

COUNCIL PROCEEDINGS OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT, LOUISIANA  
*August 10, 2004*

**(As amended and approved on August 24, 2004)**

The Regular Meeting of the City Council of The City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, was called to order by Councilman Jackson at 3:10 p.m., Tuesday, August 10, 2004, in the Government Chambers in Government Plaza (505 Travis Street).

Invocation was given by Councilman Hogan.

On Roll Call, the following members were Present: Councilmen Lester (Arrived at 3:21 p.m.), Walford, Carmody, Gibson (Arrived at 3:21 p.m.), Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

**Approve Minutes:** Motion by Councilman Carmody seconded by Councilman Walford to approve the Administrative Conference Summary Minutes of July 26, 2004 and the Council Meeting Meetings of July 27, 2004. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

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

Councilman Jackson: I know that we have at least one resolution.

Mayor Hightower: Mr. Chairman, we did have those two reports that we wanted to do today though.

Councilman Jackson: Sure. I will get back to them.

The Deputy Clerk read the following resolution:

**RESOLUTION NO. 176 OF 2004**

**A RESOLUTION TO RECOGNIZE MS. JEANNE BROWN JACKSON FOR HER DISTINGUISHED LEADERSHIP AND VOLUNTEER SERVICES TO MANY CIVIC AND PHILANTHROPIC ORGANIZATIONS AND TO THE CITIZENS OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO**

**WHEREAS**, Mrs. Jeanne Brown Jackson was Founder of the Alvin M. Jackson and Jeanne Brown Jackson Charitable Foundation, and she served in leadership capacities in many other organizations as follows: Chairman of Mother's March of Dimes of Shreveport Bossier; Chairman for the Mother March of Polio; Past President for the local Arthritis Foundation; Volunteers of America; Schumpert Guild; Past President and Honorary Board Member of The Schumpert Medical Center Foundation, St. Catherine Community Center, and Girl Scouts of America to name a few; and

**WHEREAS**, Mrs. Jeanne Jackson was a major contributor to many organizations, including: the Biomedical Medical Foundation of Northwest Louisiana; Willis-Knighton Medical Center - Nurses Library; State Fair of Louisiana - Junior Livestock Sale; Shreveport Police Department - K-9 Unit; Shreveport Fire Department - Fire Prevention; Schumpert Medical Center - Alvin M. Jackson Horticultural Conservatory; American Red Cross; the Glen Retirement System; The Grace Home; Diocese of Shreveport; The McDade House; and LSU Medical Center in Shreveport - Rheumatology Program; and

**WHEREAS**, Mrs. Jeanne Jackson received many awards for her dedicated services

including; Certificate of Merit, highest award given by The American National Red Cross for saving a life; Exchange Club Book of Golden Deeds Award for distinguished community service not previously recognized; Northwest Louisiana Extension Agents, outstanding support of the 4-H youth; Commendation Medal, highest award bestowed by the Shreveport Police Department on civilians; Daughters of the American Revolution Medal of Honor; highest award given for leadership, trustworthiness, service, patriotism; Diocesan Medal of Honor, St. Elizabeth Ann Seton Catholic Church recipient for outstanding Catholic service to the parish and community; Outstanding Philanthropist, National Society of Fund Raising Executives, North Louisiana Chapter, Dame of the Order of St. Gregory The Great; and

**WHEREAS**, Mrs. Jeanne Jackson was involved in Nurses Aide activities serving at; Willis - Knighton Hospitals in Shreveport; Charity Hospital, New Orleans; Barksdale AFB Hospital; Polio Center at VA Hospital and Confederate Memorial Center; Schumpert Hospital of Shreveport and Holy Cross in Ft. Lauderdale, Florida and a Charter Member and Secretary of the Geological Auxiliary; and

**WHEREAS**, Mrs. Jeanne Jackson volunteered her services at the Shreveport Chapter of the American Red Cross for sixty years; and

**WHEREAS**, After battling a lengthy illness, Mrs. Jackson passed away on August 4, 2004 at Christus Schumpert Medical Center.

**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 Mrs. Jeanne Brown Jackson for her dedication, dependability, her giving spirit and love for the Citizens of the City of Shreveport, as demonstrated by unselfish and generous contributions of time and resources to many civic philanthropic organizations in the City and State.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that this resolution shall be executed in duplicate originals with one original presented to Mrs. Jackson'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 Carmody, seconded by Councilman Hogan for passage.

Councilman Carmody: As is evidenced by the resolution and the tremendous amount of awards Ms. Jackson received over her lifetime, I felt it very appropriate for this body even in hindsight with her death having occurred on August 4<sup>th</sup>, that we would recognize her accomplishments. These types of persons like Ms. Jackson, whose lives are dedicated to the service of the communities, especially in the private sector. Those of us that talk about the fact that we want to be public servants and that we want to try to assist (unclear), we do so in a different capacity than those who actually put their lives, their time, and their resources and their treasures into helping their fellow man. I think it's very appropriate that this Council recognizes Ms. Jackson today. And I guess I put a charge back to all the rest of us that are here to carry on, and that is who will make up for these types of individuals who the community loses, and are each of us willing to step up to the challenge individually to fill our part to make up for their ploy. So, gentlemen, if I could ask that we go ahead and pass this resolution again, I think it's hard to add anything above what this woman's accomplishments were in here life, but I think that her greatest accolades is the fact that she cared, and that she showed that she cared and that she did

so throughout her life. So, thank you Mr. Chairman.

Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Hogan, and Jackson. 4. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Lester, Gibson, and Green. 3.

The Deputy Clerk read the following resolution:

**RESOLUTION NO. 177 OF 2004**

**A RESOLUTION TO SUPPORT THE VISION, MISSION AND GOALS OF THE AMERICAN DIABETES ASSOCIATION, AND TO ENCOURAGE THE CITIZENS OF SHREVEPORT TO SUPPORT THE SHREVEPORT- BOSSIER AMERICA'S WALK FOR DIABETES.**

**WHEREAS**, the mission of the American Diabetes Association is to prevent and cure diabetes and to improve the lives of all people affected by diabetes; and

**WHEREAS**, the vision of the American Diabetes Association is to make an everyday difference in the quality of life for all people with diabetes; and

**WHEREAS**, the American Diabetes Association works to achieve its vision and reach its mission by conducting programs in research, information and advocacy; by providing authoritative information about diabetes and its treatment; by providing the opportunity for donors to make a difference by financially supporting its cause and by recognizing donors as the primary means by which it achieves its mission; and by recruiting high quality volunteers and staff to achieve the objectives of the Association; and

**WHEREAS**, on Saturday, October 2, 2004, the American Diabetes Association will sponsor the Shreveport - Bossier America's Walk for Diabetes at Summer Grove at South Park (formally South Park Mall), 8924 Jewella Avenue to raise funds to carry out its mission.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Shreveport City Council supports the vision, mission and goals of the American Diabetes Association, and encourages the citizens of Shreveport to support the Shreveport - Bossier America's Walk for Diabetes at Summer Grove at South Park, on Saturday, October 2, 2004, beginning at 8:00 a.m.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that this resolution shall be executed in duplicate originals with one original presented to the American Diabetes Association 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 Walford, seconded by Councilman Gibson passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

Councilman Jackson: At this time, I wanted to ask the two representatives from the American Diabetes Association who are here today to come forward. Mr. Avant and Dr. McCarthy. If you all would, come forward please. I just wanted to recognize both Mr. Avant and Dr. McCarthy, who if you will, we'll just receive some comments with regard to the American Diabetes Association and to the events to which we just referred.

Mr. Avant: Just to reiterate as the resolution stated that we are here to represent the American Diabetes Association and to promote the walk. Dr. McCarthy is the researcher here in our local area at LSU and I'm sure that he would like to have something just say about the walking and about the monies that are going to be taken in this area, that's going to stay here to help our community with diabetes.

Dr. McCarthy: Thank you Mr. Avant. My name is Kevin McCarthy. I'm a professor of Pathology at LSU Health Science Center, Shreveport. And I'm a lab rat. If I told you what I did on a day-to-day basis, I'll tell you right now, your eyes would glaze over and you would fall asleep. At least that's what the med students that I teach do almost everyday. But what I'm here for really is to really promote the ADA itself. I'm the local president of this chapter of the ADA. And at the nation level, I sit on the National Grant Review Committee. And what I can tell you right now is what we're seeing nationwide is a crisis. You've heard it on the news, you've heard it locally here and nationally, where we have an epidemic. We have an epidemic of Type II Diabetics in the country right now and it's growing. Currently, there are 20 million diabetics, individuals afflicted with diabetes in the country. Out of that 20 million, 15 million are Type II. Those are the people that develop diabetes because of obesity and diseases like that and later in life. But we're seeing a trend now where it's happening in kids, and you've heard this on the news also. The caveat there is if kids are developing Type II diabetes now and they are in their teens, by the 30s we're going to see vascular disease, kidney disease and heart disease in these individuals. And so, we need to step in and intervene at present. And that is the goal of the ADA. If you look at our symbol, it's a triangle and the vertices of the triangle stand for Cure, Care and Commitment. And right now, we are committed to both diabetes education, diabetes research and training of diabetes. In the area of diabetes research, currently at LSUHSC, there are four people funded by ADA including myself, and the total input of monies coming into LSU is on the order of approximately \$500,000 per year for research in diabetes. And that's all coming from the national office and that is derived from monies that we've raised here at our local walk. And we are actually right now receiving more monies from the national office than we are contributing. And we want to increase that amount so we thank you for your supporting our efforts. Currently, last year's total, we brought in \$80,000 in our walk efforts and we want to increase that to \$100,000 or more if possible. So, any help that we can get from the local community and from the City Council and the City and County would be fantastic. And I'd like to thank you all just for your time and efforts in passing this resolution.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you Dr. McCarthy. Let me just say that I certainly want to encourage and I have a commitment at least from one other Councilman who has made a commitment to be a part of the annual walk on October 2<sup>nd</sup>, and certainly would solicit not only all of the Councilman, but people who around this community, have a concern whether they are diabetic or not, all of us are generally associated with someone or know of others who have in fact been either living with or suffering from, if you will, the disease. And so, I think it's something that has reached as Dr. McCarthy said, a level of epidemics, so that it certainly is worthy of us getting involved. So, I just wanted to thank you all for taking time out to come today and talk a little about this walk as well.

Mr. Avant: And we would like to have one closing comment. The young man

said in the resolution that who is going to step up to the plate when someone such as the resolution previously was added, we would like to thank Mr. Theron Jackson, Councilman Theron Jackson for taking time out of his busy schedule to be our Walk Chairman. And that lets you know he's not just talking behind the bench, but he's showing his work in practice. So, we're asking all of you all to support us on October 2<sup>nd</sup>. Y'all ask your church and family members to at least sponsor a team (unclear) walk, call the local ADA Chapter at 425-4878. Thank you.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you so much. Madam Clerk, do we have any other resolutions?

Ms. Pierce: No sir.

Councilman Jackson: Before we move on, while we're at the recognitions of distinguished guests and communications of the Mayor and awards, I want to ask real briefly, is Chief Campbell still here? Also, if you'll come and Marvin and Terrance, if you'll come as well and I don't know- - -is Shelly here? Or someone from SPAR?

Councilman Walford: Gary is hiding back there.

Councilman Jackson: Gary, if you would? Thank you gentlemen. I just wanted to recognize. I know that yesterday the Shreveport Times in the front page of the paper talked a little bit about the Super Safe Sundays and those things that were going on and I wanted for this Council to recognize these gentlemen, they are not the only ones, but certainly they were at least these four and a few others were at the table in the very beginning. And the Chief and his staff and Gary and his staff came to the table and to their credit, didn't leave the table until they were able to work out what was necessary, also with Tom Cody and some other folks who participated in this process. It was an interesting process to observe to see if from it's genesis until the final presentation on this last Sunday. I didn't get a chance to see it this last week, but I know that the two prior events were very successful drawing crowds of over 10,000 people at these events and it was as many of you know precipitated by the idea that there was this congestion, this gathering to some degree, unruly gathering at the corner of Greenwood Road and Jewella. Many of you know, we had town hall meetings to try to get conversation going to figure out what, in fact could happen to try to mitigate some of the circumstances that were happening at that corner, these gentlemen along with others from the community and again from these respective staffs came together and put their heads together and I would suggest to everybody who was involved those who had a chance to see what was going on and those who did not, that we didn't have those same problems again over the course of the summer that we had in times past. Unfortunately, there was not a whole lot of coverage, but fortunately the coverage that did come was not on national news about a cab driver and all these other things that were negative things. So, I wanted to if you will commend all of you all for the work that you did to make this happen. I know sometimes that a lot of hard work is not appreciated and sometimes, particularly those who work for the City, no good deed seems to go unpunished. But thank you so much for the time that you spent around the table and making this happen. It's been a success. It was a super success for this community at large and I just wanted to say thank you to Marvin, to Terrance - - - I'm sorry - - - *Jabber Jaws* and *Bay Bay* and to Gary and to Chief for what they've done to make this happen. So, I just wanted to ask you if you would, just as a matter of recognition, I wanted to say that to you, but I also wanted in retrospect, if you would,

any of you all may have any comments, I just wanted to hear from you before we proceeded with the rest of our - - -.

*Jabber Jaws*: First of all, I wanted to say thank you to the Mayor and the City Council, because without you all, we wouldn't have been able to do the Super Safe Sunday and like Councilman Jackson said, it was very successful. When we first started, we were hoping to do a couple thousand people, but we turned out 10,000+ and the reviews and the response from the people, and I mean young, old, Black, White - - - all people showed up and it was a great time for all and most importantly, it was safe. Safe environment. We didn't make any kind of negative publicity and it goes to show that the City is hungry for things like that. And one of the biggest things they said in the town hall meeting is 'they don't have anywhere to go and it cost too much to go here and it cost too much there'. So again, I just wanted to say thank you to the Mayor for approving us. I remember when me and Calvin first came in your office, and you read over it. You thought it was a good idea. And Theron got involved and you all voted on it, so, again I just wanted to say thank you on behalf of the citizens of Shreveport. Because that's what it was all about. It was about all of us coming together in unity and that's what it was. We tried the first one, the second was dependent on the first one. So, it went off. The second one went off and the third one, which was the final one because starts next week, was a huge success. And I just wanted to say again thank you to all of you.

Mr. Norman: We did enjoy being a part of it. A lot of times we stand up here and take the credit for it, but my staff, Shelly Ragle, Ronnie Hammond and their staffs did a great job of working with the other City departments as well as *Bay Bay* and *Jabber Jaws* and try to pull this together. And if you didn't get a chance to go out, I mean it was quite a sight with the number of people that we had there and you know get a chance for us to see Independence Stadium used as that type of venue which was good. We feel like we had a positive impact and we were certainly glad to be a part of it.

Chief Campbell: I would just like to echo Gary's comments in particular the officers that were out there that made this thing go off again, thank you Council for thinking outside the box and lets trying something else. It was something that we worked with each time we had one, we'd go back to the table and plan. The cooperation was great between everybody that was involved and we just worked to make it more successful each time. Appreciate the opportunity.

Councilman Jackson: Well let me ask you Chief, we talked about being safe, in your opinion, I know you've talked with the officers as well, would you consider it a safe event, because our altercations were relatively none in these situations?

Chief Campbell: That is correct.

Councilman Jackson: Well, what about traffic?

Chief Campbell: The traffic, we were able to work that out, I think the first night, we had a few issues, but again, we went to the table, talked about some of the issues and I think each event (unclear).

Councilman Jackson: And the other thing I wanted to say as well is that, I think it was a wonderful opportunity for those of you who may not know it, I know it at least at the second and the third event, the second I was there. I didn't see the third one, but I know that one of the other things that happen in that situation was an opportunity for officers to embrace individuals and individuals to embrace officers in almost a

recreational kind of environment. Such that relationships could be developed in such that the officer were seen as human beings if you will and I know from my own personal observation, it seemed to be a great interaction among the people who were there and the officers themselves. And that people I think develop relationships on another level particularly with the Police Department. So, I think it was more than one. It was a win-win situation, if you will.

Chief Campbell: Oh without a doubt. Yes sir.

Councilman Lester: I just want to echo what's been said. I've just been amazed and proud of all of the participation, both from these gentlemen representing their individual companies, the Police Department and SPAR to the citizens. I think the young people of our community deserve a big hand as well. Because you know they came out and said, give us something to do and we will know how to act. And we gave them something to do, and true to their word, they knew how to act. Because quite obviously, if they did not conform to the conduct that we expected, then this would have been a tremendous fiasco. But the fact is the young people of this community came, they had a good time, and as *Jabber Jaws* and *Bay Bay* said "when it's time to go home, go home. Don't go to the corner". And they followed those directions. So, I'm very pleased. I'm excited, I'm hoping that this would be something that we continue in the future, not so much because there is a need, in terms of the traffic situation, but we just as a community need to do things to give our children and our young people some positive outlet, so they can see some positive role models, so they can see. You know, Councilman Jackson and myself and other Councilmen outside of us wearing suits. You know, just walking around in T-shirts and flip flops with our kids. To see that we're regular people just like they are. So, I'm proud of everything that's been done. I'm just hopeful and expect that we're going to do even more in the future. I just wanted to say thank you and congratulations to yourself and to the young people of this community, because they showed themselves very worthy. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you. I think this is a good example of how we can use the assets of the City with regards to the stadium and things like that. So I hope we will take a lesson from that and look at all of these assets that we do have that we've been considering off limits, and will be able to continue to do some things like that as well. Again, thank you. One other thing, I think there was for the Councilmen who are here, or those who may not have had a chance to see it, I think there was a - - how long was that? Oh, don't worry about it. Well, there is a video tape that I know they were working to put together just as a not so much as a marketing piece, but more of a documentary of what happened in this whole process and how communities can come together and perhaps this can serve as best practice for other communities who have the same kind of issues. So, thank you gentlemen. Are there any other recognitions, or awards or communications, if not, on yesterday, we had reports from the Convention Center, the Convention Center Hotel. Also, we received reports from the Property Standards - a property standards report. I do think though in this area, we also - - -there were two other reports or one other report in this area that we need to receive from the Police Department study. Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Hightower: Chief?

Chief Campbell: As we started yesterday, I'd like to introduce the consultant who has worked with us on this project over this past several months, many months. It's

been a long process. The process is by no means finished, but I think we certainly have a road map to the future. At this time, I'd like to introduce Mr. Peter Bellmio who has done similar studies with LAPD, St. Petersburg, FL., Charlotte, N.C., and Richmond VA. Mr. Bellmio.

Mr. Bellmio: Thank you. Good afternoon everybody. We have some overheads we'll be able to show in a minute. And you have in front of you a packet of those overheads. Some of the numbers may be hard to see up there as we have in front of you. This is a really, serves as an executive summary, but it's a much longer report that the Department has and will be making available. The goals for this project were to first try to accurately measure workload. And probably there is a lot involved and if you could do the favor or go through this executive summary, please hold your questions. I may answer some of them as we go along. And then at the end, I'd be more than happy to answer questions. Try to accurately measure workloads. And this is really, policing is a service industry. It's like a business. And what we've learned is you can't just count crime, because we get calls for service that are not just crimes. We get traffic calls, service calls, all kinds of calls. You can't just count the number of calls, you have to count the amount of time the patrol units spend on those calls and this study is about patrol only. About the Patrol Division. So, we had to do some work actually and count accurately how much time is spent on calls. Also the goal of this study was to see if we were using the people efficiently that the Department has now. Are there ways to use them even better. To increase the amount of proactive time. What we mean by that is police officers spend their time on citizen calls, officer initiated activities, things that they (unclear). Administrative time which is tending to (unclear) meal breaks, roll call, report writing and those kinds of things. And then what's left over is proactive. Things to go out and work proactively in the community. So one of the goals of the department is how can we increase that, because that's really where you promote. We talked about relationships earlier at this last event you were talking about and that's where those relationships that you (unclear). So although then, to try to put into place a new way to evaluate staffing needs, (unclear) management struggle at budget and so how many officers you need? Well, there is a way to figure that out and this is one of the tools we brought to Shreveport, at least within a patrol function say how many people do you need given (unclear) service level. Some time interviewing people, a lot of committee meetings, collecting data on calls, the folks at Caddo 911 were very cooperative and helpful. We had data on officer availability.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Bellmio, if you would, because this meeting is televised, we want for the people at home not only to be able to get the visual, but to be able to hear you audibly and so, we need you to stand closer to the microphone.

