A couple of things just to finish up this. I think its been the third or the fourth time that we asked the DOTD, DOTD Deputy Secretary has been asked if the road that we're building will impede or conflict with 3132, and once again, he said it does not. And let me make one thing clear. He also goes on to state that you can't build anything over in the right of way off of their, and we don't intend to do that and we can't do that without the MPC filing of or having a plat and we can't build any houses in there without filing a plat. So I don't know how to be any more clear about it. But again, one of the things that was so very clear to me in that meeting was the continued doubt that was cast, that Mr. Kalivoda's finding might not be accurate. And I was glad that we asked him again and got it again. And so it would seem to me that the introduction of that new information, if for no other reason is a good reason for the MPC to look at this again. If they were operating without this information that is still another confirmation that there's no conflict, perhaps in light of that and in otherwise doubt of it before, that they would find differently. And so it makes sense to me.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Let me ask you a question Mr. Larkin. Do you think that Council should have some concern that if you actually went out, constructed the road, is issued building permits and began to build homes there, should we not have some concerns that if there is a decision about where the highway is going to go, the existence of homes is going to impact that? If that 100-acre tract has houses on it, don't you think that that would impact a later decision about where the highway is going to go?

Mr. Larkin: I'm not sh - - -

Councilman S. Jenkins: Maybe you're not understanding. Let me rephrase it a little bit better. We don't really know where the highway is going to go at this stage. What I'm saying is the big picture is if you construct a road, that you would be issued building permits to begin to build homes and other improvements on that 100-acre tract. What happens if you build homes and the come back next year and say that this is where we wanted the highway done. Isn't that going to impact a decision about the highway? The highway would not be able to go through peoples' homes or you would end up having to purchase that property as a right of way for the highway. I'm just saying, should we not have some concern about that?

Mr. Larkin: Well here's - - - in other words you're talking about should we be considered having a construction moratorium in the corridor? I think you're asking since there is a corridor there, should we halt construction in there because it might affect where the highways goes. And that is a (inaudible) decision to make. And let me say this. The three corridors that are under consideration right now are shown on that map right there. To my knowledge, I am one of - - - I am a company that has improvements and construction going on in there, and I don't think anyone has gone to more - - - to greater pains to check with the authorities that are planning the highway to make absolutely sure that what we're doing presently does not conflict. Just like you've heard three times from the authorities that what we're doing, because we have asked does not conflict. However, let me say this. The other two corridors go through places where there is considerable construction, tens of millions of dollars in construction. And so, if you're asking is it possible that the construction in those corridors as well as some construction in our corridor might other wise cause the highway to be moved from that particular corridor, I think that it is a real possibility. I just don't think that it makes sense for the city to look at the things that are being studied and to say to everyone, we're going to cease all construction in all those corridors. So, I think that if you are constructing in one of those corridors, it is wise and responsible for you as a developer what we have done is to consider what you are building there, and to go to those authorities that are in charge of such things, and present to them what you are doing, and then ask them to respond in writing. And when we presented what we were doing to DOTD, they responded now, three or four times, that if you do what you presented to us, you will not impede 3132. Now whether there is other construction going on in other corridors, or in ours that might impede 3132, I am not - - - I can't answer that. But I don't think it's impossible.

Councilman Webb: Mr. Larkin, earlier when the MPC gentleman was up here, I was asking about Railsback, and he said I think if you were to upgrade Railsback, that you could get your permits to build without going out to Flournoy Lucas. And he said that the neighbors did not want you to do that.

Mr. Larking: Well let me say this. The access to our development has always been planned to have an access from Flournoy Lucas Road. Makes a lot of sense.

Councilman Webb: Well my point is, if you were to upgrade that, go ahead and get your permits and build your houses, a year from now, two years from now, whenever this winds up being, you could then go ahead and build your other road, and you'd have a road going in and out of both directions. Otherwise the way I'm looking at this, you've got two sides to this thing that one side wants you to go out through Railsback, and the other side you want to go out Flournoy Lucas, and my sense of the word is going back to the MPC is just going to - - - they already voted 7-0 NO. And the way

I'm looking at this, this thing is going to wind up in the courts is what's going to happen. And to me, I'd just as soon not delay it and just let it go to the courts and let the courts make the decision. And then we'll live with it, but I don't see going back to the MPC is going to resolve anything. And if we overturn the MPC, then one side or the other is going to file a lawsuit, it's going to wind up in the courtroom. So.

Mr. Larkin: Well, here's I have to deal - - - you know I have to deal with the law, and I know you understand that. And there's not a question of whether we're - - - the law that's in place does not leave us an option to upgrade that entrance at Railsback Road, but if such a law existed, we'd have to follow it.

Councilman Webb: Explain that.

Mr. Larkin: Well, when the zoning ordinance that was recommended from the MPC was then adopted into law as the stipulations that we're required to comply with. And that is what we have today spent literally millions of dollars doing. And also in the course of doing that have represented to others who have done business with us, that that's the law and that is the plan. And so what we have now is we have - - - we've come, we're on the - - - what would this be, five years later? And \$10,000,000 later complying with the law, and making these obligations with everyone, and then being very careful that the things that we do will not impede the 3132 highway, have all these things in place. And so we didn't go to the MPC expecting first of all, we do understand that they actually don't have the authority to change the law as you all would. They can recommend that. So, when we went to the MPC, we never guessed that when we asked them, when we build this road, will it satisfy the stipulation, we never guessed that what they would say is 'Well, actually even though the law says that you must build this, we don't want you to do this.'

Councilman Webb: Who said, we don't want you to do this?

Mr. Larkin: That was the finding of the MPC, that they would not like to build the road, and they would not like to have the road remain as a requirement to get the building permits. That was one of the findings that they had. We didn't know what to do with that information. Because the law is still there, and the law still says that you must (inaudible) that road up to that million and half dollar bridge, and take it out to Flournoy Lucas and we have in place agreements with all kinds of people and that's going to happen because it's the law. So, if the MPC rule that we don't have to follow the law, then I think you would - - - I'm not sure what you do. So what we hoped is that you all could look at all this, and you could hear this information and one of the things we hoped that you would be able to do is to once again confirm from the Deputy Secretary that what we're building and what we've turned in to him and the letters will

not conflict. So everyone would feel good about us doing that. And then what we thought is with that new information and with this realization that you might look at what happen, realize that it wasn't really practical for the MPC to actually change the law, and then what we hoped that you would do is you would see that, and then you would recommend that the MPC again, address the request that we had, which was to make a determination that if when we build this road, will it satisfy the stipulation which now is the law. That's the best explanation that I have for you.

Councilman Webb: I want to get him to come back up from the MPC, if you will. Yeah, you. Jambor, right? He's saying that the MPC changed the law.

Mr. Jambor: No, they don't - - - you guys pass legislation.

Councilman Webb: Yeah, I know, so I that's why I want to know why is he feeling that y'all changed the law?

Mr. Jambor: Well, he's implying that their decision is not necessarily contrary to the original ordinances. It might be more accurate (inaudible).

Councilman S. Jenkins: Well, hold up a minute, we're going to get a chance to debate it. Lets get these comments. Councilman Webb got the floor.

Councilman Webb: Thank you Mr. Chairman. So, there again, going back to the Railsback, keep going back to this. You mentioned earlier that originally he was told that if he improved that entry - - -

Mr. Jambor: No, that was his application.

Councilman Webb: That was his application.

Mr. Jambor: To improve it, but as it turns out, if he did not own the property necessary to improve it correctly, the people that did weren't willing to sell it.

Councilman Webb: Okay, I understand that now. Okay, that's where I was really confused about that.

Mr. Jambor: That's when a Plan B involved.

Councilman Webb: I got you. Okay. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Larkin: I just wanted to say that I don't want to argue that, but the end result is essentially the same here, but those - - - I don't think that all those things were accurate

and I'll bet if we were able to talk about it in another forum, we could do it, but I don't think that (inaudible) certainly the end result.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Alright, you finished Mr. Larkin? Are you finished with your comments?

Mr. Larkin: Of course, I always - - - it seems like I'm poorly chosen with my words. If I led someone to believe that you know the MPC recommended that - - - the point that I wanted to make is that my understanding here is that we're operating under an obligation and the law. And we did not think that the ordinance that we're operating under was relieved or changed by the action of the MPC. I'll put it that way. So, and none of this is otherwise suggest that it was anything - - - we're not saying that the MPC is anything other than - - - they made a decision based on information that was given, and we now have new information. And what we hope happens is it gets to go back to them and they get to consider the new information in light of all that's taken place. And I think that does conclude my comments.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Alright, thank you sir. Do we have a primary person that's going to speak in opposition to the appeal? Please come forward and give us your name and address.

Mr. Jim McMichael: (P.O. Box 72, Shreveport, LA) I represent today, not only Willis Knighton Health System, but the Finish 3132 Coalition as well. I will be the only formal presenter on behalf of those two groups. And that decision is based on your comments yesterday about the scope and content of the hearing that you hope to have today, and frankly the tone and tenor of some of the discussion yesterday with the coalition members led the coalition to feel like any additional presenters from the coalition might simply be an unnecessary and pointless distraction to what we're doing here today. I think Councilman Webb is accurate when he says this is going to end up in court. As a matter of fact, one of the decisions that you have available to you today may very well be the last step before it leaves the political arena and gets into the judicial arena. And I'll be frank again, the coalition and Willis Knighton given the history, the procedural and substantive history of the 3132 dispute that has been brewing for a number of years, we welcome that. And I'm sure there are others, perhaps others in this chamber who also would welcome the arena shift to the judicial arena. I think we need to put into context what the MPC decision did, and what it meant to Mr. Larkin and his development plans. If I misstate, I'm pretty sure Mr. Larkin will correct me, and I'm very sure Mr. Arceneaux will correct me. So I say that with that invitation in mind. As I understand the original zoning ordinance, it said to Mr. Larkin, you can't start building houses until you've put a road and a bridge to Flournoy Lucas and we're going to have to approve that road. He asked for the MPC to give him the approval for that road, but

by then, the issue of where is 3132 going to be built and we don't want to do anything that impedes or puts in peril our ability to extend 3132. The MPC was not willing to give him permission to construct his permanent road in an area that still is under consideration for being a preferred route for 3132. So they said, 'No Mr. Larkin, we're not going to approve your building a permanent road in that location. You've got a temporary road there, you've used it for years for construction purposes, it's been just fine. You haven't really told us and articulated any reason why that road won't do until we can figure out where 3132 is going. Now the other hand, they understand that Mr. Larkin is the developer. He doesn't make money until he starts building houses. He stuck a lot of money in that project. And we understand that. Everybody understands that. So the other part of the MPC decision was for them to consider whether they were going to grant building permits without the requirement of him building the road from the bridge to Flournoy Lucas. They removed item No. 3 from the zoning ordinance and are going to consider ways to let him resume or begin construction without doing anything that would compromise a possible route for 3132. Now they haven't finished the second part of their consideration, and I frankly don't know when they intend to do that. Perhaps by the next meeting. And it seems to me like they did what you are now called upon to do and that is waive the interest of the good of the public with regard to 3132 and also acknowledge and try to address Mr. Larkin's interest. Which we all have an interest in him being successful in his development. So I think the MPC has done a good job of trying to balance what's going on here, and come up with a solution that says lets hold off on the 3132 corridor construction, but lets let Mr. Larkin start doing what he does for a living, which is develop this subdivision and build these homes and start seeing a return on his investment. Now Mr. Larkin and I do agree on one thing. He said, don't let me misrepresent anything to you in my presentation. Well I don't want him to misrepresent anything to you in his presentation either. I think he did, and I think he is still misrepresenting Dr. Kalivoda's and DOTD's position on this subject. He has claimed all the long that Dr. Kalivoda's July 19, 2011 letter was the DOTD's stamp of approval on his plans to build a permanent road. But if you'll read that letter, what is going on there is this was an attempt at a compromise that was attached by DOTD and NLCOG, they got Mr. Larkin and the Glen together in order for them to try and work out a compromise where Mr. Larkin could actually use some of the property that is now owned by the Glen and have an outlet that would clearly not be involved in any potential corridor, 3132 would be far enough west, far enough over toward the Glen property that you wouldn't have any concerns about whether it was going to compromise any perceived or proposed route. And what Dr. Kalivoda says is if this compromise is reached, we don't have a problem because it doesn't appear that this is going to interfere with 3132. But the second page of his letter gives the DOTD rule, the guidelines that they mandate, that Mr. Larkin or anybody else who is thinking about building out there must follow. And that was a directive that nothing could interfere

with 3132. I mean this didn't say that to Mr. Larkin. Dr. Kalivoda says or by anybody else, by DOTD, by NLCOG, the City, MPC or LDC shall not do anything to impede 3132. I heard Dr. Kalivoda's email that Mr. Rogers read for the first time when he read it today, and obviously beauty is in the eye of the beholder. But I heard him say we don't know whether what Mr. Larkin is proposing today, we don't know whether that will impede the 3132 preferred routes. And obviously you've got to read it for yourself and glean what you believe he meant. That's the way I heard it and I urge that I think that's a fair reading. Because otherwise Mr. Larkin comes up here and says to you, I promise I'm not going to do anything to impede 3132. The question then is asked, well where is it going to go? And he goes, I don't know. So how can he promise to not impede something that he has no idea of where its gong to go. The other thing I want to point out is that Mr. Larkin has touted this permit that he has from DOTD as evidence that they have approved his plans, and with the DOTD's stamp of approval all he needs is MPC or City Council approval and the roads go in. Look at that permit. The top right hand corner, that permit expired on May 14, 2012. He doesn't have a permit. And it seems to me you can't build a DOTD road with their approval, if you don't have a permit. I suggest that his application may be moved, and the proper response is to tell Mr. Larkin, you come back, when you get a valid permit in your hand from DOTD that indicates to us that they approved the road as proposed. Now I think that's a serious problem that exist with regard to the DOTD approval. Because I think everybody here acknowledges that regardless of what happens here or at the MPC, DOTD is really pulling the strings on this deal, and they're the ones who will give ultimate yea or nay to what's going on out there. The - - - I heard Mr. Rogers and I understand Councilman Jenkins' skepticism at the timing, we've all been told various times when we should expect the Phase 0 feasibility study to be completed. Our latest and best information is what we've got today. June. Now that's five weeks. I think we can certainly understand the responsible nature of the decision by this body to say, 'Hey, lets cool it for five weeks, and just see what we - - - where that road's going. Because any construction in the corridor, whether it be a road, whether it be the homes that Chairman Jenkins was talking about. You know these are feasibility studies. They have to have as a part of their analysis, some sort of economic feasibility. And economic feasibility means how much is it going to cost DOTD or the feds to build this road. One of the biggest components of that is what's in the corridor that we're going to have to buy. And I guarantee you, if Mr. Larkin builds anything in that corridor, and it turns out that it is a route that 3132 will be built in, he's going to say pay me for what I've done. Pay me for the construction. Whether it's a road, houses, bridge whatever ends up in that corridor is going to have to be paid for by the state, or by the feds. It will increase the cost of the road, and it will directly affect decisions related to feasibility that are ongoing, and maybe not eminent, for as close to getting them as we've ever been. I think that's what we can say. You're called upon to look at the record that you have before you that

consist of the MPC hearing and its record. You also have accepted some additional information before you today, and it's the position of the coalition and Willis Knighton Health System that if Mr. Larkin is committed to build his road, that road will not be built according to the guidelines set out by DOTD as those guidelines affect every other municipal and civic body that's involved in this decision. It would also mean that Mr. Larkin's construction is very likely to impede the extension efforts for 3132 and I think Councilman Shyne put it exactly right. That is an overriding benefit to the citizens of Shreveport that we simply can't afford not to take advantage of. I think Mr. Larkin has failed to give you any legal or factual grounds that would warrant a reversal or a remand of the MPC decision. It was well considered as Councilman Shyne said. Everybody got a chance to present their position. The MPC commissioners listened and gave it great and grave consideration, and I think they made the right decision, and we ask you to affirm that decision.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Counsel, I asked Mr. Larkin a question. I said should the Council have some concern about houses being built and the highway coming later, and of course you brought out some of that meaning that if the highway comes later, that (inaudible) on that property for the right of way is an issue. And I would ask, I want to ask you a question. Should the Council have some concern about how long we stop someone from developing their private property to build a highway, which sometimes as highways go, they could be very lucid as far as the timeframe. Years and years down the road. Should we have some concern about that?

Mr. McMichael: Absolutely I think you should be concerned about that. I think that's a responsible legislative concern. But under these circumstances, when we know there is an ongoing feasibility study, and that we have been told that in five weeks, we're going to get a pretty good idea of the one or two routes that will be studied in the final environmental phase, I think it is a reasonable response to say lets keep this on the back burner, and lets wait and see where the road is going to go, or where it's not going to go. Because the identification of the preferred routes will tell us two things. 1) The two routes if there are two, that are going to be considered in the environmental study, but it will also tell us the routes that won't be in the finalist. And we'll have a pretty good indication as Mr. Rogers said. We'll have a pretty strong sense of where the 3132 route is going to be located. And at that point, I think Mr. Larkin will have a far more comfortable position in terms of where he's going to be able to build. I think Dr. Kalivoda and DOTD are going to be far more comfortable with okaying what is going on out there. I think City Council, MPC we need knowledge to make good decisions. I think if we wait, we're going to get that knowledge.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Let me just say this, and I'm speaking for myself only, but I certainly appreciate your very reasoned approach on behalf of the coalition, and I think

all of us here today do appreciate a tone that is making it a lot easier to move forward with this, because you recognize the challenges that we're facing on this, and I want to just say thank you for that. I'm also going to ask you a little bit about your professional opinion here. I should mention I do think you hit the crux of the issue for us right now is, we were kinda - - - the reason in some of our minds of potentially remanding this back to the MPC was to at least give Mr. Larkin the opportunity to move forward, i.e., for them to say okay, you're asking us - - - its not really to over rule their decision about this proposed route, it's more 'We'll accommodate Mr. Larkin's development by allowing him to start building until that issue is resolved.' We've got that at least in my mind, that would be my rationale to send it back to them. Not to encourage them to overturn the decision that they've made, but to give him the opportunity to get started. From your experience, you think that is a potential solution to moving this project forward?

