



Council Proceedings of the City of Shreveport, Louisiana

December 28, 2010

The regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana was called to order by Chairman Oliver Jenkins at 3:05 p.m., Tuesday, December 28, 2010, in the Government Chambers in Government Plaza (505 Travis Street).

Invocation was given by Councilman Webb.

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Councilman S. Jenkins.

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

Awards, Recognition of Distinguished Guests, and Communications of the Mayor which are required by law.

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

Councilman O. Jenkins: Mayor Glover, do you have any awards, recognitions, or distinguished guests?

Mayor Glover: We have no awards, or recognitions Mr. Chair, but as usual, anyone who would take any time to come and visit with us here this afternoon, we consider them to be special guests. I know we have a distinguished group of ladies here, that I'm not quite sure. I know Ms. Joyce Madden and some of the others. I'm going to stop calling names, because if I don't call all of them, I'm sure I will offend. So, I want to stop there. We are certainly delighted to see them here, honored with their presence and hope that all had a wonderful Christmas, Hanukah, holiday season, and wish all a very wonderful, safe, and prosperous new year.

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

Councilman O. Jenkins: Do any Council Members have any awards, recognitions, or distinguished guests?

Councilman Shyne: Mr. Chairman, I have a resolution that will be coming up. I haven't had a chance to talk to the Mayor, he's - - - I've been out of town and you know how busy he's been, so it's pertaining to a vote that's coming up.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Okay, and you're going to add that as New Business, or would you like to - - -

Councilman Shyne: When you get to that point, we will add that on as New Business, and Mr. Thompson, we're going to do one reading?

Mr. Thompson: Correct.

Councilman Shyne: And Mr. Chairman, if it's the pleasure of the Council, when we add it on, if it's alright with the Council, we'll just go head on and read it and present it to the family whose that's here, and they might have some more Christmas shopping that they want to do.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Okay, fantastic. Remind us when we get to that in case we move past that. And actually, just because I'd like to recognize Calvin Austin, because last time, I forgot to recognize him, and so this time, I want to make sure that I do. And I didn't want the Mayor to steal my thunder this time. So welcome today. Mayor Glover, do you have any communications relative to City Business at this time?

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

Mayor Glover: Mr. Chairman, yes we do. We have the presentation regarding the garbage collection fees that have been requested from the Council, we've got a series of questions posed by yourself and I believe other members as well as some other additional information that we thought appropriate to add in. And if you and the rest of the Council are agreeable, we will present that at this time.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Okay, and before we go to that, I have omitted something, and we need to make a motion to approve the minutes of the Administrative Conference - - -

Councilman Shyne: So moved Mr. Chairman.

Ms. McCulloch: Second.

Motion by Councilman Shyne, seconded by Councilman McCulloch to approve the minutes of the Administrative Conference, Monday, December 13, 2010 and Council Meeting, Tuesday, December 14, 2010. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes:

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

Councilman S. Jenkins: Thank you Mr. Chairman, I believe I see State Representative Barbara Norton here today, and I'd certainly like to recognize her presence here today, and commend her on the find job she's doing, not only as one of our state legislators, but I know she's getting ready for the big day, the big parade day, that's going to be coming up and I'm hoping that at some point, maybe she'll come down and tell us a little bit about it, so everybody down here at the City will know and support the effort that she's been behind for many, many years. At this time, I just wanted to recognize that she was here, our Representative Norton and appreciate seeing you. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Okay, Mr. Mayor, you all may proceed with your reports.

Mayor Glover: Mr. Chairman, I think we are awaiting the delivery of the hard copies of that report. We would ask that if you would, to go ahead and allow us to come back, we want to make sure that you all have an actual hard copy in front of you as we go through our presentation, they're being prepared upstairs.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Okay, and then with that being said, Mr. Sibley if you have a revenue collection plan, you can start with that, and we'll go through the rest of the reports and see where we are.

Reports:

Property Standards Report: None.

Revenue Collection Plan & Implementation Report

Mr. Sibley: Thank you Mr. Chair, we'll do that. Just a note, the folder that you've been given goes with the garbage report. Those are copies of the contracts on the intergovernmental agreement between The City of Shreveport and Bossier as well as the plat agreement that the Council requested. And once we get the hard copies of the questions and answers we'll add that to it, and you'll have all the information that we have. At this time, Mr. Chairman, if it's okay, I'd like to call Mr. Madden, the Finance Director to come forward. What we've prepared for you today, what we'd like to do in January to provide for you a written overview of all the collection processes and procedures of the City. For today, I've asked Mr. Madden to give an update on a year to date snapshot of kinda where we are in certain categories, so that you'll have an idea of how 2010 is going. And some projections into 2011. And so Mr. Madden if you would at this time.

Mr. Madden: What's been handed out to you is the different types of licenses and fees that we collect there in the Revenue Department showing what was budgeted last year, and what we collected and budgeted for 2010 and 11, and where we are for all those fees this year. So, it's all pretty explanatory except for the chain stores. Chain stores was kinda

dropping because of the different companies that operate chains or learning that they can record each one of the individually and save a little bit of money, so they're doing it that way. So the chain store amount is going down, but the occupational license is going up a little bit on those, which is why that number is dropping.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Can you explain that for those of us, I'll say for me, who doesn't exactly understand how that revenue source comes in? So they pay a certain fee as a chain as opposed to individual?

Mr. Madden: Right, they pay a fee for the stores, and then there's an additional amount for each additional location that operates under the same Tax ID number, on the same occupational license number. So what they're doing now is they're numbering like you'll see when you go to Walgreens, it'll say Store 520 or 5120, and that's how each one of them are recorded with us now, so they're individual licenses, instead of being - - -

Councilman O. Jenkins: Under one umbrella.

Mr. Madden: Right.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Okay.

Mr. Madden: That's the reason that number is dropping. And the bottom part there shows where we are in our tax collections so far this year. We billed \$60,000 worth of property tax. We've collected \$22,000 of it, and we're going to get probably another \$20-30,000 this week and the next few days coming in.

Councilman Shyne: That's what Christmas will do for you Mr. Chairman.

Councilman O. Jenkins: I was having a little trouble with my numbers right there. So, okay. And so the overall percentage of increase in revenue for 2010 over budget is roughly how much?

Mr. Madden: I didn't total that number out, but on property tax or overall?

Councilman O. Jenkins: Overall I guess would be most meaningful at this point.

Mr. Madden: Okay, the biggest - - - unfortunately, the biggest change I think I had some percents on here earlier and I took 'em off. The biggest increases were like in liquor license, and in the life insurance, but those are in small numbers, so overall the overall increase is only a couple percents different, but in those, it's like 60% increase the liquor license, but it's a small percent of the total overall number.

Mr. Sibley: So if I may, Mr. Chairman the items that are listed here are sort of a partial snapshot of revenue. We do have the actual numbers for the total revenue picture that we use during the process, and we have those percentages calculated, and if you would allow,

we can present those at the next council meeting, because we have those percentages as I recall, we were somewhere around 4 ½ - 5% increase of what was actually collected in '09 versus what we ended up with in 2010, which we thought was very good. And if I recall, I think we needed something like a 3 ½ % increase in sales tax, for example to break even and we've exceeded that. So we can present those total numbers so that you have a better idea as to how we've done overall in 2010-2011 as opposed to 2009.

Mr. Madden: (Inaudible) because we don't actually collect it here, it's collected by the Commission, and we're up I think 4.5% or 5.4% for the year over last year on sales tax.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Okay, thank you.

Mr. Sibley: Mr. Chairman, at this time, we do have our hard copies on the questions regarding the garbage fee and landfill questions. As I discussed with you earlier, what we basically did was took the listings of questions submitted by the Council and we appreciate them. These were the type questions that you were getting from the citizens out there. We've prepared some short answers here just to give you a snapshot. We also have Fred Williams here from Solid Waste, we have Ron Norwood from DOS available to supplement any information that you all have, so Mr. Chair, if you'd like I think perhaps the best way to do may be just to start with the questions and walk through the answers unless there are some specific questions that the Council would like to highlight as you go through that explanation.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Yes, why don't we do that and then for the record, and for those that are listening somewhere else, it'll at least give them the opportunity to hear some of those questions. Is it possible to put this on the screen for those that are here today? And fully intend at the conclusion, for those that came down here to discuss it publicly the opportunity to come forward at the end of the report and ask any additional questions that they may have.

Mr. Sibley: If Mr. Williams will come forward, he's trying to hide back there.

Councilman Shyne: Mr. Chairman, I just found out that, and I want this on TV, that Mr. Williams said that he would be ready to lead the city when I left.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Oh my goodness.

Mr. Sibley: I know it's kinda of difficult to read. Mr. Chairman and members of the Council, what we did was put the questions and tried to provide answers that would be kinda straight forward, common sense answers. We thought that one of the first questions was I think most of the citizens know that the City of Shreveport picks up garbage for the City of Bossier, and there are several questions regarding the relationship and the nature of the contract between ourselves and Bossier City as I indicated in the package that you have is a copy of that agreement, and if I'm not mistaken, I'm not sure of the exact date, but that agreement will be for renewal soon, and there'll be things we'll talk about in terms of

how that agreement was initially done, and some thoughts on how we think that agreement perhaps should be done differently this time. For example, one of the base questions that you have is whether or not we are - - - Bossier City pays a per residents fee. And I'll jump to there, I think that's on Question No. 2. And I think it's important to point out that right now under the contract that we have we receive basically an annual payment in 12 installments under that contract there's a CPI built in, but there is no per residence cost. Now you also asked how much does Bossier charge for that service. If you note the residence of Bossier City pay \$16 per month curb side, \$20 per month back door, and handicap residence \$16 per month back door. If you look at just kinda roughly, look at the annual payment that we get which is about \$1.1 (million), you'll see that if you just in rough numbers, that's probably somewhere between \$4-6 per residence if we use some rough math there. The obvious question becomes if Bossier City is charging their residence \$16 per residence, what's it costing them to collect that, and the short answer that I got within our staff is 0. We basically cover all those costs. But again, I would point out one of the issues that the contract that currently exist between us and Bossier City, and by the way that contract was executed in 2003, it is simply a flat fee. One of the recommendations that, and Fred and Ron may want to speak to it a little bit more, one of the recommendations we're going to make is that we consider - - - I mean obviously there is the consideration that these people with the administrative people in Bossier, was that we consider under a new agreement going perhaps to a per residence fee in order to kinda equalize, because I think one of the major concerns is whether or not we basically subsidizing the collection of garbage in Bossier City. And if you look at the numbers, it appears that may in fact be the case. And because we have such a flat fee arrange with only CPI built in. It may prove to be more fiscally responsible for us to look at going to a different way of measuring that cost and assessing those fees. But again, that's something that would have to be obviously negotiated between the two municipalities. But that's one of the things - - - the major question and if there are any questions on that particular aspect, right now you see the information there that the contract had an initial five year term, and right now it's scheduled to expire in 2013. But that is one of the things we thought you would find interesting is one of the questions that you asked and it's one of the things we think that we really need to consider changing how we do that in terms of being more fiscally responsible.

Councilman Everson: So now this - - - explain this to me again. There's current payment that we receive annually was based on 2003, this was based on. And do we have an estimation, just off the top of your head, how many new households Bossier City had since 2003?

Mr. Sibley: I think Mr. Williams, you used a rough number of about 18,000 total?

Councilman Everson: So, we're talking about a considerable number of additional service residence service without consideration for that, and our reimbursement. Thank you.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Let me go back. So, you're saying 18,000 total residences is how many we service, right? Roughly? And Mr. Sibley, when you, and I'm capable of math, but

I don't have a calculator right here in front of me, I'm sure my computer has one. But when you multiply 12×18 , and then divide it by - - - I mean 12×1.181 and then divided that by 18, what was the number that you came up with?

Mr. Sibley: I did a rough math. And I did it based on - - - then numbers that Mr. Williams ran for me said that if we had a per residence fee of about \$14 for those 18,000 residences, that would generate roughly \$3,000,000. Compared to what we're collecting now, 1.1, I just did a kinda rough math, that's a little less than half of that, so if you drop down less than half of 14, it's somewhere between \$4-6, and we can run all these numbers exactly. But that gives you an idea, at \$14 for those 18,000 households, you know and the difference whether it's back door or curb side, but as a rough average, possibly \$3,000,000 in revenue compared to \$1.1(million) that we're getting right now based on the flat fee arrangement.

Councilman O. Jenkins: The reason I ask is I was given a figure, and this was sometime ago, or I'd seen a figure of \$10.83. And I'm not sure where that \$10.83 came from, and I believe I got it here. But that might have been - - - Mike Strong might have presented that number, and I'm not sure what that appoints, but does that number strike accord with anybody here - - - \$10.83?

Mr. Sibley: It really doesn't and what we propose to do is actually the math. And it's a little bit difficult, because you've got to break it down by how many at curb side, how many at back door. But what I asked them to do is just kinda for conversation purposes, give me an idea of what different numbers we generate, and that's where - - - that kinda gives us a ballpark of a \$14 fee would generate, and if you kinda look at where we are now, that - - - if you took that number and broke it down for a house, that's significantly less than what they are charging their residents basically.

Mr. Norwood: And I might add as Bossier expands and adds more residents, we still pay the same. It doesn't change.

Councilman O. Jenkins: We receive the same. So then obviously the other side of the equation is how much does it cost us per pick up over in Bossier?

Mr. Williams: I think the number that you mentioned earlier, the \$10 and something, I think at one point Mike Strong had come up with a figure that he figured that it cost us per household to collect in Bossier.

Councilman O. Jenkins: You may be correct.

Mr. Williams: Yeah, and I think that's what, by Mike's calculations, that's roughly what it was costing us to collect per household in Bossier.

Councilman O. Jenkins: You know for this to be what I would say a good budgetary tool and exercise for the sake of another term is definitely need a little bit more fidelity on those

numbers, and so that everybody's really clear across the board on how that's working and/or you know the eventual opportunity to get back together with Bossier and just explain to them what our fiscal restraints and concerns are at this point with regard to that contract.

Mr. Sibley: And Mr. Chairman and members of the Council, a related issue goes back to the first question in terms of where the trucks are allocated and how the trucks are allocated. And actually some of the older trucks in the fleet are trucks that are running in Bossier now, and they need replacing. And again, that's another indicator that without the revenue to replace those trucks in addition to the trucks that run on this side of the river, you see that's even an added factor so that the trucks that are running over there are older trucks, been in service a lot longer, requiring more maintenance, and frankly need to be replaced without the revenue to just go out and do that again, it's just another factor that goes into a need to relook at that. And part of the reason that you know we didn't burrow down too deep into the numbers was just to kinda give you guys an idea of where we are and get some direction on how far you want us to move, since we're not in that posture yet of talking about a fee, and that contract doesn't expire until 2013, it just kinda gives you an idea that that's something we may want to look at and as we get closer to that date, dig into it, get a greater feel for what those numbers are, and what those costs are, and what may have to be a negotiating point in terms of reconfiguring how that contract is laid out.

Mr. Williams: Also keeping in mind that if we're not going to institute a per household fee, then we should not continue the way we're going now. If we're not going to continue, we need to give them ample time to get their stuff together so that they can provide for collection. Which you know if they have to go out for bid for garbage collection and purchasing vehicles, that could be a year or two year process. So, that's something that we need to consider for them. If we're not going to continue with this contract, which I would strongly recommend that we don't in it's present form.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Okay, and I certainly don't think anybody up here is in the mood to leave Bossier high and dry on the side, and you know I'm just saying that, that's something that deserves consideration and some you know give and take from both sides.

Councilman Webb: Mr. Chairman? Is Bossier considering recycling?

Mr. Williams: I don't know. We offered them the same deal that we have, and they turned it down.

Mr. Norwood: And I don't think they've revisited that.

Councilman Webb: When we initially purchased the cans, I haven't completed - - - I just now started reading this contract, but have we - - - where are we going to be when the cans need replacing? Are we going to replace those at our cost?

Mr. Sibley: The recycling cans Mr. Webb?

Councilman Webb: Um hm.

Mr. Sibley: The initial cost on the initial batch was about \$2 ½ (million), and there's no reason to think that that number is going to go down. If we have to replace them in the future. If Ms. Scott - - -

Councilman Webb: She's over there.

Mr. Sibley: And I've asked Terri to kinda look - - - burrow into that particular agreement. As we indicated, it's been around since '03 and we're just kinda getting to it to see it, and I'm not sure. I think we bought those cans, because our agreement requires that we buy them. And that's our agreement with Pratt.

Councilman Webb: You know I've always and have still be dumb-puzzled why we had to or why we even agreed to in our contract to purchase the cans, why didn't we let them purchase some since they're going to be the ones benefiting on the revenue side.

Mr. Sibley: But we under the agreement, we purchased those and - - -

Councilman Webb: And they wanted to be here just as bad as I guess the city wanted them to help us out on the landfill.

Mr. Sibley: Well Mr. Webb, if you would allow me, there were a couple of questions y'all had on garbage and then we can get into the recycling - - -

Councilman Webb: I'm jumping the gun, I apologize.

Mr. Sibley: Just very quickly, one of the questions y'all asked were how many mechanics? There are eight that do all trucks. You know we don't have any that are dedicated just to the garbage packers. The question was raised leasing versus buying. Generally according to our finance guys, the basic difference is you don't get residual value when you lease. Payments tend to be about the same, at least when you own them at the end of that life, we can auction them off, we can get some revenue back from them. But in a lease situation, you basically don't get that. That's kinda short nutshell answer to that question. Obviously you know the specific situation may differ somewhat, but the basic reason lies in no residual value when you lease as opposed to when you purchase. There's a question of the impact on the households that are below the poverty level, and basically the ordinance doesn't allow for any exemptions. Without the ordinance allowing for that, we don't have the authority or the power to separate that out for anyone. And obviously that's not something within the purview of the council in terms of amending the ordinance, amending the ordinance or anything like that. But I would suggest that the - - - all the assumptions and the numbers are based on the assumption that every household would participate in the program and as we start the (inaudible) then certainly this can affect those revenue numbers and those costs. The question was asked whether or not the \$2.50 goes into a particular fund to replace the trucks. The \$2.50 was not designated to go into any specific fund. It

goes into the General Fund, and then you know you allocate it as you see fit. There was a question what happens when we get enough trucks. Well our guys will tell you we never get enough trucks. It's just like with Fire and Police, you have a program of continual maintenance and replacement. And you know even if we had the exact number of trucks that we need, the service life on those trucks would dictate that they be of different quality, and we would still need to have a program of continually replacing those trucks as we do with fire trucks and police trucks and other vehicles. So, the prevailing wisdom is that we never reach a point where we simply have, okay we need 75 trucks. We have 75 trucks and we don't have to buy anymore.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Yeah, but I think and let me just say, I think part of that is the idea that your revenue, not there aren't trucks to be serviced, but your revenue is greater than the requirement to service your existing fleet, i.e. that this \$2,000,000 whatever plus a year, at some point, you either turn over enough new trucks at your larger percentage and you're not turning over as many the following year. You're doing you maintenance, and there's a delta at the end, so I guess your answer to that is that it's going into the General Fund and will be used for as any other revenue source.

Mr. Sibley: And you know Mr. Chairman and members of the Council, that's something that across the board in terms of maintenance on our vehicles and equipment, you know the city has for years as I appreciate it, kind of abandoned any routine maintenance program because of the budgetary situation. You know year after year, after year, maintenance budgets got smaller and smaller and smaller, and smaller. So, even if a department had a programmed outline, we're going to replace every X number of years, we're going to fix up a number of things every year, it simply didn't happen because the budgets weren't there to do it. So, I understand your point, and what we probably need to look at is what would it cost to have a maintenance program that would allow us to keep that fleet to continue to operate so that we're not getting to a point, where all of a sudden we've got vehicles that are so far gone, we've got to stop to replace them and that's something that we can look at, and I think it's something that the Council really would be interested in. I have no idea what that number is, and that number may be something way beyond what we could do, but I think your question as to what is that number at least gives us an idea of what our target is, and perhaps then if we're looking at redoing any contractual agreement, we have in mind what kind of revenue needs to be generated in order to really support that program. So, what we'll do is make that one of the things that we dig into and try and come up with. What number does it take to have routine maintenance program so that we can keep all of our vehicles or this particular set of our vehicles, such that they don't end up in the condition that we're in now.

