CC 3827
12 27 13

Council Proceedings of the City of Shreveport, Louisiana
December 20, 2013

The regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana was called to order by Chairman Joe Shyne at 2:04 p.m., Friday, December 20, 2013, in the Government Chambers in Government Plaza (505 Travis Street).

Invocation was given by Pastor Mary Richards.
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 (arrived at 2:10 p.m.), Ron Webb, Joe Shyne, and Sam Jenkins. (arrived at 2:07 p.m.) 7. Absent: None.

Motion by Councilman Webb, seconded by Councilman Everson to approve the minutes of the Administrative Conference, Monday, December 9, 2013 and Council Meeting, Tuesday, December 10, 2013. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, Corbin, Webb, and Shyne. 5. Nays: None. Out of the Chamber: Councilmen O. Jenkins and S. Jenkins. 2. Absent: 0. Abstentions. 0.

Awards, Recognition of Distinguished Guests, Communications of the Mayor relative to city business, and Required Reports
Awards and recognition of distinguished guests by City Council members, not to exceed fifteen minutes.

Councilman Shyne: Mr. Mayor?
Mayor Glover: Mr. Chairman.
Councilman Shyne: Awards, recognitions and distinguished guests?
Mayor Glover: Can we get some clarification before we proceed. I heard you reference as we were convening that this is both the Work Session and the Regular Meeting?
Councilman Shyne: That's correct. Mr. Thompson, would you - - -?
Mr. Thompson: It will just be one meeting. The only difference will be, we will hear appeals at this meeting and also votes on all agenda items can be made at this meeting.
Mayor Glover: Okay, alright. So then do you want you or Dale to handle the agenda?
Mr. Thompson: We'll treat it like a regular Council Meeting.
Mayor Glover: Treat it like a regular meeting, okay. Let me first of all start by expressing welcome to all of those who are here in person as well as those who are watching us via the cable or the city's website. And I guess maybe those of whom may be watching us today on cable. I'm not quite sure if this meeting is being aired as well as part of our contract agreement. But certainly appreciate all of you all taking time to engage and participate in your local city process. Also, a week ago this time, I was traveling back from New Orleans, after having spent yesterday, previous day, Thursday, a week ago in New Orleans for us a historic event in at least two senses, and was hopefully going to be an opportunity to see us accomplish something that hadn't been done in over 40 years. Unfortunately, we - - - the city did make history in terms of sending the very first public

school team from Caddo Parish and Shreveport area to a state championship in the Dome. First time since 1973 when Mr. Ronald Robinson was a high school senior at Green Oaks High School, and the Captain Shreve Gators won that state championship led by Carols Pennywell and a host of others. No other public schools from Shreveport or Bossier for that matter had made the state championship. Though they had outstanding seasons, made it along with Calvary Baptist, a school that has its history rolled back Mr. Jenkins to 1970, but they made their first state championship game in the dome as well, and they won. Outstanding victory, 62-7 I believe was the final score to represent their first state championship victory ever. And the Byrd Yellow Jackets played that night Mr. Chairman and members of the Council and played an outstanding game. In fact, a good portion of their defensive efforts led by at least two young men at least familiar to some, young Paul Pratt, his son outstanding senior safety on his way to a Division I school Mr. Webb. But there is also a young man who I learned while at the game, No. 2 made an interception, ran it back for a touchdown, Kirkland McCulloch, who happens to be the nephew of our very own Councilwoman Rose McCulloch. Unfortunately, they had a bad call on a touchdown, left a couple of extra points on the field, had a fumble on the (inaudible) 3 yard line, and came up costly 1 point short, but still a great game, a great memories, and a great opportunity for a lot of Shreveporters to make their way down south and celebrate the victory of Calvary, the great effort of Byrd and that following Saturday, the folks across the river, Parkway, my wife's Alma Mater put on an offensive display I think unmatched maybe in the history of Louisiana football, if not American high school football, where I think they scored well over 130 some odd points with 77 for Acadiana and 41 scored by Parkway. Unfortunately Parkway Panthers and their great quarterback Brandon Harris, came up a little bit short, but again an outstanding effort on three Shreveport/Bossier schools. Two other schools in the region, Many and Haynesville went to the Dome as well. Haynesville picked up their 16th State Championship, Many played a very competitive game, but just a lot of excitement and we look forward to having an opportunity to be able to celebrate the accomplishments of all these young men at some point a little bit later. In fact we are already in communication with the folks with our local Mardi Gras Krewes about some way that we may be able to incorporate some portion of that celebration to honor and recognize them as well. We hope that we might be able to do the same for a history making event that's going to be taking place tomorrow out at the Independence Stadium for the first time to my recognition, the Louisiana High School Athletic Association is going to play its High School All-Star Game immediately following the High School Football Season. So that game is going to be tomorrow at Independence Stadium at 1:00. We, right now as we speak, have a host of high school all-stars here in the City of Shreveport who are prepping for tomorrow's game. They're broken down into an East and a West squad and many of those young men will be playing on Saturdays come next year. But this will be a great opportunity for us to be able to come out and have a chance to see some outstanding high school athletes from around the State of Louisiana display their talents here in Shreveport, and we hope the folks who are looking for something fun and inexpensive to do on tomorrow, and who enjoy sports will come out and have a chance to be able to participate in that as well. Also Mr. Chairman and members of the Council, want to share with you all news about an effort that's going to start off the middle of next month. The Healthy Communities kickoff dinner has extended an invitation to the Council and all concerned citizens and future citizens on January 4th. This is the date set for the Healthy Communities kickoff dinner to be held in the Tiger Room at the Feist-Weiller Cancer Center. This event is being conducted by the Louisiana Healthy Communities Coalition and a wide range of health related issues will be covered during this two hour session that runs from 5:30 to 7:30 p.m. We also like you to know that folks understand the State of Louisiana ranks near the bottom in almost every category when it comes to our overall physical health to applaud the efforts

being made by this coalition to raise awareness and place a renewed focus on making Shreveport a healthier city in 2014. For more information Mr. Chairman and members of the Council, and all those who are listening who may be interested, you can call (318) 813-1461 and also look out for posters that will be advertising the event in various venues around our fair city. With that Mr. Chairman, we will wish all here a Merry Christmas and a Happy Holidays and a prosperous New Year, since it appears as if this is the last time that we will convene before we find ourselves in the midst of 2014. Want to also thank Angelita Jackson and all the Department Heads, and all the folks who assisted here in organizing last night's annual City of Shreveport Employee Appreciation and Awards Banquet. We had a room full of folks Mr. Chairman and members of the Council over at Riverview Hall, made up of our great City of Shreveport employees and their families and loved ones. And we celebrate folks who have service Mr. Webb, from 40 years to 20 years. We had one with 40 years of experience that we were able to honor last night, a little over half dozen with 35 years of experience, a good number of folks who are at their 30th year, and a good spread of folks with 20 years of service for the City of Shreveport. The one thing I told them Mr. Chairman and members of the Council that I'm absolutely convinced of is that they don't do it for the money.

Councilman Webb: That's pretty obvious.

Mayor Glover: That's more than obvious. They obviously have a great deal of care and concern about the City of Shreveport and its citizens, because without question they do an outstanding job. We're not always perfect, but we're always trying. And we told 'em last night that we certainly appreciate their efforts and believe our citizens do as well. So with that Mr. Chairman, we turn it back over to you and members of the Council

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

Councilman Shyne: Okay Mr. Mayor, we want to thank you very much. And awards and recognition of distinguished guests by City Council Members, and Jeff, I believe we'll go to you first, and then we'll go from there.

Councilman Everson: Thank you so much Chairman. I wanted to start by recognizing the members of the Shreveport Historic Preservation Committee that are here today. I invite them to come up and give us a brief update on the progress that they've been making as a committee and hear a little bit about the work that they're doing.

Mr. Lane Calloway: (Chairman, Shreveport Historic Preservation Commission) Thank you Mr. Chairman and Mr. Vice-Chairman. What I want to do is give you an appreciation for the 2014 priorities, and also want to show you some of the things we've done very briefly. Also with me is the Vice-Chair, (Inaudible) Johnson, Shreveport also, obviously, and a good friend, Mr. Billy Wayne. We have eight priorities for 2014. Each Commissioner has at least one. And some have others. The top priority is the certified local government (inaudible). In talking with the Louisiana coordinator for the certified local government in Baton Rouge, a friend of mine, he is thrilled Shreveport is going for this and will help us get to obtain it. And what I'll do Mr. Chairman, is to send this to Mrs. Johnson and send it out to all of you. But we do have priorities towards implementing the goals that you passed.

Councilman Everson: For those of you who may not be familiar with the certified local government that is a status that is provided from the State Historic Preservation Office that certified that a community's local policies are in line with federal policies as well. And it gives you a certain privilege and ability to move forward with historic efforts. So it's something that was noted in the Master Plan as a goal for our community and it's great to hear the progress they've

made towards that end.

Mr. Calloway: And also the rest of the priorities are implementing wellness and I believe Dave (inaudible) is already starting on them, that by the next time we give you any report would be 1 October, a lot of these will be done, will be up and running. Before we move to the map, are there any questions on these things. And again, I will get you a copy of this. I wanted to share with you, this is - - - my fellow historian and friend, Mr. Gary Joyner is working with the commission to map the actual boundaries of historic districts within the City of Shreveport. There seems to be as you go around talking to folks in the neighborhoods, even downtown, there seems to be a misconception that oh, and I'll use Highland as an example. Highland is our only historic district. No, it isn't. These are five of the seven districts showing Downtown, St. Paul's Bottoms, Highland and to Fairfield, South Highland. And to give you a little bit better view, zoom in on Highland and Fairfield, you can see the neighborhood boundary for Highland, that this is actually the historic district. And this will help us get our arms around the historic district, but also will help us to do what the (inaudible) has directed us to do as a survey of historic buildings in Shreveport. So this is the beginning of that. I just wanted to give you an appreciation. You have questions?

Councilman Everson: Could you also - - - I think something that might be important to some of the other council members is even if one of the historic districts may not be in your particular district, there are also properties that are (inaudible).

Mr. Calloway: Now we have a list, I will provide the Council would be not on these maps, but a list by your districts, the council districts of the historic districts and those properties that are listed in the National Register of Historic Places. I think you will see that actually Shreveport has a lot of historic structures.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Can you show - - - can you expand or show me the highlight of the South Highland's one? Obviously there is a little resolution issue. Can you blow that up and - - -

Mr. Calloway: One of the set of maps would be each one focused in.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Gotcha. Okay.

Mr. Calloway: And you see Highland especially, South Highland is so interesting because it's more historic buildings that's outside the historic district.

Councilman O. Jenkins: And that's kind of how I was trying to think how you delineate between what is clearly 1950, '60s age architecture and stuff that was built in the '20s and teens kind of era. So this answers my question.

Mr. Calloway: And that will, and I think you'd find on the survey what we're doing will show that. And also there's I don't want to give you the impression that especially for S. Highlands here, that it's easy to expand, because a lot of houses may go outside the district (inaudible) in, and that's true, but if you expand too much, you may get noncontributing elements. Modern architecture that actually will dilute the historic district. So things in every district of the districts for historic districts have been expanded in the past. So it is doable, but we have to be careful (inaudible).

Councilman O. Jenkins: And then I had just kind of one question on the Commission itself. Is anybody on the commission a non-City of Shreveport resident?

Mr. Calloway: No sir. Every person lives in Shreveport.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Okay. Because there is somebody that has some expertise in this field that is somewhat interested in getting involved. And I said well, this would be something great, and then I said that they don't live in Shreveport, they live across the river, etc., etc., and I said, but I think there may be certainly some opportunity to have some subject matter expertise and

interest, we'd surely welcome them.

Mr. Calloway: Indeed. We have provisions in our bylaws a technical advisory committee and that is where those who live outside of Shreveport would be more than welcomed to help us.

Councilman O. Jenkins: And she has a I think a Masters in Historic Preservation. So that's why I said, I'll probably get something from either one of y'all and shoot you an email with her name at some point.

Mr. Billy Wayne: May I ask who is this person?

Councilman O. Jenkins: Um, you may ask, but I'd rather send it to you in an email, rather than - - - okay?

Mr. Billy Wayne: Excellent. Also we're really concerned about our - - - May I Lane?

Mr. Calloway: Please.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Come to the mic if you would so that it's on the record.

Mr. Billy Wayne: We want to make sure that we have complete community involvement in addition to our bylaws and in addition to our (inaudible) historic areas, our residential areas. We want to make sure that the community involvement part is prevalent in our activities and our work. Because we want to make sure that community persons understand that they do have a voice in our commission and what we are doing. And the more we can educate our community, the better results we're going to have.

Councilman Everson: That's a great point that you make Billy, and I think that it's important that what's considered a historic district now is where we start. So in the future, there's history being made every day. So we want to make sure that we have that input and understanding throughout the community so that as things are potentially added or (inaudible) to your preservation aspect of our city, we have a good network of understanding of how to work through the community.

Mr. Calloway: And perhaps we can impress (inaudible) Shreveport the potential here to move over.

Councilman O. Jenkins: There's a lot of attractions over here on this side, that's for sure.

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

Councilman Shyne: Alright, Mr. Mayor, we're back with you now.

Mayor Glover: Thank you Mr. Shyne, Council Members, want to express thanks and appreciation to Bryant Francis and his staff out at Shreveport Regional Airport for putting together a very excellent presentation on yesterday. Councilman Corbin had the opportunity to attend a significant portion of it, but it was an opportunity to be able to report back on the findings and recommendations that were issued by the Northwest Louisiana Air Service Task Force that its report three years ago about this time in 2010. That group was impaneled in an effort to try and give us some recommendations on how to go about addressing some of the issues and challenges that we face here at the Shreveport Regional Airport, but also challenges that as we have unfortunately come to understand that we share with a lot of medium sized communities that are feeling similar squeeze and challenge. Some information that was shared with very pleasing that are in some respects in that it did in fact detail some of the operational efficiencies that we have achieved in the three years since that time. Some of the money that has been saved, some of the additional revenues that have come in, in the interest of time, knowing that we have a very full agenda today, and that this is a combination of both a Work Session as well as a Regular Meeting, we're going to ask that we make available a block of time for our first meeting in January for what

we hope to have as a more detailed sharing of that information with the Council, so that you all can be aware of exactly what has been shared with both the members of the Airport Authority as well as the public. And to keep us in a posture where we can continue the good news to going forward. I'll say this at this point, that the large focus of a considerate portion of the take away aspect of yesterday's gathering, focused on the efforts of the Regional Air Service Alliance, that was one of the recommendations that came out of the task force. I'm pleased to say that Tim Wilhite has taken on the chairmanship of that effort and has put in yeoman's work in helping to elevate and advance it as you all are aware. In one of the early successes of that effort in conjunction with staff and the authority with securing of the daily service to Denver, which is (inaudible) reasonable successful at this point, and also is creating the case for why it is that we should be able to also look for some additional service expansions in the months and years to come. But that's also going to be largely contingent on our ability to be able to work to figure out some ways to deliver some resources to that effort. I'm very happy to add that the folks from Bossier have already bought in, the Bossier Parish Police Jury have been financial in the efforts of the Regional Air Service Alliance, and the vision that has been essentially offered, accepted (inaudible) in advance is that Shreveport Regional Airport needs to be the airport not just for Shreveport, but for those that live and do business within essentially an hour, hour and a half, two hour radius of the City of Shreveport. And that we need to consider all of those folks, stakeholders in this effort. And enlist them in an effort to help us come up with the efforts that are necessary in order to be able to grow and expand service at the airport. So we look to have that for you all at the next meeting, and be able to answer any questions that you all may have and again, provide an opportunity for our citizens to be further array of what a lot of the options and challenges are as well. This is also Mr. Chairman the last meeting before we will host on the 31st of December, Boston College from the Atlantic Costal Conference, and the Arizona Sun Devils I believe. I get 'em confused. There's Arizona State and the University of Arizona, but I believe it's the Sun Devils here on the 31st of December for the - - - I still call the Independence Bowl, but it's the Advocare V100 Bowl, but it promises to have a history making matchup and that this represents the first time that we've ever had individuals play in this game who are top 10 finishers for the Heisman Trophy. We have one from each school. One finished I believe, No. 5 or 6, and the other was No. 10. So we hope that we have a great contingent of folks who are here from the Arizona area around the New Year as we hope for an equal representation of folks to come from the Northeast and for those of us who are local football fans, we look forward to being out there for being out there for what we hope and expect to be another great game. With that, we turn it back over to you Mr. Shyne.