Mr. McMichael: And the solution would be to send it back?

Councilman O. Jenkins: Send it to them as a - - - lets say a vehicle or a request some manner to encourage them to move forward with whatever their deliberation as you described with regard to either granting him a permit or allowing him to negate that one stipulation, use Railsback, do you think that is a valid course of action for us at this point?

Mr. McMichael: I don't know. Because I don't know what Mr. Larkin's needs are in that regard. I think he's going to have to speak to that. But I don't think sending it back based on the feedback we got from the MPC is every going to resolve in them saying you just build wherever you want to, we'll worry about the consequences later.

Councilman O. Jenkins: I'm not suggesting.

Mr. McMichael: No, but the question is if they go back and they say well Mr. Larkin, what if we permit you to begin to build houses in these areas, with your temporary road, which has already been blessed by DOTD and it doesn't really upset anybody, and your Railsback entrance to bring your potential land owners in, I don't know whether that would solve his problem or not. And I don't want to speak for him in that regard. Seems to me like that is a reasonable government solution to the problem. But he's going to have to address that.

Councilman O. Jenkins: No, no. And what I'm asking you is in your professional opinion, would that us be remanding it back to the MPC, an effective way to encourage or request the MPC to develop that line of reasoning?

Mr. McMichael: I don't know that my professional experience would let me answer that. My sense of fairness and sense of logic is it makes sense. But this is my first foray into the world of the city council is this issue. I've appeared here only to talk about 3132 and the same holds for the MPC. So, I don't profess to have a lot of experience.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Yeah, but that was my question. Thank you.

Councilwoman McCulloch: Yeah, I have been just trying to follow this ordeal from way back when we had the session at LSU. And I've also observed not only the constituents or the residents in the area as well as Mr. Larkin. And of course I'm somewhat empathetic with Mr. Larkin because in observing and listening to Mr. Larkin, he has tried to do everything that's been requested of him and follow the proper channels to do everything that's been requested of him in order to proceed with this development. And I also understood that this property has been there for a period of years undeveloped, and now that the 3132 issue is here, and Mr. Larkin is interested in development, I have to respect the decision that Mike Corbin is making. Because based on all of the information that's been provided me, the emails, all the other documentation, it seems like he's being told one thing and then he's redirected to do another thing. And of course I kinda feel for Mr. Larkin at this time because I feel his sincerity. I mean it doesn't appear as if he has anything to hide, or he's trying to do anything undercover. But I was just a bit concerned, for instance you know like on yesterday, the fact that Mr. Stonecipher and what was the other guy's name? Settles, was on the bench. And now, as the attorney for Willis Knighton, you're here today. And of course you say this is your first (inaudible) this. And it just appears to me Danyne Malone, that somebody is grasping for straws right now to maybe hold up the decision that was actually made by the representative of this district Mr. Corbin. And that is grasping at straws to block this being - - - I mean, this is just what I'm feeling. You're grasping at straws to block what's being requested by the representative, and that is this be reprimanded back to the MPC. Uncle Joe, I respect everything that you've said, and that you've brought before this council. But again, I have to go back to my experience as a Commissioner and even has a Councilman. You know there have been occasions at the Parish level where you know you do reprimand issues back to the MPC. That's nothing new under the sun. I mean that's not a practice that has never taken place so, I guess the point I want to make, and I don't feel like Mr. Larkin has lied at any point and time. I mean I feel his sincerity. But as I said, it's really wild that Attorney Settles was here yesterday and Stonecipher and you're here today. And you know it appears that right now, we're just grasping for straws to hold up the recommendation of the representative. And again Mr. Larkin, you need to know that I feel you, and I even feel the residents that want this 3132 Uncle, as a matter of fact, when we first came aboard as City Councilmen, Uncle Joe brought it to my attention, that they need 3132. But my mother is a senior citizen and so is Mr. Larkin, and I've

been observing Mr. Larkin, and what I can appreciate is how he's being railroaded back and forth to do this. Now that you've done this, no you need to do this. And when he does this, you come back and you say well that's not like it is, and like I said, I can respect and yield to the decision of Councilman Corbin. It's not new that issues have ever been reprimanded back to the MPC, they'll tell you here today. It happens all the time. I'm going to support the decision of City Councilman Mike Corbin, because of some things that I've just observed yesterday and today here. It just seems as if though we're just grasping at straws right now to hold up the reprimand by the City Councilman.

Mr. McMichael: Well, I'm sorry to give you that impression, that's not what we're trying to do.

Councilwoman McCulloch: Well I just wanted to let you know what I'm feeling and how I really feel about it.

Mr. McMichael: I've been involved in this case, I've argued, presented to this city council before on these matters. This is not my first time at the City Council. I've been involved throughout. And frankly we thought given the direction of Chairman Jenkins that we all come today prepared to look forward and not discuss what has happened in the past and what the motivations of the various parties are and what the speculation is about how we got here, that I would be best suited to address this issue in this fashion.

Councilwoman McCulloch: Well I - - -

Mr. McMichael: I don't agree with your characterization

Councilman Shyne: Right, I don't either.

Mr. McMichael: Of the history of Mr. Larkin and this process, but in deference to Chairman Jenkins' instruction, I'm not going to go into all that, I'm just going to say, he's in a pickle. I understand that. And I think it is incumbent upon the governmental bodies who are in charge of this to do their best without ruining the possibility of 3132, to see if he can be helped out to the extent he can. But as far as how he got here, and whose fault it is, that's an issue that we've been asked to stay away from. And we would add several hours to the proceedings if we didn't. So, I'm sorry you got that impression. That's not what I'm doing here.

Councilwoman McCulloch: Well, I've enjoyed your presentation, and certainly as I said before I just kinda feel for Mr. Larkin you know? It seems like he's just been flipped flopped back and forth, and that seem so unfair.

Mr. McMichael: And I'm biting my tongue, I'm going to continue to bite it.

Councilwoman McCulloch: (Inaudible) how important it was Uncle Joe, because just based on everything I've been reading and looking at, you know nothing is in stone. And I don't think that has been fair to Mr. Larkin.

Councilman Shyne: I want to commend you. I can't agree with my niece. If she would sit there and say that it seems like we're grabbing at straws, she has not been able to understand this whole process. And this has been a long process. I don't sit here and grab at straws. I take what I do very serious, and I guess this is why I've been elected to represent people in my district, probably longer than anybody. Because I don't sit here and grab at straws. What you were doing was not grabbing at straws. You gave us some very important facts. This is what the MPC did. And I love Mr. Larkin, like I love everybody else, and of course his hair is gray like mine, and I guess I would have a reason to relate to him better than my niece over here. But this is the price you pay of doing business. I've seen cases like this come up before the council, and I don't vote on it from my heart because I like you, or because you're going through this or that. And Mr. Larkin understands that's the cost of doing business. I try to make my decisions from my head, not because I like you or I dislike you or not. Mr. Larkin and I might go and have a Coca Cola after this, and I hope that he would understand that this is nothing personal. I'm not making a decision because I like Tim or don't like Tim. Sure things are remanded back to the MPC. But this is not a case. I've seen a lot of things. I've voted to remand things back to the MPC. But I have to disagree with Mike, and Mike and I are good friends. Mike knows, this is nothing personal. But I'll have to disagree with Mike. The MPC told Mr. Larkin, you have a temporary or secondary road, use that. Use that. And it's just like you stated. If the MPC or if the Council gives him permission to go and start building and if he builds in a corridor that the state comes back and say this is the corridor - - - hey, we've got to buy him or either don't build the road. So I don't make these decisions on my heart whether I like you or not Mr. Larkin, and I know you understand that. I'm trying to make a decision - - - and let me say this, I appreciate what you're doing, but this is not a decision that was left up to Mike's district. And my niece will say from time to time, stay out of my district. I will get into anybody's district where it's going to impact what goes on to the City of Shreveport. 3132 is too important, and Mike understands this. I've discussed this with Mike. And this is why I'm concerned. This is why I'm concerned because 3132 impacts the whole City of Shreveport, I would even say Northwest Louisiana. This is not a Mike's district decision. And I hope he understands that, and I know Mike does. And I would hope that

Mike is not making this decision because he likes Mr. Larkin and Mr. Larkin has been going from one place to the next place to the next place. Sometimes you come down here and pay your bills, you have to go from one place to the next place. Dale will tell you sometimes people will call him about water bills and he'll send 'em somewhere else. That's the process of doing business. And we're not pulling straws. I appreciate you coming down. You presented your case, both of you all presented your case in a very professional manner. This is what we have to have. But we have to make decisions from the head. We can't make no decisions on whether I like Mr. Larkin or not, or Attorney whether I like you or not. I have to look at what you present. And then I have to make a decision. Not on likes, not on cause Mr. Larkin's hair gray like mine. I probably got mine earlier than him, because I came out the school system and when you dealing with a bunch of kids everyday, not only will they make your hair gray Mr. Larkin, but they'll make everything else bad. So, I don't want you to think, I don't want you to get your decision from my niece over there that we're just pulling straws to block you, because we're not doing that. I appreciate you coming down and I understand what's involved in this. This is not about one district, but this is about the City of Shreveport. And my niece served on the Commission, she's been on the Council for - - -

Councilwoman McCulloch: A minute.

Councilman Shyne: Well I was going to say five. She's been on the Council for five. I've been down here about 30 years. So, I understand how important cases are like this. And we don't want to give - - - I want Mr. Larkin to start building, but I don't want him to build and the state comes back and say now this is the corridor. And then we have to buy what he has constructed. So, and again it's nothing personal, and Mike I believe we have some other people that want to speak.

Councilman Corbin: We sure do Mr. Shyne and Councilwoman McCulloch, I will ask you to make a brief statement, because we do have several people to speak.

Councilwoman McCulloch: And let me clarify this as I stated, Uncle Joe has always brought to my attention his concern for 3132, but Uncle Joe and to the audience and for the record, I don't know Mr. Larkin, and for the record I don't have to like you to feel you. I can be empathetic, feel for you, but I don't have like you. And that's what I mean Uncle Joe, I feel him. I'm empathetic with what he's being - - - with what he's going through.

Councilman Shyne: Well I hope so.

Mr. McMichael: If I could close by supplementing my poor answer to Councilman Jenkins' question about does it make sense from a legal standpoint? I believe that the Council can affirm the decision of the MPC to the extent that it does not permit any construction in the potential routes. And by doing so, it will also affirm the decision of the MPC to continue to consider ways to get Mr. Larkin permitted to begin building houses. I don't think affirming is (inaudible). My point was that affirming the decision would achieve what you have suggested would be a good result. And that would be the MPC would still have the issue by its own action, and it would be able to consider Mr. Larkin's progress on being permitted to do it.

Councilman Shyne: I think we have some more speakers Mr. Chairman.

Councilman S. Jenkins: But Mayor Glover was up.

Mayor Glover: Mr. McMichael, I guess (inaudible) would be the right or proper expression, maybe thank Councilman Jenkins, Chairman Jenkins for his expression on yesterday, that maybe results as to why it is that you are here today. Because frankly, I did not expect you to be here as the counsel for Willis Knighton. Speaking in this capacity. But if it represents a change or a shift in the tone and the tenor in which you all are choosing to address and pursue these matters, then I commend you for that. Because frankly, a good bit of what has transpired if frankly reprehensible. And all you need to do is go and look up a couple of various email misses and websites and what have you that some of the folks associated with this effort have put out to know that. And I won't go into any further detail in that regard, unless I'm pressed to. But I do have a question for you. And that is would it in your considered legal opinion, be something that would either bother you, be a conflict of interest, be potentially prohibitive if any of the individuals here who today have the authority to press one of the votes either yes or no or to abstain, regarding this matter, worked for Mr. Larkin or his companies or anything else that's associated, connected, or affiliated with?

Mr. McMichael: You posing that as a hypothetical?

Mayor Glover: Posing that as a question.

Mr. McMichael: I'd have to know more about it.

Mayor Glover: I'm saying to you if one of these individuals worked for Mr. Larkin, would that bother you or concern you, or would you consider that to be a conflict of interest?

Mr. McMichael: Well conflict of interest is a legal definition.

Mayor Glover: That's why I'm giving you broad latitude in terms of your response.

Mr. McMichael: I understand that, and I'm not familiar with the ethics rules as they apply to public bodies. Most of my work is advising private bodies, and in that realm, it's not necessarily disqualifying, it simply has to be disclosed and known if there is a potential conflict of interest. Of course we run into this with judges and in a small town like Shreveport, everybody knows everybody else, and it's often raised in the interest of disclosure, but seldom is it a disqualifying situation. So I think from my realm in the private world, disclosure is the key, rather than disqualifying.

Mayor Glover: So you would want disclosure, not necessarily disqualification?

Mr. McMichael: Well I would think that disclosure starts the process.

Mayor Glover: Would you since I gave you a very broad realm, would you comment on the concern? Would it bother you, would it - - - don't you think it would limit their ability to fairly, objectively and impartially render judgment and opinion regarding - - -

Mr. McMichael: Well, again it depends on the nature of the association, and the disclosure and the reaction that the other members of the governing bodies whether that be a private board or director or city council found out, felt about it.

Mayor Glover: Okay. Anything else to add? Thank you Mr. McMichael. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Darrell Rebouche: (9312 Shenandoah Circle) Thank you sir, I need to borrow Elmo if you don't mind. I'm here because at the most recent meeting of the Acadiana Place Homeowners Association, I was chosen as the spokes person for the neighborhood in this regard. It should not be assumed, believed, or otherwise implied by anyone that I'm representing any other organization other than my neighbors in Acadiana Place. And we are here today with a different set of concerns in that with respect to what Mr. Larkin may be planning, and I wanted to give you a brief view here, just to give you an orientation. This is Flournoy Lucas Road right here, this is 3132 where it terminates at Flournoy Lucas Road, and we'll get out of the glare here. This is the Glen and this is my neighborhood. So you can see that we're very interested and right here is the road that is a construction entrance right now, I assume for Twelve Oaks and Esplanade. And you can see it's very, very close to our neighborhood. It's also very important to point out that our neighborhood much like Twelve Oaks has one way in and one way out. And so we're very concerned about what might happen if Mr. Larkin is allowed to pave this area right here. And it's not so much about Esplanade, in fact it not about Esplanade at all, it's what may occur north of Flournoy Lucas Road in

this undeveloped area right here. That is my neighborhood's overriding concern. Right now, the majority of this area is zoned residential agricultural, but we all know that zoning can change. Our concern is this right in, right out becomes a 4-way intersection. That opens this area for potential development that concerns us. Because we don't want necessarily development along our property lines, particularly the people who live on Prestonwood which you can't really see because the lights not on, but that's a road that comes in right here and this is Prestonwood, and then it takes a hard left and goes this way. All these neighbors, their back yards, particularly right here are up against this undeveloped property. So, if you allow development in there, then you get dumpsters, security lights, noise, perhaps 24-hour traffic, all of that. So our concern is if the road is paved, what comes next? And so to that regard, we had a petition campaign in our neighborhood, and I'm here today to present to you a petition signed by 145 residents of Acadiana Place, the overwhelming majority of them. A couple of them were relatives of people. And it reads: "*We the undersigned residents of Acadiana Place petition the Shreveport City Council and the Metropolitan Planning Commission to protect Acadiana Place from unwanted traffic and congestion that could arise with the construction of a proposed subdivision entrance and access road for property on the south side of Flournoy Lucas Road, east of its intersection with Louisiana Highway 3132, with continuation of the access road across Flournoy Lucas on the property adjacent to Acadiana Place.*" Again our concern is that may take place. So we're asking Mr. Corbin who is our City Councilman along with the rest of you to protect our interest moving forward. "*We believe this construction would hamper the ease of access to and from our neighborhood, which has a single point of entrance, and that it could set the stage for unwanted commercial development adjacent to our neighborhood.*" That is our primary concern. One other thing I want to point out to you. You come here off 3132, and you're going south, and you take a right. And then here's the construction entrance. There is a raised median here. By rule, the folks who are coming in and out of this are supposed to go right in and right out only. However, you can see on a daily basis construction traffic is jumping onto the median, and turning left onto that construction road. I shot this photo with my I-Phone from my car while I was stopped at the red light at E. Flournoy Lucas and 3132. 30 seconds earlier, that guy crossing the median. And then one of my neighbors, same light different day, this truck sitting on the median. They are not obeying the rules now, they're turning left over the median, and you know if we allow this construction of this permanently paved road, what's going to happen they're going to turn right onto Flournoy Lucas Road, they're going to go to the Glen, they're going to go to the Glen, they're going to do a u-turn. They're going to go to CVS, they're going to do a u-turn. They're going to come into my neighborhood, they're going to do a u-turn. It will happen. Because they're already violating all the rules anyway. So, that's it, that's all I got. Our concern is the potential development and the increased traffic, and that's why I'm here today. And I want to

thank Mr. Corbin for his attention, he's been very attentive to us in this regard, and I will submit these petitions to the Clerk.

Councilman Corbin: I'll address both those issues. Thank you for sending me those photos. I did talk with Mr. Janca, and he has talked with all of his contractors, and we continue to have a dialogue with them and Mr. Larkin, I would ask that you talk to any of your contractors and remind them of how that right in and right out works. You know if it continues to be a problem, we can I guess at some point during the busy hours, have SPD go out and take a look at it. The second issue, development around Acadiana Place, and any realignment of access roads, I just remind everybody that Flournoy Lucas is a state controlled road, and that is within the states control of access. And I think the conversation not only needs to be here at the City Council, but also at the state side.

Mr. Rebouche: Well the DOTD's on my petition too.

Councilman Corbin: And that's one of the things that I think we talked about yesterday in some of our discussions during work session, is DOTD needs to be present at more of these discussions, and planning meetings. Thank you Darrell.

