



Council Proceedings of the City of Shreveport, Louisiana

November 29, 2010

The regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana was called to order by Chairman Oliver Jenkins at 1:36 p.m., Monday, November 29, 2010, in the Government Chambers in Government Plaza (505 Travis Street).

Invocation was given by Councilman McCulloch.

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Councilman Everson.

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.

Public Comments: None.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Is Terri Scott - - - I'm bringing her up just because she's going to - - - would you mind informing us on the correspondence we had today, just so it's clear to everybody here? Thank you.

Ms. Scott: Notice of the meeting that was posted on this past Wednesday included notice that the Council would discuss the matter entitled Department of Justice v. City of Shreveport in an executive session. The law on open meetings is very specific. Our purpose for asking that that matter be included on the agenda at the executive session item was in the event that we found that we had satisfied the requirement of the state law that would have allowed the council to discuss that matter in executive session. Open meetings law does allow a public body to discuss litigation or prospective litigation in an executive session. The Department of Justice has not filed a lawsuit against the city in regards to the sanitary sewer violations. We are in discussions however with the Department of Justice and consequently any discussion in an executive session about matters that are involved in the SSO violations would be included under the prospective exceptions to the open meetings law. That statute specifically states however that we can discuss prospective litigation after formal written demand. In this instance, persons in the City Engineer's office and in DOS have looked through all their files and records in regards to communication they've received in Department of Justice concerning the sanitary sewer violations and we can't find that we've actually gotten formal written demand from the Department of Justice. In that regard, since we have not, our recommendation to you is that any discussion on the SSO violations actually occur in an open meeting. This we don't consider as fatal because it'll give an opportunity again for there to

be open and frank discussion during an open meeting of the violations. Tim Hardy, the attorney who is representing us in our discussions with the Department of Justice called a few moments ago,

Mr. Seaton: He's behind you.

Ms. Scott: And he is sitting behind me. Good timing. I was going to tell you he was going to be delayed, but he is here to answer any questions you would have of the general nature on the violations, the history of the violations, our discussions to the extent he feels comfortable in disclosing that to you in an open meeting with DOJ so far regarding the violations and laying out a little bit for you, the path going forward or at least what we believe the path going forward would be with DOJ. This will all end up at some point in the execution of a consent decree with Department of Justice, but again, these are our negotiations and the process for those negotiations with DOJ going forward. So, long way of saying that that is the reason why contrary to the notice that was put out on Wednesday, our recommendation is that this matter not be discussed in an executive session.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Okay, thank you. To the Council, any discussion on whether we do an open session or whether we do an executive session?

Councilman S. Jenkins: Mr. Chairman, I am very disappointed. I am very disappointed, because I thought the - - - you know we talked about this a number of days ago, and to come in to the meeting today and find out for the first time that we cannot go into executive session to discuss this matter is very disappointing to me. My concern is that we as members of the Council need to know some of the legal ramifications that are involved. I'm certainly not trying to keep anything from the public, but I think our citizens will understand that if there is some legal ramifications, we need to be able to talk with the attorney. You know there is such thing as 'attorney/client' privilege out here, we need to be able to talk with the attorney to be able to ask the questions that only us and the lawyer should hear at this particular point. So I'm disappointed that we show up today and we're hearing for the first time that we cannot go to an executive session on the matter. Some of the questions I wanted to ask about this, I wanted to ask if the attorney had some degree of confidentiality with it. So I'm not really certain what we're doing here today that's going to be of some benefit. I'm really not - - - I'm certain going to follow the advice of the City Attorney on this matter, but I just wanted to express my disappointment with it, that I come to the meeting, and for the first time, I'm hearing I'm not going to be able to do what I came here to do. When did we get knowledge of this? When did we know that we couldn't go into executive session?

Ms. Scott: Mr. Jenkins, the reason we had the matter placed on the agenda was in hopes of finding that one piece of paper that would allow us to discuss it in executive session. Our belief heretofore was that we had actually gotten something in writing from DOJ informing us of the potential for litigation. When we looked in earnest, this past Wednesday and up until today, we did not find that writing. Now in regards to any questions that you may have, Mr. Hardy is available. He represents the City of Shreveport, so he is available to discuss this matter with you on an individual basis, and that hopefully will satisfy or get responses to any questions you may have from a legal perspective, that he would not be comfortable in discussing in an open meeting. Again, the potential for

litigation is there. We are in discussion with DOJ that we hope will lead to the consent decree, however, we have not satisfied that technical requirement in the open meetings law, and we just don't have a formal demand in writing from them about prospective litigation. Now, going forward, do I anticipate that we will have such a document? Most certainly. Will any future discussions have the potential to occur in executive session after we get that? No doubt about it. But right now, again, we can't satisfy that technical requirement and we would not recommend to you that you discuss this matter in an executive session in the absence of that document.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Well I mean, I'm going to follow your advice Ms. Scott as the City Attorney, but I don't want to waste a lot of time with it to be honest with you, but I am disappointed that Mr. Hardy has come up here to Shreveport and my discussing something with him on an individual basis is one of the reasons I have some concern about how many different directions - - - this just sounds like to me that it ought to be something that we're all on the same page with. The Council, the Mayor's office, whatever the people need to be in the informational loop, it just seems to me we need to be on the same page. And if he's given several pieces of advice to several different people, then we've got the potential for some mix up and for some problems. But like I say, we're here today and for what good it's going to be, I guess we'll proceed with it, but it's certainly not drawn along the lines of what I had perceived we'd be doing today. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Ms. Scott: And Mr. Chairman, members of Council, as we go forward, if there is anything specific, that you feel is not covered by Mr. Hardy in his presentation to you, then again, those items or if there is anything that he does not feel comfortable in disclosing in an open meeting, then we will be more than happy to provide that information to you. But I believe and hopefully that the information that you'll receive today may answer the majority of your questions that you'll have in regard to the violations. And particularly the cost for trying to remedy those violations.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Thank you. Any other discussions amongst Council Members? Okay, with that being said, I recommend we just remain in our current open session and Mr. Hardy, if you're prepared to speak to the Council, we'd like to recognize you at this point.

Executive Session to discuss the following matter involving prospective litigation pursuant to R. S. 42:6.2(3):

US v. City of Shreveport

(Re: Sanitary Sewer violations)

Mr. Tim Hardy: Thank you very much Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, members of the Council, Mayor Glover, my name is Tim Hardy. I'm pleased to be before you today and talk a little about the process in what we see as going forward. As you are aware, some months ago, there were discussions with Department of Justice involving what they see as violations of the clean water act by the City of Shreveport. When that happens, the normal process is that either a suit is filed, or there are negotiations between the municipality and the federal government to determine what actions the municipality will agree to, what stipulated penalties there might be, and what will be

the actual work, the investigative work, the rehabilitation work, all the work that has to take place. And the way the process works is when you negotiate first, before there can be a consent decree, then there will be the filing of a complaint. Sometimes that complaint is filed on the same day that the consent decree is to be issued. What the federal government has done so far with the client being the Environmental Protection Agency, and the legal team being the United States Department of Justice, they have served upon us by way of basically a fax, email document, some information they'd like from the city. Most of that information involves the status of the system in Shreveport. Please understand that there are two things the federal government comes after a municipality regarding its sewer. It's whether or not there are unlawful discharges into a water of the United States, that exceeds their permit. The other thing they do is they proceed after you if there are what's called SSOs (sanitary sewer overflows), that is any leaks or escapes from your collection system. Those are two things you can be fined for. And what they have determined is there have been significant SSO violations since about 2003, significant. It appears in excess of 1000. Now in terms of potential penalties, it's pretty clear from the clean water act that those waters can be up to \$27,500 per day, a violation. The thing that is of concern however is there is another penalty component, and that component can in fact be the economic - - - the benefit of non-compliance. The economic benefit. In other words, what did the city save for not having complied. And that number is indeed a wild card. That number can be tremendous. One of the things that of course, we'd like to accomplish is to have as much of our revenue put into investigating rehabilitating the system rather than paying pure penalties of the federal government. We did meet with the federal government in July, city representatives, and myself. I thought that meeting went well, there was information again, that was requested by them primarily dealing with the status of the current system of Shreveport in a number of financial items they were interested in. That was probably to determine our ability to pay or the city's ability to actually undertake the work that would be necessary to come into compliance. That work as far as I can tell at this point appears to be something in excess of \$200,000,000 to completely come into compliance. Could be \$225 (hundred-million). In talks with other city representatives, it has been told to me that it will be a challenge to come into compliance within eight years. The federal government has discussed with us, they would like for the city to be fully complaint within eight years of the entry of that consent decree. The timing for that will be probably sometimes next year, if we can sit down and we can work out all of the details, and please realize in that consent decree is typically stipulated penalties, which means if there are deadlines that aren't met along the way, we basically admit to paying a penalty for not having met those deadlines. But in fact, we are able to hammer out a consent decree, again, it appears that it will be a challenge, first of all to get all the work done, the rehab work done to do it. They'd like to see it done in six years. In talking to city representatives, that's going to be a major problem because when you have to deal with the master plan first, then you have to deal with what's called the SSES, which is an evaluation of the sewer system, typically you have to do those before you even begin the major rehab work. Now there is some good news. The good news is, and I have done this in other municipalities, typically, you have issues with not only your collection system, but you have (inaudible) with your waste water treatment plants. Thus far, it is does not appear that our wastewater treatment plants are of significant concern. It is my understanding that some \$70,000,000 has been spent on those prior to. Also, in regards to the collection system, I understand there has been probably about \$60,000,000 worth of work done on the collection system. More has to be done. In terms of paths forward, with that information that has been provided to them, both in terms of the status of our system and the

financial information supplied to them, the ball is in their court. I have been advised that they should be getting back with me, probably during the month of January, no later than February for us to resume discussions. At first they will determine whether or not they deem that information adequate, and if they deem it inadequate, there might be further requests. My desire and my goal is to get through this process with minimal. I've been told by my client, the City of Shreveport, they would advise highly if we could do with no penalties. I will tell you that's highly unusual, but that is in fact my goal. Again, the folks that are leading the charge on the other side, the legal team comes from Washington, the Department of Justice with the technical arm being some people from Washington, and the EPA. But significantly, Region VI, representatives of EPA. That's the process, that's sort of where we are. If there are other specific questions, I'd be pleased to answer them.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Okay, thank you.

Councilman Shyne: I have a question. It's a weird combination of you and the Administration. Where do we stand in relation to being able to take care of this with the projects that are in the new bond proposal? Either one of you all can answer that.

Mr. Sibley: Well I guess it's how you want it. You know we anticipated kinda doing the bond discussion separately, but I guess we roll it all into one, and I would defer to Rick and Barbara from the department to talk specifically about the projects that are in the proposed issue, and the impact they may have on the SSO situation.

Mr. Seaton: Councilman Shyne, the estimate number that's being talked about now is a catch up where we are on the sewer. It's about \$200,000,000. What's included in the bond issue as it stands now is about \$90,000,000 in sewer projects. So that tells you that 90 out of 200, just to catch up, not mentioning what's needed each year to stay caught up.

Councilman Shyne: I mean, that's what I was looking at and I don't know how we're going to keep from getting the penalties, if we don't have the money in order to do what needs to be done. And this is a time consuming project. I think the number of eight years has been thrown out there, but you know I'm not an engineer. Sam, I practice a little law from time to time, Dale, but I'm not an engineer. It seems like to me it might be a little bit more than eight years in order to do what I've heard what we need to have done, and Mr. Mayor even when you were on the City Council, years ago, that was probably before I got here, that was probably during the horse and buggy days, back during that time, we had a deficit in our water and sewer system, so I mean, we're looking at a situation where we're getting ready to go into a bond issue, and we still not going to have enough money to do what we need to have done, it seems like without getting any penalties and that's the one thing we're trying to do, trying to get ourselves in a position where we won't get any penalties. I mean, what are we looking in relation to that?

Mr. Sibley: That's correct Mr. Shyne, and Mr. Hardy can talk a little bit further, but in the earlier discussions, the EPA DOJ team is looking at the eighth year window, and our folks have gone on record to indicate to say we don't think eight years is realistic for us. Part of what I understand affects the penalties also is our plan. There is no requirement that we outline - - - hey we can do all

this, because they know we can't do it in a year or two or three, their eight year plan to us it's a little bit short, so part of the negotiations is to move that date out some, but the level of penalties and Tim, I would ask you to speak to it further, depends on what plan we present. Part of the early discussion, we talked with them about was all the work that had been done, as well as the work that's being done as indicated in our current budgetary structure. They also were aware that there was a possibility of some of it being addressed through a bond issue. A lot of it depends on how much is presented to them in terms of how much is in there, how much is in there to address these particular projects and then what is the following on plan for those other years that they agreed to allow us to work it out, and Tim, if you could speak to that just a little bit in terms of how that impacts penalties and things like that. I think that's what the Council is interested in.

Mr. Hardy: Sure, absolutely Mr. Sibley. And Mr. Sibley is exactly right. In terms of penalties that may be assessed, I think the government will take a hard look at what the city is doing in an aggressive way. If it looks like the city is not aggressively trying to bring an end to violations, I think those penalties tend to be high. The one thing we'd like to avoid if at all possible, is that when you pay penalties, that money just does not go toward fixing the problem That's just being - - it's a penalty, it's punitive. And so, we'd like to do if we can is minimize those penalties and take what monies we have and put them into the investigation, into the evaluation, into the actual rehabilitation work. And so I think the good faith that we show during this process now, hopefully will go a very long way toward minimizing that penalty. Now having said that, if a consent decree is probably drafted, there will be what is called stipulated penalties. That's a little bit different. The federal government doesn't have the authority to say 'make' you fix something, all they can do is punish you for those things for those things that escape from your system. But what we can do is agree that if we don't have say a certain amount of work done by a certain date, we agree to pay those penalties. And that's how we get out of being penalized day by day. Because once we enter that consent decree, typically, those penalty assessments end as long as we're in compliance with that document. That's why the carving out of that document is very, very important. And that's why its also important that we don't put anything in that document that we don't or that we don't voluntarily put anything in that document that we don't think as a city that we can accomplish.

Councilman Webb: Yes, I when you were explaining, I know Ron and them were - - - look like they were throwing a little fit back there, and I know he came up here and said something to you, so - - -

Mr. Seaton: I just need to clarify. The \$90,000,000 is for water and sewer combined. For sewer alone it's \$70,000,000.

Councilman Webb: Okay. I'm finished, thank you.

Councilwoman McCulloch: The July report that you were speaking of, where you met with the City officials, is there any written documentation of that meeting? Summary? The meeting you had in July.

Mr. Hardy: Yes, with DOJ. I believe there is. There is a document from them asking for the - - - both the technical information and the financial information that they in fact wanted.

Councilwoman McCulloch: Is it possible I can get a copy of it?

Mr. Sibley: We can. I think that the - - - I know that we provided it to the previous Council, but we'll provide a different copy because that was - - -

Councilwoman McCulloch: Okay.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Thank you Mr. Chair. What one of the questions that I have about this, I see the list of projects that has been provided to us by the Bond Committee. And what I'm trying to find out, what I'm needing to know is are those projects the priorities that the Department of Justice is looking for. Is there some list that's been sent by them that says these are the things that need to be done? I'm trying to see how does the legal issues that are involved interface with what we're proposing to do. If we're going to going to the citizens saying that we need X number of dollars for these projects, and if I understand bonds, once this thing is approved, we have to kinda stick to it absent some (inaudible) emergency. Are we actually addressing the things that the Department of Justice are going to be looking for us to do?

Mr. Hardy: Well Councilman Jenkins, let me just say this, in our meeting with the Department of Justice, one thing that they strongly advised is that we don't wait until the consent decree has been entered before we start doing some work. And so we can start doing some work now, of course that would be less work that would have to be done, once that consent decree is issued. Now having said that, we don't have a formal consent decree to talk about the chronology of pieces of work that will ultimately have to be done, we haven't seen that yet, but I think there are some things in talking to Ms. Featherston, and she might be able to address this. Some things that she can be begun now. I think as I said, some have already been done. I think some things to address lift stations and points of the collections, some maybe \$60-70,000,000 has already been spent. So anything that can be done now, would be to the city's advantage. But there is not hard document yet as to exactly what they're going to want from the time frame they're going to want it, and that's going to be a part of m negotiation with them.