Mr. Bellmio: Oh, very good sir, thank you. That we get data on leaves. How much time was lost to sick/injury/vacation and leave policies. And also the folks at Caddo 911 helped us to design some reports. Som new management reports, again like any business would have to tell you where your resources are being used and

where your workload is and how you're responding to it. We also installed a computer model that I don't sell. I get a license to give it to my client which is called MPP (Managing Patrol Performance). Takes a lot of this data and tells you how many officers you need. It's in use in Charlotte, Richmond, Newport News, Los Angeles, it's one of two that are really the industry's (unclear) for how you do this. And it is now in place in Shreveport. We'll be doing more training on how to use it. Also to do some training on how you use that and also (unclear) this report. So, those are the study methods. We have a picture - Shreveport gets about 170,000 citizen generated calls for service per year. That is pretty much on par with a lot of the cities with 200,000 that I deal with. Richmond, VA is a little higher, Newport News is lower, they're in the middle, but it's pretty much in the ball part. It's about 450-500 calls a day. Oddly enough, there's really not a bunch of annual growth in calls. And we would see this in the 911 data. Calls are fairly flat. There's not much growth. So, they've been flat since '99. So there is not a lot of call growth. Also, there is not much seasonal variation. It used to be there was more in southern States, but the seasons have evened out. This picture of the flow and you've got the graph here, just gives you an idea that over the Summer and the Winter, and this is 1999-2001 and then an average, it gives you this picture that basically is fairly even. Calls for service that the police (unclear) are prioritized. Priority I are emergencies. Those are the most important ones to get to. Priority II(s) are intermediate. Priority III(s) can be held because they're cold crimes. Not in progress. And then there are some that are called TelServe that about 12% of the police reports in Shreveport are taken over the phone. That saved a lot of money and time and it's (unclear) citizens satisfaction, because you can do that faster than holding the call and waiting for a unit to get out there. And these are crimes where there is no evidence, there is no solvability. People just want to file a report and it's done all over the U.S. So, that's 12% of that, that's diverted that we don't send units out on. This percentage of Priority II is a little on the high side at 54%. But we'll talk about the implication of that in a minute. One of the major issues and I apologize to the audience, this is not projected as large as I had hoped, but Council has it in front of them. One of the issues that developed and we can't see this number here, it's about 24,000 calls a year, which if you consider the department, ends at about 170,000. I mean, it's almost 15% of all the calls for service are alarms. They're alarm calls. Well over 90% of those alarm are false alarms and one of the issues that this study has raised is that the workload of the police department could be cut to the tune of at least 10% in my judgement, by taking a look at the alarm ordinance, the enforcement of the false alarm process, because each one of these calls takes two units. False alarm call, say takes two units to answer is very expensive, takes a lot of resources. So, that's one of the recommendations that we're going to deal with. Also there are some of the calls in here that probably could be handled over the phone, so we want to take a look at that to see if there are ways to provide good citizen satisfaction, good service take these things more quickly over the phone and make more proactive time. Another area to develop and this next pager handout should see a response time report and that report shows the priority of the calls and the response times. And at the bottom here, for those in the audience is about 7.3 minutes on average for an emergency call was the response time in Shreveport which is pretty good. Most cities around the country between 5 and 8 minutes. There is no national standard. Depends on what you can afford and you know there are geography

issues, road networks and all this stuff. Seven minutes is pretty good. One of the problems that we have is that we're going to work on the study. For some reason there is some delays in getting the calls out. We're not really sure what's causing that. Most stages, it's usually about a minute to get an emergency call out. We're averaging in Shreveport well over 2 minutes. So, it's something we're going to investigate within the communication center to find out what is happening. It could be there is not enough units. They're looking for people, but there are some issues about how soon we get those calls out. Overall, the prioritization is pretty good, the average time per call is pretty good. The average on scene times is at 45-50 minutes, that's fairly typical. So there are no danger signs in here, the data all looks pretty good. Another thing we looked at is (unclear) dispatching. And if you're following along with the materials, this is another issue that comes up in the studies and that is we try to look at how many of the calls are answered by a beat car when they are assigned to a beat. And you say why is this important? Well, in policing, accountability is a (unclear) factor. Territory is important. For many years, officers owned a beat and they didn't want anybody else coming into their beat. That was their beat, they had to know the citizens and how to really work that beat. The problem here is that, there are about eight of the beats where they approach having 70% of the calls answered by the car assigned to that beat. As you can see from the graph, there are some that take less than 30% of the calls from their own beat. In other words, they're going all over the place. Cars are being dispatched everywhere. And once this trade is (unclear) into of each structure that does not support community policing, that you don't really have officers assigned to a beat, this is their area. They stay in it, they're dispatched in it and their job is to get to learn the people and to deal with the problems and to be accountable. Because you can't look at an officer who gets dispatched out 70% of the time to their beat and say 'hey fix these problems' when you're out of it that much. It's a structural problem. As talking to the Department, the beats have not really been seriously re-drawn in many, many years. So, this goes back a number of years. So, it's time to look at this as part of growing community policing. So, this cross beat dispatching issue is a big one. This again has got squeezed a little bit, but the cost for service are higher on weekends, Saturday and Sundays, which is probably no surprise to you. Saturdays and Sundays are higher and during the week on Sunday is lower, there is a pattern to the calls. Usually, the dilemma is staffing right about 4:00 in the morning in here. There's not a lot of calls, but there is a lot of high risk that you have to really try to staff in a way that matches the staffing to the workload. In Shreveport, there is an attempt to do that, there is some adjustments have to be made in this. We can see here that pre-dawn morning on weekends has a significant number of units and field about 158 a day. And we've been working with a department. I'm looking at this pattern of how many units we put out where. It's a scheduling issue, deploying issue and there is some work that has to be done there. Another issue that comes up is when you try to decide how many officers you need. What do you lose to sick/injury/vacation? What's the overhead for the relief factor? Or if you've got a certain number of officers on the street, how many do you have to have available for duty. That impacts on budget. How many people do we have to hire. How many slots do we have to have. We've got leave data from the payroll records and as you can see here, sick leave is about six to seven off days per officer per year. Frankly in a public safety environment, that's pretty standard, it's not

very high. So the leave issue is very normal. I go to some places where the leave policies do not control leave as well as they could. The bottom line on the relief factor is that in Shreveport, it takes, if you're going to put 10 officers in the field any given day, you have to have hired 18. Because the multiplier is 1.8. If ten people are working everyday, you have to have 18 hired and ready to work. That doesn't count your vacancies for folks in the military, people in the academy, and there is a vacancy factor that we have to talk about. But again, in the studies that I do, this is a very reasonable number. We are not losing a tremendous amount of time in staffing because of leave policies or other scheduling. So, this is good. This is good stuff. What we did next was take all this stuff and put it into a computer model called MPP - Management Patrol Performance. We put this data in the model and what it is, they call it a queuing model. And what it does is and it sounds fancy, but the analogy I give is the grocery store. If you ever go to the grocery store at 5:00, and I've been there and you're standing there and you see all the places for checkers to be, and you'd like to think that the grocery store looks at their receipts and figures out how many checkers they need, but inevitably, there is a long line, there's three people checking everybody out. Now all the grocery store managers are going to be mad at me, but I'm sure they do better. So, if you have three lines and there's all these people stacked up, what a computer model does it says, if we've got 30 people on only three servers, how long are these people going to wait. You open three more lines, the wait for those people get shorter and the computer counts that and that's how you figure out if you have ten units in the field and 60 calls an hour coming in, how many calls can those units handle and how long are they going to wait. So, it sounds very complicated, but it's very simple. Time, distance, and speed figures how many people you need. It's the same software and map that they use to route airplanes in and out of the airport, to route school buses, trash trucks, ambulances, it's been around for 30 years. So, it's nothing that I cooked up in my garage. It is a tool that's been used in the field. So we put all this stuff in the computer and the reason you use this is that what it allows you to do is to say, 'gee, if my response time is at this level, or if my proactive time is at this level now, how many more units do I have to add?' Or, how can I shift them around and then what results will I get? How can I test that through the mall. And that's what it does. So you can test response times, you can look at, it takes in all kinds of traffic problems. You have some traffic problems in Shreveport, as I've noticed, based on different times of the day and those travel times do impact your ability to get to calls for service. So what the model takes in square miles, travel times and it's a way to figure out, gee, at 5:00 in certain parts of Shreveport, we need to have enough units out there so that we can get to an emergency in seven minutes. And that's because you don't want to say 'well, we can't do it at 5:00 cause we don't have enough cars'. The standard to service the public is we're going to try to get the emergencies as close to that average as we can. So, it looks at road work networks and it also helps with growth and annexation. One in some of the Florida cities have used it. We'll look at an area that's being developed and I don't know if this council's faced it, but many have, but in areas developed, how much policing does it need? Well what we do is go get another part of the City that is developed the same way, get some of the call data from that one, look at the land use where we're going to build and then figure out how would that apply to this area and you can get a pretty good number of what its going to take and be accurate and still keep

the service level up. So, it's a good tool for that kind of thing. The model counts car rates, how many units you have out there, their time on calls, how many units get sent on calls, the admin time, travel time, square miles of the area. And again, you can't see this up here. This is a lot of the input data and this is in your handout. We have one problem. And this looks at the different times of the day from 2300 or about 11:00 at night to 8:00 in the morning, some of these calls are very long. The average time for the first unit is 90 minutes. An hour and a half. And we looked into this and I said, this is just too long. Something is not right. We actually went and looked at the calls and found out that these are calls that are legitimate calls, but they are calls related to medical treatment of people, standing by at the hospital, processing prisoners, so there is some work the department needs to do to figure out how we can free these officers up from it, but unfortunately, it's a huge drain on workload, because when do you think your busiest time is on Saturday night, and Friday night? Well, its 2300 hours right in through the peak periods, so it's really couldn't happen at a worst possible time. So, this is something that managerially is an issue that the department is going to work on. Then the questions become after we go through all of this effort and put in all of this work to get the data and the policy question becomes how fast do you want to get units to answer emergency calls? How long do you want their Priority III(s) to sit? How fast you want to- -and it's just like any other City service. Do you want your streets swept once a week, once a month or once a year? Do you want trash picked up once a week, twice a week or once a month? It's a service level. So, we look at how fast do you want to handle an emergency call. How much time away from calls in the course of a day, kind of a piece of the pie chart, do you want them to have a proactive work? And then another issue is officer safety. And that is we want to make sure there's enough units free at any given time that if somebody needs a backup, they can get it. And the model accounts for that. You just say, I want to have a certain number of units free. We put four units for a city-wide so at least a backup could be found, and we've used that so far in the analysis. And those of you, I don't know the bottom of what page this is on, but you need to turn to this if you have not. This is essential the rosetta stone. This is the last piece. And I appreciate you hanging in with this. It's a lot involved. This is kind of a menu. This takes the workload data for the period of 1999-2002. The call rates, the most recent service times from 2002 and what you have here is we are now fielding 158 officers. To make 7 minutes, 153, 159, you're right at about 7.3. You're right in here now. The problem is to get to at least 30% proactive time, the City would have to add over 50 police officers to make that work. Actually 56. Now, I'm not recommending that today. Because I think there is a number of issues that you deal with. Now, I'm reading this chart. The way this works is if you want to achieve both levels of service and you see, we've got to four units free, you need 163. You know you have to choose the highest of the three. So, in this case, if you wanted to reach 30% proactive time, if you don't change anything else, you'd be 214 officers working. That's does not count vacancies for the economy, military and all those other things. So the point here is what do we do? Well one of the suggestions here is that, there's some factors impacting these results. One is we need to look at how we can look at those times when we've got really, really hot service times. There is something there we have to fix. Also, I think the alarm ordinance, dispatch delays, are a major issue that we talked about. And also within the department, there's about 40 some odd sworn

personnel assigned to special units of various kinds. So I suggested to the department, we really scrubbed the roster pretty hard and said 'is everybody in patrol that needs to be in patrol'? We have people out on the streets where they need to be. So, these are areas that we have to look at to see if we can improve the use of time. Calculated vacancy rate decide what's it's going to be and we'll talk about that in a few minutes. Now recommendations are - - - I think you gotta put some people to work and establish a process for working on this. Because you don't need to add those 50 officers now, but what you have to do is do some work on some issues that could reduce the patrol workload and start working on that over the next two to three years. This is a long term process and it's kinda like building a bridge. You need to get together and see where these points are going to come together. Because I think you can do it for less than 50 officers. But there is some work that has to be done. First thing is, get a group of people within the organization, that the Chief's agreed to form, to work on these problems. I think they need to continue hire officers. At this point, the vacancy rate looks like its around 8%. At about 8% of the force and as of the end of 2003, it was about 493 people working about 505 funded, to run two academy classes a year is about (unclear) people. If you were to keep that pipeline full, you'll start to go negative at some point. In other words, the number starts to decline. You need to have that replacement rate at about 8%. So you don't want to go negative. But keep the pipeline moving. I think you need to take a look at the false alarm issue. False alarm issue is critical. It's costing an awful lot of money to the City. I have just looked at some of the data about the collections of fines and how it's administered. It looks like it's really a loser on both ends. We're not really getting any revenue in, and also we're sending officers out to the tune of 15% of the police department's workload is false alarms. So, we need to look at that. I think also, change the work schedule. I think we could modify, not throw it out. Make some adjustments in the schedule to better fit the staffing to the workload. It's not really far off, but this (unclear) could be more efficient. Also (unclear) and to take a look at reports that we could take with heightened citizen satisfaction, get more of them over the phone, provide more advice over the phone. It's the world we're in. People seem to expect it and we may be able to divert more calls. The short term (unclear) is we think you need to work on, the department needs to work on, and also look at the dispatch for emergencies, we could improve emergency response time, by just trying to figure out what are the delays in getting these calls out the door. The travel times, if you get a chance to look at the data when you look at the report, travel times are pretty good. Once the officer gets the call, we're good in there. There is something wrong in this process. Whether it's not enough units at the right time or something. But it's causing these delays to be too long. I think also strengthen the department's operations analysis capability. This is a business. And it is a multi million dollar business and there needs to be people assigned to measuring what are we doing, where are our costs, what are our results and the department's committed to that, but there is some more work to do. And I need to train the managers to use the reports. Like any other business, managers need to know their labor costs and need to know how time is spent and those reports are out there and we're starting to use them. Long term recommendations - we think that one of the ways that you might recover some personnel and in the long term is to try to adopt a generalist model that increase special units every time we have a problem. If you can create a geographic policing

system which we've done in Newport News, Charlotte, Richmond now, where we build a team of people who own a piece of territory, and you give them the right staffing and you give them the proactive time, they should be able to deal with a lot of problems, very proactively, get to know the people in the neighborhoods. It's really the next step in community policing. And that is what a lot of my work is now. People are moving for special units to (unclear) policing. And what that means is expanding all of the officers, and giving them a bigger role even in investigations. An ownership of territory has to be strengthened. That's a big part of that. Once you adopt the idea, we want them to be able to do more things out there. Do they really own a beat? And so far, the answer is not everywhere. There is some work in the CAD codes, the second highest call for service is see the complainant. So, if this was a business and you sent people out, let's go see the customer. About what? We don't know. So, there is some cleanup work we have to do on some of the coding. And I think set goals of proactive time. As what (unclear) policy makers, as you know, many of these decisions fall on your shoulders. What's the service level? What level of proactive time do you think these patrol officers ought to have out in the neighborhood to work with people to solve problems. Right now, there is not a whole lot, there are as I said, some ways we could increase that. But this is probably gonna be some combination of staffing increases and efficiency increases, that's going to take some time to figure out and I think it's going to be a process of everybody working together to see what's the best way to use the public's money to provide a good level of service and do it efficiently. So, set those goals and one of the other things too is to give patrol officers more involvement in doing proactive work by setting up a different kind of directorial program where they pick things they think need to be worked on. Citizens have input in that. We plan it and we track it just like it's a call for service and you give officers credit for the good work they do when they tackle these problems. So, those are the recommendations and if I could just make a closing comment and open to questions, sometimes people think that consultants have this secret officer per thousand population chart that we have in our pocket that tells you how many officers you need. And that's not so. Every one of these communities is different, it has it's own needs, it's own issues. My recommendation at this stage is to keep going forward. Make sure that you keep two academy classes in process on an annual basis. Start working with the department and how can we be more efficient and there are some things the Council can do, there are some things City Government can do, and some things the department needs to do to really do this the right way. That's all I have.

Councilman Carmody: Your study is very interesting, but it begs a couple of questions and I hope you will bear with me. I realize that you're not here to solve every problem of the City of Shreveport and it's police department, but hopefully, you can help us out. One of the things that you seem to reiterate was the fact that we really do need to instill a sense of ownership in the officers on a particular beat. In the past in talking to the department, there was a feeling that if you were to do that, there would be some officers who would be assigned to beats that they would feel like were really the worst parts of the system. How do you do that so that you don't burn out an officer by making him feel as if you are feel you are putting him in harm's way everyday that he shows up to work. I would just like to hear your thoughts on that, because I myself, thought that, and I agree with you that if you know the people that you are going to see everyday and

they have confidence in the fact that if they talk to you about a problem, that you would be working to try to address it. That builds the rapport and gives them confidence that I'm looking for officer so and so, he'll be out here. This is the area in which he works. And I do think that, that helps because the community is not seeing a different face everyday and not familiar with who the officers are in their area. But how do you do it as such that the officer is not assigned to a beat which he feels like is punishment?

Mr. Bellmio: Well, there is a couple of approaches to that. The first is to staff, and I've just finished doing Richmond, VA., which has got a significant homicide problem. It's got a lot of violence. We get the officers involved in the process, number one. Then we have work sessions. The second thing is we figured out ways to design these beat boundaries so the workload is equivocal. Relatively equivalent. In other words, some of them are going to be larger in their land area, some of them are going to be smaller and have more crime problems, but they got the staffing, so that in each one of these areas, they would be able to have a 7 minute emergency response time, they would have shortened amount of proactive time, and they've have four units free. In other words, the workload and the people got matched up. Then nobody felt overburdened. Now, one of the things that the department will have to work on is the system of assignment of people to these beats. I'm a former Director of Public Safety in a city in Illinois. We did this kind of thing, we worked out procedures where people could have some preferences to where they'd want to work, but they couldn't nest. And then we had to - - - . So those are the things that we have to work out. But it is an excellent question. It really goes to the point that the current district lines are imbalanced. There are some of these lines have not changed and there is all kinds of things have been built in these areas- - - and the workload is really too heavy for one or two people to handle. So, we equalized it. It helps sort that out.

Councilman Carmody: And I guess in other communities, they have precincts as opposed to the way that our community operates in which we have a central police station, which all officers show up to assuming that they take their commands from the shift manager as to where they're going and how they're going to do it and of course, I think in the past, it's been some years, we've actually looked at the possibility of putting in substations. But the costs were so prohibitive, as well as, I think there was concern over having an oversight and the supervisory positions of making sure that what goes on in isolated settings versus having everyone show up at the same place and check in and then check out, it's easier to monitor so to speak. So, we, I think in essence kinda ditched the idea of trying to implement the substations and said 'well, we'll continue with what we have and again, it kinda goes back to the idea that maybe if we do look at what currently are the patrols, then and revamp those that it will help, but I'm not sure that if I'll consistently see the same officers in the area in which I live in Shreveport. At any given time, it's always a different officer, which again, I don't find that disconcerting, I'm glad to see an officer.