Councilman Shyne: Let me just throw something out, and it's kinda been thrown out before and we're going to have a little disagreement on it, but I think it's something that we need to look at. The employees that work for the sanitation department are some of our lowest paid employees in this city. I think we might need to look at and it's nothing that we need to rush into, because you know you're going to always have some employees that say you gave so, and so, and so a raise, and you didn't give so and so, a raise, but a lot of times,

that's just the way life is. You know as a Lt. Col., you made one salary, and Sam and I were Sergeants, and we made another one. So you know, when you all got the raises, we couldn't tell Uncle Sam, well you know they're making so much money already, so - - - but I'm saying that to say this. Dale, I wish we would look at maybe seeing what other cities this size is paying their garbage employees because they have not started coming to you yet, but they will. Because they feel like they're being underpaid, and I feel like that they are too, and I feel like that we need to look at maybe some protective gear for these people. Picking up trash and stuff like that, and garbage today is not like it was 20-30 years ago. Because in the trash and garbage now, you don't know what kinda of diseases and stuff that you're exposing yourself to, nowadays. Not like it was maybe 20-30 years ago, when I was picking up garbage Sam. You didn't have to worry about it, but nowadays, it's a little bit different. So, I would really like for us to look at it Mr. Chairman, that there would be some basic safety gear if it's nothing but like gloves, or maybe uniforms that they could wear and leave 'em on the job, and not wear 'em home. Because a lot of 'em wear their shoes and their stuff home that they work in everyday, and you don't know what kind of diseases and stuff they're taking home with 'em. You don't know what kinds of viruses that they're taking home with them. So, I would like for us to look at that Mr. Chairman, in relation to making sure that our city employees, especially at that level, are protected. Because you know for our police department, you look at buying them a bullet proof vest and other equipment that they need in order to do their job. But I'm told by some of the sanitation employees that we have not really made a concerted effort in trying to provide them with protective gear. And I'd like for us to sit down and talk with Butch and some of the other people that work in that area to see what we really need to do. So, I'd like for the administration to look at that with some of that money that would be generated.

Councilman O. Jenkins: And I believe that we have another question that talks about an automated service that you know may be one of the eventual solutions to something like that. So, I'll let you go on to that. And just - - -

Mr. Sibley: Yes sir, that's on Question 4, coming to the last aspect and I'm going to ask Mr. Williams, because I know he lives for us to jump in, but one of the automated services has been looked at before. And it is being considered still. One of the obstacles, and I guess there's no way to say it, right now any citizen of the City of Shreveport that puts anything out on the street, it gets picked up. And if you noted with the recycling guys, it is automated. And whatever you don't have in your container doesn't get picked up. Well, when our guys go out and pick up the garbage, whatever you lay out there, somebody is going to get out of that truck, go pick it up, and make sure it gets put away. One of the biggest obstacles we have is that. Is educating our citizens as to how it has to be packaged and what is going to be picked up and what is not, because that automated system went awry for all that other stuff that lays out there to be picked up. One of the other major obstacles, and Fred, jump in here, is the nature of some of our neighborhoods and on street parking, makes it very different to have an automated system that goes in there and works in between, so a part of moving and what the department has fond, part of moving towards an automated system has to be combined with a serious educational component that really re-educates and re-focuses our citizens into how to package it, what will be picked up, what

will not be picked up, where it needs to be placed, when the cars can't be on the streets, and in some neighborhoods, that may prove to be an impossibility in terms of getting cars off the street. So there are some obstacles that they run into, and Fred, you can speak to that.

Mr. Williams: No, I would just say that in parts of the City of Shreveport, automation would be ideal. In other parts of the city, it would be a nightmare, simply because in more on street parking than anything else. In neighborhoods, where you don't have driveways, everyone has to park on the street. There is no place to put the garbage if you're going to have an automated system, you have to be able to get to it. On the street parking pretty much prevents that, so what do you do? You tell your citizens on your collection day, you can't park your car on the street. Well, where are you going to take it? Around the corner? No, because we're going to be picking up around the corner as well. So, it's a process. It's something that bears some real education as far as the citizens are concerned. And like I said, in some areas of town, ideal. Other areas of town, not so good.

Councilman O. Jenkins: How does, I mean in this discussion, how does the recycling guys overcome that on those particular streets?

Mr. Williams: Well honestly, and I really hate to say this, but in most of those areas, the people don't really recycle.

Councilman Shyne: That's true.

Mr. Williams: Bottom line.

Councilman Shyne: Bottom line.

Mr. Williams: So, it's not a problem. They want the garbage picked up, but they're not recycling.

Councilman O. Jenkins: No, and I'm just obviously just duck-tailing into the next one.

Mr. Williams: I mean the other thing is that the persons in those areas that want to recycle will find somewhere to put that container. They'll move that car down the street in front of someone's house whose not participating in the recycling program.

Mayor Glover: Mr. Chairman, I'll also offer that while there are folks in those areas who do recycle, participation rates are not as high. What ends up happening is that those trucks end up running less than efficient routes in order to be able to facilitate that. It's not an orderly down the street on one side, and U-turn down the street, back on the other. It's a lot of the drivers themselves getting out and physically moving that recycling container to a point on the street to where his on truck mechanism can make a pick up, clear dump, put it back down and then that driver physically takes that container back to the household where it was. So, it's possible, it happens, it just ends up not being an effective use of the equipment under those types of circumstances. But what you're - - - the suggestion of

automated, I've spoken with mayors, council members, administrators in cities and communities that have these types of systems, and it's a matter of - - - we're coming up with a code of ordinances that for those of us in a place like Shreveport were not accustomed to. Somebody tells you, no on street parking on Tuesday, on the following areas in Shreveport, there's no on street parking. And not only is it because of the fact that the garbage trucks are coming through, but that law enforcement folks are coming through, and they'll effectively enforce that. Those types of changes and practices, behaviors, (inaudible) that you have to be able to incorporate if you're going to be able to get the effective use of that type of equipment. Otherwise, you'll end up like many of the Pratt guys under those types of situations where he's making the adjustment in order to get the job done, under those situations that don't represent the ideal circumstances.

Councilman O. Jenkins: And apparently following this garbage collection thing a little too closely, but I know there was a suggestion about the knuckle booms if my term is correct about periodically twice a month or something - - -

Mr. Williams: Once a month.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Once a month, okay, and I recognize there was a discussion on the reallocation of manpower in terms of those who would do this to get people that are accustomed to putting out large items and taking care of that, largely because it was going to fix or remedy a couple of issues. One is wear and tear on the actual trucks they were using everyday, and then it may keep us from those unsightly periods of time our garbage out there for extended periods of time. Where are we or did that kind of idea die on the vine, or are we still pursuing that at all? You're welcome to give us your honest opinion at this point.

Mr. Williams: And it wouldn't be a re-allocation, we'd have to hire new employees for that, because we still have to pick up a certain amount of garbage. But what would happen is that we were looking at a fleet of 10 knuckle booms. And we would pick up bulk items, large trunks, light goods like your refrigerators, your dryers, washers and things like that once a month with this knuckle boom. And what it does, it really does prolong the life of these packers that we are putting everything in right now. They operate off of hydraulics, and guys will try to crush just about anything you put out there. But if we had a separate collection of bulk items, the larger items, once a month, which is what happens throughout the country, I can give you cities and locations, but basically what it does it requires us to hire additional people, and buy additional equipment. And I think that's where we kinda got bogged down.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Gosh, and I just listening to this discussion, certainly sounds like we could make some economies at least in part of the sections of this city, by doing an automated service, and if we initiated a knuckle boom service in addition to that, we may get further economies. Wouldn't fix our total problem, but I'd certainly at least from my perspective like to see some type of potential program or proposal going on those lines, and see if there's really some cost savings we could potentially generate.

Councilman Corbin: I think we have over time made it tremendously easy in our city to pick up trash and garbage. I mean, whether I have a bag of trash or I have a couch, I put it out, and then the next day it's gone. And I see the day coming where we do have to make some changes. Because I think we're lagging behind what other cities do. It's (inaudible) as all get out, and nobody likes change, but I see it coming.

Mr. Williams: Let me give you one little example of something that they're doing in San Antonio. You put a garbage cart out on the curb in San Antonio. If the lid is ajar, more than four inches, you get a citation.

Mr. Norwood: And they won't pick it up.

Mr. Sibley: And the interesting thing members of the Council is our ordinance actually precludes a lot of what we pick up. Because there are ways that stuff is supposed to be packaged, and what's supposed to be (inaudible), but again as everybody said, whatever our citizens put out.

Councilman O. Jenkins: And those are some hardworking guys.

Mr. Williams: And even the things that we're not supposed to pick up, Joe will call me and say, Butch - - -

Councilman Shyne: That's the truth.

Councilman Corbin: I see that change is going to come one way or another. The second is have we discontinued backyard pick up in Shreveport?

Mr. Williams: We have not discontinued it, we're not adding on any new ones. And I think we're down to like 600 some right now that are actually paying for it. We have another 18-1900 people that are handicapped, that we pick up back door. But as far as the paying back door pick up customers, we're not adding any more.

Councilman Corbin: Okay, and do we have any idea how many back door pick up customers are in Bossier?

Mr. Williams: I have no idea. I've heard that it's high as half of the people in Bossier are back door.

Councilman Corbin: I'm just thinking about how much extra time and manpower it takes to do that.

Mr. Williams: And they reap all the benefits of that.

Councilman Shyne: Mr. Chairman, before we leave that, I'd just like to suggest to the Administration, and to the Council, that we would look at redoing the contract with

Bossier. I think Butch is on the right track by saying that we need to let them know that we're looking at this, to give them some time. Because I think all of us can see that it's almost like a Christmas gift, what we've given them. And I think we need to look at it, and I have some good friends over in Bossier, and Mr. Chairman, you might have some kinfolks over there. So, you know I think we need to kinda let them know that we are looking at - - - and it's just only fair to let them know that we're looking at some change. Like Fred said, it's going to take them some time if they don't want to go along with the new contract, to get their act together. So in order to be fair to them, I think we need to notify them because right now, I think we are bearing the biggest blunt of the show, so to speak. So, I'd like to see the Administration along with the what is it the Infrastructure Committee?

Councilman O. Jenkins: Um hm.

Councilman Shyne: Look at what we could do in order to make the playing field a little bit more level. And I think we need to do that soon, so Bossier won't say well look, you all should have given us more time.

Councilman O. Jenkins: And I agree with that. And also, I think there's certainly a mood afoot among some of the council to consider an ordinance so that, that \$2.50 fee is actually going into a directed fund towards sanitary, infrastructure, or capital expenses, whatever term we actually come up with, to give them some flexibility, but also to make sure it's oriented towards packers and/or knuckle boomers or that type of equipment as we go forward. Anybody else while we're on garbage alone at this point? Okay.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Chairman, other than Councilman Shyne and Councilman Jenkins, whenever Councilman Shyne refers to Butch, he's talking about me.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Yeah, I looked around and I figured that was the most likely candidate at that point.

Mayor Glover: Ron looks a little butch Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Norwood: I take exception to that. Respectfully.

Mr. Sibley: I'll note that since we - - - (inaudible) it appears the direction of the council to really look at re-evaluating that contract, then we'll go ahead and start the process to really digging into those numbers to try to come up with a per resident cost, and to adjust those fees, we'll go ahead and start that process and have some information for you shortly.

Councilman O. Jenkins: And frankly, I think our neighbors across the river, it'll provide them certain fidelity on why we find ourselves exactly where we are today.

Mr. Sibley: Exactly. So, we'll go ahead and start that process. Moving very quickly into recycling, again, all we're trying to do is kinda provide a basis anticipating what questions

the citizens may have out there. As to recycling, we provided a copy of the contract in the file, of course, we'd all need a little time to really dig into that, but some of the basics, the contract was entered into October 8, 2007. Has a primary term of 10 years from that date. The term of the current contract will expire on October 8, 2017. The agreement permits an extension for an additional 10 year term provided Pratt notifies the city in writing of that election at any time during the calendar year in which the term expires. There are certain provisions made pertaining to water and sewerage charges, provisions for disposable waste generated by the paper mill and the recycling center. So they in fact for the year 2010, have been billed approximately \$971,000 for the disposal fees at the landfill. There is a question on how has the recycling company survived without the \$2.50 fee up to this point? Has the city been paying them out of our taxes from previous years? Actually, no payments have gone to Pratt during this 10 years of payments. The payments to Pratt will start when the city starts to collect the \$2.50 fee. So basically what they've been doing over this period, they've been doing without any fees, transfers from the City of Shreveport taxes or otherwise. They will get the \$2.50. They will basically flow through the city to them. There is no collection fee or anything like that written into the agreement. We are simply a pass-through. The \$2.50 comes in, it goes out to them. But prior to January of 2011 when it starts, there have been no transfer of payments of money to Pratt in accordance with the agreement. Did the City pay for the blue containers? We talked about that. Yes, under the contract the city was obligated to do so at a cost of about \$2.5 (million). One of the questions involved whether or not they were making a profit and things like that. That is information that we really don't have, don't know. We've asked - - - I've asked Ms. Scott to look at the contract and see what reporting requirements may be there, but that is an aspect of their - - - a private company's business that we really don't go into. It is my understanding the contract is just limited to those services that they will provide, the services that we will provide, and those costs associated with that. The city does make - - - and I'm going to ask Ron and Butch to speak to. There are primarily two ways that the city benefits beyond just the general aspects of trying to be green and recycling. One is - - - involves the extension of the long term life of our landfill. You know by reducing the uses of it, then we save some of those long term costs of what it cost to go out, find another site and keep this landfill going. But also Pratt is obligated to pay a disposal fee, and that \$971,000 that was billed in 2010 is an example of those revenues. One of the things that I've asked the department to do for the council is provide an idea because prior to the recycling, we were going to the landfill and dumping all of our garbage. Just a quick note, Fred help me here. 2007 was the last full year with no recycling. Our trucks disposed of some 332,000 tons. 2009 that went down to 318,000 tons. This year to date, we're about 309,000 tons. We've paid the company about \$25 per ton, so since we've started recycling, we've seen a savings of approximately \$600,000, and those are round numbers based on the fact of lessening of the tonnage that actually goes into the landfill. If you combine that with the fact that Pratt then pays the city a fee for disposing, then we see some balancing of those numbers. But what I've asked the department to do is actually put more pin to paper and get more exact, than what we were paying prior to 2007, started recycling, what we are paying or getting now. So we can really see the difference in what is actually costing us if anything, or what we're making if anything in terms of the recycling program that started basically in 2008. But one of the benefits that I appreciate when this was done was the idea

of the long term liability of our landfill and saving those costs which I understand are very major cost. And Ron, Fred, you want to add anything to that?

Mr. Norwood: No, I'd just like to reiterate what Dale said about extending the life of the landfill. I mean it's logical if you're taking less to the landfill, you're going to get more useful life out of it, and in this case, I think we're looking at several years extended life. So there is a real benefit there.

Mr. Williams: The other benefit is that when we constructed the present landfill, back in '86, '87, 88, that I cost the city about \$6,000,000. If we were to do that same construction today, it would cost over \$30,000,000 for that same 435 acres that we have now.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Do they pay, does Pratt pay the same cost per ton as anybody else that goes and uses that landfill?

Mr. Williams: No.

Councilman O. Jenkins: They get a reduced rate?

Mr. Williams: Yes.

Councilman O. Jenkins: And that's negotiated in their contract?

Mr. Williams: Yes.

Councilman O. Jenkins: At some percentage of the going rate?

Mr. Williams: It was a set fee, and it fluctuate with the CPI adjustments. Right now, for instance right now, they pay \$19.11. The tipping fee at the landfill is \$36.50. We pay the contractor that actually does the dirt work for us out there, \$25.59 per ton.

Councilman O. Jenkins: So, obviously I'm going a couple of layers here, but essentially, if we let Pratt dump for free, it wouldn't be necessarily - - - we wouldn't need to charge the citizens \$2.50 if that dumping number ends up fairly close to what we end up getting back.

Mr. Williams: Somebody has to pay for collection. That's what the \$2.50 fee is for.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Right, but totally we've got about two-million and some, and this \$2.50 a month generates how much revenue for Pratt?

Mr. Williams: I don't have that figure. I think back when they talked about it, they were some 60,000 water bill - - -

Mr. Sibley: 66,000.

Mr. Williams: 66,000 water bills. \$2.50 a month.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Well, what my point is, at this point, is lets take the pick up thing apart. Okay, essentially we ask for a fee from the citizens at \$2.50 from Pratt, we turn around Pratt takes some of the recycling apart, and then dumps whatever they have left back in the landfill, correct?

Mr. Williams: Yes.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Of which we recoup a million or so dollars, i.e., in fees from the landfill right back in here to the city is the way it's being presented to me. And then if we're giving them a reduction on that price as part of our contract. So - - -

Mr. Norwood: You're saying there should be some point at which everything evens out?

Councilman O. Jenkins: That is exactly what I am saying. I mean based on the numbers that we're talking about, and I should have brought my calculator, I think that's fair that we are unarmed today, but conceptually based on those numbers alone, that's what it sounds like to me. My next question, and once again, I must be the garbage man because I spent too much time looking at this, but out of the amount of refuse they pick up, what percentage of that ends up in the landfill, i.e., that is not "recycled."

Mr. Williams: I'd had to get that information from Pratt. I don't have it.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Is that certainly would add some clarity on where we are in terms of how green we really are. And then the next part of that, the thing for me is if we are indeed paying Pratt to pick up these garbage cans only, do we know since they subcontract out the actual pick up of that part of the process, I'd be curious to know what they charge and/or is there not another system in place in which we pay for that directly and they're not getting a profit on their subcontract to pick up the fees.

Mr. Williams: Well we don't have privy to that - - - that's a contract between Pratt and Allied.

Councilman O. Jenkins: I recognize that.

Mr. Williams: I've not seen the contract. I have no idea.

Mr. Norwood: Councilman, if we go back to your last statement about the amount that is picked up and recycled and not in the normal waste stream, that would depend on the participation or percentage, and it would also depend on people recycling everything that can be recycled. I think if they do that, then you have a good percentage of participation. You find that there is a large percent that is not going to the landfill that would be going there. I don't know if we have the exact numbers.

Mr. Williams: No, what he was asking is how much of the residual from the process of recycling, the pickers, that comes back out to the landfill. In other words if you pick up 100 tons of recyclables, how much of that actually goes back to the landfill that's not recyclable. I think that's what you were asking.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Yes.

Mr. Williams: I can get that information for you, I don't have it today, but I can get it for you.

Mr. Norwood: And I would think again that if you are recycling everything that you can recycle, you're going to see a substantial amount that is not going to the landfill. When you look at the definition of what can be recycled. And if people follow that I think you're going to see a substantial decrease.

Councilman O. Jenkins: I mean I am aware of that. What they could potentially recycle and what they do actually recycle because of some economies out there and where that secondary market is, that's not all being done. I recognize that, and that's - - -

Mayor Glover: Mr. Chairman, if I could offer, I think we've answered this question a couple of times, that's come from several different sources. There've been some, in fact I think one of our Parish Commissioners who is still serving, at one point directed a question several months ago. Based on a perception, a belief - - - information had been passed along that glass and some other recyclable were actually not being recycled, but they were in fact being directed onto the landfill. We had a very specific detailed response back from PRATT that we would be able to find and provide to you all that answer that is very much in detail that said that is in fact not true. But there is a very small percentage of the recyclable material that ends up not actually finding its way into the recycling stream. Obviously, some of the markets are more favorable than others, but I think the biggest problem they had in terms of non-recyclable materials being sent through their process was the rejection of that which is a combination of paper and plastic. Which is difficult to affectively attract the plastic from the paper, in order for it to be able to be recycled. But the assertion that glass and I think - - - I'm not sure if it was plastic, but I know glass in particular was one of the items that specifically, we had been told was not being recycled. In fact is not true, all things are being recycled. All things are being accepted and processed, and no actual recyclable material that's listed as an acceptable recyclable that's being just simply collected and then in turn transferred out to the landfill.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Now, I'm glad to hear that, because that is definitely not and I'm not questioning - - - I'm hearing my rumor mill, reading my papers. I am very glad to hear that personally. Because that is not what I understood. That there is - - - because of - - - and frankly has to do with China, what China is now willing to take on as recyclable material and what the revenue source is for recycling companies, I was told that not all of it is being recycled anymore. But I'll be very - - - and certainly that number, whatever you generate in

terms of how much is collected and how much ends up back in landfill will help us with that.