Councilman S. Jenkins: So there stands to reason that if we go forward with this bond proposal, there could still be - - - I mean there's going to be some additional work that's going to be needed at some point - - - I guess we'll learn what that is, but these things that are listed here, just from my - - - make sure I understand it, it's of benefit that the city do it, that these things are not necessarily things that the Department of Justice is going to say, since you've done this, you've met the concerns that we had or something along those lines. There may be some - - -

Mr. Hardy: We're not there yet, Mr. Jenkins. But let me say, those are things are probably things that are going to have to be addressed. I just cannot tell you that it's all inclusive, because I think that we're going to be meeting with them and dealing with them over the next number of months, hopefully, not years.

Councilman S. Jenkins: But where did this list come from?

Mr. Sibley: I was about to say we can't speak for the committee itself, but having sat through those hearings, what they tried to do was anticipate what may come out of DOJ, and the departmental folks who put the list together, put it together with that in mind. And we can ask them, ask Barbara to come up please, but the projects that are in there are projects that if they're done, will contribute to us fixing the SSO problem, even though DOJ hasn't told us specifically, but what they asked for is kinda what are your plans? What are the things that you're working on, and these are the things put together by the department that would further that cause. So Barbara, could you speak a little more directly to that?

Ms. Barbara Featherston: Sure. We did exactly that, we have a list of projects that we keep up with that is submitted to Council once a year. It has a list of all of our unfunded projects and the list of sewer projects generally speaking entailed projects that we have defective systems, a defective lift station, are areas that need repair, that need work. There are no projects that are expanding facilities, or making things - - - you know putting in new sewer lines where we don't have sewer lines. These are all projects where we know that we have an aged infrastructure that is causing us issues with sanitary sewer overflows. Whether that be at lift stations, some minor issues out at the treatment plants that still need to be addressed, or in the collection system itself with the general piping out in the system.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Is there a list of projects that needs to be done, that's not included here? And what's come from (inaudible)?

Ms. Featherston: What was included in the - - - when we were requested by the bond commission, the bond committee to do a list, we went through all of our projects, and we prioritized those projects and gave them the entire list of unfunded projects. And what was given to the Council by recommendation is in the Citizens Bond Committee was a somewhat shorter list. Obviously, it was \$68-70,000,000 that they put in their report versus, \$189,000,000 that we had in the unfunded list. So yes sir, there are - - -

Councilman S. Jenkins: Does this list represent what the Department feels prioritized?

Ms. Featherston: The list that we submitted to the Bond Committee is more complete. The list that came out of the bond committee has our top priorities.

Councilman S. Jenkins: But this is what my question is. Bond Committee, hold one second Ms. Featherston, hold one minute. The Bond Committee has given us a list of projects that I understand are going to be made a part of a proposition that's going to be presented to the citizens to be paid for is a lot of money. Okay? What I'm trying to find out from the department right now, are these the ones you think that we need to be moving forward with, or did you have a different opinion?

Ms. Featherston: That list is the priority from the whole list that we submitted. We have a list of almost \$200,000,000 projects that will need to be done ultimately.

Councilman S. Jenkins: So, you're satisfied in your mind with this list that's going to be going on proposition?

Ms. Featherston: That's a very good start, but it is not complete.

Councilman S. Jenkins: That kinda get us going. Here's the other thing I want to ask while I've got the floor. And Mr. Hardy, you may need to come back up again. I have some serious concerns as to whether or not, what we're doing will have some legal ramifications, and if so, what are the roles of the individuals that are involved here? Mr. Hardy is the attorney that's leading this thing. Who else is going to be in the informational loop? I guess what I don't want to see - - - I think is something that we all need to be on the same page with. Speaking as one (inaudible), there shouldn't be in my mind, seven, eight, nine different meetings with individuals on the Council, individuals in the Mayor's office on the ultimate decisions that have to be made about it. I'm trying to get some sense of direction. Who is going to be in charge of how this proceeds? We can depend upon if they tell me something. I'm not going to be hearing something different later on. I mean that's a part of what I think we need to get straight too.

Mr. Sibley: Mr. Chairman, if I may, one of the early decisions we made was to defer to legal counsel in this matter because of the nature of it, and Mr. Hardy is that person. We've agreed from our side, from the DOJ side because one of the things they asked for was whose your point of contact. Secondly, there's been one initial meeting at what we call the staff level between the EPA/DOJ and our attorneys. And we've asked for and they are they are scheduling a second meeting that will include not only the Mayor, but also Chairman of the Council, the elected officials, we call 'em. We wanted a higher level meeting with their regional bosses, their top folks, and our elected folks. So there's only been one meeting so far at the staff level trying to outline how to - - - because practically everything is just rumor. That was the first meeting where there was some consistence on where we're going, how does this process work, here's the information that you all are asking for, do you have it, and Mr. Hardy indicated we still finalizing making sure that they have all the information they have. Beyond that, that second meeting that we've asked for would be the meeting that would pull in both the Mayor, yourselves as a Council so that you all can hear directly from those folks who are over those sections. But from my point of view, Mr. Hardy is our point of contact and he's walking us through this process because it is very much a legal process that may in fact lead to litigation for a consent decree. So he is the point of contact.

Councilwoman McCulloch: And that first meeting was the July meeting right?

Mr. Sibley: Yes Ma'am.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Okay, is there anybody else?

Mr. Sibley: And Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, but if I may, I forgot to mention Ms. Featherston is the Assistant City Engineer, I wanted to make sure that was included in the record. I don't think she gave her name and address or anything, but I just wanted to identify who she was.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Okay, I just got a couple of questions myself. To your knowledge right now, have we supplied DOJ, we the city, provide DOJ everything they've asked for from financial, and/or capability or plans, what they've asked for so far? You mentioned they've had several deliverables. Have we answered those?

Mr. Hardy: Yes sir, in my view we have. Now they might want some expanded version of something, but in my view, we've given them exactly what they've requested.

Councilman O. Jenkins: So far at this point?

Mr. Hardy: Yes. And they have not told us otherwise although I would not be surprised if when they got back with us in January/February they wanted some additional information or they wanted something clarified.

Councilman O. Jenkins: But to your knowledge, we're not withholding anything up until now that they've asked for?

Mr. Hardy: Absolutely not.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Okay. And I don't mean that we would be negligent, just in terms of we didn't have what they wanted?

Mr. Hardy: We were timely, and we provided what we thought was a reasonable request.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Secondly, you mentioned the SSES. Now is that a mandated requirement to perform this survey, or is it truthfully a - - - we'll call it a management tool for us to best execute future sewer repairs?

Mr. Hardy: It is a management tool for us. I think the bottom line is very difficult to know where your problems are in the system without having done that. Now one of them was in the past that are members of Department of Justice had advised us that that it's too old. They like to see another one. The real difficulty is and I think Councilman Jenkins, you make a very good point. When you're in a situation like this, justice can ask you to do some things, but they cannot force you to do. But those asked if they're reasonable, are things that we do undertake.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Okay. And then you said the good news is that our treatment programs are in compliance? Is that what you mentioned?

Mr. Hardy: No, I don't think I said that, what I said was the treatment plants, I've done a number of these for other municipalities, and very often, it's not just the collection system that is the major issue before the Department of Justice. It's typically the plants themselves. Thus far, in my negotiations with Justice, they've not pointed out issues with the treatment plants. Maybe that has to do with the fact that some \$70,000,000 have been spent on those plants. Those plants seem to be as far as I can tell performing well.

Councilman O. Jenkins: So, if we were addressing a critical need, investing in treatment plants, probably isn't where we should right now focus our monetary efforts?

Mr. Hardy: Well, let me say this, depending upon the state of them, there's nothing wrong with staying ahead of the curve, but having said that, again, that's not been said to be our major issue. If

it's not, if it's work that needs to be done, so that does not become an issue, I still would recommend that. And I would defer to Ms. Featherston and her staff to advise me of such.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Any further comments?

Councilman Webb: Yes sir, I have one. To the Administration I guess basically, I mean, I know we've been knowing this day was coming for quite some time, you know, we've been discussing it, and I think we're using the correct approach, going out to seek a bond. Lord forbid is there a back up plan if the bond doesn't pass? We will definitely be backed up in a corner. But I'm going to be in prayer that this thing will pass, because I think we're getting a good message out there to the people and that's what it's going to take on an individual council person basis as well as to inform your constituents in every way that you can just exactly what we're up against. And I've been doing that in some of the meetings that I've had with the neighborhoods and business associations. And so, that's really the only way that we're going to sell this to the citizens. And I think that the time frame that we're using to talk about that has been long and drawn out, but I think it's been on a more positive note to get this thing passed.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Any further comments?

Councilman S. Jenkins: Briefly Mr. Chairman, Mr. Hardy, your involvement - - - is it restricted to the water and sewer issues, or is it with any other areas of the bond issue? I see that we have some police and fire.

Mr. Hardy: No, this is strictly with the Department of Justice issue, the SSO.

Councilman O. Jenkins: So, not any of the ADA stuff?

Mr. Seaton: Right.

Mr. Sibley: No sir. He's retained specifically for the EPA/DOJ situation

Councilman S. Jenkins: So, the ADA issues that's being handled by Ms. Scott that's pretty much what your department - - -

Councilman O. Jenkins: If there are no further questions from the Council, thank you very much for your time today Mr. Hardy, appreciate you coming down.

Mr. Sibley: And Mr. Chairman, while you take a moment, just going back to Mr. Jenkins' question. Mr. Jenkins, actually Shelly with SPAR, the non legal side apart from Terri has managed the ADA program and what you see within the proposal would have come out of her area. So, if there are specific questions about that, Shelly can address those in terms of where we are in that process, and why those particular projects are included and the importance of including those particular projects.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Mr. Chairman, would it be okay for her to go ahead and come up?

Councilman O. Jenkins: Sure, but let me - - - before we ducktail directly into bond specific items, and we can roll right into that right afterwards. I just put it on the record we have planned to call the Council Work Session on the 27th of December for 8:00 in the morning meeting. So if you would make note of that.

Councilwoman McCulloch: That's the 27th?

Councilman O. Jenkins: Monday, the 27th.

Councilman Shyne: And did you want to give the reason why, because the Mayor and I will be out doing a little tailgating?

Councilman O. Jenkins: Well, I would hate to not mention a good event that most of the city should be supporting in one way or another, and that's the Independence Bowl which will go on that afternoon. That's one of the reason for the early start date. Thank you for pointing that out. Okay, as suggested, we'd like to roll now into comments and presentations from the various department heads regarding the bond issue. Unless there is anything we should start with at this point, and I defer either to Mr. Seaton or Mr. Thompson in that regard.

Mr. Seaton: Mr. Chairman, I think based on discussion that we heard earlier if you'd like to address the matter of capacity, the bond issue we have now representatives from the financial advisor team here.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Excellent point. Okay, and if you would, would somebody like to introduce them specifically?

Mr. Seaton: Sure. Jerry Liang and Sherikka Fields from Calvin Grigsby and Associates, Sherikka, you can come on up too.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Thank you for coming down today.

Mr. Liang: Thank you for having me.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Okay, if you would - - -

Mr. Sibley: Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry. We also have Bill Boles bond counsel and Jacqueline Scott. If there are any questions on the process or procedure side that bond counsel would address.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Okay, thank you. Appreciate you coming down. If you would basically cover, and I believe Mr. Seaton has discussed this with you privately, what our full capacity is, both in terms of as a function of our tax base, and in terms of where we stand with milages today without increasing milages or in terms of total bonding capacity outstanding.

Mr. Liang: I'm from Grigsby and Associates. We are the financial advisors for the City of Shreveport. Council Chairman, Members and the Mayor, the legal debt limit on the general

obligation is set by statute, where you take the total assessed value, which is \$1.3 (billion), and you multiply that by 35%. So that gives you your taxable assessed value. So that the maximum length that you can raise which is as you see up there on the board, it's \$465,000,000 is the amount that you can issue in general obligation debt. The total amount outstanding as of right now is \$183,000,000. So that allows the city to issue another \$282,000,000 in general obligation debt without going over the limit. Now the other issue is being able to phase in your debt issue, so that when you issue \$282,000,000 you do not want to go over your current milage of 26.56. Yes, 26.56 is the current milage, so as you can see right now with the existing general obligation debt, you're in the range of about 17 mills.

Mr. Seaton: Excuse me Jerry. Council Members, if you'd like to see that closer, you can go in front of your screen, just to the right of your screen, press B. It says input B, you can look at it.

Mr. Liang: So in this light, it represents there's quite a bit of spread between the current milage and what's being charged the taxpayers at 26.56 and what debt service is. We've run various scenarios of how you can phase in, in several tranches \$165,000,000 issue which is represented here. So, what this represents is \$50,000,000 being phased in 2011, another \$50,000,000 being phased in 2012, and \$65,000,000 being phased in 2013. So, each of these structures is done based just off a 5% market rate with a level amortization schedule. So as you can see from this slide here, you can do a total of \$165,000,000 and still have capacity before you reach that 26.56 current milage. We further did an analysis- -

Councilman O. Jenkins: Sorry to interrupt, but can you tell us what assumption that is made on in terms of interest rates and funding costs?

Mr. Liang: In terms of your interest rates, we're far from the date of issuance, so at this point in time, in terms of just running scenarios, we use a conservative market assumption, and at this rate and the tax exempt rate, for 20 year issue, we have coupons that range anywhere from 3-5%. So your all in costs on a yield basis, would be below 5%, because you have maturities that mature earlier at 3%, and then you final maturities are at 5%. So we just use a 5% flat rate, and that's to be used as an assumption for structuring purposes.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Okay, and so that's it. Conservative largely estimate for an all in cost at this point?

Mr. Liang: Yes.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Marring major market fluctuation. Okay?

Mr. Liang: So, we've taken a look at it as well as doing a \$215,000,000 issue. So this would be phased in over a period of four years. So, in 2011, 12, and 13, in each of those years, \$50,000,000 would be issued and then in 2014, we would have a \$65,000,000 issue. Using this scenario, this really (inaudible) to that limit of getting to that current milage of 26.56. Again, we used a 5% rate, level amortization going out for 20 years. We did one final analysis, say if the city wanted to issue the entire \$282,000,000 this year, can that be done without raising the current milage, and that can

be done. There is a structure - - - there is an ability to do that based off this slide here. You can issue \$281.8(million), 5% amortization going out 20 years, and essentially fills in that gap between the existing debt service and your current milage.

Councilwoman McCulloch: So, when would you be able to due another bond issue if you would maximize the bond issue that we have now?

Mr. Liang: If you were to do an issue like this is what we do not recommend. But if you do an issue like this, you would not be able to issue another general obligation until 20 years from now, assuming the assessed value stays exactly where they are in this time frame. If the assessed value goes up, and typically they do over a period of time, as that goes up, then your amount of current milage that's calculated against that, the assessed value increases the amount of revenues that come in to pay debt service.

Councilwoman McCulloch: So when would be a good idea to maximize the debt? I mean the - - -

Mr. Liang: No, not all in one issue. And the other issue too about doing one major issue, you have to be able to spend the money over a certain period of time. There's a little limitation there.

Councilman O. Jenkins: And just to confirm this, on that particular calculation, that 5% amortized, that's putting out an issue now, I mean it doesn't forecast 5% interest rates out until 2025 and beyond right? When you do that forecasting model?

Mr. Liang: On that - - - are you talking about just in tranches?

Councilman O. Jenkins: Yeah.

Mr. Liang: Yeah, exactly. So that doesn't assume what the rates are going to be, its still just using the 5% rate for short term purpose.

Councilman O. Jenkins: So, and even when we're looking at this particular slide here, when we look at a - - - well I guess you're not issuing a new tranche after 2015 in this particular - - - is that where - - -?

Mr. Liang: Yes.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Is that where - - - okay. So essentially, we're predicating on analysis that a 5% rate even in 2015 according to this graph right here?