Reports

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

Councilman Shyne: Thank you. Okay, we'll move into reports. Ms. Farnell. Anybody have any? Ms. Farnell, if they have none, we appreciate it and want to wish you a Merry Christmas. I'm not saying that you should leave now, just want to wish you a Merry Christmas.

Mayor Glover: Mr. Shyne, There is a Mr. Farnell who was one of our honorees last night at the great - - - (inaudible) honoring him for his 30 years of service to the City of Shreveport - - - 35 years, I'm sorry. 35 years of distinguished service.

Councilman Shyne: Mr. Mayor, he married a very young lady. Don't look like she's more than 35.

Mayor Glover: Well that's the good thing that the Statute of Limitations eventually runs out Mr. Shyne. I'm sure Chief Farnell may not want to tell that story.

Councilman Shyne: Alright, well Merry Christmas to you. Mr. Sibley?

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

Mr. Sibley: Yes sir, we'll have the full report on the January 14th.

Councilman Shyne: Thank you. Did you clear that with Mr. Thompson?

Mr. Sibley: Yes sir, I think he's okay with that.

Surety Bond Forfeitures Report *(Res 238 of 2010)*
Master Plan Committee Report *(Res. No. 132 of 2012)*

Public Hearing: None
Adding Items to the Agenda, Public Comments, Confirmations and Appointments.
Adding legislation to the agenda (regular meeting only) and public comments on motions to add items to the agenda.

Mr. Thompson: We have none Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Shyne: Okay.

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

Councilman Shyne: Public Comments. Ms. Betty Jackson. I'm sorry, let me stop this meeting right now and recognize Mr. Archie Hall and his friend, the Commissioner.

Councilwoman McCulloch: John Escude.

Councilman Shyne: Yeah. Mr. Hall, glad to have you down. I was going to give you an opportunity to introduce the Commissioner, if you wanted to. But since Rose beat you to it, I don't know what that means, John, it might be fundraiser coming up. Archie, tell John, Rose might have a fundraiser coming up.

Councilwoman McCulloch: I used to serve on the Commission.

Councilman Shyne: Okay, Betty?

Ms. Betty Jean Jackson: (4102 Evers Drive) Thank you Chairman Shyne and other members of the Council. I am appealing a decision by Property Standards Board through Ms. Dorothy Farnell. On December 10, she agreed to cancel charges that had been billed to me by Property Standards or Code Enforcement whichever one, of $389.60 for grass cutting on property that I own. The grass was cut less than six weeks after I had already had cut. That has been one of my contentions, but not only that. I didn't get a bill after the grass was cut in June until October of that year. But on December 10th, Ms. Farnell agreed to cancel those charges. A few days later, she changed her mind and decided she wasn't going to cancel the charges. I'm asking that those charges be cancelled.

Councilman Shyne: I would like to ask the mercy of this Council that we would waiver those charges and if I could get a second - - -

Councilwoman McCulloch: Second

Councilman Shyne: I would put that in the form of a motion.

Motion by Councilman <u>Shyne</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>McCulloch</u> to waive charges in the amount of $389.60, levied by Property Standards for grass cutting on properties located at 4130 and 4132 Booker T. Street.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Let me - - - are there some - - - I'd like to just discuss it.

Councilman Shyne: Yeah.

Councilman O. Jenkins: And I'm not suggesting you don't know the whole story, but I'm sure I don't know the whole story, and I guess the other part of it is from a legal perspective, can we even just raise our hands and say 'yeah', and then we're all good to go on this?

Mr. Sibley: Yes sir.

Councilman O. Jenkins: And I'm looking for some guidance from the Administration or Terri or whatever. And it's not that I'm not sympathetic to her cause, I just want to know procedurally where we are on this.

Mr. Sibley: Where we are Mr. Jenkins, I think procedurally, the issue is if an issue can't be resolved within the administrative apparatus then it generally comes to you guys at the Council. Here's the situation where the department feels that the documentation they have in their file is sufficient to maintaining their position, Ms. Jackson disagrees. And there's some disagreement as to what exactly happened. Basically she contends that the property didn't need to be cut at the time that it was cut, and obviously she's going after billing issues. Ms. Farnell and her guys looked at it. You know asked them to look at it again, but just feel like the information in their file makes it difficult for them to administratively waive the fees. And in those cases, those generally would come to you guys to make a decision to do something that we as an administration don't feel it's within our authority to do, based upon what's in the file. Often times there is disagreement between what's in the file and what the individual citizen says with the department. I insist that they maintain what's based on information in their file, recognizing that when you gentlemen and lady hear it, you may see it differently and direct that something differently be done. And so this is a situation where at our level, we are where we are and in that case, it generally comes to the Council to see if you want to look at it a little bit differently.

Councilman S. Jenkins: How much are the charges on it?

Mr. Sibley: I think $389.60.

Councilman O. Jenkins: And it's entirely weed abatement?

Mr. Sibley: Grass cutting.

Councilman Corbin: And we're at a complete stalemate? I mean there's no other - - - negotiation or - - -?

Mr. Sibley: No sir.

Councilman Corbin: Cause my concern is when we take up something like this we often open the door for ten other people that feel like they don't have to pay their bill. So I think we - - -

Mr. Sibley: And generally Mr. Corbin, it's a lot more clear cut, and generally we handle it on the administrative side. But in some cases when you get to the point where it's just two opposing positions, again, what I did with the department, I generally tell them you know if you feel that your file is sufficient, maintain that, even though there may be disagreement from the citizen and as I said, that you guys may want to look at it differently than we look at it.

Ms. Glass: Mr. Chairman, this is not on the agenda for a vote today I don't think.

Councilman Shyne: No, I mean I'm - - -

Ms. Glass: So it probably - - - I would just say two things on a legal standpoint on that. One would be technically to avoid any challenge, we really should have a vote to add the item to the agenda if you want to vote on it today. And then the other thing is I don't know what the time frame is, if she missed normally when there's an appeal, it needs to be within 10 days of decision being appealed, and of course, the Council does have the authority to waive that, but it should always be for a good cause and just as Mr. Corbin just said, if you don't - - - if you do it for some people and you don't do it for other people, it causes a problem. So, you know there should be some kind of a statement of why this is a unique situation.

Mayor Glover: Mr. Chairman, Council Members, that is pretty much encapsulates the circumstance that we're in. Because certainly, and I hope Ms. Jackson doesn't mind me saying this, this is a wonderful lady, who is one of the leading citizens of the City of Shreveport from my perspective, and is certainly someone who is extremely active and involved and concerned about the affairs in her community. And so I know that she would be here asking either Dale or Dorothy or anyone within the Administration to do something that she absolutely doesn't believe in. The problem with that is, is that as Dale just mentioned, (inaudible) you have a case that's been established by staff that is just as compelling and just as legitimate. And recognizing that the great challenge that we have for those of us who are entrusted with these privileges is to do them with fairness and impartiality. And to understand that we cannot begin to do for one, what we ultimate cannot be willing to do for all. And so that's why we find ourselves at a point where it's just through absolute honest, good faith we cannot do this, because it would put us in a situation of establishing a precedent that would open up a door that we would have to end up essentially with essentially every one of these coming before you guys under these types of circumstances. And so, we ask the staff to act in good faith that ends up being further challenged and appealed and processed by Dale, by me when necessary as well, and ultimately we end up standing on what it is that we believe represents the good, fair, balanced, consistent stance that are to go forward in terms of how we enforce these various policies and rules.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Mr. Chairman, could I ask a questions?

Councilman Shyne: Yes.

Councilman S. Jenkins: I'm just trying to get something straight in my mind. Her position is that the grass had already been cut. And Property Standards came back out, and cut it again?

Ms. Jackson: In less than six weeks.

Councilman S. Jenkins: In less than two weeks?

Ms. Jackson: In less than SIX weeks.

Mr. Sibley: She's saying that it basically hadn't regrown to the point where Property Standards needed to cut it. So it was an unnecessary cut is her position. And I will add just two items, just for the record. One is as Ms. Jackson said, she did come at the last meeting. There was a discussion where I think she maybe thought everything had been resolved, and it hadn't. And secondly, December 31st obviously is the ending of the tax year, and she was hoping to try and get it resolved before the tax year ended. So just for the record, those two factors in all fairness to her.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Can I ask one more question Mr. Chairman?

Councilman Shyne: Yes.

Councilman S. Jenkins: I'm just trying to get stuff straight in my mind. The $389.00 what makes up the $389.00? Is some of that administrative fees or what exactly - - -

Mr. Sibley: Let me get Dorothy to give you details. That's basically the cost of cutting that lot, plus probably a small administrative fee. But let's get Dorothy to detail that.

Ms. Farnell: Good afternoon. One of the lots was $42.50, the other one was $47.60. Each one of those had $150 administrative cost on it.

Councilman S. Jenkins: I don't know. According to what she's saying would have to be added to the agenda first of all in the proper fashion. But I would certainly would like to waiving some of this. Indeed if what happened was you know, the grass was cut and they came back out and cut it again. There's some dispute as to the necessity of it, I mean, I could support the idea of waiving some of these fees. I don't know about the complete amount.

Councilman Shyne: I would hope Mr. Jenkins, that you could support waiving all of the fees. I mean this is not necessarily about open up Pandora's Box. This is about maybe there was a mistake made where somebody went out and cut her grass at a time that it didn't necessarily need

to be cut. And to me this would not be opening a Pandora's Box. And you know I think this is one thing that we are obligated to do. Is to do what's morally right. And we all make mistakes. We all make 'em. None of us are necessarily perfect. We all make mistakes and if this is from a standpoint of asking for some mercy, not necessarily some mercy, but asking for the city to do the right thing. And this is not a monumental thing that we're about to do in order to help our citizens out. And like the Mayor said, Ms. Jackson has been a very productive citizen in this community. Ms. Jackson has conducted a lot of cleanup campaigns in her area that she should not get one dime for. I don't even know if she got a bottle of water for it. So, you know I think it would be a worthwhile action on our part if we could waive these fees, because we're looking at $350 of administrative fees for two lots that even need cutting at that particular time. So I would hope and I'm asking my fellow Council Members - - -

Councilman Webb: Mr. Chairman, I'll make a motion to add it to the agenda.

Councilwoman McCulloch: Second.

Councilman Shyne: Okay.

Mr. Thompson: If you're adding an item to the agenda, according to our state laws - - -

Councilman Shyne: I'm sorry, right. I'm sorry, I'm sorry. Is there anyone in here who would like to speak against the Council adding this particular item to the agenda? If not, it has been moved by Councilman Ron Webb, seconded by Councilwoman Rose McCulloch, that we would add this to the agenda.

Motion by Councilman Webb, seconded by Councilman McCulloch to add Property Standard Appeals WAB1201688 and WAB1201687 to the agenda. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 7. Nays: 0. Out of the Chamber: 0. Absent: 0. Abstentions: 0.

Councilman Shyne: This item has been added to the agenda.

Councilman Webb: Mr. Chairman, I make a motion to waive the fees.

1. **WAB1201688** 4130 Booker T. St, Shreveport, La (F/Shyne) Ms. Betty Jean Jackson, 4102 Evers Drive, Shreveport, LA 71109 (F/Shyne)

2. **WAB1201687** 4132 Booker T. St, Shreveport, LA (F/Shyne) Ms. Betty Jean Jackson, 4102 Evers Drive, Shreveport, LA 71109 (F/Shyne)

Motion by Councilman Webb, seconded by Councilman McCulloch to waive fees in the amount of $389.60 for grass cutting for property located at 4130 and 4132 Booker T. Street. to the agenda.

Councilman Corbin: Ms. Farnell, are these lots side by side, or are they two separate lots?

Ms. Farnell: The lots are - - - they are actually two separate lots that are pretty much, one is at 4132 and one is at 4130, so yes.

Councilman Corbin: They are adjacent.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Can I get clarification of the motion? Is that - - - you said waive the fees, are you talking about - - -?

Councilman Webb: Waive the entire fees.

Councilman Shyne: The entire fees, that's correct. Okay and I would ask the indulgence of my Councilmen

Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 5. Nays: Councilmen Corbin, and O. Jenkins. 2. Out of the Chamber: 0. Absent: 0. Abstentions: 0.

Councilman Shyne: The fees have been waived and Ms. Jackson, we appreciate you coming down and that's it Ms. Jackson.

Ms. Jackson: Thank you very much.

Councilman Shyne: Thank you. And I appreciate my fellow Council Members. And I know this is the Christmas season. Ms. Jackson, Merry Christmas, hear?

Mayor Glover: Merry Christmas Ms. Jackson.

Councilman O. Jenkins: I guess maybe (inaudible) is that Councilman Shyne won't be here next Christmas when there's a list of a lot of people waiting in line for fee waivers.

Councilwoman McCulloch: We'll be here.

Councilman Shyne: Yeah, we'll be here.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Next Christmas? (Inaudible) until the 27th. I thought it was like the 20th. Okay, excuse me, my mistake.

Councilman Shyne: Mr. Hall, when you and the Commissioner start talking about me, you can say well, one thing, he's got a good heart. Ole boy kinda seems to be like Santa Claus. Okay Ms. Judy Macanto. Did I pronounce that right?

Ms. Judy Macanto: (3833 Addison Ave) I am the President of the Homeowner Association for N. Highlands and I (inaudible) this organization of Council of Homeowners from all over the city. I'm nervous, I don't know why. You all look real friendly, but I just came to see what's going on and they said you're speaking.

Councilman Shyne: We just demonstrated that we got a big heart.

Ms. Macanto: That's right, you do, thank you. But we're newly organized and we got together a couple of times, and we have a new organization of about 20 of us just starting out. We've got the bylaw committee organized and we're going to set up our bylaws. I was elected as the Interim Chairperson until they find somebody better. But Betty Jackson is our Interim Secretary. And we have so much to benefit from you all supporting us, and sanctioning this organization. It is obvious, but you have a lot to gain by us as well. You cannot be everywhere. The Mayor cannot be everywhere. (Inaudible) to the (inaudible) Highland National Night Out, where you felt the bottom fell out and it rained dogs and cats. And we were so excited that he showed up. But he can't be everywhere. We are the eyes and ears throughout the City of Shreveport in every neighborhood. And we support you, and we would like you to support this resolution. I'm going to leave the time left to let them introduce themselves and say the part that they play in this organization. Thank you.

Ms. Betty Jackson: (4102 Evers) As Ms. Macanto said, I am the Interim Secretary for the Council of Neighborhoods. I believe you would serve (inaudible) for all communities. We would even get a chance to learn from each other, and that would be an awesome, awesome opportunity. As she also stated, you and neither can the Mayor be everywhere. So we'd be your eyes and ears as well. And we hope that we could get you to not only support us as a council of neighborhoods, but we could report to you some of the things that are going on, and you can better do it than those of us who live in the various communities. I thank you for being attentive.

Mr. Billy Wayne: (6144 Farrington Court) I'm the President of the Fairway Forest Neighborhood Association. Chairman Shyne, Honorable Mayor Glover and members of this distinguished council, for years as a teacher, I've taught my students the importance of being

involved in political and community affairs. The creation of this neighborhood council city-wide neighborhood council will do just that. Give students and members of the community an opportunity to be involved. This administration has made every attempt to be transparent in its dealings and we want to make sure that as community residents, we do the same. Everything is transparent involving its most important. We ask for your support.