Mayor Glover: We will find that, in fact I think - - - if you'll give me a moment, this is in response to - - - this is from Sean State with Pratt Industries, and this is from an August 31, 2010 email response and it reads thusly. "Mike, per the email trail below, I detailed yesterday that Pratt is currently doing without non-paper commodities, that the folks that are seeing these trucks dump, could take down information off of the trucks and/or video the truck dumping along with the material in it, I would be happy to take a look at it. I can tell you with all certainty, that we have a market for all non-commodities with the exception of glass at this time, and we do sell our non-commodities in full truck load quantities. There has never been a time when the (inaudible) has been so busy that anyone was instructed to or normally went to the landfill with recyclable material. In fact, as the murph volume has grown, we have added employees and added shifts to handle the material. I would suggest that if someone has seen a Pratt compactor going to the landfill, the folks out there are seeing one of two things. No. 1, the mill has a heavy "reject screen" that is high in plastic film, plastic strap and some metal and aluminum cans. This heavy reject screen is generated from "out throws" and "prohibitings" that come in with the paper we purchase that goes mill direct. This occurs in all mills and accounts for about 4-7% of the weight of all the bail paper we purchase. No mill that I'm aware of that's taking in this heavy reject screen and then trying to run it through the material recovery facility to capture any of this film or cans. The film and cans are heavily contaminated after having being put through the pulping process and must be landfilled. The murph has two types of trash compactors that go with the landfill. One is a glass compactor that has shredded paper, bottle caps and small contaminants that are typically under one inch in diameter. The second type of trash compactor is that one generated by the murph rejects, i.e., there's a certain amount of material from the curb side program that cannot be recycled in our process and ends up on the trash conveyor line. So the person that doesn't have an intimate working knowledge of our murph, either of these compactors may appear as if they could be full of recycled materials. That said, anyone that has been copied on this email is welcome to call me if they are concerned or would like further classification. Additionally, I would be happy to arrange a tour of our murph to better clarify any of the process detailed above. Again if someone can give me more information, license plates, pictures, video, etc., of the truck that they have seen dumping material that they believe to be recyclables, I would be more than happy to review it and give you my feedback. Thank you, Sean State." It appears that that may indicate the one that they are challenged for is glass.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Is glass.

Mayor Glover: The exception to that is glass, everything else, cans, plastics, paper obviously is being recycled. And we can get the specifics with regard to the glass. But this is from an email that as I said is dated August 31st of this year.

Councilman O. Jenkins: I appreciate that. That's certainly informative for me.

Councilman Corbin: That email answered one of my questions. The second question Dale, we have billed Pratt \$971,000 and a little bit in 2010. Are those payments current?

Mr. Sibley: As far as I know and Charles, can you say otherwise? We can confirm that for you Mr. Corbin.

Councilman Everson: Well I was going to say that I received a similar response during the course of this past year, there were a lot of people asking questions about things going on in the city. I too was curious and asked the same thing from Pratt and got a comparable response. I think, from what my understanding was, there is a good bit of material that goes into those recycling bins, that is not actually recyclable, but appears to be various plastics that aren't recyclable as opposed to plastics that are. Some things that have contained certain products that cannot be recycled, that type of thing. And so those are the things that are coming out. But my great concern was more were we kinda being - - - were we double - - - were we being double charged for when people are putting waste in recyclable bin that is not recyclable, and then it goes into the landfill, which is costing a double charge to us. I think I'm now understanding that that is not the case, so that is good. But I appreciate Pratt's response in that, because that was a concern of many residents in District B, who are green minded, and I know it was an appropriate response, so I was happy to hear that. You know I still have some concern with how efficiently this automated system is going, and certainly think it gives us cause to stop and pause and look at thinking about doing it with our typical trash pick up. I mean obviously we need a change like Councilman Corbin said, I think change is necessary, it's coming, but that may not be the change. That may not be the appropriate resolution to this problem. But certainly I think the knuckle booms and a monthly pickup is standard practice across the country, and it's something I'd like for the Planning and Infrastructure Committee to take a strong look at.

Mr. Williams: Mr. Chairman, I need to answer a question that you all haven't asked yet, because you probably hadn't read the recycling contract.

Councilman O. Jenkins: You are right that we hadn't, I can assure you - - - we got it here.

Mr. Williams: I'm going to answer a question for you that you're going to have that will come up later on. There are two different entities out at the Port. One is the paper mill, and one is the recycling center. At the landfill, we have two separate accounts. One for the paper mill and one for the recycling center. At the paper mill, there are two different types of products that come out of the paper mill and goes to the landfill. It's called 'clean purge' and 'dirty purge'. That's what we call it. The clean purge is - - - it looks just like dirt, and it's actually a product that we can use for daily cover. The other product, the dirty purge is like dirt, but with a lot of debris in it. Okay, that has to be landfilled. Now, something that you're going to see in the contract is that. The first 100 tons per day of the clean purge that comes to the landfill, they do not have to pay for. Everything beyond that 100 tons a day of the clean purge, is paid - - - in other words, they bring me 120 tons of clean purge, the first 100 tons are free. I have to pay BFI, but they only have to pay for that 20 tons, or anything over 100 tons. Now on the dirty purge that comes from the mill, they have to pay the entire

amount, which is I think \$1911. And also everything that comes from the recycling center, they have to pay the full fee. But on what they call the clean purge, it may not say clean purge in the contract, but you'll see something that says the first 100 tons are free, that's the clean purge that comes from the mill to the landfill. You'll see that in the contract, I just wanted to go ahead and - - -

Councilman O. Jenkins: And of that clean purge, how much of that is reused on an annual basis or monthly basis?

Mr. Williams: Oh, I don't know about an annual basis, but what Allied does is they can take a lot of the clean purge, where they would have to buy dirt for daily cover, we have to put a certain amount of cover on the garbage each day, they can use that clean purge as dirt as daily cover, which is why I guess for the first 100 tons, they don't have to pay to dispose of. Because really, they really not disposing of it. If it's coming to the landfill, it's going across the scale, I do have to pay Allied that money for that, but it's free to them.

Councilman O. Jenkins: How much is that?

Mr. Williams: \$1911.

Councilman O. Jenkins: So we pay - - - our contract with Allied side is \$1911 dirty or clean purge?

Mr. Williams: Well like I said, the clean purge, the first 100 tons per day is free to Pratt. Everything over 100 tons of the clean purge each day, they pay for. I know it's kinda confusing, but it'll sink in.

Councilman O. Jenkins: That's not good. No, I got it, it's not confusing for me, it's just me not being too happy.

Mr. Williams: I wanted to answer that question before you ask.

Mr. Norwood: But it's put to good use.

Councilman Everson: How much would - - - okay, I understand that the clean purge is a usable product, how much if you purchased that product?

Mr. Williams: We don't have to purchase it. I can find out from BFI or Allied, or Republic, or whoever they are today, how much they would pay for a yard of dirt. I don't know, it's an avoided case (inaudible). And I can find that out for you.

Councilman Everson: It's not equitable to the amount. I'll wait.

Councilman Corbin: That first 100 tons, we're being charged \$19?

Councilman O. Jenkins: We the city are being charged \$19, but we're taking it in from Pratt for grass.

Councilman S. Jenkins: I guess there's two things. We've been talking a whole lot about some garbage up here today is one thing, but on the recycling, you know my first question what can we really do with a contract that's already in place? I guess I'm really trying to see where we going. This contract was pretty much put in place by the prior council. I mean at this stage, is there really something that we can do to modify the contract. Is the contract such where the modifications could be done? Suppose we wanted to bring about some changes to the contract, could we even do it? I guess that's one of the questions that come to my mind, even if we see some things here that we're not happy with, what can we do about it. The contract has already been signed, sealed, and delivered so to speak. To change it or to modify it, and I would like that to be looked at, I really think it should be looked at. Is there a window?

Mr. Sibley: We'll get it (inaudible) Councilman Jenkins also looking at it on Page 10 of that agreement, there is a procedure for the city to amend or modify and of course it triggers Pratt the opportunity to respond, and perhaps renegotiate, but there appear to be provisions, and we'll get legal to really look at it and detail that. But there appear to be provisions to allow the city to amend or modify prior to the termination of it.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Because there are some things about it that we would like to see a little differently, I guess we need to know first if it's worth this exercise to go through (inaudible) to change it. I guess the second thing is can the performance under this contract be audited in some form or fashion to try to give us as a council a - - - I guess - - - what is the impact? There's always some good and bad to every contract. I've never seen one where anybody get everything they want, but I'm just speaking from my perspective as the representative of the citizens is I would like to have a good understanding of the performance of the contract. What the numbers really look like, what kind of benefit has actually come to the city as an entity, what kind of benefit is coming to our citizens, is there an economic impact involved here, is Pratt creating jobs. Are they adding to the tax base? There are things like that I think need to be put into a snapshot not only for us as a council, but also maybe for our citizens when they begin to pick up this charge next month to really get an understanding of what this is all about. I just want to believe that this was looked prior to my coming that we didn't enter a contract that was all (inaudible). I'm just having a hard time believing that. I wasn't here, but Councilmen Shyne and Webb was, but it's difficult for me to accept that we would enter into a contract that supposedly nothing about it benefited the City of Shreveport or it's citizens that are here. But those are the two things that I wanted to raise. Is there something we as a new council can do to a contract that's already in existence. (Inaudible), can the performance of this contract be audited in some form or fashion that we can look at in a snapshot version, what these numbers are really about, and whether or not there is a benefit so to speak, for the city, for the citizens as well as, is there an economic impact here that we may be overlooking or failing to discuss that this company has created for the city. If they are creating some jobs and things like that, I want to look at a little bit differently than - - - we're coming in and we got a contract, and

they're sucking up a lot of fees and (inaudible). So, those are some of the things I think too that may need to be looked into. Where can we go with that, now, I don't want to be just putting it out there. Is there any legal - - - can it legally be looked at, can it be audited?

Mr. Sibley: We'll get those answers.

Mayor Glover: For those who obviously - - - the previous council, the previous administration and a lot of folks did not follow this process very closely, but this actually represents the culmination of an economic development effort that we engaged in, in conjunction with council, and with the economic development department down in Baton Rouge. This was an effort that we were competing for against other cities. Because it represents 1) a significant number of jobs, and 2) a significant investment within our local communities. Just over a year ago, the Governor was here on the 15th of September of 2009 for the official grand opening of the Pratt (inaudible). On that day, I and other members of the council, other members of our delegation, some members of our parish commission, and others, we were all there, in full regalia smiling and taking pictures, and very much pleased that this effort had come to fruition, all with the understanding that the provisions that have been detailed were part of our back and forth negotiation process in conjunction with Governor Jindal, Secretary Moret and the folks from Pratt to successfully land this particular operation, one of only three in the U.S. at this point. The other two being in the Atlanta area, the other being in the New York city area, and they were looking to move westward. The final two choices came down to us and Dallas, TX. As I mentioned, the governor was here. One of his quotes was 'Today's announcement by Pratt Industries will build upon Louisiana's economic development momentum'. He detailed that located at the Port of Shreveport/Bossier a new mill is created what now is about 200 new positions in total. It was quoted as 120 on this day, that number is closer to 200 right now, at an average salary of approximately \$54-64,000 per year plus benefits. Construction began in November of 2007, and this 212,000 square foot mill which represents more than a \$150,000,000 capital investment. The ultimate dollar impact was detailed on behalf of the state and the city by De Lloyd Consultant, which I'm assuming is a current manifestation of De Lloyd (inaudible) one of the former big 8 accounting firms. There's an economic analysis conducted by De Lloyd Consulting in 2007, estimated that this project would stimulate \$227.4 (million) in economic output during the construction period. Once fully operational, the mill is projected to have an annual average of \$133.7 (million) in sustained annual economic impact. The De Lloyd also estimated that 1,695 new, direct, indirect and induced jobs would be created during the construction phase. Upon full operations, De Lloyd estimated an average of 593 direct, indirect, induced jobs would be created and maintained by the economic activity from Pratt's new facility.

Councilman O. Jenkins: And I'll be the first one to say, the intent is to say we should forego recycling, we're just trying to get - - - I mean so it's clear to everybody, at least from my perspective, and I'm probably the one that's asking the most probing questions at this point, my intent is not to fault certainly the people that are taking the bullets up here in front, or anybody else. I just think we need a little bit more, as I say fidelity on how this

whole thing gets broken down, where the second and third facts are relative to this contracts are and how it impacts the citizens.

Councilman Shyne: Mr. Chairman, I don't want the mayor taking all the shots, of course he's big enough to take 'em. But I was here too, and at the time, and I still believe it was a good investment for the city. Now, what I'm finding out like you and other Council Members that a lot of our citizens out there Mr. Mayor who really don't understand, and I guess I'll take my share of the blame cause we're a team. We might not have informed Joe Blow or - - -

Councilman O. Jenkins: Oliver Jenkins.

Councilman Shyne: Oliver Jenkins, yeah, the Sam Smiths, you know like we should have because communication is so important. But the bottom line is and Sam, like you said earlier, it's very contracts - - - even if you sign the kind of contract that LeBron James signed going down to Miami, you know you're going to always have some drawbacks. But you always got something good in it. So, it was a lot of good in it because we were looking at providing jobs. We were really looking at the economic impact that this company would have, not only Mr. Mayor, for the City of Shreveport, but for all of this northwestern region. Because you probably have people who work out there who just don't live right here in Shreveport. So, it was a good idea and of course Dale, you've got on a beautiful suit, but I could sit here and pick it apart if I wanted to. You know I could tell you that it's a little bit large around the neck or it should have been larger in the waist, and that kind of stuff. I mean I could sit here and pick it apart. But overall, you've got a beautiful suit. In this particular project Mr. Mayor, I want to commend you for the part that you played in it. We needed that here in Shreveport. Now Sam you're right, everything in it might not be the best, but this is why we can take it and look at it. This is why it's not in concrete, it's not in stone, we can take it and look at it, and those parts that we feel might not be so beneficial for us, you know we can just kinda take those out when we get to that point. But overall now, it was good for this area. And it has produced some good benefits. And I will say that maybe we didn't do a good job Mr. Mayor, and we want to make sure Dale, that we do this from now on. We might not have done a good job of letting the citizens know what was going on. What was the down side, and talk about the benefits. That's just like sometimes, I used to tell my boys they do a little something, and Butch, I might have to spank 'em, and I tell 'em, 'Now you might not believe it, but this is going to be good for you.' And I remember one telling me 'Well dad, if it's going to be that good for me, why don't you take it.' But I'm saying you know we maybe should have explained the good side, and the down side. But overall Mr. Chairman, it was really from an economic development situation.

Councilman O. Jenkins: And I appreciate that, I appreciate that. And I don't think any of our - - - I'll speak for myself, but my intent is just to find out a little bit more about it that isn't necessarily available to everybody else out there, and I found myself in a position where I could ask a few questions that I think the questions many others have. And that's what I'm using this as a tool. And please don't - - - I hope nobody takes it any other way.

Mayor Glover: Obviously we welcome the opportunity, the problem was trying to make this as part of having these newer younger eyes as a part of the process now, is to give you all an opportunity to help us make that which this administration, the previous council anything else that we've done during the course of the city's history. If we have a chance to make it better, create a better value for our citizens, we welcome that. The thing that we obviously want to balance against that is as I mentioned, is that this represented a collective economic development effort that we were successful in achieving. The benefit is definitely quantifiable as Councilman, or Vice-Chairman Jenkins mentioned. We do need to make sure not only with this economic development project, but all of those things that we affectively go out and recruit and bring and that we may provide incentives or assistance, or support in an effort to either keep jobs, or bring jobs or expand jobs, actually ends up giving us the return for whatever might be the public investment. That's just a good thing to do period. I would also offer that one of the things that we were hopeful for, and I don't want to put any pressure on the folks at Pratt, but to give the citizens of Shreveport and this area an idea right now, what we're out there doing is we're milling paper. In fact with the Christmas Holidays being just wrapped up, I would venture to offer that to all of the folks out there, or a good percentage of folks out there who got something that came in a new box, and I know we often marvel at children who get an expensive toy, who spends more time playing with the box than they do with the expensive new toy, a good number of those boxes were made with paper that came from either this mill, the one in Georgia, or the one in New York. This mill right now happens to be just a mill. One of the potential opportunities that are available potentially for us is for this situation to grow and expand. That was a part of the vision from the beginning, was that they become not just a mill, but a corrugators, or what is often times referred to as a millagator, and that is you not only mill the paper, but you also have a second value adding part of the process where that milled paper is otherwise wound onto big huge several ton rolls also ends up being formed into the various boxes that hold the X-Boxes and the PS3s and all the other new shiny things that we buy and package on a daily basis. If we're able to put ourselves in a position to be able to see that happen, one that would be another round of discussions and negotiations, both at the local and at the state level in terms of how best to position ourselves, but it also means a considerable number of new jobs. And one thing I know that all of us are happy about here is that not only will we get jobs, but when you can reliably quantify a job as being in the \$53-64,000 per year range, those are the types of jobs that we need as many of as we can get. Because those are the types of jobs that one of our guys who works in our public works division, or works in our sanitation division, if he has a chance to go from working for the City of Shreveport to working for a company like Pratt and seeing that kind of increase in pay, it gives him the ability to further live out the American Dream. It allows us to be able to raise up the overall quality of our economic life here in this region. These represent the types of folks that we want here in Shreveport, but that doesn't mean that they get a pass either from me, or you all, or from anybody. And what we're doing here, we welcome it. We just want to make sure that we don't end up putting ourselves at a competitive disadvantage by someone out there who says, 'Now you see those folks in Shreveport, they're picking at you, you go on here to where we are, we're going to welcome you with open arms'. But this is the type of open process that I think gives us an open, a better

outcome for our citizens, but also allows us to be able to sharpen our competitive edge by making sure that our numbers are as tight and as appropriate as possible.

Councilman S. Jenkins: I just wanted to really kinda wrap it up by saying I feel like - - - first of all, I want to commend y'all acts and inquiry and the information coming forward. I think that was good, and it was necessary, and I hope to some extent, this discussion today has helped the public. But I'm still - - - there are two things I'm wanting to find out is, if we wanted to change something, can we legally do it, and the second thing I'm trying to find out is from Council perspective, is can the performance of this contract can be audited at some stage, when we can take a good look at the numbers. And when people hear the word audit, they generally associate that with something being wrong, so I'm not suggesting that at all. There are a lot of different audits. It's the scope and the goal of what you're trying to get your hands on, and what I'm asking is going back to what Councilman Shyne said. I think there needs to be a good explanation to our citizens about this. I don't think anyone set up and entered a contract that they thought would be ineffective to the city or our citizens. It's just repugnant to think that that would have been the case. I think if we could get a good snapshot of the benefits and all of that, I believe it would really help. Because I see a lot of (inaudible) too, so you know it needs some following up. I've heard Councilman Corbin ask about this \$971,000 in landfill fees, and is that actual cash money being paid to the city, or is it a credit (inaudible) what Pratt is collecting from us. You know it's some things like that I think needs to get laid out a little bit better where people could really understand what's involved. And as far as changes, the calls I'm getting from a lot of citizens are why are they being forced to participate in something as opposed to having the option to participate in something. Of course when you start that kind of dialogue, then you're talking about somebody's revenue under this contract, when you start saying people ought to be able to opt out, and Pratt is saying wait a minute, I've got a contract, based on what I thought all the citizens were going to participate in. Those are the kinds of calls I'm getting. Can I elect not to participate in it. So I just think it all needs to shake out a little bit better. A good snapshot of what this thing is all about, and the goal as a city as to what it's all about needs to be laid out in a more clear fashion in my opinion.

Mr. Sibley: We'll work on that Councilman Jenkins and find out.

Councilwoman McCulloch: In regards to the additional fee, I had citizens to call and inquire about maybe some exceptions being made for the senior citizens. What do you think we could - - - could we possibly make some exceptions as far as that fee goes for our senior citizens? Is that in the contract anywhere? I mean that's what I've been getting, the feedback from the residents. You know, does this have to apply to our senior citizens?

Mr. Sibley: And that's one of the questions that you all had, but really right now, there are no provisions for anyone, as Mr. Jenkins pointed out, to opt out. But again, one of the questions he asked was whether or not you guys could modify the agreement. And (inaudible) re-examination says you can, it may cause a re-negotiation of the contract. But you also have to weigh the fact of the assumptions that were there when the contract was made in terms of how many people would be participating that underlines kinda of the

economics of the contract. But certainly this council, as we present this information has the option to look at, guys we want to create some exceptions and you know that triggers sitting down with Pratt again, and trying to reach an agreement that may or may not work. But certainly the provisions appear to be and we'll get a more detailed report as Councilman Jenkins is asking on how you go about doing that if you choose to make some changes in this contract.