Mr. Liang: No, the 5% rate in 2014.

Councilman O. Jenkins: 2014. Okay. I mean it may - - - mine is not exactly lined up, but okay. So yeah, so as opposed to tranches that hit in 2011 and 2012, we're not putting any more of a conservative buffer on interest rate changes in 2013 and 2014?

Mr. Liang: No, not on these initial scenarios. That was not done.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Okay, comments from any other council members?

Councilman S. Jenkins: Mr. Chairman, I just want to know - - - am I hearing that if we move forward with this proposal as - - - I'm sure y'all are familiar with what we're talking about going forward with right? That is not going to result in any increase of taxes on anybody. We would be able to do this without the necessity of raising somebody's taxes?

Mr. Liang: Yes, that's correct.

Councilman S. Jenkins: And it's going to leave us a little room if something else develops under that ceiling that you're saying that we could go - - - leave us a little more financial room for another bond issue?

Mr. Liang: Yes.

Councilman O. Jenkins: But not in us looking at this model, not in year 2014 thru 2017, right?

Mr. Liang: Yes, that's correct.

Councilman O. Jenkins: It would only be 10 years down the line.

Councilman S. Jenkins: It would be 10 years down the line before we could do another bond issue?

Mr. Sibley: Of course, this was at \$215,000,000.

Councilman Everson: Also assuming that property values don't increase, which they most certainly will.

Councilman O. Jenkins: And the interest rates don't change, I mean you've got a lot of moving parts there. So, okay.

Mayor Glover: Mr. Chairman, to be clear Councilman Jenkins, this is at \$50,000,000 more than what is in the current recommended package. That's what that (inaudible)

Councilman O. Jenkins: The slide that we're looking at right now.

Councilman Everson: Can we go back to the slide that has the \$165,000,000?

Councilman S. Jenkins: See that's what I was asking questions about. I was asking questions about the \$165 (million). I was saying that the proposal that we had been talking about going forward.

Mr. Liang: Yes, that does, that gives you capacity.

Councilman S. Jenkins: It'll be 10 years before you can do another bond issue?

Mr. Liang: No, no, it would not. You could do another issue in 2014.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Are there any other questions from the Council? Then thank you very much for your time today, appreciate the presentation, it's very helpful.

Mr. Liang: Okay, thank you.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Are there any questions from the council regarding procedures for a bond issue?

Councilwoman McCulloch: I have a question. In light of amending the bond issue, will we actually at some point be able to amend some of the items that have already been placed into the bond issue?

Councilman O. Jenkins: It's certainly our intent to go through department by department right now to see what's in there, what they may have missed, or what they wished the Citizens Bond Committee had proposed instead, and I think that'd be the ideal time to question specific issues in the current bond proposal.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, the members might want to look at - - - there are certain amendments that are already attached to the proposal. And those amendments are not exclusive in the sense that other people can offer other amendments, and these don't have to pass. You know it's up to this body as to what passes. So, we do have the opportunity to offer amendments if you can reach a consensus on those amendments.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Just correct me if I'm wrong, I guess we don't necessarily - - - do we need to reach a consensus to make propose an amendment?

Mr. Thompson: No.

Councilman O. Jenkins: And I'm curious to know from a procedural perspective, why those amendments carried over for those Council Members that are no longer on the council?

Mr. Thompson: Well, they postponed the entire deal. That is the proposal plus the amendments. And we just brought them over. However, this council can do whatever it wants to do with them.

Councilwoman McCulloch: I noticed that it indicates here that we have some attachments. Exactly where are those attachments? It's on here? Okay.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Okay, then in that case, Mr. Seaton, if you would get started on the actual bond proposal and the department head review.

Mr. Seaton: Mr. Chairman - - -

Councilman S. Jenkins: Can we go through those deadlines again? The deadlines to get everything done. I remember getting an email on it, but I want to be sure that I'm up to date on it.

Mr. Seaton: From now forward, or if you go from collection backward?

Councilman S. Jenkins: From now forward.

Mr. Seaton: From now forward, the next deadline would be December 17th which is the deadlines to apply to - - -

Councilman S. Jenkins: December 17th? The next deadline would be December 14th for us.

Mr. Seaton: December 14th, you are correct, for the Council to adopt resolutions calling for an election and to accept the committee's - - - or amend the committee's report.

Mayor Glover: Mr. Chairman: Rick, Terri, could that meeting be held at some other point at a special meeting beyond the 14th?

Mr. Seaton: As long as it's before December 17th is my understanding.

Ms. Glass: Mr. Chairman, I've discussed this with Mr. Boles just before the meeting, the application must be to the state bond commission by December 17th. It's just kind of a time bind if you have a meeting on the 16th, everything will have to be put together and I guess it can be done electronically though I think, can't it Bill? So, it could theoretically be done, it's just it'd be nice to have a couple of extra days.

Mr. Seaton: And it could be done before December 14th as well.

Mayor Glover: But the absolute deadline would be the 16th?

Ms. Glass: Well, I mean, you know we'd hate for you to have a meeting on the morning of the 17th, and we put it all together. But it can be submitted electronically. Technically, theoretically, I guess you could have it on the 17th. But it must be to them on the 17th.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Yeah, and the reason we've proposed the 14th, is that's it's an already scheduled City Council Meeting, and then we largely give them a little opportunity to get all the electronic digits in line before they press send.

Councilman S. Jenkins: The remaining deadlines I've got are January 20, 2011, State Bond Commission.

Mr. Seaton: That's when the bonds if you apply by December 17th, it goes to the January 20th bond commission meeting, and then the Bond Commission basically walks it over to the Secretary of State's office, and that deadline is January 21st in order to get a proposition on the April 2, 2011 election. Before each one of you, you have a list like this. It's very similar to a list you've seen in

the past. It just had a single column of numbers. That single column of numbers was what the citizens bond committee passed. The column that was added and Councilman S. Jenkins, this is part of what you were asking about earlier. We added a column that says submitted by department, so that you can see each and every item, the dollar amount that was submitted by the department, and the dollar amount that was passed by the committee. Sometimes, it is the exact same amount, and sometimes the committee was zero, sometimes that dollar amount was reduced. And also to answer your question, if you look at that first page, and you start at sewer wide sewer rehabilitation at \$97,000,000, and you go down to city wide lift station and rehabilitation of \$3,000,000. And you added up all those numbers that was requested, the \$189,280,000.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Say that number again?

Mr. Seaton: \$189,280,000. Now if for some reason the committee said hey, we want to do all \$189 (million), there are limitations by statute that you mostly can do in water and sewer according to state statute is 10% of the total assessed value for the city, which is \$130,000,000. If you wanted to do a \$130,000,000 in water and sewer, you could do that. Mr. Chairman, we can - - - we've got some slides where we can go down. These are the projects that were in the citizens bond study committee report. You also have things on your list here that were not included. We can go as fast or as slow as you want to help you (inaudible).

Councilman O. Jenkins: Just so we're clear for the rest of the Council, you're representing the Assisting CAO, or are you representing DOS?

Mr. Seaton: I'm the assistant CAO, and then when we start on water, if there's any - - -

Mayor Glover: He's representing the Administration, I think would be probably - - -

Mr. Seaton: (Inaudible) all of the above.

Councilman O. Jenkins: I guess my question should be if we get to a DOS specific issue - - -

Mr. Seaton: If there are specific questions, I want to defer to - - - if it's on water and sewer I want to defer to Barbara Featherston, if it's on streets and drainage, I'm going to refer to Ron Norwood.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Okay, thanks.

Mr. Seaton: On water projects, we have \$10.5(million) in Amiss water treatment plants and rehabilitation, \$3,000,000 in water treatment plants, raw water piping modifications, and \$7.6(million) in !2-Mile Bayou pump station, which is in desperate need. Subtotal for water is \$21,165,000. On sewer projects - - - yes sir.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Now none of those water projects fall under this SSO investigations. So, this is essentially \$21,000,000 that is not going to any of the DOJ - - - I don't want to call it mandated, because it's not mandated. But to appease - - - probably the wrong term.

Mr. Seaton: If Council wanted to do \$130,000,000 in sewer projects and zero on water, there would be smiles all around.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Smiles? Alright.

Mr. Seaton: Sewer projects, there is city wide rehabilitation, wastewater and I'm not going to - - - if you want me read all these, I can but you have the list in front of you, and you get a subtotal from sewer projects of \$68,805,000. And like Barbara said earlier, none of these are new projects or new lines. These are fixing what we've got. Fixing the lines we've got, fixing the lift stations we have. Yes sir.

Councilman O. Jenkins: First question is was there any discussion, and I recognize you were in most of those citizen bond committee meetings, if you don't feel perfectly intoned with the answer, I know we have at least one other person in the room that was on part of that committee. That differential between what was submitted by the department and adopted by the citizens bond committee with regard to city wide sewer, do you know what the rationale or was it just an overfunding limit overall and to keep within their - - - you know what they thought was an appropriate number, \$165,000,000 worth of some - - - you know?

Mr. Seaton: My understanding is that there were some guidelines given to subcommittees ahead of time that said, this is what your number needs to look like. On specific line items, for instance I know the one we brought up before the Stoner force main replacement. DOS asked for \$10,000,000 to fix the entire (inaudible) and do it completely. Dozens of times during the process, the question was asked how much do you absolutely have to have? The answer that came back was \$5,000,000. That's how much you have to have, and it's what's needed. But five is better than zero. (Inaudible) is that inaccurate?

Councilman O. Jenkins: How much do you have to have in order to do what in order to make sure that it's not going to require more? Or to get started, or - - -

Mr. Seaton: That's why I'm going to lean on Barbara.

Mr. Thompson: Barbara and Ron might as well come up.

Councilman O. Jenkins: If you think you're going to sit back there and not get any attention, you're sadly mistaken.

Ms. Featherston: Question again?

Councilman O. Jenkins: Yeah, I'm sorry. We're looking at the Stoner lift - - - I mean the - - -

Ms. Featherston: The Stoner force main as the council and the administration is obviously aware of, we've had a couple of major problems with that force main. That force main was constructed back in the late 70s when the clean water act was first enacted where you basically - - - the US Government said you had to treat your wastewater prior to that time, the wastewater was not

treated, it was basically pumped directly to the river. There were a number of force mains similar to this that were constructed at the same time that take the wastewater instead of to the river, to the actual treatment plants.

Councilman S. Jenkins: And I think what our question was more specifically was from your department, the request would have been for a \$10,000,000 cost and then in the citizens bond study committee, they came back and said a \$5,000,000 would be their recommendation, the same as the bare minimum that would be required, what would that \$5,000,000 do for you?

Ms. Featherston: That \$5,000,000 is enough to pay for that force main is several miles long. It's enough to take about four miles of it out from underneath various private properties that we have easements through, including under Champion Lake. It's part of the area that based on previous repair history, we've had the worst problems, if we were to get that force main moved out into areas that are not quite so environmentally troublesome. But it does not repair - - - correct it, you know we can't do the whole line for that.

Mayor Glover: Mr. Chairman, I want to follow up and extend that answer. Barbara that takes the blowout out from under Champion Lake now, makes most likely to occur where?

Ms. Featherston: We would be looking at right away along the parkway.

Councilman Corbin: Barbara, I know we're kinda bouncing around a little bit, and sewer is on everybody's mind. I want to back up just a second to our list that we're looking at. On the water side, we're only proposing funding for three projects?

Ms. Featherston: Yes.

Councilman Corbin: If we look down the road into our crystal ball, do we see that we're going to have some severe water issues in the next five, ten years and there are some more projects that we need to consider for a bond issue to put off for further legislation down the road that's going to cost us fines?

Ms. Featherstons: From the water standpoint, the monies that are in place that are adopted by the citizens committee are all projects that deal with either the supply of water to the treatment plant or the treatment plant itself. Generally speaking the regulations deals strictly with what is happening at your treatment plant, making sure that the water is of quality that meets the federal guidelines, and these projects are what we considered the most important projects to make sure that we stay within those guidelines and any proposed guidelines. The bulk of the issues out in the what we call the distribution system, you know those set of pipes that go out and take water to the houses are as we've seen in the past are leaks or blowouts. Obviously we've repaired those as they break, those cause a lot of problems, however they do not cause significant water quality issues. When we have a major leak, we do issue advisory letting the people know hey, we've had a break. Be careful with your water. But the most important thing is making sure that the water is coming through those pipes is meeting all the federal guidelines.

Councilman Corbin: Back to the sewer side of things, the projects recommended by the department, do you feel comfortable with those cost estimates? Some of them may be low. Even before the bond committee reduced them even more? And this would be to complete the project, not a percentage of it.

Ms. Featherston: The projects as they were submitted by the department, we feel that those cost estimates are fairly well in line. Again these projects are not designed. Staff including our field staff and our engineering staff have used some rule of thumb in recent bid histories to come up with some very general cost estimates based on lengths of lines, in particular the size of the pipelines, general area if it's real congested, trying to come up with those cost estimates, you're going to see some that may be a little bit low, you're going to see some when they're actually designed and bid, that may come in less than what we had estimated, but it's impossible without having a full blown cost estimate to know the exact cost. We try to keep it in a contingency level, you know within 25% of what we anticipate the actual cost to be.

Councilman S. Jenkins: I heard - - - I understand what you're saying, but it's the point of it that I didn't really hear that I was trying to hear. Does any of the sewer projects and the estimated amount of money that's going to be spent, does it complete the project, or are we just doing a part of a project?

Ms. Featherston: What we have and what we submitted would complete the project. The ones that were reduced, obviously the ones reduced to zero wouldn't complete the project, but the ones that were reduced would only take care of a portion of that project. They would not take care of the entire project. And those include mainly the ones that were reduced were the force main replacements, because they are huge projects and those force main replacement projects were - - - the Stoner force main, Cedar Grove force main and the Wallace force main, again all three of those pipelines were built at the same time of the same piping materials, covering great lengths, crisscrossing through the city and what we were given would be enough to take care of some of the worst areas, but would not take care of the entire problem.

Councilman S. Jenkins: So as general proposition, any of - - - when I look at this chart, and I look at the column submitted by the department, and adopted by the citizens bond committee, if the citizens bond committee came back with a lower amount that's a project, as a general project is (inaudible) if we get the same amount, it's a project that will be?

Ms. Featherston: Yes, yes sir.

Councilman O. Jenkins: From a just a purely pragmatic prospective, those water treatment plants, I noticed are fully funded. And I recognize there are three that are not, that are partially funded under the sewer category. Would the potential exist to partially fund those water treatment plants and fully fund those sewer plants? And you can say no it won't really work like that?

Ms. Featherston: With the plant - - - you'd have to take them project by project. For the plant to rehabilitation, you could probably split that into two different projects. There's a chemical component to that project as well as the rehabilitation of our largest treatment train, you could

potentially split those out, however we are having discussions with the Department of Health and Hospitals over some of our chemical treatments. So, it would be a little bit difficult to do that. We've got problems with the basins as well. And with leaking in the basins and some other issues, the raw water piping medication is really - - - you can't do it piece meal. The same thing with the 12-Mile Bayou Pumping Station, that's a critical component to our system. We could potentially reduce the cost. Cut some things out of it, make it bare bones, but really it's not - - - none of those projects are really anything that you could cut up into parts and pieces.

Councilman O. Jenkins: And then in terms of overall priorities for the city, those three - - - where do those treatment, those water projects fall with regard to our sewer projects?

Ms. Featherston: They are even though we're not mandated by the Department of Justice or EPA, those projects are very important for a number of reasons. And that's why they were selected from the total list of water projects. Again the plant 2E is one of the Amiss has three different separate treatment trains and the plant 2E is the largest of those treatment trains. If we have issues with that treatment process, we lose a very large portion of our treatment capabilities. In the summer time, that would reduce us into some sort of conservation measures, if we lost part of that treatment train. The raw water piping modifications are basically to bring another line into the Amiss treatment plant from Cross Lake. Right now, we have one pipeline going under the railroad tracks coming into the plant. Something happens to that pipeline, we do not have the ability to get water into the Amiss treatment plant. We consider that, even though it technically is a backup, it's a very critical backup. The same thing with 12-Mile Bayou pump station, that is where we pump water from 12-Mile Bayou into Cross Lake or we can pump straight from 12-Mile Bayou into the Amiss treatment plant. If something were to happen, an event on Cross Lake and we were not able to utilize that water source, we would utilize the 12-Mile Bayou pump station. It is in dire straights, anyone that wants to go out and visit, I'd be more than happy to take 'em, but it is very rough right now.