Councilman Shyne: Darrell, I appreciate you coming down and I want you to know that this forum down here belongs to the people, doesn't belong to me, doesn't belong to the Mayor. As long as you come down, get as passionate as you want to, just as long as you don't make it personal.

Mr. Rebouche: Listen Mr. Shyne, I want everybody to know as I went around my neighborhood and I spoke to my neighborhood about this petition, not one single neighbor was in opposition of the development of Esplanade. We all think that's a good thing. We are very concerned about the road to Esplanade. We have one way in and one way out. There's already a road as been discussed on Railsback. We kinda don't understand why he can't use his Railsback Road. But that's been discussed today. So, but as far as being personal, I've known Mr. Larkin a long, long time. Our fathers did business together in Bossier City. I like Tim, so nobody should think that this is personal, and nobody in Acadiana Place is trying to impugn him or prevent him from doing Esplanade.

Councilman Shyne: And I appreciate that. In the meantime, Jim, I really didn't like the kind of - - - I don't know whether the dressing down that came from the Administration, but if he has a legal question like that, let him ask the Attorneys General. You don't work for the Attorneys General. If he thinks that somebody shouldn't be voting or shouldn't be discussing a certain subject, let him go to the

Attorneys General and the Attorneys General will give him an opinion on that. And whatever the opinion that the Attorneys General gives, this is what we're going to abide by. But you don't have to come in with no secret. And that was the same thing that he was trying to tell you, don't come in here with no secret stuff trying to point the finger at somebody in a roundabout way. I mean all of us up here are able to take care of ourselves. Nobody up here is perfect, and if he's looking at me, I'm a big boy. You know I've been in and out of things, and so it really doesn't matter to me. But you're not an Attorneys General, you don't work for the Attorneys General office, and you handled it extremely well. I don't know whether he thought he could out smart you. I mean as long as you've been around, he's gonna get you caught up in something, but Darrell I appreciate it. Always come down. This is body down here belong to the people. I like to see people coming down and being passionate.

Mr. Rebouche: Thank you sir. One more thing while I have the microphone, before I go. Since I'm representing the neighborhood here. There was an unpleasant occurrence in our neighborhood several weeks ago, the Mayor became aware of that and took a personal interest in it. There has been a resolution to that, so Mayor on behalf of my neighbors thank you for that.

Mr. Thompson: Is this the same petition that was presented to the MPC?

Mr. Rebouche: Identical.

Mr. Thompson: The reason I asked is we've already emailed that to Council Members, and I don't know whether to make another copy.

Mr. Rebouche: It is the same one.

Mayor Glover: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Darrell, I appreciate that comment and the compliment, and it certainly welcome your presence and certainly acknowledge your statement that you're here today in representation of the Acadiana Place Subdivision. You have been here on numerous occasions prior to today. And I'm asking you have you been in those other instances here as a representative of Acadiana Place Subdivision as well?

Mr. Rebouche: Mayor, (inaudible) 27 years in the local media as you know, I've been at the City Council in various capacities over the last three decades.

Mayor Glover: So, you are here as a member of the media?

Mr. Rebouche: Today I'm here as the duly authorized representative of the Acadiana Place Homeowners Association.

Mayor Glover: As I have acknowledged. My question is, in your prior visits here, city council meetings and others, were you here in your capacity as the representative of the Acadiana Place Subdivision?

Mr. Rebouche: The last time I was here, I spoke to the Council in the public comment section. In that particular case I believe that was four weeks ago, I was absolutely and exclusively representing Acadiana Place Homeowners Association. So any comments I've made to this body have been exclusively as the duly authorized representative of the Acadiana Place Homeowners Association.

Mayor Glover: You've covered today, you've covered four weeks ago. You have been here on numerous other occasions. You've tweeted from here, I'm picking your picture as you've sat there and what have you. I'm asking you in those other instances were you here in your capacity as the duly appointed representative of the Acadiana Place Subdivision?

Mr. Rebouche: No. Only in these two instances.

Mayor Glover: Okay, in those other instances, in what capacity were you here, as a member of the media?

Mr. Rebouche: No, no I was here because my employers asked me to be here.

Mayor Glover: And your employer is?

Mr. Rebouche: Willis Knighton Health Systems.

Mayor Glover: And of the seven members on the City Council, are any of those seven individuals on the City Council one of your fellow employees?

Mr. Rebouche: Not to my knowledge.

Mayor Glover: Not to your knowledge. You have no knowledge of that.

Mr. Rebouche: Not to my knowledge.

Mayor Glover: Alright, thank you. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Vernon Hastings, Jr.: (6105 Gaylyn) I'll be honest, I do not work for Willis Knighton, although by God I wish I did. They have more employees in this parish than anybody else. This has been a terrible, terrible display of how government works. Not today, but how this whole thing has been handled. It's been horrible. I would kiss Joe Shyne if he didn't have a mustache. I know it's terrible, but it's the truth. He's the first man, the first elected representative or named to anything NLCOG, MPC, wherever you want to go, DOTD, all of 'em, no one has said 3132 is vital to the City of Shreveport. Not Mike Corbin's place. He's already written us off. It is so vital to this city when you drive down Flournoy Lucas and you see the obvious exit going to the road. Yet grown men and women are fighting for months over whether or not to do 3132. How can this be? This is Alice in Wonderland. I mean it's just totally unbelievable that we've wasted all this time and energy arguing over something that should have been a no-brainer a long time ago. Now it's going to be three to four years before anything happens. People when we get - - - lets get something straight. I'd almost buy a car from Tim Larkin. He's so honest appearing and everything, but I want him to make money. I want him to build houses till he gets tired of it, and makes a ton of money. And then once we get decided and everybody from NLCOG and all the other alphabet soups would decide we're going to build 3132, and somebody says I am representing the city, and I demand 3132 be built. When that happens, then everything in the city of Shreveport from the inspector to the plumber to turn their efforts to getting this man in business. He's millions of dollars probably out of pocket at this point. And he still is stymied as she was saying. But I also say, don't vote for anything that will endanger 3132. And if that includes his road, if that includes Mr. Janca's trust cut, don't do it. That comes first. I wish everyone to be on the record of where they stand on 3132, and that they were going to do everything they could possibly do to make it happen. Remember when they sold us the Big Red by 95 or Big Red by 80 or whatever it was? You got a Port setting down there that's supposed to help out the city, we don't have a good road to it. Come on. We've got so many problems in this city, we should be able to unite and get this taken care of. Thank you and I love all your efforts. Thank you.

Councilman Shyne: Can I clap Mr. Chairman? No, I won't do it.

Councilwoman McCulloch: We're going to let him kiss you.

Mr. Gil Pittard: (492 Grand Oaks Drive) Mr. Mayor, I am here to represent me. Nobody but me.

Mayor Glover: Thank you Mr. Pittard.

Mr. Pittard: But I really wanted to say thanks to Joe Shyne, I agree with every word my predecessor said. You invited me to come out and bring a presentation to you. I don't

have prepared notes. And I can't bring you the presentation, I don't have a teleprompter, I've got to speak my heart. That man spoke most of what I had to say anyway, I was going to tie it into a little bit of story of my life of why I came back here. And how seeing that progress was being made when I decided to move from Texas which was a hard decision back to Louisiana. I was influenced by 3132 work being done. They've built an extension to it and seeing it was going on farther, that would help bring Shreveport, where I'd been gone for 50 something years. And I put with all the jokes about the worst (inaudible) in the country, and how many of my grandparents still voted even though they'd been dead. And all those kinds of things. But this extension I knew was in the books. There were (inaudible) already been done to extend it. But now we're all into this harass. It makes no sense. And after hearing what Mr. Hasting had to say, I wonder if we could bring up the big chart that Mr. Larkin had. Could I borrow that?

Mr. Larkin: Sure.

Mr. Pittard: We're looking at this proposed road, it's conjecture, it's not planned, its you know artistic design or whatever. But when you start to build a road right into an intersection there, that tells me that you're asking for traffic trouble. And to think that you could go in there and build that, that close to an intersection is ridiculous. I'm a retired engineer, you don't do that. And I think that Mr. Larkin is blowing smoke when he thinks that doesn't interfere with an intersection. Thank you for your time. I appreciate everyone of you.

Mr. Tom Arceneaux: (400 Texas Street, Suite 419) I'm going to be very brief, I wanted to address a couple of things. 1) I want to read you the stipulation: New homes shall not be constructed except homes that front Railsback Road, until documentation from the appropriate authorities having jurisdiction has been received by the Planning Director, that clearly demonstrates the satisfaction of the Planning Director, that the Flournoy Lucas entrance and boulevard from Railsback Road to Flournoy Lucas Road has been completely constructed. 2) In compliance with any and all local, state and federal guidelines that may be applicable to said construction. The question that Mr. Larkin asked the MPC is if we build this road, will it comply with that stipulation? The MPC did not answer that question. The MPC said, don't build the road at all. That's not the question that was asked, and that's why Mr. Corbin's suggestion that perhaps the thing to do is to get it back to the MPC so that they can answer the question that was asked. That's what Mr. Larkin is asking you to do today. Either answer the question or send it back to the MPC to answer the question. Because this did not require approval of the MPC, it didn't require approval of a route, it simply said, you build a road, and if the road meets the specifications, it satisfies the ordinances. Before spending another million dollars, Mr. Larkin asked if when he did that would he be able to get his

permits. That's as simple as it is. But the MPC didn't answer that question. And so it seems to us appropriate that you ask the MPC to answer that question. I also want to make one brief remark. Since the photographs were taken by Mr. Rebouche, there have been additional barriers put out there in the median by Mr. Larkin to try and resolve that situation. And he certainly is prepared to do what he can do to make sure that people under his control obey the law. I'll be glad to answer any questions.

Mr. Jim McMichael: (P.O. Box 72, Shreveport, LA) That is a request as I understand it for a curb cut on Flournoy Lucas into the Twelve Oaks Subdivision back in March I think. Mr. Janca requested that Willis Knighton that it consent to the curb cut. Apparently to tell whatever body was hearing his request that Willis Knighton didn't have a problem with it. We wrote a letter to Mr. Janca and explained to him that under the circumstance and given Willis Knighton's strong believe that nothing should get in the way of 3132, we weren't able to consent to his request for a curb cut. Because we didn't know whether or to what extent that might hinder, influence or otherwise have anything to do with 3132. And so that's the position of Willis Knighton. That consistent with it's position throughout all the issues related to Flournoy Lucas, we're just concerned that anything that happens out there without the routes being designated to the extent possible may interfere.

Mr. Gil Pittard: (492 Grand Oaks) Just briefly on 97. I have a concern there about curb cuts on Flournoy Lucas. Regardless of where they are, because that is state controlled. I recently moved from Texas, I don't know the rules regarding curb cuts in the multi-lane traffic and all. I'm just concerned that we're opening up things that might not be well thought out. And authorizing or considering authorizing curb cuts until this one even that we're talking about Mr. Larkin who has a curb cut and how that interferes with (inaudible) and general rules, we don't want to free that road up and have it just another island. And I thank you for hearing me.

Mr. Tony Janca: (720 Catalpe Cir) And I am representing this developer of Twelve Oaks. The area that we're talking about, Robert Westerman addressed yesterday is 1400 feet from anything to do with the 3132 future. I'm for 3132. Has no impact on 3132. What occurred here was the property that was purchased by the city way back when, and this is the assessor's map, included this bow and that's where the 16 acres was. It was bought that way because they knew they were going to have to realign Flournoy Lucas. This was part of the realignment of Flournoy Lucas. Well the state is under a moratorium that they cannot take any more right of way than absolutely necessary. But consequently between the time they bought this, the city bought it in '91, or '92, till the time the state got around to taking it last year, they did not take this little strip that you see before you right here. Okay? That now still remains as city dedicated property. It has already been challenged once at the very outset when we sold lots in Twelve Oaks,

because technically we would have been landlocked if this was not considered right of way. It is city right of way. So what we're having to do today is consider that as city right of way. Nothing to do with 3132, but the city right of way. The issue would not have been here before because we've already applied to the state twice and got two curb cuts approved there twice already from the state. But because the state didn't take the strip, we had to revert back and was told by MPC that well because we didn't own the land adjacent to the state highway, therefore we weren't the adjacent landowner, could not request a curb cut. It's all semantics, but the facts is, it's the city's property. There's nothing that can ever be done with that property, other than be a green space, and that's just because that's what was left from the state. You can't put a building on it, you can't put a parking lot on it, you can't put anything on it, it has no value. So we concurred to go ahead and landscape that section, because that's about all that can be done with it quite honestly. So what we're asking for, Michael asked me when I first we brought this up, if I would talk to the homeowners association, which I did. And the homeowners association went out and did a survey. And they got back 167 responses. Okay, this is from the residents of Twelve Oaks which is over 50% of the residents, which is fantastic in any election or any kind of (inaudible) to get that kind of response. 94% of those, 157 wanted this curb cut. Now it's the same percentage, 94% want commercial development in front of their area. So we gave them the choice at that time to tell us what they wanted and I think all of y'all have been served a copy of this, if you haven't the Clerk has it. But we listed all types of things that we feel are neighborhood services, which is what the (inaudible) for. Dry cleaners, beauty shop, daycare center, etc., etc. Very interesting draft if you read it, to see what they really wanted. The items that they really said that they wanted, and the biggest thing was Starbucks, or coffee services, which is one of the reasons why we're doing this curb cut. No national coffee service, Starbucks or otherwise is going to consider that if they don't have accessibility to the street. But that's the reason why the curb cut on Lot 3. Okay. It's vitally important. Other items on this same list was a wine and cheese shop at 57%. A health food store at 53%, a bakery at 53%, and a dry cleaners at 44%. Now these are the demands of the people that live out there, what they're looking for from us to put out there, and we're trying to accommodate them. That was a very interesting product. We have a six lot development that any one of you could invest in, buy a lot, build a building, lease it for yourself, use it for your self, condo it into a four-building complex, and sell the condos is a unique concept for Shreveport. Not been done here. Been done on Fern Avenue, for businesses and it's been very successful. What we're doing is we're bringing it to the retail market, so that the retailer has that same ability. So what I'm asking you today is: 1) To recognize that we are not impacting in any way, shape or form, 3132. This was a left over piece of land because of the moratorium of the state. Nothing to do with 3132. And to say that we should not have curb cuts on Flournoy Lucas is almost a gross absurdity We have landowners on both sides. They all should have control of curb cuts.

But curb cuts brings us, brings everybody prosperous. Mr. Elrod would not have been able to have a curb cut on his location. I mean you can't ask a business or a person to buy land and not have a curb cut. So curb cuts reasonable curb cuts are logical, and that's what this is. A reasonable curb cut. Servicing six business lots. Not one curb cut per lot like we have seen in so many other developments, this is one curb cut serving six business lots. I thank you for your time. Any questions?

Councilman Shyne: Just one question Mr. Chairman. I think what you're saying is that your request is far enough away from the 3132 proposed corridors wherever they might be? Where it would not impact?

Mr. Janca: Absolutely. And Robert Westerman said that yesterday, as the City attorney, it will not impact in no way impact 3132.

Councilman Shyne: And I did hear you say that you are for 3132?

Mr. Janca: Yes sir. In fact, Joe you know I'm - - - Councilman Shyne, I don't want to - - -

Councilman Shyne: No, just call me Joe.

Mr. Janca: Well you and I go way back and I want 3132 as much as anybody. I truly do. And let me say one other thing. I carry a lot of stroke and votes in Twelve Oaks. And we pushed for 3132. It was a difficult meeting. I was about hung that night, because there's a whole bunch of those people who would vote today not for 3132, if given the opportunity because they feel like they'd rather have nothing in their backyard. That's always typical. Okay? But I convinced them to support 3132 as a group, and I would hope to hold that support for 3132. Not getting into Tim's thing, if anybody here has a reason to be opposed to Tim, it would be I. He and I have some bones to pick, but that's not to be laundered out here.

Councilman Shyne: That's good.

Mr. Janca: The issue - - - and I'm not going to laundry my laundry out here, but the point I guess I'm getting at is Tim has worked very diligently to try to bring something to this community. And there's a lot of people outside our community that look and see what's going on, and they say to ourselves, are we doing the right thing. I don't want anything Tim to do to block 3132. And one thing and I know that I may be overstepping my position, but one thing that this council can do cause you passed the ordinance that basically says that he cannot build until he has that road, is to simply have that reversed until such time on a time limited basis so that he can build homes today, exit out on

Railsback and still be under the demand. Because quite honestly, if you know construction, if you told Tim to go start a house today, nice homes he's building are going to take 18 months to get completed. So you won't have but one family driving out in 18 months. So he sells five houses, and he gets five families. Five houses is not going to impact Railsback over the next two or three years. Okay, but I would still hold the requirement on him to have his route. Because I understand the people of Railsback said, we want to be concerned. But this council does have that ability to send this reprimand back with the caveat and say, it's either that or lift the building restriction on it.

Councilman Shyne: One question. Could you give that information to - - - I mean what you just gave us, maybe to the MPC? You know that would give them something to look at.

Mr. Janca: Sure I can do that and I think there's - - - the city attorney is not here, but there are a couple of little things that y'all would have to twist because y'all have already blessed that ordinance that he's under, that mandate. But that ordinance could be lifted, and I hear from Rose over here, saying very well, she understands. Okay? I think we all understand when you've got \$10,000,000 in the ground that we need to move forward and not backwards. But at the same point and time, I don't want to see 3132 route encumbered in any way, shape or form. So consequently I think the solution is to let him build. Let him go out Railsback until 3132 route's determined, and then he's required to put the road.

Councilman Shyne: Thank you. I love you Tim, but I don't want to kiss you. Dale how about that? Of course I heard Rose a while ago, and I don't know why Rose wanted - - -

Councilwoman McCulloch: That sound like a good deal.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Alright I believe that's all of the Public Comment request to speak that I have on both the MPC Appeal on Larkin's Development, as well as Resolution No. 97.