Councilwoman McCulloch: I know some of them were saying, well you know we have set incomes, and you know that shouldn't apply to us. And I do agree for some of our senior citizens. Definitely I know we can't be prejudiced just toward District A, but I would really like for us to look at making some exceptions for our senior citizens.

Mr. Sibley: We'll provide that information (inaudible). One other question you had again was based on income like with garbage, and again, this doesn't allow for any exemptions based on income either, but again we'll outline the process that will allow any modifications to take place with this agreement.

Mr. Norwood: And also, we'll look at the audit provision.

Councilman Corbin: Contract questions and issues aside, I think we have a - - - the easiest type of recycling that you can have. I mean you talk to people that live in other cities, and recycling is certainly a personal decision. It's made a huge impact in our house, you know garbage versus (inaudible) recycling bin. To build off something Councilman Shyne said, I know if we initiated the recycling program, we had a big public relations campaign informing the citizens about it. And I wonder if we might not need to go back and do a little more public relations and try to get our participation back up a little higher in the program. Because the higher participation we get, the better we'll all be (inaudible).

Mr. Williams: Mr. Corbin, Mr. Chairman, one of the reasons why we chose this particular type of recycling is because it's user friendly. In a lot of cities that recycle, and have recycling programs, you have to separate at the curb. You've got a bin for paper, you've got a bin for plastic, and you've got a bin for aluminum. In the City of Shreveport, you've got what we call single stream recycling. You put everything in that one container, and it's taken away. There was one other question that Mr. Thompson asked me, I don't know if it came from one of the council members or not, but it was pertaining to the disposal of the waste coming out of Bossier City. And Bossier does pay their own disposal fee. Somewhere between \$65-70,000 a month for disposal. So in case someone had that question.

Councilman O. Jenkins: but that is based on the amount - - - that's not a flat fee?

Mr. Williams: That's based on the amount of waste. Not at all. That's based on the tonnage. And they do not pay, they get a reduction (inaudible).

Mr. Sibley: Mr. Chairman, that kinda concludes what we had, sort of an overview. We certainly have made some notes on those things we'll follow up on, and I anticipate we'll have a lot more discussion and these guys are still here, if you have any additional questions.

Councilman O. Jenkins: And one thing that was on there is on the back page. For apartments that want to opt in, there are some that have spoken to me about that. Is that - - - have we discussed that with Pratt at all and/or is it a potential consideration?

Mr. Williams: Pratt has a separate commercial recycling program that they're doing. The only people that we're providing recycling service to are the people we provide garbage service to. So, if we don't provide garbage service, then you're not going to be assessed a fee. Pratt has a separate commercial recycling collection program that they've used for large businesses and probably could also be used for apartment complexes.

Councilman O. Jenkins: So, your recommendation is for me to make that link between them and their commercial group to follow up with that. Okay, appreciate that. If nobody else has any questions, at this point if y'all wouldn't mind taking a good seat, I think we have one or two, or at least one citizen that had some questions about garbage, and we might as well come up now and just give them the opportunity to speak. And if y'all are available to answer any of the tough ones.

Audience Member: He left Oliver, y'all were taking too long.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Well that's the way we worked it. I think Mr. Allen is here, and he'd like to speak about the garbage and recycling fees.

Mr. J. C. Allen: (7333 Camelback) First off, I want to thank the Council for their interest and enthusiasm about getting some of these questions answered, and I want to thank Mr. Sibley and the Mayor for a very interesting and informative presentation. And I won't delay this meeting much longer, because all of those questions were answered, and I think some really good issues have been brought up about how we might be able to resolve some of the questions that were proposed and the questions that were submitted. A couple items about the garbage trucks - - - in the past, we've always seemingly had the garbage trucks bought and paid for under bond issues, and as I understand it, the current bond issue that's coming up has provisions in it for funds for passenger cars and/or fire trucks. And I guess the outlying question that might remain is why weren't garbage trucks put in that same bond issue? It bothers me a little bit that the fee for the garbage trucks which were presented as a fee to replace these retiring and bad off trucks is going into the general fund. And I admire the group that may want to put that and dedicate those funds to replace those garbage trucks. I hope you will proceed to do that, rather than put money in the general fund sometimes have a tendency to go places that you didn't intend for it in my opinion. So I would hope you would pursue that. Also the question came up about the maintenance of the garbage trucks or the fleet. I think there is some merit. In my past life, when I was working, I had some oversight into the fleet operations, and I think some maintenance,

normal maintenance crew and maintenance of vehicles will save you monies in the long run, and not all of a sudden jump on you like it is the case now. In the case of the recycling fees, I think everybody is on board and I understand that the reason for the recycling. My concern and the concern of the folks who have talked to me about this is the fact that it's being unevenly implemented of sorts. I think the questions about Bossier and the issue that we obviously are subsidizing Bossier, or their garbage is going into our landfill, they aren't participating in any sort of recycling. And so there is an inequity there. It bothers me still, and I think a lot of the other folks that have we've got some 20,000 households according to the last census, that's at or below the poverty level, and it's just not the older, elderly that's on fixed income, but this is going to impact. We've got a lot of folks that are not elderly that are poverty level folks that this impact is going to hit. And I appreciate the Chairman's innovative thinking about there may be something, some way in that contract to offset and reduce at least the \$2.50 fee for the recycling perhaps. So, I would hope that you would pursue that. And again, I will close and appreciate the Council's interest, and I plead with you not let today be the last interest that you have, that continue to pursue that and see what other alternatives that you can come up with to keep this program going as far as recycling, and keep the poverty folks with the proper implements to take care of the city's garbage and it's collecting, take care of Bossier. They're not going to be happy with any kind of changes, but again, I think the issue was clear about there are some inequities that we need to address. Thank you again, gentlemen and lady for your time.

Councilman Shyne: I have a group that has been here for about two hours, and they have a death in their family, and they need to kinda take care of some business and some arrangements, and I was wondering if we could get to their addition of legislation to Council so that we can add it. It's a resolution pertaining to their grandmother, and if we could do that and I could present it to them and they could be on their way making their arrangements that they need to make. If I could impose on the council?

Councilman O. Jenkins: Mr. Thompson, any problem with us making a slight - - -

Mr. Thompson: No sir. This is an item that needs to be added to the agenda. If the Council is ready to take it up, I can read it and you can inquire first as to whether or not there is anybody who would like to speak on whether or not it should be added to the agenda, and if not, the council can vote on it, and then if Mr. Shyne wants me to read it, we can read it and take it up at that time. *The Clerk read the following:*

5 Resolution No. 294 of 2010: A Resolution to remember and honor Miss Trueheart Haley and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (F/Shyne)

Councilman O. Jenkins: Is there anybody here to speak for or against that particular motion?

Councilman Shyne: If not Mr. Chairman, so move.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Second.

Motion by Councilman Shyne, seconded by Councilman S. Jenkins to add Resolution No. 294 to the agenda. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and Jenkins. 7. Nays: None.

The Clerk read the following:

RESOLUTION NO. 294 OF 2010

A RESOLUTION TO REMEMBER AND HONOR MISS TRUEHEART HALEY AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BY: COUNCILMAN JOE SHYNE

WHEREAS, Miss Trueheart Haley was born November 6, 1912 to Mr. James and Alice Haley; and

WHEREAS, Miss Haley confessed Christ at the young age of 12 and was baptized at the Bossier Baptist Church where she remained a faithful member for over 86 years and was “The Mother of the Church” until her passing; and

WHEREAS, Miss Haley moved to Shreveport in 1942 and was a resident of the Mooretown community for 68 years; and

WHEREAS, Miss Haley was employed as a private housekeeper for over 40 years and after retirement she joined the Foster Grandparent Program where she continued to nurture, influence and touch the lives of young people and those who came into contact with her; and

WHEREAS, After living a blessed 98 years on this earth, Miss Haley passed away on Thursday, December 22, 2010 in Shreveport, Louisiana at Willis Knighton Pierremont Hospital.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened, that it publicly recognizes Miss Trueheart Haley for her dedication, dependability, her giving spirit and love for her family and fellow mankind.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this resolution shall be executed in duplicate originals with one original presented to Miss Trueheart Haley’s Family and the other resolution file in perpetuity in the office of the Clerk of Council for the City of Shreveport.

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

Councilman Shyne: Mr. Chairman on behalf of the Shreveport City Council and the Administration, I'd like to present this resolution (inaudible) and God bless you all and anything that the City of Shreveport can do, please call. And if you need some money, make sure you call Dale Sibley. Dale, I know how charitable you are.

Mayor Glover: Mr. Chairman, if you didn't mind for just one moment, I wanted to offer a response for the record to one of the things Mr. Allen said. We certainly appreciate him coming down and offering the insight, and information that he did. The one thing that I think for the record, and Charles please be ready to bolt up and correct me if I'm wrong, and that is the City of Shreveport, has not, does not, and will not spend bond money on garbage collectors. We have spent money in years past on fire trucks. Those are and have been considered capital investments, that have been paid for with bond dollars, but never any other types of vehicles. No police cars, no dump trucks, no police or fire pumpers and those sort of things, but only fire trucks. I'm assuming that means pumpers and ladders and things of that nature, but never garbage collectors. The lifespan on the garbage collector is far too short to be able for anyone to construe a legal basis by which we could end up including that as a capital expense.

Councilman O. Jenkins: He mentioned the term passenger vehicles and I don't believe we can attest to that, that we have not spent any on that either from bond money.

Mayor Glover: With bond money.

Surety Bond Forfeitures Report (First Regular Meeting of the Month)

EMS Transports Report (Second Regular Meeting of the Month)

Councilman O. Jenkins: Waiting patiently in the back, Chief, if you wouldn't mind coming forward and giving us the EMS Transports Report.

Chief Crawford: Mr. Chairman, members of the Council, Administration, you should have a copy before you of the January through November 2010 year to date EMS Transport. I'll go over it quickly with you and if you have any questions, I'll be glad to answer those. Basically, the numbers for 2009, year to date 2010, the total runs were about 50 short of where we were last year, a little less than 0.1%. That's total run volume. As far as the EMS calls which are about 73% of our total call volume, we're less than 0.1% fewer actually this year than we did last year. So almost the same number or 242 short of what we did last year. And then as far as EMS Transports, we've got about a 1% decrease over where we were the previous year with 15,213. The differences in the number though if you look at 'em and you do some of the math that you were talking about a while ago, for the number of EMS calls that we made both in 2009 and 2010 year to date and those people that we transported, it's 57% for both last year, year to date, and then this year to date. We transport about 57% of the people that we actually get a call to. So that's the same. The good news is we transported fewer people and it's not reflected on this report, but we actually increased our collections by a pretty significant amount, by half million dollars

more this time this year than we were at the same place last year were about \$5.4 (million). Right now with collections, we're about \$4.85 last year. So, we've got fewer transports, but we've got higher collections. In fact we've collected far more than we even projected, because we were projecting last year and we attribute that to a more aggressive pursuit of those collections and in a different collection method by ACS who is our contract collection carrier, and they've done an outstanding job.

Councilman O. Jenkins: What per cent are we roughly running on those collections?

Chief Crawford: You know I believe we're in the 80 percentile, and that's pretty significant when you look at a national average, usually they're in the 60s even with a good collection rate. But they do a very good job at finding all collection sources, whether it's third party billing or Medicare/Medicaid, those types of things, they try to exhaust everything that they can before they even bill the person. And if there's nothing left insurance and the like, then of course the bill ends up going to the individual.

Councilman O. Jenkins: And that contract arrangement, do they get a percentage of that?

Chief Crawford: Absolutely.

Councilman O. Jenkins: We don't pay them directly, they get a percentage.

Chief Crawford: No, they get a percentage off the top of whatever they collect. Any questions?

Councilwoman McCulloch: Well actually, I didn't understand the numbers here. I mean I was wanting somebody to kinda interpret the numbers here on this chart.

Chief Crawford: Yes Ma'am. If you look at the first column, that's just the months January through December. 2009 is the next column. That's the number of patients that we've transported in 2009, that first column. If you look, that's month by month.

Councilwoman McCulloch: 16,000?

Chief Crawford: That's year to date. So through November 30th, we've transported 15,369. If you look over a couple of columns to that first white column, that's what we've done this year. That first column that we just explained, that was last year. We've done 15,213 which is a total of about 1% less transported, it's 156 patients less than we did last year.

Councilwoman McCulloch: I heard you mention 57% when you got started. What was that in reference, what are you referring to?

Chief Crawford: If you look at the number of medical calls that we make each year which is that second, that pink column, that second one. That's the number of medical calls that we made in 2009 which was 26,956. If you look at the second white column, that's what

we've done this year, 26,714. So, we've done about 242 less transports overall, but if you look at the transports that we made and the ratio of how many EMS calls that we've made, and how many people we transport going on those calls, we transport about 6 out of 10 people. We don't transport everybody that we go to. If they don't meet the mandatory emergency criteria, we don't transport people to doctors offices, we don't transport people just because they say, I've got a cut finger and I want to go to the doctor. We have to deem it medically emergent and necessary for them to be transported to a hospital.

Councilwoman McCulloch: That's the 57%?

Chief Crawford: It's 57%, it was 57% this time last year, it's 57% this time this year. Even though the numbers are down a little bit, which is you know it depends on how you look at it. I see it as a good thing, that we're not responding to as many calls, and we're not using as much gas, and we're not using as much resources and supply. So, we're looking at saving some funding there, and some of that is attributed to public education and those types of things. When to call 911 and when to call 911 and it's helping yourself, those types of things.

Councilwoman McCulloch: I notice you're showing here under 2010 EMS a -0.90%. What is that for now?

Chief Crawford: That is based off - - - if you look at the kinda pink column there and the second white column, the EMS runs that we made in 2009 totaled 26,956. If you look at the bottom of the white column, the same EMS calls that we made year to date being in November were 26,714. So it's just 0.1% less this year than we did last year. So, I mean essentially we're at the same numbers that we were last year which is pretty good, because usually we had been averaging over the last five years about a 2-3% increase every year. And it looks like this year, we're going to hit about the same as we did last year.

Councilman Webb: You mentioned that you transport 6 out of 10. Do you have the numbers on that 6 out of 10, or all our pickups, where do we rank on local versus non-local. Do y'all keep that data?

Chief Crawford: Now as far as our transports goes, everybody that we transport is in the City of Shreveport. We don't transport anybody in the parish. We're strictly a - - -

Councilman Webb: I understand that, but lets say there's a wreck on I-20, and they're from Texas. That what I consider a non - - -

Chief Crawford: Oh, I see what you're saying. We don't have a tracking mechanism built in the software that I say would separate somebody that was from outside of Shreveport. I can probably extrapolate that from the data. But it would have to be a report by report somebody would have to physically, manually go through each one of those to see who was not from Shreveport. But as you know especially the wrecks on the interstate, you've

got a 50/50 chance of somebody being from Shreveport as you do somebody coming in from the outside and having an accident.

Councilman Webb: Where I was going with this, and I'm not being critical by any means, I'm just - - - I'm curious to know, I know when looking at our sister city, Bossier City, they every year make it available to every household to join an ambulance fee to be picked up and if they join that fee, their family can be picked up and not get billed. We don't do that?

Chief Crawford: Yes sir we do.

Councilman Webb: How are we pushing that?

Chief Crawford: Actually, we do that and Bossier City was is considered forced membership. It's on their water bill, so everybody is forced into a membership in Bossier City, and thus everybody pays for the ambulance service. Kinda like a \$2.50 garbage fee, they have an EMS fee that's on their water bill and thus, everybody is in their membership.

Councilman Webb: Well, I don't want us to do that.

Chief Crawford: No sir, I don't either.

Councilman Webb: I wouldn't mind seeing that offered to them. A lot of people don't even know about it. I had an elderly lady ask me about it, and that was the first I had heard about it last year.

Chief Crawford: One of the things that we have is - - - it's called EMS Life Care. And for the first four months of the year, we have about a three month window that's open enrollment, because we can't leave it open all year and add and take away members, and we send out a notice in the water bill that says if you want to join EMS Life Care for \$35 a month.

Councilman Webb: Oh, it's a monthly fee?

Chief Crawford: Oh, I'm sorry, \$35 a year. Sorry. It's a \$35 annual fee and it not only covers you, it covers everybody in your household as long as you're within the city limits of Shreveport, and we promote it. I send out a series of EMS supervisors and EMS officers to nursing facilities and assisted care facilities, because if you take one trip to the hospital in an ambulance, your bill is going to run anywhere from \$700-1200 depending on the level of medical care that you receive, and those types of things. And so, \$35 for a whole family that lives at a residence - - -

Councilman Webb: So, that's going to be on my water bill next month?

Chief Crawford: It will be in your water bill when the open enrollment starts, and you'll have about a three month window to return that. And that generates - - - I think it was about

\$70,000 a year revenue. But I can tell you that in years past when we first started the program, probably some 20 years ago, we did have a line item for advertising, for television commercials and radio spots. And we haven't had that in a long time. So a lot of that has to do with - - - you talk about getting the word out, we get the word out by mouth, we send it out in the water bill, but not everybody - - - you know you see something in the water bill, you throw it away.

Councilman Webb: About how many people did we have this past year join this?

Chief Crawford: I'll have to get you those numbers Councilman, but I can get 'em pretty quickly. So I'll probably have them by the end of the meeting.

Councilman Webb: I'll bet you the number is a lot lower than I'm even anticipating.

Chief Crawford: And it's progressively gotten lower as the years have gone by because of the like I said, we used to advertise it, push it pretty heavily.

Councilman Webb: What would advertising cost? You just got a half million dollars in extra revenue from collections.

Chief Crawford: Well the thing is, that's a general fund.

Councilman Webb: If the advertising would be less than what we could bring in for it, we're (inaudible) ahead.

Chief Crawford: I'd be glad to explore that for you and talk to some of the local media and get you some figures on running 30 second spots, and maybe some radio spots and get back to you.

Councilman Webb: I'm thinking about the non-collected revenue, if those numbers paid in and some people never use it. I've only ridden in an ambulance one time in my whole life and hope I never have to again.

Chief Crawford: Like I said, it's probably the best value that we offer as a city. \$35 per household that if you get transported by us (inaudible).

Councilman Crawford: I just feel like we're losing a golden opportunity to generate a little revenue.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, as I recall and Chief, please correct me if I'm wrong. When we used to do that program, we used to get complaints because people felt that non-emergency transports would also be available to them through the fire department. And then when that did not occur, then there were complaints about it. Does Bossier transport non-emergencies?

Chief Crawford: They transport everything because the law - - - because of a forced membership, they're required by law, that if that person wants to go to the hospital, they have to transport 'em because they have forced them to join actually through their water bill payments that they are a part of that ambulance membership. We do not have that. And Mr. Thompson is right. It's very clear, and it's clear in the language of the contract that they sign, but a lot of the patients that we are catering to are elderly, and so, and so when some individuals had gone through and gotten the Life Care, you know and they called and said okay, I'm ready to go to my doctors appointment, and we had to say we're sorry, we don't do that, we're an emergency ambulance service, and that contract only covers that. And we did have some problems with that. But I think that can be clarified through proper notification, and simple language, and if there's any advertising make sure that that's very clear, that those individuals understand. I know that the members that I send out to the nursing home communities and the retirement villages, they are very clear and explicit because they're the guys that actually are going to be doing the transport. Call us if you have an emergency, here's what an emergency is. If you just have a doctors appointment, or you need to go to the pharmacy and get some medicine, we don't do that, and we'll be glad to give you a number of a private ambulance service that does provide that service, but we only transport you if it's a true emergency.

Public Hearing: None.

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

Adding Items to the Agenda (Clerk reads items into the record - public comments allowed on items proposed to be added, then items can be added only after unanimous vote [See Act 131 of 2008])

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, we have five items remaining. The first three, they're on your e-agenda. It's sort of a housekeeping matter. Resolutions 285, 288, and 289 as it appears on the agenda contains the name Wimberly Custom Homes. The name that should be on the agenda for each of these items is S. R. Homes, L.L.C. So we would ask you to add these three resolutions to the agenda and when we get to the agenda items that are presently there, we'll ask you to remove those. So, all of these have to do with connecting to the water and/or water and sewer system, the first three.