Councilman O. Jenkins: In summary, you're satisfied with - - - if they were to say, here's your \$90,000,000, you would still break it out roughly the way it's broken out on that spreadsheet?

Ms. Featherston: Yes sir I feel that we would just because there's a certain level to the water. That's why you don't see the parts and pieces and the pipelines on this list. We whittled it down and whittled it down and felt the most important water aspect was the treatment of the water.

Councilman O. Jenkins: And then last one for me, the two that were not funded at all, the Blanchard Road and the Caddo/Bossier Port Lift Station, cause those other ones were treatment plant issue which according to our - - - we don't necessarily feel that's going to be getting the most scrutiny by the Department of Justice, but the two that were not, the Blanchard Road and the Caddo/Bossier Lift Station, what do the impacts of not funding that at this point?

Ms. Featherston: The Caddo/Bossier Port Lift Station is the main lift station out at the Caddo/Bossier Port, that all the sewerage from that area pumps to the Lucas treatment plant. That station obviously as things have grown out at the port, that station is reaching it's capacity. The concern is that at some point very soon if there were an industry that were to come to Shreveport to

locate out at the Port, we would not have the capacity, if they were more of a water intensive, or had a water type process, we would not be able to offer them services or we would have to say hey, you're going to have to wait until we expand the capacity of that lift station.

Councilman O. Jenkins: I personally would love to have that problem come to us.

Ms. Featherston: It would be great, and obviously the city is always in discussions with the Port working with their economic development team to bring new industries there, and if you look at any of the little confidential questionnaires they ask, what's your water capacity, what's your sewer capacity, what can you provide in the way of water and sewer? And to say that we don't have anything, we can't provide anything, you'll have to wait until we upgrade our lift station, we don't want to be in that situation, but it's been a good thing that there's been a lot of industry moving there that we have that problem in the first place. The Blanchard Road/Havana widening project is a project that was originally conceived when DOTD was looking at widening that section through the Shreveport/Blanchard Road near KCS, all of that area, that would provide a higher level of pressure into the northern part of the system. There are some industries in that area. While it's not an absolutely critical project, it is one of our priority water projects.

Councilman O. Jenkins: But in both of these two projects we've just discussed, in terms of Department of Justice, they're not particularly - - - I mean - - -

Ms. Featherston: No, no.

Councilman O. Jenkins: They're a critical threshold, those two particular projects.

Ms. Featherston: No, no. Those are not critical with regards to the Department of Justice.

Councilman O. Jenkins: And further on, when it talks about the various treatment plants that are not funded on here, those numbers are of interest to the Department of Justice?

Ms. Featherston: At some point they will be. They will be included when we start looking at - - - when we go through the process of the characterization of our system and the prioritization of the projects, those will become more and more important as - - - with regards to if you look at the two projects, there's one from (inaudible) for the sludge system improvements and that is right now, that system is at capacity. It's an older system. We need new equipment. We're spending thousands of dollars a year on (inaudible) and replacing equipment parts and pieces. Sometimes we are not able to keep up with the pressing of sludge that we need to, while it doesn't technically, we have the capability to keep it from becoming an impact at the treatment plant with regards to the (inaudible) quality. It is a problem and it will be something we will have to address if something were to happen to that system. The same things with the bio-solids facility that's located south of town. That facility is in very poor shape. If something happens to that facility and we're not able to pump sludge to the facility, that backs up the whole process and we will start to have violations at the treat plants because we can't send the sludge there, the solids will - - - we will exceed our solids limits going out into the red river. That is a very big potential. We've had a lot of breakdowns at that facility recently. The flow equalization basins, we have a lot of structural

problems with those basins collapsing. During wet weather event, those are the basins that we're required to use first, before we go to our wet weather treatment facilities. Portions of those basins are unusable at this point because of structural defects. We're doing what we can to maintain what is there. But obviously as it is a part of our permit to go to those basins first if we're not able to go to those basins, then we will have some issues with the regulatory agencies.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Okay, last part if you were given the opportunity of this \$60,000,000 more dollars, would you rather see that in your city wide sewer rehabilitation, or in these projects that are unfunded back here with regards to remaining compliance or to mitigate any liability with the Department of Justice?

Ms. Featherston: I would say the bulk of it would go to city wide rehab. I would still like to look at and evaluate which of the "treatment plant or solids processing projects". We could do something to get us a little further along, to give us a little more than a band aid than what we have now, I would say the bulk of it would go to city wide where we have the majority of our issues with SSO violations. But I would still say that some of that would need to be looked at, at the treatment plants.

Councilman S. Jenkins: That's city wide sewer?

Ms. Featherston: Yes, city wide sewer.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, may I ask a question?

Councilman O. Jenkins: Absolutely.

Mr. Thompson: Barbara, you have \$3,000,000 here for the master plan. As you go through and develop the master plan, when you get to the end of that, do you think you might say I wish we had not submitted to do one or more of these projects because something else is needed more? Do you feel comfortable that you're going to stay with the projects that you have listed as being the most important?

Mayor Glover: Mr. Chairman? Art, if you don't mind Barbara before you answer that, I want you to clarify exactly what we mean by master plan. Because I know there are folks who are watching at home and maybe even some who are here who may see that overlapping with the regional master plan that was done. So, would you be sure that we're specifically defining what we're talking about.

Ms. Featherston: Sure, what we mean by a master plan, and it's just called a master plan in this document is a document that is part of that process that's going through and characterizing your system which is what EPA is going to be looking to us to do that SSES (Sanitary System Evaluation Survey), which is going out and doing flow monitoring, monitoring where the water is coming in from during wet weather events. Finding those holes, fixing those holes, prioritizing those projects based on reductions in wet weather flows. Part of that master planning is looking at the lift stations themselves, what is over capacity, what is under capacity, what do we need? There

is basically a tradeoff that is looked at when you do these types of plans and this type of work is a transporter (inaudible), do you try to plug the holes or do you try to treat the plant and take in more water. There is a number of different things this master plan also includes a hydraulic model which will be basically from researching consent decrees for other municipalities online trying to get an idea of what they're going to expect from us. Hydraulic modeling is one of the things that's top on the list, in addition to the physical characterization of the system. So I have no issues. \$3,000,000 is probably not all we spend for that general function.

Councilman Shyne: Let me kinda come in. does that mean - - - I know in my area, I have maybe two or three areas where whenever we have severe rain, we have a lot of water that will get into the sewer system, and we have houses that this water will actually back up into Mr. Chairman, and does that mean that we will be looking at problems of this nature so we can see what we can do in order to eliminate them with the master plan?

Ms. Featherston: Yes sir. That is the intent. A master plan using that general term, people think of more a developmental thing you know, where can we put this or new expansion, that is why you have to consider growth within the city. The focus of this this going to be looking at prioritization of the projects within the city that are going to make the most sense, that are going to reduce the SSOs as much as possible.

Councilwoman McCulloch: In looking at your priority list here for the Department of Justice and the adoption by the City Council, I noticed here with the Cross Lake Dam spillway. The Department of Justice suggested \$15,000,000 and of course it wasn't adopted by this body, and I was just wondering if this body was aware of the flooding that occurs out of this area, off 173? I mean if you were to prioritize that, because actually its flooding to the extent whereby traffic is cut off, I mean cars aren't able to travel through.

Ms. Featherston: Yes Ma'am. As we even have a project. One of the last projects on the list is a new road at the North Regional, at the wastewater plant. During flooding periods as you're talking about, we have to boat and barge into the treatment plant out off of Russell Road. That project, the Cross Lake Dam and Spillway project is a technically under the water projects as a function of looking at the existing dam structure, is from a stability standpoint as well as the spillway which is obviously an older structure. It does not have all of the operational functionality that it had when it was originally designed. We can't even get replacement parts and pieces for some of the gates. Looking at that project in particular, we'll look at how that water is - - - we're actually in a contract with an engineering firm to look at alternatives as far as how that water comes off of the spillway. And looking at how that can be managed in another way so we don't have some of the downstream flooding.

Councilwoman McCulloch: But you couldn't even consider doing it phases? I mean whereby you could do some prevention?

Ms. Featherston: That project in particular involves the dam's stability in the spillway, so yes Ma'am it could be done in phases, and we are currently under contract with an engineering firm to get updated cost estimates and look at alternatives to see what we can do with that area.

Councilwoman McCulloch: So in the meantime, it will just flood when the rain comes huh?

Ms. Featherston: That is - - - yeah. I don't know what the flooding issues are, I don't deal so much with it. I do water and sewer, and I don't deal with the drainage. But I can get with Ron Norwood and our other assistant Ali Mustapha and talk about the flooding issues and the impacts and where those are coming from.

Councilwoman McCulloch: Yeah, within the past year or so, we've had a real bad flood on Russell Road whereby the traffic was actually cut off, going on to 173, which is just across from Cross Lake.

Ms. Featherston: Yes Ma'am, I understand. We weren't able to access the treatment plant by normal means.

Councilwoman McCulloch: But you're going to get with who now you said?

Ms. Featherston: Ali Mustapha, and Ron Norwood is the City Engineer. Ali Mustapha handles the - - - is the Assistant City Engineer for drainage.

Mr. Sibley: Mr. Chairman, just wanted to clarify to Ms. McCulloch, the department you referred to is not the Department of Justice. It's actually the city department that actually submitted that project.

Councilwoman McCulloch: Oh, okay. And it was adopted by - - -

Mr. Sibley: And that's one that was not recommended by the committee.

Ms. Featherston: It's a project that we submitted to them and it was not recommended by the committee, yes Ma'am.

Councilwoman McCulloch: The Citizens Bond Committee?

Ms. Featherston: Yes Ma'am.

Councilwoman McCulloch: Wow.

Councilman Shyne: This is why I wanted to wait until you all came on to look at the bond proposal. There were some people who wanted to pass it through. Like an example. If there's something that's important to you, then it comes to the point where you can add it in. Because those members who were here two weeks ago are gone. And if something doesn't go right or needed to be added in, they're going to be looking at you Mr. Chairman or they're going to be looking at you Sam or Rose or myself. So this is why what we're doing now is so important. Because if they left out something that you feel is important to your area, then this is an opportunity we'll have in order to add it in.

Councilman O. Jenkins: And you bring out a good point, and I should have mentioned this to everybody, but I do recommend or at least I made the effort myself to speak to the representatives from my district on the particular citizens bond committee, and I do recommend that if you know who they are to give them a call, to see why in their particular case, they chose to or not to include specific projects. Because that is the one (inaudible) continue you know, carry over from the previous group that I do think we should use as a resource.

Councilman Corbin: We've kinda talked around this, but just sort of a yes or no, all of the projects submitted by the department under Proposition 1 for water and sewer, none of those projects are going to wait. We're going to see 'em again, whether we include them in this bond issue, or it's another bond issue or something down the road, these projects will have to occur. And I'm guessing that there's also a bucket with new projects every month that's being added to this list already.

Ms. Featherston: Yes. Well the simple answer is yes. The one thing I do want to point out while I have this group, the one thing that was not - - - what you see on this list are some rehab projects for the water plant, pipeline projects for distribution, sewer projects. What you don't see on this list which is included in what we call the book, which is our total unfunded project list that we keep up with is at some point and time, the city will be needing to look at a new water treatment plant or multiple water treatment plants. And those are very expensive to the tune of about \$300-350,000,000.

Councilman Corbin: I know Mr. Hardy's stepped out of the room for a minute, but however we end up, I guess I just see some timing issues. If we end up on December 14th with these projects that are in our bond issue, we could include or toss out a project that in the first part of 2011 when we begin to work possibly towards s consent decree with Department of Justice, there may be something else that Department of Justice says, this has to be done ASAP.

Ms. Featherston: They will not require - - - through this process, what they will require us to do is to come up with a plan. Then they will approve that plan. And that plan will list those projects. They will review and approve the methodology, and the process and once they're comfortable with that, they will say yes, that's the list of projects that we all agree will reduce or eliminate your violations. So until that plan is complete, which will be another year to two years, they really won't have a list of projects, so it should not be an issue.

Councilman Corbin: But they'll look at what we're doing here as good faith?

Ms. Featherston: Yes, they will definitely look at this as good faith and that the city is making a very good effort to try to remedy the problem.

Councilman Everson: Thank you for that, and you know I think we've gone over back and forth and I know Sam worries are echoed by many of the rest of us on Council, just that this is going forward and in the right process. And so I do want to make sure just for clarification, and maybe Ken could speak to this as well for the Citizens Bond Committee. So what we're looking at is a set of projects that will not completely address the situation, but it will get well on the way, and we're

going to bring this that we have put together to Department of Justice, as this is our plan, this is how we're showing that we're showing that we're moving forward, so this is what we're going to do. In the decisions that were made by the Citizens Bond Committee, was that discussion had that this is enough to be - - - I mean that this is something that you all felt comfortable with during those meetings, or could you maybe answer that, or Ron? I mean whoever wants to - - -.

Mr. Ron Norwood: Let me just say that while we made our initial presentation to the Citizen Bond Committee, it was made very clear that we were looking at a \$200,000,000 figure for sewer, for the SSO problem. So they knew that going in. But of course, they weren't going to approve a bond issue of \$200,000,000 and dedicate it all to sewer, so they did as much as they could. But they all understood that the number was \$200,000,000 for sewer.

Mr. Thompson: But there is something else here and the Committee was also told that the old Council would not approve more than a certain amount and I think it was \$125,000,000?

Mr. Norwood: Correct.

Mr. Thompson: And so they were working to try to reduce to that number. They finally said, we can't leave it at that number and they approved more than that, but they were always told that you had to - - -

Councilman Everson: Try to get to the \$125(million), and in their desperate attempts to get to \$125 (million) meaning we still have some considerable amount of needs.

Mr. Norwood: But they were always aware of the \$200,000,000 for total we were looking for.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Are there any further questions at this point?

Councilman S. Jenkins: Mr. Chairman (inaudible) they would answer this question, I don't know, but you know what I keep going back to is, if we adopt a resolution on December 14th, and put a bond proposal out for these projects, we can't come back, let's say the citizens approve it. We can't come back and change that if we get something from the Department of Justice saying these are some things that we think you need to move on next. We can't (inaudible) - - -

Councilman O. Jenkins: Let me ask why me, I would ask it a different way. Instead of doing line items specific in terms of projects, can't we put a proposition that just says Sewer projects in order to be in compliance with DOJ's master plan or DOJ's consent decree?

Mr. Thompson: Yes.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Yes, we can write it like that so that if the two things that they've come up with like, hey priorities have changed, or DOJ comes back and says I wish y'all would have put this on the list rather than that.

Mr. Thompson: The resolution that's in front of you, that kind of resolution is put there because in the past, the Council wanted to assure the citizens that if you approve the bond issue, here are the projects that we were going to do. And so that if somebody wanted a street, they'd know that that street would be there or wanted a sewer, they would know that that sewer project would be there. But this is a little bit different, and it could be structured and written basically in the way that you say, so that there would be more flexibility on how you would spend this money particularly as it relates to the sewer part of the project.

Mayor Glover: Mr. Chairman?

Councilman O. Jenkins: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Glover: I just want to make sure though Councilman Jenkins and the rest of the Council, that you all understand the process that was outlined by Ms. Featherston. DOJ won't give us a list of projects.

Councilman O. Jenkins: I think we all understand that, but I think that we all are worried that we get too hemmed into a particular - - -

Mayor Glover: I'm not sure if Councilman Jenkins is clear on that though. Can you - - -

Councilman S. Jenkins: Now you're correct Mr. Mayor, what I was trying to get straight and I think maybe I finally got to the answer I was looking for in all this. My concern of December 14th is to say this is the resolution and we put it out before the people to vote on April 2nd. The Department of Justice might come back behind us and say you need to spend the money a different way. I was concerned that you couldn't change what the people had voted on. I'm hearing now that the proposition could be written in a more general term to meet unexpected information (inaudible).