Ms. Wanda Wright: (No address given) I'm the Vice-President of the Southern Hills Homeowners Association and I'm proud to be on the bylaws committee for the Shreveport Council on Neighborhoods.

Ms. Barbara Hartwell: (1105 Dalzell Street) I am the Treasurer of the Fairfield Historic District Association, and I'm looking forward to working with this group of people so that we can better our city as a whole, and also help each other in our own respective neighborhoods. Thank you very much.

Councilman Shyne: We want to thank you all for the awesome job that you are undertaking.

Councilwoman McCulloch: Councilman Shyne, if you would allow me to, I would like take this opportunity to thank Mayor Glover for assisting in helping us with the Council on Neighborhoods. I'm really grateful for your assistance, and I want to thank all of the volunteers. As a matter of fact, we have over 24 volunteers at this time. So I think this resolution today will make this official. So I'm going to ask that you support this resolution today to form this Council on Neighborhoods. Thank you again Mayor Glover.

Mayor Glover: Well thank you. Mr. Chairman?

Councilman Shyne: Yes.

Mayor Glover: And before you all go and please, I don't want to belabor - - - but I want to express my appreciation to Councilwoman McCulloch and Councilman Everson and the rest of the Council for working with us along with Dara Sanders and the staff of the MPC in helping to bring this effort forward. This is a wonderful gift that is being given to the citizens of the City of Shreveport. And it's ironic, that as we sit here in December, this was 25 years ago, December 1988 Mr. Shyne, members of the Council, that I was honored to become the President of what is now the Martin Luther King's Neighborhood Association. One of my fellow presidents of that organization is Mr. Ronald Robinson, who is a City of Shreveport employee, whose sitting out in that audience. But it is exactly the type of organization that needs to be able to affectively connect with other folks who are concerned about what's happening on their street, on their block, in their neighborhood because that's where the true quality of your life as a Shreveporter is detmined. Not necessarily by what happens downtown on the Riverfront, or the other side of town or what have you, but where you live. And Mr. Wayne, you're right. That's why we have focused on how it is that we go about helping people to take back their neighborhoods and make them better places. Which is why we have T-Bone and all these other various things out here, working with people where they live. Working with the Police Department, working with Property Standards, working with Parks and Recreation. So, God bless you all. We look forward to the Council on Neighborhoods moving up, getting bigger, getting stronger and being just that type of dynamic grassroots citizen driven force that helps to make Shreveport a better place. God bless you all and Merry Christmas to you.

Councilman Shyne: Mr. Mayor, it seems like it must have been a lot of stress on Ronald, he lost his hair, and you didn't lose yours.

Mayor Glover: He lost his hair two years later, while I was running for City Council.

Ms. Frances Kelly: (935 Linden Street) I'm here to speak against the repeal of the Shreveport Fairness Ordinance, I understand that it's to be introduced today. And I just wanted to

talk about why it's not necessary to reconsider this. (Inaudible) right after the ordinance passed a couple of weeks ago, the poll was released. It was done by the LSU Public Policy Research Lab. And it's conducted from November 6, 2013 to November 26, 2013. It is an anonymous poll, there are three questions in it that dealt with the attitudes of people in Louisiana towards rights and equality for LGBT people. And what is being passed around is an article from the Advocate that covered the poll results. What we found was that there is overwhelming support throughout Louisiana among Republicans, Democrats, Black, White, North Louisiana, South Louisiana for nondiscrimination protections in law. There are three questions, the first deals with (inaudible). The second question is should people be evicted or denied housing because they are Gay or transgender? 93.7% of respondents believed that they should not be denied housing because they are LGBT. The third question is should employers other than churches or religious organizations be able to fire employees because they are gay or transgender. 89.3% of respondents believe that people should not be fired because they are LGBT. So this demonstrates overwhelming support across Louisiana for (inaudible) already enacted. This poll included 1,280 respondents which is the statistically significant poll. The margin of error is plus or minus 2.7 percentage points. So, as you can see there's overwhelming support for us. This has already had a public hearing, where there were many people who talked about it, it's been in the newspaper, there have been letters to the editor before this was voted on. So, there's no real reason to bring this back up again since there is such overwhelming consensus across the state of Louisiana that what y'all did was the right thing. Thank you.

Dr. Bradley M. McPherson: (153 Wilkinson) Professor Emeritus of Biology, Centenary College. And for 32 years, I've taught science and genetics. From the science we know that there's no basis for repealing this issue. Whenever we throw the dice for the birth of an individual, it's chance. And because chance gives each and every one of us what we are, we should respect that and (inaudible) individuals. So I would recommend that each of you look in your hearts and say to yourself, 'I am what I am because of the roll of dice that made me'. That person is what he or she is because of the roll of dice. We should not discriminate cause of chance, and that's what we're doing if we repeal this issue. Thank you.

Councilman Shyne: I think your wonderful wife who did a super job last time is up next.

Dr. Pamela McPherson: (833 Thora Blvd) I'm his daughter.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Joe has a special way. (Inaudible).

Dr. McPherson: Thank you Council members, I'm Dr. Pamela McPherson, I live at 833 Thora Blvd in Shreveport. I'm a Child and Adolescence Psychiatrist, and I would like to speak against the repeal of the Fairness Ordinance as well. I work with children and adolescents in this area, and fairness, anti-bullying, are very important issues for our young people, and Shreveport making a statement like this makes a profound statement to all of our children and I applaud you for passing the ordinance. Thank you.

Ms. Deborah Allen: (4220 Reilly Lane) I'm here to speak against the repeal of the Fairness Ordinance that you passed a couple of weeks ago. I'm here representing the ACLU and myself. And I just feel that people should be judged for their performance and not their sexual orientation. As you (inaudible) people are productive members of society, who contribute to the economy just like everyone else. And it's only fair that they're able to enjoy a living just like everyone else. Overwhelming majority of Americans, like 75% agree that we all have the right to earn a living to support our families regardless of sexual orientation. And the recent study of LSU also conducted, this day shows evidence that residents of Louisiana feel the same way. A couple of years ago, you showed commitment to equality in ensuring equal rights to all members of this community, which is the spirit of the people of Shreveport. We ask that you not repeal this ordinance. Thank you.

Mr. Montgomery Mewers: (2911 Centenary Blvd) I'm here to ask and encourage you to vote to keep Shreveport fair. The Fairness Ordinance neither infringes on individual liberty nor the free exercise of religion. This is only a reasonable regulation of business activity. There are exceptions that are built in. Small businesses with fewer than eight employees, religious organizations and charitable organizations are all exempt. On this issue, individuals (inaudible) hemispheres, and entire denominations are differing. Coherently, there is not a consensus and there is not a single Christian view. Shreveport made news last weeks. And whether one likes or dislikes the reason, the results increase the likelihood that our city is seen as progressive and is seen as progressing, and is moving forward. That said, what we're talking about is not cutting edge, it's merely keeping up as other cities in the region have already enacted similar measures. Repealing the fairness ordinance on the other hand would send a message that our city is unwelcoming to the (inaudible) of diversity within human family and we would make news in a very unwelcomed way. I respectfully request and urge the council to vote no on the repeal and to keep Shreveport fair. Thank you.

Mr. Mark Medicus: (10455 Linwood) Really and truly it's a discussion of the war of two gods. It comes down to this. We're speaking about persons, we're speaking about emotions. Well, we're not speaking of who established all of this. And it comes down with that is discussed in Genesis 3:4-5 of who the gods were speaking to at this moment. And it's the god of emotion or whatever (inaudible) of that, and ye shall be as god deciding that which is good and evil. Well you're officers of God. That's your purpose, that's your place, and so we should review a little bit of what God says. We have to serve the God of all creations, we find Him in Genesis 1:1. We also find Him in John, verses 1-5. And we need to consider the power of who this God is, and look and review of this and our job here is to trust in the Lord with all of our hearts. We're not to lean on our own understandings. In all our ways, we're supposed to acknowledge Him, that He is to direct our paths. If He is going to direct our paths, we have to go to the source, and that's the Word of God. And the source of the Word of God is very clear, Old Testament and New Testament as spoken needs to be addressed and looked at. Now, with that in mind, I come to you as a father, as a husband, as a grandfather, and I look at this and I say you know there is a lot of change in the world that's going on at an extraordinary rate. And it's so emotional in this day. But I ask you to look at what the Word of God says. We've seen topics come up as late as yesterday and the day before with our precious people in West Monroe. And they don't want to talk about sin. But the sin exist as I'm not an employer, but I am over employment. I'm not opposed to hiring anybody as long as they can do the job. If I hire them and I find they cannot do the job, I will part companies with them and terminate them. I will do that in a good way and try to encourage them to do good things for another company, but their fashion does not fit with our fashion. And I'm not talking about this community that's being talked about now, what I am talking about is people in general. I don't want to have a rule in place that protects the status of someone else over someone else. I do not want to our company up to litigation because I hire a person and they can't do the job, and we terminate them because they can't do the job. And with that being said, I trust that you would look at the God of creation. Lean not on your own understanding, we acknowledge you God above and I appreciate your time.

Mr. David Hylan: (843 Gladstone Blvd) Mr. Mayor and members of the City Council, I come to you today in really a state of disbelief honestly and a little bit shocked. On December 10 th, I witnessed one of the proudest moments in our history as a city and through your vote, approving Ordinance 149, you proclaimed Shreveport, LA as a welcoming city and a fair minded city. And that failed for all of our citizens. I cannot imagine a more shameful and a more harmful thing than to repeal such an ordinance. To do so would be letting the world and the rest of the

country know or to think that we've made a mistake. It's okay to discriminate here. It's okay to treat people unfairly and inequitably. What a horrible corrosive and negative message for us to tell people. The rules by which this body operate allows for the introduction of an ordinance, the ordinance was made public through all normal channels and procedures, the same as for every other ordinance that was publicized in the newspaper. There were letters to the editor that were written, there were guest columns, the public was allowed to speak to the ordinance, and then it was voted on and passed. I might add, that Mr. Webb tried to put off the ordinance and you as a body said no. Everyone has had plenty of time to process this. There is no trickery, there was no smoke and mirrors, and now that it's passed and it's gone through all of the normal democratic process and procedures that was established by this body, Mr. Webb wants a do over. A do over. That's not fair, that's not how it works Mr. Webb. That is not the procedure that's adopted by this body. We don't do 'do overs' and that's not in the best interest of this city. I'm a preacher's kid. I can recite the bible as good as most. But you know what? That doesn't have a thing to do with any of this. This city is comprised of Christians, Buddhists, Muslims, Atheists, Hindus, Agnostics, Bali(s), Native Americans, Blacks, Whites, Asians, Jews, Gays, Straights, Bi-sexual and transgender(s) and the list goes on and on and on. And you know what, y'all represent every one of us. And the text of the Christian Bible doesn't play into your decision and people have come up here and they have symbolic struck their chests and made comments to you and that doesn't really have anything to do with public policy. I'm not asking you not to even consider putting this on your agenda. Thank you.

Ms. Adrienne Critcher: (817 Ontario Street) Mr. Mayor, City Council Members, the very fact that we're here 10 days after you passed the Shreveport Fairness Ordinance, just proves and it passed by a vote of 6-1. Only one descending vote. It just shows why we need this fairness ordinances. We're here just ten days later and already, the strength of some small but very vocal anti-gay forces are asking you to repeal what an overwhelming majority of this bipartisan council decided to support. What kind of a message does this send to businesses, to talented workers that we're trying to recruit. A vote for fairness immediately followed by a repeal of fairness? Believe me, the national media will notice and our city's efforts to recruit businesses and talented people will suffer. Here's something else that's kind of confusing to me. When I and two other representatives of my organization met with Councilman Webb before the December vote to ask him to support this because most people are in favor of fairness in the workplace and housing and public accommodations, we explained to him that we had PACE officers who had actually been fired after receiving very positive job reviews, were fired when their boss found out they were gay. And Councilman Webb instinctively said, well they should sue. But now here he is today, trying to repeal the very ordinance that would allow people who were fired unfairly, now willing to see the ordinance doesn't do that, but to file a grievance with the commission, and to hopefully have some mediation. And to address something that was brought up, there's nothing about the fairness ordinance that requires an employer to keep someone on board who is not doing the job. We're simply asking that people who are doing the job, not be fired for something that's irrelevant. Now, this ordinance to repeal suggest that there will be legal and cultural changes as a result of the fairness ordinance, but we have a four year history of already having a similar ordinance for public employees. There has been no un-intending consequences, nothing has happened, no grievances, no lawsuits, have been filed. Every segment of the community was represented here last meeting, December 10th. We had ministers, we had a Baptist minister, an Episcopal minister, we had a wide variety of people, Black, White talking in favor of the ordinance. It was highly publicized in the paper, the Shreveport Times had a full section on this. We had groups across the state, both pro-gay and antigay, who sent out email blasts across the state. So this was widely publicized. And

people had a chance to let their opinions to be heard. On December 10th, all but one of our City Council Members decided that Shreveport should join the ranks of cities like Austin and Dallas and Ft. Worth and Atlanta and New Orleans, a city that welcomes everyone. After positive attention in the national news, do we really want the national news now to say 'Oh, we changed our minds?' You know antigay animist among young people just doesn't really exist. This is literally a dying problem, so I ask you, let's let this repeal die right here today too. Thank you.

Ms. Sherry Lester Kircus: (2609 Parham Drive) Mayor Glover, Chairman Shyne, Council Members, thank you for allowing me to speak today for PFFLAG (Parents Families and Friends of Lesbians and Gays). I grew up here in Shreveport and with my family, I attended Mangum Memorial United Methodist Church, where we children were taught that the most important parts of the Bible were living in community tell us to judge not and to love your neighbor. There were no qualifications on either of those injunctions. Neither one said, unless of course your neighbor is gay, lesbian, bisexual or transgender. We seem to do pretty well in life when we just avoid judging and love our neighbors. As for obeying the Bible, we've stop telling slaves to obey their masters, because we realize that slavery is wrong. We don't worry about mixed fibers in our clothing, and here in Louisiana, we love our shrimp and our pork chops. Surely we can manage to love our LGBT neighbors also. As for homosexuality being a choice, I have long since lost count of how many gay people have said to me that they would never choose something so difficult. My son said it most poignantly some years ago. He said, Mom, if I had a choice, I would be straight, and I would marry Althea, and we would live happily ever after. But I don't have a choice. So, I thank you too for your overwhelming passage last week of the fairness ordinance, and I thank you for maintaining it today. Thank you.

Councilman S. Jenkins: I would like to suspend the rules if I could Mr. Chairman and bring this matter up if we could Mr. Chairman. It's a zoning matter, and I believe it's on the docket under - - -

Mr. Thompson: It's Zoning Appeal C-77-13.

Motion by Councilman <u>S. Jenkins</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>O. Jenkins</u> to suspend the rules to consider Zoning Appeal C-77-13. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 7. Nays: 0. Out of the Chamber: 0. Absent: 0. Abstentions: 0.

The Clerk read the following:

3. **<u>Ordinance No. 156 of 2013</u>**: **ZONING APPEAL C-77-13**: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport zoning ordinances by rezoning property located on the SW cornier of Emery Street and Hearne Avenue, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, LA from **<u>R-2, Suburban Multi-Family Residence District to B-2, Neighborhood Business District</u>**, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (G/S. Jenkins) *(Postponed November 26, 2013 until December 20, 2013)*

Councilman S. Jenkins: Thank you Mr. Chairman, this is Mr. Scott's appeal and I'm going to give you an opportunity to address the Council let you tell us what your position is on it.