Mr. Bellmio: Yeah, well, if I could answer that, I think the issue is- - -I'm not a real big fan of precincts, if you can avoid it. Shreveport is on the cusp of about 200,000 population, 200,000 calls. I've seen departments that have over done the substation. I've never seen a building jump up and go answer a call. And what tends to happen is when you build a building, people tend to want to be in the building. And it's just a draw on resources. I think you can have good geographic ownership of territory without

building precinct stations, (unclear) stations. If you think capital expense, and I think more wise to be reluctant to do it. I think you can have ownership of territory. The teams in Richmond and the teams in Charlotte are about 18-24 officers. They work as a group. It's almost like this is their territory of people. The minimum is two is on, and at some time, they could have as many as four or five. They meet together, they work on their plans and they're accountable for that population like it was a village. That doesn't take a building, it takes management, it takes structure, it takes information, it takes supervision. A program of work is what it takes. And so, I think the last thing frankly I'd be worried about is - -I'd stay away from the building.

Councilman Carmody: The second question though is within my real career. I sale commercial real estate and so the false alarm calls interest me greatly. Because of course there's an associated fee that goes with that. I've always assumed that it was a profitable thing because it's not inexpensive to have officers show up to a building on a false alarm call, but the bill does get sent. Now, you said you reviewed the information regarding the number of invoices or I guess citations that are sent out to be paid as well as the collections. I'd like your thoughts on that and what recommendations you might have as to how we would proceed to address that problem.

Mr. Bellmio: I only saw one report from the month of May that we happened to have at the police department on what's been collected and what's not. It starts really back at the beginning. Charlotte Mecklenberg again is the department I've worked and have been very successful with false alarm reduction and one other thing to do was there a license to all alarms. Alarms also are an inspection item, and the alarm has to be put in properly. You don't want to have alarms put in that cause every time you have a thunderstorm, no when the alarms go off and we're answering calls. Also the fine system should be such that it provides an incentive for people to use the alarm properly.

In Charlotte, I think probably, if my memory serves correctly, even though it may sound owner risk, we have boiled down that only about 8% of the people paid any significant fine and they were able to control false alarms by putting in good licensing, good ordinance, being serious about it, collecting the money and there is even an ordinance and this sounds like harassy, but there is an ordinance from the Alarm Trade Association, a model ordinance that says if people don't pay their fine, you cut them off. And you say, you've abused the right of it. And our attorneys in Illinois, in Decatur, in the State of Illinois where we do a lot of it, I used to sign this public safety record five or six a month. Where people just used to refuse to pay the fines and we would send them a notice. You know, you're abusing the system, you're not paying your fines, we're not coming. And it's amazing how people would come down and pay their fines and pay attention. So,

Councilman Carmody: So, let me make sure I understood what you're saying? Are you instructing the alarm company to turn off their service or are you saying that they are put on a 'do not respond to' list.

Mr. Bellmio: Do not respond to list. That's right. What they do with the alarm company is their business. But I think also, there is a lot of community policing in this. There is a lot of - - - one of the first things you'd like to ask people to do is look at the false alarms you have and where? In one city I worked in, there were one or two places that were the biggest problems. So, lets go work on those. Let's talk to those people and we're not businesses by the way. They were institutions in the City oddly enough. I

think you're going to have a very effective ordinance, that does not overburden anybody that saves the City money and there are many, many, many examples of them and I think it's something worth pursuing. But it will take Council action to put a few more pieces into the - - - . I've reviewed the ordinance that you have now and I think it needs some work.

Councilman Carmody: And my last question. I was interested to see the graphic you had on the I guess the amount of crime occurrences by month because I guess as a lay person, I'm trying to remember what page that was on gentlemen.

Mr. Bellmio: Yeah, that's the call for service trends? Per month? Okay, 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 I think?

Councilman Carmody: Right page 5. It does appear, I mean against what I guess what we've all grown up hearing is that more crime occurs during the summer months because people are out of school, or more crime occurs during close to Christmas, because people are - - -

Mr. Bellmio: Oh yeah, there's a couple of bumps there. Yeah, there are. And in other parts of the country with more extreme cold climates, this would be more drastic. But yeah, there is. There really is. The summer is the time when we have to pay attention because as the calls go up, your proactive time goes down. Your staffing stays the same. (Unclear) goes down.

Councilman Carmody: Well, in climate weather, all humans don't want to be outside.

Mr. Bellmio: That's true.

Councilman Carmody: Thank you sir.

Mr. Bellmio: Thank you.

Councilman Gibson: Thank you Mr. Chair. Just a couple of quick questions. One being the review of technology that hasn't gotten, you haven't gotten any extensive review of where we currently stand in terms of technology utilization by the department?

Mr. Bellmio: I have, I know something about the laptop project in terms of the laptops being in cars, but I pretty much looked at the CAD data that was computer rated dispatch system and the workload information that's in that system. No, I have not really looked at the computer systems at all.

Councilman Gibson: Okay, so we're not in a position to know if we're properly using or we need additional upgrades or anything of that nature. Going back to what Councilman Carmody was talking about in terms of in your comments regarding substations and buildings. In the day of technology, obviously the more we can take advantage of, the less dependent we will become on fiscal plans. The other question in terms of evaluation, I noticed towards the end in terms of some of the comments, evaluation of some of our current staffing. You didn't go into great detail in terms of where we've got to achieve what - - -five hundred and some odd police personnel? So, there's not really been a breakout to see how that- - -where that's being used and also how that is in relationship to where it's being allocated around the City?

Mr. Bellmio: Well, if I understand the question correctly, the point I was making, is that within a police agency, there are police officers assigned all over through the organization. The point I was trying to make was to say, we need to look at all the other units at officers are being (unclear) and make sure that there really is a need for them there, (unclear) patrol. If I understand the other part of your question, yes, it's also

looking at geography, the way we assign them by geography, some of these beats are very, very, very busy with the same people as some of the beats that are not and they are out of balance. And that cross beat dispatching is what really is an example of how out of balance they really are. So the officers running these beats, that's where the stress comes from, that's where all the problems come from and it's- - -so we need to equalize that.

Councilman Gibson: And then I guess the last thing I picked up, and this Council through a couple of budget process committed to making sure that this year was the first year in several years that we've had two training academies. And you're recommending that a minimum of two training academies take place now to in the future?

Mr. Bellmio: Yes sir. To make sure that, that - - - we don't go down, that we keep the retention level and give the department some time to take a look at these other cross savings and changes that could be made and they, at some point will come back to you with a number based on hard analysis. We're doing another look at the analysis next to look at by hour of the day and day of the week in detail what needs to be out there based on different service levels. So, there's more to do. But I think right now, it's really to make sure those two classes get through, which is two classes of 20.

Councilman Gibson: But in terms of compromising some of the information that will be coming from future data from this evaluation and the work, working with your task force, we should not be in a position of compromising any or future staffing by making any cuts regarding training academies.

Mr. Bellmio: That is correct. That is exactly it. I think given the lack of proactive time, it would be a mistake to cut the academies. And you gotta keep the pipeline open and somewhere between that 50 and what you have now, and somewhere in the middle there'll be a number, based on what service level you choose. Whether it's 20%, 30%, 40% and we'll give you better data, the department will as time goes on as to where you want to scribe that line and what level of service you want to provide.

Councilman Gibson: Wouldn't that hold true really throughout the history of this City. I mean obviously, there are going to be times where we may be in a luxury position, it's not going to be anytime soon to have a younger group of officers, which obviously will stay around for X amount of years, but we shouldn't be in a position at any point and time, really compromising our training academies?

Mr. Bellmio: No, I would not. It's - - - because of what happens in that kind of a process, it takes about a year to get somebody through. So, if you cut some academies, now you're two years behind. And if you're not careful it takes you then three years to catch up. So, it's just not a - - -

Councilman Gibson: A two to three year lag time.

Mr. Bellmio: Yeah, it really is. So, it's just not a prudent thing to do at this stage when you know you're trying to make more proactive time so you can do more of these things in the neighborhood. So, it's a real level headed kind of a decision. Let's keep that open.

Councilman Gibson: Thank you Mr. Chair. Thank you.

Councilman Lester: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Very interesting reading. When you talked about on page 9, the cross district dispatching. And there were several beats, just looking at the graph, 11, 10, 9, 5,4,3, and 1 which it says that- - -does this

mean that 70% of the time, they're answering the calls for their district 70% of the time?

Mr. Bellmio: Yes sir, that's exactly right.

Councilman Lester: Okay, okay. My question is this. What would be the optimum number given your expertise and experience, what would be an optimum number of responses for an officer or a beat?

Mr. Bellmio: Actually, there's two answers to that question. One is it depends on how many emergency call you have. Now on an emergency, it shouldn't matter. So, based on where you are, we will figure that out, but normally, (unclear) Charlotte Mecklenberg is in the 70s, high 70s, 70-75%. So, in other words, Shreveport is not that far off. You have some beats that are okay. You have others, but it's about ten out of the 18 that really not. But we need some tuning to do. That's why I say, this is a repair situation, not a redo where we have to you know- - - but we need to look at these lines.

Councilman Lester: My question is why would you, let's just- - -like District 13. On the graph it says District 13, a little bit more than 40% of the calls they answer, 40% of the calls. That means 60% of their calls are answered by another beat?

Mr. Bellmio: Yes.

Councilman Lester: Why would that be the case? Not specifically, but what types of - - -what would be some of the contributing factors I would say?

Mr. Bellmio: Well, one of two things. And actually in the report when you get it, and it will be distributed to the Council, so you'll have all the details. There's actually a report that shows for each one of those beats, so if I was in 13, it shows the unit. How many 13 answered and how many calls coming in. Show you every place 13 got sent. In some cases, 13 is a less busy beat and I don't know 13, but 13 is less busy and is getting drawn out to help somebody else or in some cases, it could be - - -and that's typically what it is for the most part, or it could be that there is not that much work in there and that they're getting drawn out. So, it really have to look at the big table to see what that does. But most of the time, if a district has such low percentages, they're being pulled elsewhere.

Councilman Lester: Well, okay.

Mr. Bellmio: And that would happen because there's too many calls elsewhere and they are the less duty district. So they're - - -

Councilman Lester: So that means they go to another district to answer the calls. But what are about the calls that happen in their district?

Mr. Bellmio: Well, now you've hit on a key point. Those of you, maybe I'm dating, I circum date myself as I go on here, but remember there was a game when we were kids called Chinese Checkers with a big star and you had marbles in it and you had to move 'em around. What tends to happen with all this cross beat dispatching is when 13 leaves and a call comes in, they bring somebody from some place else. When you look at this chart, that you're going to- - this big table in back of our report, it's just a sign of we're not keeping people where they need to be because once you move, everybody is out of position. And that's really- - -this is just a first cut. The real dilemma is people out of position because of cross dispatching.

Councilman Lester: Okay, so as I appreciate it one of your recommendations is changing the district structure. In doing so, would you be reducing areas in terms of geography or when you say fix the beat structure, what are we talking about?

Mr. Bellmio: It's really talking about- - - and it's really two things. You want to fix

the schedules so that we make sure at the peak period we have most people on duty.

Councilman Lester: Right.

Mr. Bellmio: Then once you do that, what you would do is and the way we just did it in Richmond. You get little reporting areas where you count all the time spent by officers on calls. So, if we put 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 units on a call, count all their time. You get their hours and you add it up and get an amount for the City. In Richmond it was 100,000 hours in a year. We determined we needed to have 12 areas. We divided by that 12 and used the building blocks to try to equalize it. So, what you're going to do is try to do is equalize the workload. What that tends to do in the less busy places, they're bigger. In the urban centers that are busier, they are smaller. What's good about this computer model is it checks and balances us to make sure that if we make that beat too big, we still don't make it so big that you can't make a 7 minute response time in there. So that's why. Cause you're hitting the nail on the head on that. There is a geography thing in here, road network thing in here you've gotta watch. You make 'em too big in outlying areas, citizens will be getting less service. And the idea is equity. Everybody should get the same amount.

Councilman Lester: Okay. Now the other question and I guess that would be to the Chief. And Chief Campbell, my question, enlighten us. When we talk about proactive time, proactive patrol time, what types of activities are we talking about when we talk about proactive patrol time.

Chief Campbell: That would be the time that the officers have available that they are not on calls, not on administrative time, to deal with specific crime problems within that district. And what you see now based on our current level of staffing is that number is down where it should be ideally minimal and again, I would stress minimum 30%. It's down at some periods of the day in some areas of our town, down to 10%. That's the time that we're out there interfacing with the public, determining what the problems are and actively through directive patrols addressing the issues. For instance, if you had a geographic area that had a specific- - - that had a burglary problem, a residential burglary problem and we would be taking. And we would have enough people allocated to that area. For those patrol officers who work that area to actually address that problem in a directed patrol. And have the time available to do this.

Councilman Lester: So, when we talk about proactive patrol time, that would be in response to the citizens calls that we get as Councilmen. We've got a drug house on the corner of blah, blah, blah- - - blah, blah, blah or are these people are doing these actions at this particular location, we want you to send some police out. We want to see more police. That's what we're talking about for the average person.

Chief Campbell: That would be some of the things. And I noted I think you've noticed and even when we did our surveys, one of the complaints was, we never see the police. We don't see the police because they don't have any proactive times. We're making calls. But this would be the opportunity for those officers to make those calls and to address those issues within the community that they're working. And it could be anything from drug houses to burglaries to whatever and also part of that, our crime analysis determine here's the area, what are the (unclear)? What's occurring, what do we need to get on top of and then directed patrols against that with the manpower to address those issues.

Mr. Bellmio: Just I could answer, just a quick thing. There's been a - - - the

history of policing in the last 10 or 12 years in this country. 15 years, is that when we get a problem, we tend to get a small group of people very special unit and they go out and tackle that problem. The only problem is they only attack within the places where they can hit the hot spots. Well, we're talking about areas (unclear) on every beat and on every shift, on every day, this proactive time to pay attention to these problems and that it is ongoing city-wide pressure on the problems that are affecting the community. It's a way more powerful for the officers because they feel like they are accomplishing something. They're not just answering calls. They stand taller, and get better results. So, it's a big leap, but for the cities that do it, they just get better bang for their buck and everybody gets more out of it.

Councilman Lester: On page, you talked about allocation of sworn personnel within the police department. Are we talking about breaking up special units like you know let's say, the narcotics division is maybe too large, or something else. What are we talking about when you're saying that.

Mr. Bellmio: Well, let me answer from my perspective. I didn't study any of the detective units, what I did do was- - -

Councilman Lester: And I'm not casting any dispersion on one or the other, I'm just throwing that out.

Mr. Bellmio: Well, it's a typical example and again, no disrespect to the downtown unit or any of the special units. Ideally, the beat structure is design (unclear) and the department staff (unclear) and we've said it all the long. There should be enough people downtown in the normal compliment to handle the problems. And that's the point. Because what tends to happen, is we take a relatively small unit and say okay, you're going to handle all the problems in here. It's really not enough people, they're not there 24/7, so the idea is to take a good hard look at where do we really need a special unit, what's their mission and what might be better off taking some of those people and putting them back in a patrol. So, it's work yet to be done and we've discussed it that we have more.

Councilman Lester: Right, right.

Chief Campbell: And if I could enhance on that is the fact that we would have to look at those things. And it would be like for instance (unclear) present when we have a traffic unit that is severed, it is a specialized unit. And many departments across the country, that's a specialized need and that's what they do and they're going to keep that. But I think the importance here is and what this study reflects is when you do a scrub within our whole department, look at these issues and see and that's how we'll squeeze, because I understand we can't hire 56 officers. I understand the fiscal issues involved in that. We're going to have to hire some officers and I hope everybody sees that today when we leave here. However, I think we're going to make that 56 up by combination of things. By a combination of working more efficiently. Putting this plan, these recommendations into place until we get down and find out that, that number is going to be reduced. But I think and I don't want this to get lost on anybody is the fact that you have to keep the pipeline open. You have to keep people in the system. Today, we're 60 officers short in theory, because they're not out there working the street, because we interrupted the pipeline. In order for us to continue that pipeline, we've got to hire two classes next year. We talked about 8%. That's what needs to be in there. Right now, we have funding for one academy class of 20. That doesn't make

the 8%. If we don't fund that class next year, we're right back where we were. Where we started from. And we'll continually making up. And we're several years behind right now. And if you look at cross beat dispatching or look at the issues, it's a manpower issue. We don't have enough people to do the things that we need to do. And now as we take this study and we start implementing the recommendations and this is not a one year thing. This is not something that's gonna be fixed in a year. It's something I think that we need to embrace, not only as the Police Department, but as a Council, as an Administration for several years to fix the problem and I think that as we become efficient at managing our resources as we become more effective in community policing, then I think you're gonna see changes that affect this whole community (unclear). And I think we can do that. If we implement the things here and we go back to the table and we looking at restructuring our districts because they've been pretty much the same since I've been here, 30 years. And each district is different. Each district is gonna have different problems, and we know that now. Some district, their problem is speeding and juvenile issues. Other districts are way more serious. So, it's just a lot of things that - - - and I think that this is business approach to managing the resources that we have.

Councilman Lester: Let me ask this question. One of the things though you said was, looking at the last chart, the MRP Analysis Results. I guess this would be the grits and gravy of the whole deal. If we're saying that the Police Chief says and I take him at his word, because he is experienced, that the proactive patrol time, that you would desire the most at a minimum would be a 30% model, is my question and under that chart, that's 214.2 officers. And currently, how many do we have - - - how would I read that graph to compare where we are now to what we're desiring.

Mr. Bellmio: Right now, in patrol, blue (unclear) gear uniform personnel in a car in a district is 158.

Councilman Lester: Okay, that's the number - - - units fielded.

Mr. Bellmio: That's right. Units fielded and then the relief factor, sick/injury/vacation. So that's the difference between 214 and the 158. That's the difference we've got to make up to make that 30%.

Councilman Lester: Okay. Okay. And you also said, which I thought was very interesting that you would not hire 50 officers now. Why?

Mr. Bellmio: I think that if you worked hard on the alarm ordinance. If we worked hard on a couple of these areas of looking how to expand TelServe, it has been very well accepted around the country. Studies have been done on it. If you pick the right calls and you've got the right people on the phone and I think you have some good people in that unit. The public is very happy to report over the phone, minor occurrences and we don't need to send an officer around to the tune of 40 minutes in a \$24,000 car and people are just as satisfied and they wait shorter. They don't wait as long. So, I think there are some areas where we can cut the calls, cut the number of times we send units out and that will reduce the need to hire that 50. Somewhere between those two things, it's like building a bridge, that those pieces are going to meet together if the engineers do their job right and that's really what we're going to try to do.

Councilman Lester: So, even with efficiency, I mean, the difference between the 158 and the 214 is roughly about 50 some odd officers. So are you saying that you believe that we could get to that level with efficiency as opposed to actually hiring more

police officers?

Mr. Bellmio: I would say that we need to see how far you can get. I'd feel very, very reluctant and my reputation is on the line here is to say I don't want to give you a number that I don't think is right. I think what you need to do is the department, the City, the Administration monitor this, work together, make that second class happen this year and then let's see where we go. And they'll come back to you. Again, this is kinda like a very gradual build up over the next 2-3 years. Let's do this.

Councilman Lester: Let me ask this and I know you can't project this, but one of the things that is typically takes police officers off the street, in terms of not only sick time and things like that are military commitment. And it appears regardless of who is going to be in the White House in the next year or so, we're going to be committed to the situation over in Iraq. Possibly more people committed to that, maybe less depending on how things shake out. How does - - - what compensation have you made for the military commitments and things of that nature?

Mr. Bellmio: I have none at this stage. This is studied bottom up. And we've now determined what you might need to make 30%. Now, we've got this issue of keeping the academies full, which is two groups of 20 a year. I think you raised an excellent point. One of the things that the cities that I work with are going to have to decide in the long term, how are going to handle this? Right now, it's 11. Is this really going to come out of the hide of the department or is the City going to fund this contingency or carry this some place else and give those 11 bodies back. Because really that came out of the base of the police department. So, I'm not sure what that number would be either. So that's another factor frankly and that's an excellent point. But to bring us to these two, how do we deal with those military minutes? Many of the Chiefs and Sheriffs around this country are still trying to see how this is going to shake out. And nobody really is quite sure. But I think they're coming to the conclusion you did, that I think no matter what, we're probably going to have these commitments for a while.