The Clerk read the following:

1. **Resolution No. 285 of 2010:** Authorizing S. R. Homes, L.L.C., located at 9487 Milbank Dr., to connect to the Water & Sewer System of the City of Shreveport and otherwise providing with respect thereto. (D/Corbin)
2. **Resolution No. 288 of 2010:** Authorizing S. R. Homes, L.L.C., located at 9510 Milbank Dr., to connect to the Water & Sewer System of the City of Shreveport and otherwise providing with respect thereto. (D/Corbin)

3. **Resolution No. 289 of 2010**: Authorizing S. R. Homes, L.L.C., located at 9514 Milbank Dr., to connect to the Water & Sewer System of the City of Shreveport and otherwise providing with respect thereto. (D/Corbin)

4. **Resolution No. 291 or 2010**: Authorizing the Mayor to dedicate the 3200 block of Lakeshore Drive in honor of Mrs. Mamie Love Wallace and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (G/Jenkins)

6. **Resolution No. 295 of 2010**: A resolution clarifying the decision of the City Council in Zoning Board of Appeals Case no. BAC 98-10, King Restaurant Group Property located within Pierremont Mall, 4801 Line Avenue, Shreveport, La and otherwise providing with respect thereto

Mr. Thompson: As you can recall, during the last meeting, there was an amendment because of the various discussions that people made before the Council, and the amendment was not really clear as to what the intent of the Council was, and so this resolution is intended to reflect the intent of the Council as it relates to that particular matter. So those are the five items that are on the agenda.

Councilman Shyne: So moved Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Everson: Second.

Motion by Councilman Shyne, seconded by Councilman Everson to add Resolution No(s) 285, 288, 289, 291, and 295 to the agenda.

Councilman O. Jenkins: So that's a motion to add these items to the agenda. Is there anyone present who would like to speak for or against adding these to the agenda? Ms. Dixon, would you like to speak for or against adding one of these items to the agenda?

Ms. Dixon: Well, I would like to answer any questions you might have, I'm not sure if right now is the time I need to speak.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Will we bring her up during Public Comments?

Ms. Pilkinton: Correct.

Mr. Thompson: That's correct.

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

Mr. Thompson: All of these items can be considered for adoption today, so during the comment period, anybody who would want to speak on any matter that's in those items could do so.

Public Comments (*Comments on items to be adopted*)

Ms. Ann Dixon: (7332 Saybrook Cr) After we received notification from the last meeting, there was a little confusion by both my client who is the tenant and the landlord who is Pierremont Mall as to what exactly needed to be done at the end of the first year of occupancy. And that's when I contacted Mr. Thompson, and I thank you so much for your speedy response and to Chairman Jenkins that we have clarification of that because we were a little bit concerned that it also included his approval to sell alcohol and also his hours inside the restaurant til 10:00 p.m. And the purpose of this is to give us some firmer clarification. So we can move forward in getting a lease signed. And I'm here to answer any questions you may have.

Councilman O. Jenkins: I believe in our conversation, you're relatively satisfied with the current amendment as it's been presented, and if there's significant issue going forward, you'll let us know?

Ms. Dixon: Right. Exactly.

Councilman O. Jenkins: And that is an item to be added to our agenda today.

Mr. Thompson: For the Council and for the public, what this resolution clarifies is two things. 1) That the one year period will not begin to run until after the certificate of occupancy has been granted, because it's going to take several months for construction.

Ms. Dixon: It'll be in May probably at the earliest.

Mr. Thompson: And the second thing is that the one year period, the thing that could be altered only has to do with the patio and the extended hours on the patio and none of the other whether or not they can have a restaurant or sell alcohol or any of that. So it just makes that clarification.

Confirmations and Appointments: None.

CONSENT AGENDA LEGISLATION

TO INTRODUCE RESOLUTIONS AND ORDINANCES:

RESOLUTIONS: None.

ORDINANCES: None.

TO ADOPT RESOLUTIONS AND ORDINANCES

RESOLUTIONS:

The Clerk read the following:

1. **Resolution No. 285 of 2010**: A resolution authorizing Wimberly Custom Homes, L.L.C., located at 9487 Milbank Dr., to connect to the Water & Sewer System of the City of Shreveport and otherwise providing with respect thereto
2. **Resolution No. 288 of 2010**: A resolution authorizing Wimberly Custom Homes, L.L.C., located at 9510 Milbank Dr., to connect to the Water & Sewer System of the City of Shreveport and otherwise providing with respect thereto. [Map](#) (D/Corbin)
3. **Resolution No. 289 of 2010**: A resolution authorizing Wimberly Custom Homes, L.L.C., located at 9514 Milbank Dr., to connect to the Water & Sewer System of the City of Shreveport and otherwise providing with respect thereto

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Corbin, seconded by Councilman McCulloch to remove Resolution No.(s) 285, 288, and 289 of 2010 from the agenda. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and Jenkins. 7. Nays: None.

The Clerk read the following:

RESOLUTION NO. 284 of 2010

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING WIMBERLY CUSTOM HOMES, L.L.C., LOCATED AT 9472 MILBANK DR., TO CONNECT TO THE WATER & SEWER SYSTEM OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

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

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened, that Wimberly Custom Homes, L.L.C. be authorized to connect the structure, located at 9472 Milbank Dr. to the water & sewer system of the City of Shreveport.

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

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

RESOLUTION NO. 285 of 2010

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING S.R. HOMES, L.L.C., LOCATED AT 9487 MILBANK DR., TO CONNECT TO THE WATER & SEWER SYSTEM OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

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

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened, that S.R. Homes, L.L.C. be authorized to connect the structure, located at 9487 Milbank Dr. to the water & sewer system of the City of Shreveport.

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

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

RESOLUTION NO. 286 of 2010

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING JASON MICHAEL TRAINOR & LINDSEY NICOLE TRAINOR, LOCATED AT 9488 MILBANK DR., TO CONNECT TO THE WATER & SEWER SYSTEM OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

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

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened, that Jason Michael Trainor & Lindsey Nicole Trainor be authorized to connect the structure, located at 9488 Milbank Dr. to the water & sewer system of the City of Shreveport.

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

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

RESOLUTION NO. 287 of 2010

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING WIMBERLY CUSTOM HOMES, L.L.C., LOCATED AT 9505 MILBANK DR., TO CONNECT TO THE WATER & SEWER SYSTEM OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

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

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened, that Wimberly Custom Homes, L.L.C. be authorized to connect the structure, located at 9505 Milbank Dr. to the water & sewer system of the City of Shreveport.

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

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

RESOLUTION NO. 288 of 2010

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING S.R. HOMES, L.L.C., LOCATED AT 9510 MILBANK DR., TO CONNECT TO THE WATER & SEWER SYSTEM OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

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

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened, that S.R. Homes, L.L.C. be authorized to connect the structure, located at 9510 Milbank Dr. to the water & sewer system of the City of Shreveport.

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

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

RESOLUTION NO. 289 of 2010

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING S.R. HOMES, L.L.C., LOCATED AT 9514 MILBANK DR., TO CONNECT TO THE WATER & SEWER SYSTEM OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

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

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened, that S.R. Homes, L.L.C. be authorized to connect the structure, located at 9514 Milbank Dr. to the water & sewer system of the City of Shreveport.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that if any provisions or items of this resolution or the application thereof are held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions, items

or applications of this resolution which can be given effect without the invalid provisions, items or applications, and to this end, the provisions of this resolution are hereby declared severable.

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

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Corbin, seconded by Councilman S. Jenkins to adopt Resolution No(s) 284, 285, 286, 287, 288, and 289 of 2010.

Councilman Webb: Question. What subdivision?

Councilman Corbin: Twelve Oaks.

Councilman Webb: Okay.

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

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, we also have two items that were added that can be taken up at this time.

The Clerk read the following:

RESOLUTION NO. 291 OF 2010

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO DEDICATE THE 3200 BLOCK OF LAKESHORE DRIVE IN HONOR OF MRS. MAMIE LOVE WALLACE AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BY: COUNCILMAN SAM JENKINS

WHEREAS, Mrs. Mamie Love Wallace, has worked tirelessly for the cause of civil and human rights throughout the City of Shreveport and the nation; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Wallace served on the front lines of the Civil Rights movement in Shreveport and participated in such notable events as the “March Down Milam Street” a protest of the 1963 church bombings in Birmingham, Alabama; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Wallace continues to hold membership in the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People (NAACP), the Southern Christian Leadership Conference (SCLC), and other organizations whose purpose is to fight for the rights of all persons without regard to race, class or gender; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Wallace was an entrepreneur and business owner in the City of Shreveport for well-over forty (40) years and has provided employment opportunities for countless numbers of persons throughout her professional life; and

WHEREAS, the life and legacy of Mamie Love Wallace is aptly summed up by the phrase "...if I can help somebody..." for she has indeed helped countless persons as she has passed their way; and

WHEREAS, Mrs. Wallace has been a member of the Sunrise Baptist Church, 3220 Lakeshore Drive, for over thirty-six (36) years and like her service to the civil rights movement, her dedication and devotion to her Church is without bounds; and

WHEREAS, it is both apt and fitting that Mrs. Wallace's service to the City of Shreveport and its citizens be recognized and honored by the dedication of the 3200 block of Lakeshore Drive in her honor.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened, that the Mayor of the City of Shreveport is hereby authorized to dedicate the 3200 block of Lakeshore Drive in honor of Mrs. Mamie Love Wallace.

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 the 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 ordinances or resolutions or parts thereof in conflict here with are hereby repealed.

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

RESOLUTION NO. 295 OF 2010

A RESOLUTION CLARIFYING THE DECISION OF THE CITY COUNCIL IN ZONING BOARD OF APPEALS CASE NO. BAC 98-10, KING RESTAURANT GROUP PROPERTY LOCATED WITHIN PIERREMONT MALL, 4801 LINE AVENUE, SHREVEPORT, LA AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO

Whereas, on December 14, 2010, the City Council adopted a motion to modify the decision of the Zoning Board of Appeals in Case No. BAC-98-10 – King Restaurant Group Property located within Pierremont Mall, 4801 Line Avenue, Shreveport, LA; and

Whereas; the City Council now wishes to clarify said motion.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened that the decision of the Metropolitan Shreveport Zoning Board of Appeals in Case No. BAC-98-10 – King Restaurant Group Property located within Pierremont Mall, 4801 Line Avenue, Shreveport, LA is modified by amending Stipulation No. 4 to read as follows:

4. a) Hours of operation shall be to 12 midnight inside the restaurant.

b) i) Hours of operation shall be to 10 p.m. for the patio.

ii) Provided, if a party is seated for dinner prior to 10 p.m. on Friday or Saturday, the party may remain on the patio until they finish their dinner, but in no event later than 12 midnight. The patio may be used for smoking until 12 midnight.

iii) The approval for parties to remain on the patio after 10:00 p.m. until they finish their dinner shall be for a period of one year from the date a certificate of occupancy is issued for the premises. The applicant shall re-apply for approval to continue this practice prior to the expiration of one year from the date of issuance of the certificate of occupancy.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that Stipulation No. 8 contained in the motion adopted by the City Council on December 14, 2010 is deleted.

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

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

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

ORDINANCES: None.

REGULAR AGENDA LEGISLATION

RESOLUTIONS ON SECOND READING AND FINAL PASSAGE OR WHICH REQUIRE ONLY ONE READING:

The Clerk read the following:

RESOLUTION NO. 281 OF 2010

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE EMPLOYMENT OF SPECIAL LEGAL COUNSEL TO REPRESENT THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, on September 28, 2010, the Shreveport City Council adopted Resolution 176 of 2010 which, among other things, recognizes the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees Union and AFSCME Local 13-25 as the exclusive representative agent for City employees and provides for other matters related thereto; and

WHEREAS, the City desires to retain the services of Cook, Yancey, King and Galloway, APLC (S. Price Barker), Attorneys at Law, to represent the City in regard to implementation of the requirements of the resolution and related matters at an hourly rate of \$165.00 per hour, plus expenses; and

WHEREAS, the Office of the City Attorney recommends the employment of such special legal counsel to represent the City in these matters pursuant to Section 8.03 of the City Charter.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, regular and legal session convened that the Mayor be and he is hereby authorized to execute, for and on behalf of the City of Shreveport, a retainer agreement with Cook, Yancey, King and Galloway, APLC (S. Price Barker), Attorneys at Law, to represent the City of Shreveport in regard to implementation of the requirements of Resolution 176 of 2010, substantially in accordance with the terms and conditions of the draft thereof which was filed for public inspection, together with the original copy of this resolution in the office of the Clerk of Council on December 14, 2010.

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

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

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

RESOLUTION NO. 282 OF 2010

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF AN AMENDMENT TO THE COOPERATIVE ENDEAVOR AGREEMENT WITH SHREVEPORT REGIONAL ARTS COUNCIL AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport is the owner of property located at 801 Crockett Street, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana. The property is the former location of the Central Fire Station; and

WHEREAS, over the years, the City of Shreveport (“City”) by contract, has engaged in activities and events with the Shreveport Regional Arts Council (“SRAC”) designed and intended to promote, encourage, carry on and aid in the establishment, production and promotion of the arts for the benefit of the citizens of the City of Shreveport and surrounding areas; and

WHEREAS, SRAC also serves as the City’s Arts Administrator, provides technical and administrative support to the City and local artists, and serves as the arts grant (re-grant) agency on behalf of the City; and

WHEREAS, the art/artist resource center was previously located, managed and operated by SRAC on the City’s behalf, at 800 Snow Street; and

WHEREAS, the building was destroyed by a fire in August, 2009; and

WHEREAS, the City has executed a Cooperative Endeavor Agreement (the “Agreement”) with SRAC for management and operation of a new resource center at 801 Crockett Street; and

WHEREAS, the Agreement provides for an initial term of ten (10) years with an option to renew for four (4) additional terms of five (5) years each; and

WHEREAS, a condition for application for and receipt of tax credits is that the applicant demonstrate that they possess a right for use of the property for a period of at least thirty-nine (39) years; and

WHEREAS, as currently written, the Agreement provides for a Primary Term of ten (10) years with an option to renew for four (4) additional terms of five (5) years each; and

WHEREAS, City and SRAC officials desire to amend the Agreement to provide for two (2) additional option terms of five (5) years each.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, regular and legal session convened that the Mayor of the City of Shreveport is hereby authorized to execute an amendment to the Cooperative Endeavor Agreement with Shreveport Regional Arts Council substantially in accordance with the terms and

conditions of the draft thereof which was filed for public inspection, together with the original copy of this resolution in the office of the Clerk of Council on December 14, 2010.

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

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

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

Councilwoman McCulloch: Could we get more information or - - - could somebody talk about this?

Mr. Sibley: Sure we can. Mr. Chair, this is an amendment to the SRAC agreement. In order for them to qualify for a tax credit program, they needed a term of 39 years. Initially (inaudible) they only had 30 years. So, this is adding two terms so that they can meet that requirement.

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

RESOLUTION 283 OF 2010

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO ACCEPT A DONATION FROM

WILLIS KNIGHTON HEALTH SYSTEMS AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH

RESPECT THERETO

WHEREAS, WILLIS KNIGHTON HEALTH SYSTEMS wishes to make a cash donation to be used for purchase of Emergency Medical Services SPRINT vehicles and equipment; and,

WHEREAS, the donation is valued at four hundred thousand dollars (\$400,000.00); and,

WHEREAS, Shreveport City Code Chapter 26-187 requires City Council approval for acceptance of any donations valued in excess of five thousand dollars (\$5,000.00)

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due regular and legal session convened, that the Mayor be and is hereby authorized to accept the donation referenced herein and execute any necessary documents to complete the donation.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that if any provision of this Resolution or the application thereof is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions, items or application of this Resolution which can be given affect 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 in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

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

Councilman O. Jenkins: A moment of discussion here for me. Chief, we have a place to keep these vehicles, and/or we have a plan for that. You're not going to be coming up here at the end of our budget next year to say hey by the way, we've got all these vehicles now, we've got to come up with a certain expense to house all these?

Mayor Glover: Mr. Chairman, in the course of giving that answer, Chief I realize this may be something that Councilman Shyne and Councilman Webb may be a little bit more familiar with, but I think for the benefit Mr. Chairman of you and the five new members, and the public in general, I would ask that the Chief give a very brief, but quick overview of the SPRINT Car program. Exactly what it means, and to address those questions and what have you because in addition to space, there are also as we begin this process, some concerns about additional staffing levels as well. And the Chief can answer all of those for you in a pretty brief answer.

Chief Crawford: Thank you Mr. Chair. The SPRINT Car program is the single paramedic, rapid non-transport units. They're SUVs. If you haven't seen them, Willis Knighton was graciously enough to donate \$700,000 for the purchase of these vehicles simply because we did not have the available funding for those material resources we needed to start this program. We looked at the time at several other programs that were going on across the country. Memphis has a SPRINT Car program, Houston does, San Antonio does. San Antonio had the model that we adopted here in Shreveport. Because we knew that we would not be able to hire additional firefighters to put on these vehicles, and that we would have to use the existing resources. We just simply didn't have the budget means. And so San Antonio's model was to use the ladder truck personnel. The ladder trucks as necessary as they are and as needed as they are, when they're needed at a structure fire, a tall structure fire, those just don't happen all that often in the city. And so they're our least busiest pieces of equipment. And so, the San Antonio model has taken those men off of the ladder truck when a medical call comes in, in that district. And they get on the SPRINT Car and make the EMS call, and they come back, and they're back on the ladder truck, and they

get back in service. And so, it's actually a better utilization of resources that they're making more calls, we're getting more bang for our buck with those guys making calls. But additionally, and kind of a collateral benefit that we didn't anticipate, it actually increases our fire coverage. Because where I put these SPRINT vehicles are not only our busiest EMS stations, they're our busiest fire stations too that actually make structure fires. I'll give you an example. Station 9 in Cedar Grove which is at the corner of W. 70th and St. Vincent, is not only - - - was not only the busiest fire engine in the city, they were the busiest fire engine in the state. They made about 3600 calls before we put the SPRINT program in place there. Most of those calls were medical calls. But they were also my busiest fire calls. By putting that SPRINT vehicle in there, that engine that would have put about 100,000 miles on there in about six years will now last me about 12 years before I put 100,000 miles on there. That engine is about half a million dollars, the SPRINT vehicle cost me \$25,000 on a state contract. So, there's a huge benefit in not having the wear and tear. Those fire trucks were never made to make all those EMS calls. Even the manufacturers will tell you that. And so, they were put there, but by the SPRINT Car going on the EMS call, the engine now stays in the house, and they're actually making more fire calls now that they were missing, because they were going on so many EMS calls. So it's a better use of the resources that we have available. It kinda spreads the run volume out a little bit among everybody so that all the companies are equally as busy. But also a cost saving as well. As you can imagine, an SUV even at the worst gets better gas mileage than a fire truck does. The fire truck gets anywhere from 2-4 miles a gallon, and an SUV gets anywhere from 10-16 miles a gallon depending on if they're running with lights and sirens or if they're running just in a regular mode of transportation. But even more than that cost saving is, there's a risk management issue. A fire truck weighs 50,000 fully loaded with water. If it hits a vehicle, it's over with. They're going to take that vehicle out. Plus the replacement parts for a windshield for a fire truck is \$3,000. The windshield for an SUV is a couple of hundred dollars. A brake job for a fire truck, \$2200. A brake job for an SUV, couple of hundred dollars. And so there's a huge maintenance factor too. So between the risk management, the fact that it's actually providing better fire service coverage, we believe there's going to be a significant fuel savings as well, and it's a better utilization of resources. It just seemed like a no-brainer to us. And we were able to see the models in the other parts of the country that were working, and there's a lot of people that are actually looking at Shreveport now, and saying how are you doing that and is it being successful. I can tell you it's very successful. We purchased three SPRINT vehicles last year. One of them went to Station 8, which is at the Fairgrounds, which is our second busiest company, one of them went to Station 9 as I just mentioned, and then we have one right down here at Central Fire Station, and they have become some of the busiest running pieces of equipment on the department. They're also very popular among the paramedics. They're a great piece of equipment for a young firefighter to be on and to see a lot of interesting things, and to be very active. And so this additional \$400,000 donation will actually purchase three more SPRINT vehicles. Two of those will go to fire stations, and one of them will be used as a back up. But we do have a plan in place for where those are going to go.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Okay. And when you say where they're going to go, you mean - -
-?