Mr. L. Howard Scott: (1049 Southfield Rd) I'm the son of Leroy H. Scott, Jr., who died several years ago and Rebecca Campbell Scott who died two months ago. My parents have for many years, I am the executor for both of their estates. My parents have for many years earned the piece of property where my thumb is at the corner of Hearne Avenue and Emery Street in

Shreveport. I lived there so long, I don't even remember when they bought it. But many years ago, (inaudible) expropriation proceedings and the house was taken down so they could widen Hearne Avenue. Which it's hard to tell anybody here that's as old as I am that that was a long time ago. But it was a 24 ft. lot left at the corner of Hearne and Emery with 140 ft. on Hearne on and 22 or 24 ft. on Emery Street. Because of the expropriation it's too small to build anything on, it's zoned residential. My family's paid the taxes on it for I don't know how many decades, but many and about the only thing it's been used for in the last 30 years that I know of it to put those people's political signs there when they ran for Mayor and Councilman and Judge, etc.

Councilman Shyne: I saw a couple of them there had Sam Jenkins name' on it.

Councilman S. Jenkins: I think it had Jeff Everson's name on it.

Councilman Everson: It is not quite in my district, but it is close.

Mr. Scott: About two months ago, I got a notice addressed to my parents from the MPC telling me that there was a hearing on a zoning change. That someone who bought the three lots next our lot and were requesting a zoning from residential to business. I got in touch with the staff at MPC, and they were a little bit berated that whoever was trying to develop this had not included the 3,000 square foot lot that was owned by my family. I then contacted the people that wanted to do the development which is a little strip mall facing Emery Street, not facing Hearne to find out what was going on. And I don't really have any objection to them building something there. I think it's bold had it not to have the corner lot as part of their development. And I made a reasonable suggestion to the people that had bought the lot, and that is they could have my lot for the same price they paid for the lot next door to me. I didn't want a bonus because it was on Hearne, because I have the street frontage on Hearne. Frankly, my parents are both deceased now, I just as soon move on with it. The MPC held a hearing and channeled all kinds of problems with the development. I spoke to a number of people on the MPC staff. They all thought it was wrong to do it this way. I then spoke with Ali Mustapha and Mr. Mustapha, who I had met previously, told me oh my gosh, your lot would solve all the problems that I have found. Notwithstanding, for some reason or other, they don't want to include my lot. I've been offered $.50 a foot for it. I think it's kind of crazy, I didn't ask for a premium for it, I asked for the same price they paid for the lot next door. Which is certainly more than reasonable. The problem I've got with the development is that because the City expropriated half of the property years ago, for Hearne, that by changing the zoning so the property next door would be leaving a 3,000 square foot island in the middle of all business. The property gets rendered useless. And I have tried to get Councilman Jenkins, I've tried to get the MPC, I've tried to get everybody together in one room, let's resolve this. It doesn't make any sense. It really doesn't make any sense. But notwithstanding, I'm here today asking that somebody look at this. Maybe send it back, and say why don't you get everybody to sit down and resolve this. I think the fact that these guys want to do a development out there, I think that it's a great idea. They told me that they know what's going to happen to my lot, that it's going to be basically rendered useless, and they could then come pick it up later for pennies. It doesn't make any sense. I think it's bad planning to plan something this way. The MPC and city zoning rules are designed for planning, and this lacks planning, it doesn't make any sense to do this strip mall without it having the frontage on Hearne Avenue. If I was trying to hold up their project and I wasn't willing to go along with what they wanted, I could understand not wanting to go over my head and let them do it. But that's not the case. I've tried to work with these people. If the city MPC office and Mr. Mustapha's office, if they've come here, I hope they're as candid with y'all as they were with me, that they think this is a dumb idea, and that it really needs to (inaudible) this. I don't want to hold up these guys progress, but I also don't particularly want to be left because of an expropriation many years ago and then a zoning change, I

don't want to be left with what amounts to administrative taking. I'm left with a piece of property that's worthless. And yet, I'm sure y'all expect me to continue to pay the taxes on it, which means continue to cut the grass. I've gotten the same bills they lady earlier got for cutting the grass, and I don't like it when I get it, and I go out there and cut the grass sometimes myself, but I still get those bills. And I pay 'em.

Councilman Shyne: Jean, did you want to make a few statements?

Councilman Webb: Mr. Chairman, could I ask him a question? Is the - - - The people that are developing next to you, do they have a desire to buy your little strip of land there? Or, they don't want it, or - - -?

Mr. Scott: Well, they've expressed a desire to buy it, but they also expressed they want to pay me $.25 on $1 for what they paid for the lot next door, and yet it doesn't fall on Hearne.

Councilman Webb: How much did they pay for the lot next door?

Mr. Scott: $6250, and I told them they could have my lot for the same thing. Now, a lot of y''all new my dad, I know Mayor Glover did. My father I think once thought that someday somebody was going to come along and build a service station there and pay him $100,000 for that piece of land. And I told him every time somebody called him, and as a lot of you knew my dad, he'd say somebody's going to want it. Well my father's dead now and my mother is dead now. And I am under no illusions that somebody is going to come along and want to pay $100,000 for that lot. And I frankly don't want to bother with it. So I thought the fairest way to arrive at a price was what did you pay for the lot next door? And the gentleman told me $6250. Whereupon, he offered me $1500. And you know if I'm going to give it away, I'm going to give it to a charity. I don't really want to be in here. I'm not here by choice. I didn't throw the first punch at this. The gentleman told me that when he had initially done his plans that he had inquired of the city who owned my lot, and was told that it was part of the public right of way. And therefore he did not include that in his development. And when I called him and he learned that it wasn't part of the city's right of way, that was privately owned, he was a little bit indignant with me. And said, look, I don't feel I should have to buy it when the city told me it was part of the right of way. Now I don't know whether that's true, I don't really care. The fact is, it's not part of the right of way, it's part of private property, and I'm happy to let him have it for the same price he paid for the property next door. I've talked to Michael Long who used to be on this Council. He's one of my clients, and he's in real estate business. And Michael told me that was more than reasonable and fair price for that piece of property. And actually somebody told me today that that was a giveaway at that price. I don't know. I just don't - - - I really don't want to be here.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Let me ask the gentleman a question. The square footage of your lot is what?

Mr. Scott: 3,000.

Councilman O. Jenkins: The square footage of the lot that he paid $6250, for is how much?

Mr. Scott: It is a little bigger. I don't know the exact square footage of it, but it's probably 4,000.

Councilman O. Jenkins: And just conceptually on a pro rata share per square foot, is that something that was ever offered to you?

Mr. Scott: $2 a square foot is what it amounts to.

Councilman S. Jenkins: And I believe Mr. Washington is here Mr. Chairman. I believe he is one of the people developing the property. I do want to recognize him and give him a chance to come up and speak also.

Councilman Shyne: We will. Let's hear from Jean and where is Mr. Washington? Tell Mr. Washington to come around.

Mr. Stephen Jean: (MPC Staff) Mr. Scott, we really respect Mr. Scott, and he comes and fights for his rights quite often with the MPC, but I do want to say a few things that were really inaccurate about what he presented. Yes the plan that we did have submitted to us originally had quite a number of problems. There wasn't a dumpster shown on the plan, the storm water detention wasn't taken care of, there were just a number of issues with the circulation, there was issues with some of the parking spaces not being able to be accessed. And there wasn't a design professional involved in the project at the very beginning. And so say that we were dealing with an applicant that wasn't that sophisticated. So what we began to do is get the information to the applicant and what that resulted in, there was a deferment of the case, and there was a revised site plan submitted. The revised site plan was submitted rather - - - probably a day or so before the hearing. But I had a chance to look at it. And I had a chance to go down and see Mr. Mustapha. This revised site plan reduced the size of the building. It allowed for storm water detention. He took care of the issues of the circulation within the site. It took care of the issues with the dumpster. We've heard a lot about- - - I think there's something very telling that was said a moment ago, when we heard threw the first punch. And I think there's more to this story, but that's not what we're here about. We're here about a site plan and a land use decision. And what really needs to be looked at is whether or not this is the proper use for this property and whether or not we have a good site plan as a result of that. And that's the kinds of things I wanted to point out. Respectfully, respect very highly that we do have a revised site plan. I will say that I wish that Mr. Scott had been given the opportunity before the meeting to study that plan. He did not get that. I personally handed it to him at the hearing. That's one part of this that I would have given him more time, and we work on being able to do that in the future where we're not having last minute. Y'all bear with us, we'll get better. Thank you.

Mr. Anthony Washington: (1516 Arrow Street) The plan you have is the southwest corner of Emery in Shreveport, LA. We did everything the MPC asked us to do. And Mustapha passed it, he agreed on it and Mr. Scott here, I talked to him three or four times. He raised his price. And the property that's next to him was 6000 square feet. His is 3,000. I told him I'd give him $1 a square foot and he don't want it.

Councilman S. Jenkins: You know my position on this, I respected what everybody has said. And I went out and I took a look at this site. I don't think it's our job to try to broker some deal and say something about somebody else's property. I mean from a standpoint of looking at physically, I could sit down and it would be a good idea to include Mr. Scott's property, but you don't necessarily need Mr. Scott's property to comply with what the MPC has asked you to do. And you have complied with the site plan and what's being required. It sounds like it's boiling down to me on this appeal, a scenario where somebody wants a property purchase, and we simply cannot do that. I've talked with Mr. Scott a couple of times myself, and I know his father, his parents very well, but this is not the arena where we can come forward and referee some kind of bid for the property to be purchased. Especially if it's not needed to comply with what the MPC has required you to do. For that reason now, I'm going to make a motion that we would uphold the decision of the MPC, which I think - - -

Mr. Thompson: The motion - - - this is a zoning matter and there is a zoning ordinance. And we would ask you to move to adopt the ordinance.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Alright, I want to make a motion to adopt the ordinance.

Having passed first reading on <u>November 26, 2013</u> was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman <u>S. Jenkins</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>McCulloch</u> to adopt.

Councilman O. Jenkins: I've got a question for the attorney, and I'm happy whether it's Julie or Terri. Is there - - - and Sam's point makes a lot of sense to me, is there any precedent or anything? I mean what we're asked to consider right here is, you know is this about appeal relative to the actual (inaudible). I don't necessarily disagree with Mr. Scott, but I don't see where there's anything that I have to vote on to support Mr. Scott's case. And is there some other option out there as we stand today?

Ms. Julie Glass: I think you're correct in that Mr. Scott's property has not been the subject of an application or a hearing at the MPC. He couldn't rezone his property to be included with this if you wanted to right now.

Councilman O. Jenkins: I mean I don't have a vote on something other than to deny, or accept this appeal.

Ms. Glass: It should be based on this (inaudible).

Councilman O. Jenkins: I mean and obviously I don't see anything in front of me that says why it can't be zoned the way it is. And is it an efficient use - - -?

Councilman Everson: Could I ask a quick question for clarification? Is the vote that we're doing for the site plan approval.

Mr. Thompson: No, it's a zoning matter.

Councilman Everson: Okay, there was some conversation about the site plan.

Mr. Thompson: The zoning includes a site plan. It's a part of the zoning. But you're voting on the whole package.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Okay, and let me ask on other question so I'm clear. You can have a (inaudible) B-2, that has plenty of access onto a residential street. Is that true? Yes, whatever I'm looking for the expertise on zoning.

Mr. Jean: We have to evaluate that on a case by case basis, and we have to look at what is happening in the neighborhood. As it relates to the pattern of that neighborhood and - - -

Councilman O. Jenkins: Business that fronts - - -

Councilman S. Jenkins: But there's a number of - - -

Mr. Jean: It's a case by case basis.

Councilman O. Jenkins: That answers my question. Thank you very much. What I was wondering was is this going to be the first one that only had - - -

Councilman S. Jenkins: No.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Okay.

Councilman Shyne: And Jean, I'm glad that made that statement, that a lot of times we have to vote on things up here as they come case by case, and not just a blanket.

Ms. Scott: MPC has a policy that was adopted some time ago on Hearne Avenue that they allow the zoning for B-2 to go one block down, when the property is on Hearne Avenue, they will allow one lot on Hearne Avenue that fronts on Hearne Avenue to be rezoned to a business rather than a residential. And that' policy has been in affect probably in excess of 20 years.

Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 6. Nays: Councilman Everson. 1. Out of the Chamber: 0. Absent: 0. Abstentions: 0.

Councilman S. Jenkins: That doesn't stop you all from discussing further business or some kind of further deal on what you're going to do, it's just that we can't do it from here.

Mr. Washington: Thank y'all, happy holidays.

Councilman Shyne: I see a couple of attorneys in the back there if you might want to consult one or two of 'em. Ron, might be a little Christmas money there. I guess I'm not in a position to promote business, but lately I over spoke. Now let's get back to where we left off. Mr. Thompson, do we have any confirmation of appointments?

Mr. Thompson: We do Mr. Chairman. Mr. Chairman, those were all of the public comments?

Councilman Shyne: Yes. Did I overlook somebody? Yes Jean?

Mr. Jean: I'm one of the people to comment.

Councilman Shyne: I'm sorry Jean, I thought this was - - - let's get Jean and then we'll move on. Jean, I thought you had made your comments.

Mr. Stephen Jean: (2201 McCutcheon Ave) Well, that's real interesting, because I'm not going to make any comments about my position.

Councilman Shyne: I'm sorry, after Jean we have Ms. Nettie Brown and Mr. Craig B. Lee. Not Mr. Craig Lee, but Mr. Craig B. Lee. I don't know whether that B stands for Bernard or - - -?

Mr. Jean: If you give me one minute. Please don't start on me Bea, because I'm going to set it up here. I want to make it very clear I'm here as a private citizen. I moved to Shreveport on December 26, 1973. Day after Christmas. I think that's quite interesting, the timing of that. The (inaudible) my senior year I went to Eisenhower High School in Lawton, OK. I studied, I went to a Votech school, and I had aspirations to become an architect. I also was a member of the (inaudible) choir. But I came here before you today Mr. Mayor, Dale Sibley, Ms. McCulloch, Messrs. Webb, Everson, and Joe Shyne. Messrs. Corbin, Jenkins, both Jenkins. And you know me, but you don't know me. Because see I have a secret, but you don't know me. I'm a cyclist and a vegetarian.

Councilman Shyne: Wow.

Councilman S. Jenkins: We didn't know that.

Mr. Jean: I've been wanting to tell people this for a long time, but I've been holding back. But the story begins in the Spring of 2012. This is all about my Christmas vacation. As you recall, my Christmas vacation started just a few days after I had been surprised to find out I was going to be having an entirely new job. (Inaudible) kinda go back in 2012, I just - - - we, my wife decided to start something new. I thought maybe it might be fun. Ride a bike occasionally. So, we went off and began the family thing. That's my grandson Nylan and that's a (inaudible) bike. And that is how it got going. In the Spring of 2013, we discovered a new way of working with food and I've spoken with the Mayor about this not too long ago, and I saw a documentary called "Forks Over Knives". Changed my life. Changed the way I ate. We started making different food choices, and we started going (inaudible). That is my property, and I fail for the record and apologize that I live at 2201 McCutcheon Avenue, Shreveport, LA 71108. I'm not here representing Southern Hills, but I just happen to live there. I'm not here representing any group whatsoever except my family. This is what happened, opportunity. Always miss 100% of the shots you never take. So we decided as a family we would take a shot. We started growing our own food. It was small to begin with. Everybody had to pitch in. We discovered strange and many ways to grow food, horticulture. This raised garden bed is an example of that. That's the definition if you want to read that quickly. That is just a - - - it's a sustainable way to grow food. We start off digging a ditch. This great (inaudible) you see here is because I dig a lot of ditches, I don't work out at a gym. And you fill it full of (inaudible) and you grow food on it. It's a family affair. And is my grandson allowed (inaudible)? We also looked and studied about permaculture, a way to planting and (inaudible) gardening. That is what's called a keyhole garden. It's actually a garden that began in Africa, and it is draught resistant. And that green (inaudible) is to volunteer

to another plant that apparently decided to waste my compost and it took off.

Councilman Shyne: I want Oliver to know that my great-grandfather started this.