Mr. Thompson: I think the Mayor is saying that the Department of Justice is not going to tell us how to spend it. The same thing in doing the master plan, we may determine that we need to spend it in some other way, and so you could have language in there or an amount and language to give more flexibility on how the funds are spend.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Well, that relieves me quite a bit. It really does. Because I felt like we were put in a 'cart before the horse' kind of - - - Councilman Shyne. And I didn't want the nightmare on my end that we committed to the people that we were going to do something, and then we get something from another way and millions of dollars, and we're over here working on something that people may not be that concerned about. So that helps me quite a bit today.

Mr. Seaton: Mr. Jenkins that line item is city wide sewer rehabilitation allows that flexibility to do the work that needs to be done and where it needs to be done.

Councilman S. Jenkins: (Inaudible) to ask a question down here, (inaudible) I'm used to being in the Parish government.

Mr. Seaton: I was waiting for the opportune time.

Councilman Shyne: And Mr. Chairman, it's how we structure when we take it to the voters. If that flexibility is in there when we take it to the voters on the ballot, then we're in good shape. But if we narrow it down and just pinpoint that we're going to spend this - - - for an example, we're going to do a park in - - - let me say Hollywood Heights Sam, if it's alright. Lets say if we would narrow it down to that, then that's legally what we would have to do. But if we use that flexibility when we go to the citizens, then we have the flexibility to make the change.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Now let me make sure of one other thing. That's okay with the state bond commission to have something that (inaudible)

Ms. Glass: Mr. Chairman, if I could be a little bit more specific about it. You actually have two resolutions to consider, not on your agenda for today, but you'll need to consider. One is the resolution calling the election. And it will have very general propositions. The one proposed so far has three propositions. One for Water and Sewer for \$89,900,000. It doesn't name the projects, and the Proposition No. 2 and a proposition No. 3 for the other types of projects. Then you have a second resolution where you would adopt the Bond Study Committee Report or adopt it with your own modifications to it. And that's the one that list all the individual projects. And usually that resolution says that the Council intends to use this, if this money passes at the election, we intend to use the money for these particular projects. It usually says to the extent feasible, so that if a project becomes unfeasible, you don't have to just let that money sit there. And then what Mr. Thompson and I were discussing is we've never done this before, but we thought that it could also have language in there that would say, to the extent feasible, or to the extent that either the new master plan doesn't tell us that there should be other priorities, or to the extent that you know the Department of Justice - - - discussion indicate that other projects should be done. Something to that affect. Now we just talked about that. I certainly want to talk to 'em about it, to Mr. Boles, our Bond Counsel about that, but - - - so you have the proposition that the voters will look at versus the list of projects. If that helps.

Mr. Seaton: Mr. Chairman, we were discussing the sewer projects that are specifically listed on this listing right now are such huge holes in the system, they have to be done, there's no question that they have to be done. We are completely totally confident that those specific projects need to be done and need to be done in this project. The amount that you could put in that is city wide sewer is the department's flexibility to do the work where it needs to be done, and somewhere somebody earlier mentioned tying something to the consent decree in the proposition. The risk and the concern with that is that we need to do some of these projects before that consent decree finally comes, so we wouldn't want it to prevent us from spending that money prior to that point.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Okay, if there are no other questions, listen, thank you all very much for your time. It was certainly informative for me, and I think for the rest of the Council.

Mayor Glover: Mr. Chairman, before we wrap up, I think it's also appropriate to 1) Go over the number of questions and requests that we had to make sure that we have a list of those, so we can make sure that we get that information to you all. I have one that mentioned specifically from

Councilwoman McCulloch who wanted the summary of the DOJ meeting from July. Were there any other specific requests that you all have outstanding information-wise? We need to make sure that we're in a position to provide you all with.

Councilman O. Jenkins: I wasn't planning on ending the session, I was just thanking those from water and sewer.

Mayor Glover: And this is specific to - - -?

Councilman O. Jenkins: To water and sewer.

Mayor Glover: And then secondly, I'd like for and Rick, Charles and anybody else feel free to chime in to offer the background on this. One of the things I'm not sure, if you all also have had an opportunity to discuss, and that is that this represents I think, only the second or third time in the course of the city's history where there has been the information of the administration and the council to make use of the city's GOB bonding capacity to address water and sewer issues. I think that's a relevant second time, '78 and now.

Mr. Seaton: Sanitary sewer has been included in GOB in 1968. GOB as well as 1978, general obligation bonds, and to the best of my knowledge water has not before, but sanitary sewers and include at least those twice prior to 1968, we haven't been able to find. Couldn't go back further than that.

Mayor Glover: So from a philosophical standpoint, there are some who have offered that this represents some new territory as far as the city is concerned. It's the administration's perspective that in order for us to be able to get to that \$200,000,000 solution, it would be a scenario that would require a combination of GOB as well as some other measures. There are those though who haven't point out, that for these other areas within this bond proposition, they have no revenue generating capacity in and of themselves, these are two that do. And that's why this type of measure has not previously been done before. And so we want to make sure that you all have that knowledge, have that information and have an opportunity to be able to answer or ask and have answered any questions in that regard because it may end up being a part of what you hear as a part of the community discussion in the next couple of weeks between now and the time that you all actually end up moving forward with hopefully some sort of a proposition.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Have we looked at other sources of bonding for these projects other than the money that's coming from the bond proposal? Has it been looked at?

Mayor Glover: A couple of things. No. 1, to dispel a vicious false rumor that circulated throughout the course of the mayoral campaign, there are no big pots of federal dollars waiting out there for us to go in and ask Uncle Sam to give us to be able to address these issues and problems. That doesn't exist for Shreveport or any place else. Any answer to this is going to be something that we're going to end up largely funding at the local level. We may have an opportunity for Build America bonds and some other propositions that may come along at some point in the future, but 1) From a federal standpoint, there are no honey pots of dollars out there waiting for us to come and get them

too. Same thing at the state level. Any dollars that may come from the state even under better fiscal times than the ones that we're in the midst of right now are generally reserved for smaller communities than Shreveport that end up with more interesting fiscal challenges than what we have right now. Thirdly, traditionally the way these types of improvements have been funded by previous administrations and previous councils have been via increases in the water and sewer rates. And resulting, issuing of revenue bonds that would correspond with those entities. There has been I think, some work done by (inaudible) that would indicate the level and amount of increase that would be necessary to address, I think various levels of work within the water and sewer department. And we certainly are prepared to share that with council if that's something that you all would like to have as well.

Councilman O. Jenkins: I think certainly that, that would be a great idea to see it - - - I know I've seen the one that shows how you get from the \$90 to the \$200 (million) and what that does for our water rates, and looking at that figure, I'd hate to see what it did if we had to go from zero to \$200 (million) and to the water rates. That would be an ugly figure. So absolutely, if you have that available to us, then distribute it whatever way is practical, that would be great. Okay, if we could go to SPAR next, just sadly gentlemen, but you know ladies first in this regard and there are some other priorities up here that we're trying to work through if we could, that'd be great. Assuming that was the next on your - - - I don't know.

Mr. Seaton: Actually next it would be Police and Fire and then SPAR, but we will do however you want it.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Seaton: Number of ADA projects included in the Municipal Auditorium, and what the committee did, at first the committee was presented with a dollar figure for each location. The Citizens Bond Study Committee asked the departments to split that up, tell us what you need in ADA, and then do everything else in a separate line item. And so these are just what is required for ADA improvements in those facilities to bring them up to code. The total ADA is approximately \$8,000,000. And then the Municipal Auditorium Phase I improvements if \$2.8 (million). It includes lighting and sound which we desperately need and that's a revenue generating vessel. Cargill Park ball field complex, the Barnwell Center roof which Shelly can tell you more about, we desperately need and then a number of park issues that touch locations all across the city. Any questions for Ms. Ragle on SPAR?

Councilman O. Jenkins: I would certainly defer to my cousin here because he's been good on these questions today.

Councilman S. Jenkins: No really when we - - - thank you Mr. Chairman. When we - - - this seems to be prioritized (inaudible) not to say that water and sewer was not. The ADA issues here are - - - is there some timeline that has been provided as to when these things could be completed?

Ms. Ragle-Stone: We entered into a voluntary agreement with ADA in 2005, and we had until last October - - -

Mayor Glover: DOJ.

Ms. Ragle-Stone: Pardon?

Mayor Glover: DOJ, you said ADA.

Ms. Ragle-Stone: Sorry. With the DOJ for ADA compliance. We had to complete those projects last October. We wrote a letter last October to the DOJ and said, here's what we've done so far, we've done a little over a million, about \$1.1 (million) worth of work that was in our voluntary agreement. We told them that there was an opportunity for a bond issue and asked for an extension. They have at this point granted us that extension, because we had showed good faith on the work that was in the agreement. We'd already spent about \$1.1 (million) towards the projects that were listed in the voluntary agreement.

Councilman S. Jenkins: What's the - - - and I can understand and accept the ADA issues. What was the rationale behind all the rest of this parks and what's been actually done in these parks?

Ms. Ragle-Stone: How do we determine our list of projects?

Councilman S. Jenkins: Right.

Ms. Ragle-Stone: Well we used a couple of different scenarios. One is we did a - - - in 2005, SPAR along with Caddo Parish did a master plan for recreation for not only the City of Shreveport, but Caddo Parish as a whole. And we took what people sent to us in that master plan for recreation to develop our list of projects. We used that, and then we also used a list of outstanding maintenance and renovation projects that have come to us over the last almost 15 years. SPAR has not been included significantly in a bond issue since 1996. So a lot of our facilities are aging, and have not had any maintenance or repairs done to them of any significance since 1996. So that's how we developed our list. It was based on citizen input, it was based on maintenance needs and then the recreation master plan as well as the - - - at the time we developed this list, the current city wide master plan was going on at the same time.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Does SPAR generate any fees to maintain any of this?

Ms. Ragle-Stone: No sir. No, we do not have a way of generating fees for recreation facilities. We do charge fees for rental of facilities, such as Riverview Hall, Festival Plaza, and we do not have a way of generating fees for maintenance. Another thing that we talked about in our budget hearing was the fact that we used to get Riverfront money, hotel/motel tax to maintain those Riverfront or what we would consider tourism destinations like Festival Plaza, Riverview Hall, Barnwell Center, we no longer get that money. That money was earmarked debt on Independence Stadium, which was a good thing to do. I'm not saying that, but that took away a lot of our maintenance money for facilities.

Councilman S. Jenkins: But if I'm understanding this right, everything that's not ADA is not necessarily mandated to be done?

Ms. Ragle-Stone: No sir.

Councilman S. Jenkins: These are just based upon the aging, natural aging of these facilities?

Ms. Ragle-Stone: Right. Because in our operating budget at this time, we do not have the money to do any of these projects. We do not have the maintenance. I think I showed y'all a graph during our budget where we at one time had about \$380,000 in our maintenance budget and we're down to right at \$76,000. So, you know we don't have the money to maintain these facilities within our operating budget. And when citizens come to us and say can we fix the gym, or can we add on to this facility, we do not have that in our operating budgets. So the things that you see here are things that are outside that.

Councilman Everson: Shelly, when you - - - there's a particular project or two on here that I guess I'd like a little bit more explaining about 'em, is the complete street projects that I see there?

Ms. Ragle-Stone: Those are the ones that were removed?

Councilman Everson: Yeah. They're not funded in the Citizens Bond proposal recommendation, but I have a working knowledge of what these are, but tell a little bit about what that project was and why it was - - - how it falls under SPAR as opposed to a kind of a streets project?

Ms. Ragle-Stone: That should be it. We have to work together on that project, but it's a recreation project basically, and when we were looking at putting our recreation projects together, we were listening to what the citizens were saying in the master plan and what you kept hearing, and what we heard in our recreation master plan is, more and more trails, greenways and the connection of the ones that we have. And so what we had in our linear park and greenway development was connections, complete street projects and extensions of some of our paths so that they would actually connect to each other. Did y'all get a list of those that had the definitions - - - the - - - y'all got the book that had exactly what was included in that \$2,000,000 for greenways?

Councilman Everson: No, I don't think I got a greenways.

Councilman S. Jenkins: I thought they were talking about the (inaudible).

Ms. Ragle-Stone: This will give you a list of all the projects that we had proposed and then it outlines those things that were taken out, and it has a description too. So it might be a little easier to understand what we included in there. And it also gives a map of the entire city so you can see where those projects would take place that were proposed as well as a grid for all of our facilities that we maintain. So, if you look on page 3 of that booklet, it's where the linear parks and greenway. When it came down to it Councilman Everson, we and they started saying you got to cut, you got to cut, you know for us there were so many dire needs on existing facilities that creating new facilities did not take precedent over fixing up what we already own.

Councilwoman McCulloch: I know I was asking you about this to notice this Sam, the ADA projects, you said those were mandated? Is that what I heard you say?

Ms. Ragle-Stone: We had entered into a voluntary agreement with the Department of Justice to come into ADA compliance, yes Ma'am.

Councilwoman McCulloch: I just had some concerns about Cargill Park appearing twice. You know one of which is under ADA, and the other was \$2,000,750 which is not listed. And of course both were approved by the Committee. Why wasn't that just listed under one - - -?

Ms. Ragle-Stone: If you look at the list, we turned it all in under one project. Cargill Park, we turned in for \$3,000,000. When the Citizen Bond Committee.

Councilwoman McCulloch: Okay.

Ms. Ragle-Stone: Took it up, they decided to take all of the ADA, and put it in one project, so you will see several places where projects are listed twice. The Municipal Auditorium is one of them. If you look at what I gave you, we left it all as one project. Cause we felt like everything needed to be done that we listed, but they took out ADA. They separated ADA from - - - for instance at Cargill, ADA projects that need to be done to be in compliance, but there are also renovations and upgrades that need to be done there if we want to continue to use it as a facility for softball and to attract national softball tournaments. At this point, we're not bidding on them because that facility is in such disrepair.

Councilman O. Jenkins: I hate to be the one that ask this question, but what happens if we were compliant in only part of the ADA requirements, i.e., you know the golf shop being ADA required the tennis center being ADA compliant, some of the sporting aspects of that ADA compliance as opposed to Municipal Auditorium obviously that's going to get a lot of use potential for the disabled people, which should be you know offered that opportunity. I'm just saying on some of the other ones where the impacts are financially significant, probably not as significant to the actual - - -

Mayor Glover: Mr. Chair? And Shelly, I know you may feel comfortable answering, but this is one I'd also like to have our lawyers to comment on, because this is an actual consent decree that the City of Shreveport prior to this council, prior to my administration, did in fact enter into as you heard Shelly just reference that we would have to have been in compliance by October of last year. What I would not want is for Shelly or for anyone else to say anything - - - since they've been kind enough to extend that timeframe for us since this past October, I don't want Shelly to say anything that might end up having some implications in terms of what they might be inclined to do. Because the reality is that this situation is exactly the same as what we are facing with regard to the EPA and the Department of Justice. When you agree that you're going to comply with the order, they have an expectation that you're going to do just that. We haven't done so, with regard to ADA, and I don't want us to end up (inaudible) by making comments that might end up being reported, read from the record or what have you that might cause them to come back in and take some action that may not end up being favorable to the City of Shreveport.

Councilman O. Jenkins: That sounds like prudent approach. Disregard that please.

Ms. Ragle-Stone: Some of the projects that I know that we had talked about in our budget that were not included, Huntington Golf Course was not included when the Citizens Bond Committee came back with their recommendations. That is the place where - - - that is a decision that we have to make. Whether we - - - if we do not intend on renovating it, we need to look at an alternative for that facility. Cause it is in you know we don't have an irrigation system, so you don't spend - - - as managers, we don't go out and spend money on fertilizer and pesticides and all those things that make greens look good, because you're just throwing away good money, because you can't water those things in and so Huntington is one of those places we really need to look at. I can't tell you what they thought when they were thinking about again I think as a whole, they were getting to a number, and that was one they felt could be left out and maybe they thought there could be an opportunity to sell it, or have somebody else manage it. There were lots of thoughts when they looked at Huntington. But I will tell you that at some point we have to make a decision on whether or not you leave it open or you use it for something else.