Councilman Walford: I've got several questions on the false alarm. First of all, if I wanted to ask our staff to find me some sample very successful ordinances, where would you recommend that they contact?

Mr. Bellmio: I would say first of all, there is Charlotte Mecklenberg has a very good one. Also, I have some of them. I have the one from the Alarm Trade Association and there is also an association for false alarm reduction. It's a national association of police and alarm industry that have come together and I have their website. So, there is a lot of information about that and I'd be more than happy to provide that to the Chief. I'll get that to him (unclear). Lot of good information.

Councilman Walford: I know Chief, what 3 or 4 months ago, Councilman Jackson and I talked about some amendment to the false alarm ordinance. And I don't think either one of us were aware that it was this much of a problem as it is. I'd like very much to see those samples and what we might do if you would make that available to the Chief. Chief, if you pass it on to us and if you have any suggestions on collections, that's a tough one to quit responding. That certainly would draw the attention. I know of businesses that (unclear).

Mr. Bellmio: Hopefully it doesn't get to that. Actually, one of the things that Charlotte does is electronic data systems. EDS actually now provides a contract service where if in, and I don't know if Louisiana you can do this, some states you can't.

North Carolina, Council can delegate the authority for collecting fines to a private corporation. And I believe you've done that with (unclear) parking. There's some that (unclear) with the alarm ordinance, EDS will administer the ordinance, send out the notices, collect the money and then bring back a positive revenue stream to the City over time. They have the initial cost, they pay all the set up, but at some point, revenue comes back to the City. It would be worth exploring that and that is the Charlotte model.

Some people have not done that where the City is (unclear), so there's other options. Also they're actually association of chiefs and police teaches a course that some clients of mine in Akron, Ohio went to. And it's a very good course that teaches you all about alarm administration. Also maybe a thing that they may want to do is to go off and see what else the Chief's association has to say.

Councilman Walford: And my second question and last one, you said it should be an inspection item. Are you talking about like permitting for installation and having to inspect it or - - ?

Mr. Bellmio: Yeah, standards need to be set on the kind of alarm you're going to allow in Shreveport and what some communities do is in the normal course of inspecting a new building, we look at sprinkler lights safety codes, we look at - - building inspector looks at various things, alarms ought to be just part of that. And I don't know how appropriate that is. For example, I think you'd have to evaluate your alarm activations and see if they are from alarms that could be better installed than they are. And I have no idea about that. I've only heard some anecdotes about that when we have storms, all the alarms go off. Well, by rights shouldn't be happening as much as it sounds like it does. May be that some of these installations may not be up to standards. So, it's something that would have to be worked to see if the installation issue warrants including that as one of the things in the City Code that we look at in a building. Because if the alarm works right, it should work right for everybody. We should catch bad guys, we shouldn't have to be spending a lot of time. But to do that, you have to have a good ordinance. Thank you very much.

Councilman Hogan: Just a couple of general questions. I was curious to know in your analysis, did you take into consideration any work that's done by auxiliary police officers?

Mr. Bellmio: No, I did not. Not a topic I get into, so maybe the Chief can answer that.

Chief Campbell: Yes, generally speaking, they would not be dispatched to do a normal call. We use them primarily for additional - - like special events, traffic deals, and those type things. Not in the traditional law enforcement mode of answering calls.

Councilman Hogan: I guess what caught my attention and made me think of that when it said, dealing with non-emergency calls. And I thought that legally, we cannot send them out on a dispatched call, whether it's not an emergency or not.

Chief Campbell: There would be some issues.

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Bellmio, I'm not sure how you like to work. In other studies that you've done, but I can appreciate all the recommendations that you have. As we work to implement these and the near future, are you going to be available for any extra information that we need, such as Councilman Walford just brought up about the resolution or ordinance on false alarms. Does your fee include any type of consulting time in the future that we may need?

Mr. Bellmio: Well, at this point two things are going to happen. I have one more visit scheduled in this contract and I will follow up on all those items that you're referencing here and I'll be back in October to do another run on this and that ends this current agreement. The Chief and I have not really talked about assistance past that. But what I'd like to say is clients that I develop, we're all part of the same family. If there's any way I can help the Police Department and there's questions I can answer, please send them to the Chief and I'll do my very best to get answers to those questions for you.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Bellmio, just a couple of things I'm concerned about in the presentation, well really in the question and answer- - and pardon me, I'll just try to reiterate the metaphors that you and the Chief both used. One of you talked about the bridge coming together and the Chief talking about the need to scrub. At what point do you scrub until you recognize you scrubbed too far? And then at what point do we come together- - lets assume that we're talking about 60, 56, somewhere in that neighborhood, a deficit of about 60 – that being the case even with the implementation of these efficiency recommendation, do we believe that there's that much inefficiency that currently exist that it would significantly close the gap so that we could just turn our heads when it comes to hiring?

Mr. Bellmio: My best judgement is no, that I think you are going to have to hire some additional, I do not believe it's going to be frankly substantial, but what I would suggest here is that within the next six months, we will have a better picture of what that is, and what I would suggest is the department needs to give a regular reports – and one of the biggest things for this presentation is to give us some sure language. What are we counting? Why are we counting it? What are we looking at? I think now – and when you get the report, read the report in detail, and when they give you that report back they'll show you where we are, and I think you just monitor it every quarter, take a look at it get regular reports. I think within the next six month you are going to have a pretty good idea of how to answer that question, and right now I just feel like I don't want to give you a number that's a bad number, and I want to be honest with you.

Councilman Jackson: All right, and let me ask you Chief, then we've been talking about, you know, certainly over the last few weeks about a need and the number that banned about was the number 20, we talked about hiring 20 officers, as a matter a fact, you know, we talked about if in fact we had more money what we would do is hire 20 officers. That's 36 officers less than what we talked about in that number. Is it safe to say that even with the scrub that we could perhaps get around 36 officers eliminated and that 20 would help to close that gap, not only close the gap but kind of bring the bridge together or would that be too presumptuous to throw out a number.

Chief Campbell: No, and I think –

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, the last time the Chief spoke they couldn't hear him.

Chief Campbell: I'm sorry I think to answer your question Councilman, I think it's like building a bridge together to meet each other, and I think – and this is what I don't lost in the conversation. We're not going to have to hire 56 officers, I don't believe, what that number is, I don't know.

Councilman Jackson: Sure.

Chief Campbell: But until we do this work, until we implement these things

however; I do know this that if we don't maintain 8% which roughly is 20 officers, a second academy class, if we don't maintain that, if we don't hire that then we're back in a deficit again.

Councilman Jackson: Right.

Chief Campbell: So I think if you have a minimum and I don't know, that (unclear) would agree or not, if you have a minimum that we need to hire, we need to hire 20 officers for next year, to keep in the pot so that we don't go back to the negative. And in the meantime, we take this study the recommendations and let's work together as Council, as a Administration, as a Police Department, as a Community, and work and start putting these recommendations into place, the alarm ordinance, and all the other little things, and hopefully we may can do that, and I just could tell you.

Councilman Jackson: But is it safe to say, that even with the measures of the recommendations toward efficiency that the 20 is a necessary rate, for it represents 8% replacement rate, not withstanding efficiency?

Mr. Bellmio: I believe so, yes. Well, another thing I'd ask here is that most of the departments that really do a full bloom geographical policing, with generous officers working the community, there 40%. The 30% is a minimum that is the city of Los Angeles, seven minute emergency response time, 40% proactive time, same as Charlotte, same as Newport, so we're just putting a down payment on trying to get the 40%, really.

Councilman Jackson: Right.

Mr. Bellmio: Again, we want to do this responsibly, and that's why we're going to try to go through this (unclear) process and (unclear)

Councilman Jackson: In this community, there are times currently when we are at 10%, is that correct?

Mr. Bellmio: Yes.

Councilman Jackson: And that 10% proactive patrol time suggest that there – if we could increase that time, we could A. – and this is just my opinion and I need you to tell me whether or not this is correct because I could be assuming this incorrectly. But if in fact we were at a rate where we could move from 10% to let's say 30%, which kind of what we talked about, then in fact that could represent an opportunity for better intelligence, within a department, is that correct?

Mr. Bellmio: Oh yeah, all kinds of things.

Councilman Jackson: And then it could also represent better, I mean a preventive form of policing, is that correct?

Mr. Bellmio: Yes sir.

Councilman Jackson: And so while we talk about crime analysis and what could actually happen in our communities, very often we have officers who are going out who have less intelligence now with regards to the time that they could've been spending on proactive patrol, if we had enough officers. And so now you got over worked officers who are now responding to situations that perhaps could've been mitigated with some proactive patrol time, and we just don't have in that respect, is that correct?

Mr. Bellmio: That's correct.

Councilman Jackson: All right.

Chief Campbell: And I would just like to make a –

Councilman Jackson: Sure.

Chief Campbell: I appreciate the Council's (unclear) and here's where we are today. This department, and it's a tribute to the men and women who work there, have done a (unclear) in task to maintain what we've been able to maintain what we've been able to maintain over this past year. As you remember when we talked about the issues when our crime rate was up 18%, doing a lot of hard work I (unclear) some monies that were made available to us, we've been able go out and do some of those directed patrols dealing with issues. That rate, the last number we got is down to 6% we got a long ways to go to get down the rest of the way, but I would be remiss if I didn't bring to the council the job the men and women of that Police Department has done. Also, during that same time though, remember we burning the candle at both ends.

Councilman Jackson: Sure.

Chief Campbell: And when you work continuously, you make mistake accidents happen, things like that so we need to fix the problem, and we need to fix it for the future, I think it's a fiscally responsible program plan that we put in and if we do our part, if we work more efficiently that we have the tools to do that, and that's what were going to do, and hopefully we can meet somewhere in the middle and its all about levels of service, levels of service for our citizens.

Councilman Jackson: Right, and as we speak to this response times, and all of those things, you know, I just certainly would like to suggest, you know, to this Administration as well as to this Council, there's a lot of hard work to be done, because, you know, the easiest portion is to talk the talk, the most difficult piece is to walk to walk, which suggest that there's some hard work that's got to be done. We've had different opportunities and we're going to be faced with another opportunity the next few months when it comes to budgeting, and you know I want to remind, you know, everybody involved in these processes and the Chief included that, you know, it's just some tough work. And if we want to have greater response time, if we want our people to not only have the perception and the sense of being safer but to legitimately and authentically be safer, but it's going to take some time to employ these efficiency models and recommendation that you talked about, but at the same time we can't continue to ask police officers make bricks with no straw. At some point we got to do our part and ante up, you know, doing it one time is great but we need to institutionalize our commitment and our investment in our Police Department, because ultimately what we invest in is the public safety of this community so, you know, I hope that you will not be – that we want subject you again to having to wonder whether or not you're get another class and so on and so forth. But it take money and we got to make those tough decision, so thank you, Mr Carmody.

Councilman Carmody: One last question, and duck tailing on your thought. If we institutionalize the idea as a department, that in order to make the response time to acceptable to the public whatever that be that it starts with the academy then I'm going to make an assumption myself that if within the budget process that the Chief prepares, that it would start with the fact that you would budget for two classes so that you would make sure that, that pipe line is filled. As opposed to saying, here the discretionary money that if we don't need it we'll pull it away and eliminate one class, I think you will be cutting your nose to spite your face, you'd be working against what you are trying to accomplish, and in conjunction with that and again, I know there's really not anything to respond to here but you also as the Chief has to be looking at the fact that you got

some officers that are at the end of their tenure with the department and they are looking forward to retiring, and justly so. But when those persons take the opportunity to go ahead and have their retirement, those faces are (unclear), and so it might be in this instance we need to two classes, but instead of having two classes of 20, we need to have two classes of 25.

Chief Campbell: Sure that would based on the projections.

Councilman Carmody: Yeah, and that was my point, was it would seem to me that you would institutionalize the fact that you would start with the fact that your budgeting for two classes and not look at that as discretionary money to take away, that's just my thought.

Chief Campbell: That's correct, but you have to have money to budget.

Councilman Carmody: Correct.

Councilman Jackson: Any other questions gentleman? Chief, Mr. Bellmio thank you, so much for the time and the presentation.

Mr. Bellmio: Thank you.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Mayor, you have any other comments?

Mayor Hightower: No, Mr. Chairman.

### **Public Hearing:**

Resolution No. 151 of 2004: Approving a restoration tax abatement application for 411 Ashley Ridge Blvd., (Formerly TicketMaster) Ashley Ridge Partners, Ltd. (D/Gibson)

Councilman Jackson: The public hearing is now open is there a presentation from the Administration?

Mayor Hightower: No, Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Jackson: Do we have anyone here to speak in favor of the proposed tax abatement? Does anyone wish to speak in opposition to the proposed tax abatement, if not then this public hearing is now closed.

### **Confirmations and/or Appointments.**

Department of Operational Services - Permits and Inspections: Bobby Burnett - Chief Electrical Inspector

Motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Gibson, for confirmation of Bobby Burnett - Chief Electrical Inspector. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Gibson, and Jackson. 4. Nays: None. Out of the Chamber: Councilmen Lester, and Hogan. 2. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

### **Adding Legislation to the Agenda.**

Mr. Thompson: We have a resolution authorizing the Mayor to execute an agreement with Bank One Leasing Corporation and other necessary parties, for the financing of vehicles and equipment. We have a resolution authorizing the Mayor

execute mineral leases with alternative fuels systems of Louisiana Inc. We have a resolution declaring the Cities interest in certain adjudicated properties at surplus, the resolution establish a Shreveport youth council comprised of local high school students. There's an ordinance authorizing the incurring of debit and issuances of not to exceed \$9 million of general obligation bonds, this is a refinancing. We have an ordinance amending the 2004 water and sewer enterprise fund budget, and we have resolution to request an opinion from the attorney general of the State of Louisiana, and to otherwise with respect thereto.

1. Resolution No. 181 of 2004. Authorizing the Mayor to execute an agreement with Banc One Leasing Corporation and other necessary parties for the financing of vehicles and equipment and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
2. Resolution No. 182 of 2004. Authorizing the Mayor to execute mineral leases with Alternate Fuel Systems of Louisiana, Inc., and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
3. Resolution No. 178 of 2004. A resolution declaring the City's interest in certain adjudicated properties as surplus and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
4. Resolution No. 179 of 2004. A resolution establishing a Shreveport Youth Council comprised of local high school students and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
5. Resolution No. 180 Of 2004. A resolution to request an opinion from the attorney General of the State of Louisiana and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
6. Ordinance No. 128 Of 2004. An ordinance authorizing the incurring of debt and issuance of not to exceed Nine Million Dollars (\$9,000,000) of General Obligation Refunding Bonds Series 2004B of the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana; prescribing the form, terms and conditions of said Bonds; designating the date denomination and place of payment of said Bonds; providing for the payment thereof in principal and interest; and providing for other matters in connection therewith.
7. Ordinance No. 129 Of 2004. An ordinance amending the 2004 budget for the Water and Sewerage Enterprise Fund.

Motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Carmody, on adding legislation to the agenda. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Out of the Chamber: Councilman Lester. 1. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

### **Public Comments**

Frank Thaxton (*8518 West Wilderness Way*): Thank you, good afternoon, Mr. Chairman and members of the Council. I'm here on two matters today the first is 9 D

#116, which is the zoning matter from the Metropolitan Planning Commission, regarding property at the intersection of Valley View and Wyngate in Shreveport. This was approved by the Metropolitan Planning Commission, following the meeting of the Metropolitan Planning Commission, we did meet with several of the area business, and they expressed four items that would ask that we consider as accommodations for the property, we have done so. One of those is a six foot privacy fence, the second is landscaping along Valley View, the third is to limit the project 88 units, which was the number of units in the application to the MPC. And the third had to do with the entrance along Valley View Drive, and we have agreed to move that entrance as far east toward Wyngate as it's feasible this matter was also previously the (unclear) of resolution support by this Council which is filed in the record of these proceedings. The second matter if I could take these up both at the same time, is Cambridge Court, a matter you're all familiar with, which was remanded back to the Metropolitan Planning Commission, following the remand a meeting was held by the owners of the property and all of those who would appear to prior hearings on this matter both before the MPC and before the City Council. An agreement was reached that there would be four accommodations made those where: that there would be a 8-foot privacy wall along Nelson Street, a property with no ingress or egress for either pedestrian or vehicular traffic. The second was that there would be a 6-foot privacy fence along the east side of the property, the third was that ingress and egress to the property would be from North Market Street, in order to accomplish this the owner of the property has entered into a contract to purchase approximately seven acres to the north of this property, which does give access to North Market and precludes and additional access that vehicular or pedestrian after the construction of the property onto Nelson Street. And this was the primary concern of the area businesses, the last is that there would be no parking of vehicles or construction equipment along Nelson during the construction, these four items were agreed to following that all of the parties where in an agreement. This matter was then heard again by the Metropolitan Planning Commission, which unanimously approved the rezoning of the property. I think other than that you are familiar with both, and I will be glad to answer any questions if you have them?

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, have you seen the latest stipulation of ordinances on both of these?

Mr. Thaxton: Yes sir, I have I was handed the one on Valley View today, and I believe that I have also seen the one with regards to Cambridge Court, which is the Nelson Street property.

Mr. Thompson: And both of those are as you –

Mr. Thaxton: Yes, they both reflect the minutes of the meetings and they're both in agreement, the owner of the property has agreed to comply with both of those request.

Mr. Thompson: Okay.

Mr. Thaxton: Anything else? Thank you very much, I appreciate your time.

Kenneth Craft: (157 Archer Avenue): First of all, as the president of Broadmoor Area Associations, no opposition in denying ordinance 114, the Brown Eyed Girl. Secondly on the infrastructure report, which I understand is going to come later, I haven't seen it yet but I think its under item 12 on the agenda. I think we do this twice a year I just wanted to briefly summarize a comment that I gave about six weeks ago on

the (unclear) City and what it would take it's mostly infrastructure. B minus is not a reflection on the management on the funds that we have, I think that's about an A, B minus is the financial condition of the City to get to a B, if we had enough money for streets and drainage. To get to a B plus we got money for water and sewer the annual maintenance, the millions, to get to an A minus if we had money for an employee pay (unclear) and extra police class, the second class. To get to a straight A, to develop over time a reserve in the Riverfront and Development Fund, kinda like Bossier has, and to get to an A plus having achieved all of the above, our bond rating goes up to the maximum level we save on interest and then we might be able to cut taxes, so that's basically it.

Councilman Jackson: Any questions, gentlemen?

### **CONSENT AGENDA LEGISLATION**

#### **TO INTRODUCE RESOLUTIONS AND ORDINANCES**

**RESOLUTIONS:** None

**ORDINANCES:** None

#### **TO ADOPT RESOLUTIONS AND ORDINANCES:**

**RESOLUTIONS:**

Mr. Thompson: I note for the record that we have a substitute 166 that is not on your screen, but it was inserted to correct the parties, to make sure that the correct parties were inserted, all you need is a motion on the resolution, she has the correct one.

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 166 of 2004**

#### **A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING CALVIN E. MORRISON, ROSEMARY G. MORRISON, SANDRA N. TODARO, & RAYMOND TODARO LOCATED AT 9553 LINWOOD AVE., TO CONNECT TO THE WATER SYSTEM OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.**

WHEREAS, Calvin E. Morrison, Rosemary G. Morrison, Sandra N. Todaro, & Raymond Todaro 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 Calvin E. Morrison, Rosemary G. Morrison, Sandra N. Todaro, & Raymond Todaro, be authorized to connect the building located at 9553 Linwood Avenue, to the water 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 Gibson, seconded by Councilman Walford, to adopt. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Out of the Chamber: Lester

1. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

**ORDINANCES:** None

**REGULAR AGENDA LEGISLATION:**

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

The Clerk read the following resolutions by title:

Resolution No. 139 of 2004: A resolution authorizing the Mayor to execute an agreement with W.G. Yates & Sons Construction Company relative to Fair Share requirements and penalties and otherwise to provide with respect thereto.