Mr. Jean: So (inaudible) harvest. (Inaudible) as well. So then right about the time, I even had the conversation with the Mayor (inaudible) so we went to Austin, TX. And he lives on (Inaudible) Street and we saw all kinds of things. Connections began to emerge. Saw some strange sites from a (inaudible) project. We also (inaudible) project with a volunteer (inaudible) initiative that puts bicycles on the streets of Austin and Central and Texas (inaudible) community bike shops, bike mechanics and bike maintenance acting as a local (inaudible) group. And that's how this starts off. Donate bikes and fix 'em up, people can actually earn credits and as a volunteer and walk away with a brand new bike regardless of whether they've ever ridden a bike. So I thought I would give it a try. And it's all part of the neighborhood. So I went on a 10 minute bike ride and arrived here. (Inaudible), wow what a concept. How about a fresh salad? Another trip previous to that to Bentonville, AR. I love to fish. I was able to combine biking with fishing all at the same time. So, what does (inaudible) have to say about all this? We (inaudible) cleaner energy and resource (inaudible), maintaining and improving existing infrastructure with (inaudible) in remote areas, encourage healthy lifestyles through accessing nutritious food, of healthy activities that meet that (inaudible) needs of our population., All of this is directly from (inaudible). Connect people and places, connect people in different (inaudible) across barriers of waste and class and (inaudible) for the benefit of the whole of Shreveport and Caddo area (inaudible) futures in a usable network of greenways and blueways provide safe and efficient transportation towards (inaudible) including alternatives to the car, such as bicycle, and enhance public transit. This is a personal vision statement taken from the Master Plan, and Shreveport is widely recognized as the best place in the South to live, work, raise a family, and its infrastructure and education resources are world class. Racial harmony and economy opportunity are model for the country. I signed up to speak on an initiative on the agenda, and it's all about neighborhoods becoming active. It's all about them having a voice, and it's all about you having an ear to listen and I thank you very much for your time.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Citizen Jean, good to have you here today.

Councilman Shyne: We have two other speakers, but you will come at the end. Now Craig would like to come up and talk about the dog park.

Mr. Craig B. Lee: (1035 Eustis Street) I know you guys will be voting on this particular measure. Didn't make the last meeting, but the meeting before, this one I just wanted to make sure to state for the record, the Dog Park Alliance, a few years ago on this thing came up and indicated that they would take the lead road and of course now, this is being dumped on the city. Again, I applaud Mayor Glover for holding on this initiative because it's been a lot of shenanigans going on with this particular project. I wanted to say for the record that the Dog Park Alliance needs to be responsible for the maintenance along with the Parish if they are going to help advocate for this particular situation. I will say, Councilman Everson had made the statement at the meeting before last to equate dogs to all those people. One of the things that bothers me, when we get into these issues where people have their interesting concepts to push, and I made the point that dogs don't pay any taxes. Dogs are not expected to go to high school, graduate and go to college, and get a job and then become a productive member of society, and become a contributing member of the tax base. Dogs are luxury items, and from (inaudible) overall standpoint, I have no problem with people who want dogs, cats, aardvarks, or whatever they want. But for you to try to pass on maintenance of a dog park to the city, and that was not the original deal, that's wrong, that's disingenuous, and I will say, Mayor Glover and I've been on different political sides on many issues, but this one we stand united. If you want a dog park and (inaudible) the City Council that

all that needs to be done was to have you guys sign for this, of course we're in this year-long plus legal battle, that everything would be fine, but that's not what the case is going to be. Even when you vote on this measure for a new site location, the maintenance piece does not need to be the responsibility sole on the City of Shreveport. And I will say to you again, dogs are not people. I could care less how much you love your dog, they cannot take care of themselves. And you have - - - you don't have a dog do you Oliver?

Councilman O. Jenkins: No, I do not.

Mr. Lee: I know you have - - - I saw you (inaudible).

Councilman O. Jenkins: (Inaudible)

Mr. Lee: You participated in the dog (inaudible), but at the end of the day, again, we don't have an issue with this particular park, it's just how this thing is now coming down. And I have no problem with the new location. It's unfortunate that the individuals pushing this wants to keep this lawsuit going. I think Mayor Glover made a good point to show them he's willing to negotiate the situation. So I urge you guys this time as the Council, because you are doing a good job of analyzing this and the lawsuit has been filed, has held it up. Look at all the letters concerning this. Make sure that all the "I"s are dotted and the "T"s are crossed so we can move forward on this. And I'm sorry, nobody is willing to you know, 10,000 people aren't going to move to Shreveport because of a dog park. I'm sorry to tell you. I think it would be a good addition to the Riverfront, but at the end of the day, we need to make sure that the maintenance costs are taken care of in an equitable manner with the Dog Park Alliance. Because they got the money to bring to afford to build this thing, they need to basically also contribute to the upkeep. This was the primary reason that the City of Shreveport does not have a zoo. Because the maintenance cost was going to be absorbent. So I just wanted to say that for the record.

Councilman Shyne: Thank you Mr. Lee, we have one other person.

Mr. Daniel R. Keele: (1032 Texas Ave) I just put my name in the hat as a prophylactic measure to explain whatever questions the Council might have. We keep having discussions about maintenance costs and other things that are turning the attention from the actual establishment. The city had protocol to establish dog parks, the city has ordinances, the city had even approved the Hamel's location. We've had some difficulties. The Mayor's had some concerns that we tried to address, and I'm asking you to try to streamline this process in support of Resolution 220, as a way to accomplish what we think are most of the concerns that are concerning the construction of the case. The Red River Waterway Commission has approved the money to go from one location to another, and I think with the efforts that have been made the past couple of weeks, everything that we can do to get as close as we're going to get to get this thing resolved is here before us, and I'd like the Council to consider that open-mindedly.

Councilman Shyne: Thank you very much, and we want to assure (inaudible) that we do look at things in a very analytical position, and of course we might disagree with people from time to time, but that doesn't necessarily say that the decisions that we make are bad. I wouldn't want a person to come up and indicate that we made a bunch of bad decisions, because we've made some pretty good analytical positions. Okay. Mr. Thompson, I believe confirmation of appointments?

Confirmation and Appointments:
The Clerk read the following:

Shreveport-Bossier Convention & Tourist Bureau's Board	Ms. Tari Bradford (Re-appt)
Assistant Director-Property Standards	Mr. Terrence Green

Motion by Councilman S. Jenkins, seconded by Councilman McCulloch to confirm the executive appointments of Ms. Tari Bradford and Mr. Terrence Green.

Councilman S. Jenkins: I will say that I think these are some great nominees for these positions. I know both of these persons, either personally or in their professional capacities. I think both certainly add some value to the boards that they are being appointed to. I commend the Mayor on bringing these appointments before the Council.

Councilman Shyne: Mr. Jenkins, you are very smart. Mr. Sibley, did you want them to stand and wave or?

Mr. Sibley: Well Ms. Bradley is a reappointment, she's not available today, but Mr. Green he's shaking his head, but he should stand. I think all of you know him.

Councilman O. Jenkins: I certainly know and appreciate his efforts.

Councilman Shyne: Right. Okay.

Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 7. Nays: 0. Out of the Chamber: 0. Absent: 0. Abstentions: 0.

Consent Agenda Legislation
To Introduce Routine Ordinances and Resolutions
Resolutions: None.
Ordinances: None.
To Adopt Ordinances and Resolutions
Resolutions: None.
Ordinances: None.
Regular Agenda Legislation
Resolutions on Second Reading and Final Passage or Which Will Require Only One Reading
The Clerk read the following:

1. **Resolution No. 206 of 2013**: A resolution authorizing the Mayor to execute a contract agreement between the City of Shreveport and Denny Drive Water System (DBA Eagle Water, Inc.) for emergency connection of water supply service, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. *(Postponed December 10, 2013)*

Mr. Sibley: We've asked for an additional postponement, we haven't reconnected with the owner and we're getting some additional information. They were out of town for a while.

Councilwoman McCulloch: Move to postpone.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Second.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Corbin, seconded by Councilman O. Jenkins to postpone until the next regular meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 7. Nays: 0. Out of the Chamber: 0. Absent: 0. Abstentions: 0.

2. **Resolution No. 212 of 2013**: A resolution repealing Resolution No. 133 of 2012 which authorized the execution of a cooperative endeavor agreement with the Red River Waterway District relative to the Construction and maintenance of a dog park on land

owned by the City of Shreveport adjacent to the Red River in Shreveport; Encouraging the exploration of cost-efficient options for construction and maintenance of a dog park at other locations within the City of Shreveport; and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. *(Postponed December 10, 2013)*

Mayor Glover: Mr. Chairman?
Councilman Shyne: Yes sir.
Mayor Glover: You're on 212?
Councilman Shyne: Yes sir.
Mayor Glover: Are we at discussion at this point?
Councilman Shyne and Councilwoman McCulloch: No.
Councilwoman McCulloch: You walked right into .
Councilman Shyne: No, no, no. He didn't walk right into discussion Ms. McCulloch, and I believe you directed that at the Chair. We're ready for a motion and a second, and then we'll get to a discussion. (Inaudible)
Councilman O. Jenkins: Just so we're clear, we have to make a motion to adopt and then if we're against it, while I'll make the motion.
Councilman Corbin: Second.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman <u>O. Jenkins</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Corbin</u> to adopt.

Councilman Shyne: Now, we are ready for discussion.
Mayor Glover: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Members of the Council, obviously we have drafted 212 in an effort to try and bring this situation involving the dog park to some kind of conclusion and resolution. This particular resolution in some form or another has specifically been in existence, and I think before the eyes of Council Members, dating back to at least August, I know it was at some point in September when we actually convened, three members of the Council to sit down and visit, and then other members of the vigil to talk about essentially moving this situation off of center, so we could come to some close. Prior to that, we had offered some additional suggestions about how this process we thought should go forth, but we did not get any desire or inclination to look to try and move the needle on this until I guess essentially we were able to provide Council Members with some information that you all requested dating back to our September meeting with you all, where essentially we (inaudible) from looking at this from two different perspectives. 1) Let's go ahead and say let's establish this as a project and go through your process. Shelly and Tim Wachtel and others in terms of how this would proceed as a normal capital project for the City of Shreveport. That entails projecting costs and what have you. Essentially what came back was I think the final lynchpin in this. Because to briefly recap, I've been against this because this $280,000 of taxpayer money going towards a dog park. We can build dog parks and several parks around the City of Shreveport for that sum of public taxpayer dollars, issue No. 1. That didn't resonate or gain traction with the Council, I think it did with a lot of our citizens. Issue No. 2, invalid process. We have Mr. Escude who is here, he's a member of the Commission. This was a request that was actually made by one of his colleagues, Mr. Mathew Lynn, along with I think a couple of members of the Council of the Dog Park Coalition, to the Waterway Commission. It was not something that came directly from the City of Shreveport. The information that was acquired by the Commission staff to make the request came from an email that went from Randy Lucky to Tim Wachtel, which indicated the sum was $280,000, but with a

subsequent message that said 'Please do not assume this to be the actual expense that will be necessary to construct a dog park at the Hamel location.' That in and of itself creates bad information as a part of a bad process, that ultimately resulted in a bad outcome. Ultimately what happens to this point, to where we're moving hopefully towards resolution is the fact that it is now abundantly clear that the City of Shreveport cannot affectively build a dog park at the Hamel's location as called for and spelled out in the Resolution No. 133 of last year as well as the ensuing cooperative endeavor agreement for any sum approaching $280,000. So not only do we have what is already a significant sum of public dollars, that in order to be able to construct there, it would take even greater sum of dollars. Staff indicated that that sum would be somewhere in the neighborhood of $580,000. That's when the request came to us to find those independent sources of cost projections of construction costs that you guys would be able to look at and feel that there had not been inappropriately prejudiced by me directing Council to prepare documents that were absorbingly high, whereas fate would have it, those projections came back and indicated that $580,000 was actually on the low end. One came back as $640,000. The other came back at $690,000. At that point, we said look, we need to settle this. If I sign this and at this point, it becomes the province of the Council to figure out how you're going to establish a dog park location at Hamel's with $280,000, when you have staff as well as two other outside sources telling you that you are hundreds of thousands of dollars short. Signing this particular cooperative endeavor agreement at this point and signing the resolution, would end this and Mr. Corbin as you put into the Council's lap, which is something that potentially could still be an option. As I have understood and Councilman with staff, the intention of the option of the Council at that point, since I assumed that you would not have the ability to convince your other Council Members, to appropriate additional dollars. The Dog Park had not indicated that they would be able to provide those additional dollars. What would be left would be the effort to try and construct a $280,000 dog park at the Hamel location in a fashion that would ultimately not make the Dog Park folks very happy. They would not be very representative as quality efforts on the part of the City of Shreveport. And so with that brings us to is obviously at this point, a decision on the part of the Dog Park Alliance to recommend both the Council and the Administration that we shift locations. That we go from the Hamel's location to Stoner. A set of circumstances that we're open and receptive to. It provides in that particular set of circumstances exactly some of the issues that we pointed out for the Hamel's location. You'd have access to parking, to ADA accessible, you'd have bathrooms, you also have to have the presence of the Caddo Parish Sheriff's Department that's located there in the old marina that the City of Shreveport owns. That opens opportunity for additional security presence and some other hopefully assistance from an operational standpoint. And so we're open to addressing and resolving this. And so we offered, well because what it says is either rescind the Resolution 133 of 2012, and now let's focus on going forward at the Stoner location. To the Council's credit at this point, you have not come forward with something that at least gives us the opportunity to advance this effort forward. And that's Resolution 220. What Resolution 220 also does is that it gives us a chance to be able to encompass within the actions of the Council, matters that involve an authorization for a cooperative endeavor agreement, which takes us another step down the road. One of the things that we've also managed to be able to accomplish as you heard being Dan Keele just referred to, is that on Wednesday of this week, the Waterway Commission responded to two requests that we offered and made as an Administration. One that they agree to shift the location, which they have done. The second was for them to take on the responsibility of being the party, the entity that would manage, construct and ultimately turn this particular improvement back over to the City of Shreveport in similar fashion to what they did with the initial improvements done at the Stoner Boat Launch location, what we're talking about

right now. The same exact thing that they did starting in 2002 with Riverview Park, the same thing that this Council just authorized need to enter into an agreement with them to do regarding the $1.1-1.2 (million) worth of improvements that are currently under design right now by the Waterway Commission for an additional phase of work to be done at Riverview Park. Unfortunately, this Council, the Dog Park folks as well as the Waterway Commission don't want to accept that responsibility. They want that burden to stay with the City of Shreveport. That's unfortunate. I'll accept that decision, we can't make them do what it is they don't want to do. What I'm also going to suggest is that we have the opportunity between now and the first meeting in January to address many of the other issues that Mr. Lee just made reference to. I think the issue of maintenance and operations is one that does need to be given consideration. With the budget that is as tight as the one we have right now, and some of the decisions that this Council has recently made with regard to who gets funding and who does not. To have a staff recommendation that tells us that the operations and maintenance of a dog park at this location is going to be a six figure proposition is something that we need to give serious consideration to. Because that will be a reality in one form or the other. That's one of the reasons as to why we've also asked from an Administration stand point that the Sheriff be open and receptive to the possibility of joining the City, possibly the Parish as well as the Dog Park Alliance in pulling together a collective agreement that helps us to be able to address those maintenance and operational issues so that for a future Council and a future Administration would not be dealing with the possibility as recently been directed away from our neighborhoods, away from an area that's already neglected in many respects, and directed towards a dog park that obviously is not necessary, desired or wanted by all sectors and segments of the City of Shreveport. To that end, I believe that based upon the indication that Mr. Everson has given to a willingness to meet with me, I believe Councilwoman McCulloch has also expressed an interest, we would like to be able to work with them on some possible amendments and some suggestions that could be essentially added to Resolution 220 at the next Council Meeting, that would 1) absolutely cap the actual financial exposure of the City of Shreveport with regard to the construction of the dog park; the way the suggestive language both in the original cooperative endeavor agreement as well as the one that the Waterway Commission appears to want us to adopt right now, still puts the City of Shreveport in a posture of having to be responsible for additional funding for construction of a dog park, (inaudible) $280,000 provided by them and the $28,000 provided by the Dog Park Coalition is not enough. That to me is not an acceptable set of circumstances. We need to be able to undeniably and unequivocally represent that there would not be an additional public expense to the citizens of Shreveport for the construction of a dog park beyond the money that would be provided by the Waterway Commission and whatever else would be provided by the Dog Park Alliance. That to me that I think we should be able to come to a meeting of the minds on. I think we also be in a position to be able to come to some clear understanding of how to address as Mr. Lee has asked and others as well and have great concern about the maintenance, the operations, as well as be in a position to make some reference to how we address the liability issues and concerns as well. I've also Mr. Shyne, been around long enough to know that Resolution 212 does not have the, while I think it's the best thing to do, and would be the most direct way of being able to absolutely address this situation, is not going to have enough votes to be able to pass on this Council today, for whatever number of reasons. But I will say this, that should Resolution 212 to ultimately get us to a point to where we now have a Resolution 220, and in the spirit of cooperation and compromise, we're going to ask that this Council withdraw Resolution 212, and give us an opportunity between now and the next meeting in January to work as I mentioned with Councilman Everson, Councilwoman McCulloch and anybody else on this Council, as well as the public that wants to insure that we have the ability to

make Resolution 220 as tight and as sound and as protective of the interest of the City of Shreveport as possible. I hope also what that will do is serve as the basis for the completion of a cooperative endeavor agreement particularly between now and then as well. And that also give us the ability to resolve the issue of Resolution 133, would serve as the basis of the lawsuit in my opinion. And give us the gift of being able to end that litigation, cease the need to have the Administration represented in terms of advocating its position before the courts and allow us to be able to move forward from this matter.