Councilman Corbin: Mr. Chairman, I agree. I was going to say the same thing, I believe we have finished our public comments on these two items, and I was going to ask you if it would be the appropriate time to make a motion on the appeal, the MPC appeal or do we need to go back into - - -

Councilman S. Jenkins: No, this is just Public Comment, if you want to - - - I believe we suspended the rules to take it up. So if you want to do a motion now, you can.

Metropolitan Planning Commission Appeals and Zoning Board of Appeals

MPC APPEAL - SP-11-09/PO28-07: Larking Development North, L.L.C., and Larkin Development at Railsback, L.L.C., of a portion of the decision of the Metropolitan Planning Commission.

Councilman Corbin: I would like to make the motion that I discussed yesterday for the MPC Appeal. I do still believe that the property thing to do is to remand this back to the MPC. The MPC created these stipulations. I want to make it very clear that remanding this back, does not mean a road is going to be built or permitted. But I think in my conversations with MPC Staff and Board Members, I have no feeling that they intend to take it up and straighten this out at the June meeting. So my motion will be that we remand this decision back to the MPC and that we encourage a expedient solutions that is fair and equitable to both parties that will protect the corridor, the future corridor of 3132 and allow development only in the unit that is approved for development at this time. Which would be between the bridge and Railsback Road. I would also encourage MPC to have local representatives from DOTD at any discussions or meetings. So that is my motion that we remand back to the MPC.

Councilwoman McCulloch: Second.

Motion by Councilman Corbin, seconded by Councilman McCulloch to remand this decision back to the MPC and that we encourage a expedient solutions that is fair and equitable to both parties that will protect the corridor, the future corridor of 3132 and allow development only in the unit that is approved for development at this time. Which would be between the bridge and Railsback Road.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Alright on motion by Councilman Corbin and seconded by Councilwoman McCulloch to remand the matter back to MPC. Questions? Let me ask this now, because I'll be honest with you, I'm struggling with it a little bit. This is on my behalf. If it goes back to the MPC, if we remand it back to the MPC, they're being asked to make some decision about it. Can someone once again appeal that decision? And it will come back to us again?

Councilman Shyne: Um hmm.

Councilwoman McCulloch: And it's going to wind up in court.

Councilman S. Jenkins: And I want to be clear on exactly what would the MPC do if we sent it back? I'm trying to replay in my mind - - - because this is the concern I got. It seems to me that if the road is approved, that opens the door for building permits and

that building could take place anywhere on that 100 acre tract, if I heard this information correctly today.

Councilman Corbin: We may want to ask Mr. Jean to come up from the MPC and see if he can't answer some of these questions. Again, I want to state that my motion says **we are sending this back to the MPC asking them to work out a solution and I guess I'll take it a step further in that my suggested solution may be that the construction road, the unimproved road from Flourney Lucas to the bridge stay just that, a construction road. And stipulations be changed or modified that will allow Mr. Larkin to use the Railsback entrance only for residents whose houses are completed in the development.** I think everybody wins that way. But under the current stipulations that are logged, we can't do that. And the MPC needs to make that change. And Stephen, I'm sorry, I started talking and you were on your way up here. If you would add a little bit to that.

Mr. Jean: Well I'd like to clarify a question that came from the Chair in regard to what Mr. Larkin can do below Bayou Pierre, back down to Railsback. When you said that he could build pretty much anywhere within that 100 acres, he has platted lots, approved platted lots, what he can do is build within those platted lots, if there was a way that he could comply with the stipulations, or if somehow those stipulations were altered. At the MPC meeting, there was a motion made that the MPC consider those - - - Stipulation No. 3. Since that time, the MPC staff is not 100% sure that on its own accord, that the MPC can modify those stipulations and is still working with the City Attorney to determine whether or not has the authority to do so. Mr. Larkin however can request that those be modified, and we have made Mr. Larkin aware that he could request that that could be done. That's where we are today. That's where we are right now.

Councilman S. Jenkins: And so, if I'm hearing this correctly, I'm just saying, the MPC doesn't really have the power.

Councilman Shyne: We do.

Councilman S. Jenkins: To modify - - -

Mr. Jean: We don't have a clear answer at this time.

Councilman Shyne: We do.

Mr. Jean: But we don't think there is some question whether or not we do. And I'll leave it at that at this point. There is some question of whether or not the MPC has the

power to modify that stipulation. It seems clear the MPC has the power to initiate zoning, but whether or not they have the power to change that stipulation with regard to that case is a question that we still need to get an answer to clearly. And that's where we are right at this moment. The MPC staff in discussion with Mr. Kirkland, if this was remanded back to us, of course we would do our best to find some resolution. There was some new information provided that can also be considered by the (inaudible).

Councilman O. Jenkins: I would like us to modify slightly the proposal or consider the modification to the proposal that Councilman Corbin has stated to include the word temporary in the problem of that access period until such time the 3132 issue is resolved as well as that path. Because I do think that despite some suggestion that nobody is interested in seeing 3132 continue, we are all interested in that and the only reason we're in this delay it sounds like amongst everybody uniformly you know just doesn't want to make a non-prudent step at this point. So I think once that's resolved, I'd like to see that temporary piece in there.

Councilman Shyne: Mr. Chairman, and I can vote on this. I want the Administration to know that I can vote on this. I can vote on this. What I would like to see is not to remand this back to the MPC, because the MPC I don't believe would have the authority to modify any decisions that were made by the Council. And Tom will tell you, I'm not an attorney, but I practice a little public law from time to time Mr. Mayor. I believe we have the authority as a Council Body, because we basically made that piece of legislation. And for us to modify it, and I don't think we could do it if we sent it back to the MPC. Maybe if we would table it or postpone it, and put some thought into how we would modify it, I think we would come out a whole lot better. Because like it's been said, I mean, we all like Mr. Larkin and whether we like him or not, it's a good business deal. And that's generally what I vote on, not so much whether I like you or not, but whether it's a good deal for the city. And I'm concerned because 3132 impacts the entire city. And Like I say, I would not necessarily say I'll even say Northwest Louisiana, because as Shreveport goes, this is how this area goes. And I would like to make a motion that we would either postpone or table it because the MPC isn't going to take it up for another six weeks probably. And we could take a look at it and modify it here on the council, because we have the authority to do it. Jean, I don't think you all have the authority with the MPC.

Mr. Jean: We just don't have a clear answer on it at this time sir.

Councilman Shyne: I just don't think they have the authority to do it, but if I'm out voted, and Mike knows its nothing personal. You know my vote will be a 'No' vote to send it back to the MPC. Whether I'm outvoted or not, I don't know. But I would look as Mike has said, since he's added in to modify a way by which 3132 would not be

impeded - - - the progress of it would not be impeded for us to look at it. But I'm not for letting my daddy build in there if its going to impede 3132. That goes to show you how strong I am about having 3132 built.

Councilman Webb: What are you in reference to that the MPC does not have the power to change? Explain what you're - - -.

Mr. Jean: Whether or not the MPC, on its own accord, can change stipulations associated with a zoning case is the question that we would like to get a clear legal answer on before moving forward with attempting to do so. I just want to make sure that we indeed do have the authority to do that and we've done research, we just don't have a clear answer on that. That was the motion made at our meeting. Subsequent to that we still trying to be sure that we on our own accord. Now I think its clear Mr. Larkin can request to us to do that, but whether or not we on our own accord can, that's just a question. And I'm not saying one way or the other yet other than we don't have a clear answer on that.

Councilman Webb: Thank you, Terri Scott, would you come up? With his comments, what can you tell me?

Ms. Scott: Well the zoning ordinance provides that the amendments to the zoning ordinance may be initiated by the City Council, may be initiated by the applicant on its own accord. The ordinance goes on to say that any amendment to the zoning ordinance has to have the approval and consent of the applicant. And in this instance, the stipulation that we're all talking about, and I believe its Stipulation No. 3 in that approval, that's the relevant stipulation that talks about the building permits and the road being constructed to the approval of Planning Director. That stipulation was imposed as a part of a rezoning application that was done for that property. Since that stipulation again was a part of a rezoning application, the question that we have is whether or not the MPC would be allowed or has the authority to initiate any change or amendment or modification to that zoning ordinance as a whole without the consent of the property owner applicant and that's the issue that we are looking at.

Councilman Webb: Okay, that's make it so much more confusing.

Councilman S. Jenkins: To me too.

Councilman Shyne: That's why you pay lawyers so much because they confuse you.

Ms. Scott: Let me see if I can make it a little clearer.

Councilman Webb: Danny Malone use to do that on the parish commission, he would give us all this legal mambo jumbo and I would say at the end of the day just say yes or no.

Ms. Scott: Well to answer your question, were not certain right now whether or not this is an action that can be initiated by the planning commission in this particular situation.

Councilman Webb: Okay.

Ms. Scott: The reason for that is the stipulation was apart of the case that rezoned the property. Because it was a part of that rezoning application the ordinance says that you can not amend the zoning ordinance without the consent of the applicant and in this instance the applicant neither has consented to nor even requested the modification of that particular stipulation.

Councilman Webb: So, having said that what the MPC voted 7/0 was – how can they change that?

Councilman Shyne: Right.

Ms. Scott: Well what the MPC did was – you got to recall the application that Mr. Larkin originally or the request that he originally submitted was asking the MPC to acknowledge or tell him whether or not the proposed alignment would satisfy the requirement of that third stipulation. What the MPC did was say in essence no it doesn't, because they denied the proposal that was submitted to them but then they also added the additional condition about the stipulation so that was something that was not originally requested by the applicant. The applicant never asked them to consider that stipulation that said, before you can build any buildings or get any building permits you've got to provide a roadway and that roadway has to be approved by the planning director. That was never a request of the applicant, that was a direction that the MPC went in of their own accord, dare I say.

Councilman Webb: But we have that same thing now when a developer develops any subdivision he has to build the road and they have to be approved and brought into the maintenance system before you can even sell a permit to build a house.

Ms. Scott: Yes sir.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Not if you are not dedicating the street –

Councilman Webb: Well dedicated, right.

Ms. Scott: Right for a public roadway. But in this instance the singular issue that MPC was asked to decide was whether or not the proposed roadway satisfied that stipulation that was the only issue.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Okay, are you saying and this is hard for me to believe but you are essentially saying that his construction of that roadway, he doesn't need to go to the MPC to request that, that's just he's doing that so that he can agree with the stipulation for the development of – what you just said was he's got to agree with that stipulation so he presents that road up there but there's nothing necessarily precluding him from improving that road right now if he chooses to.

Ms. Scott: No, what I am saying is his request to the MPC was to basically tell me whether or not the road that I plan to construct from Flournoy Lucas to Ellerbe satisfies stipulation number three.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Correct.

Ms. Scott: MPC's decision that they gave him back - now whether or not that decision was responsive to what he asked them, but the decision that they gave him back was a denial of his proposal of the roadway. Then MPC said, we denied the roadway as you laid it out but now what we want is for the planning commission to reconsider that stipulation that was imposed and I believe it was on the 2007 approval we want the planning commission to go back and reconsider that third stipulation that says you can't get the building permits until the planning director approves the roadway.

Councilman S. Jenkins: So, let me ask a question on the heels of what you said.

Councilman Webb: I thought I had the floor Mr. Chairman.

Councilman S. Jenkins: I'm sorry councilman –

Councilman Webb: Everybody wants to talk while I'm trying to ask questions.

Councilman S. Jenkins: I apologize you are absolutely right, go ahead. Councilman Webb: Okay, thank you. You know, I'm definitely in favor of Mr. Larkin developing new development but I guess my whole big concern all along has been the curb cut coming out to Flournoy Lucas and whether we got into that – what I am worried about is where the road is going to be built, we don't know where the 3132 is going to actually be, if it's going to be too close and cause traffic problems at the curb cut with the entrance and exits of it, that's why I kept harping about the Railsback and I'd like to see him hold up on the curb cut out to Flournoy Lucas and go to Railsback and I don't

know if that is possible somebody mentioned earlier something about going to Ellerbe Road direction or whatever I just – I don't really have a problem with remanding it back to the MPC I just feel like we just are – I mean maybe that's what we should do and we maybe right back regardless to what the decision is we are going to be right back to the council and regardless of which way it goes, I still feel it's going to wound up in the courts. But if we could resolve it going back to the MPC then that would be great and we will see where we are at and anyway, I'll yield the floor back to you councilman.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Okay, thank you Councilman Webb. This is kind of hypothetical and I think it goes back kind of inline with what Councilman Webb was just saying I am just trying to see what is going to happen if it goes back to the MPC –

Councilman Webb: We don't know.

Councilman S. Jenkins: What authority do they have to do anything?

Ms. Scott: It depends on how you all send it back to the MPC Mr. Chairman. If you send it back to them giving them some directive or instruction on what you want them to look at that you may feel that they did not consider the first time they heard the case then you can remand it back to them with some specific directives for them to look at. If on the other hand you are just remanding it back the only thing to come out of that is that you are asking them to reconsider again a decision they've already made based on information that's already been provided to them. So, if anything has changed or you feel like they did not give a through review or there's some additional information that you asked them to consider that perhaps they did not consider before then send it back to them with that information.

Councilman S. Jenkins: And that's what I think is a little lacking I'm hearing right now not in the critical sense but in the motion to remand, I need to know exactly what it is that we are asking them to do and if it's worth sending it back?

Ms. Scott: Let me say this, there appear to be two issues is the construction of the roadway. The second issue is building houses. At some point those two issues joined but again the request before the MPC was, tell me whether or not the roadway as I proposed it will satisfy this stipulation that will allow to get the building permit to build the houses. If you all see the issues as joined you all see the issue of the roadway having some bearing on whether or not Mr. Larkin can build the houses. Then you may want to say, well fine there's no reason for us to remand it back to MPC because we believe the issues are so joined and we don't feel the need to remand we can make a decision now based on what is before us. If you believe however there is possibly a way to ask the MPC to review the decision on the alignment as well as separate – but look at that as a

separately as a separate issue on the proposed alignment, Mr. Larkin also has the right as any applicant or property owner that is subject to stipulations or condition imposed on an approval for a rezoning application to of his own accord ask the MPC to review or reconsider those stipulation. There is a process by which that can be done that could have been done and still can be done by Mr. Larkin initiating the request to MPC to say give me some relief from that stipulation that says that I can not get building permit unless I show you a road. But again it's up to whatever decision the council wants to make with regard to the roadway and or building permits that allows the development to continue. See the issues are so intertwined –

Councilman S. Jenkins: And in my mind I think they are the roadway – if it goes back to the MPC and the MPC takes a look at it the question that we asked the MPC to answer is the question they did not answer that we believe they did not answer at first which was does this proposed roadway meet the stipulation? If they come back now and say yes it does, does he have a right to put in a permanent road there?

Ms. Scott: And that maybe the question that you ask the MPC and again the critical part I believe is the language of that stipulation itself and there has been some reference made about the stipulation and some assumptions made but if you were to remand it then MPC needs to look at the pure language of that stipulation in light of the application that was submitted to them and that is whether or not as he proposed the roadway whether or not that satisfies the requirements of that stipulation.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Okay.

Councilman O. Jenkins: If we send back a question to the MPC of what stipulation does Mr. Larkin need to meet to begin construction today we have thereby disassociated it with the road to a certain extent, I mean they could come back and say you have to make this a permanent road and we're going to have to approve it etcetera, etcetera which we have already denied. But they could also come back and say well we don't have any stipulation for you anymore to, you know, or you have met three of the four and that is all we need to go forward. If we ask remanded that question back to the MPC do you believe that would put us in a posture to move forward with it at this point?

Ms. Scott: I think all I can say is perhaps, because again I don't know what questions or concerns the MPC would have once they receive it on remand. They may very feel that they provided a through review and provided a decision and they maybe in a position to review it again in light of the consideration or the question that you asked them and render a decision; I just don't know that would be a question for the planning commission.

Councilman O. Jenkins: I'm finished, thank you.

Councilman Corbin: We have a motion that's been seconded out on the table and this maybe completely out of line but I am going to address a question to the three gentlemen on the front row here and somebody can tell me if it is out of line. If we were to remand this back which then gives you the opportunity as the landowner to request the MPC change stipulations along the lines that we have discussed here, with keeping the construction road and using Railsback might that be a solution that you would seek from MPC?

Mr. Arceneaux: I'm going to be his lawyer for a minute.

Councilman Corbin: I thought that might happen.

Mr. Arceneaux: What he might be willing to do was to consent to the initiation of that application by the MPC. Because there are other people that he made commitments that he doesn't feel that he should be the applicant. But if the MPC should decide to initiate, then he would – as Ms. Scott just said, he would consent to that application. Those were her words, and that's why I advised Mr. Thompson that we would consent. Now I don't know what their application is going to say. I have to be a little bit of a lawyer on hedging there but assuming that is somewhere along the lines of what you were discussing, then the applicant would consent to that application by the MPC because this is the MPC's idea. Not saying it's a good or bad idea, but I am saying it is their idea and we believe they should be the applicant, but the applicant - the owner - would consent to that application.