Resolution No. 140 of 2004: A resolution authorizing the Mayor to execute an agreement with SMG relative to Fair Share requirements and penalties, and otherwise to provide with respect thereto.

Resolution No. 141 of 2004: Urging and requesting the Convention Center Hotel Authority to execute an agreement with HRI relative to Fair Share requirements and penalties and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Jackson to postpone items 139, 140, 141. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Out of the Chamber: Councilman Carmody. 1. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

**RESOLUTION NO. 151 of 2004**

**A RESOLUTION STATING THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT'S ENDORSEMENT OF ASHLEY RIDGE PARTNERS, LTD TO PARTICIPATE IN THE BENEFITS OF THE LOUISIANA RESTORATION TAX ABATEMENT PROGRAM AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO**

**WHEREAS**, the Restoration Tax Abatement has been created by the Electors of the State of Louisiana as an Act 445 of 1983, and amended in Act 783 of 1984, Article VII, Part II, Section 21(H) of the Louisiana Constitution and Louisiana R.S. 47:4311-4319, to authorize the Board of Commerce and Industry, with the approval of the Governor and the local governing authority and in accordance with procedures and conditions provided by law, to enter into a contract granting property owners who propose the expansion, restoration, improvement or development of an existing structure or structures in a downtown development district, historic district, or economic development district, established in accordance with law, the right to pay ad valorem taxes based upon the assessed valuation of the property prior to the commencement of the expansion, restoration, improvement or development; and

**WHEREAS**, the City of Shreveport desires to promote economic activity, create and retain job opportunities, and improve the tax base throughout the City for the benefit

of all citizens; and

**WHEREAS**, it is the desire of the City Council to foster the continued growth and development (and redevelopment) of the City to the continued prosperity and welfare of the City; and

**WHEREAS**, this project is located in an Economic Development District; and

**WHEREAS**, this project is a commercial property;

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular, and legal session convened that the City Council hereby approves the **ASHLEY RIDGE PARTNERS, LTD** application **1998-0099-13** for participation in the Louisiana Restoration Tax Abatement Program.

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

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

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Lester, to adopt. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Out of the Chamber: Councilman Carmody. 1. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

The Clerk read the resolution by title: Resolution No.156 of 2004: A resolution authorizing the Mayor to execute a professional services agreement between Commerce Street Ventures, LLC and the City of Shreveport and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Lester, to withdraw the resolution from the agenda.

Councilman Walford: There are a number of problems with this contract, it is not a contract it is not identical to what we had with (unclear) entity – I can't remember the Shreveport Marketing – rather than try to do amendment after amendment to make it just totally confusing I spoke with the Administration, I'd like us to come up with a new contract that takes in the elements that should be in there. This one would be in conflict with at least two City ordinances so I would appreciate a vote to remove this one from the agenda and this is certainly is not a reflection on the Red River District or Commerce Street Ventures, I'm in support of the Red River District and I think the entire Council is, but this is not what we need to be executing right now. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Out of the Chamber: Councilman Carmody. 1. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

The Clerk read the following resolution: Resolution No. 162 of 2004: A Resolution stating City of Shreveport's endorsement of Certainteed Corp., Roofing Products Group to participate in the benefits of the Louisiana Quality of Jobs Program and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Gibson for adoption. The clerk read the following amendment:

Amendment No. 1

Amend the ordinance as follows:

Delete the resolution as introduced and substitute the attached resolution.

Motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Jackson on the amendment. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Out of the Chamber: Councilman Carmody. 1. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

Motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Walford, to adopt the resolution as amended. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Out of the Chamber: Councilman Carmody. 1. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 162 of 2004**

#### **A RESOLUTION STATING CITY OF SHREVEPORT'S ENDORSEMENT OF CERTAINTEED CORP., ROOFING PRODUCTS GROUP TO PARTICIPATE IN THE BENEFITS OF THE LOUISIANA QUALITY OF JOBS PROGRAM AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.**

**WHEREAS**, the Louisiana Quality Jobs Act of 153 of 2002 and;

**WHEREAS**, the Louisiana Quality Jobs Program offers significant incentives for economic development to some of the most distressed areas in the State, and

**WHEREAS**, Louisiana Department of Economic Development designated Census Tract 205.00 Block Group 2 in Caddo Parish as eligible based on enabling legislation (R.S. 51:2451-2462) and;

**WHEREAS**, the City of Shreveport states this endorsement is in agreement with the overall economic development plan for the City of Shreveport, and

**WHEREAS**, the **attached map** has been marked showing the location of the business being endorsed, and;

**WHEREAS**, in accordance with the Louisiana Quality Jobs Program requirements the City of Shreveport agrees:

1. To participate in the Quality Jobs Program.
2. To assist the Department in evaluating progress made in any Quality Jobs within its jurisdiction
3. To REBATE the 2.75% local sales/use taxes on the purchase of eligible construction

materials, machinery, and equipment purchased for this project and used by the business permanently on that site.

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the City of Shreveport, in due, regular, and legal session convened that **CERTAINTED CORP., ROOFING PRODUCTS GROUP** and their project **LAMINATOR LINE**, Quality Jobs Application #2003-0012, is hereby endorsed to participate in the Louisiana Quality Jobs Program.

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

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

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 163A OF 2004**

#### **A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING A COOPERATIVE ENDEAVOR AGREEMENT WITH THE CADDO PARISH SCHOOL BOARD RELATIVE TO THE MUTUAL USE OF FACILITIES, BUILDINGS AND EQUIPMENT AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.**

**WHEREAS**, the City of Shreveport (“City”) and the Caddo Parish School Board (“CPSB”) are political subdivisions of the State of Louisiana; and

**WHEREAS**, City and CPSB are owners of various athletic facilities and other buildings located in the City of Shreveport and in Caddo Parish which are used by children and adults of the City and Parish; and

**WHEREAS**, City and CPSB each have a long history of sharing the use of facilities and equipment for their mutual benefit and to benefit the citizens of the City of Shreveport and Caddo Parish which is a public purpose; and

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened that the Mayor is authorized to execute an agreement with the Caddo Parish School Board substantially and in accordance with the draft thereof which was filed with the original copy of this resolution for public inspection in the Office of the Clerk of Council on July 19, 2004.

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

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

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Gibson passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Out of the Chamber: Councilman Carmody. 1. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 164 OF 2004**

#### **A RESOLUTION RATIFYING THE AMENDMENT OF AN INTERMODAL TRANSIT FACILITY COOPERATIVE ENDEAVOR AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF**

**SHREVEPORT AND THE LOUISIANA STATE UNIVERSITY HEALTH SCIENCES CENTER FOUNDATION, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO**

**WHEREAS**, Resolution 119 of 2004 was adopted by the City Council on May 25, 2004, approved by the Mayor on June 1, 2004, and effective on June 9, 2004, which authorized the Mayor to approve an Intermodal Transit Facility Cooperative Endeavor Agreement between the City of Shreveport and the Louisiana State Health Sciences Foundation, as well as authorized the submission of a 5309 grant application to purchase land for an intermodal transit facility; and

**WHEREAS**, the amendment modifies Page 1, Paragraph 4, and Page 2, Subsection 1, of the Original Agreement to now provide that the grant funds will be used by the Louisiana State University Health Sciences Foundation for the purchase of immovable property for an intermodal transit facility and for the construction of improvements on same.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, legal and regular session convened:

4. That the execution of the amendment to the Intermodal Transit Facility Cooperative Endeavor Agreement between the City of Shreveport and the Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center Foundation is hereby ratified.
5. That Keith Hightower, Mayor, is authorized to execute any and all documents in connection with the grant agreement on behalf of the City of Shreveport with the U.S. Department of Transportation for aid in the financing of the planning, capital and operating assistance program of projects and budget.
6. That Keith Hightower, Mayor, is authorized to execute any subsequent amendments to the Intermodal Transit Facility Cooperative Endeavor Agreement necessary to expend the funds.

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

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

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Lester passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Out of the Chamber: Councilman Carmody. 1. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

**RESOLUTION NO. 167 of 2004**

**RESOLUTION STATING CITY OF SHREVEPORT'S ENDORSEMENT OF B & B CUT STONE, LLC TO PARTICIPATE IN THE BENEFITS OF THE LOUISIANA ENTERPRISE ZONE PROGRAM AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.**

**WHEREAS**, the Louisiana Enterprise Zone Act of 901 of 1981, Act 337 of 1982, Act 433 of 1987, Act 1024 of 1992, Act 581 of 1995, Act 624 of 1997, and Act 997 of 1999;

**WHEREAS**, the Louisiana Enterprise Zone Program offers significant incentives for economic development to some of the most distressed areas in parish, and

**WHEREAS**, B & B CUT STONE, LLC is located in Census Tract 218.00 Block Group 1 , which is a designated Enterprise Zone, and

**WHEREAS**, said business will employ a minimum of 35% of its employees from the distressed groups targeted by the Enterprise Zone, and

**WHEREAS**, the City of Shreveport states this endorsement is in agreement with the Overall Economic Development Plan for the City of Shreveport, and

**WHEREAS**, the **attached Enterprise Zone map** is marked showing the location of the business being endorsed, and

**WHEREAS**, in accordance with the Louisiana Enterprise Zone Program requirements the City of Shreveport agrees:

1. To participate in the Enterprise Zone Program
2. To assist the Department in evaluating progress made in any Enterprise Zone within its jurisdiction

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** by the City of Shreveport, in due, regular, and legal session convened that **B & B CUT STONE, LLC** and their project **2004 ADDITION**, Enterprise Zone Application # **2004-0315**, is endorsed to participate in the Louisiana Enterprise Zone Program.

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

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

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Gibson passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Out of the Chamber: Councilman Carmody. 1. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 168 of 2004**

#### **RESOLUTION STATING CITY OF SHREVEPORT'S ENDORSEMENT OF BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH FOUNDATION OF NORTHWEST LA TO PARTICIPATE IN THE BENEFITS OF THE LOUISIANA ENTERPRISE ZONE PROGRAM AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.**

**WHEREAS**, the Louisiana Enterprise Zone Act of 901 of 1981, Act 337 of 1982, Act 433 of 1987, Act 1024 of 1992, Act 581 of 1995, Act 624 of 1997, and Act 997 of 1999;

**WHEREAS**, the Louisiana Enterprise Zone Program offers significant incentives for economic development to some of the most distressed areas in parish, and

**WHEREAS**, BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH FOUNDATION OF NORTHWEST LA is located in Census Tract 217.00 Block Group 4 , which is a designated Enterprise Zone, and

**WHEREAS**, said business will employ a minimum of 35% of its employees from the distressed groups targeted by the Enterprise Zone, and

**WHEREAS**, the City of Shreveport states this endorsement is in agreement with the Overall Economic Development Plan for the City of Shreveport, and

**WHEREAS**, the **attached Enterprise Zone map** is marked showing the

location of the business being endorsed, and

**WHEREAS**, in accordance with the Louisiana Enterprise Zone Program requirements the City of Shreveport agrees:

1. To participate in the Enterprise Zone Program
2. To assist the Department in evaluating progress made in any Enterprise Zone within its jurisdiction

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** by the City of Shreveport, in due, regular, and legal session convened that **BIOMEDICAL RESEARCH FOUNDATION OF NORTHWEST LA** and their project **BIOSPACE / WET LAB INCUBATOR**, Enterprise Zone Application # **2004-0166**, is endorsed to participate in the Louisiana Enterprise Zone Program.

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

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

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Lester passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. 1. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 169 of 2004**

**RESOLUTION STATING CITY OF SHREVEPORT'S ENDORSEMENT OF DMR MECHANICAL, LLC TO PARTICIPATE IN THE BENEFITS OF THE LOUISIANA ENTERPRISE ZONE PROGRAM AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.**

**WHEREAS**, the Louisiana Enterprise Zone Act of 901 of 1981, Act 337 of 1982, Act 433 of 1987, Act 1024 of 1992, Act 581 of 1995, Act 624 of 1997, and Act 997 of 1999;

**WHEREAS**, the Louisiana Enterprise Zone Program offers significant incentives for economic development to some of the most distressed areas in parish, and

**WHEREAS**, DMR MECHANICAL, LLC is located in Census Tract 243.02 Block Group 4 , which is a designated Enterprise Zone, and

**WHEREAS**, said business will employ a minimum of 35% of its employees from the distressed groups targeted by the Enterprise Zone, and

**WHEREAS**, the City of Shreveport states this endorsement is in agreement with the Overall Economic Development Plan for the City of Shreveport, and

**WHEREAS**, the **attached Enterprise Zone map** is marked showing the location of the business being endorsed, and

**WHEREAS**, in accordance with the Louisiana Enterprise Zone Program requirements the City of Shreveport agrees:

1. To participate in the Enterprise Zone Program
2. To assist the Department in evaluating progress made in any Enterprise Zone within

its jurisdiction

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** by the City of Shreveport, in due, regular, and legal session convened that **DMR MECHANICAL, LLC** and their project **DMR MECHANICAL, LLC** , Enterprise Zone Application # **20040321**, is endorsed to participate in the Louisiana Enterprise Zone Program.

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

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

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Lester passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Out of the Chamber: Councilman Carmody. 1. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 170 of 2004**

**RESOLUTION STATING CITY OF SHREVEPORT'S ENDORSEMENT OF OUACHITA INDEPENDENT BANK TO PARTICIPATE IN THE BENEFITS OF THE LOUISIANA ENTERPRISE ZONE PROGRAM AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.**

**WHEREAS**, the Louisiana Enterprise Zone Act of 901 of 1981, Act 337 of 1982, Act 433 of 1987, Act 1024 of 1992, Act 581 of 1995, Act 624 of 1997, and Act 997 of 1999;

**WHEREAS**, the Louisiana Enterprise Zone Program offers significant incentives for economic development to some of the most distressed areas in parish, and

**WHEREAS**, OUACHITA INDEPENDENT BANK is located in Census Tract 239.03 Block Group 2 , which is a designated Enterprise Zone, and

**WHEREAS**, said business will employ a minimum of 35% of its employees from the distressed groups targeted by the Enterprise Zone, and

**WHEREAS**, the City of Shreveport states this endorsement is in agreement with the Overall Economic Development Plan for the City of Shreveport, and

**WHEREAS**, the **attached Enterprise Zone map** is marked showing the location of the business being endorsed, and

**WHEREAS**, in accordance with the Louisiana Enterprise Zone Program requirements the City of Shreveport agrees:

1. To participate in the Enterprise Zone Program
2. To assist the Department in evaluating progress made in any Enterprise Zone within its jurisdiction

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** by the City of Shreveport, in due, regular, and legal session convened that **OUACHITA INDEPENDENT BANK** and their project **ELLERBE ROAD BRANCH OF OIB** , Enterprise Zone Application # **2004-0167**, is endorsed to participate in the Louisiana Enterprise Zone Program.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that if any provision or item of this resolution or the

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

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

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Walford passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Out of the Chamber: Councilman Lester 1. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 171 of 2004**

**RESOLUTION STATING CITY OF SHREVEPORT'S ENDORSEMENT OF REGIONAL UROLOGY, LLC TO PARTICIPATE IN THE BENEFITS OF THE LOUISIANA ENTERPRISE ZONE PROGRAM AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.**

**WHEREAS**, the Louisiana Enterprise Zone Act of 901 of 1981, Act 337 of 1982, Act 433 of 1987, Act 1024 of 1992, Act 581 of 1995, Act 624 of 1997, and Act 997 of 1999;

**WHEREAS**, the Louisiana Enterprise Zone Program offers significant incentives for economic development to some of the most distressed areas in parish, and

**WHEREAS**, REGIONAL UROLOGY, LLC is located in Census Tract 239.03 Block Group 3, which is not a designated Enterprise Zone, and

**WHEREAS**, said business will employ a minimum of 35% of its employees from the distressed groups targeted by the Enterprise Zone, and

**WHEREAS**, the City of Shreveport states this endorsement is in agreement with the Overall Economic Development Plan for the City of Shreveport, and

**WHEREAS**, the **attached Enterprise Zone map** is marked showing the location of the business being endorsed, and

**WHEREAS**, in accordance with the Louisiana Enterprise Zone Program requirements the City of Shreveport agrees:

1. To participate in the Enterprise Zone Program
2. To assist the Department in evaluating progress made in any Enterprise Zone within its jurisdiction

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** by the City of Shreveport, in due, regular, and legal session convened that **REGIONAL UROLOGY, LLC** and their project **REGIONAL UROLOGY, LLC**, Enterprise Zone Application # **2004-0124**, is endorsed to participate in the Louisiana Enterprise Zone Program.

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

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

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Walford passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Out of the Chamber: Councilman Lester. 1. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

**RESOLUTION NO. 172 of 2004**

**RESOLUTION STATING CITY OF SHREVEPORT'S ENDORSEMENT OF ROOFING SUPPLY, INC. TO PARTICIPATE IN THE BENEFITS OF THE LOUISIANA ENTERPRISE ZONE PROGRAM AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.**

**WHEREAS**, the Louisiana Enterprise Zone Act of 901 of 1981, Act 337 of 1982, Act 433 of 1987, Act 1024 of 1992, Act 581 of 1995, Act 624 of 1997, and Act 997 of 1999;

**WHEREAS**, the Louisiana Enterprise Zone Program offers significant incentives for economic development to some of the most distressed areas in parish, and

**WHEREAS**, ROOFING SUPPLY, INC. is located in Census Tract 233.00 Block Group 2, which is a designated Enterprise Zone, and

**WHEREAS**, said business will employ a minimum of 35% of its employees from the distressed groups targeted by the Enterprise Zone, and

**WHEREAS**, the City of Shreveport states this endorsement is in agreement with the Overall Economic Development Plan for the City of Shreveport, and

**WHEREAS**, the **attached Enterprise Zone map** is marked showing the location of the business being endorsed, and

**WHEREAS**, in accordance with the Louisiana Enterprise Zone Program requirements the City of Shreveport agrees:

1. To participate in the Enterprise Zone Program
2. To assist the Department in evaluating progress made in any Enterprise Zone within its jurisdiction

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED** by the City of Shreveport, in due, regular, and legal session convened that **ROOFING SUPPLY, INC.** and their project **SIDE YARD EXPANSION**, Enterprise Zone Application # **2004-0140**, is endorsed to participate in the Louisiana Enterprise Zone Program.

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

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

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Gibson to postpone approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Out of the Chamber: Councilman Carmody. 1. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

Mr. Thompson: We have three that were added.