Councilman Shyne: Thank you Mr. Mayor, I call for the vote at this particular time.

Councilwoman McCulloch: How are we voting?

Councilman O. Jenkins: I don' think we have to vote if he withdraws his.

Councilwoman McCulloch: I move to withdraw.

Councilman S. Jenkins: I second the motion,.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman McCulloch, seconded by Councilman S. Jenkins to withdraw Resolution No. 212 of 2013. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 7. Nays: 0. Out of the Chamber: 0. Absent: 0. Abstentions: 0.

3. **Resolution No. 213 of 2013**: A resolution expressing no opposition to the waiver of Section 26-57 of the Code of Ordinances; reaffirming the findings and the directives of resolution Number 120 of 2013 regarding the collection of overcharges from the 2011 General Obligation Bond Election; and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. *(Postponed December 10, 2013)*

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Corbin, seconded by Councilman O. Jenkins to adopt.

Mayor Glover: Mr. Chairman?

Councilman Shyne: Yes.

Mayor Glover: Again, we know how to read the Ti Leaves when it comes to Council inclinations, but I think that this is a matter that unlike 212 does not warrant withdrawal, and unfortunately appears to be one that is much farther away from a potential basis for compromise. And as one that I think is even more important and representative of the larger, more challenging issues that we face as a city. Obviously I am encouraging this Council to vote in favor of Resolution 213, because I believe it would allow us to be able to move forward past something that we should have resolved at this point long ago. I think part of the problem that exist with this situation is that we have not taken advantage of the opportunity to engage in a real open unvarnished and direct discussion about the issues that are in place in this particular set of circumstances. We have I guess in some cases (inaudible), danced around it, but not actually dealt with it. And I hope that as we go forward into 2014, that we will look to do just that. Because this is a situation that is unfortunately, I think, does not speak well for where we are as a city right now. And I'll give you a little context for the comments that I'm going to make. When this whole matter started, as best I can recollect was about the fall of 2011. If you guys will remember, that was the your first four year on the City Council. In April of that year, the citizens of Shreveport to the tune of 60+ percent had just passed three general obligation bond propositions that represented the largest bond proposal in the history of the City of Shreveport. And that was after having just

come through the previous four years where we had some rather trying sister circumstances that we had to address as a city. Otherwise we could have found ourselves in great peril with large problems that would have been without question to the detriment of the City of Shreveport. As this thing began to take shape, it happened as I recollect about the time we had moved beyond the election of the bond proposal in April. Myself along with at that time, Chairman Oliver Jenkins and other members of the staff had gone to New York to do our round of visits with the underwriting agency and what have you as we were preparing for the first sale from the April 2011 bond proposal. One of the things that we represented as an inadequacy of the April 2011 bond proposal was a substantial lack of dollars for street construction. As you guys can remember, the recommendation, the $165,000,000 recommendation, that came from the citizens committee only had about $4,000,000 worth of street work in that $165,000,000. To this Council's credit and I believe that was an effort largely led by at that time, Council's Vice-Chairman Sam Jenkins, added and additional $10,000 to the overall bond proposal before it was placed before the voters and shifted around some of the dollars internally that resulted in about $21,000,000 being included within that April 2011 bond proposal. Still an amount that was far less than what was necessary and needed to be able to address the street problem of the city. So in the Fall of 2011, we came forward with a proposition that we called 'Fix Shreveport Streets Now'. It was made possible because of action that was made by this Council at that same time by a less than, well just slightly a majority vote that decided to align Shreveport with the rest of the SWEPCO service area by increasing the City's franchise fee from 2% to 3%. That additional revenue resulted in an additional dollars flowing to the City of Shreveport to the tune of about $6 + (million) a year. That we indicated and Council as well, Councilman Sam Jenkins in particular indicated wanted to be used and directed towards street improvements. We suggested that the best way to be able to make a significant step toward significant work being done toward improving our streets would be to leverage those dollars. And so we put before this Council, a $111,000,000 proposition I believe in the Fall of 2011 that would have leveraged those dollars to do over $100+ (million) worth of street work, which would have given us close to $150,000,000 in street dollars had it been combined with those dollars available from the April bond proposition. It was at that time, that someone said that we were not looking to do additional street work because it needed to be done, but we were looking to do additional work Ms. McCulloch, simply because we can provide and an additional opportunity for Mr. Calvin Grigsby to do work on behalf of the City of Shreveport. And that unfortunately came from the same individual who accused us of attempting to undermine the extension of 3132 out on Flournoy Lucas as it stops there. What has been proven in the ensuing two years, is that that individual and group of individuals were as wrong in their accusations about 3132 as they were about our motivations in doing work with Mr. Calvin Grigsby. What have we seen in those ensuing years with regard to 3132? That the actual group that caused and accused us of blocking it, because their litigation and other actions, actually result in the fact that that project has not moved forward based upon their litigation. They've lost again and again, and again, and we've not been able to proceed with the engineering and design work that's necessary on that project because of the litigation of the very folks who said they want us to go and finish the project. Now parallel that to the Calvin Grigsby situation. That same group of individuals made accusations that ultimately had no basis and fact or reality, that turned into an internal investigation of the City's Internal Auditor which found that there were some management issues that needed to be addressed. We in fact addressed those issues. That was not sufficient. There was also a belief that there needed to be a higher level of investigation done. Council exercised its authority and power and empaneled and did that actual investigation to the tune of $100+ (thousand) of city resources. When it was all said and done, what that particular investigation concluded was that

there was no wrong doing, that there was nothing to be reported to any law enforcement agency, that this was not even a matter that would warrant the attention of the State's legislative auditor, and all we have to do is look around here in Northwest Louisiana, just in the last several weeks, an d to see that when the available (inaudible) bodies who don't make proper judicious use of the resources that have been left to us, not only will it end up gaining the interest of law enforcement folks, it will get the interest of the legislative auditor. And they will come in and do what they do and do it very well and report what is appropriate (inaudible) to the Council, to the public and everyone else that would be relevant. That did not happen. Because it did not happen, again, Council spent $100,000 to do an investigation. An investigation essentially bogged down to the tune of about $53,000, and that comes from an interpretation of whether or not the bond transactions of 2011 were three separate transactions since there were three propositions, or if you combine them as one transaction, but with three propositions involved. That $53,000 has now been placed at Capital One Bank in an escrow account. It is awaiting the opportunity for the City to attach itself to that account. With an agreement to do binding arbitration that would resolve whether or not that $53,000 is available to the City of Shreveport or should be kept by Mr. Calvin Grigsby. We believe that that represents a way despite all of the various huddles and issues and accusations and everything else that's been made, a way for us to be able to resolve this issue and move forward. The real question is why do we believe it should move forward? Well, in the Fall of 2011, I came across an article that I sat aside to help me understand exactly why it is that as the incoming mayor of the City of Shreveport, I decided to recommend that we use Calvin Grigsby, not as 'my' financial advisor as one local comment would offer or suggest, but as the city's financial advisor. And that article was in the New York Times, and the headlines Mr. Chairman, Council Members was 'Promises Made and Re-Made by Firms and SEC Fraud Cases'. It says that a Citi Group agreed to pay last month $285,000,000 to settle civil charges that entered fraud and customs as being the housing bubble, the Securities and Exchange Commission rested a typical pledge from the company. Citi Group would never violate one of the main antifraud provisions as a nation's security laws. The problem was is that Citi Group had made that same pledge in 2010, July of 2010 and May of 2006, also in March 2005, and again in April of 2000. Also says that Citi Group is far from the only such repeat offender in the eyes of the SEC. On Wall Street, you have a list that some of the biggest names in the financial industry, Goldman Sachs, Morgan Stanley, J.P Morgan Chase and Bank of America among them. Of all (inaudible) fraud cases by promising the SEC that they would never again violate any antifraud laws. Only to do it again in another case a few years later. But further research indicated that the SEC was probably poking over for criticism for missing warning signs that could have softened the blow. The pattern of repeated accusations of security fraud laws violation adds another layer of concerns that the SEC failed to watch in many instances where wrong doing seemed to have been avoided. And I wrapped up the references from this article with this, but will add the holding for the record. But why violations are plentiful? For example, Bank of America Securities Unit has agreed four times since 2005 not to violate a major antifraud stat. And another four times not to violate a separate law. Merrill Lynch with Bank of America (inaudible) in 2008, a separately agreed not to violate the same two statutes seven times since 1999. Of the 19 companies, that the Times found to be repeat offenders, over the last 15 years, 16 declined to comment. They read like the Wall Street Who's Who. American International Group, Ameriprise, Bank of America, Bear Sterns, Columbia Management, Deutsche Asset Management, Credit Suisse,, Goldman Sachs, J.P. Morgan Chase, Merrill Lynch, Morgan Stanley, Putnam Investments, Raymond James, RBC Dain Rauscher, UBS and Wells Fargo/Wachovia. What that reminded me of Mr. Shyne, and members of the Council, was that the reason why back in 2007 and 2008, we picked Calvin Grigsby, was because

as I came to understand very early on, we're in business from a financial standpoint, the City of Shreveport with virtual giants. People who held our date were amongst some of these types of names that I just made reference to. These folks as evidence going back to 2008-2009, had done things that had been harmful to the U.S. economy, to many U.S. citizens, business folks, and ultimately also to group of municipalities. Places like Jefferson County and Alabama comes to mind. If we had those types of challenges, before us here in the City of Shreveport, where we wanted to be able to effectively navigate and walk through and maximize the city's interest and position amongst the virtual giants who based upon this article and many just like it, appear to be a immune from sanction. Because nobody is held accountable either at a corporate level or individually, that we needed to have somebody who had the ability to be able to ensure that the City of Shreveport could effectively address and deal with these giants. So in that regard, Calvin Grigsby is kinda like our version of (inaudible) that's put us in a position to have Shreveport that is not too big to fail, that is not someone who would have its debt and obligations and considerations forgiven, but it had to deal with the challenges that we're facing, and to do so in a way that allowed us to be able to protect the interest of this city. And I believe we've done it. The work that you have seen detailed done by Mr. Grigsby, points that out. We managed to be able to attract the city from some of the worst types of financial obligations that any city would ever want to find itself in. It's been reported that we have on a per capita basis, the highest number of credits default swaps of any city in the United States of America. And when you think about what's happened in Jefferson County, Alabama, which is around Birmingham and what's happened in places like Detroit, Michigan and when you look at other municipalities that face some of the challenges to know that we were on a per capita basis, higher than those communities, that was quite troubling. But we managed to be able to work our way through those things, to do some (inaudible) fashion that by the time myself and Councilman Oliver Jenkins were in New York City, I believe in the office of 2011, Mr. Webb, not only did we end up seeing us maintain our A+ bond rating, but we also had the management factors that the City of Shreveport upgraded. And those management practices were specifically upgraded from standard to good based upon the identified body of work that this city, this administration along with the previous Council, and this Council engaged in. But we did so under the leadership and direction of Mr. Calvin Grigsby. Now there's been as recently as yesterday some additional effort to challenge the credibility of Mr. Grigsby, and I want to deal with a couple of those Mr. Shyne as we wrap up here if you don't mind.

Councilman Shyne: Please Mr. Mayor. I don't mean any harm, but you've been talking for about 25, well about 30 minutes so, and I believe Mr. Thompson says that the rule says that we have is 10 minutes. Could we give you three more minutes?

Mayor Glover: Absolutely Mr. Shyne. And if I thought taking one could convince you to vote for it, I'd only take one.

Councilman O. Jenkins: I was going to stop him if he got to Dr. Seuss. I had seen that recently and I was less impressed. Appreciate that.

Mayor Glover: But the truth of the matter of it Mr. Shyne is that there have been assertions made that just simply I think warrant some response. 1) The reference to Mr. Grigsby's status with (inaudible), one of the financial oversight agency or what have you. An accreditation that Mr. Grigsby maintain while he still was engaged in the underwriting aspects of the municipal finance business. When Mr. Grigsby decided that he was longer engaged in underwriting, but specifically directed his efforts to financial advisor as both financial advising and underwriting, he no longer was required to maintain that (inaudible) designation and allowed it to go away. And so, there was no (inaudible) where there was no good standing or anything that has to do with any of his actions. It was simply a career decision on his part. 2) Mr. Grigsby informs me and staff that when it

comes to his registration with the State of Louisiana and the Secretary of State's office, he has been registered with the state since 1987 and has been so continually. And that whatever issues there are minor in nature and will absolutely hopefully be addressed and resolved. The last thing that I believe warrants the most direct comment and attention is the fact that I think at some point back in the 1990s, Mr. Grigsby was twice invited by his (inaudible) for allegations that he denied. Rather than plea or accept or in any way try and indicate that he had in fact was guilty of what he was accused of, Mr. Grigsby fought those charges. Did so in open court and on both occasions, was victorious. Something that is quite rare when you understand the federal government has a (inaudible) rate of allowing 97% when it comes to prosecutor of criminal cases against individuals. And so, that particular set of circumstances is one that is based on (inaudible) should be resolved and settled. The truth of the matter is though Mr. Grigsby felt that he had been affectively wronged based upon those allegations Mr. Shyne and Council Members and chose to pursue action against Miami Dade County in Florida for the basis of those circumstance. And as I understand it, that particular lawsuit that he filed against Miami Dade County for allegations that read to those indictments that he was ultimately proven to be not guilty of. Recently, I believe in 2012 resulted in a settlement between him and Miami Dade County of somewhere around $500,000 in damages paid to him to settle. And so you have a situation where 1) Certainly has done outstanding work, and has served the city well, has been able to indicate that based upon all the reviews, evaluations and critiques. 2) Did so against forces and circumstances that I believe you need somebody who can be independent of those Wall Street Journalists who come in with their smooth songs to mayors and councils and what have you. about what they can do. But ultimately, often times as we have seen with other cases, left folks in very bad circumstances. So he's provided outstanding service, and then lastly, to be challenged and accused of wrong doing, to stand up to that, to face those charges affectively refute them, and then also seek redress because of the wrong that you think has been done to you and to prevail in that to the tune of a half million dollars, is an indication of someone who obviously knows how to fight for what they believe to be right. And that ultimately represents why it is that we have worked with Calvin, believe he has done and served this city well and is the individual that is best positioned as we go into 2014 to help us deal with a myriad of issues that are before this city from a financial standpoint. And that why we believe it would be detrimental to the city's interest to try and bring someone else into this process at this particular point and time with these circumstances before us, especially when you have an offer that's before you like this one, that has already placed those dollars there, makes them available, keeps us from having to have more lawyers retained, more lawsuits, more dates in court and what have you, and that says that if we lose the arbitration, then he gets to keep his money. If we win the arbitration of the City of Shreveport, then the City of Shreveport gets to keep the $53,000. But it's there, it's available, it's set aside, it's unequivocal and represents what we hope is an opportunity to be able to see some movement and some resolution of this.