Mr. Larkin: Enlarge on that purely in a practical way and there is a certain amount of speculation because, you know, say well if you do this and they do that but here is in a practical way here is what matters. I have a commitment to a lot of people that there will be a road there and there will be a road there and I am ready to build it and frankly the road thirty days one way or another or sixty days one way or another is one issue. The issue of the building permits that I think is critical that I made to two others that don't even live there is, I told them and this is where they were so specific, we said that before we begin building houses that it would be the old developer thing where I would treat you right, we will build a bridge one day and don't worry about it we said we will build the bridge and we will build the road. The reason we will build the bridge and the road is so those building materials can come from the highway over the bridge and delivered to those buildings sites and not be carried out through that neighborhood down there and through Ellerbe Road. And so, that is like the number one thing that was so very important and we are doing that now, that is today the roads built and so I feel very good that we are in a position where building materials would not be allowed

to be delivered off of the Railsback Road. So, who does that leave if you got the building materials and you got the workers they can all come that way so for the next, just like Tony pointed out, for the next, for quite some time what you have utilizing the Railsback Road number one is everybody that is building something in there that owns something in there that has the right to use it anyway. And so, then you narrow this whole thing down in this period of time while they are trying to figure this whole deal out of how many times somebody who has the right to come in Railsback Road who might have otherwise used the road that they came on the other side if it was paved. So, I do believe that the suggestion that the planning commission if they would initiate that then I would ask that if you are going to do that for heaven sakes, please don't thirty day me, sixty day me, ninety day me, one hundred twenty day me, do it and do it immediately and carry it out because all of these things that just freeze don't seem reasonable giving what we are doing. So, I don't know if I answered your question right there but what I just went through keeps me in shape with people that I'm committed to and no one will be able to come to me and say, you know, well you know you said you were going to do this, I am, you know, and I said you will not have building materials coming over your road and I meant that so I just must deliver these commitments that I have to others and believe me you all can see that I made those commitments based on the law that you hung me with, I mean not you all but I am following the law. So, anyway that's my observation of this and how it would practically apply.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Hold up sir, Councilman Corbin, were you finished?

Councilman Corbin: I was going to restate my motion if I could to see if we could get a vote.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Well we do have two people up Councilman Shyne and Councilman Jenkins (inaudible), but we can certainly call for the question.

Councilman Shyne: I want to make a statement before he get his vote and I want you to go on and get his vote. What I'm understanding and let me say this he says he has made a commitment to somebody. I made a commitment also Mr. Mayor, and it wasn't to Willis Knighton, if you understand that. I made a commitment to the people of the City of Shreveport, the people in my district that I would do whatever I could, the little bit that I could do to make sure that we get 3132 and nothing is built to impede 3132. What I am hearing Mr. Larkin say is that he is not so much concerned about being able to have this modified, where he could continue his building, as he wants the road. I mean this is what I understand him coming back to say what he wants is to be able to go in there and build this permanent road. I was in the MPC meeting, and with the MPC, what I got from the meeting is, Mr. Larkin you have a commitment to some business people but we have a commitment to the people of Shreveport if you want to continue

to use that secondary road or the temporary road that you have you can do that but we not going to let you go in there and build a permanent road because we don't know whether that will be apart of 3132 corridor. If so that's additional expenses that we have to go through in order to reimburse him for any expenses that we give him the right to do and what we are saying to him is we want you to build but we can't give you the authority to go in and build that road that you want and he's saying I got to have that road. I want that road. Now if you remand it back, remand it back but tell them modify it and give me that road. I'm sorry I just can't agree to that, I can not agree to have the MPC modify or alter or overturn their decision and say Mr. Larkin you can have that road I'm sorry, I m not for that because we don't know where 3132 where the corridor will be, and I think maybe that's what has happen now and that's why he has spent so much money, and Rose you're right some folks have been giving him the wrong information. But that's not my fault and that's not the fault of the citizens of Shreveport. So, Mr. Chairman and Mike my position is going to be I don't mind him using the temporary road he has the right to do that but I'm not for overturning the decision of the MPC and having them to modify it saying you can go in and build that road and I think we are all for that I don't think any of us want anything because we don't know where that corridor is going to be and I know we have some people who is going to do some fortune telling, and Rose I use to but I lost my touch on that I can't do that anymore. Dale I use to do a little fortune telling but I can't do that anymore. I don't know whether it's my age or what maybe I've been out of practice but I think we need to postpone this table it until we can talk to the MPC to see what can be done what we can do for Mr. Larkin beside giving him the authority to build that road. Mr. Chairman, thank you so very much.

Councilman O. Jenkins: I'm going to say I am going to support Councilman Corbin in his motion because I do feel that one group that has frankly been left out of this whole discussion, is the residents of Railsback Road of whom obviously lobbied fairly significantly and initially with the MPC to put in some of these stipulation. So, I think the appropriate place for those people to be giving at least the opportunity to state their case is at the MPC, so that's one more compelling reason in my mind to support the motion.

Councilman S. Jenkins: I too will be supporting Councilman Corbin's motion and if it is going back to the MPC for consideration for the Railsback entrance consideration of the new information that just came in from the Department Secretary of the Louisiana Department of Transportation consideration of the Louisiana Department of Transpiration Study I'm hearing that we may have some new information we assume that is coming on that but certainly no consideration of a permanent road coming off of Flournoy Lucas. You know, I'm just concerned if you put something out there right now without knowing where the highway is it's going to be disrupted and I'd hate to

see improvements put out there and a highway come and you are try to buy the improvement of disruptive people who planned to build a home or whatever the case maybe but I do think that the MPC need to take a further look at it with those type stipulation and with those kinds of questions that we are asking them to answer and to some extent with the restrictions that we are talking about no permanent road coming off of Flournoy Lucas under these circumstance. Alright any further discussion.

Motion by Councilman Corbin, seconded by Councilman McCulloch.

Councilman Corbin: Could you read back the motion as is?

Councilman Shyne: No.

Councilman Everson: It is a long one.

Councilman Corbin: Well let me restate before we count the vote. **My motion is that we remand this appeal back to the MPC and we request that MPC work with the property owner looking at the stipulation and see if an agreement can be worked out to continue use of the temporary unapproved construction road for – to allow building permits to be issued and when residents are located in the development they use the Railsback entrance. That makes sense.**

Councilman S. Jenkins: Does that motion also include that they consider this new information that's come in from the Deputy Secretary and I believe they need to consider the information that's contemplating to be coming from the Department of Transportation and Development Study.

Councilman Corbin: **I would add to that motion that all communication from DOTD and local DOTD representative be included in any discussion.**

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, clarification, just so that we will know, is that the only compromise that they can consider or is that a suggested compromise and they are free to look at other suggestions? I just want to be sure that they understand.

Councilman S. Jenkins: I think that should be only. It should be the only, because we don't want to go down a path of a permanent road being constructed on Flournoy Lucas, we don't want to go down that path.

Mr. Thompson: That's all I needed to know.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Is it still unclear?

Councilman O. Jenkins: Well, I think it is going to be difficult – I'm going to keep it simple, stupid marine.

Councilman S. Jenkins: What do you find to be unclear about it?

Councilman O. Jenkins: I believe that we are giving him some direction and I think that is appropriate, I'm not sure that we are asking them a question to answer unequivocally.

Councilman Everson: You say you want it phrased in a yes, no.

Councilman S. Jenkins: What would your suggested question be?

Councilman McCulloch; He said give him direction, that's what attorney Scott said do, give them direction, so we did.

Councilman O. Jenkins: I guess I would say ask them to determine a scenario that allows Mr. Larkin to begin building.

Councilman Shyne: That's too broad then you might say he can go in and build a permanent road and that's what we don't want to happen, Mr. Marine.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Okay.

Councilman S. Jenkins: This is about the best that I thin I can do with it; I mean just considering everything that's involved. Please vote.

Mayor Glover: Mr. Chairman, I guess I'm still confused as the Mayor, I don't know about the public but I just wanted to make sure I understood what the motion was.

Councilman Shyne: Oh my God.

Councilman S. Jenkins: My understanding is that –

Mayor Glover: Indulge me Mr. Shyne.

Councilman Shyne: What?

Mayor Glover: Indulge me; I'm trying to understand the motion –

Councilman Shyne: Well Sam is good at indulging, go ahead on Sam.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Well I was just simply saying that we are remanding it back to the MPC and we are giving them some instructions or directives on some of the things that we need them to look at, consideration of Railsback that entrance there for whatever development is going on. Temporary construction road only, off of Flournoy Lucas and not getting into a permanent road scenario at this time and that they need to consider the recent information that has come in from the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development in their further discussion of this I would hope that this is something that they can take up at maybe, you know, the next meeting that they are going to have which should be the first part of next month. But I really think, you know, all things – if I don't vote this I'm voting – I want to be clear that I'm voting no because I would be concerned about developments on the property Mr. Mayor that we don't have a clear cut picture of where the highway is going to go. My concern would be if homes were built out there later on the highway come along and say this is the most preferred way to go now we got houses out there we just added to a problem. So, I'm hoping that maybe if it goes back to the MPC it's just my hope right now that something could be worked out with where some development can take place at the same time, you know, we protect any future route for 3132.

Mayor Glover: And I would ask just for clarity sake from Mr. Corbin how was that different from what you intended motion was?

Councilman Shyne: It's the same.

Councilman Corbin: It was pretty close I think we just cleared up little statements in there.

Mayor Glover: Okay, thank you Mr. Chairman, thank you Mr. Corbin and thank you Mr. Shyne I know you getting a little grumpy at this point but I understand –

Councilman Shyne: That's my age

Mayor Glover: Oh, well I understand.

Councilman Shyne: That's my age Mr. Mayor, it's getting – it's after six o'clock –

Mayor Glover: Youth would account for that Mr. Shyne.

Councilman Shyne: Right and getting up at 6:00 and when you get my age, you'll get a little grumpy too. Lets go head on.

Councilwoman McCulloch: There's pizza in the back Uncle Joe.

Mayor Glover: Mr. McMichael and Mr. Rebouche helped you out.

Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Webb and S. Jenkins. 6. Nays: Councilmen Shyne. 1.

The Clerk read the following:

RESOLUTION NO. 97A OF 2012

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO PERMIT THE PROPERTY OWNER OF LOT 3 OF THE TWELVE OAKS PROFESSIONAL PLAZA SUBDIVISION TO CONSTRUCT A DRIVEWAY ACROSS CITY OWNED PROPERTY TO TIE ONTO FLOURNOY LUCAS ROAD (LA. HWY 523), AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the City has received a request for the permission to cross City owned property adjacent to Flournoy Lucas Road (LA 523) and:

WHEREAS, Resolution No. 108 of 2011 required City Council permission to allow access across this property, and:

WHEREAS, The City Council finds that the proposed driveway access being 1400 feet East of the LA 3132 interchange, does not interfere with the planned improvements and extension of LA 3132 and:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in legal session convened, that in accordance with Resolution No. 108 of 2011, the Mayor is authorized to permit a driveway access across the City owned property to lot 3 of the Twelve Oaks Professional Plaza Subdivision.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the remainder of Resolution 108 of 2011 shall remain in full force and effect.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that if any provision or item of this resolution or the application thereof is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions, items or applications of this ordinance which can be given effect without the invalid provisions, items or applications; and, to this end, the provisions of this resolution are hereby declared severable.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that all resolutions or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Councilman Corbin: Do we have anybody from Engineering?

Mayor Glover: Robert Westerman.

Councilman Corbin: And yesterday you did a good job of showing us maps and this piece of land. I think that's one of the clearest maps that we've seen, anything along the Flournoy Lucas corridor in some time. One of the things I want to be sure that the Council understands and we discussed this a little bit yesterday. Resolution 97 is simply a right of way issue today. This is the developer of Twelve Oaks asking to cross a narrow piece of city land. That's all this resolution does?

Mr. Westerman: That is correct.

Councilman Corbin: The next step would be an application would be made to DOTD for a curb cut?

Mr. Westerman: That is correct.

Councilman Corbin: If that curb cut were granted, still no road, no driveway, anything, at that point, MPC would have to approve a plat plan, and I may not be using the right word there, but they have to approve the developer's plan of what he's going to put in there, how it's going to be zoned, it's a public hearing, so there is public input on the plan, and there would be additional considerations of any traffic related issues to the curb cut. If a straight curb cut was in order, a right in, right out was in order or some modifications to that?

Mr. Westerman: That is correct.

Councilman Corbin: I just wanted to be sure we got all that out there, and everybody up here and out there understood the steps. But Resolution 97 is just a right of way crossing?

Mr. Westerman: That is correct.

Councilman Corbin: Thank you.

Councilman Shyne: Mr. Chairman, just before Robert sit down, you getting ready to ask some questions?

Councilman S. Jenkins: Well yeah, I was. But we're once again involving - - - is it the 16-acre tract? We're not involving the 16-acre tract that we're voting for now? For 3132, that's not involved in this at all?

Councilman Corbin: No.

Councilman S. Jenkins: This is further up the road from?

Mr. Westerman: This is about 1400 feet away from that tract of land, yes it is. Basically, this is excess right of way of Flournoy Lucas that is owned by the city and is not involved with the 3132 right of way or projected right of way that is zoned by the city, which is the 16-acre in the larger quadrangle shape.

Councilman S. Jenkins: There's a little bit of the difference between what's going on with what we just voted on, which was the MPC appeal. The difference is that roadway coming into that area was kinda in the zone so to speak of the 3132. This one is not? Is that what I'm hearing?

Mr. Westerman: That is correct. This is not within that zoning.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Corbin, seconded by Councilman McCulloch to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 7. Nays: None.

Public Hearing: None.

Adding Items to the Agenda, Public Comments, Confirmations and Appointments.

Adding legislation to the agenda (regular meeting only) and public comments on motions to add items to the agenda.

The Clerk read the following:

1. **Resolution No. 107 of 2012**: Suspending the effects of certain provisions of Chapter 10 relative to alcoholic beverages for the Let the Good Times Roll Festival on June 15 through 17, 2012, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

2. **Resolution No. 108 of 2012**: Authorizing the Mayor to execute a donation agreement between the City of Shreveport and Elgin Court, L.L.C., hereinafter called "owner" and acting herein through Matt Harris, Manager, for the private water main extensions and related facilities to Serve Ogilvie Hardware Lofts, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. Attachments(B/Everson)

Mr. Thompson: This is strictly a housekeeping matter, Resolution 106 which attempts to do the same thing is already on the agenda, but the title was not put on correctly. So we will ask you to take that title off and to add this one to the agenda.

Councilman Everson: So Moved.

Councilwoman McCulloch: Second.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Is there any person present that has opposition to these items being added to the agenda? Any person present in support of these items being added to the agenda?

Motion by Councilman Everson, seconded by Councilman McCulloch to add Resolution No(s) 107 and 108 to the agenda.

Councilman Webb: Point of Order Mr. Chairman. Does this have to be a unanimous vote? To be added to the agenda?

Councilman Shyne: It sure does. To be added to the agenda, it does.

Councilman Webb: Okay, we have a Council Member out of the Chamber, so how does that affect the vote?

Ms. Glass: It's those present and voting.

Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 6. Nays: None. Out of the Chamber: Councilman Corbin. 1.

Public Comments (*In accordance with Section 1.11 of the Rules of Procedures*)

Confirmations and appointments: None

Consent Agenda Legislation

To Introduce Routine Ordinances and Resolutions

Resolutions: None.

Ordinances: None.

To Adopt Ordinances and Resolutions

Resolutions:

The Clerk read the following:

RESOLUTION NO. 105 of 2012

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING SAMUEL BREWTON MUSE, JR. LOCATED AT 3775 MERIWETHER ROAD TO CONNECT TO THE WATER & SEWER SYSTEM OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, Samuel Brewton Muse, Jr. has agreed to secure all permits and inspections required by the Shreveport Comprehensive Building Code. Said party having submitted a petition for annexation to the City of Shreveport, and having agreed to fully comply with the regulations of the City of Shreveport in connection with said property, all as set forth in Section 94-1, et. Seq., of the Shreveport City Code. Said request and petition are attached hereto.

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened, that Samuel Brewton Muse, Jr. be authorized to connect the structure, located at 3775 Meriwether Road to the water & sewer system of the City of Shreveport.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that if any provisions or items of this resolution or the application thereof are held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions, items or applications of this resolution which can be given effect without the invalid provisions, items or applications, and to this end, the provisions of this resolution are hereby declared severable.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that resolutions or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Webb, seconded by Councilman McCulloch to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 6. Nays: None. Out of the Chamber: Councilman Corbin. 1.

Ordinances: None.

Regular Agenda Legislation

Resolutions on Second Reading and Final Passage or Which Will Require Only One Reading

The Clerk read the following:

RESOLUTION NO. 89 OF 2012

A RESOLUTION SUSPENDING CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF CHAPTER 10 RELATIVE TO ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES ON MAY 26, 2012 RELATIVE TO DISPENSING, SALE AND/OR CONSUMPTION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES AT HAMEL MEMORIAL PARK FOR A 5K RUN FUNDRAISER FOR THE PROPOSED SHREVEPORT DOG PARK AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BY: Councilman Oliver Jenkins

WHEREAS, the Shreveport Dog Park Alliance will host a 5K Run for a fundraiser for the proposed Shreveport Dog Park on May 26, 2012 between the hours of 7:00 a.m. and 2:00 p.m.; and

WHEREAS, the Shreveport Dog Park Alliance desires to dispense and allow the sale and consumption of alcoholic beverages at Hamel Memorial Park, 2751 Clyde Fant Parkway, during the event; and

WHEREAS, Section 10-80(a) makes it unlawful for any person to dispense alcoholic beverages except within those sections of the city wherein such sale is permitted by the applicable zoning ordinance, Section 10-190(a) prohibits consumption of alcoholic beverages on the parking lot of a business or on other property of a business where said property is open to the public, Section 106-130(6) provides that unless otherwise excepted, all uses shall be operated entirely within a completely enclosed structure, and Section 10-81 provides that Section 10-41 (requiring a retail dealer's permit) shall not apply to a bona fide nonprofit event meeting the requirements of this section, only when it is held within the confines of an enclosed building; and

WHEREAS, Section 10-192 prohibits the possession, sale and consumption of alcoholic beverages in city parks; and

WHEREAS, the adoption of this resolution would allow the dispensing, sale and consumption of alcoholic beverages at Hamel Memorial Park, 2751 Clyde Fant Parkway, on May 26, 2012 for a 5K Run Fundraiser for the proposed Shreveport Dog Park.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened that Sections 10-80(a), 10-81, 10-190(a), 10-192 and 106-130(6) are hereby suspended on May 26, 2012 for a 5K Run Fundraiser for the proposed Shreveport Dog Park, between the hours of 7:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m. at Hamel Memorial Park located at 2751 Clyde Fant Parkway.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that all other applicable provisions of the City of Shreveport Code of Ordinances shall remain in full force and effect.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that if any provision or item of this resolution or the application thereof is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions, items or applications of this resolution which can be given effect without the invalid provisions, items or application, and to this end, the provisions of this resolution are hereby declared severable.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that all resolutions or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman O. Jenkins, seconded by Councilman Everson to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 7. Nays: None.