**RESOLUTION NUMBER 178 OF 2004**

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

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

**WHEREAS**, the City of Shreveport has entered into an intergovernmental agreement with Caddo Parish under which Caddo Parish will undertake to sell or donate said properties as authorized in R.S. 33:4720.11 or R.S. 33:4720.25; and

**WHEREAS**, pursuant to Section 26-294 of the Code of Ordinances, the city's interests in said properties can be sold after the City Council declares them to be surplus; and

**WHEREAS**, the purchasing agent has inquired of all city departments regarding the property described herein and has not received any indication that it is needed for city purposes.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened that the following described properties are hereby declared surplus:

Lot 7, the South 32.28 feet of the

Geographic Number  
181417-013-052400

North 182.28 feet of Lot 461, Jones-Mabry  
Subdivision Unit #7  
Municipal Address: 1935 David Raines Rd  
Council District "A"  
Application for Donation

A tract of land in the Southeast Quarter (SW1/4)

Geographic  
Number 161408-000-  
010100

of Section 8, Township 16 North, Range 14 West  
Caddo Parish, Louisiana, said tract more fully described as:  
From the Southeast corner of said Section 8, run North 89  
degrees, 26 minutes, 30 seconds West along the South line of  
said Section 8 a distance of 1126.12 feet to a point on the West  
right-of-way line of U.S. Highway Number 171 (Mansfield Road)  
and point of beginning; Thence, continue North 89 degrees, 26  
minutes, 30 seconds West along said South line of Section 8 a distance  
of 350.0 feet; Thence, run North 0 degrees, 33 minutes, 30 seconds  
East a distance of 100.0 feet; Thence, run South 89 degrees, 26  
minutes, 30 seconds East a distance 118.32 feet; Thence, run North 0  
degrees, 33 minutes, 30 seconds East a distance of 204.03 feet; Thence  
run South 89 degrees, 26 minutes, 30 seconds East a distance of 360.0 feet  
to a point on the West right-of-way line of said U. S. Highway Number 171

(Mansfield Road); Thence, run South 23 degrees, 26 minutes, 30 seconds West along said West right-of-way line a distance of 330.0 feet to point of beginning; Said tract containing 2.3364 acres or 101,773.6 square feet; Municipal Address: 9660 Mansfield Road

**Council District "E"**

Application for Donation  
Lot 6, Rockwood Addition

Geographic Number 171402-036-000600

Municipal Address: 2622 Lakeshore Drive

**Council District "G"**

Lot 30 and the South 5 feet of Lot 29,

Geographic Number  
171424-001-003700

lying next to and adjoining Lot 30,  
Heights Subdivision

Municipal Address: 6344 Thornhill Avenue

**Council District "C"**

Lot 25, Block 9, Oakview Subdivision

Geographic Number  
171425-032-002500

Municipal Address: 455 Marx Street

**Council District "D"**

Lot 4, Bunche Subdivision

Geographic Number 181416-046-000400

Municipal Address: 0 Bunche Street

**Council District "A"**

West 35 feet of East 40 feet of Lot 14,

Geographic Number  
181436-005-003100

Block 1, Ingersoll Heights Subdivision

Municipal Address: 1554 Garden Street

**Council District "A"**

Lot eight, Block F, Jefferson Heights

Geographic Number  
171403-107-000800

Subdivision

Municipal Address: 3231 Judson Street

**Council District "G"**

Lot 1, Kidd Subdivision, less North 30 feet

Geographic Number  
171436-023-000100

for 85th Street

Municipal Address: 404 East 85th Street

**Council District "D"**

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

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

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Carmody passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

**RESOLUTION NO. 179 OF 2004**

**A RESOLUTION ESTABLISHING A SHREVEPORT YOUTH COUNCIL COMPRISED OF LOCAL HIGH SCHOOL STUDENTS AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.**

**WHEREAS**, the young people in the City of Shreveport want and deserve a voice in their communities which in turn will identify positive solutions and build stronger communities; and

**WHEREAS**, a concerted effort is needed to encourage youth participation and involvement to help municipal leaders make better decisions and wiser public investments; and

**WHEREAS**, youth participation and involvement in local government promotes the full and healthy development of young people; and

**WHEREAS**, researchers have suggested young people who are involved in positive activities such as community service and participation in civic affairs are less likely to pursue risky behaviors.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened that ten public High Schools: Booker T. Washington, Caddo Magnet, Captain Shreve, C.E. Byrd, Fair Park, Green Oaks, Huntington, Northwood, Southwood, and Woodlawn; and two Private Schools: Loyola and Evangel; are invited to participate in the Youth Council by nominating one student from each school.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Youth Council will decide its agenda but a long range goal is to create and administer a youth master plan for the City of Shreveport.

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED** that the Youth Council meetings will be held once a month at 4:00 p.m. or at a time schedules by the Council.

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

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

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Jackson, seconded by Councilman Lester passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

Councilman Jackson: For the record, those who look through that resolution, there was a mission of Captain Shreve High School, it has since been added. So, we won't have any problems with the rest of the Gators.

**RESOLUTION NO. 180 OF 2004**

**A RESOLUTION TO REQUEST AN OPINION FROM THE ATTORNEY GENERAL OF THE STATE OF LOUISIANA AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO**

**WHEREAS**, the State of Louisiana, and the City of Shreveport and Shreveport Convention Center Hotel Authority have entered into a Cooperative Endeavor Agreement for the planning and construction of the "Convention Center Complex; and

**WHEREAS**, the Cooperative Endeavor Agreement lists the local (city) share of the project as \$85,000,000, and the state's share as \$12,000,000; and

**WHEREAS**, because the Cooperative Endeavor Agreement and related documents do not specifically state that the City of Shreveport can use the \$12,000,000 of state capital outlay funds for the construction of a hotel; it is necessary for City of Shreveport to receive an opinion from Attorney General of Louisiana in this regard before the City commits or guarantees \$40,000,000 for the construction of the hotel; and

**WHEREAS**, an opinion is needed from the Attorney General of Louisiana as set forth below.

**NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED**, by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, regular and legal session convened, that an opinion is requested from the Attorney General of the State of Louisiana which addresses the following:

- (1) Whether the Constitution and laws of this state, and the constitution, laws and regulations of the federal government allow capital outlay funds to be used for the construction of a convention center hotel by the City of Shreveport or the Shreveport Convention Center Hotel Authority? If so,
- (2) Whether the Louisiana State Legislature authorized the expenditure and use of \$12,000,000 in capital outlay funds for the construction of the convention center hotel?

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that if any provisions or items of this resolution or the application thereof is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provision, 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 Carmody, seconded by Councilman Walford to adopt.

Councilman Jackson: Question. What is it?

Mr. Thompson: The resolution was passed out by Mr. Carmody.

Mr. Antee: Mr. Chairman, I think what this does is formalize a request that Mr. Carmody had made several months ago for an Attorney General's opinion. I think we all thought that, that request had been formally made. And in our visit with the Attorney General a few weeks ago, he told us that it had not. And I think all this is doing is

formally asking. Although we, very confident based upon our meeting with him and two assistants and the case law that they've sent to us since then that is going to come back showing that the money can be spent for the hotel, but this will just clarify that.

Motion passes by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester Walford, Carmody, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

Councilman Hogan: Just a quick question. Of all that we just voted on for companies, we did an endorsement to and approve for them to participate in the Enterprise Zone Program. I'm just curious to know, Mr. Antee, maybe you can answer the question, but I understand it's sponsored by Community Development. Whose responsibility is it to go behind and in the coming weeks or months ahead, to follow up on the jobs that they are proposing? If they've claimed- - - the whole idea behind this is as I understand it, they're generating new jobs.

Mr. Antee: These with very few exception only include the State's portion of the taxes and does not include the City's portion, so the State, they're responsible for reporting to the State and the State monitors, I'm not sure if there is a second monitor that we do but that's pretty – we're kind of a conduit for the State, and only in a few circumstances do we actually include the City's portion, where we would then follow up as well.

Councilman Hogan: Okay, thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Councilman Jackson: Yes sir. Did you say that was all of the resolution?

Mr. Thompson: That's all to be adopted.

Councilman Jackson: To be adopted, today.

## **INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS**

Mr. Thompson: We have resolutions for introduction, 173, 174, 175, and a resolution that was added, authorizing the Mayor to execute an agreement with Bank One Leasing Corporation.

Councilman Walford: I may offer a substitute motion here in just a moment.

Councilman Jackson: Did you offer a motion –

Councilman Walford: I'd offered a motion for three, then he added one but I think there's two that we discussed yesterday that are going to come off.

Councilman Jackson: Okay.

Councilman Walford: So –

Councilman Lester: Well can we start from the beginning?

Councilman Walford: Let's do –

Councilman Jackson: Hold on just a second, let's clarify your motion and you can begin.

Councilman Walford: Let me just make my motion for 173 at this time.

1. Resolution No. 173. A resolution ratifying the signature of the Mayor on an assignment of permit to encroach, authorizing the subsequent assignment of a permit to encroach on a portion of Cross Lake by Judith C. Rossey to Kyle and Gae Graham on land below the 172 foot contour line located on West 54 feet on

Lot 3, Page Bayou Subdivision, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, and otherwise providing with respect thereto. (A/Lester)

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Lester, for introduction to lay over until the next regular council meeting. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

2. Resolution No. 174. A resolution designating the adjusted millage rates for various Ad Valorem Taxes of the City of Shreveport as required by Article VII, Section 23 of the Louisiana Constitution and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
3. Resolution No. 175. A resolution calling a public Hearing on the matter of increasing the millage rates on various Ad Valorem Taxes and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Lester, to withdraw.

Councilman Gibson: Question.

Councilman Jackson: Question

Councilman Gibson: Is this in reference to rolling taxes forward?

Councilman Jackson: Yes this is what this is.

Mr. Thompson: Julie might be the best person to answer that.

Ms. Glass: Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Jackson: Yes.

Ms. Glass: One seventy-four and one seventy-five were steps that would have been necessary if you had planned to roll taxes forward, and so the Administration has said that they do not plan to go forward with that, so that was why the advice that you did not need these two if you were not going to roll forward.

Councilman Gibson: Okay, Mr. Chair. I was one of those people that was voting no to roll taxes forward and at this point and time I want to make sure that I'm on record that the reason that I'm voting no or was going to vote on that particular item is because there was no written proposal about how monies were going to be spent, that at a later date that if a plan of action would be put forward with blind items and how we are going to spend that money, then I think that then the prudent call would be to then ask for a vote on this, but obviously with budget talks coming up and things of that nature I think a lot of clarity going to come into play for this Council, but I think it was important that I point out why I was going to vote against this particular proposal. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Lester: Question, Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Lester.

Councilman Lester: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. This question is to Ms. Glass, do we have a specific time frame that we have to make a decision in terms of rolling forward or rolling backwards, what type of time constraints are we under, if any?

Ms. Glass: We do have time constraints it is not absolutely clear because the statute says that you're suppose to levy the taxes by June 1<sup>st</sup>; however we did not receive the reassessment numbers until July, so the assessor has – it's obvious that the June 1<sup>st</sup> date can't be meet and that they need to be levied. I think the time constraint that were under is that they need to be levied as soon as possible, as a particle matter the tax rolls are prepared – I believe as of November 1<sup>st</sup> and that assessor have to have the levy long before that, to do it. So I can't give you a certain date, because the statutory date has passed, but we are on a short time frame.

Councilman Lester: Okay, thank you. That answers my question because one of my concerns or my question was whether or not there were any time delays that we were dealing with in terms of, you know, at what point the notice had to go out, you know, how much time we had to deal with – go ahead.

Ms. Glass: If I could, Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Jackson: Sure.

Ms. Glass: One thing that I did not mention, if you did decide that you didn't want to roll the taxes forward the first step is to designate the lower adjusted rates. The second step is called public hearing and you do have to advertise the public hearing twice, 30 days before it is held, so that would be another thing that you would want to keep in mind.

Councilman Lester: Okay, thank you.

Councilman Jackson: I'm sorry, Mr. Lester, were you finished?

Councilman Lester: I'll yield. I was going to say I'm voting – my motion was to withdraw – well I seconded Mr. Walford's motion to withdraw the role forward, but I'm going to be voting against it. And I would have voted for the roll forward because, I mean we've heard that we need more police on the street and this was an opportunity for us to deal with that, and I'm very sensitive to the needs of our communities particularly as it relates to our City worker's, I mean these men and women are working their behinds off day in and day out, making us look good, and we have an opportunity to spend some money to tell to them – or at least express to them and maybe in a limited fashion of our support for the hard work that they do everyday. The glories, thankless, sweaty work that they do in this City to help us and this City move forward, so I was voting for rolling forward for those reasons, and I just wanted to put that on the record. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Walford.

Councilman Walford: If I could Mr. Chairman address to Ms. Glass?

Councilman Jackson; Yes sir.

Councilman Walford: Go a little further with Mr. Lester's question? If we don't do the roll forward now, is this over for four years until there's another reassessment or is that something that can be done annually or – ?

Ms. Glass: I believe that in the following year you have the opportunity to roll forward to the prior – actually I'm not sure if I should answer that at this point, I believe you do but I'm not absolutely positive without looking back at the statute.

Councilman Jackson: Is that it?

Ms. Glass: Mr. Chairman, if I could.

Councilman Jackson: Ms. –

Ms. Glass: I don't know if this would help, if there's some confusion. Number 174 and 175 are two preliminary steps to rolling forward. If you left them on the agenda or even if you adopted them, you would not have rolled forward yet, you would've just kind of kept your place, the actually tax levy ordinances are on introduction.

Councilman Jackson: Let me just say as well that, you know, and I don't know if – and I certainly don't direct this toward the Administration as much – maybe I should say I direct it toward the Administration, but I know that there was an attempt to make sure that we were able to do what every other governing body in this area was doing, which was to pace with revenue. We talked about the fact – I just want to express my disappointment because we talked about the fact that we needed to bring this bridge together, we needed 20 more officers, what was articulated to me and unless I'm wrong about it, I like Councilman Gibson, I haven't seen a written plan for what we were going to do with the \$1.5 million that we've giving back now, but I have not heard a plan on how we going to get 20 more officers next year either, so I mean I don't know if there's a plan that exist with that regard, I do know that there's no money fairy that's passing through Shreveport in the next serval months to drop us off something that when I talk, you know, one of the things I hope that I can do, let me say the Chair can do is to try to be consistent, because if we say it then I think we ought to do it and my effort was to try to see how we can, as we digest the information from the staff meeting patrol, I didn't have another plan and I know that as a Council now we are going to have to go away if we turn down this money, we are going to have to go back and come back with a plan. Obviously, it's not the Administration responsibility – my opinion to dictate what that plan should be I think as, you know, you may have some ideas but ultimately the responsibility for oversight is this Council's and at least this Chairman's thought process is that, you know, that money represent not only the opportunity as Mr. Lester said, to give our City employee's a raise, but because it perpetual revenue that it gave us an opportunity to not shoot in the arm the Police Department, but to institutionalize those numbers that we talked about a few minutes ago and for those reasons, you know, I'm disappointed that we don't, you know, all of us who own property, you know, it cost all of us but, you know, progress counts. And if we compare ourselves – and I don't remember who but I know we talked the other day about comparing ourselves to other areas, but if we truly compared ourselves to other areas I think we are blessed, we talk about the property tax rate that we pay at this particular time in our City and again, you know, it takes money to do all of these things everything that is on this agenda we talk about all day it takes money to get those things done, and in the system of the City that we have, much of that comes from what revenue we are able to generate. We are obviously are limited in those sources, in those strings of revenue so when we see opportunities nobody wants to tax the people, but I think this is a situation where it was not put before us to quote unquote raise taxes but to maintain the milage that was there. Each Councilman, it's not our duty, our job to judge the motive of another council member and I take this very seriously, and I just know that we are going to have to be prepared to come back and do the work, if we say no to this money we have to be able to say yes to some money somewhere else and this, you know, prepared us – excuse me, we as a council and this as a community for having to do some of those tough

things, so, you know, I would with that offer a substitute motion to postpone this rather than to withdraw.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Jackson: Yes sir.

Mr. Thompson: It's on introduction it should have been on the for passage but it is on introduction so – if it's just introduce then it will lay over.

Councilman Jackson: But his motion was to withdraw, so rather than postpone – just vote to introduce it?

Councilman Lester: First, let me do this I'll seconded his motion.

Mr. Thompson: That's okay.

Substitute motion by Councilman Jackson, seconded by Councilman Lester, to postpone 174 and 175.

Councilman Gibson: Mr. Chair.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Gibson.

Councilman Gibson: Thank you, Mr. Chair. In a follow-up before I cast my vote on this thing, I do think it's the Administration responsibility to come up with budgets and now that we have a report that says that a recommendation by a consultant that we have two training academies, I think it's incumbent upon the Administration putting together a plan that – and this goes back to our discussion yesterday, where Councilman Carmody had a good point to where we charge department heads to look at, you know, worst case scenarios and best case scenarios and I've taken some things out of context Councilman Carmody, so but that's what I kind of interrupted, but the fact is best case scenario we got a consultant that says, at least in the Police Department case, that we got two training academies that we need to maintain. Worst case scenario, and this is news to me today, where, you know, we got a Chief saying that we are going to have one training academy next year, I'm going to be asking some important question during the next coming month to the Administration about where the money went to or where it came from to get to the academies this year. But I think it's incumbent that the Administration is the beginning point on budgets and then giving us option to look at and then based on those option I believe that then this Council is then charged with oversight to look at the ends and outs about how we prioritize and what is a priority, but I strongly disagree, I think the Administration has the full responsibility to put together budgets based on where the needs are currently, based on keeping minimum numbers at least from previous years, but that's probably going to be debate quite a bit leading up to the fall budget, but that's my comments on it, Mr. Chair, thank you.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Jackson.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Carmody.

Councilman Carmody: Just a quick thought, I know that the motion was made to withdraw this and now we got a substitute motion to go ahead and postpone and let it lay over. My thought as I have mentioned to all of y'all is the fact that I don't want toy with anybody emotions about the financial situation in the City of Shreveport finds us in this year, but in the same way we – all of around the desk have got to live within our budget and revenue sources that the City of Shreveport has – true the Administration got to work with the department heads in order to bring us those budgets. We are the ones that are in charge of asking the question scrutinize what their recommendations are and then voting, either approving them, rejecting them or modifying them. And so, I guess

you have to say the buck stop rights here, because they do not have the ability to spend money without this specific authority to do so being granted by us. And so, I don't see it as being an advisory relationship between the Administration and the Council, I think it should be more of a team effort along with the citizens of the community to make sure as this gentleman pointed out, what level of municipal service the citizens expect us to deliver? Within the financial constraints that we find ourselves in what can we do? And you use the expression scrub the budget, how far do you scrub it? Well sometimes I guess you have to actually cut back to a point to where the public says, hey y'all got deliver more than what y'all are delivering, if the mayor comes forward and say that we have spent every dollar that we have given to do what we are presently doing then that's when the public cry will come out to say well then we will pay more because we expect more, that is where we're about to go into that process right now. The Administration realizes as all of us do, that certainly our revenue sources are flat, I wish that were not the particularly scenario that we find ourselves in. The revenue that we've always dipped into as our Reserve, the Riverfront Development is down, that can be for a number of factors, but lets just say the reality of it, it's down, okay, so where that appear to be a windfall for the community to dip into that pool of money, we know really need to scrutinize how that money is being spent. Because in addition to that pool of money every other bit of money we got has got to be prioritize to make sure that we are doing what the public requires us deliver to them. If we don't we're not doing our jobs as public servants, and it's not as I say and advisory type of relationship, it should be in concert with the Administration believe you me the public will come forward and stand at that desk and look all of us dead in the eye to say if you got to come back and require us to pay more we'll do it because we expect more, but they're also going to say if we pay more, what will you deliver? Just as any consumer would. I'm happy to go in and look at buying a product or service, but I want to know what is that product and service gonna do for me. And then I get to make the choice as to whether to buy the high end, the middle or the low, depending on what my tolerance is for what I expect out of that product. So, if the vote today is to go ahead and postpone that, it's certainly the discretion of the Council. My vote is not going to change if it's today or tomorrow. I said from the beginning when the Mayor asked us each to confirm with him our thoughts. Mine is that I think that the City needs to tighten its belt, live within its budget, look for where we can move some money. I don't know if 5% decrease or 10% increase is right or wrong, I leave it to the Administration. We cannot demand that of them. But I do think that they understand and will communicate to their department heads that this Council is looking for their input specifically into where granted if the scenario turns worse, would they cut, if on the other hand that we have an infusion of money, what would they do if we allocated it to their department. There is nothing wrong with asking those questions and asking them to come forward. The Administration mentioned yesterday that, that's normally part of the packet. Their unfunded desires that each department is going to have. We're just asking them to go a little bit further and to look at what are you presently doing, that if you did not have the money to do it, where would you cut? Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Lester: My concern in this is that I don't want to cut off any options. I mean, we talk about 5% cut, we talk about what if you have a 10% increase, but I don't want to cut off any options to this process. Because we're not giving a truly 100% best