Councilman Shyne: Thank you Mr. Mayor, I call for the vote.

Councilwoman McCulloch: So moved.

Motion failed by the following vote: Nays: Councilmen Everson, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne , and S. Jenkins. 6. Ayes: Councilman McCulloch. 1.
Out of the Chamber: 0. Absent: 0. Abstentions: 0.

RESOLUTION NO. 215 OF 2013

A RESOLUTION TO RECOGNIZE THE SHREVEPORT COUNCIL OF NEIGHBORHOODS AS AN OFFICIAL ORGANIZATION OF REPRESENTATIVES OF

THE SHREVEPORT COMMUNITY AND A RESOURCE TO THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT ADMINISTRATION AND CITY COUNCIL AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO
BY: COUNCILWOMAN ROSE WILSON-MCCULLOCH
WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport, Metropolitan Planning Commission, and Shreveport -Caddo Master Plan Committee have joined efforts to bring together a Council of Neighborhoods for Shreveport, Caddo Parish, to provide a forum for our neighborhoods and community stakeholders to share information, concerns, and ideas and to facilitate communication between the community and government agencies; and
WHEREAS, the Shreveport Council of Neighborhoods is intended to be an autonomous organization made up of representatives from various neighborhood, home owner, and community organizations within the Shreveport city limits pursuant to their established standards and bylaws; and
WHEREAS, Great Expectations: Shreveport-Caddo 2030 Master Plan recommends a structured method for neighborhood associations, residents, and other stakeholders to be informed of forthcoming redevelopment and development projects.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular, and legal session convened, that the Shreveport City Council recognizes the Shreveport Council of Neighborhoods as an official organization of representatives of the Shreveport community.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Shreveport Council of Neighborhoods shall have use of Shreveport Public Assembly and Recreation Community Centers no more than one time per month at no cost for the purpose of official business.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that if any provision or item of this resolution or the application thereof is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions, items, or applications of this resolution which can be given effect without the invalid provisions, items or applications and to this end the provisions of this resolution are hereby declared severable.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that all resolutions or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman McCulloch, seconded by Councilman Everson to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 7. Nays: 0. Out of the Chamber: 0. Absent: 0. Abstentions: 0.

RESOLUTION NUMBER 217 OF 2013
A RESOLUTION DECLARING THE CITY'S INTEREST IN CERTAIN ADJUDICATED PROPERTIES AS SURPLUS AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.
WHEREAS, there are numerous parcels of property which have been adjudicated to the City of Shreveport for non-payment of ad valorem taxes; and
WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 26-300 of the Code of Ordinances, the city's interests in said properties can be sold after the City Council declares them to be surplus; and
WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport has an Adjudicated tax interest in the properties described in Attachment "A-11" for non-payment of City Property taxes; and

WHEREAS, the purchasing agent has inquired of all city departments regarding the properties described in Attachment "A-11" and has not received any indication that it is needed for City purposes.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened that the properties described in Attachment "A-11" are hereby declared surplus.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that pursuant to Section 26-301 of the Code of Ordinances, this declaration that these properties are surplus satisfies the requirement of Section 26-301 (1) (d), therefore the MAYOR, Cedric B. Glover, is authorized by said Section 26-301 to do any and all things and to sign any and all documents, including Acts of Cash Sale, in a form acceptable to the City Attorney, necessary to effectuate the purposes set forth herein.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that if any provision or item of this resolution or the application thereof is invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions, items or applications of this resolution which can be given effect without the invalid provisions, items, or applications, and to this end the provisions of this resolution are hereby declared severable.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that all ordinances or resolutions or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman S. Jenkins, seconded by Councilman Everson to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 7. Nays: 0. Out of the Chamber: 0. Absent: 0. Abstentions: 0.

RESOLUTION NO. 218 OF 2013

A RESOLUTION URGING AND REQUESTING THE SHREVEPORT METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION OF CADDO PARISH TO INCLUDE TWO MEMBERS OF THE SHREVEPORT CITY COUNCIL ON THE COMMITTEE RESPONSIBLE FOR INTERVIEWING AND SELECTING THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE SHREVEPORT METROPOLITAN PLANNING COMMISSION OF CADDO PARISH; AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO
BY: Councilman Everson
WHEREAS, RS 33:140.1 authorized the creation of the Metropolitan Planning Commission (MPC) to plan and to regulate orderly development of Shreveport and Caddo Parish: and
WHEREAS, the operating subsidy from the City of Shreveport provides most of the operating revenue for the MPC; and
WHEREAS, Charles Kirkland has announced his retirement as executive director of the MPC, and the MPC has begun the process of selecting the next executive director; and
WHEREAS, the selection of the next executive director will greatly influence, if not determine, the future course of land use planning in Shreveport; and
WHEREAS, the Shreveport City Council, whose members are elected by citizens of Shreveport, desires to participate in the selection of the next executive director of the MPC.
NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened, that it urges and requests the Shreveport Metropolitan Planning Commission of Caddo Parish to include two members of the Shreveport City Council as members of the committee that will interview candidates and select the next executive director of the Shreveport Metropolitan Planning Commission of Caddo Parish.

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

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

Mayor Glover: Mr. Chairman, could I get some discussion? Just some idea of background with regard to - - -?

Councilman Shyne: Just a minute Mr. Mayor, I don't mean any harm. But please, not that 35 or 40 minutes. If you stick to the rules, it says 10 minutes maximum, we would entertain that and I see the Commissioner at there has been looking at his watch, I don't know whether he has a plane to catch or what, but we don't want to hold him up any longer.

Commissioner Escude: I'll be brief

Mayor Glover: Well, Mr. Shyne, it was actually a question, so unless Mr. Everson takes 35 minutes, we should - - -

Councilman Everson: I assure you, I won't.

Councilman Shyne: I hope he doesn't, because if he takes 35 minutes, I'm going to cut him off.

Councilman Everson: This is a resolution notifying members. This is a request that they include members on the selection team. It reflects a resolution that was passed unanimously by the Caddo Parish Commission the other day, and in an effort to make sure the City's voice is represented on this committee as well. We're reflecting that request to have some members to be invited to serve on that committee.

Mayor Glover: That hadn't been done before? Is that a part of their standard operating procedures? When you say the 'City', Council representation doesn't translate into Administration representation even if we thought that this was something that was proper and appropriate. So I guess I'm just trying to understand the basis on which this is offered. Because it is my understanding that MPC is a separate entity created by the legislature and decisions about how they go about their personnel processes are already laid out.

Councilman Shyne: John, you want to come forward to say a word or two? Let's extend an invitation to John to come forward.

Councilman Everson: And we may have Julie, looks like she may have an answer.

Ms. Glass: Well no, Mr. Thompson and I were talking about it. I was not involved in drafting this and I really have not researched this. My understanding when I read it was of course that of course the Mayor makes appointments to - - - some of the appointments to the Planning Commission, but then under state statute, the Planning Commission appoints the executive director. So other than that, I didn't really have anything else to say.

Councilman Shyne: John, you want to say a word or two and then we'll go from there?

Commissioner Escude: (Caddo Parish Commission, District A) I worked with Ms. McCulloch and Mr. Everson along with Commissioner Landau on the Master Plan Implementation Committee for the last two or three years. And we were able to when we decided to hire the consultants for the UDC, we asked to be involved. The state's statute created enabling legislation that allowed the city and the parish to create the MPC, the way it's written, and it specifies that the

Council/Mayor makes certain appointments, the Commission makes certain and then we have joint appointment. And the Mayor is right, that they hire their own staff and choose their own members. But, the Parish as long with Ms. McCulloch and several Council Members have talked about/with, have decided that since we are/were jointly the creating the entity, authorizing them to do this, stood it up, and we are the funding entity, and we are the entities that appoint those members who are working really on our behalf, as an extension of us that we have a big dog in the hunt, because we have the skin in the game. And that the Director's position for this organization is very, very responsible in a huge way. The economic development and the growth and the growth and the myriad of things in this parish. And we thought that since we are the funding and creating entity, that we're respectively asking that we have a seat at the table, make sure that someone appropriate is chosen for this position. Cause the worst thing in the world that could happen is we have to continue to fund an entity that has someone who is not qualified for the job, or may be beholding to other people, but that's simple logic, and it's just a simple request. They can refuse it, but then you know I truly don't think that they will. Like I said, we are the source of funding, and the bodies that appoint those members. It's just a simple request to be part of the process as we were with the UDC. Thank you.

Councilman Shyne: Thank you John.

Mayor Glover: Mr. Chairman? I listen and hear pretty directly. That sounds as if what I just heard as if give us four folks to be on your selection committee or we're going to cut your funding off. To me, that sounds as if we're politicizing a body which ought to be as far removed from politics as it can be, when it comes to their deliberative decision making process. Cause when you take what you just said.

Commissioner Escude: I don't know if that's an exaggeration of what I just said or a bad interpretation of what I said. You know the state provided us, allowed us to create the entity, and those members that we appoint are appointed on our behalf. They act on our behalf. They're an extension of both bodies. And it's important that we select good members. It's also important I think, the Director be vetted by members of this body as well as the Commission. That's the Commission's position, and we passed it unanimously. I don't think it's too much to ask. We're not trying to hijack the process, we're just asking to be a part of the process. And there was no threat made, no threat intended. I was just simply expressing to you what the law provided for when the state provided the enabling legislation. So, if you read anymore into it than that, I'm sorry, it's not the case.

Councilman Everson: And the nature of the way it is written, it is not forcing us or anything, it's just a request.

Councilwoman McCulloch: To come to the table.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Could I ask a question?

Councilman Shyne: And John, knowing you as well as I do, I don't think you'd try to hijack anything.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Okay, I'm just trying to get some clarity on a couple of things. 1) Who would appoint these two members?

Councilman Everson: I believe the Council Chair.

Councilman S. Jenkins: So, the Chairman of the Council would appoint two Council Members? And what is the total number of members that will be on the whole committee, that's going to be in this process? Do we know how many?

Councilman Everson: I believe two from the Council, two from the Commission, and the membership of the full MPC, however many members that is. Is it seven?

Commissioner Escude: I believe that the MPC Board has a search committee of three or four members who would be in addition to that. Just like we were for the UDC Consultant study. And as a matter of record, when they were selected, that passed unanimously by everybody. So - - -

Mayor Glover: Who? Voting members of a search committee? So you take two Commissioners, two Council Members, add that to three MPC members and that would be your seven member search committee? With four of the seven members coming between the Commission and the Council?

Councilman Everson: Is it three members for sure? Do we know?

Commissioner Escude: Oh, I don't know, you could ask Stephen. I have no idea what their committee member number is.

Councilman Everson: I think that's their determination.

Commissioner Escude: They can expand it if they want. They can make it - - - hey, as I said, the process is not intended to be hijacked, and it wasn't when we did the UDC study. The ultimate selection was unanimous. And they were graded blind, 1, 2, 3, in order of priority, and the one that got it, had everybody's first (inaudible) vote. We worked very, very hard with the implementation, the Master Plan, and the UDC study and everything else. And we continue to be involved. That's all.

Mayor Glover: Mr. Chairman, I would just offer this. The history of appropriation separation between the operations and the function of the MPC, and the Council and the Commission and the Mayor's office, I think has had some proper parameters and boundaries around it. This to me sounds as if we're starting to encroach upon that. We already had a situations where the decisions of that body end up being appealed to the Council and the Commissioner respectively. It sounds to me as if we've created a set of circumstances where simply the next step is to appoint some commissioners and some council members to MPC itself, so you guys can help make a decision before it ends up being appealed to the council. So,

Councilman O. Jenkins: Let me say this and I'm probably a little late to the game and I have heard about this before but I will say this. There's two members of the commission on there, and no offense to John, who he and I are friends, I certainly want two council members on there. Now I wouldn't want a scenario where we have two commission members, three people from the MPC and no City Council representative.

Mayor Glover: Well my recommendation to MPC is that they reject the request. But to follow your logic, if there's two members of the MPC, two members of the Council, then there ought to be some representation from the Administration as well, which is where all of us ought to take a step back and honor and recognize - - -

Councilman O. Jenkins: I got it, I got it. I missed the - - -

Councilman Shyne: Yeah.

Councilman O. Jenkins: I missed the underlying thing, sorry.

Councilman S. Jenkins: How many people on the committee? On the entire committee?

Councilman Shyne: Stephen, you want to come up and see if you can clear up a little bit of this, it's gotten so boggy.

Mr. Stephen Jean: The MPC appointed a search committee of four.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Four. So that would be some additional - - - if we pass this, it will be an additional four.

Mr. Stephen Jean: What you have right now, is a request. What would have to happen at this point, is the MPC would have to consider whether or not they would consider this request, and then they would have to vote on it.

Councilman S. Jenkins: So, ultimately than can - - -

Councilwoman McCulloch: Reject.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Make a decision and - - -

Mr. Jean: Well, as I read the language, it says urge and request. So, they could decide not to move forward with it. But that's going to be a decision of that nine member board, which is only eight persons currently, because we had a recent retirement.

Councilman Shyne: Why don't we vote on it at this particular point, and we leave it up to them. John, we appreciate you coming down here. All in favor, vote 'Yes', opposes, 'No'.

Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 7. Nays: 0. Out of the Chamber: 0. Absent: 0. Abstentions: 0.

RESOLUTION NO. 219 OF 2013

A RESOLUTION SUSPENDING CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF CHAPTER 10 RELATIVE TO ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES ON March 2, 2014 RELATIVE TO DISPENSING, SALE AND/OR CONSUMPTION OF ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES AT 4041 FERN AVENUE FOR MARILYNN'S PLACE, MARDI GRAS CELEBRATION AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BY: COUNCILMAN Oliver Jenkins

WHEREAS, Marilynn's Place located at 4041 Fern Avenue will host a Mardi Gras Celebration on March 2, 2014 between the hours of 3:00 p.m. and 10:00 p.m.; and

WHEREAS, the establishment desires to dispense, and allow the consumption and sale of alcoholic beverages on the parking lot of the establishment, between the hours of 3:00 p.m. – 10:00 p.m.; and

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

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

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

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

WHEREAS, the adoption of this resolution would allow the dispensing, sale and consumption of alcoholic beverages on the parking lot of Marilynn's Place, 4041 Fern Avenue, on March 2, 2014 for a Mardi Gras Celebration.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened Sections 106-130(6), 10- 103(a)(5) 10-80(a) and 10-172 are hereby suspended on March 2, 2014 for a Mardi Gras Celebration, between the hours of 3:00 p.m. - 10:00 p.m., at Marilynn's Place, 4041 Fern Avenue.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that all other applicable provisions of the City of Shreveport Code of Ordinances shall remain in full force and effect. **BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that if any provision or item of this resolution or the application thereof is held invalid, such invalidity

shall not affect other provisions, items or applications of this resolution which can be given effect without the invalid provisions, items or application, and to this end, the provisions of this resolution are hereby declared severable.
BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that all resolutions or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman O. Jenkins, seconded by Councilman Corbin to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 7. Nays: 0. Out of the Chamber: 0. Absent: 0. Abstentions: 0.

Introduction of Resolutions *(Not to be adopted prior to January 14, 2014*)
The Clerk read the following:

1. **Resolution No. 220 of 2013**: A resolution authorizing the execution of a cooperative endeavor agreement with the Red River Waterway District and the Shreveport Dog Park Alliance relative to the construction and maintenance of a dog park on land adjacent to the Red River in Shreveport; and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Everson, seconded by Councilman McCulloch to introduce Resolution No. 220 of 2013 to lay over until the next regular meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 7. Nays: 0. Out of the Chamber: 0. Absent: 0. Abstentions: 0.