RESOLUTION NO. 95 OF 2012

A RESOLUTION DECLARING THE INTENTION OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT TO PROCEED WITH AN APPLICATION FOR A LOAN FROM THE LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF ENVIRONMENTAL QUALITY (“LDEQ”) FOR FUNDING UNDER THE CLEAN WATER STATE REVOLVING FUND (“CWSRF”) PROGRAM IN AN AMOUNT NOT TO EXCEED FIVE MILLION AND NO/100 DOLLARS (\$5,000,000) FOR IMPROVEMENTS TO THE CITY’S SEWER SYSTEM; DECLARING THE INTENTION OF THE CITY TO HIRE PROFESSIONALS IN CONJUNCTION WITH THE LOAN APPLICATION; DECLARING THE INTENTION OF THE CITY TO MAKE APPLICATION TO THE LOUISIANA STATE BOND COMMISSION FOR APPROVAL OF SUCH LOAN; AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana (the “City”) now owns and operates a combined revenue-producing water and waste water (sewer) utility system (the “System”) and desires to upgrade the sewer distribution and related facilities of

such System by the acquisition and construction of improvements, extensions and replacements related thereto (the "Project"); and

WHEREAS, the City pursuant to authority contained in Resolution 257 of 2011, the City submitted a pre-application to the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality ("LDEQ") for funding under the Clean Water State Revolving Fund ("CWSRF") Program for a loan in an amount of not to exceed Five Million and no/100 Dollars (\$5,000,000) (the "Loan"); and

WHEREAS, the City desires to and is proceeding with an application to the LDEQ for funding under the CWSRF program for the Loan for the purpose of financing the Project and that the Loan be in the form of the issuance of not to exceed Five Million and no/100 Dollars (\$5,000,000) Utility Revenue Bonds (LDEQ Sewer Project) Series 2012 to be privately placed with LDEQ in the manner prescribed by and under the authority of Part XIII, Chapter 4, Title 39 of the Louisiana Revised Statutes of 1950 as amended (LSA-R.S. 39:1011 to 1025 inclusive) (the "Act") and other constitutional and statutory authority; and

WHEREAS, the City desires to apply to the Louisiana State Bond Commission ("SBC") for preliminary approval of the issuance of the Bonds.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the City Council of the City in legal session convened, acting as the governing authority thereof (the "Governing Authority"), that:

Section 1: Declaration of Intent. Pursuant to and in compliance with the provisions of the Act, and other constitutional and statutory authority, the Governing Authority does hereby declare its intention to issue not exceeding **FIVE MILLION AND NO/100 DOLLARS (\$5,000,000)** Utility Revenue Bonds (LDEQ Sewer Project) Series 2012 (the "Bonds"), the proceeds of which will finance the constructing and acquiring of improvements, extensions and replacements to the sewer portion of the combined revenue producing utility system (the "System") of the City, a work of public improvement for the City (the "Project"). The Bonds shall be limited and special revenue bonds of the City, secured by and payable in principal, interest and redemption premium, if any, solely from the income and revenues derived by the City from the operation of the System, after paying the reasonable and necessary costs and expenses of operating and maintaining the System. The Bonds shall not be a charge on the other income and revenues of the City as prohibited under the provisions of Article VI, Section 37 of the Louisiana Constitution of 1974, nor shall they constitute an indebtedness or pledge of the general credit of the City. The Bonds will be issued and authorized by ordinance (the "Ordinance") of the Governing Authority. The Bonds shall

be of such series, bear such dates, mature at such time or times (not to exceed twenty-two (22) years from their date of issuance), bear interest at such rate or rates not exceeding three and ninety-five hundredths per centum (3.95%) per annum (inclusive of any administrative fee), be in such denomination or denominations, in fully registered form, carry such privileges, be payable in such medium of payment at such place or places, be subject to such terms of redemption and be entitled to such priorities on the income and revenues of the System as such Ordinance may provide.

The City will, in the Ordinance, enter into such covenants with the LDEQ to whom the City intends to place the Bonds or any future owner or owners of the Bonds as to the management and operation of the System, the imposition and collection of rates and charges for the services rendered thereby, the disposition of such fees and revenues, the issuance of future bonds and the creation of future liens and encumbrances against the System and/or the revenues there from, the carrying of insurance on the System and the disposition of the proceeds of insurance, the keeping of books and records, and other pertinent matters as may be deemed proper by the Governing Authority to assure the marketability of the Bonds, consistent with the provisions of the Act. Such Ordinance will also include remedies in case of default, provision for the issuance of parity bonds, and such additional covenants, agreements and provisions as are judged advisable or necessary by the City for the security of the registered owners of the Bonds, including (if any) sinking funds and reserves for the payment of principal and interest on the Bonds and an adequate depreciation fund for those repairs and improvements to the System as may be necessary to assure adequate and efficient service to the public, all as provided by the Act.

Section 2. State Bond Commission Application. This Governing Authority hereby authorizes and directs that application be formally made to the SBC, Baton Rouge, Louisiana for approval of the Bonds within the parameters set forth above.

Section 3. Notice of Intent. The Mayor, upon approval of the SBC and LDEQ, be and he is hereby authorized, empowered and directed to publish an appropriate notice of the intention substantially in the form of **Exhibit "A"** hereto (the "Notice of Intention"). Such Notice of Intention shall embody in a general way substantially all the provisions of this resolution hereinabove set out and shall be published four (4) consecutive weeks in issues of *The Shreveport Times*, a newspaper of general circulation in the City and the Parish of Caddo and published daily in said Parish, with such alterations as the Mayor, upon advice of Bond Counsel, may deem necessary and appropriate.

Section 4. Public Hearing. The Governing Authority will meet in open and public session at its next regularly scheduled meeting or at a special meeting following the fourth consecutive publication of the Notice of Intention (the date of such meeting

which shall be determined by the Mayor prior to publication and set forth in the Notice of Intention) to hear any objections to the proposed issuance of the Bonds; provided, however, if at such hearing a petition or petitions duly signed by electors of the City in an aggregate number not less than five percent (5%) of the number of electors of the City voting in the last special or general election held in the City object to the issuance of the Bonds, then the Bonds shall not be issued until approved by a vote of a majority of the qualified electors of the City who vote at a special election held for that purpose in the manner provided by Chapter 6-A of Title 18 of the Louisiana Revised Statutes of 1950. Any such petition shall be accompanied by a certificate of the Caddo Parish Registrar of Voters certifying that the signers of the petition(s) are registered electors of the City and the number of signers amounts to not less than five percent (5%) of the registered voters that voted in the last election held in the City, all as provided by the Act.

Section 5. Declaration of Official Intent under Reg. 1.150-2. Prior to the issuance of the Bonds, the City anticipates that it may pay a portion of the costs of constructing and acquiring improvements, extensions and replacements to the System from other available funds. Upon issuance of the Bonds, the City reasonably expects to reimburse said expenditures from the proceeds of the Bonds. Any such allocation of the proceeds of the Bonds for reimbursement will be with respect to capital expenditures (as defined in Treasury Regulation 1.150-1(h)) and will be made upon the delivery of the Bonds and not later than one year after the date of (i) the date such expenditure was made or (ii) the date the improvements were placed in service. This resolution is intended to be a declaration of intent to reimburse in accordance with the provisions of Treasury Regulation 1.150-2.

Section 6. Employment of Bond Counsel. The City hereby finds and determines that a real necessity exists for the employment of special bond counsel in connection with the issuance of the Bonds, and accordingly The Boles Law Firm, APC, Monroe, Louisiana, ("Bond Counsel"), is hereby appointed and employed to do and perform comprehensive legal and coordinate professional work with respect to the issuance of the Bonds. Said Bond Counsel shall prepare and submit to such officials of the City for adoption all proceedings incidental to, and shall counsel and advise the Mayor and City Council on the issuance of the Bonds. The fees of Bond Counsel shall be contingent upon the issuance of the Bonds. The fees to be paid to Bond Counsel shall be in the amount approved by the City and shall not exceed the Attorney General's then current Bond Counsel Fee Schedule as negotiated and other guidelines for comprehensive, legal and coordinate professional work in the issuance of bonds applied to the actual aggregate principal amount of the Bonds at the time the Bonds are issued, together with reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses incurred and advanced in connection with the issuance of the Bonds, said fee to be payable out of Bond proceeds.

Section 7. SBC Swap Policy Language. By virtue of applicant/issuer's application for, acceptance and utilization of the benefits of the Louisiana State Bond Commission's approval(s) resolved and set forth herein, it resolves that it understands and agrees that such approval(s) are expressly conditioned upon, and it further resolves that it understands, agrees and binds itself, its successors and assigns to, full and continuing compliance with the "State Bond Commission Policy on Approval of Proposed Use of Swaps, or other forms of Derivative Products Hedges, Etc.", adopted by the Commission on July 20, 2006, as to the borrowing(s) and other matter(s) subject to the approval(s), including subsequent application and approval under said Policy of the implementation or use of any swap(s) or other product(s) or enhancement(s) covered thereby.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Governing Authority hereby authorizes and directs its Mayor, Chief Administrative Officer, Director of Finance, Clerk and such other officials of the City individually and/or collectively to do any and all things necessary and incidental to carry out the provisions of these resolutions.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that if any provision or item of these resolutions or the application thereof is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions, items or applications of this resolution which can be given effect without the invalid provisions, items or applications, and to this end, the provisions of this resolution are hereby declared to be severable.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that all resolutions in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman S. Jenkins, seconded by Councilman McCulloch to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 7. Nays: None.

RESOLUTION NO. 96 OF 2012

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF A COOPERATIVE ENDEAVOR AGREEMENT WITH SHREVEPORT FEDERAL CREDIT UNION AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport is the owner of property located at 2230 Jewella Avenue, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana; and

WHEREAS, the City, through its Department of Community Development, intends to engage in a cooperative endeavor with Shreveport Federal Credit Union (“SFCU”), a duly organized Louisiana non-profit corporation, to provide a credit union, financial education, small business entrepreneur preparation and other services (“Empowerment Center”) to and for the benefit of citizens of the City of Shreveport at this location; and

WHEREAS, the facility, will be managed by SFCU with programming oversight provided by the Department of Community Development.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened, that the Mayor of the City of Shreveport is hereby authorized to execute a Cooperative Endeavor Agreement with Shreveport Federal Credit Union, Inc., substantially in accordance with the terms and conditions contained in the attached draft thereof which was filed for public inspection, together with the original copy of this resolution in the office of the Clerk of Council on May 8, 2012.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that if any provision or item of this resolution or the application thereof is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions, items or applications of this resolution which can be given effect without the invalid provisions, items or applications and to this end the provisions of this resolution are hereby declared severable.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that all resolutions or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman S. Jenkins, seconded by Councilman McCulloch to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 7. Nays: None.

RESOLUTION NO. 98 of 2012

A RESOLUTION DECLARING THE OFFICIAL INTENT OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT TO REIMBURSE CERTAIN CAPITAL EXPENDITURES FOR WATER AND SEWERAGE EQUIPMENT AND GOLF EQUIPMENT FROM PROCEEDS OF LEASE-PURCHASE AGREEMENTS AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport intends to acquire certain vehicles, equipment and other property as generally described below (hereinafter, the “Property”); Equipment for Water and Sewerage Equipment for Golf

WHEREAS, the City may pay certain capital expenditures in connection with the Property prior to its receipt of proceeds of a lease-purchase agreement (“Lease Purchase Proceeds”);

WHEREAS, the City reasonably anticipates that it will make expenditures with respect to the Property in the principal amount not exceeding \$1,200,000 (“Principal Amount”) for which the City may or expects to enter into one or more Lease-Purchase Agreements;

WHEREAS, Treasury Department and Internal Revenue Service Regulations do not allow the proceeds of a tax-exempt borrowing to be spent on working capital;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport (“Governing Body”) in due, legal and regular session convened that:

Section 1. The Governing Body finds and determines that the foregoing recitals are true and correct.

Section 2. This Resolution is adopted by the Governing Body of the City for the purpose of establishing compliance with the requirements of Section 1.150-2 of Treasury Regulations. This Resolution does not bind the City to make any expenditure, incur any indebtedness, or proceed with the purchase of the Property.

Section 3. The Governing Body of the City expects the City will pay certain capital expenditures in connection with the Property prior to the receipt of Lease Purchase Proceeds for the Property.

Section 4. The Governing Body of City hereby declares the City’s official intent to use Lease Purchase Proceeds to reimburse itself for Property expenditures.

Section 5. This resolution and declaration of official intent shall take effect in accordance with Section 4.23 of the City Charter.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that if any provision of this resolution or the application thereof is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions, items or applications of this resolution which can be given effect without the invalid

provisions, items or applications and to this end the provisions of this resolution are hereby declared severable.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that all resolutions or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman S. Jenkins, seconded by Councilman McCulloch to adopt.

Councilman Webb: What kind of golf equipment are we going to buy?

Mayor Glover: Mr. Chairman, we'll bring Shelly to the mic if - - -

Councilman Webb: Okay.

Councilman Shyne: I hope its not, Ron I hope its not Tiger Woods.

Ms. Ragle-Stone: Greens and mower, a fairway unit, and one other piece of - - - all three of 'em are pieces of mower.

Councilman Webb: Are we going to cut Huntington with it?

Ms. Ragle-Stone: No, these are actually for Querbes.

Councilman Webb: Okay, that figures.

Ms. Ragle-Stone: Hopefully, they will piece together enough to get us through Huntington before we start construction. And when we do after we finish at Huntington, we'll want to purchase equipment for there.

Councilman Webb: Okay.

Ms. Ragle-Stone: But now we need to buy it (inaudible) for a year.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Promise me it wasn't \$1.2 (million) for those mowers?

Ms. Ragle-Stone: No, that's not mine. I'll take it, but that was not all of golf. Golf was about \$77,000.

Mr. Crawford: A million of it is water and sewer.

Councilman Everson: It's a capital expense, water and sewer. Golf is only a small portion.

Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 7. Nays: None.

RESOLUTION NUMBER 99 OF 2012

A RESOLUTION DECLARING THE CITY'S INTEREST IN CERTAIN ADJUDICATED PROPERTIES AS SURPLUS AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, there are numerous parcels of property which have been adjudicated to the City of Shreveport for non-payment of ad valorem taxes; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 26-300 of the Code of Ordinances, the city's interests in said properties can be sold after the City Council declares them to be surplus; and

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport has an Adjudicated tax interest in the properties described in Attachment "A-5" for non-payment of City Property taxes; and

WHEREAS, the purchasing agent has inquired of all city departments regarding the properties described in Attachment "A-5" and has not received any indication that it is needed for City purposes.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened that the properties described in Attachment "A-5" are hereby declared surplus.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that pursuant to Section 26-301 of the Code of Ordinances, this declaration that these properties are surplus satisfies the requirement of Section 26-301 (1) (d), therefore the MAYOR, Cedric B. Glover, is authorized by said Section 26-301 to do any and all things and to sign any and all documents, including Acts of Cash Sale, in a form acceptable to the City Attorney, necessary to effectuate the purposes set forth herein.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that if any provision or item of this resolution or the application thereof is invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions, items or applications of this resolution which can be given effect without the invalid provisions, items, or applications, and to this end the provisions of this resolution are hereby declared severable.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that all ordinances or resolutions or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Shyne, seconded by Councilman Everson to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 7. Nays: None.

RESOLUTION NO. 100 OF 2012

A RESOLUTION DECLARING CERTAIN ADJUDICATED PROPERTY TO BE SURPLUS, WHICH WILL AUTHORIZE THE MAYOR TO SELL THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT'S TAX INTEREST IN THESE ADJUDICATED PROPERTIES, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport has an adjudicated tax interest in the properties described in Attachment "A2" for the non-payment of City property taxes; and

WHEREAS, the properties described in Attachment "A2" are not needed for public purposes and should be declared surplus properties; and

WHEREAS, LA R.S. 47:2202(B) and Code of Ordinances Section 26-301. authorize a municipality to sell adjudicated property to an adjoining landowner who has maintained the adjudicated property in accordance with said section for a period of one year; and

WHEREAS, Code of Ordinances Section 26-301 provides that the sale price for such sales shall be one dollar and other good and valuable consideration; the real consideration for such sales is the purchaser's effort, labor and expenses in maintaining the property for a full year; and

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport has received applications pursuant to the above cited laws from adjoining landowners to purchase its tax interest in each of the properties described in Attachment "A2".

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, regular and legal session convened that the properties described in Attachment "A2" are hereby declared surplus.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the City Council of the City of Shreveport does hereby authorize the sale of its tax interest in each of the aforesaid properties for one

dollar and other good and valuable consideration; the real consideration for such sale is the purchaser's effort, labor and expenses in maintaining the property for a full year.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that pursuant to Section 26-301 of the Code of Ordinances, this declaration that these properties are surplus satisfies the requirement of Section 26-301(1)(d), therefore the MAYOR, Cedric B. Glover, is authorized by said Section 26-301 to do any and all things and to sign any and all documents, including Acts of Cash Sale, in a form acceptable to the City Attorney, necessary to effectuate the purposes set forth herein.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that if any provision or item of this resolution or the application thereof is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions, items or applications which can be given effect without the invalid provisions, items or applications, and to this end, the provisions of this resolution are hereby declared severable.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED. that all resolutions or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Shyne, seconded by Councilman Webb to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 7. Nays: None.