effort to deal with the problems. If there is an option that will allow us to do certain things, and we say no when we don't want that option, then you're not having a true and honest and up front discussion with folks. People talking about living within the budgets, I agree Councilman Carmody, 100%. But this is not a situation where we raising the mills, the mills are remaining constant. The revenue is changing because the value of the property changes. And lets not get it - - - any confusion. They're all properties that have increase in value and they're going to pay additional taxes regardless of whether we roll the mills back or not. I mean, that's just Mathematics 101. So, this is not a situation where we, the seven of us are going to take additional money from people because we're raising their taxes. No, the mills remain constant. The revenue is going to come in at a higher rate, because the value of property goes up. And in terms of demanding service. You know, the citizens in my district and I can only speak for the citizens of my district tell me quite frequently that they want more police, and they don't want us playing with public safety. And my concern is if we cut back, where are the cuts going to happen? I mean, we talk about Operational Services and things of that nature. Are we talking about laying people off? I mean yesterday, I gave the example and this was something that happened to me Sunday Morning. 7:00 my phone rings at home, not my office, my home. Constituent says Mr. Lester, I've got a problem on the 500 block of Pierre Ave. The water main is busted. The water's been running. I need somebody to come and fix it. I get on the phone, I call Mike Strong. I say "Mike, good morning, send somebody out to the 500 block of Pierre Ave". And they did it. You know, we have people that are working hard everyday and do those types of things as general course of business. The people that work for the City, for the most part, aren't doing it to make a tremendous income. They aren't. But we expect more and more of them to work more with less, work smarter, not harder and they're doing it. And we have an opportunity. You know when the storm situation came, to a person, each and everyone of us lauded the City workers for the hard work that they did in cleaning up our debris and cleaning up our trash and making sure that everything goes right. We talked about the folks at SPAR and working with Super Safe Sunday and all these different events. We talk about those folks doing these jobs when it comes time for the Mardi Gras, "oh, what a good job you're doing", but when we have an opportunity to recognize and give them something that says 'we know that we want to give you more, but this is what we can afford to do", we say no. And I have a problem with us cutting off those options. If we're going to have a truly intellectual discussion about what our budget is, we should look at revenue streams, as well as expenditures. You don't balance budgets basically on expenditures, especially when you have revenue streams that you can deal with. Now, once you have started that dialogue, and if you decided at a certain point that this is more than you want to deal with, then lets say no. But to cut off an argument before you even have a true intellectual discussion, I don't think we're being fair with the people. And a lot of times, we make decisions up here everyday. Some of them are popular, some of them are not. But I think you said it Councilman Carmody, and you're right. The buck stops with us. And I'm not afraid to make a tough decision, if it means that we deal with our priorities. But everyone has to do with what everyone has to do. So, I mean we've got a situation where in terms of public safety, we've been told by the Police Chief just today, we're down 60 officers. We've got an opportunity to rectify that situation, but we want to cut that discussion, because politically, or well- - - I'm not going

to say that because I don't know what's in everybody mind. I'll take that back. But there is a prevailing thought that you know, I can't be for voting for more taxes, because at some point, people are going to say I'm a bad person. Well, what happens when someone is a victim of a crime and there is not a police officer there. What happens when the water main breaks and there's no one there. What do we tell them then? I mean endured the pain, I'm sorry? I don't think so. I just would like for us to have a complete discussion on all of the issues and put everything on the table. Everything on the table and then once we put everything on the table, then we can make some decisions. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, is the substitute motion on 174 and 175?

Councilman Jackson: Yeah to postpone 174 and 175.

Mayor Hightower: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Just real briefly, I think some council members have made some pretty accurate comments during this discussion period today. One of which being, you know I think we need to lay the options in front of you guys to let you know what we have. It wasn't my plan that all of our properties are worth more. I think that is a good thing. It shows that our economy is growing and we all ought to be proud of that. I think any community that doesn't have reassessment has come along - - and their property value goes up, they have a whole lot more problems than we have going on in Shreveport. So, I think No. 1, that's excellent news for us. That we should have to pay more, because our properties are worth more. The next thing that I think my job is again. Come back, lay out options to you guys as to what we would do. I could have come back to you and said millages are - - - assessments have gone up, millages will stay the same (unclear) raise \$1,500,000, and we're going to throw a party. I didn't think that was the best thing to do, not from the Administration's standpoint. We knew coming in that we need more police officers. We've listened to the personnel board, we've listened to employees, I've listened to Central Trades, Roosevelt and his guys out there talk about the real issues and pay equities and those type of things and what we need to do to get our employees to where they ought to be. We've listened to those things, and so have you guys. They've been down here and you've listened as well. We had an opportunity with the million and a half dollars to address two of the problems. And that's the reason that we recommended those two, as expenditures of the assessment windfall. I think we're passed that. Councilman Carmody said a couple of times, he's talked about scrubbing the budget and Councilman Jackson. Everybody's talking about scrubbing the budget and hard decisions to make, I think the fact of the matter is, you can run, but we can't hide. It's going to come around at some point and we've got to make a decision as to what we're going to do with the revenue we generated. It's that simple. There's no magic bullet here. The only thing that we can do from our standpoint to create more revenue is really, is to go out and promote businesses and increase sales tax. And we've been doing that. We've got and Economic Development Department that's all she does everyday is goes out and tries to create retail for the most part, because we know that's what drives the engine. That's the gasoline. If we don't have it, somebody is getting it. Be it Bossier City or be it Dallas. So we have worked to be sure that we are bringing those retail outlets and opportunities to the City of Shreveport, so that our citizens and visitors can take advantage of the opportunities while they're here and dump monies into our coffers, so that we can

continue to grow. You know the other thing I think we have to do is exactly what we're doing with the Convention Center and the Hotel project. We have to create a new industry - - tourism. We have to go somewhere we've never been before. We have to bring people here that'll continue to spend those dollars in those facilities and the casinos and again in the retail outlets. So that again, our tax revenues go up without an extra burden on the people that live here. But again, I don't think that we can continue to hide and we can't continue to run. We've got to be willing to make the choices to decide what we want to do. It's easy to sit back and say, we cut a class before, we shouldn't have cut a class. Well, that's okay, it's easy to go into a restaurant and order the most expensive thing on the menu, but when the check comes, somebody's got to pay it. Or you gotta start washing dishes or something. And I don't see anybody around town that's wanting to wash dishes or worry about bills that can't be paid. The bottom line is expenses go up to do what we want to do. As Councilman Carmody said, there's a threshold there. There's a number there that we have to decide, is a 7 minute response time good enough for you. I listened to the consultant today say 7 minutes is our average response time. And he says that good. You know that's good, if it's not your house. And it's not your wife that's pinned against the wall or whatever may be happening. So, at some point, we do have to as a City decide what we want to afford. And at what level of service we can provide. But it's easy for all of us to say response time ought to be 30 seconds. You know the golf courses ought to be in great shape. We ought to have 800 policemen. We ought to have an 800 room hotel. We ought to do all these things, but at some point, we have to pay for it. And at some point, we have to have leadership and backbone to stand up and say, I can explain to my constituents what it is they want, what it takes, just like- - - you know we tried to lay it out to you guys. You've gotta make a decision and so do the taxpayers. We all do. And the good news is we're all taxpayers here. So, what's good for the goos is good for the gander. We all benefit or suffer no matter what the decision is. So, we can postpone this today if you guys want to, I don't see any real benefit in doing that. I think it's clear. Everybody was forthright in our meeting. Everybody expressed the decision they had made and how they came to it. I think the reality is we need to get back to reality. And this tax roll forward is not going to happen. So, lets punt. Lets go back, lets take a look. If what we're going to have to do to provide that extra class to do those extra things, but also keep in mind as Councilman Carmody said, and Councilman Jackson said. At some point, somebody's gotta pay. Somebody's gotta pay. There is no free lunch. And we'll have the perfect opportunity to through that process over the next several months during the 2005 budget. We're going to ask the Department Heads once again, to cut. We're going to probably tell City Employees once again, no cost of living increases. We're going to have to do those things, but we all need to stand up say this is reality and this is why. We don't need six of us saying that and one running. We all know where the money is. We all know what to expect and we all take part, as Councilman CArmody said. The buck stops here. And I take as much responsibility as anybody at this dias. But we're going to bring recommendations to you whether we have money or we don't have money that we think are going to keep the boat floating and headed in the right direction so that this City is in good shape down the line. And that's what we've done and that's what we'll continue to do. But as far as continuing to beat our heads and wish that this money will drop on us, actually I think we're past that point. Lets move on.

Decisions have been made. I'm comfortable with that. Lets see what we can do to get back on track instead of dragging this thing out for two more weeks to - - - I think Councilman Lester said or somebody said the other day to give hope to those that think that, that's necessary and we know that, that's not coming.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you Mr. Mayor. I just want to say as we move to vote that we talk about options being laid out and the Chair personally was prepared to vote on the option that was laid out. The option that presented to me was we had a million and a half dollars worth of revenue from rolling forward the millage for which we would then be able to give a 3% raise to our citizens, excuse me, yeah our citizens who happen to be employees too. And we would be able to hire 20 more police officers. Everybody's district is different and when you talk to constituents who live in the district, everybody's got different needs. Every constituency has different priorities. In the district, that I represent, people are concerned about public safety. They're concerned about crime and those things. And I make no apologies for voting the concerns of my constituents. And they wanted more. I see that this is an opportunity by rolling forward. It would have been an opportunity to in fact hire more police officers to make sure that we had - - -that we meet the replacement percentage, so that our- - -at least our public safety does not diminish. I don't think with not rolling back, it does not give me a level of comfort and it adds no guarantee that there's going to be something. We can say, well find it. But we also have to say conversely that something else is going to suffer. There's not going to be any new revenue. This is the forum with which we generate revenue through this tax millage. And nobody's talked to me about replacement. A lot of folks have talked about re-appropriation of existing funds. But this was not a re-appropriation of existing funds. This was new revenue. And my issue is that I think apples to apples, and dollars for dollars, somebody ought to be able to (unclear). Once this is killed and we turn back and give this \$1.5 million, turn it down let me say this \$1.5 million. Does anyone know, and again if the Administrations assumes responsibility for that, what I'm interested in knowing is not just how you fill the gaps through the scrubs, I want to know where we can find \$1.5million in new revenue, that even if it's not police, it's for something that this City has a need for. And if we turn that \$1.5 million, then my charge to the Administration and those who have the other idea that may be grand ideas as well, is someone needs to show me the money. Show me where the new revenue generation is going to be to offset what legitimately would be new revenue generation. And I think we talked about it, but we're not talking apples to apples. Nobody wants to pay more, but there is no where in the world- - - we talked getting back to reality. There is nowhere in the real world where you pay less to get more. We'd all like to do it but, it just doesn't happen. If we're going to be real, we've got to be real from top to bottom. And I just would suggest that my motion and my votes would represent the fact that I believe that we have to be able to pay for what we need. Nobody is going to give it to us. We've got to be able to pay for it.

Motion to postpone denied by the following vote: Nays: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Gibson, and Hogan 4. Ayes: Councilmen Lester, and Jackson. 2. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

Councilman Jackson: That motion dies. We still need action on 174 and 175.

Mr. Thompson: The original motion was a motion to withdraw.

Motion to withdraw denied by the following vote: Nays: Councilmen Gibson, Jackson, and Lester. 3. Ayes: Councilmen Carmody, Hogan, and Walford. 3. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

Councilman Jackson: Motion to withdraw would in fact die for lack of a majority.

Councilman Walford: It fails.

Councilman Jackson: We still need some action though on 174 and 175?

Motion by Councilman Jackson, seconded by Councilman Walford, for introduction to lay over until the next council meeting passes by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Gibson, and Jackson. 4. Nays: Councilmen Carmody and Hogan. 2. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, we have one more.

4. Resolution No. 181 of 2004. A resolution authorizing the Mayor to execute an agreement with Banc One Leasing Corporation and other necessary parties for the financing of vehicles and equipment and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Lester for introduction to lay over until the next council meeting passes by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, and we still have one other too. The ordinance that was added today. Another resolution was added today.

5. Resolution No. 182 of 2004. A resolution authorizing the Mayor to execute mineral leases with Alternative Fuel Systems of Louisiana, Inc.,

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Lester for introduction to lay over until the next council meeting passes by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

*(See Amendment to the August 10, 2004, City Council Minutes as published on August 17, 2004 in the Official Journal)*

## **INTRODUCTION OF ORDINANCES (not to be adopted prior to Aug 24)**

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, you might want to take these in small bites. I would recommend 120, 121, and 122 for introduction.

1. Ordinance No. 120 of 2004. Amending the 2004 Airports Fund Budget.
2. Ordinance No. 121 of 2004. Amending the 2004 Capital Improvements Budget.

3. Ordinance No. 122 of 2004. Amending the 2004 Community Development Special Revenue Fund Budget.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Walford for introduction of the ordinances to lay over until the next council meeting. Motion approved by the following votes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green.

4. Ordinance No. 123 of 2004: Levying various taxes totaling eighteen and eight-two one hundredths (18 and 82/100ths) mills per dollar on all property subject to Ad Valorem Taxation within the City of Shreveport for the year 2004 in the amounts and for the purposes described herein and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Gibson for introduction of the ordinance to lay over until the next council meeting. Motion approved by the following votes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green.

5. Ordinance No.124 of 2004: Levying a tax of thirty and fifty-four one hundredths (30 and 54/100ths) mills per dollar on all property within the City of Shreveport for the year 2004 for the purpose of paying principal and interest on the outstanding General Obligation Bonds of the City of Shreveport, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Mr. Thompson: The 124 that's on your agenda Mr. Chairman, is a debt service ordinance and it is for thirty and 54 One hundredths (30 and 54/100ths) mills per dollar. However the Administration has given us a new one. It would levy twenty-seven and eighty-two one hundredths (27 82/100s) per dollar. It brings it down to the same amount that we collected last summer. And so - - - you would introduce the one that would bring in 27 and 82/100ths mills per dollar.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Gibson for introduction of the ordinance to lay over until the next council meeting.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Kirkland on 124 in affect, what in affect are we doing on 124? I know what the numbers - - - are 27, but what in affect- - -?

Mr. Thompson: This is the money to pay the debts of the City for GO Bonds and what you're doing, this is the debt service, and you are just collecting enough to pay the debts that you have outstanding.

Mayor Hightower: This is the issue that I talked about yesterday. That if council decides that we do not want the City of Shreveport property taxes rolled forward, then we need to drop the debt service one as well. If we don't drop this one, 124, then in fact, all property owners will see an increase on their property taxes from the City of Shreveport.

Councilman Jackson: And that's just for debt service?

Mayor Hightower: Correct. And the other one, the one that we've been talking about was for the operating budget. So, to net zero increase on your property tax bill you get in December from the City of Shreveport only, we'll need to roll the millages back on both. And that's what this ordinance will do.

Councilman Jackson: But this is just for introduction?

Mayor Hightower: Right.

Motion approved by the following votes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green.

6. Ordinance No.125 of 2004: Providing for an increase in the millage rates and levying various taxes totaling 20.76 mills per dollar on all property subject to Ad Valorem taxation within the City of Shreveport for the year 2004, in the amounts and for the purposes described herein and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, 125 is an ordinance that if introduced, it will roll the taxes forward and it is here for introduction.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Jackson for introduction of the ordinance to lay over until the next council meeting. Motion approved by the following votes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Gibson, and Jackson. 4. Nays: Councilmen Carmody, and Hogan. 2. Absent: Councilman Green.

7. Ordinance No. 126 of 2004: Levying a tax of eight and thirteen one hundredths (8 and 13/100ths) mills per dollar on all property subject to Ad Valorem taxation within the bounds of the Downtown Development District of the City of Shreveport as defined by Act 554 of 1978, as amended, for the purposes as set forth herein and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Lester for introduction of the ordinances to lay over until the next regular meeting.: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green.

8. Ordinance No. 127 of 2004. ZONING: C-51-04, 5832 Linwood Ave, *Michael Paul Murray*, David Horton, West side of Linwood Avenue between Woodrow and Champ Clark Street, from B-2 to I-1. (F/Green)

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Carmody for introduction of the ordinances to lay over until the next regular meeting.: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green.

Mr. Thompson: We also have two ordinances that were added to the agenda today.

9. Ordinance No. 128 Of 2004. An ordinance authorizing the incurring of debt and issuance of not to exceed Nine Million Dollars (\$9,000,000) of General Obligation Refunding Bonds Series 2004B of the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana; prescribing the form, terms and conditions of said Bonds; designating the date denomination and place of payment of said Bonds; providing for the payment thereof in principal and interest; and providing for other matters in connection therewith.
10. Ordinance No. 129 Of 2004. An ordinance amending the 2004 budget for the Water and Sewerage Enterprise Fund.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Carmody for introduction of the ordinances to lay over until the next regular meeting. Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green.

Mr. Antee: Mr. Chairman, the one that was introduced on the issuance of debt, that's a refinance.

#### **ORDINANCES ON SECOND READING AND FINAL PASSAGE**

1. Ordinance No. 94 of 2004: An Ordinance authorizing the lease of parking spaces at the Stoner Marina parking lot to Overton Brooks VAMC and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on June 22, 2004, was read by title and as read on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full ans as read motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Walford to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green. 1

2. Ordinance No. 98 of 2004: An Ordinance authorizing the Lease of City-Owned property to North Shreveport Development Corporation, Inc.

Having passed first reading on June 22, 2004, was read by title and as read on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full ans as read motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Carmody to postpone.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to ask the Administration, I know that yesterday during our work session, y'all had said that you would like to see us postpone it again. Are we working toward trying to get some resolutions so that we can go ahead and facilitate this lease with North Shreveport Development?

Mr. Antee: Right. We've got somebody interested in purchasing the property and we're currently getting an appraisal. It may benefit us to sell it rather than to maintain it.

Councilman Carmody: Very good. Thank you gentlemen.

Councilman Lester: I was going to ask that question. Because that was my

understanding from talking to the Administration, that they were moving forward with a purchase as opposed to a lease.

Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green. 1

3. Ordinance No. 107 of 2004: An Ordinance declaring the City's interest in certain adjudicated properties as surplus and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on July 27, 2004, was read by title and as read on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Walford to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green. 1

4. Ordinance No. 108 of 2004: Closing and abandoning the 50' foot-wide Blueberry Lane Adjacent to Lots 27 and 28 in the Southwood Terrace Subdivision located in the SE 1/4 of Section 4 (T16N-R13W), Caddo Parish, Louisiana and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on July 27, 2004, was read by title and as read on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Carmody to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

5. Ordinance No. 109 of 2004: An Ordinance closing and abandoning the 50' foot-wide Ardyce Lane in the Southern Hills Park Subdivision Unit No. 1 located in the NW 1/4 Section 3 (T16N-R14W), Caddo Parish Louisiana and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on July 27, 2004, was read by title and as read on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Hogan, seconded by Councilman Carmody to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

6. Ordinance No. 110 of 2004: An Ordinance closing and abandoning the 15' foot-wide Alleyway in Mooretown G.D. Subdivision located in the NE 1/4 of Section 16 (T17N-R14W), Caddo Parish, Louisiana and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on July 27, 2004, was read by title and as read on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Walford to postpone.

Substitute motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Gibson to adopt.

Councilman Carmody: Very quickly, it looks like this is a proposed closing of an alleyway, which I know that the City of Shreveport has tried to over the years go ahead and abandon these alleys, which at one time served the purpose for sanitation to be left behind the homes and to be picked up. We no longer utilize those alleyways, and I'm assuming that this again, is one that has been through the process and has been evaluated by the different departments of the City to say that there is no real reason to maintain this particular alley. And I don't know that it would be prudent for us not to go ahead and do that, unless the Administration were to give us some other direction.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Chairman. My motion to postpone dealt not with the merits, more to the point, it deals with an issue that's in Councilman Green's district. And just out of respect and due deference to him, and the fact that he is absent, I would move to postpone. Because if I were in that situation and I had an issue, I would like for that to be postponed if I'm not here. Understanding that it may or may not be an exigent situation. As I appreciate it, it probably isn't, but I just think standard practice is that if a Councilman is not here, we would postpone that issue unless that Councilman had said, this is something I need you guys to do and I hadn't had an opportunity to communicate with him on that. So, that's why my motion was to postpone.