Chief Crawford: What stations they're actually going to be assigned to. When I made the presentation to President and CEO James Elrod last year, I already had a plan. And I went to him and I said, this is what we want to do, and we think it will not only save the city money, reduce our risk management issue, provide a better use of our personnel resources, but it'll also provide better patient care in the long run. Those smaller vehicles, you've seen some of the streets, in Councilwoman McCulloch's district in Queensborough and Cedar Grove, some of the people park on the side of the street, it's tough to get a fire truck down some of those streets. And I'm telling you, when somebody's having a heart attack, being able to get that little SUV out there, out the door quicker, and able to get down the streets and maneuver better, sometimes we get there 10-15 seconds quicker, but sometimes 10 or 15 seconds makes the difference in us being able to save somebody's life and somebody having passed away. And so they do that as well. And so this new resolution provides the additional three and we'll close out that program and we're excited about getting those in place and continuing the program. But I believe and Mr. Thompson can add here, I think the resolution, well the original resolution last year stipulates in the resolution that no additional resources outside of my operating budget of what you provide to me each year, will be used. And I think it's primarily for staff, it's not for me replacing equipment on the truck, but it's basically to say that you know, Chief you're not going to hire any firefighters to put on the SPRINT vehicles, you're going to use the resources that you have to, and that was something that we agreed upon as an administration, as a council, that if we're going to implement this program that we're going to have to do it with the necessary resources that we have within the confines of our budget.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Okay, perfect. I like this, the sound of those economies and certainly the efficiencies. And then that translates into a different (inaudible) for some of our other fire trucks are considering.

Mayor Glover: Mr. Chairman, if I could add very quickly.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Well I better comment on his nice photo in the paper that we see in the paper that we see so frequently in front of those EMS trucks, and certainly Willis Knighton's support certainly deserves a lot of credit.

Chief Crawford: I can tell you that every time we've gone to Willis Knighton for whatever, whether we needed just some equipment and some life pack for the EKG monitors or we needed this large donation, in fact when I approached him I was hoping that they would just buy one of these vehicles. And they turned around and said how much for the whole program? And I said well \$700,000 and they were gracious enough. And you know they do so many firsts in the city. And they're certainly somebody whose been a friend to the fire department and a friend to the citizens, and making sure that we have. Because the EMS community is not just the ambulance, it's the whole thing. It's the ambulance, it's the emergency room, it's the secondary, tertiary care they receive when they get to the hospital

and being able to walk out of the hospital is the goal for all of us. So the quicker we can get there, the quicker we can get 'em to the ER to get that care, and get out the door, everybody benefits.

Mayor Glover: Mr. Chairman I just want to before you guys cast your vote, I wanted to express my thanks and appreciation again as Mayor on behalf of the city for the wonderful generosity of James K. Elrod, and the folks at Willis Knighton for all of the things that they do, but in particular for recognizing the value of this initiative. 2) Also commend the Chief as well as the other members of the fire department. This is one of the examples of the benefit of actually going through the 20+ hours of interviews with each of the individuals that qualified for the next Chief. We interviewed everyone who passed the test and who was interested in actually becoming the Chief. One of the questions that was posed was give me your idea on how you would help to operate the Shreveport fire department more effectively and more efficiently. What's interesting is, is that this concept came from Chief Crawford, and two of the other candidates who were in contention.

Chief Crawford: They stole it from me Mayor.

Mayor Glover: Well I'm sure it came from firehouse discussion, no doubt. I couldn't ever get anybody to actually give me (inaudible), but three of the sharper individuals in consideration mentioned this as one of those scenarios. Well when the final decision was made, and we selected Chief Crawford, one of the charges I gave him was please see if you can't take this and make it happen. It started with an SUV, and Chief, where did you get it from?

Chief Crawford: We had an old 2000 SUV that was left over, it was an Excursion that had about 150,000 miles on it, we did a pilot for about four months at Station 9, to see what the gas savings would be and how the make up would be, and once we were able to see there was some usefulness in this project, especially if we expanded to more than one station, then you know we had that conversation, and we moved forward with seeking those funds.

Mayor Glover: And this is an example of how we described for the previous council, this administration to just simply work harder and smarter. And I'll tell you as a quick aside, this was actually going to be one of my commercials in last year's campaign, but my wife told me, she said, 'If you run that, they'll just accuse you of trying to buy more SUVs', so we pulled the plug on it, and figured the truth would get out on it one way or the other. And we're glad that we got the support of the previous council and certainly welcome you all's support here today.

Chief Crawford: One of the things if I could just add to what the Mayor is saying, the Shreveport Fire Department long before I was the fire chief, and it'll be that way when I leave here has always been on the cutting edge of not only technology, but also innovative programs like the one you're seeing here. We didn't create the SPRINT program, but if I see somebody that's doing something a better way than we're doing it, I'm not afraid to steal it. And I'm proud of it, I'm not afraid to ask for a partnership with the city from our

private partners that are in the area, and ask for a donation to help us out. I mean, we all live in this community, whether you work for the city government, or you work for Willis Knighton, you work somewhere else. And so I think we're all here to help each other. And I think Willis Knighton understand that as well as any of our community partners do. And so a lot of cities that are struggling right now during the recession are looking at the SPRINT model in Shreveport for ways to save money. I've entertained numerous emails and phone calls from Chiefs saying tell me more about this program, they've come to visit us to see and take a look at it, and one of the interesting things that I'm doing right now is I'm talking to a couple of the CNG people about partnering with us. Because those SUVs are perfect candidates for CNG. So, now you put a CNG on there and you not only have to put gasoline in there, but you're putting CNG (Compressed Natural Gas) in there at half the price that we're paying for gasoline, and then you have another significant saving. The only drawback now is that conversion kit is pretty expensive, and so we're looking at how long it would take us to recoup those costs and we're looking for someone to step forward, so yes this is a commercial to help us offset that cost of CNG conversion for these 8 or 10 trucks that we're going to get, and we'll be glad to put their sticker on the back of the truck to let everybody know that they helped us convert these vehicles. So another cost saving measure that we're looking at doing.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Well, there's certainly one councilman here that's obviously very involved in - - -

Councilman Everson: I was looking his way, and he was smiling mine, so I hope that's a good thing. I think I know somebody who can help you.

Councilman Shyne: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to suggest that he might call the fire department in Atlanta and invite the Chief down and show what a modern city has done with their fire department.

Chief Crawford: I send him regular updates. He's in about six inches of snow right now. I talked to him Friday.

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

RESOLUTION NO. 290 OF 2010

A RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH THE HAYNESVILLE SHALE REVENUE COMMITTEE TO MAKE FINDINGS AND RECOMMENDATIONS CONCERNING THE EXPENDEITURE OF REVENUE GENERATED BY THE HAYNESVILLE SHALE NATURAL GAS FIELD, AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BY: COUNCILMAN RON WEBB

WHEREAS, it is the obligation of the City of Shreveport to use its resources to provide infrastructure and services needed to insure a healthy and vibrant city; and

WHEREAS, current taxes, fees, and other income of the City of Shreveport are insufficient to provide the infrastructure and services needed by the citizens now, and in the future; and

WHEREAS, natural gas in the Haynesville Shale located beneath public property owned and administered by the City of Shreveport, may provide unexpected revenue for the City of Shreveport; and

WHEREAS, the Shreveport City Council should established policy and set priorities to insure that any and all revenue from bonuses and royalty income generated by Haynesville Shale leases, will be used to insure, to the greatest extent possible, that Shreveport continues to be healthy and vibrant city; and

WHEREAS, the Haynesville Shale Revenue Committee should be established to make findings and recommendations concerning the expenditure of revenue generated by the Haynesville Shale natural gas field, and to report said findings and recommendations the City Council.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, legal, and regular session convened, that the Haynesville Shale Revenue Committee is established to make findings and recommendations concerning the expenditure of revenue generated by the Haynesville Shale natural gas field. Said Committee shall consist of three Council Members appointed by the Chairman of the Council.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that all revenue generated by the Haynesville Shale natural gas field shall be budgeted in “Mineral Bonus Operating Reserve” in the General Fund, and said funds shall not be expended or moved unless said proposed action has been submitted to the Haynesville Shale Revenue Committee for approval, and approved by the City Council.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that any provisions 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 servable.

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 Webb, seconded by Councilman O. Jenkins to adopt.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Thank you Mr. Chairman, and I apologize I really intended to contact Councilman Webb about this, but given the holidays and a tight schedule, I didn't get around to it. Look, will this actually create a separate line item in the budget? Will it go as far as being able to really delineate the sum of money separately so we'll know exactly what the Haynesville Shale is bringing in, or is the intent to (inaudible) that far?

Councilman Webb: Yes, it does. In fact that was presented to us, if I'm not mistaken when the budget was presented to us for 2011. (Inaudible) how much the reserve was and actually the reserve this year is higher than what the city's reserve is, if not, somebody correct me.

Mr. Sibley: And it is accounted for.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, and it will be budgeted in the Mineral Bonus Operating Reserve in the General Fund. It's an operating reserve in the general fund, but it has a separate designation and all of the funds go there so that you can see it, how much it is and it will be accounted for out of that separate item.

Councilman S. Jenkins: So, any income from that Haynesville Shale is going to that account?

Councilman Webb: Well my purpose for that was I felt that the Haynesville Shale was going to be here for a while, and we were going to generate more and more revenue from that, and I didn't want five years from now or even one year from now, people coming up and saying well we're having such financial problems, where is all this gas money gone to that we've been receiving, and I thought if we could as the old saying goes, following the paper trail, you know the money trail, we would be able to answer the constituents and citizens of this city exactly how much money we generated from the Haynesville Shale and exactly what we spent it on. And before they can take any money out of the Haynesville Shale revenue reserves, it would go before a committee and recommendations to the whole body for approval if the administration decides they need it for something.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Well I certainly support it, I think it's a great idea. We did something similar to this on Commission to set aside those funds and to have some mechanisms in place to be accountable to our citizens for the income from it. So if I'm understanding this correctly, and excuse me if I'm a little bit behind the ball, this policy is already in place of separating these funds out in the budget? They're already doing that is what you're saying?

Mr. Thompson: That's correct.

Councilman S. Jenkins: And how much, approximately how much do we have now? Does anybody know?

Ms. Pilkinton: I can find out. I think it's like - - - isn't it \$6,000,000?

Councilman Webb: I thought it was \$11(million) I can't remember.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Somewhere between \$6 and 11(million).

Mr. Sibley: I think that's totaled with both.

Councilman Webb: Both together?

Ms. Pilkinton: Yeah.

Councilman S. Jenkins: Both what?

Mr. Sibley: Operatives. We have basically two operating reserves. The mineral and the general fund reserves and combined. And the accounting of them is separate. We asked that the monies remained combined because that helps our balance sheet look better. But the accounting of them is separate. But they're both operating reserves funds. I'm saying that correct Sharon?

Ms. Piklinton: We have \$6,153,900 in minerals, we have \$4,740,600 in operating reserves. So they are separated out.

Councilman S, Jenkins: And this resolution here will become effective immediately, as far as the establishing of the committee or - - -?

Councilman O. Jenkins: 7 days Art?

Councilman S. Jenkins: Once again, I think it's a great idea.

Councilman Webb: Unless the Mayor vetoes it.

Councilman S. Jenkins: I think it's a great idea. I appreciate it, thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mayor Glover: Kumbaya Mr. Webb.

Councilwoman McCulloch: I'd like to make a request while where there. And I hit abstain, I shouldn't have hit that, I was really trying to make a request.

Mr. Thompson: I think you can change it.

Councilwoman McCulloch: While we're here, I wanted to make a request from the administration with regard to North Shreveport Industrial Park and any monies that might have been collected in oil and gas leases. Can we research that and find out if any monies for North Shreveport Industrial Park were collected in regards to this.

Mr. Sibley: We'll take a look Ms. McCulloch, I don't think we have as a city. That's one of the Boards as a matter we'll be submitting names to flush that board out so that they can go forward and generate some revenue, but I don't believe (inaudible) so far.

Councilwoman McCulloch: I'm requesting that on behalf of the Board because I actually meet with the Board. So that's a concern that we've had for the past couple of years. If any monies have been collected.

Mr. Sibley: And they have not.

Councilwoman McCulloch: By the city?

Mr. Sibley: Right. They have not by the city. As a matter of fact, one of the challenges we have with that board, that's the one that had some timber sales. It's getting that board flushed out so that they can vote. That's the one that had basically a supervisory board and another board, and we have to flush out the one or the other so that they can act and go forward and actually generate revenues. But as a city, we have not generated any monies from that park.

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

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS: *(Not to be adopted prior to January 11, 2011)*

The Clerk read the following:

1. **Resolution No. 292 of 2010:** A resolution authorizing the Mayor to execute a facility servitude agreement with Centerpoint Energy Field Services, Inc. for the construction and maintenance of pipelines and related facilities on City property and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

2. **Resolution No. 293 of 2010:** A resolution declaring the City's interest in certain adjudicated properties as surplus, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
(A/McCulloch/B/Everson/C/O. Jenkins/F/Shyne/G/ S. Jenkins)

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Shyne, seconded by Councilman Everson to introduce Resolution No(s). 292, and 293 of 2010 to lay over until the next regular meeting.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Do we have an outline of where if they are at all building any new pipelines or plant or is that just maintenance on those facilities and when we get to that, eventually, I'd like to see what that looks like. But not something that needs to be right now.

Councilwoman McCulloch: Regarding Resolution 293, are our employees permitted to purchase adjudicated properties? City employees?

Ms. Glass: I'll have to look into that. Off the top of my head, I'm thinking if they work in the department that does the adjudicated property program, probably not. In separate departments, they might be able to. I'd be happy check on that for it.

Councilwoman McCulloch: Say like Property Standards or something like that.

Ms. Glass: Well it's done in the Operational Services, Property Management Division. So, you know that's the department I was talking about, but I'll be glad to check on that for you.

Councilwoman McCulloch: I was just concerned because one of the applicants are actually city employees. That's why I asked.

Ms. Glass: As I said, I think if they're not in the same department, it's probably okay.

Councilwoman McCulloch: Alright thank you.

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

INTRODUCTION OF ORDINANCES: *(Not to be adopted prior to January 11, 2011)*

The Clerk read the following:

1. **Ordinance No. 189 of 2010**: An ordinance amending Section 102-164 of the City of Shreveport Code of Ordinances relative to vehicles for hire and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
2. **Ordinance No. 190 of 2010**: An ordinance amending the 2011 General Fund Budget, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
3. **Ordinance No. 191 of 2010**: An ordinance amending the 2011 Golf Enterprise Fund Budget, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
4. **Ordinance No. 192 of 2010**: An ordinance amending certain sections of Ordinance No. 104 of 1963, Stop Intersections, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
5. **Ordinance No. 193 of 2010**: An ordinance amending the 2010 Downtown Parking Enterprise Fund Budget, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Shyne, seconded by Councilman Corbin to introduce Ordinance No(s). 189, 190, 191, 192, and 193 of 2010 to lay over

until the next regular meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and Jenkins. 7. Nays: None.

ORDINANCES ON SECOND READING AND FINAL PASSAGE (*Numbers are assigned Ordinance Numbers*)

The Clerk read the following:

1. **Ordinance No. 94 of 2010**: An ordinance amending Chapter 22 of the Code of Ordinances relative to demolition delays and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (B/Walford) (*Postponed December 14, 2010*)

Having passed first reading on June 8, 2010 was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman S. Jenkins, seconded by Councilman Everson to postpone until January 25, 2011. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and Jenkins. 7. Nays: None.

2. **Ordinance No. 171 of 2010**: An ordinance amending and reenacting Chapter 58 of the Code of Ordinances by adding Section 58-29.1 relative to the use of certain vehicle brakes and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (D/Corbin) (*Postponed December 14, 2010*)

Having passed first reading on November 23, 2010 was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Corbin, seconded by Councilman S. Jenkins to postpone until January 25, 2011. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and Jenkins. 7. Nays: None.

3. **Ordinance No. 177 of 2010**: An ordinance amending the 2011 Budget for the Riverfront Development Special Revenue Fund, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on December 14, 2010 was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman S. Jenkins, seconded by Councilman Webb to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and Jenkins. 7. Nays: None.

4. **Ordinance No. 178 of 2010**: An ordinance amending the 2011 Budget for the General Fund, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

5. **Ordinance No. 179 of 2010**: An ordinance amending the 2011 Budget for the Metropolitan Planning commission's Special Revenue Fund, and otherwise providing with respect thereto. (E/Webb)

Having passed first reading on December 14, 2010 was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Webb.

Councilman O. Jenkins: I'd like to make amendment to postpone these two until after we meet with the Commission to agree or acknowledge the Master Plan, at which point put this back on the agenda and - - -

Councilwoman McCulloch: Second.

Substitute motion by Councilman O. Jenkins, seconded by Councilman McCulloch to postpone Ordinance No(s). 178 and 179 of 2010 until January 25, 2011.

Councilman Webb: Mr. Chairman, if I could ask Roy to come up, I'd appreciate it. I had a phone call today from one of my constituents concerning this, begging me not to approve this, and told 'em I'm the one that authored it, you know, trying to get it approved. But I did not read the newspaper today, and I understand there's an editorial also, I don't know if you read the editorial today. I don't even know what it said. But it seems like here we go again, we're getting all this negative feedback, and I was wondering if you might could enlighten the public that might be listening on TV a little bit about you know - - - we have spent so much money on this master plan and we've got to implement it, and if we don't have the right people in place to implement it, then we've wasted over a million dollars. And you can do a better job of explaining all of that than I can.

Mr. Jambor: Well in addition to serving as a liaison to the public bodies, one of the main things that is emphasized in the master plan is to keep the public engaged, and keep them involved. And obviously that's going to take somebody to keep them informed and to educate them about it. You know it's not expensive, if any of y'all have seen the (inaudible) that document even in graph form, it's a tremendous amount of information. The idea that every department head that works in government service is going to know and memorize and understand the implication of every item in there is a fairly silly notion. And so the idea is that somebody is going to help provide that service and make sure things aren't overlooked. And that includes government employees, as well as the public at large to keep them engaged. And otherwise those are how these things get put on the shelf, if you will. And certainly we're at that crossroads now. If you guys are satisfied with the idea that all we were trying to do is perform a master plan so that we could say oh we have one, and do nothing with it, then you know that's a real good way of accomplishing that. And that's not my recommendation, it's in the master plan itself. And I think at one point when this was discussed during the budget process I re-printed the section of the master plan itself to show you what the duties of this coordinator were going to be and the duties of all the various departments and public agencies on making sure that these sort of things weren't overlooked. Even that was a fairly voluminous piece of paperwork, and I'm sure it's around. If y'all need me to dig that up and re-distribute it. But you know certainly the timing of this thing is not yet critical. I mean the idea of delaying it until after the master

plan is either amended or adopted as is, it's certainly not a problem. The idea that you would never do these things, I think is a very serious problem.

Councilman Webb: I agree.

Councilman S. Jenkins: I think you may have just answered the question I was asking which is if we postpone this or delay it, what kind of affect would it have on y'all ability to advertise the positions (inaudible).

Mr. Jambor: Absolutely not, in fact I'll tell you when we started this thing, it was kinda anticipated that we would hire somebody to be involved during the process, so that they wouldn't have to learn about something that had already been published. When that didn't happen, one of the lessons we learned then was to advertise that position. And it was a tremendous and in fact even an impossible task, it got to the point where I couldn't even respond to the people that were inquiring about the position. They finally just figured out that when I wouldn't answer all their telephone calls and emails, that the position was either filled or wasn't going to be filled. We learned from that lesson to wait until the money was actually appropriated. We'll do so this time. You know if we start dragging towards the middle of February, I might get a little nervous. But until then, our timing is such we hope to have a short list of candidates developed by our national conference, which is in Boston in April, and you know that's a very convenient place to interview candidates. They have job fairs, places where they'll all be, and you can arrange those interviews in one place at one time. That seems to be a fairly effective way of doing it. There'll also be - - - I might address some of the so called negative comments. Those negative comments seem to be limited to the Shreveport Times Editorial Staff. Nationally, we're getting a lot of outstanding recognition. In fact, the Shreveport Master Plan will be presented as a case study in best practices at that conference in Boston. So the potential candidate will have the opportunity to attend that session, and learn about this particular project at that conference, if they so choose to avail themselves of it.

Councilman S. Jenkins: So a delay in the appropriation of these funds here is not going to adversely affect - - -

Mr. Jambor: No, if you guys want to wait, like I said, as long as we're able to advertise the position, which we will do so on the American Planning Association website as well as the normal local avenues and newspapers, etc., but we're looking for a professional planner, which is something which is emphasized in the planner. We need somebody, this is what they do, they've been educated in it, they're on what we call a track to becoming a certified planner. It's not necessary that they have that credential yet, but if they have the educational credentials that will get them to that point. And as long as you don't disturb that situation and put us back a year, you haven't really affected us.

Councilman S. Jenkins: When will the master plan be presented to this body?