RESOLUTION NUMBER 101 OF 2012

A RESOLUTION DECLARING THE CITY'S INTEREST IN CERTAIN DJUDICATED PROPERTIES AS SURPLUS AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO

WHEREAS, there are numerous parcels of property which have been adjudicated to the City of Shreveport and Caddo Parish for non-payment of ad valorem taxes; and

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport has entered into an intergovernmental agreement with Caddo Parish under which Caddo Parish will undertake to sell said properties as authorized in R.S. 47:2201-2211, and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 26-300 of the Code of Ordinances, the city's interests in said properties can be sold after the City Council declares them to be surplus; and

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport has an adjudicated tax interest in the properties described in Attachment “A-5” for the non-payment of City property taxes; and

WHEREAS, the purchasing agent has inquired of all city departments regarding the properties described in Attachment “A-5” and has not received any indication that they are needed for city purposes.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened that the properties described in Attachment “A-5” are hereby declared surplus.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that pursuant to Section 26-301 of the Code of Ordinances, this declaration that these properties are surplus satisfies the requirement of Section 26-301(1)(d), therefore the MAYOR, Cedric B. Glover, is authorized by said Section 26-301 to do any and all things and to sign any and all documents, including Acts of Cash Sale, in a form acceptable to the City Attorney, necessary to effectuate the purposes set forth herein.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that if any provision or item of this resolution or the application thereof be held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions, items or applications of this resolution which can be given effect without the invalid provisions, items, or applications, and to this end the provisions of this resolution are hereby declared severable.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that all resolutions or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman McCulloch, seconded by Councilman Shyne to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 7. Nays: None.

RESOLUTION NO. 102 OF 2012

A RESOLUTION SUSPENDING CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF CHAPTER 10 RELATIVE TO DISPENSING, SALE AND/OR CONSUMPTION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES FOR THE JUXTAPUTT EXHIBITION AT ARTSPACE, 710 TEXAS AVENUE AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, Artspace, located at 710 Texas Avenue, operated by the Shreveport Regional Arts Council, will host the “Juxtaputt Putt: For the Art of It” Exhibition on June 1, 2012 from 5:30 p.m. until 8:30 p.m. and wishes to sell and serve alcoholic beverages on the sidewalk in front of Artspace: and

WHEREAS, Section 106-130(6) provides that unless otherwise excepted, all uses shall be operated entirely within a completely enclosed structure; and

WHEREAS, any special exception approval granted to the establishment for alcoholic beverage sales, consumption and/or dispensing does not specifically authorize outside sales and/or consumption on the premises; and

WHEREAS, Section 10-80(a) makes it unlawful for any person to sell, barter, exchange or otherwise dispose of alcoholic beverages except within those sections of the city wherein such sale is permitted by the applicable zoning ordinance; and

WHEREAS, Section 10-103(a)(5) provides that the city council may suspend or revoke any permit if a retailer allows any person to consume any alcoholic beverage on the licensed premises or on any parking lot or open or closed space within or contiguous to the licensed premises without a proper license; and

WHEREAS, Section 10-190 makes it unlawful for any person to consume alcoholic beverages on the public streets or sidewalks of the city; and

WHEREAS, the adoption of this resolution would allow the dispensing, sale and consumption of alcoholic beverages at the above listed event.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened Sections 106-130(6), 10-103(a)(5), 10-80(a) and 10-190 are hereby suspended on June 1, 2012 from 5:30 p.m. until 8:30 p.m. for the “Juxtaputt Putt: For the Art of It” Exhibition at Artspace, 710 Texas St.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that all other applicable provisions of the City of Shreveport Code of Ordinances shall remain in full force and effect.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that if any provision or item of this resolution or the application thereof is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions, items or applications of this resolution which can be given effect without the invalid provisions, items or application, and to this end, the provisions of this resolution are hereby declared severable.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that all resolutions or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Everson, seconded by Councilman McCulloch to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 7. Nays: None.

RESOLUTION NO. 103 OF 2012

A RESOLUTION SUSPENDING CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF CHAPTER 10 RELATIVE TO ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES ON JUNE 16, 2012 RELATIVE TO DISPENSING, SALE AND/OR CONSUMPTION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES AT 3030 CRESWELL AVENUE FOR COLUMBIA CAFÉ 10TH ANNIVERSARY CELEBRATION AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BY: COUNCILMAN JEFF EVERSON

WHEREAS, Columbia Café located at 3030 Creswell Avenue will host their 10th Anniversary Celebration on June 16, 2012 between the hours of 12:00 noon and 11:00 p.m.; and

WHEREAS, the establishment desires to dispense, and allow the consumption and sale of alcoholic beverages on the parking lot of the establishment, between the hours of 12:00 noon – 11:00 p.m.; and

WHEREAS, Section 106-130(6) provides that unless otherwise excepted, all uses shall be operated entirely within a completely enclosed structure; and

WHEREAS, any special exception approval granted to the establishment for alcoholic beverage sales, consumption and/or dispensing does not specifically authorize outside sales and/or consumption on the premises; and

WHEREAS, Section 10-80(a) makes it unlawful for any person to sell, barter, exchange or otherwise dispose of alcoholic beverages except within those sections of the city wherein such sale is permitted by the applicable zoning ordinance; and

WHEREAS, Section Chapter 10-103(a)(5) provides that the city council may suspend or revoke any permit if a retailer allows any person to consume any alcoholic beverage

on the licensed premises or on any parking lot or open or closed space within or contiguous to the licensed premises without a proper license; and

WHEREAS, the adoption of this resolution would allow the dispensing, sale and consumption of alcoholic beverages on the parking lot of Columbia Cafe, 3030 Creswell Avenue, on June 16, 2012 for a 10th Anniversary Celebration.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened Sections 106-130(6), 10-103(a)(5) 10-80(a) and 10-172 are hereby suspended on June 16, 2012 for a 10th Anniversary Celebration, between the hours of 12:00 noon - 11:00 p.m., at Columbia Café, 3030 Creswell Avenue.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that all other applicable provisions of the City of Shreveport Code of Ordinances shall remain in full force and effect.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that if any provision or item of this resolution or the application thereof is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions, items or applications of this resolution which can be given effect without the invalid provisions, items or application, and to this end, the provisions of this resolution are hereby declared severable.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that all resolutions or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Everson, seconded by Councilman McCulloch to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 7. Nays: None.

RESOLUTION NO. 104 OF 2012

A RESOLUTION TO AUTHORIZE THE EXPENDITURE OF CITY WIDE STREET IMPROVEMENT PROGRAM (11C003) FUNDS FOR ACKARD AVENUE, CARROLL STREET, AND CAPTAIN SHREVE DRIVE PROJECTS AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BY: COUNCILMAN OLIVER JENKINS

WHEREAS, the City Wide Street Improvement Program has an appropriation of \$11,000,000, funded from 2011 GOB, Prop 3 funds; and

WHEREAS, the paragraph numbered 3 in Ordinance No. 114 of 2011 (the 2012 Capital Improvements Budget) requires the City Council to authorize by resolution individual street improvement projects before City Wide Street Improvements Program Funds can be expended for those projects; and

WHEREAS, the City Wide Streets Improvement Program will be funded at \$21,000,000 which, if allocated equally between districts, will be \$3,000,000 for each district; and

WHEREAS, City Wide Street Improvement Program funds should be used to fund Ackard Avenue, Greenway to Southfield at a cost of \$1,500,000; Carroll Street, Annette to East Kings Highway (100 to 300 Block) at a cost of \$951,650; Captain Shreve Drive, Reilly to Bayou (1100 to 1600 Block) at a cost of \$477,350 for a total cost of \$2,929,000.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened, approves the use of City Wide Street Improvement Program funds for the following projects: Ackard Avenue, Greenway to Southfield at a cost of \$1,500,000; Carroll Street, Annette to East Kings Highway (100 to 300 Block) at a cost of \$951,650; Captain Shreve Drive, Reilly to Bayou (1100 to 1600 Block) at a cost of \$477,350 for a total cost of \$2,929,000; and the Mayor is therefore authorized to execute all contracts, deeds, grant documents and other legal instruments necessary to expend funds from the City Wide Street Improvement Program for this project.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that if any provision or item of this resolution or the application thereof is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provision, items or application of this resolution which can be given effect without the invalid provision, items or applications, and, to this end, the provisions of this resolution are hereby declare severable.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that all resolutions or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman O. Jenkins, seconded by Councilman Everson to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 7. Nays: None.

RESOLUTION NO. 107 OF 2012

A RESOLUTION SUSPENDING THE EFFECTS OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF CHAPTER 10 RELATIVE TO ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES FOR THE LET THE GOOD TIMES ROLL FESTIVAL ON JUNE 15 THROUGH 17, 2012 AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BY: COUNCILMAN JEFF EVERSON

WHEREAS, Rho Omega and Friends, a non-profit corporation of Rho Omega Chapter of Omega Psi Phi Fraternity, intends to sponsor the Let the Good Times Roll Festival at Festival Plaza on June 15 through June 17, 2012; and

WHEREAS, a major liquor company wishes to participate as a sponsor of the festival, and Rho Omega and Friends wishes to sell and serve beverages of both high and low alcoholic content; and

WHEREAS, the event will contribute to the economic, recreational and cultural opportunities and development of the city; and

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened that Sections 10-80(a) and 10-172(a) of the Code of Ordinances are hereby suspended to the extent necessary to allow the sale, dispensing and consumption of beverages of high and low alcoholic content at the Let the Good Times Roll Festival at Festival Plaza on June 15 through 17, 2012 between the hours of 12:00 p.m. and midnight on Friday, June 15th, between the hours of 12:00 noon and 12:00 midnight on Saturday June 16th, and between the hours of 2:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m. on June 17th.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that all other applicable provisions of the City of Shreveport Code of Ordinances shall remain in full force and effect.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that if any provision of this resolution or the application thereof is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions, items or applications of this resolution which can be given effect without the invalid provisions, items or applications and to this end the provisions of this resolution are hereby declared severable.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that all resolutions or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Everson, seconded by Councilman McCulloch to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes:

Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 7. Nays: None.

Introduction of Resolutions (*Not to be adopted prior to June 12, 2012*)

The Clerk read the following:

1. **Resolution No. 106 of 2012**: A resolution authorizing the Mayor to execute a donation agreement between the City of Shreveport and Elgin Court, L.L.C., hereinafter called "Owner" and acting herein through Matt Harris, Manager, for the private water main hardware lofts (located at 217 Jones Street) and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (B/Everson)

Motion by Councilman Shyne, seconded by Councilman O. Jenkins to remove Resolution No. 106 from the agenda. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 7. Nays: None.

The Clerk read the following:

1. **Resolution No. 108 of 2012**: Authorizing the Mayor to execute a donation agreement between the City of Shreveport and Elgin Court, L.L.C., hereinafter called "owner" and acting herein through Matt Harris, Manager, for the private water main extensions and related facilities to Serve Ogilvie Hardware Lofts, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. Attachments (B/Everson)

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Everson, seconded by Councilman McCulloch to introduce Resolution No. 108 of 2012 to lay over until the next regular meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 7. Nays: None.

Introduction of Ordinances (*Not to be adopted prior to June 12, 2012*)

The Clerk read the following:

1. **Ordinance No. 51 of 2012**: An ordinance amending the 2012 Capital Improvements Budget, appropriating the funds authorized therein, and otherwise providing with respect thereto. (*Intermodal Bus Facility (10A002)*) (B/Everson)

2. **Ordinance No. 52 of 2012**: An ordinance amending Ordinance No. 7 of 2012 (which amended the 2012 Capital Improvements Budget), and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

3. **Ordinance No. 53 of 2012**: An ordinance amending the 2012 Airport Enterprise Fund Budget, appropriating the funds authorized therein and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

4. **Ordinance No. 54 of 2012**: An ordinance amending the 2012 General Fund Budget, appropriating the funds authorized therein, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

5. **Ordinance No. 55 of 2012**: An ordinance amending the 2012 Streets Special Revenue Fund Budget, appropriating the funds authorized therein, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Everson, seconded by Councilman McCulloch to introduce Ordinance No(s). 51, 52, 53, 54, and 55 of 2012 to lay over until the next regular meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 7. Nays: None.

Ordinances on Second Reading and Final Passage (*Numbers are assigned Ordinance Numbers*)

The Clerk read the following:

1. **Ordinance No. 44 of 2012**: An ordinance creating and establishing a No Parking Zone in the 800 block of Linden Street, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (*See attached petition*) (B/Everson)

Having passed first reading on May 8, 2012 was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Everson, seconded by Councilman McCulloch to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 7. Nays: None.

2. **Ordinance No. 45 of 2012**: An ordinance creating and establishing a No Parking Zone in the 800 block of Stephenson Street, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (*See attached petition*) (B/Everson)

Having passed first reading on May 8, 2012 was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Everson, seconded by Councilman McCulloch to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 7. Nays: None.

3. Ordinance No. 46 of 2012: An ordinance creating and establishing a No Parking Zone in the 900 block of Stephenson Street, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (*See attached petition*) (B/Everson)

Having passed first reading on May 8, 2012 was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Everson, seconded by Councilman McCulloch to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 7. Nays: None.

4. Ordinance No. 47 of 2012: An ordinance amending and reenacting Article VII, Division 2 of Chapter 90 of the Code of Ordinances relative to Administration and Enforcement of Stopping, Standing and Parking Regulations, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on May 8, 2012 was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman O. Jenkins, seconded by Councilman S. Jenkins to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 7. Nays: None.

5. Ordinance No. 48 of 2012: An ordinance amending and reenacting Article VII, Division 4 of Chapter 90 of the Code of Ordinances relative to Parking Meters, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on May 8, 2012 was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman O. Jenkins, seconded by Councilman Everson to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 7. Nays: None.

6. Ordinance No. 49 of 2012: An ordinance authorizing the donation of certain city-owned property to Community Support Programs, Inc., and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (*Not to be adopted prior to June 12, 2012*)

Having passed first reading on May 8, 2012 was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Everson, seconded by Councilman McCulloch to postpone until the next regular meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 7. Nays: None.

6. Ordinance No. 50 of 2012: An ordinance amending and reenacting Chapter 102 of the Code of Ordinances relative to taxicab fares and to otherwise provide with respect thereto

Having passed first reading on May 8, 2012 was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman O. Jenkins, seconded by Councilman Everson to adopt.

Councilman Shyne: Question, if Sammy is watching this, Sammy call your Councilman Jeff Everson if you have any questions.

Councilman Everson: And he has no problem doing that.

Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 7. Nays: None.

7. Ordinance No. 43 of 2012: ZONING APPEAL: C-18-12: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by Rezoning property located on the SE corner of Pierremont and Willard, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, LA, from B-1, Buffer Business District to B-1E, Buffer Business/Extended Use District Limited to a “restaurant with a drive thru” only. (C/O. Jenkins) (*Postponed May 8, 2012*)

Councilman O. Jenkins: So moved to overturn.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Second.

Ms. Glass: Mr. Chairman, I think the way we would do these is you make a motion to adopt, and then ask for a ‘NO’ vote. Because this is an ordinance, its not a matter of overturning or not. You just need an up or down vote.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Okay then, so moved.

Councilman S. Jenkins: And you’re asking us to vote ‘NO’, is that what you want?

Councilman O. Jenkins: And then once I get a second on that, then I'm going to (inaudible).

Councilwoman McCulloch: Second.

Having passed first reading on May 8, 2012 was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman O. Jenkins, seconded by Councilman McCulloch to adopt.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Oh, okay.

Councilman Webb: Now, is this one that they approved?

Councilman O. Jenkins: They approved.

Councilman Webb: They approved it?

Councilman O. Jenkins: I'm going to give you the history behind it since while I'm going to give you the discussion part. This was a group that came a little, maybe 15 of them the last time, but they were a little overwhelmed with regard to all the other people that were there for appeals. And so they were the first group that spoke. The gentleman who was actually the property owner who got the rezoning is an older gentleman and he really couldn't wait until the end of the rest of the proceedings. So in that regard, I gave him the opportunity to come and state his case. Today he has chosen not to fight the appeal at this point.

Councilman Webb: So they approved it and somebody appealed it?

Councilman O. Jenkins: Somebody has appealed it, and so I'm asking for your 'NO' vote at this point.

Councilman Webb: Okay.

Motion failed by the following vote: Nays: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 7. Ayes: None.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Okay, that was unanimously 'NO'.

Councilman O. Jenkins: That was unanimously 'NO'. Now you're sure this is correct? Because it does say 'Zoning Appeal'.

Ms. Glass: That's correct. But its basically an ordinance that's in front of you, that it would not go into affect unless you voted 'YES'. So you have basically defeated the ordinance that would have rezoned the property.

Councilman O. Jenkins: I mean I would argue that it should say 'Zoning Case' and then I'm voting 'NO' against the zoning case, not voting 'NO' against the Appeal.

Mr. Thompson: Let me - - - it says Zoning - - - what you're voting on is a Zoning Ordinance.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Correct.

Mr. Thompson: And we put 'Zoning Appeal' so that you will know that somebody appealed it, because all zoning changes come to you as ordinances, but all of them are not appealed.

Councilman O. Jenkins: So long as its clear.

Councilman Webb: Don't feel bad Oliver, I'm still confused.

Councilman Corbin: Just to be safe, I'm driving the other way home.

Mr. Thompson: We'll explain it again at 8:00 in the morning.

Councilman O. Jenkins: No, no problem. I'm okay with the explanation.