Introduction of Ordinances (*Not to be adopted prior to January 14, 2014*)
The Clerk read the following:

1. **Ordinance No. 163 of 2013**: An ordinance declaring the city's intention to acquire full ownership of certain adjudicated properties for the Ledbetter Heights Land Banking Project and otherwise providing with respect thereto. (B/Everson)

3. **Ordinance No. 165 of 2013**: **ZONING - C-83-13**: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City Of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the north side of Kirby Place 200 feet east of Creswell Avenue, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, LA**,** be and the same is hereby changed **from R-1H, Urban, One Family Residence District to R-1H-E, Urban, One Family Residence/Extended Use District limited to "temporary housing for nine veterans limited to approximately 18 months"** only, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (B/Everson)

Councilman Everson: I'd like to make a motion to introduce Ordinance No(s). 163 and 165.
Councilwoman McCulloch: Second.
Councilman Webb: I would like to make a motion to introduce Ordinance No. 164, and to also table.
Councilwoman McCulloch: Second.
Councilman Shyne: Okay, lets vote on what you say, 160 - - -
Mr. Thompson: 163 and 165.
Councilman Shyne: 163 and 165, and then we'll come to 164.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Everson, seconded by Councilman McCulloch to introduce Ordinance No(s). 163 and 165 of 2013 to lay over until the next regular meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 7. Nays: 0. Out of the Chamber: 0. Absent: 0. Abstentions: 0.

2. **Ordinance No. 164 of 2013**: Repealing Ordinance Number 149 of 2013, and Chapter 39 of the Code of Ordinances titled Human Relations which said Ordinance enacted, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (E/Webb)

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Webb, seconded by Councilman McCulloch to introduce and table Ordinance No(s). of 2013.

Councilman Webb: And I would respectfully request the Council grant me this, to be introduced. I intend to lay it over. It's not going to be a vote in two weeks. I've never known the Council not to allow a Council Member to introduce an ordinance, I don't know why the Council is afraid to vote on this again. But it's not going to be a vote on this in two weeks, and I would like to put it on as an introduction, and I'd also ask that to be tabled.

Councilwoman McCulloch: I have a question. So we can vote on both of 'em at the same time? I mean to introduce and table? They don't have to be done individually?

Mr. Thompson: If there is no objection.

Councilwoman McCulloch: Actually I was seconding to table. I was putting a second out there to table it.

Councilman Webb: It would be introduced and tabled.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Listen I do agree with offering Councilman Webb the opportunity to introduce legislation. We have over the course of this Council, always offered people that opportunity. And so I would hate to treat this any different than anything else. There is a significant amount of support. On the other hand, I have to say I'm not in favor of tabling it. Cause I don't want this to be the - - - I don't want to use the Mayor's example, 'The Dog Park' of 2014. I'm not interested in rehashing issues where we have 6-1 votes over and over again. That is so, I'm- - - I will support you on the introduction, but that is my only vote of support at this point. I am not in support of tabling it.

Councilman Webb: Well we can rehash it every two weeks if you want, or you can just give me one more opportunity, and that's all I'm asking for.

Councilman O. Jenkins: So, I will second his motion.

Mr. Thompson: Now the motion as I understand it is to introduce and table.

Councilman Corbin: I'd offer a substitute motion to introduce only.

Councilman O. Jenkins: And I will second that.

Substitute motion by Councilman Corbin, seconded by Councilman O. Jenkins to introduce and table Ordinance No(s). of 2013 to lay over until the next regular meeting.

Councilman Webb: So what are we voting on first Mr. Chairman?

Mr. Thompson: To introduce only, the substitute motion.

Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 6. Nays: Councilman Webb. 1. Out of the Chamber: 0. Absent: 0. Abstentions: 0.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Mr. Chairman, I know we voted on it. I do want to say I'm one of the co-authors of that legislation that we passed. Wants to afford that courtesy and I think we should afford that courtesy. I just wanted to speak to that, it's a very uncomfortable vote. And I certainly hope it doesn't send the wrong message to the public about a decision that we previously made. You know I've often said that we should give the appearance when we make up our minds about something, we've made up our minds about it and sometimes there can be some situations where there is new information and different things like that. But I don't know of anything new that's going to come forward as it relates to the decision that we made. So hopefully we don't appear to be double minded and hopefully the matter will be addressed the next time it comes up. And I just wanted to put that out there on my own behalf.

Councilman O. Jenkins: If I may, I think there are many of us that feel likewise.

Councilwoman McCulloch: I too am supporting the introduction, but - - - and I understand somewhat where Councilman Webb is. That in reviewing comments to let's just say comments from the public, the one thing that I had to agree with being a child of God is the one thing, the one comment that stuck out the most with me was that we should love our neighbors as we love ourselves. And so we don't really choose our neighbors. I mean I understand where you are, and with that being said, we are to love our neighbors as we love ourselves.

Councilman Webb: That's what the Bible instructs us to do.

Councilwoman McCulloch: And we don't choose who we love because of choices that they make. And so I just wanted to kinda throw that out there, and ask that this Council sleep and rest on that. Thank you so kindly.

Councilman Everson: Well then I would add as well, that I think that your concerns are valid, but I think that the people in the viewing audience, I think probably understand and I hope that that shows that side, but as a procedural move, this is what we have to do to move forward to stay consistent with the decision that we made at our last meeting.

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

Mr. Thompson: However, of the two ordinances that we have remaining, both of them need to be postponed because we didn't have enough time between the time that they were introduced and today to adopt them.

1. **Ordinance No. 161 of 2013**: An ordinance amending the 2013 Capital Improvements Budget, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. *(Noise Compatibility Plan Study Update) (Not to be adopted prior to January 14, 2014*)

2. **Ordinance No. 162 of 2013**: An ordinance amending Section 66-151 if the Code of Ordinances relative to sick leave donations and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. *(Not to be adopted prior to January 14, 2014*)

Motion by Councilman O. Jenkins, seconded by Councilman Corbin to postpone until the next regular meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen

McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 7. Nays: 0. Out of the Chamber: 0. Absent: 0. Abstentions: 0.

Mr. Sibley: Just one question. I know previously Councilman O. Jenkins had asked that we have Ms. Jackson here to talk specifically about 162. Did you want to go ahead and do that today? She's been waiting patiently. She really should be down getting ready for the leadership graduation.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Okay, well then, I would have been happy to entertain her earlier if that was the case.

Mr. Sibley: I think she can very briefly encapsulate what's going on with it.

Councilman Shyne: Ms. Jackson, blame that on the CAO for not letting us know, because you know we always do whatever he tells us to do.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Blame it on me since most everybody else blames everything on me up here.

Councilman Shyne: Okay, blame it on Oliver then.

Ms. Jackson: I'll be very brief. Just to give a little bit of background regarding the sick leave donation, with this ordinance currently, (inaudible) receive as much sick leave donation as possible. There is no limit on it. This ordinance will limit or cap sick leave donation to one employee to 480 hours or 12 weeks, and it's the same thing for FMLA. The purpose of it is that previous inconsistency. We have administrative policies among managers as well as the department. I hate to use the word 'abuse' but also hopefully there will be no excessive use of sick leave donation as well. And that's pretty much the nuts and bolts on the ordinance.

Councilman Shyne: Jeff, we could have gotten that in the beginning. We didn't know that.

Councilman Corbin: So if I have exhausted all of my sick leave and I'm on a long medical issue. Then other employees can give me up to that amount of time?

Ms. Jackson: yes.

Councilman Corbin: And it could be multiple employees, or it can be one employee?

Ms. Jackson: No, yes. Either way. As long as they maintain 160 hours in their own account.

Councilman Corbin: But I have to have depleted all of my - - -

Ms. Jackson: It's only after you have exhausted your leave. So they will have already used 12 weeks or 10 weeks. And then after that's exhausted, then they start using the 12 weeks from the sick leave donation. So it's an additional benefit to the employee. And currently they can use their leave, which may be two or three months, and then add unlimited number of use from their donors to their leave as well. Some up to a year or more.

Mr. Sibley: And Mr. Chairman, this is (inaudible) unintended consequences. This was a change that was done, we'd asked for previously from the previous Council, because people were limited to what they could get. Well we went to the extreme and opened it all the way up, then we found out that's a little too broad, we need to bring it back, and I'll also note this is in accordance with the collective bargaining agreement.

Councilman O. Jenkins: That was my next question. Is this in coordination with that?

Mr. Sibley: Yes and it's consistent with FMLA, so we thought that would be very reasonable and consistent number.

Ms. Jackson: Thank you, and we hope to see you all tonight at the 6:30 at the graduation. Thank you all.

Councilman Shyne: If Dale would let us get out.

The Adopted ordinances and amendments follow:

ORDINANCE NO. 156 OF 2013

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 106 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES, THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT ZONING ORDINANCE, BY REZONING PROPERTY LOCATED ON THE SW CORNER OF EMERY STREET AND HEARNE AVENUE, SHREVEPORT, CADDO PARISH, LA, FROM R-2, SUBURBAN MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO B-2, NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS DISTRICT AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO

SECTION I: BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, LA, in due, legal and regular session convened, that the zoning classification of Lots 3 & 4, & the west 38 feet of Lot 2, Block 3, Ingleside Subdivision, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, LA, property located on the SW corner of Emery Street and Hearne Avenue, be and the same is hereby changed from R-2, Suburban Multi-Family Residence District to B-2, Neighborhood Business District.

SECTION II: THAT the rezoning of the property described herein is subject to compliance with the following stipulation:

1. Development of the property shall be in substantial accord with the revised site plan submitted at the November 6, 2013 public hearing, with any significant changes or additions requiring further review and approval by the Planning Commission.
2. A detailed storm water plan with calculations shall be submitted to and approved by the City Engineer prior to the issuance of permits.
3. Site shall be re-platted into one lot prior to the issuance of any permits.

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

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

Tabled Legislation.

1. **Ordinance No. 170 of 2012**: Amending and reenacting portions of Chapter 90 of the Code of Ordinances relative to Residential Parking Permit Zones, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto *(Tabled December 11, 2012)*

2. **Ordinance No. 89 of 2011** Amending and reenacting Chapter 74 of the Code of Ordinances relative to Solid Waste Collections, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto (G/S. Jenkins) *(Tabled August 13, 2013)*

3. **Ordinance No. 90 of 2013**: Amending and reenacting Section 102-47 of the Code of Ordinances relative to insurance required for Vehicles for Hire and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (F/Shyne) *(Tabled August 27, 2013)*

4. **Ordinance No. 96 of 2013**: An ordinance amending and reenact Chapter 14 of the Code of Ordinances by adding Article V relative to fowl and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (F/Shyne) *(Tabled September 10, 2013)*

Appeals

Property Standards Appeals

PSD1000086 2837 Logan Street, Shreveport, LA (G/S. Jenkins) Ms. Carolyn Ivory Wilson, 3646 Del Rio Street, Shreveport, LA 71109 (G/Jenkins) *(Postponed September 23, 2013 until December 20, 2013)*

Ms. Farnell: Good afternoon, we have two appeals. The first one is in Councilman Sam Jenkins' district. It is for 2837 Logan Street. The owners are present. And we requested certain things be done, (inaudible), they've had 90 days. The person who was actually working on the house had a heart attack last month, and because of that, it's caused a delay. They are here requesting for more time. And they're asking for an additional 90 days. She is here if you would like to ask her any questions.

Councilman S. Jenkins: How do you feel about that?

Ms. Farnell: Considering everything that they've shown me, I'm okay with it. As I told here, we've given her several things that she must do within that 90 days and they've assured us that they would.

Councilman S. Jenkins: I must say to my fellow Council Members, these ladies stay in constant contact with me.

Councilman O. Jenkins: I'll second that.

Motion by Councilman <u>S. Jenkins</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>O. Jenkins</u> to postpone until March 24, 2014. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, O. Jenkins, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 5. Nays: Councilmen Everson and Corbin. 2. Out of the Chamber: 0. Absent: 0. Abstentions: 0.

PSD1000141 728 Austin Pl, Shreveport, LA (B/Everson) Ms. Deborah Bryant, 9640 Tammy, Shreveport, LA 71106 (Caddo Parish) *(Postponed December 9, 2013 until February 24, 2014)*

PSD1300151: 3015 Catherine St., Shreveport, LA (A/McCulloch) Mr. Larry Davenport, 2245 Soda Lake Circle, Shreveport, LA 71107 *(Postponed November 25, 2013 until January 13, 2014)*

PSD 1300082 5918 Attaway Street, Shreveport, LA (F/Shyne) Mr. Jerome Fields, 5954 Attaway Street, Shreveport, LA 71108 (F/Shyne) *(Postponed October 21, 2013 until December 20, 2013)*

Councilman Shyne: Dorothy, did you and Mr. Fields? Did you all get together?

Ms. Farnell: Yes sir, that's the next case.

Councilman Shyne: Okay, what did y'all decide on?

Ms. Farnell: Yes sir, we did come to an agreement. I met with him and I requested that he accomplish certain things with the house like completing the siding. He'd already bought the material.

Councilman Shyne: Is he still here?

Ms. Farnell: He probably left. He's a truck driver and had just gotten in this morning, hadn't had any sleep. So I think he must have already left. But I did agree with him on that.

Councilman Shyne: How much time do you think - - -

Ms. Farnell: We're looking at 45 days.

Councilman Shyne: Okay, so moved.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Second.

Motion by Councilman <u>Shyne</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>S. Jenkins</u> to postpone until February 10, 2014. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, O. Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and S. Jenkins. 7. Nays: 0. Out of the Chamber: 0. Absent: 0. Abstentions: 0.

PSD 1300135 795 W. 70TH Street, Shreveport, LA (F/Shyne) Mr. Liaqat Ali, 550 Atkins Avenue, Shreveport, LA 71104 (B/Everson) *(Postponed November 11, 2013 until January 13, 2014)*

PSD1300218 360 E. 68th Street, Shreveport, LA (C/O. Jenkins) Mr. Daniel Southern, 368 E. 68th Street, Shreveport, LA 71106 (C/O. Jenkins) *(Postponed November 25, 2013 until February 24, 2014)*

PSD1300137 1447 Hollywood Avenue, Shreveport, LA (F/Shyne) Ms. Mary Dickens, 6004 Fox Ridge, Shreveport, LA 71129 (G/S. Jenkins) *(Postponed November 25, 2013 until January 27, 2014)*

PSD130017 276 Wall Street, Shreveport, LA (B/Everson) Mr. Jarrod C. Hammonds, 2714 Phelps Road, Shreveport, LA 71107 (A/McCulloch) *(Postponed December 9, 2013 until January 13, 2013)*

PSG1300472 3649 Darien Street, Shreveport, LA (G/S. Jenkins) Mr. Kevin Belcher, P.O. Box 3313, Shreveport, LA 71133 *(Postponed December 9, 2013 until January 13, 2013)*

Councilman Shyne: Thank you Ms. Dorothy, okay.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, we're now under Reports from Officers, Boards and Committees.

Alcoholic Beverage Ordinance Appeals
Metropolitan Planning Commission Appeals and Zoning Board of Appeals
Other Appeals
Taxi Appeal
Reports from officers, boards, and committees

Councilman Shyne: Oliver, I think you might be disappointed again. The Clerk does not have a report.

Mr. Thompson: But we're under Officers, Boards and Committees.

Councilman O. Jenkins: I mean I'm glad to know you don't have a report. If I had Board or Committee Meeting, I'd be short, but - - -

Councilman Shyne: We just started with you first, that's all. Any reports from any Council Members? Okay, Mr. Thompson.

Clerk's Report

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I'm not aware of any Clerk's report.
Councilman S. Jenkins: You got to wait until your term comes up.

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

Adjournment: There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting adjourned at approximately5:49 p.m.

_____
//s// Joe Shyne, Chairman

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

Merry Christmas
and
Happy New Year