Councilman O. Jenkins: That's a perfect question because I was about to ask the same thing. Now, I did read in the paper, not today's paper but yesterday's paper that apparently in a joint meeting with the Commission that we were going to be presented this plan the first week in January, though neither the Chairman of the Commission, nor myself are even aware of this meeting at this point and time, and I'm not sure if the Mayor's staff is aware of this meeting.

Mayor Glover: Here's what I want to make clear. We didn't call the meeting.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Whoever is calling that meeting maybe ought to invite somebody.

Mayor Glover: We didn't know about the meeting until you just referenced it.

Councilman O. Jenkins: I just read about it in the paper, but of course - - -

Mr. Jambor: Well again, we asked the newspaper to please don't let - - - you know we've been in discussions about when the appropriate and convenient date for everybody is - - -

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, if there has not been proper communication, it comes from me. Because that was my responsibility. We talked about what was the best way to get this information to everybody and to the public, and one of the things we discussed, and I'm sorry, I thought I discussed it with you, but apparently I did not. Because you would have remembered it. What we talked about was maybe having a joint meeting with the Commission and with the School Board and with the City at Independence Stadium, the way that we have those quarterly meetings. I know that we talked to Ms. McCulloch, because we were concerned about whether or not she could come at a certain time. And the time that was agreed on, and we talked to the staff of the Commission and I guess they did the same thing that I did, they did not follow through the way that they should have. We looked at the 7th at 11:30 to have a noon meeting with vittles, for a presentation of the master plan to everybody. Again, we apologize if we jumped the gun on that, but I thought that everybody had been notified.

Councilman O. Jenkins: I'm not casting (inaudible), like I said, I read about it in the paper and Commissioner Escude asked and he didn't know about it either, so - - -

Councilman Webb: How long are we talking about delaying this?

Councilman O. Jenkins: This funding, or now we're talking about this?

Councilman Webb: Right.

Councilman O. Jenkins: My proposal is just until such time that we acknowledge receipt or adoption or adopted it as amendment as we both as a city and hopefully the parish is on board, when we get to that stage, then we just bring it back up.

Mr. Thompson: If there is a meeting on the 7th, then it's possible that at the next meeting, it could be on the agenda for whether we would do any acknowledgement or adoption or whatever would be appropriate. And we've been talking about whether a resolution or an ordinance or whatever.

Mr. Jambor: The lawyers have started their conversation.

Mr. Thompson: To do this, but the important thing is for everybody to agree that, that's something we want to move forward with in some form or the other. And so, it would be early in January 2nd.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Or the second meeting in January, I mean once we get everything else done.

Mr. Thompson: Correct.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Does that answer your question Councilman Webb?

Councilman Webb: Yes.

Councilwoman McCulloch: My concern is in the past when it came to master planning, we've lost millions of dollars planning and drafting master plans, and I'm just concerned that you know, about the millions of dollars being spent currently. Normally, and you're saying too, that we're doing intergovernmental agreement here possibly when it comes to the master plan, or intergovernmental planning, I'm just concerned - - - I mean normally when we consider pay raises or additional jobs, we tend to look at other parishes or other governmental entities within the surrounding regions to see if when they're master planning, are they actually requiring planners? Because again, you're still counting dollars. And so, we've lost millions in the past, and now we're spending millions presently for master planning. I just have this fear or some anxiety about hiring additional employees that we really don't need. I mean are these planners going to - - - are will these planners as well? I mean is this just a city?

Mr. Jambor: Absolutely. Let me answer your question this way. Nationwide typically, what you have are what we call strategic planning. Your planning commission staff is made up of people who are zoning experts, and people who are more about being proactive. Cause in essence, zoning is a tool to implement your strategy. Okay, but Shreveport since - - - as you're well aware of, in the last real comprehensive plan they did was roughly in 1957. The staff has morphed to where when you're asking about the strategic planners on your staff, you're looking at him. Okay, I'm it. Typically nationwide, that's roughly a 50/50 mix. Where you have people that are trained as strategic planners and that's the primary focus, and under the kind of theory that the more planning that you do, the less zoning you that you do. It becomes less necessary. So, the idea is what we're trying to do, is kinda transfer the focus of our staff from basically a zoning commission to one that does both planning and zoning. And the idea is that you can't just wake up and say now you know everything

you need to know about strategic planning when there's not training or anything else to expect him to be able to do that. So the idea is, it's going to take time, and it's going to be a transition. There's no doubt about that.

Councilwoman McCulloch: So it's a common practice among other governmental entities?

Mr. Jambor: That's what I'm saying, if you want to compare us to just to another specifically, I can give you data about all of the planning commission staffs nationwide. And what their percentage of resources are to current planning and zoning enforcement, etc., versus strategic planning. And I can assure you, we're way, way, way behind the curve because of the emphasis that's been occurring for 50 something years now. And what we're hoping is to change that trend.

Councilman O. Jenkins: So the proposal is to postpone?

Mr. Thompson: Until the first, second, or - - -

Councilman O. Jenkins: Second meeting in January, cause I figure it's going to take us a week to get a resolution or ordinance passed on this.

Ms. Johnson: That'll be January 25, 2011.

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

6. **Ordinance No. 180 of 2010**: An ordinance amending the 2010 Grants Special Revenue Fund Budget, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (*COPS UHP Grant Increase*)

Having passed first reading on December 14, 2010 was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Shyne, seconded by Councilman Everson to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and Jenkins. 7. Nays: None.

7. **Ordinance No. 181 of 2010**: An ordinance amending the 2010 General Fund Budget, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on December 14, 2010 was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Shyne, seconded by Councilman Everson.

AMENDMENT 1 TO ORDINANCE 181 OF 2010

AMEND THE ORDINANCE AS FOLLOWS:

In Section 2 (Appropriations):

In Personnel (Human Resources), decrease Personal Services by \$40,000, increase Contractual Services by \$35,000 and increase Improvements and Equipment by \$5,000.

Adjust totals and subtotals accordingly.

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT:

This amendment adjusts funding in Human Resources between characters. This amendment does not impact Operating Reserves.

This amendments funds the purchase of an Applicant Tracking System and provides additional funds needed related to the complete revision of Human Resources rules and regulations. This amendment also provides funding for the purchase of a camera, LCD projector and laptop computer.

Motion by Councilman Shyne, seconded by Councilman Webb to adopt Amendment No. 1 to Ordinance No. 181 of 2010.

Councilman O. Jenkins: I'd like one piece of discussion here. As it is the 28th of December, I'm just curious to know, is this really 2010 budgets or are we just not - - - I mean have these things already been purchased? Are we buying this tomorrow, or whatever else on the last little items there on the bottom?

Ms. Pilkinton: Mr. Chair, what with the city's financial system, if an invoice is dated 2010, those fields will be processed through the first month in 2011.

Mr. Madden: (Inaudible) they're 2010 expenses.

Councilman O. Jenkins: That answers my question. Any further discussion? Lets vote.

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

Motion by Councilman Shyne, seconded by Councilman Webb to adopt Ordinance No. 181 of 2010 as amended. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and Jenkins. 7. Nays: None.

8. **Ordinance No. 182 of 2010**: An ordinance amending the 2010 Capital Improvements Fund Budget, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on December 14, 2010 was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Webb, seconded by Councilman O. Jenkins to adopt.

Councilman O. Jenkins: I have one discussion point. We'd asked - - - this is really Mr. Sibley or the mayor, about an opportunity for somebody to come particularly to speak to the new council on how all these reallocations of prior bond issues and refunding. I received some communication. We initially proposed for the first meeting in January, but I understand the Grigsby Group was not available until the second meeting in January. And so that is fine for us. We had proposed doing it at the conclusion of the Work Session on the whatever that is, the 24th of January. That's really just a follow on, I don't know if you were on that email trail or not, but it's still in our interest I believe for the new folks to understand how that all got re-characterized in the SWAPs as such.

Mr. Sibley: We'll set that up.

Councilwoman McCulloch: Well I guess I probably need to wait on the meeting, huh? But really I'm just being a female, I'm just anxious to make this inquiry. The decreased appropriation for Amiss filter improvement, could you explain that versus right below that, you have the same amount as an increase. Could somebody explain that to me.

Councilman O. Jenkins: I believe it's the source of the two. One if you look below, it says 2005 Revenue Bonds, and then the other one is Louisiana Community - - -

Mr. Sibley: And Mr. Chairman, if I may, what we try to do, what we starting doing is trying to reconcile Capital Projects. What we've found historically over the years, there were Capital Projects where the work had been completed, funds were still sitting there being unused. And part of the idea is to reallocate those funds. If the project's been completed, there's funding left over, then lets shift it, and put it to use somewhere else. So, you'll see a lot of these, we intend to do a lot of these, just trying to reconcile and make sure they zero out, and make use of those funds that are available, that perhaps were left over from the project.

Councilwoman McCulloch: Well I was a bit concerned because its for the same thing. I mean we had a decrease of \$628 (thousand) and you also came right below that for the same and you gave an increase. So, you're saying you had \$628,000 sitting somewhere, and then you came - - - I mean I don't understand that. I mean could you explain that. See right here decrease the appropriations for Amiss WTP filter improvements, \$628,118, then right below that, you said increase the appropriation for Amiss WTP filter improvements, \$628,118. Was two different funding sources, but I don't understand it.

Mr. Norwood: It's a change in funding source, that's all it is.

Mr. Thompson: One source fell through I believe. One source fell through or didn't come through?

Mr. Norwood: This is Barbara's, Barbara Featherston's ordinance, and she can go into a little detail on that part.

Ms. Featherston: Yes ma'am. The decrease in funding is - - - you'll see most of the decreases in funding, where there's an increase right below it are for the 2005 URB, that is the \$25,000,000 in bonds that we had to re-appropriate money through a different source. And so, we are taking that money out from 2005, and putting in the new funds, which are the new 2010 LCDA.

Mr. Sibley: And some of that will be covered in the briefing, because it impacts the \$75,000,000 that we re-financed and all that, so part of that briefing with the bond team, with the finance team will also cover these type things.

Mayor Glover: Mr. Chairman, we'll also have staff and the bond team consult with you and the rest of the council and council staff to see if there may not be some advance materials that we may be able to provide you all prior to that meeting in January, just to make that as productive as possible.

Councilman O. Jenkins: That would be great. Appreciate it.

Mr. Thompson: Ms. McCulloch, do you want to abstain or?

Councilwoman McCulloch: No, I don't want to abstain, I want to just vote yes.

Mr. Thompson: Would you change it?

Councilwoman McCulloch: I just hit the wrong button.

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

9. **Ordinance No. 183 of 2010**: An ordinance amending the 2010 Water and Sewerage Enterprise Fund Budget, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on December 14, 2010 was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Shyne, seconded by Councilman Corbin to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and Jenkins. 7. Nays: None.

10. **Ordinance No. 184 of 2010**: An ordinance amending Certain sections of Chapter 38 of the City of Shreveport Code of Ordinances, the Property Standards Ordinance, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on December 14, 2010 was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman O. Jenkins, seconded by Councilman S. Jenkins to adopt.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Mr. Holt, are you back there? I've got one question about this with regard to swimming pools. With regard to swimming pools in this proposed changes to Property Standards. I noticed there wasn't a provision in there about pools that are not kept to a certain level of cleanliness, etcetera , etcetera because I've gotten some complaints about neighbors that you know the neighbors pool has not, the water hasn't been changed in 9-10 months. They've got algae growing, they've got bugs in the back yard, it's coming over into the next door neighbors' property, etcetera, etcetera.

Mr. Holt: That the corner of Swedes and Anniston by any chance?

Councilman O. Jenkins: Swedes, it's over there - - - it is in the Broadmoor neighborhood, yes.

Mr. Holt: We've been chasing that man for two years. You give him a citation to court, and just haven't caught him yet. Now what you're talking about is already in the ordinance. What you're seeing here are changes only. The latest deal on swimming pools, we've had so many foreclosures in the last two years, than more than we've ever seen before. People are just walking away from nice brick homes, in-ground pools, leaving them full of water, leaving the gates wide open, this allows us to go into a vacant property with an open gate and pool access and padlock that gate after we have sent notices as required by state law.

Councilman Shyne: And Sam Jenkins, that applies to my area too.

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

11. **Ordinance No. 185 of 2010**: An ordinance granting to the Southwestern Electric Power Company the right, privilege, and franchise to acquire, construct, erect, maintain, repair, reconstruct, and operate a system of electric power lines, wires, transformers, communication cables,, and other related and necessary or desirable appurtenances in, under, over, across, through, and along any and all of the present and future streets, avenues, alleys, thoroughfares, roads, highways, sidewalks bridges, and public properties of the City of Shreveport, Louisiana for the purpose of transmitting and distributing electric power to the city and it inhabitants and any other person or persons, firms, and corporations for a term of twenty-five years, regulating the use of streets by the company and repair and restoration of the streets disturbed by construction; Providing for compensation to be paid to the City; Providing that this franchise shall not be exclusive; Providing the company's obligations to furnish efficient service; Providing for indemnity by the company to the city; Providing for conditional forfeiture in event of default by the company; Making miscellaneous provisions relative to this grant of franchise; Providing for acceptance by

company; Providing a severability clause; Providing an effective date, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on December 14, 2010 was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman O. Jenkins, seconded by Councilman McCulloch to postpone until January 25, 2011.

Mr. Sibley: Mr. Chairman, just wanted to note for the record, that the council did ask for written confirmation that SWEPCO would not have a problem and thus, the documents that we just provided, wanted to be sure those get entered into the record.

Councilman O. Jenkins: And for the record, we're probably going to try to put together a committee to study this appropriately with some people on the administration and see where we want to go forward with regard to some of these franchise (inaudible) that we're proposing. That's the intent.

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

12. **Ordinance No. 187 of 2010**: ZONING - C-72-10: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, The City Of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the west side of Havana Street 180 feet south of Martin Luther King Drive, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, LA., from **R-1H, URBAN, ONE FAMILY RESIDENCE DISTRICT TO B-1, BUFFER BUSINESS DISTRICT** and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (A/McCulloch)

Having passed first reading on December 14, 2010 was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman McCulloch, seconded by Councilman Everson to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and Jenkins. 7. Nays: None.

13. **Ordinance No. 188 of 2010**: ZONING - C-79-10: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, The City Of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the west side of Youree Drive at its intersection with Albert Avenue, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, LA., from **SPI-3(B-1), COMMERCIAL CORRIDOR OVERLAY (BUFFER BUSINESS) DISTRICT TO SPI-3-E (B-1), COMMERCIAL CORRIDOR OVERLAY/EXTENDED USE (BUFFER BUSINESS) DISTRICT LIMITED TO RETAIL SALES OF CLOTHING, FURNITURE, AND GIFTS FOR BABIES AND EXPECTANT MOTHERS" ONLY**, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (C/Jenkins)

Having passed first reading on December 14, 2010 was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by

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

The adopted ordinances and amendments follow:

ORDINANCE NO. 177 OF 2010

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2011 BUDGET FOR THE RIVERFRONT DEVELOPMENT SPECIAL REVENUE FUND AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BY: Councilman Ron Webb & Councilman Sam Jenkins

WHEREAS, the City Charter provides for the amendment of any previously adopted budget; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds it necessary to amend the 2011 budget for the Riverfront Development's Special Revenue Fund to adjust appropriations, reflect current revenue estimates and for other purposes.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in legal session convened, that Ordinance No. 138 of 2010, the 2011 budget for the Riverfront Development's Special Revenue Fund, is hereby amended as follows:

In Section 2 (Appropriations)

Increase Other Charges by \$30,000

Decrease Operating Reserves by \$30,000

Adjust totals and subtotals accordingly.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the remainder of Ordinance No. 138 of 2010 shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

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 to be severable.

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

ORDINANCE NO. 180 OF 2010

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2010 GRANTS SPECIAL REVENUE FUND BUDGET, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the City Council finds it desirable to amend the 2010 budget for the Grants Special Revenue Fund, to adjust revenues and for other purposes.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, legal and regular session convened that Ordinance No. 135 of 2009, the 2010 budget for the Grants Special Revenue Fund, be amended and re-enacted as follows:

In Section 1, (Estimated Receipts)

In Police 2009 and Prior-Years Receipts:

Increase COPS Universal Hiring Program 2008, \$35,000.

In Fire 2010 Revenues:

Increase Fire SPRINT Vehicles by \$400,000

In Section 2, (Appropriations)

From Police 2009 and Prior-Years Receipts:

From Prior Year COPS Universal Hiring Program 2008, increase Personal Services \$35,000.

From Fire 2010 Revenues:

From Fire SPRINT Vehicles, increase Improvements and Equipment by \$400,000

Adjust totals and subtotals accordingly.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the remainder of Ordinance 135 of 2009 shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that if any provision or item of this ordinance or the application thereof shall be held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions, items or applications of this ordinance which can be given effect with out the invalid provisions, items or applications; and to this end, the provisions of this ordinance are hereby declared to be severable.

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

ORDINANCE NO. 181 OF 2010

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2010 GENERAL FUND BUDGET, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the City Council finds it necessary to amend the 2010 budget for the General Fund.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED, by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in legal session convened, that Ordinance No. 126 of 2009, the General Fund Budget, is hereby amended as follows:

In Section 1 (Estimated Receipts):

Increase Taxes and Special Assessments by \$73,500

Increase External Service Charges by \$1,075,000

In Section 2 (Appropriations):

In Finance, decrease Personal Services by \$85,000, increase Contractual Services by \$125,000 and increase Improvements and Equipment by \$35,000.

In General Government, increase Contractual Services by \$73,500.

In Operational Services, increase Materials and Supplies by \$200,000 and \$800,000 in Contractual Services.

Adjust totals and subtotals accordingly.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the remainder of Ordinance 126 of 2009 shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that if any provision or item of this ordinance or the application thereof shall be held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions, items or applications of this ordinance which can be given effect with out the invalid provisions, items or applications; and to this end, the provisions of this ordinance are hereby declared to be severable.

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

AMENDMENT 1 TO ORDINANCE 181 OF 2010

AMEND THE ORDINANCE AS FOLLOWS:

In Section 2 (Appropriations):

In Personnel (Human Resources), decrease Personal Services by \$40,000, increase Contractual Services by \$35,000 and increase Improvements and Equipment by \$5,000.

Adjust totals and subtotals accordingly.

EXPLANATION OF AMENDMENT:

This amendment adjusts funding in Human Resources between characters. This amendment does not impact Operating Reserves.

This amendment funds the purchase of an Applicant Tracking System and provides additional funds needed related to the complete revision of Human Resources rules and regulations. This amendment also provides funding for the purchase of a camera, LCD projector and laptop computer.

ORDINANCE NO. 182 OF 2010

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2010 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS FUND, APPROPRIATING THE FUNDS AUTHORIZED THEREIN, AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the City Council finds it necessary to amend the 2010 budget for Capital Improvements,

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED, by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in legal session convened, that Ordinance No. 124 of 2009, the Capital Improvements Budget, is hereby amended as follows:

In Program E – Water Improvements:

Decrease the appropriation for **McNeill Water Treatment Plant Improvements (94-E004)** by \$422 and close project. Funding source for this project was 1994A Water and Sewer Bonds.

Decrease the appropriation for **McNeill Water Plant Improvements (05-E013)** by \$21,301 and close project. Funding source for this project was 2005 URB.

Decrease the appropriation for **West Laurel Water Main Improvements (05-E014)** by \$35,361 and close project. Funding source for this project was 2005 URB.

Decrease the appropriation for **60” Water Main – Amiss to West College (06-E001)** by \$9,626 and close project. Funding source for this project was 2007 URB.

Decrease the appropriation for **Southfield Road Water Main Improvements (07-E001)** by \$26,213 and close project. Funding source for this project was 2005 URB.

Decrease the appropriation for **Fifth Street Water Main Improvements (07-E002)** by \$27,883 and close project. Funding source for this project was 2005 URB.

Decrease the appropriation for **Amiss WTP Filter Improvements (98-E006)** by \$628,118. Funding sources for this amount are \$175,000 in 2005 URB, 53,000 in 2007 URB, and \$400,118 in 2000 URB.

Increase the appropriation for **Amiss WTP Filter Improvements (98-E006)** by \$628,118. Funding sources is 2010 LCDA.

Decrease the appropriation for **Amiss WTP Improvements (05-E012)** by \$9,857,812. Funding source is 2005 URB.

Increase the appropriation for **Amiss WTP Improvements (05-E012)** by \$10,013,026. Funding source is 2010 LCDA.

Decrease the appropriation for **City-Wide Water Main Renewal/Replacement (05-E008)** by \$2,000,000. Funding source is 2005 URB.

Increase the appropriation for **City-Wide Water Main Renewal/Replacement (05-E008)** by \$2,000,000. Funding source is 2010 LCDA.