Councilman S. Jenkins: You know I just noticed that. I opened up that. The Huntington Park Golf Course renovation and ADA compliance, for \$3,000,000, that was not accepted by the committee, is that what you were referring to?

Ms. Ragle-Stone: Yes sir.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Okay, I guess we would need to look at it. I'm not speaking specifically on any litigation or anything like that (inaudible), but I will say as a general proposition, this ADA compliance thing, of course is a very serious matter. It's not like a zoning thing, it's a federal (inaudible) and enforcement is very serious. So we would like to know a little bit more about this particular one as far as why it would not be included among the other ADA.

Ms. Ragle-Stone: Well I think what they thought was not to make any of - - - the thought of the committee was for the city not to operate Huntington at all. So, if you didn't operate it, we can opt out of that. For instance, we were part for instance - - - with the DOJ's agreement, one of the things that was in here was the Marina at Stoner Ave. When we stopped operating that as a public space, we wrote the DOJ and asked to opt out of the agreement in ADA. We were granted approval to bring that out. Same way with the City Hall Annex. It was part of our voluntary agreement, but once we moved our employees out of the City Hall Annex, we wrote and asked for an exemption to that section in the agreement. And they let us out of it. I think it's the same way that group was thinking, well if we're not operating Huntington, we can opt out of the ADA requirements.

Councilman Corbin: Shelly at a recent Council Meeting, we talked a little bit about I guess some of the past funding for the Council on Aging, Council on Aging said that some of our community centers did not have adequate kitchens to serve meals. Are any of these projects ADA not included in that, any of these park projects going to improve community centers that would allow us to work with the Council on Aging at those facilities?

Ms. Ragle-Stone: Right. You look under 'Other Projects', both Bilberry, Hattie Perry and Mamie Hicks and Valencia. None of those have complied kitchens. So, under other projects that would

bring these recreation centers up to current uses that we have in our other centers. You know places like Lakeside or Airport, where we have kitchens where you can have the Meals on Wheels program. These particular ones, you cannot. Bilberry, if you're familiar with Bilberry, it's constructed in a way that there are times, because of staffing issues, we don't - - - we're not able to utilize both buildings and this project would actually give them a kitchen and also incorporate the gym and the other facility so that you could actually open and have a full service recreation center there, similar to the one at Bill Cockrell or Airport.

Councilman S. Jenkins: If we don't include a kitchen?

Ms. Ragle-Stone: Yes sir.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Is on the list of unfunded priorities, is there a particular one or two that seem to rise to the top of that group that you really think we should re-visit in terms of either adding or are you were (inaudible) surprised that things did make the cut that maybe weren't quite on that priority list?

Ms. Ragle-Stone: Well since SPAR normally gets left out, I will tell you that I was pleasantly surprised at the list of projects that we did get. I did not want to stand up here for one minute and not seem grateful for what's in this project. I mean, we've looked through the list and we get giddy at the department level, going can you believe it. Because basically these are maintenance needs, honestly that have not been addressed in a long time, so I do not want to begin to appear ungrateful at all. Huntington is one that I just mention it, is because we need to make a decision. Cause we've got guys out there trying to do a job, they can't do a job, because they don't have the resources or the tools for golfing. You know a golfing experience is not up to - - - if you go to Querbes, and I will tell you and I tell golfers all the time, this is the same conversation we were having about Querbes 15 years ago. We didn't have irrigation, we didn't have bathrooms on the course, we didn't have new greens, you know all of those things that - - - and we weren't having a lot of play there. That's exactly what's happening at Huntington, and at this point, I think collectively we have to decide if we're going to make the investment or we're not. If we're not, then we have to make the hard decision on what to do with that piece of property. So, Huntington would be - - - the tennis court improvements, I was surprised they took 'em out, because it wasn't a lot of money. You know it was - - - that makes a big impact. We are not right now able to attract some of the sporting events at these tennis centers that we could had we done some renovations. They took out over \$750,000. I thought that was you know for what they took out. The trail part which is exciting for us, and it's also kinda addresses the needs that they told us in our recreation plans, but it was something new. And we were really concerned at SPAR about getting fixed what we had, because when we did our parks master plan, that's the one thing our citizens said, we don't only want to see new, we want you to fix up what you got. That's exactly what they said to us, and that's what this list represents to you all is fixing up what we already have. And that's what our citizens told us when we did the master plan with the parish. You know don't necessarily go out there and build another rec center, another you know Cargill Park, just fix up what you've got. And that's what this represents. The other thing that was left out was Riverfront building improvements. We had a million dollars in there, and at some point, we're going to have to start thinking about Sci-Port, Riverview, those places as things go out, Sci-Port is going to need carpet, they're going to need

painting, that's our facility, and we're going to have to do some upgrades to it. And we have no other way to fund those, and this was a way to start thinking about the funding for places like Sci-Port, Riverview hall, you know tables and chairs and staging and skirting, those are all not included in any renovations that \$1,000,000 is in there for that. So those are the three Tennis, Huntington, and Riverfront building improvements, those three were probably the three that we, because another way to fund those projects.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Say again? Riverview, Huntington and what else?

Ms. Ragle-Stone: The Riverfront building improvements. And I gave you a book, it's on page 2 of that book, you might be - - -.

Councilman Webb: Shelly on Page 4, I did an amendment on the South Shreveport Metro Park Tennis Center renovations. They - - - it was a \$250,000 request and the committee took it out. But then right below, it says Tennis Center renovations, \$250,000 but no description. What - - -?

Ms. Ragle-Stone: When the committee was asked to cut something, we had \$1.25 (million) in for total Tennis Center renovations. When they were asked to cut, they said cut a million from there, and so they just left it as a generic tennis center improvements. So, it will - - - you know, there's no specific - - - that's the way the committee's final version came out.

Councilman Webb: Well we only have two tennis courts, and that's the ones at Querbes and - - -

Ms. Ragle-Stone: Well actually under the tennis center improvements, if you look at that on page 4, Airport Park, Bill Cockrell, Querbes and South Shreveport, Southern Hills. So actually those four were included there. Airport had some very, very nice tennis court center in desperate need of repair at Airport Park.

Councilman Shyne: I'm sorry. Say that again?

Ms. Ragle-Stone: I thought that might get your attention. He was asking about Tennis Center improvements, we actually put Airport Park under Tennis Centers. That's where we used to do our - - - that's where our pros at the other three courses go and teach young children who don't participate in our pros program, children in our inner city. We do that at Airport Park, and they're a very nice facility, but they're in desperate need of repair. And that \$250 (thousand) was in there to repair them too, so the (inaudible) tennis centers in their own, and if you'd look at our list of projects, we tried to divide it by different, yet tennis center improvement, you had facility improvement, you had riverfront building improvement. So tennis, they get used and they're just in bad shape.

Councilman Corbin: Shelly, there's an unfunded item for Fairgrounds Field.

Ms. Ragle-Stone: You know this is going to be an interesting conversation. We're going to have a conversation I think tomorrow with the Shreveport Captains to talk about that facility. I know we believe it's a great facility, it's just in need of some repairs and upgrades, and some things it

doesn't offer that makes other teams feel like it'd be lucrative for them to be there. You don't have any kind of suites, you don't have anything to sell that you could really attract a different type of ball club there, so I mean again, it's one of those things where we have to decide what we're going to do there. It had some flooding and draining issues that are pretty significant, but when it came down to priorities, it was not for us apparently.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Thank you very much for coming down. I appreciate it.

Mr. Seaton: Any other questions related to SPAR? If not we'll go onto Fire and Police?

Councilman O. Jenkins: Whoever is in a bigger hurry over there.

Mr. Seaton: They're here for the duration Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Shyne: I know Fire and Police was going to be kinda long, so I want to get me some water. You know how long winded they are.

Mr. Seaton: We're going to start out with Chief Shaw. We have four items that were listed and approved by the Citizens Bond Study Committee (inaudible).

Chief Shaw: Good afternoon. I think we're going to go back a little bit and give you a history of how we got to where we are. Back in '09, July there was some stimulus money out there. So the department was tasked with putting together a project or projects that we thought that we needed to move the department ahead. Well at that time, they came up with the property room, a new crime scene unit, renovate the old jail, get a new boathouse for Cross Lake, and also get some renovations at the training academy. Well that never really came to pass but initially that project of \$6.8 (million) was actually \$9.7 (million). That's where it initially started out at \$9.7 (million). Early in 2010, there was talk of this bond proposal. That price was reduced down from \$9.7 (million) to \$6.8 (million) based on square footage. It was initially a facility was thought to be needed of about 40,000 square feet, and this one as it stands today is at 33,000 square feet, at a cost of about \$201 per square foot. And also the - - - and I think I'll talk mostly about the property room, because I know that there's been some sticking points and a lot of different questions about the building as such as it's going to cost. The one that we (inaudible) is the old Cuban Liquor store, 1149 Texas. It's in deplorable shape. And I don't think anybody could deny the need that we have for our property (inaudible). The need is there. I think the debate is about the cost. We've looked into it and trying to cut back and realizing that we need one, but we don't one that is substandard. The facility that it's in now is substandard, and what we get into is a case where it's part of the infrastructure as well as the streets and any other thing that you might be looking at today. Because without the property/evidence room, we stand to lose cases in court. These things that we hold property for years, and years, and years. For all these heinous crimes, rapes, armed robberies that people get life sentences or get these long, long sentences make an appeal on, and over time you may lose witnesses, you may lose officers, but the evidence should be in a place where we can always get our hands on it. So, we need a place that's climate controlled. That meets OSHA standards, that's not a building that's put up with (inaudible) engineering, and I've been told that somewhere between \$120 and \$160 per square foot is about the right price. And I was just told that

earlier today. Because we've been out trying to figure out a way to lower the cost, because I know that's a concern with the Council. But now I've been told that we can actually put one up for around \$5.2 (million) and that's inclusive of the crimes unit. Now with that in mind, there was also some, I guess some concerns of whether or not we could use an existing building. We looked at it also. We looked at the old Boys and Girls Club off Hearne Ave. And that project would cost us about \$3.2 (million) to renovate that building. The only problem with that is, it's going to be away from the Police Department. And so when you get away from the Police Department, of course you know there are drugs, money, guns, so that facility would have to be secured. So that would cost us to have to man it 24 hours a day, seven days a week. That cost would be about half million dollars a year. So, when you look at that, you say well \$3.2, another half million, \$3.6 (million), but then you're looking at taking about six officers off the street. So, it's problematic in the long run. Now there's been some other buildings that have been tossed around. We're currently looking at that. So today, I stand before you not to eliminate this project, because we need it. It is just as important as anything else that you're looking at. Because without being able to keep this property, keep this evidence in tact for the long haul. For years, and years, and years down the road, we stand to lose cases and appeals, and those people who've been incarcerated would be free to go back out to commit other crimes. So, we don't want that to happen. I think that we're in a position where we can find some common ground, because even at \$30 off \$201 a square foot, it would save a million dollars. And I've been told that we can build it for \$120, but I'm not sure, because I don't know if that meets the standards that's put forth by the property/evidence standards, a group that standardize these buildings throughout the country. And they built one in Tucson, AZ, 80,000 square feet for \$163 a square foot, for \$13,000,000. So we're somewhere between \$120 and \$201, but we've only contacted one architect initially, and of course some time ago. And now we're looking at it and got some feelers out to see if we can do it. I know that time is ticking, because you guys need some information. We'll have some additional information for you hopefully by the first of next week or the beginning of this week.

Councilman O. Jenkins: And it was brought to my attention that apparently St. Tammany Parish did one relatively recently at about a similar size - - - I don't know the specifics, you probably know more at about a \$3.2 (million) cop if I'm not mistaken.

Chief Shaw: Right. St. Tammany built one, and you get (inaudible) the kind of building that you have. We have over 400,000 pieces of evidence. Our evidence comes in at about a rate of 1200 a month. And we've discard or have released about 900, so it's about 25% that we keep, and eventually over time we're going to do more and more evidence than St. Tammany will ever do. That's down in Slidell, LA which is not even a fourth the size of Shreveport.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Yeah, and I think that was just based on the square footage comparison, not a usage option. I had no - - - didn't take that into account at all. I just threw that out there comp that was out there.

Chief Shaw: You know that I've heard that, and I don't know what kind of engineering that they used to build that building. I haven't seen it, but of course now, we're in a process where we can find out, and also include that in our - - - we'll give you something in writing by Monday of next week.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Fantastic. Councilman Webb?

Councilman Webb: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Chief, how big is the current building you have right now?

Chief Shaw: It's 20,000 square feet.

Councilman Webb: Okay, and how much parking spaces do you have?

Chief Shaw: Very limited.

Councilman Webb: Okay, the reason I was asking that and I know you want to get - - - do you have a spot in mind, or a piece of property you're wanting to buy?

Chief Shaw: We have property that we own, that's between the Police Department, the 911 Center and the City Jail. It's our property, the city owns the property, and we have a spot to build it.

Councilman Webb: Okay, because the reason I was - - - what I was leading to was I knew we had the new Fire Station facility you know maintenance repair out on Mansfield Road, where the old Wray Ford was, and I was just wondering why you couldn't build it out there in the back corner or something. You know?

Chief Shaw: We would like to have it right there at the station. It eliminates the problem of having to take officers off the street to man this - - - it's our property, it's close proximity, it just works out a lot better.

Councilman O. Jenkins: I had one more question, now the Cross Lake Patrol facility in our last - - - in our budget discussion, I believe there was some suggestion there may be some other source of funding for that particular - - - Homeland Security if I'm not mistaken, but - - - was that looked at and/or - - -

Chief Shaw: That is not the case. That building is about to fall into Cross Lake. Downtown unit, you can step through the floors in that particular facility, so all these things that we have up there, as you can see if you look at your list, we've cut back, took away generators, the project for the jail, the project for the academy, we eliminated all those things, because we can move forward without that. Now the other thing is a must, because if we don't build it, (inaudible) fall in on itself. You know we get to a point to where liability is an issue for the officers working in and out of these places, so.

Councilman O. Jenkins: No, I was just referring to the Cross Lake specific facility because in our last discussion, there was some point that because it secures the water source, that it may be fundable out of some Homeland Security federal funding.

Asst Chief Huddleston: Mr. Chairman, we did look at that, but there's nothing available at this time that would provide a new building, there were some other things, but they were very specific as to

the type of equipment you could purchase. We hadn't found anything to this point that would let us build a new building out there.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Gotcha. Okay, that was all in my question, how that fell out in the end.

Councilman Everson: You did mention the downtown unit headquarters, which is funded at \$200,000. Is that enough to stabilize the facility?

Chief Shaw: That is enough to put a new mobile home on that site, and do some work on the foundation.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Okay, thank you very much. I appreciate your interest in trying to lower your costs, because it is a concern, not only by us, but met by many of the citizens, so and I think you know working cooperatively together is certainly the way ahead of that.

Chief Shaw: Right, and we'll have something for you, each and every one of you in writing hopefully by Monday, and give you kinda of bottom line of what we can deal with, something you can be proud of and that will last the next 25-30 years.

Councilman O. Jenkins: And obviously, I know y'all are looking at some existing facilities, and I know there's a couple been mentioned downtown that are open. And so keep that research up and we're certainly not going to tell you how to do your business, because y'all know what you're doing. But we're just cognizant of the expense factor. Thank you very much.

Mr. Seaton Mr. Chairman, next would be Fire projects. As you see what came out of the Citizens Bond Study Committee, eight fire engines at \$500,000 each for a total of \$4,000,000. The relocation of two fire stations and fire station renovations at \$2.1 (million). Now with that, did you want to do a presentation, do you have questions?

Councilman O. Jenkins: I think we're certainly near the end of our candle here, so lets move straight to questions.