The adopted ordinances and amendments follow:

ORDINANCE NO. 44 OF 2012

AN ORDINANCE TO CREATE AND ESTABLISH A NO PARKING ZONE IN THE 800 BLOCK OF LINDEN STREET AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in legal and regular session convened that it shall hereafter be unlawful for anyone to park any

vehicle between the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m., Monday through Friday on either side

of the 800 block of Linden Street.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that if any provision or item of this ordinance or the application thereof is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions, items or

applications of this ordinance which can be given effect without the invalid provisions, items or

applications and to this end the provisions of this ordinance are hereby declared severable.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that all ordinances or resolutions or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed

ORDINANCE NO. 45 OF 2012

AN ORDINANCE TO CREATE AND ESTABLISH A NO PARKING ZONE IN THE 800 BLOCK OF STEPHENSON STREET AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in legal and regular session convened that it shall hereafter be unlawful for anyone to park any vehicle between the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m., Monday through Friday on either side of the 800 block of Stephenson Street.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that if any provision or item of this ordinance or

the application thereof is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions, items or

applications of this ordinance which can be given effect without the invalid provisions, items or

applications and to this end the provisions of this ordinance are hereby declared severable.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that all ordinances or resolutions or parts

thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

ORDINANCE NO. 46 OF 2012

AN ORDINANCE TO CREATE AND ESTABLISH A NO PARKING ZONE IN THE 900 BLOCK OF STEPHENSON STREET AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in legal and regular session convened that it shall hereafter be unlawful for anyone to park any vehicle between the hours of 8:00 a.m. to 10:00 a.m., Monday through Friday on either side of the 900 block of Stephenson Street.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that if any provision or item of this ordinance or

the application thereof is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions, items or

applications of this ordinance which can be given effect without the invalid provisions, items or

applications and to this end the provisions of this ordinance are hereby declared severable.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that all ordinances or resolutions or parts

thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

ORDINANCE NO. 47 OF 2012

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND AND REENACT ARTICLE VII, DIVISION 2 OF CHAPTER 90 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES RELATIVE TO ADMINISTRATION AND ENFORCEMENT OF STOPPING, STANDING AND PARKING REGULATIONS AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, legal and regular session convened that Sections 90-271 through 90-275 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport are hereby amended and reenacted to read as follows:

Sec. 90-271. - Method of notice.

Any notice permitted or required to be given under this article shall be considered given when mailed by first class mail to the operator, if known, or to the registered owner at the address appearing on the registry of the office of motor vehicles of the state

department of public safety, or any successor agency thereof, or the appropriate office of motor vehicle registration of any other state, or to a vehicle lessee at the address provided by the lessor. The owner's failure to receive delivery of the notice due to a change of address of which no notice was given to the office of motor vehicles of the state department of public safety, or the appropriate office of motor vehicle registration of any other state, shall be deemed to be receipt of such notice. The laws relating to citation and service of process shall be observed prior to legal enforcement of any civil judgment.

Sec. 90-272. - Parking ordinance hearings officer.

(a) The mayor shall appoint, subject to the approval of the city council, parking ordinance hearings officer(s) who shall not be employees of the city. The term of each appointment shall be three years commencing from the date of confirmation by the city council.

(b) The duties and function of the hearings officer shall be as follows:

(1) To hold hearings and make determinations pursuant to sections 90-273 through 90-275 of this chapter.

(2) To establish rules of procedure for requesting hearings, setting hearing dates, the conduct of hearings; and other matters within its duties and functions.

Sec. 90-273. - Impoundment of illegally parked motor vehicles.

(a) Any motor vehicle parked in violation of this article shall be subject to removal, impoundment and detention by the city, when such parked vehicle:

(1) Creates or constitutes a traffic hazard or other safety hazard;

(2) Obstructs or may obstruct the movement of any emergency vehicle;

(3) Is parked on a sidewalk in the B-4 central business district; or

(4) Is parked in an alley in violation of section 90-292.

A motor vehicle which is impounded under this subsection shall be subject to immediate removal without notice.

(b) (1) Any motor vehicle that appears inoperable and is left unattended on public property for a period of more than seven days, or that has remained illegally on public

property for a period of more than seven days, or that has remained on the property of any city-owned housing project, or the property of any city-owned housing project operated under contract by another, for more than seven days, shall be subject to removal, impoundment and detention by the city or any person authorized and instructed by the city to do so.

(2) Prior to the removal, impoundment, or detention of a motor vehicle in accordance with this subsection, a notice shall be securely affixed to such vehicle, stating that the vehicle has been parked there for an excessive period of time, and notifying the owner thereof that it will be towed away unless removed within seven days.

(3) Evidence that a vehicle is or appears to be inoperable under this section includes but is not limited to; a missing wheel or wheels, no motor, flat tire or tires, any unsafe condition which would be a danger to life or property, or if the vehicle does not otherwise contain those parts and equipment in proper condition and adjustment as required in R.S. 32:51 et seq.

(c) Whenever any motor vehicle has been removed, impounded, or detained in accordance with subsections (a) or (b), the police department or a third party contracted by the city shall as soon as practicable, send a notice to the last known owner of such vehicle, notifying such owner of the following:

(1) That the vehicle has been impounded.

(2) The amount or rate of assessed charges for towing, storage or other costs incident to the impoundment, and that the release of the vehicle may be obtained by paying the stated charges and by showing proof of ownership of such vehicle.

(3) That in the alternative he may obtain the release of the vehicle by posting an appearance bond which shall be in an amount not less than the amount of all amounts described in subsection (c)(2).

(4) The procedure to be followed in obtaining and posting such bond.

(5) That he has the opportunity for a hearing as provided in section 90-275 if he so requests, concerning the amount and propriety of the fees for impoundment and storage fees under subsections (a) and (b) of this section.

(6) The procedure to be followed in requesting such a hearing.

(d) Except when the person making the impoundment is doing so pursuant to a contract with the city let pursuant to public bids, when a motor vehicle is impounded under this section, a charge for towing and storage in accordance with the provisions of article V of chapter 102 shall be assessed and collected prior to the release of such vehicle.

Section 90-274. Impoundment or immobilization of motor vehicles having unpaid parking citation(s).

(a) Any motor vehicle parked upon a street, highway or public property, against which there is a parking citation, including costs and late payment penalties, which has not been paid within 60 days of the date of issuance of the citation, shall be subject to removal, impoundment, detention or immobilization by the city or by a third party contracted to provide these services to the city.

(b) (1) Prior to removal, impoundment, detention or immobilization of any vehicle pursuant to this section, the owner of such motor vehicle shall be mailed a notice that the vehicle will be subject to removal, impoundment, detention or immobilization because of the unpaid parking citation(s) unless within 15 days from the date of the notice the owner either pays all outstanding parking citations including late fees in full or requests a hearing, in writing.

(2) The notice shall provide the address and telephone number of the office at which the request for a hearing must be made and the procedure for requesting a hearing.

(3) The notice shall provide the owner of such motor vehicle with a written summary of the unpaid parking ticket(s) on which the immobilization is based.

(4) When a timely request for a hearing is received, the parking ordinance hearing officer shall notify the owner of such motor vehicle of the date, time and place for such hearing, and advise the owner that he may appear, in person or by written statement, to present reasons why the vehicle should not be immobilized.

(c) The fee charged for immobilization of a motor vehicle by the city, or by a third party contracted to provide these services to the city, shall be \$75.00.

Sec. 90-275. - Hearings by parking ordinance hearings officer.

(a) Upon receipt of a written request, the parking ordinance hearings officer shall hold hearings relating to removal, impoundment, or detention of motor vehicles pursuant to section 90-273 in accordance with the rules of procedure established by the hearings officer(s). In hearings pursuant to this subsection, the hearings officer's determination

shall be limited to the question of whether the city had probable cause to tow the vehicle, but the hearings officer shall have the power to reduce or waive the charges even when probable cause is shown, when, in his discretion, it determines that such waiver or reduction is justified. The hearings officer shall also have the power to order the release of the vehicle prior to hearing, upon execution of an appearance bond as provided for in section 90-273.

(b) Upon receipt of a written request, the parking ordinance hearings officer shall hold hearings prior to removal, impoundment, detention, or immobilization of any motor vehicle pursuant to section 90-274. In hearings pursuant to this subsection, the hearings officer's determination shall be limited to the question of whether the criteria for the proposed removal, impoundment, detention or immobilization have been met. The hearings officer shall not hear or determine the liability of the vehicle owner on the merits of the parking citations.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that if any provision or item of this Ordinance or the application thereof is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions, items or applications of this Ordinance which can be given affect without the invalid provisions, items or applications and to this end the provisions of this Ordinance are hereby declared severable.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that all Ordinances or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

ORDINANCE NO. 48 OF 2012

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND AND REENACT ARTICLE VII, DIVISION 4 OF CHAPTER 90 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES RELATIVE TO PARKING METERS AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, legal and regular session convened that Section 90-332(b) of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport is hereby amended and reenacted to read as follows:

Sec. 90-332. - Overtime parking.

* * *

(b) For the offense of overtime parking or parking beyond the period of legal parking time established for any parking meter zone, the penalty shall be a fine of \$10.00;

provided, however, that if such fine is not paid within ten days of the date of the offense, the fine shall be \$50.00.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that if any provision or item of this Ordinance or the application thereof is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions, items or applications of this Ordinance which can be given affect without the invalid provisions, items or applications and to this end the provisions of this Ordinance are hereby declared severable.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that all Ordinances or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

ORDINANCE NO. 50 OF 2012

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND AND REENACT CHAPTER 102 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES RELATIVE TO TAXICAB FARES AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, legal and regular session convened that Section 102-83(a)(1) through (3) of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport is hereby amended and reenacted to read as follows:

Sec. 102-83. - Taxicab fares.

(a) Metered rates. The metered taxicab rates for taxicabs operating in the city shall be as listed herein. Rates shall not be adjusted more than once in a 365-day period and only with the approval of the city council.

(1) A base fee of not more than \$4.00 for each trip, and

(2) For each one-eighth mile or fraction thereof, \$0.25.

(3) When a taxicab is required to wait at the request of the passenger, the charge therefore shall be \$25.00 per hour for such waiting time.

* * *

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that if any provision or item of this Ordinance or the application thereof is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions, items or applications of this Ordinance which can be given affect without the invalid

provisions, items or applications and to this end the provisions of this Ordinance are hereby declared severable.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that all Ordinances or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Tabled legislation.

1. **Ordinance No. 89 of 2011**: An ordinance amending and reenacting Chapter 74 of the Code of Ordinances relative to Solid Waste Collections, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (G/S. Jenkins) (*Tabled September 13, 2011*)

2. **Resolution No. 179 of 2011**: Authorizing Melba Yvonne Warr Baldwin located at 382 Cope Drive to connect to the water & sewer system of the City of Shreveport, and otherwise providing with respect thereto. (Near D and is not contiguous to the city limits.) (*Tabled Oct 11, 2011*)

3. **Resolution No. 222 of 2011**: Authorizing Lawrence Johnson Franklin Jr. and Elizabeth Fry Franklin located at 421 Bob White Lane to connect to the water and sewer system of the City of Shreveport and otherwise providing with respect thereto. (*The property is located near Council District D, and is not contiguous to the City limits*) (D/Corbin) (*Tabled Oct 11, 2011*)

4. **Resolution No. 223 of 2011**: Authoring Lee Roy Stanley located at 419 Mohican Lane to connect to the water and sewer system of the City of Shreveport and otherwise providing with respect thereto. (*The property is located near Council District D, and is not contiguous to the City limits*)(D/Corbin) (*Tabled Oct 11, 2011*)

5. **Resolution No. 226 of 2011**: Authorizing Frank G. Harris III located at 437 Bob White Lane to connect to the water and sewer system of the City of Shreveport and otherwise providing with respect thereto. (*The property is located near Council District D, and is not contiguous to the City limits*)(D/Corbin) (*Tabled Oct 11, 2011*)

6. **Resolution No. 227 of 2011**: Authorizing Kaylan Franklin Worley, Sr. located at 3008 Nottingham Drive to connect to the water and sewer system of the City of Shreveport and otherwise providing with respect thereto. (*The property is located near Council District D, and is not contiguous to the City limits*)(D/Corbin) (*Tabled Oct 11, 2011*)

7. **Resolution No. 228 of 2011**: Authorizing Jeffery Charles Shamsie located at 414 Mohican Lane to connect to the water and sewer system of the City of Shreveport and

otherwise providing with respect thereto. (*The property is located near Council District D, and is not contiguous to the City limits*)(D/Corbin) (Tabled Oct 11, 2011)

8. **Resolution No. 229 of 2011**: Authorizing Joan E. Thoma located at 2036 Pepper Ridge Lane to connect to the water and sewer system of the City of Shreveport and otherwise providing with respect thereto. (*The property is located near Council District D, and is not contiguous to the City limits*) (D/Corbin) (Tabled Oct 11, 2011)

9. **Resolution No. 230 of 2011**: Authorizing Henry Eugene Raines, Jr., and Gloria Jean Wingate Raines located at 3004 Nottingham Drive to connect to the water and sewer system of the City of Shreveport and otherwise providing with respect thereto. (*The property is located near Council District D, and is not contiguous to the City limits*)(D/Corbin) (Tabled Oct 11, 2011)

10. **Resolution No. 231 of 2011**: Authorizing William Sidney Hunt and Gaynel Neyrey Hunt located at 10015 Nightingale Drive to connect to the water and sewer system of the City of Shreveport and otherwise providing with respect thereto. (*The property is located near Council District D, and is not contiguous to the City limits*)(D/Corbin) (Tabled Oct 11, 2011)

11. **Resolution No. 233 of 2011**: Authorizing James Allan Bell and Betty Ann Kilpatrick Bell located at 3055 Dryden Court to connect to the water and sewer system of the City of Shreveport and otherwise providing with respect thereto. (*The property is located near Council District D, and is not contiguous to the City limits*)(D/Corbin) (Tabled Oct 11, 2011)

12. **Resolution No. 241 of 2011**: Requiring the Chief Administrative Officer to offer the fair market value (and if accepted) to purchase the flood prone properties located at 8035 and 8037 Jewella Avenue by October 26, 2011, or to provide a report to the council relative to this matter on that date and to otherwise providing with respect thereto. (Tabled October 24, 2011)

13. **Resolution No. 243 of 2011**: Authorizing James Michael Johnson and Kelly Renee Larry Johnson located at 352 Cope Drive to connect to the water & sewer system of the City of Shreveport and otherwise providing with respect thereto. (*The property is located near Council District D, and is not contiguous to the City limits*) (Tabled October 24, 2011)

14. **Resolution No. 244 of 2011**: Authorizing Byron Wayne Ruesch and Leslie Baldwin Ruesch Located at 369 Cope Drive to connect to the water & sewer system of the City of Shreveport and otherwise providing with respect thereto. (*The property is located*

near Council District D, and is not contiguous to the City limits) (Tabled October 24, 2011)

15. **Resolution No. 248 of 2011**: Authorizing Claude E. Franklin and Mary Elizabeth Womack Franklin located at 442 Bob White Lane to connect to the water & sewer system of the City of Shreveport and otherwise providing with respect thereto (*The property is located near Council District D, and is not contiguous to the City limits*) (Tabled October 24, 2011)

16. **Resolution No. 249 of 2011**: Authorizing Jason Wayne Waltman and Kristy Mcgee Waltman located at 3028 Nottingham Drive to connect to the water & sewer system of the City of Shreveport and otherwise providing with respect thereto (*The property is located near Council District D, and is not contiguous to the City limits*) (Tabled October 24, 2011)

17. **Resolution No. 36 of 2012**: Opposing Senate Bills 269 and 273, introduced in the 2012 Regular Session of the Louisiana Legislature, which will amend R,S, 33L4461 and R.S. 33:4510(D), relative to franchise fees, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (E/Webb)(Tabled March 27, 2012)

18. **Ordinance No. 25 of 2012**: An ordinance amending the 2012 Capital Improvements Budget, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (*Texas Street Turn Lanes*) (B/Everson)(Tabled March 27, 2012)

Appeals

Property Standards Appeals

PSD0900275: 140 Pennsylvania Avenue, Shreveport, LA (C/Jenkins) Mr. & Mrs. Robert A. Powell, 819 ½ Boulevard Street, Shreveport, LA 71104 (B/Everson) (*Postponed March 26, 2012 until May 21, 2012*)

HBO1000030: 153 Merrick Street, Shreveport, LA (B/Everson) Ms. Lola B. Layton, P.O. Box 4582 Shreveport, LA 71134 (*Postponed April 23, 2012 until August 27, 2012*)

PSD1000086: 2837 Logan Street, Shreveport, LA (G/S. Jenkins) Ms. Carolyn Ivory Wilson, 3646 Del Rio Street, Shreveport, LA 71109 (G/Jenkins) (*Postponed April 23, 2012 until July 23, 2012*)

PSD1000141 728 Austin Pl, Shreveport, LA (B/Everson) Ms. Deborah Bryant, 9640 Tammy, Shreveport, LA 71106 (Caddo Parish) (*Tabled April 11, 2011*)

PSD1100017 3634 Sumner Street, Shreveport, LA (G/S. Jenkins) Mr. Roberto Strickland, 3740 Jackson Street, Shreveport, LA 71109 (G/S. Jenkins) (*Postponed March 12, 2012 until June 11, 2012*)

HBO1100050 3819 Bobbitt Place, Shreveport, LA A/McCulloch) Ms. Cheryl Barnhardt, Jackson and McPherson, LLC., 1010 Common Street, Suite 1800, New Orleans, LA 70112(*Postponed April 23, 2012 until July 23, 2012*)

PSD1100251: 3631 Stonewall, Shreveport, LA (G/S. Jenkins) Mr. Charles Parson, 4308 Lakeshore Dr., Shreveport, LA 71109 (G/S. Jenkins) (*Postponed April 9, 2012 until June 11, 2012*)

Alcoholic Beverage Ordinance Appeals

Other Appeals

Taxi Appeal

Reports from officers, boards, and committees

Master Plan Committee Report

Mr. Thompson: As we discussed yesterday Mr. Chairman, the Master Plan Committee Report will be heard at the next meeting.

Clerk's Report

ZONING APPEAL - BAC-36-12: 3802 Hollywood, north side of Hollywood 200' east of Bellar Street, Special Exception Use & variance in hours in a B-3 District. (F/Shyne)

The Committee "rises and reports" (reconvenes the regular council meeting)

Adjournment: There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting adjourned at approximately 7:20 p.m.

//s// Sam L. Jenkins, Jr., Chairman

//s// Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council