Increase the appropriation for **Russell Road Water Main Improvements (05-E001)** by \$1,500,000. Funding source is 2010 LCDA.

In Program F – Sewer Improvements:

Decrease the appropriation for **Corbitt Street Water and Sewer Improvements (02-F009)** by \$149,946 and close project. Funding source for this project was 2005 URB.

Decrease the appropriation for **Cedar Grove Lift Station Improvements (05-F004)** by \$20,570 and close project. Funding source for this project was 2005 URB.

Decrease the appropriation for **Flournoy Lucas/Twelve Oaks Sewer Main Repairs (05-F001)** by \$50,000 and close project. Funding sources for this amount were Water and Sewer revenues in the amount of \$15,000 and 2000A Water and Sewer Bonds in the amount of \$35,000.

Decrease the appropriation for **Lucas and North Regional WWTP Expansion (00-F001)** by \$166,863. Funding source is 2003B DEQ SRLF.

Decrease the appropriation for **Hardy Lift Station Improvements (05-F008)** by \$81,314. Funding source is 2005 URB.

Decrease the appropriation for **Lucas Lift Station Improvements (05-F013)** by \$400,000. Funding source is 2005 URB.

Decrease the appropriation for **Miscellaneous Lift Station Improvements (05-F025)** by \$500,000. Funding source is 2005 URB.

Decrease the appropriation for **Pine Hills Lift Station Improvements (05-F015)** by \$4,600 and close project. Funding source is 2005 URB.

Increase the appropriation for **Sanitary Sewer Evaluation Survey and Master Plan (10-F001)** by \$2,000,000. Funding source is 2005 URB.

Adjust totals and subtotals accordingly.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the remainder of Ordinance 124 of 2009 shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that if any provision or item of this ordinance or the application thereof shall be held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions, items or applications of this ordinance which can be given effect with out the invalid provisions, items or applications; and to this end, the provisions of this ordinance are hereby declared to be severable.

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

ORDINANCE NO. 183 OF 2010

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2010 WATER AND SEWERAGE ENTERPRISE FUND BUDGET, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the City Council finds it necessary to amend the 2010 budget for the Water and Sewage Enterprise Fund.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED, by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in legal session convened, that Ordinance No. 130 of 2009, the Water and Sewerage Enterprise Fund Budget, is hereby amended as follows:

In Section 1 (Estimated Receipts)

Increase Water Charges by \$600,000

In Section 2 (Appropriations):

Increase Materials and Supplies by \$200,000

Increase Contractual Services by \$100,000

Increase Water and Sewer Main Improvements by \$300,000

Adjust totals and subtotals accordingly.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the remainder of Ordinance 130 of 2009 shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that if any provision or item of this ordinance or the application thereof shall be held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions, items or applications of this ordinance which can be given effect with out the invalid provisions, items or applications; and to this end, the provisions of this ordinance are hereby declared to be severable.

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

ORDINANCE NO. 184 OF 2010

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CERTAIN SECTIONS OF CHAPTER 38 OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT CODE OF ORDINANCES, THE PROPERTY STANDARDS ORDINANCE, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened, that Section 38-4 of the City of Shreveport Code of Ordinances is hereby amended as follows:

Nuisance shall mean the condition of any premises which is dangerous or potentially dangerous to human life or detrimental or potentially detrimental to the health, safety and welfare of the citizens of the city including, but not limited to, the following:

(1) Any condition or use of any land, building, structure or dwelling, or any operation thereon or therein that causes or may cause a person to desire to examine such condition,

use or operation, and that is reasonably calculated to cause harm to such person, whether the condition, use or operation is located in a building or structure, on the premises of a building, or on a vacant lot. This subsection includes, without limitation, any abandoned wells, shafts, basements, refrigerators, motor vehicles, swimming pools, structurally unsound fences, retaining walls, driveways, parking areas, or other structures, or any lumber, trash, debris or vegetation reasonably calculated to be a hazard or which poses or may potentially pose a threat to the health or safety of anyone.

(2) The keeping, retaining, or depositing on, or the scattering over the premises of any of the following:

- a. Lumber, fallen dead trees, trash, garbage, debris, glass or building material;
- b. Weeds, grass and wild growth in violation of section 38-61 or weeds, grass, or saplings allowed to grow around any exterior wall of any structure, or stands of bamboo which generate any type of vermin or which may provide cover for criminal activity;
- c. Abandoned, discarded or unused objects or equipment including, but not limited to automobiles, boats, motorcycles, motor homes, furniture, appliances, cans or containers; and/or
- d. Standing water in any receptacle.

(3) Any dwelling, building, structure, premises or the use thereof which is unsanitary, unclean, dangerous or potentially dangerous to the physical health or safety of any person, or which, as a result of its condition, may generate criminal activity, such as graffiti.

(4) Every vacant dwelling unit with an in ground or above ground swimming pool must have all gates accessing pool area securely locked.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED, that Section 38-11 of the City of Shreveport Code of Ordinances is hereby amended to now read as follows:

Sec. 38-11. - General requirements for buildings.

No person, owner, party-in-interest, agent or tenant shall occupy, lease or sublease any building or structure designed or intended to be used for residential or nonresidential purposes located within the corporate limits of the city which does not comply with the following minimum requirements this section. The municipal address of any such residential or nonresidential building or structure shall be posted on the front of each main structure in a conspicuous place that is visible from the street. The municipal address numbers and/or letters shall be a minimum of three inches and shall be the address on file with the office of the city engineer.

(1) *Residential.* No person, owner, party-in-interest, agent or tenant shall occupy, lease or sublease to another for occupancy any dwelling or dwelling unit designed or intended to be used for the purpose of residential living, sleeping, cooking or eating therein, or otherwise maintain any unoccupied dwelling or dwelling unit located within the corporate limits of the city which does not comply with the following requirements:

d. *Means of egress.* Every dwelling shall have safe, unobstructed means of egress and shall open from the inside.

f. *Protective railings.* Protective railings shall be required on any porch or other path of ingress or egress over 30 inches from ground level or on any steps containing four or more rises.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED, that Section 38-51(a) of the City of Shreveport Code of Ordinances is hereby amended to now read as follows:

Sec. 38-51. - Maintenance of swimming pools.

(a) *Harbor or infestation.* Any owner, party in interest, tenant, lessee or occupant of a dwelling, dwelling unit, premises or property having a swimming pool or manmade pond located thereon shall maintain the swimming pool or pond in the following manner:

(3) All swimming pools (in ground or above ground) access gates shall be locked at all times that structure sits in a vacant state with no renter, lessee or any other permanent resident.

(4) The director shall be authorized to secure any unsecured entrance to any pool area at any vacant structure by any means necessary to ensure public safety after notification as required by this section.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that Section 38-61 of the City of Shreveport Code of Ordinances is hereby amended to now read as follows:

Sec. 38-61. - Grass and weeds and wild growth.

(a) The owner, party in interest, tenant, lessee or occupant of a dwelling, dwelling unit, premises, vacant lot or occupied, unoccupied, vacant, residential and nonresidential

properties located within the city shall be required to cut, destroy or remove weeds, grass, harmful or unhealthy growths or other obnoxious or wild matter growing, lying or located in or on any such property with a height equal to or greater than 12 inches and to cut, destroy or remove such weeds, grass, harmful or unhealthy growths or other obnoxious or wild matter lying or located in or on any sidewalk abutting any such property or encroaching upon adjacent property by natural growth or by growth through, over or under fences or walls, regardless of height. No growth described in this subsection shall be allowed to interfere with the passage of any pedestrian on any sidewalk nor shall any such growth be allowed to obscure the clear line of vision of any motorist. Responsible parties shall insure that concrete curbs adjacent to property are trimmed or edged and shall be responsible for vegetation maintenance to the edge of any abutting street surface.

(c) Enforcement. The director shall be authorized to issue a citation or notice of violation to any owner, party in interest, tenant, lessee or occupant of any dwelling, dwelling unit, premises, or property who shall fail to comply with the provisions of this section. The citation or notice shall be served upon the owner, party in interest, tenant, lessee or occupant of such property as provided in this chapter. The institution of legal proceedings against any owner, party in interest, tenant, lessee or occupant of any such property shall not prevent the city from abating the violation by use of city resources or a private contractor as provided in Section 38-85. Notice shall be given as provided in this section.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED, that Section 38-81 of the Code of Ordinances is hereby amended to now read as follows:

Sec. 38-81. - Administration of this code.

(a) The administration and enforcement of this code shall be the responsibility of the Department of Property Standards. The director may employ inspectors, assistants and other employees to administer and enforce the provisions of this chapter. The director may assign the duties and responsibilities under this chapter to other employees of the department.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED, that Section 38-83 of the Code of Ordinance is hereby amended to now read as follows:

Sec. 38-83. - General powers and duties.

(d) The director is hereby authorized and directed to enforce the provisions of this code. The director shall have the authority to render interpretations of this code and to adopt

policies and procedures in order to clarify the application of its provisions. Such interpretations, policies and procedures shall be in compliance with the intent and purpose of this code. Such policies and procedures shall not have the effect of waiving requirements specifically provided for in this code.

(e) The director shall serve written notice of the violation upon the owner, party in interest, agent, occupant or tenant of the dwelling, dwelling unit, or premises in the manner provided in Section 38-84. Except as otherwise provided herein, any notice served pursuant to the provisions of this section shall automatically become an order, unless a written request for an appeal is filed with the board in the manner provided in section 38-105. The director may, for good cause, extend the time period in which to comply with the notice of violation.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED, that Section 38-106 of the Code of Ordinances is hereby amended to now read as follows:

Sec. 38-106. - Appeal from the decision of board.

Any person aggrieved by the decision of the board shall have the right to appeal the decision to the city council by filing a written request for an appeal within ten days of the date of receipt of notice of the decision of the board. The city council shall conduct the hearing on the appeal in accordance with its established rules and procedures. The city council shall affirm, modify, reverse or remand the decision of the board.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED, that Section 38-107 of the Code of Ordinances is hereby amended to now read as follows:

Sec. 38-107. - Appeal from the decision of the city council.

Any person aggrieved by the decision of the city council shall have the right to appeal the decision to a court of appropriate jurisdiction; provided, however, such petition is filed within 30 days of receipt of notice of the decision of the city council.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED, that Section 38-108 of the Code of Ordinances is hereby amended to now read as follows:

Sec. 38-108. - Notice to the chief building official.

Following the conclusion of all appeals, the director shall provide the chief building official or his designee with a copy of each order or decision rendered by the director, the board, or the city council which will require issuance of a building permit in order to comply with the order or decision. The chief building official or his designee shall thereafter limit any

permits issued on the property affected by the order or decision to the period of time specified in the order or decision.

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.

ORDINANCE NO. 187 OF 2010

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 106 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES, THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT ZONING ORDINANCE, BY REZONING OF PROPERTY LOCATED ON WEST SIDE OF HAVANNA STREET, 180 FEET SOUTH OF MARTIN LUTHER KING DRIVE, SHREVEPORT, CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA, FROM R-1H, URBAN, ONE-FAMILY RESIDENCE DISTRICT, TO B-1, BUFFER 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, Louisiana, in due, legal and regular session convened, that the zoning classification of property located on the west side of Havanna Street, 180 feet south of Martin Luther Drive, legally described as the south 60 feet of Lot 11, Oak Forrest Subdivision #1, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, be and the same is hereby changed from R-1H, Urban, One-Family Residence District to B-1, Buffer Business District.

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

1. Development of the property of the property shall be in substantial accord with the site plan submitted with any significant changes or additions requiring further review and approval by the Planning Commission.
2. A detailed landscaping plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Zoning Administrator prior to the issuance of building permits.
3. A subdivision plat that defines the building site shall be submitted to and approved by the MPC.
4. Approval from the Zoning Board of Appeals regarding the reduction in the front yard setback shall be obtained prior to the issuance of any building 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.

ORDINANCE NO. 188 OF 2010

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 106 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES, THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT ZONING ORDINANCE, BY REZONING PROPERTY LOCATED ON THE WEST SIDE OF YOUREE DRIVE AT ITS INTERSECTION WITH ALBERT AVENUE, SHREVEPORT, CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA, FROM SPI-3(B-1), COMMERCIAL CORRIDOR OVERLAY (BUFFER BUSINESS) DISTRICT, TO SPI-3-E(B-1), COMMERCIAL CORRIDOR OVERLAY/EXTENDED USE (BUFFER BUSINESS) DISTRICT LIMITED TO “THE RETAIL SALE OF CLOTHING, FURNITURE AND GIFTS FOR BABIES AND EXPECTANT MOTHERS” ONLY AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO

SECTION I: BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, in due, legal and regular session convened, that the zoning classification of property located on the west side of Youree Drive at its intersection with Albert Avenue, legally described as the N/2 of Lot 8 and the S/2 of Lot 7, resubdivision of Plot 106 Broadmoor Subdivision Unit 1, and the S/2 of Lot 8 and the N/2 of Lot 9, resubdivision of Plot 106 Broadmoor Subdivision Unit 1, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, be and the same is hereby changed from SPI-3(B-1), Commercial Corridor Overlay (Buffer Business) District, to SPI-3-E(B-1), Commercial Corridor Overlay/Extended Use (Buffer Business) District limited to “the retail sale of clothing, furniture and gifts for babies and expectant mothers” only

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 a revised site plan showing landscaping to Ordinance standards. This plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Planning Director. Any significant changes or additions shall require further review and approval by the Planning Commission. No permits shall be issued until the revised site plan and/or replatting of lots has been approved by the MPC Director or the Planning Commission

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.

Mayor Glover: Mr. Chairman, before you go on to Unfinished Business, I want to if you will, take a moment to acknowledge Mr. Willie White, the Executive Director and Administrator of the David Raines Clinic, who has been sitting here very quietly awaiting passage of 187. I think he informed me that upon the Council's favorable approval of the measure today, that I believe the groundbreaking for the David Raines Administration Building would be scheduled for the 4th of January. And the time?

Mr. White: 12:30.

Mayor Glover: 12:30, 4th of January, in the 100 block of MLK Drive and Havana? Intersection of MLK Drive and Havana. That's across the street from Southern University, on the western end of MLK Drive.

Councilman Shyne: Mr. Mayor, I was waiting for Councilwoman McCulloch to extend an invitation to us for the groundbreaking.

Councilwoman McCulloch: You got it.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Well in the interest of fairness and other related to my district, I'm not sure if the gentleman who is putting together the expectant mother's store is having a groundbreaking ceremony, but if he does, I will make sure we notify the council at this point.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

Mr. Thompson: I don't believe that we have any items that the council would take up at this time Mr. Chair, at least I'm not aware of any.

1. **Ordinance No. 167 of 2009**: Amending and reenacting Chapter 10 of the Code of Ordinances relative to alcoholic beverages, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (A/Lester) (*Tabled December 14, 2010*)

2. **Ordinance No. 168 of 2009**: Amending and reenacting Chapter 10 of the Code of Ordinance relative to alcoholic beverage permits, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (A/Lester) (*Tabled December 14, 2010*)

3. **Ordinance No. 03 of 2010:** Amending and reenacting Chapter 10 of the Code of Ordinances relative to Alcoholic Beverage Permits and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. *(Tabled December 14, 2010)*

PROPERTY STANDARDS APPEALS:

HBO0700145: 426 Woodrow, Shreveport, LA (F/Shyne) Ms. Carolyn Miller, 424 Woodrow, Shreveport, LA 71105 (F/Shyne) *(Postponed November 22, 2010 until May 23, 2011)*

PSD0900006: 2006 Looney Street, Shreveport, LA (A/McCulloch) Ms. Niakia Cook-Jones, 6777 Raspberry Lane, Apartment 1421, Shreveport, LA (F/Shyne) *(Postponed November 22, 2010 until May 23, 2011)*

PSD0800400: 5318 Mansfield Road, Shreveport, LA (F/Shyne) Mr. Darien Kirkendoll, P.O. Box 8703, Bossier City, LA. *(Postponed November 22, 2010 until January 24, 2011)*

PSD0900275: 140 Pennsylvania Avenue, Shreveport, LA (C/Jenkins) Mr. & Mrs. Robert A. Powell, 819 ½ Boulevard Street, Shreveport, LA 71104 (B/Everson) *(Postponed November 8, 2010 until January 10, 2011)*

HBO1000030: 153 Merrick Street, Shreveport, LA (B/Everson) Mr. Benjamin A. Cornier, P.O. Box 44021, Shreveport, LA 71134 *(Postponed November 22, 2010 until January 24, 2011)*

PSD1000086: 2837 Logan Street, Shreveport, LA (A/McCulloch) Ms. Carolyn Ivory Wilson, 3646 Del Rio Street, Shreveport, LA 71109 (G/Jenkins) *(Postponed October 25, 2010 until January 11, 2011).*

CAB1000828: 3135 Idledays Dr., Shreveport, LA 71107 (A/Lester), Mr. Leroy Carey, 3135 Idledays Drive, Shreveport, LA 71107 (A/McCulloch) *(Postponed November 22, 2010 until January 10, 2011)*

PSD1000150: 2717 Lakeshore Dr, Shreveport, LA (G/Jenkins) Ms. Gwendolyn C. Williams, 6410 Dianne Street, Shreveport, LA 71119 (A/McCulloch) *(Postponed November 22, 2010 until January 10, 2011)*

PSD1000061: 9025 Hilton Dr, Shreveport, LA (E/Webb) Mr. Jim Bruce, 9045 Hilton Drive, Shreveport, LA 71118 (E/Webb) *(Postponed December 13, 2010 until February 7, 2011)*

PSD1000128: 2900 West Maple Street, Shreveport, LA (G/Jenkins) Mr. William Herbert Edelen, III, PO Box 8888, Shreveport, LA 71148 *(Postponed December 13, 2010 until January 10, 2011)*

NEW BUSINESS:

Mr. Thompson: There is no New Business.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Regarding Property Standards?

Mr. Thompson: I believe all of those matters - - - none of those matters are to be taken up today.

Councilman O. Jenkins: Any New Business?

Mr. Thompson: No sir.

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES

Councilman O. Jenkins: By the way, for the sake of the Council, I've submitted some potential nominations, and - - - for various committees, if you would get back to me with regard to that, that would be great.

CLERK'S REPORT:

Councilman O. Jenkins: Is there a Clerk's Report?

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, do you want us to continue to plan the Intergovernmental Meeting between the City Council, the Parish Commission, and the School Board on the 7th to receive the city's master plan presentation?

Councilman O. Jenkins: I would like you to do so if there is no other body on the council that has a problem with it. As long as it's coordinated properly with the Commission.

Mr. Thompson: We will continue to do that, and we apologize again for not consulting with the council members earlier.

Ms. Pilkinton: And also I need a headcount to be able to give MPC, where they should make plans for lunch, along with the Administration office.

Mr. Thompson: The Mayor made certain appointments and it's under the Clerk's Report to the Comprehensive Environmental Board of Appeals. Those will be on the agenda at the next meeting and if there are any questions or anything, I would encourage you to talk to the Administration about it. That's all we have Mr. Chairman.

Comprehensive Environmental Board of Appeals Appointments – Received December 20, 2010:

Individual proficient in Area of Mr. Burns Doss, Jr.

Environmental Regulations 8932 Blom Blvd

Shreveport, LA 71118

Engineer w/proven background in Design, Larry Lashley

Environmental Operations, or 2005 S. Kirkwood Drive

Environmental Regulatory Matters Shreveport, LA 71118

Person with proven expertise in Robert B. Raines, Jr.

Environmental Field 10230 Westwood Drive

Shreveport, LA 71118

Registered Voter Howard Allen

3011 Dallas Street

Shreveport, LA 71104

Registered Voter Susan Standke

4718 Fairfield Avenue

Shreveport, LA 71106

Councilman O. Jenkins: Since we are talking about appointments, if the council would please provide the names for those religious leaders at their convenience, that would be greatly appreciated with regard to moving forward with the union issue. And I think most of the council has their appointments, it's just a matter of giving those names to you. Is there a motion for the council to resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole?

Motion by Councilman Shyne, seconded by Councilman Everson for Council to resolve itself into Committee of the Whole. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen McCulloch, Everson, Jenkins, Corbin, Webb, Shyne, and Jenkins. 7. Nays: None.

THE COMMITTEE RISES AND REPORTS: *(Reconvenes Regular Council Meeting)*

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business to come before the council, the meeting adjourned at approximately 7:02 p.m.

//s// Oliver Jenkins, Chairman

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