Mr. Seaton: That's why I wanted to ask for direction (inaudible)

Chief Crawford: Mr. Chair, Council. It's my first opportunity to address the new council, so congratulations to each one of you. I look forward to a productive working relationship with you for the next four years. So I haven't talked with you individually yet, I'll look forward to that as well, and I'll be glad to answer any questions that you might have about our portion of the bond proposal. What you have being handed out to you Council Members if the original Fire Department submission before we scaled it back. Like the Police, one of the things that I'd like to say is we're very much a team player. We understand the significance and the importance of water and sewerage in this bond proposal. Our original submission was somewhere around \$25.2 (million). As you can see, we've taken about a 52% cut on that. We're down to about \$11 ½ (million), and more so than possibly the police is, the Fire's reliance on water. Obviously it's important to us that the water system is maintained to the highest degree, not only for supplying

our fire trucks with water, but also our Class I fire rating. A lot of you may not know this, but when we get rated, and we will be rated in 2011, by Property Insurance and Associates of Louisiana. That Class I rating saves us about \$3,000,000 in business and residential taxes a year, or insurance premiums is what I'm trying to say. The water system accounts for 40% of that rating. So it doesn't matter how many trucks I have, or how many people I have, and I get all of my points if the water system is not up to that same high level and standard that a Class I fire department receives, and there's only a few of those in the whole country, then we're all hurt by that. So, we certainly understand that importance, and we try to scale back our needs to where they were just absolutely essential and critical on there. Some of the things that you first see on there, the eight fire trucks, and a lot of the questions we have are - - - it's a 20 year bond, you know you're going to buy a fire truck and you're going to pose it over 20 years, and is that something that's really responsible? Is there a better way to do that? Certainly we've done it a couple of different ways in the past. In 2001, we purchased four trucks. They're half-million dollars a piece, and that's why we don't have it in our operating budget. My operating budget would be about \$50,000,000 next year, about 91% of that is personnel service cost. That leaves me about \$4.5 (million) to deal with operations. And so you can tell taking a \$500,000 fire truck out there would put a big dent in that and so, in 2005 was the last time we purchased fire trucks, and we purchased five of those off a finance package that the city receives, with a low interest loan that was actually very amenable to the city and other departments. We went in with police, fire, I believe sanitation bought a few trucks on that. And we do that with Mr. Seaton's help at the end of each year, we look at if there's something that's possible for us. But what we've got and the original proposal I believe had 10 fire engines in there, one ladder truck and a rescue truck. And we paired it back to the absolutely eight essential trucks that we needed to replace. They're all 1993 models, so you say you're putting a fire truck on a 20 year, well - - - 10,013 is right around the corner, they've almost lasted 20 years, and they'll actually last 20 years because they'll go into reserve now. All of these trucks are either right at or over a hundred-thousand miles. The one in councilman - - - in fact your district Councilman Jenkins, at Line and Oneonta has 130,000 miles on it. By the time we actually purchase these trucks, they'll probably have like 150,000 miles on it. The National Fire Protection standard for replacing fire trucks is at 75,000 miles from frontline, and then you put 'em into reserve. And now these eight trucks are way over that standard, you truck at Station 10 is almost double that standard. The trucks that we would be replacing would go into reserve to replace the older trucks that we have now. And so there are different ways to purchase trucks. But - - - go ahead sir.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Well no, I mean, you purchased the only - - - is leasing, are you saying not an option I guess?

Chief Crawford: We've looked at lease purchasing and I'm certainly open to that, but when we've explored it in the past, the interest rates were so low, and the bond has been such a good proposition for us in the long term, that from what I'm - - - I'm not a financial expert, but from the powers to be that have told me in the past that this was the best way to do it. Was either the low financing rate which we did in 2005, or through a bond initiative that we've always done in the past. But certainly we've looked at that in the past and will continue to look at in the future to see if there's something that we can do there. The trucks that we purchased are from Holden, LA. They're from Ferraro, of course it's a bid process, but Ferraro is on a state contract. We get the

lowest possible price we can get for those trucks and \$500,000 is a pretty much an industry standard now. One of the things that you may have seen before you took office was the implementation of the new SPRINT vehicles. The SUVs that are making a lot of the EMS calls now. When three of those trucks are in place, where some of my busiest engines previously were. Station 8, which is at the Fairgrounds, Station 1, which is downtown, Station 9 which is at Cedar Grove is not only the busiest engine in the city, it's the busiest engine in the state and the number of calls they have. Those SPRINT vehicles have reduced their mileage that they're putting on those engines, those engines would accumulate somewhere up into 60-70,000 miles within three or four years. Now we expect those engines not to hit that number until 10 years. And so, these next round of engines that we plan on purchasing hopefully, and with that plan in place will last a lot longer than these other engines do, because those really busy stations were putting these SUVs out, so they can make those here and fro runs, and make the EMS calls. So, we're trying to stretch our dollar even a little bit further by doing that. No questions about the fire engines, I'll move on. We originally proposed four fire stations. Like SPAR, we had a five year master plan that we've had in place since 2001. We update it every year. And in that five year master plan is a fire station relocation plan that has been in effect for some six or seven years now. We operate off that plan, it was a study that we did in house with the help of a consultant firm to tell us where our fire stations in the right place, which ones needed to be replaced and so on. This is just a continuation of that plan. In 2001, the bond that was passed relocated the old Central Fire Station to its new location, next to the beautiful SWEPCO power plant. We're easy to find now, just follow the smoke. And then we also replaced Station 13, which was on N. Market because now Central Station was so close, there was no longer a need to have it there, we moved it to Western Hills where it was very much needed off Pines Road, across from Turner Elementary School. And so this is the next continuation. In your book, you'll find some detailed information about the other stations that were proposed, but this is the ones that we felt were absolutely essential and had to be replaced. They're both 1961 fire stations, they're single bay inline stations. Station 14 is on Greenwood Road, right there at Broadway. A little bit down from there. It's landlocked, it's got a medic unit and a fire truck. I would invite you, I would encourage you, I will take you by there for a visit to show you the needs. That's a community that vitally depends on the fire and EMS service. And that fire station has been there for some 40 years now, and it just no longer meets the needs of the community. We need nice three bay station out there that's going to allow those fire trucks to run out of their own bays, have a community center where people can meet and have medical screenings and their blood pressures and those types of things. The great part of both of these stations is we've had land donated to us that will save us anywhere from a quarter to a half-million dollars. Trying to find property for these stations. The first one Station 14 will be moved about two-tenths of a mile to the west, where the old Sheraton facility was, right there at Broadway and Greenwood Road. Most of you know where that is, if you don't Chesapeake Energy has bought that property all the way from the road line all the way back to Shreveport Country Club, or what used to be Shreveport Country Club. And they've donated or are in the process of donating a two acre tract of land that's right off of Greenwood Road, which would facilitate the use this for the new fire station. I have a nice big area, a drive thru fire station where no body has to back in. One of the biggest problems with Station 14 is not from its size, it's right on Greenwood Road, and if you've ever traveled down Greenwood Road, it's a very busy street, we've actually had fire trucks that have been hit there trying to back into the station. We've actually had fire fighters that have been hit there, so there's a safety issue there too. The new fire station, Broadway would be

extended out a little bit to a dead end, the new fire station will be turned to that dead end, so you won't have any traffic coming in and out of there. The fire trucks will be able to pull out free of being struck, or fear from another vehicle coming down the lane. Station 15 is much like Station 14, it's a landlocked station, there's a picture of it in your brochure as well. It's a single bay inline station, it also has an ambulance and a fire truck, which means if one of them gets a call and the other one doesn't, there's some moving around that has to be done there, the new maintenance facility that was spoke of while ago about a possible relocation for a crime lab or an evidence room by Councilman Webb, is the new Wray Ford facility or the old Wray Ford facility where our new maintenance facility is. There's plenty of property there to put a new fire station and it still maintains a very good geographic distance for it's first response area including the PIL which measures about a mile and a half radius when they do their measurements. One of the things that this will help also is the closing of the railroad tracks at Wyngate and Valley View which will happen very soon, some of the Hyde Park residents were concerned about fire response. Moving that fire station close to there will take out equation, even have that fire truck respond to them even faster getting on Kingston from Hyde Park. And so that's just an added benefit, kinda of a side issue. Fire station renovations, we need about \$3.5 (million) total which was the original submission. I've got 22 stand along facilities. I've got a couple of other facilities being the maintenance facility, being fire investigations which is on Snow Street. That alone with SPAR, we have to maintain. Of those 24 pieces of property, I have about \$180,000 a year to maintain. If I have one roof go out, it's about \$30,000. If I have one plumbing system go out, it may be \$10-20,000. So you can see if I have two or three problems that occur every year, which they do, I not only meet that \$180,000 which was \$140 (thousand) last year, and thanks to the old Council, we got it up to \$180 (thousand), and so I appreciate that, but it doesn't meet our needs overall. It's like Shelly said, we can maintain the critical needs that happen today, it's kind of a put out this fire today, put out this fire today, we've got a roof leak, we've got a plumbing problem. As far as maintaining, a lot of these structures were built in the '60s and '70s, and even '80s now that are in need of new roofs, new plumbing, new infrastructure, new design - - - cause a lot of 'em were built like the Station 14s and 15s with not the square footage or the wherewithal to handle the mechanisms that we do today. We didn't do emergency medical services and ambulance transport until 1984. And so a lot of these stations were built before that. And so we've just had to try to squeeze them in the stations. Some of these stations need to be renovated to the point where they can facilitate some of the needs. The other things is women are a big part of the fire service today.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Who?

Chief Crawford: Women.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Oh.

Chief Crawford: And we do not have in most of our fire stations, because of when they were built, we don't have separate male and female accommodations. And so they have to use the same facilities. We put the locks on the doors, put occupancy signs in the bathrooms. But one of the things we're going to do with some of this money is go in there and create these separate facilities in the stations that we can go into. They're much needed, and there's a privacy issue there as well.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Let me ask - - - did you happen to notice how much SPAR put in for building renovations for the city in the budget?

Chief Crawford: I'm not sure.

Councilman O. Jenkins: I think \$17,000,000. They got zero funded for it. So my question is how were you particularly successful to get the \$2,000,000 that you did?

Chief Crawford: Like I said, I didn't really check SPAR's for a number of reasons. But I'm not sure. One of the things, I talked about our master plan. This has always been our master plan. In the 2001 bond, I believe we were allocated some half million to \$800,000 in that bond for station renovation. We also had a little money that was left over from the '96 Bond that CAO Tom Dark afforded us as well. And so that was another \$2 or 300,000. So every year, we were clocking along doing because SPAR didn't have it in their operating budget, the fire department in cooperation with SPAR took on a lot of doing of projects that were at the fire stations because ultimately SPAR is responsible for all the buildings in the city, but because they didn't have funding, we worked hand in hand with them, and take some of that off of them. And so I think it was a cooperative effort. I can't explain to you how we were able to get it and they weren't. We proposed it. I'm not sure what they proposed.

Councilman Shyne: I think maybe the CAO Dale Sibley was for one, and he wasn't for the other. So that might have been how that - - - Shelly, that might have been how - - - that might have been what happened. See how it is when you go out and play golf with people.

Councilman Webb: I just wanted to ask you on the front cover running here in second place?

Chief Crawford: Let me see - - - Councilman, you know what? I believe that is me running. That is when Chief Cochran was here.

Councilman Webb: That's him in front of you?

Chief Crawford: That's him, and I was still a training officer at that point, cause Chief Hollins who is retired now, and Chief Gates who is on the far right are all retired now. Yes sir it is.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Any questions? Let me just ask this. Lets say you were not - - - not a, in your current professional role, and you were just a citizen of Shreveport, would you asses our priorities to be appropriate in terms of the funding for the Fire Department relative to streets and drainage, and/or water and sewer?

Chief Crawford: You know I think if you look at it historically Councilman, if you look at the last bond election which was (inaudible) \$60,000,000? \$70,000,000? I think the fire department was allocated \$12,000,000. I think we started out at \$12 (million) and ended up at \$8 (million), and so if you look at proportional, the number here, we're a lot less percentage wise than we got in that bond issue. I think that - - - like I said, I'm a team player, and so if there is a need that's greater than what I have, by all means I'll acquiesce and allow that money to go into that category. But I

think as the Fire Chief, it's my responsibility to bring to the attention of the administration and the council my needs, and then obviously and ultimately, it's up to you to make that decision on whether those needs take priority, and public safety and some of the things that you're looking at in water and sewerage. And I appreciate that, and that's where I am. But I will say this, each fire station does have water and sewerage in it. And so you will be helping in that aspect.

Councilman Jenkins: Anybody else have any questions? Thank you very much appreciate it Chief.

Mr. Seaton: Mr. Chairman, within Proposition 2, Fire, Police and SPAR we have one project listed for Finance on an Accounting System. Originally the number for that was \$3.5 Million. As we went through the process one of the things we looked at, on all projects but on this one specifically is what is the general fund impact. While a new system would be a wonderful thing to have the general fund impact on the maintenance contract for that is about a half million dollars a year. Right now we are about a hundred and something maintenance contract. If we do an upgrade to our existing system at \$1 Million the annual maintenance contract comes up to about two hundred thousand, so we can still get most of the bells and whistles that we need. We are still using the basic framework structure that is currently existing but we are putting a, it's call a (inaudible) interface – a prettier face on the top that would allow (inaudible) functions and allow more transparency with citizens. Any questions on –

Councilman Everson: So the million dollars will be able to make – I mean I have seen y'all's accounting system, I mean it looks like its from the 60's.

Mr. Seaton: 1982.

Councilman Everson: It looks like somebody came up with it in a science fiction movie in the 1950's or something but –

Mayor Glover: Councilman, it is now ours.

Councilman Everson: What's that?

Mayor Glover: As of last Tuesday it is not ours.

Councilman Everson: Yes indeed, yes indeed. I don't feel so bad criticizing it but it's laughable for sure. But this would be enough to upgrade it – you are just talking about a new interface, the workings of the system are good enough are good enough is what you are saying and so we are looking at a new interface something that would make the functionality better.

Mr. Seaton: The function of our system as far as an accounting point of view, there is absolutely nothing wrong with it. It keeps track of every single penny the City has and every single penny – makes sure there is no question about that. What we are looking to do is to try to increase the reporting functions so that we could pull up one list of things rather than having to go to several different screens and several different places to get that. It would also allow us the ability to have greater transparency for citizens. We will be able to post things and look at – for citizens, to look at

and pull up and hey, what is this department doing or where are we on sales tax right now. That would be the idea.

Councilman Everson: Perfect.

Mr. Madden: What the accounting system – the accounting system itself is used mainly by the Finance Department, by Accounting, we are use to it, you know. The biggest part that the rest of the City employees use is the purchasing system and this upgrade does bring the purchasing system into the Twentieth Century, at least. It is a drop down menu driven program like people are use to. It makes it a whole lot easier to use so, the other employees in the City, it gives them a whole lot better usage and like I said, us in Accounting we are use to it.

Councilman Everson: Great, but what I suppose my line of question is, is this enough to – I mean are we going to re-spend in a few years or is this something that will last for a while.

Mr. Madden: This will last us – the last major upgrade we did besides the Y-2K thing was in '97 and it has gotten us from '97 to now and this will get us to 2020 probably.

Councilman Corbin: What company system is it?

Mr. Madden: It started out Pete Marwick, KPMG. It has gone through several companies and just recently it has been bought again by somebody – it was Cogsdale out of Canada, was the last company and the present owners are also a Canadian Company.

Councilman Corbin: Well I ask because I was here in 1982 when –

Mr. Madden: When the original was put in, right.

Councilman Corbin: But my question would be and I haven't been in the accounting system business for a while, do we have any idea from the current owner of the company how are they going to continue to maintain and support this. Are they going to support it for another ten years?

Mr. Madden: They are. They have no intention of getting out of the business.

Councilman Corbin: Because I have seen that happen with a number of companies where they reach the drop dead –

Mr. Madden: We just met with them about a month ago, they are not going anywhere, at least not planning on it.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Anything else? Thank you very much.

Mr. Seaton: I'm looking at the third proposition now which is streets and drainage. In the Citizen Bond Study Committee Report it is \$2.3 Million for sidewalk repair program, \$7 Million in neighborhood streets program, \$4 Million in traffic signal system, and then after that you will see

the number of specific – Ravendale and Old Morningsport Road \$850,000; Murphy Street viaduct \$2.2 Million and Knight Street, \$3.5 Million. If you will look on the list, the hard copy in front of you will see a number of items that are listed that could be included specifically but right now the subtotal for Streets Project is \$19,850,000. Any questions on streets.

Councilman Webb: Explain to me the \$3.5 Million on Knight Street that I know that Ken wants so badly.

Mr. Norwood: And since you mentioned Ken, he's sitting right here, Ken Krefft. Ken was the Chairman of the Streets and Drainage sub-committee who did all of the work on the bond issue. The \$3.5 Million for Knight is right near Wal-Mart, it improves Knight Street from Shreveport-Barksdale, Preston, widens it and reconstructs the entire street.

Councilman Webb: Widens it how wide?

Mr. Norwood: It would be three lanes continuous where it is two lanes and then it widens out at each end but it will be three lanes continuous roadway.

Councilman Webb: Going all the way to where?

Mr. Norwood: From Shreveport-Barksdale to Preston.

Councilman Webb: To Preston. Okay, thank you.

Councilman O. Jenkins: I'm curious to know the traffic signal system went from \$25 Million to \$4 Million. That's seems like such a large reduction. Are we getting anything at that –

Mr. Norwood: It could have been a lot larger reduction. The ITS System that is needed to cover the whole city between fifty and sixty million. This covers the whole city, new computer system, new arm strollers,

Mayor Glover: Make sure everybody understands what the ITS system is.

Mr. Norwood: Intelligent Transportation System.

Mayor Glover: And exactly what that does and what it means.

Mr. Norwood: This has a set up with cameras and computers and it automatically reads the traffic demand approaching an intersection and times the signals accordingly. It provides for a better flow of traffic.

Mayor Glover: We currently have some of those in place right now. There are people who actually think that we have red light cameras. What they actually see on the stanchions are not red light cameras those are in fact a partial portion of the ITS system that we currently have in place.

Mr. Norwood: We have some in place – it cost about two hundred thousand to do an intersection, so that's why the numbers are so daunting. And if we took this four million, we would look at no state highways, these would be all city streets, for instant, Jewella, Kings Highway, those types of corridors, that we would go as far as we could until we expend the funds. So to do the whole city again, is a much larger number.

Councilman O. Jenkins: But I mean essentially based on that figure, correct me (inaudible) does that mean we get twenty traffic signals based on your figure right there?

Mr. Norwood: Twenty intersections.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Twenty intersections.

Mr. Norwood: Yes sir.

Councilman O. Jenkins: I need to see how many are in my district then.

Mr. Norwood: We wouldn't be buying a new computer to set somewhere, it would all be done at the intersections. These are intelligent intersections. We would have control of them from traffic engineering but they would all operate on their own.

Sharon Pilkinton: Question, wasn't it also that our computer system is out with –

Mr. Norwood: Yes, it got struck by lightning.

Sharon Pilkinton: So we do not have a computer system at all with

Mr. Norwood: (Inaudible) . . . basically 1950's technology.

Sharon Pilkinton: And that would be under that money also?

Mr. Norwood: Yes.

Ms. Pilkinton: Correct, okay, so it's not just - - -

Councilman Webb: When you are going down Bert Kouns, either direction, say the Auto Mall and a car is approaching the side streets where there's red lights like at the Highland Hospital and they automatically change red when a car approaches and it doesn't stay green for enough time, maybe enough time for one or two cars to get and it turns red but when you are coming down Youree Drive going north from 70th Street where the Kroger light is, every signal time that thing, I don't care what time of the day it is, as soon as you cross 70th that light will turn red on you and it's green and there ain't nothing coming either direction. Why do y'all have a program like that?

Mr. Norwood: That is state maintained. We would certainly not want something like that when we do our system.

Councilman Webb: Go out there any night and check it out.

Mr. Norwood: I understand, I know where you are talking about.

Councilwoman McCulloch: You said the intersection of Bert Kouns and Youree?

Councilman Webb: No, 70th, right where Kroger is.

Councilwoman McCulloch: Oh, okay.

Councilman Webb: Every time you're going north, I guarantee you, that light is going to turn red and ain't nothing coming nowhere, and it's going to turn red on you, and I thought this is crazy.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Back to that traffic signal, I mean that is \$4,000,000 and obviously you've governed this whole program, Do you think that - - - I mean we've got only \$7,000,000 going to streets, and we've got \$4,000,000 going to this ITS. Are you satisfied with that balance? Certainly on a user perspective, seems like a lot - - -

Mr. Norwood: When this was first looked at, the intention was to use that money to try to leverage bigger federal dollars, and I believe that's still possible.

Councilman O. Jenkins: That is the ITS figure or the neighborhood street program?

Mr. Norwood: The ITS figure. Yes sir.

Mayor Glover: Now the reason for that being Ron is that we managed to be able to do that, the previous administration, previous council to the tune of about?

Mr. Norwood: I don't have the exact number Mayor. It was at least a couple of million. But that was the intent, and I would actually to answer your question, I would much rather - - - if I had the choice of either neighborhood streets or the ITS. I'd want to put the bulk of the money into neighborhood streets. And I know Councilman Shyne can attest to the fact that you can drive up and down Jewella, and we are going to be doing work on Hollywood.

Councilman Shyne: Good.

Mr. Norwood: Don't get me wrong, we are going to replace a lot of slab, but when you go down the street like Jewella, and you have big stretches of payment that's just falling apart- - -

Councilman Shyne: That's exactly right.

Mr. Norwood: You have to reconstruct the whole thing. And that's what that money was intended for.

Councilman O. Jenkins: And then just to follow up one last, what is the bare minimum that you can take an ITS and still be eligible for any of these federal grants and shift that balance back to streets?

Mr. Norwood: At this point, I would not say there is a minimum - - - if we ended up with a million dollars in ITS, of course your chance of leveraging the larger money goes away or lessens, if you're only putting up a million, well your chance is going to be less of getting a significant amount. But if you're willing to put up \$4 or, 5-6,000,000, your chance is improved.

Councilman Shyne: Question. Mr. Mayor, I was in a barber shop, and I'm not going to say which one, but I was at a barber shop about a week ago, and I got beat up on because we have a railroad crossing on Hollywood, and it is extremely bad. I wish we could send Dale across there and I would hope that we could kind of make that a priority. The other one was done extremely well that was in, I guess our district together -

Councilman Webb: On Jewella.

Councilman Shyne: On Jewella but that one on Hollywood, I mean it is really bad. So I wish we could make that a priority cause if not I might have to change barbers and you know how these barber shops are. You know they are kind of like wives and I don't mean no harm Rose, but they don't want you to change from one to the other one.

Mayor Glover: We are certainly - we share your concern Mr. Shyne and we are working to address it. I hope we have something to report soon.

Councilman Shyne: Did you hear what Ron told me? Ron told me I ought to start going to Bossier to get a hair cut.

Mayor Glover: I guess this might be your last race, Mr. Shyne.

Councilman Shyne: You should have heard what Art told me. Art told me to just leave it like that cause it slows the traffic down. I'm in a no win situation.

Mr. Norwood: At any event, that's the type of project I would like to see us do. We need to focus - I mean water is actually our number one priority. If a city doesn't have water they don't - you don't have a city. Sewer, we have the EPA, next priority should be our streets because if you can't get around your city doesn't grow and we are getting to that point on a lot of our heavily traveled (inaudible) and we need to focus.

Councilman O. Jenkins: And from my perspective we talk about economic development, we do the worst job of marketing ourselves just by the conditions of our streets when people show up in this town. I mean I see that everyday when I talk to people.

Councilwoman McCulloch: I have actually talked with Mr. Thompson in regards to possibly amending the bond issue to address a street in the area which I represent and I notice you do have it as I believe a capital outlay project already. It's Hersey D. Wilson Drive from Russel Road –

Mr. Norwood: Actually, we have it in the book as an unfunded overlay project, just an asphalt overlay which is not a reconstruction, we are just putting asphalt on top and that was about a \$36,000 project.

Councilwoman McCulloch: Right but the bond issue itself can actually be amended to include a complete makeover as far as concrete goes.

Mr. Norwood: Yes ma'am.

Councilwoman McCulloch: Okay.

Mr. Norwood: And as a matter of fact we did one section from Russell Road to North side and we are going to look at the other section which is two blocks on the west end.

Mr. Seaton: Let me rephrase that, we have quotes for one section and we have the quote for (inaudible)

Mr. Norwood: Right. These are all estimates.

Councilwoman McCulloch: Because what I was really considering was the fact that the middle school is there and our students – of course they don't have sidewalks on any of the streets but Hersey D. Wilson is more commonly used as far as City buses, your mailman, your school buses, and your students walking to and fro, from the middle school within the community and I'm sure there are not holes anymore, they actually have ditches in the street and so what I really wanted to look at is the relocation as well as eliminating overlay and getting something more concrete.

Mr. Norwood: Reconstruction which would include – which would get rid of the ditches, which would put in sidewalk, put in underground drainage systems, and put in a good street. I'll have that –

Councilwoman McCulloch: So that it would more accessible to the community.

Mr. Norwood: I will have that estimate in the morning.

Councilwoman McCulloch: Alright, thank you.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Do want to say anything about drainage specifically or –

Mr. Norwood: No.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Okay. Essentially, you are satisfied with the way it sits today –

Mr. Norwood: Actually, our drainage believe it or not is in a lot better shape than it was 15 years ago. We always have issues. There are parts of town that have issues, I mean you talk to anybody who lives in Tillwood Normandy Village over by Sears, drainage issues there. Keep in mind that in the past two years we had two rain events, one in 2008, one in 2009 that were more intense than any others that we've had and that brought a lot of this to everybody's mind about localized problems areas but sure we could use more drainage money but I think we can do a lot of good with what we have. But if you focus on anything, I think you need to focus on giving us more street money. I think that's where it's needed.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Anybody else have any questions. Thank you for your time.

Mr. Seaton: One of the things that – and Art would probably comment on this too, because I think he was in just about every one of those meetings – it appeared that the priorities of the citizens bond study committee were, do the things that you have to get done, do the things are revenue generators, and between those two things that's the majority of our projects. With that – if there are any other specific questions we can do that. If there are any council members that would like see any of these projects, we can take you individually. We can post it and hop on a bus and tour anything and everything, whatever you want to do –

Mayor Glover: Save that part for me, I will address that –

Mr. Seaton: Okay. Any questions?

Mr. Ken Krefft: I just want to invite anybody who wants to hear Chairwoman Liz Swaine and Rick present tomorrow night after we have a meal at the Broadmoor Neighborhood at 6:15 at the Broadmoor Presbyterian gym, fried chicken and mashed potatoes, green beans and then we are going to have some entertainment or skits, "Who's On First," and then we are going to have a presentation of all the budgets and the bond issue, if y'all want to join us. And the most important thing about this, we are in the year 2010, twenty to me represents five new pair of eyes plus five new pair of ears, that's twenty. Ten represents five new mouths to speak their minds and five new noses to sniff what's going on and if we can do anything we really might have boxed ourselves in when started a hundred twenty-five, a hundred fifty, a hundred sixty-five million, y'all know what the limits are and I'm hearing some tremendous needs, whether it's federal, ADA, EPA, DOJ and then we have a lot of need in – we actually had a motion in our committee to increase citywide streets to \$28 Million by Ronald Robinson and seconded it and we defeated it 11 to 4 but there was a sense of \$4 Million per district and right now we are only at one million if you divided the seven. So if there is anything y'all do, you mentioned the public atmosphere of the city, Joe mentioned Jewella and two more things you might do as a council, you might want to set up your Public Safety sub-committee of three, whoever those three might be, so this is an ongoing process and that might be Jeff and Rose and Joe for EMS and then you need to set up your Infrastructure sub-committee. I don't think y'all have done that yet but those are two of the crucial sub-committees you might want to set up in the early part of '11, however y'all want to do that.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Appreciate your comments. Thanks Ken.

Mr. Seaton: Mr. Chairman, we have also prepared a summary of your amendments, one, two, three, and four if that's something you wanted to do.

Councilman O. Jenkins: I think all of us can read them ourselves, so – I hope we can.

Mr. Thompson: I might mention one thing. If you have amendments that you are going to propose, if you get them to us we will work with the administration to get them done and we would – unless we have instructions otherwise, send it to everybody so everybody will know what's going on because when you get to the meeting and you start trying to do all of this, it's going to be better is everybody knows where they are going pretty much, when you get there.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Good advice.

Councilman Shyne: Mr. Chairman, I would hope that I would need an amendment for Dale's project doing the Hollywood crossing.

Mr. Sibley: It's already in the books, Mr. Shyne.

Councilman Shyne: Thank you Dale.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Mr. Mayor, do you have any closing comments you would like to –

Mayor Glover: Yes I do, Mr. Chairman. Obviously, as you all can tell by today's presentation we have quite a bit of bread but very few pats of butter and so it's a heck of a challenge but it is what you all have asked the opportunity to be apart of. Obviously, it's something I have asked to have the opportunity to continue to be apart of and so if I work to get better. One of the things that I would ask that, Mr. Chairman and members of the Council is that you all would check your schedules to see if we can't help facilitate and that is I would like to be able to do as Rick just referenced, I think that this effort would be well served if you all would have the opportunity to be able to join me on a bus that will give chance to be able to go out and look at up close and personal some of these issues and problems that we are talking about specifically when it comes to some of the public buildings issues and challenges if you haven't actually seen these fire stations that we are talking about. I think you all would be greatly benefited by being able to do so, that was one of the thing I gleaned from the committee when they had a chance to see the evidence room, the fire station, some of the issues with our sewer system, some of the issues with our streets because some of you all have referenced some streets and some others I would like to be able to show you as well, because the one thing I think that would doom this effort without question would be if we were to submit a bond proposal to our citizens of this size, level, and scale and have \$7 Million in new street dollars available or some number that ends up being as low as what's currently there. The two things that I think we need to come away from this bond issue having been able to address significantly and that's one our issues involving the EPA and the DOJ and the second thing as you mentioned Mr. Chairman had to do with the fact that we send a statement everyday to our citizens and our visitors when they drive the streets of this city and we need to make sure that this bond issue puts us in a position to have significantly address those issues and challenges as well. At the same time we got public buildings, ADA that still needs to be wrapped up and a part of it and I

think having a true and detail understanding of exactly where we are will be well served by taking a couple of hours and giving us a chance to be able to take a lot of what's here on paper and actually bringing it to life for you all and so we will make ourselves available. My schedule is clear or will be cleared or whatever we need to do and I don't have a problem with it being something that we obviously would have to notice which would allow us to be able to bring Adam and the other members of (inaudible) along with us as well because these are all issues that we have nothing to hide. All of this is a part of just what needs to be discussed, seen and inspected as we move forward so we would be able put you all and all of us in a position – because I have to sign off on whatever you all end up passing and so if you would have your respective members check your schedules. If there is something as early as Wednesday or Thursday or even Friday or if we have to we will make it the weekend but we will get Gene Eddy to get one of his buses and drivers available for us and would like to go out take about two hours, maybe no more than two and a half hours of time to be able to give us the chance to be able to bring this thing (inaudible)

Councilman O. Jenkins: We will certainly get together and look at or respective schedules and get back with you or Rick.

Mayor Glover: That works

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, we need at 24 hours lead time to post the notice for a special meeting and we will have to call it a special meeting.

Councilman O. Jenkins: We will make sure you are in the loop. Are there any other questions, comments? If there are no foreclosing I do appreciate everybody that came down. We definitely, at least I got a lot out of it today in terms education and puts me in a much better place to make eventual decisions on this and so I gravely appreciate everybody times and patience of the rest of the council as we move through this today. So with that, council meeting is adjourned.

Adjournment: There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting adjourned at approximately 4:46 p.m.

//s// Oliver Jenkins, Chairman

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