Motion denied by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Carmody and Hogan. Nays: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Gibson, and Jackson. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

Motion to postpone approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

7. Ordinance No. 111 of 2004: ZONING: C-29-02, 2001 Centenary Boulevard, *Delores B. Cole*, SE corner of Centenary & Olive from B-2 to B-2-E, Auto repair.

Having passed first reading on July 27, 2004, was read by title and as read on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full ans as read motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Carmody to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

8. Ordinance No. 112 of 2004: ZONING: C-42-04, 3100 North Market, *Retail Net Lease, L.L.C.*, John C. And Linda Treadway, Regions Bank, NE corner of N. Market and Ravendale from B-1 to B-2, Pharmacy or other permitted uses within this zoning classification. (A/Lester)

Having passed first reading on July 27, 2004, was read by title and as read on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full ans as read motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Carmody to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

9. Ordinance No. 113 of 2004: ZONING: C-44-04, 672 Egan, *Jimmy Russo*, North side of Egan Street 100' west of Nutt Street from B-2 to B-2-E, Multi-purpose center or other permitted uses within this zoning classification. (B/Walford)

Having passed first reading on July 27, 2004, was read by title and as read on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full ans as read motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Carmody to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green.

10. Ordinance No. 114 of 2004: ZONING: C-45-04, 3612 Youree Drive, *Brown Eyed Girl, Inc.*, David J. & Patricia Smith, West side of Youree Drive 300'south of Archer SPI-3(B-1) to SPI-3-E(B-1), limited to a nail salon with retail sales of clothing, accessories & gifts. (C/Carmody)

Having passed first reading on July 27, 2004, was read by title and as read on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full ans as read motion by Councilman Carmody seconded by Councilman Walford to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

11. Ordinance No. 115 of 2004: ZONING: C-48-04, 2800 Blk Summer Grove Drive, *SUMMER GROVE BAPTIST CHURCH*, North side of Summer Grove Drive 500' east of Mansfield Road from R-1D to B-2, Office, retail development.

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Chair, just for clarification, I'd like for everyone on the Council to know we don't yet have a buyer for this property. This would enable us to sell it. It would be easier to sell. And so - - -

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Hogan, we need the - - -

Councilman Hogan: We need the motion first and then discuss. Excuse me, I'm sorry. Motion to approve.

Having passed first reading on July 27, 2004, was read by title and as read on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full ans as read motion by Councilman Hogan, seconded by Councilman Gibson to adopt.

Councilman Jackson: Councilman Hogan, anymore discussion?

Councilman Hogan: Excuse me Mr. Chair, no. That's all, I just wanted to clarify that we don't yet have a buyer, but this will enable us to help sell the property.

Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

12. Ordinance No. 116 of 2004: ZONING: C-49-04, 8100 Wyngate, *712 Milam, L.L.C.*, NW corner of Valley View & Wyngate from I-1 to R-2, 88 unit apartment complex or other permitted uses within this zoning classification.

Having passed first reading on July 27, 2004, was read by title and as read on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full ans as read motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Gibson to postpone. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

13. Ordinance No. 117 of 2004: ZONING: C-50-04, 5510 Broadway Avenue, *Larry Williams*, G & J Miciotto Properties LP, West side of Broadway, 100 feet south of Murvon Street from B-1 to B-1-E, Antique shop.

Having passed first reading on July 27, 2004, was read by title and as read on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full ans as read motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Walford to postpone. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

14. Ordinance No. 118 of 2004: ZONING: C-28-04, 9301 Wallace Lake Road, *Richard K. Candler*, Franklin Delano Falcon, Sr., East side of Wallace Lake Road 700 feet south of Dalton Street, from R-1D to B-1, Office Building or other permitted uses within this zoning classification.

Having passed first reading on July 27, 2004, was read by title and as read on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full ans as read motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Carmody to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

The adopted Ordinances and amendments follow:

**ORDINANCE NO. 94 OF 2004**  
**AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE LEASE OF PARKING SPACES AT THE**  
**STONER MARINA**  
**PARKING LOT TO**  
**OVERTON BROOKS**  
**VAMC AND TO**  
**OTHERWISE PROVIDE**  
**WITH RESPECT**  
**THERETO.**

**WHEREAS** Overton Brooks Veterans Administration Medical Center (“VA”) has requested the lease of 100 parking spaces at the Stoner Marina parking lot for employee parking; and

**WHEREAS** the parking spaces are not needed for public purposes; and

**WHEREAS** the lease provides for an initial term of three (3) years with an option

to renew for three (3) additional terms of one (1) year each; and

**WHEREAS** lease payments shall be \$1,000.00 per month; and

**WHEREAS** the City of Shreveport desires to enter into this lease with VA relative to use of the parking spaces.

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT ORDAINED** , by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, legal and regular session convened, that the City of Shreveport is authorized to lease 100 parking spaces at the Stoner Marina parking lot to Overton Brooks Veterans Administration Medical Center.

**BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED** that the Mayor of the City of Shreveport is hereby authorized to execute all documents relative to the lease of the parking spaces substantially in accordance with the draft hereof filed for public inspection with the original of this ordinance in the Office of the Clerk of Council on June 22, 2004.

**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.

#### **AMENDMENT TO ORDINANCE NUMBER 94 OF 2004**

Delete the original pages 1-5 of the Lease Agreement and substitute with the attached pages 1-5 of the Lease Agreement.

#### **ORDINANCE NO. \_100\_ OF 2004**

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 106 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES, THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT ZONING ORDINANCE, BY REZONING PROPERTY LOCATED ON NORTH SIDE OF NELSON STREET AT ITS INTERSECTION WITH CORPORATE DRIVE SHREVEPORT, CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA, FROM I-2, HEAVY INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT, TO R-2, SUBURBAN MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENCE 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 north side of Nelson Street at its intersection with Corporate Drive, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, legally described below, **be and the same is hereby changed from I-2, Heavy Industrial District, to R-2, Suburban Multi-Family Residence District:**

A tract of land located in the S'ly portion of Sections 14 and 15, T18N-R14W, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, more particularly described as follows: from the common corner of Sections 14, 15, 22 and 23, T18N-R14W, said common corner being on an extension of the N line of Nelson Street, as dedicated; run thence N89°35'03"W a distance of 123.10 feet to a point within 6.00 feet to the toe of the Twelve Mile Bayou Levee; run thence N19°37'27"E a distance of 84.72 feet along a line 6.00 feet E of the toe of the Twelve Mile Bayou Levee; to the P-O-B, continue thence N19°37'27"E a distance of 786.81 feet along a line 6.00 feet E of the toe of the Twelve Mile Bayou Levee; run thence S24°40'45"E a distance of 820.80 feet along said W line of shopping center, run thence N89°35'03"W a distance of 606.84 feet to the P-O-B; containing 5.175 acres

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

with the following stipulations:

1. **A revised site plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Planning Director, with any substantial changes requiring further review and approval by the Planning Commission. Revised site plan shall indicate:**
  - (a) **An eight foot solid steel fence shall be erected along Nelson Street, subject to approval by the Zoning Board of Appeals.**
  - (b) **Permanent access from or to the development shall be from North Market only.**
  - (c) **There shall be no pedestrian traffic, storage of construction equipment or parking associated with this development on Nelson Street at any time, including during the construction period.**
  
2. **Applicant shall apply to the Zoning Board of Appeals for a variance of two ft. in the fence height. Fence will be set back 15' paralleling Nelson Street.**

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

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

#### **ORDINANCE NO. 107 OF 2004**

**AN ORDINANCE DECLARING CERTAIN ADJUDICATED PROPERTIES TO BE SURPLUS AND TO AUTHORIZE THE MAYOR OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT TO SELL THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT'S TAX INTEREST IN CERTAIN SURPLUS ADJUDICATED PROPERTIES, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.**

**WHEREAS** the City of Shreveport has a tax interest in the herein below described properties which have been adjudicated for the non-payment of City property taxes; and

**WHEREAS** the herein below described properties are not needed for public purposes and should be declared surplus properties; and

**WHEREAS** the City of Shreveport has received offers to purchase its tax interest in the herein below described properties as indicated below.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED** by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened that the following described property is hereby declared surplus:

**BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED**, that the City Council of the City of Shreveport does hereby authorize the sale of its tax interest in the herein below described properties for

an amount not less than the offer as indicated below.

**Property No. 1:** Legal Description - Lot 8, Block 17, West Shreveport Subdivision, a subdivision in the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, as per plat thereof recorded in Book 15, Page 776 of the Conveyance Records of Caddo Parish, Louisiana, together with all buildings and improvements located thereon.  
(GEO#171402-077-0008-00) Municipal Address - 1323

Andrew Avenue

**AMOUNT OFFERED: \$6,501.00 APPRAISED VALUE: \$11,000.00 DISTRICT A**

**Property No. 2:** Legal Description - Lot 142, Eden Gardens Subdivision, Unit #2, a subdivision of the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana as per plat recorded in Book 800, Page 365 of the Conveyance Records of Caddo Parish, Louisiana, together with all buildings and improvements located thereon.  
(GEO#171330-085-0142-00) Municipal Address - 724

Bernard Blvd.

**AMOUNT OFFERED: \$4,100.00 APPRAISED VALUE: \$21,000.00 DISTRICT D**

**Property No. 3:** Legal Description - Lot 541, Unit #8, less 30 Ft. For Aline Street, Jones-Mabry Subdivision, a subdivision of the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, as per plat recorded in Book 450, Page 281 of the Conveyance Records of Caddo Parish, Louisiana together with all buildings and improvements located thereon.  
(GEO#181420-010-0541-00) Municipal Address- 0 Brooks

St. (Aline)

**AMOUNT OFFERED: \$3,000.00 APPRAISED VALUE: \$8,000.00  
DISTRICT A**

**Property No. 4:** Legal Description - Lot B, Legardy Hills Park, a subdivision of the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, as per plat recorded in Book 1200 Page 325 of the Conveyance Records of Caddo Parish, Louisiana, together with all buildings and improvements located thereon.  
(GEO#181417-048-0002-00) Municipal Address - 1781

Caldwell St.

**AMOUNT OFFERED: \$500.00 APPRAISED VALUE: \$2,000.00 DISTRICT A**

**Property No. 5:** Legal Description - Lot 4, Holly Hill Subdivision, Unit #2, a subdivision of the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, as per plat recorded in Book 1400, Page 13 of the Conveyance Records of Caddo Parish, Louisiana, together with all buildings and improvements located thereon.  
(GEO#171416-037-0004-00) Municipal Address - 5613

Fallowmont Dr.

**AMOUNT OFFERED: \$5,000.00   APPRAISED VALUE: \$23,500.00   DISTRICT F**

**Property No. 6:**   Legal Description - S. 50 Ft. of the W. ½ of Lot 78, Jones Mabry Subdivision, Unit #2, a subdivision of the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, as per plat recorded in Book 300, Page 54 of the Conveyance Records of Caddo Parish, Louisiana, together with all buildings and improvements located thereon.  
(GEO#181421-001-0257-00)   Municipal Address - 1905

Northside Rd.

**AMOUNT OFFERED: \$350.00   APPRAISED VALUE: \$1,200.00   DISTRICT A**

**Property No. 7:**   Legal Description - Lot 43 & E. 17.5 Ft. Of Lot 44, Less R/W, Currie and Busby Subdivision, a subdivision of the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, as per plat recorded in Book 20, Page 133 of the Conveyance Records of Caddo Parish, Louisiana, together with all buildings and improvements located thereon.  
(GEO#181331-052-0099-00)   Municipal Address - 436

Stoner Avenue

**AMOUNT OFFERED: \$715.00   APPRAISED VALUE: \$4,500.00   DISTRICT B**

**Property No. 8:**   Legal Description - W. 22.5 Ft. Of Lot 44 & E. 35 Ft. Of Lot 45 less R/W, Currie and Busby Subdivision, a subdivision of the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, as per plat recorded in Book 20, Page 133 of the Conveyance Records of Caddo Parish, Louisiana, together with all buildings and improvements located thereon.  
(GEO#181331-052-0100-00)   Municipal Address - 442

Stoner Avenue

**AMOUNT OFFERED: \$715.00   APPRAISED VALUE: \$4,500.00   DISTRICT B**

**BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED**, that the Mayor of the City of Shreveport shall be authorized to do any and all things and to sign any and all documents, including Acts of Cash Sale, in a form acceptable to the City Attorney necessary to effectuate the purposes set forth herein.

**BE IT FURTHER 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 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. 108 OF 2004  
AN ORDINANCE CLOSING AND ABANDONING THE 50' FOOT-WIDE BLUEBERRY**

**LANE ADJACENT TO LOTS 27 AND 28 IN THE SOUTHWOOD TERRACE SUBDIVISION LOCATED IN THE SE /4 OF SECTION 4 (T16N-R14W), CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.**

**WHEREAS** the Property Management Section of the Department of Operational Services has received a request to close and abandon the above identified right-of-way; and

**WHEREAS** Water and Sewerage Engineering has reviewed this request and has no objections to the 50' foot wide right-of-way being closed and abandoned.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED** by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened, that the portion of the 50' foot wide right-of-way acquired by the City of Shreveport and recorded in Plat Book 800, Page 681, dated July 31 1959 of the Records and as shown and as indicated on the plat attached hereto and made a part hereof, is hereby closed and abandoned.

**BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED** that a certified copy of this ordinance be filed and recorded in the official records of the District Court for Caddo Parish, Louisiana.

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

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

**ORDINANCE NO. 109 OF 2004**

**AN ORDINANCE CLOSING AND ABANDONING THE 50' FOOT-WIDE ARDYCE LANE IN THE SOUTHERN HILLS PARK SUBDIVISION UNIT NO. 1 LOCATED IN THE NW 1/4 OF SECTION 3 (T16N-R14W), CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.**

**WHEREAS** the Property Management Section of the Department of Operational Services has received a request to close and abandon the above identified drive; and

**WHEREAS** Water and Sewerage Engineering has reviewed this request and has no objections to the 50' foot wide right-of-way being closed and abandoned.

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED** by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened, that the portion of the 50' foot wide right-of-way acquired by the City of Shreveport and recorded in Plat Book 1000, Page 139, dated October 30, 1967 of the Records and as shown and as indicated on the plat attached hereto and made a part hereof, is hereby closed and abandoned.

**BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED** that a certified copy of this ordinance be filed and recorded in the official records of the District Court for Caddo Parish, Louisiana.

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

**BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED** that all ordinances or resolutions or parts thereof in

conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

**ORDINANCE NO. 111 OF 2004**

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 106 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES, THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT ZONING ORDINANCE, BY REZONING PROPERTY LOCATED ON SOUTHEAST CORNER OF CENTENARY AND OLIVE STREET, SHREVEPORT, CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA, FROM B-2, NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS DISTRICT, TO B-2-E, NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS EXTENDED USE DISTRICT, LIMITED TO "AUTO REPAIR" 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 the N120 feet of Lot 169 and the N 120 feet of the W 39 feet of Lot University Plaza, located on the southeast corner of Centenary and Olive Street, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana **be and the same is hereby changed from B-2, Neighborhood Business District, to B-2-E, Neighborhood Business Extended Use District, limited to "auto repair" only.**

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

7. Development of the property shall be in substantial accord with the approved site plan submitted with any significant changes or additions requiring further review and approval by the Planning Commission.
8. No building of transmissions or engines and no paint or body work shall be permitted.
9. The maximum number of vehicles permitted on this site at any one time is limited to 8, with no un-licensed vehicles permitted.
10. No outside storage or repairs permitted.
11. Hours of operation shall be from 7:00 a.m. to 7 p.m.

**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. 112 OF 2004**

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 106 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES, THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT ZONING ORDINANCE, BY REZONING PROPERTY LOCATED ON THE NORTHEAST CORNER OF NORTH MARKET AND RAVENDALE STREET, SHREVEPORT, CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA, FROM B-1, BUFFER BUSINESS DISTRICT TO B-2, NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS DISTRICT, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO**

SECTION I: BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, in due, legal and regular session convened, that the zoning classification of property located on the northeast corner of North Market and Ravendale Street, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, legally described below, **be and the same is hereby changed from B-1,**

**Buffer Business District, to B-2, Neighborhood Business District:**

A tract of land consisting of Lot 1 of First American Bank Subdivision, a portion of Lot 71 Lears Subdivision, Lot 102, and a portion of Lots 94 & 95 of Oak Park Subdivision, being more particularly described as follows: begin at the SW corner of Lot 1 of First American Bank Subdivision and run N24°25'07"W, along the E'ly R-O-W of North Market Street (LA. Hwy 1) a distance of 224.46 feet; thence run N75°32'15"E a distance of 356.19 feet to a point on the W line of Dearborn Street; thence run S12°03'00"E, along said R-O-W a distance of 135.70 feet to an angle point; thence run S3°12'38"E a distance of 96.73 feet to a point on the N R-O-W of Ravendale Drive; thence run S82°06'38"W, along said R-O-W, a distance of 77.60 feet to an angle point; thence run S75°40'00"W a distance of 215.70 feet to the P-O-B, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana.

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

1. **Development of the property shall be in substantial accord with a revised site to be submitted to and approved by the Planning Director for specific approval of landscaping plan and buffering elements. Any significant changes or additions shall require further review and approval by the Planning Commission.**
2. **Revised site plan shall show shared curb cut for both commercial lots on Dearborn Drive.**

**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. 113 OF 2004**

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 106 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES, THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT ZONING ORDINANCE, BY REZONING PROPERTY LOCATED ON NORTH SIDE OF EGAN STREET 100 FEET WEST OF NUTT STREET, SHREVEPORT, CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA, FROM B-2, NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS DISTRICT, TO B-2-E, NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS EXTENDED USE DISTRICT, LIMITED TO A "MULTI-PURPOSE CENTER" 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 Lot 14, Block 4, Holmesville Subd., Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, located on the N side of Egan Street 100 feet W of Nutt Street, **be and the same is hereby changed from B-2, Neighborhood Business District, to B-2-E, Neighborhood Business Extended Use District, limited to a "multi-purpose center" only.**

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

12. Development 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.

**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. 114 OF 2004**

**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 300 FEET SOUTH OF ARCHER, 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 “ONE NAIL TECHNICIAN AND THE RETAIL SALES OF CLOTHING ACCESSORIES, & GIFTS” 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 Lot 404, Broadmoor Subd, Unit 2 and an 8 foot strip located on the W side of Youree Drive 300 feet S of Archer, 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 “one nail technician and the retail sales of clothing accessories, and gifts” only.**

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

13. Development 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.

**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. 115 OF 2004**

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 106 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES, THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT ZONING ORDINANCE, BY REZONING PROPERTY LOCATED ON NORTH SIDE OF SUMMER GROVE DRIVE 500 FEET EAST OF MANSFIELD ROAD SHREVEPORT, CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA, FROM R-1D, URBAN, ONE-FAMILY RESIDENCE DISTRICT, TO B-2, NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS DISTRICT, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO**

SECTION I: BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, in due, legal and regular session convened, that the zoning classification of

property located on the north side of Summer Grove Drive, 500 feet east of Mansfield Road, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, legally described below, **be and the same is hereby changed from R-1D, Urban, One-Family Residence District, to B-2, Neighborhood Business District:**

A tract of land being Lots 5-8 and a portion of Lots 1, 2, 4, 9, 10 and 11 of Summer Grove Village, being more particularly described as follows: begin at the SE corner of Lot 11 and run N77°49'43"W, along the N R-O-W line of Summer Grove Drive a distance of 842.54 feet to the SE corner of Lot 3 of Summer Grove Village Unit 4, thence run N3°46'08"W, along the E line of said Lot 3, a distance of 194.99 feet to the NE'ly corner of said Lot 3; thence run N86°08'54"E, along the S line of Lot 2 of said Unit 4, a distance of 169.90 feet to the SE corner of said Lot 2, thence run N3°57'14"W, along the E line of said Lot 2, a distance of 113.08 feet to a point on the N line of Lot 4 of Summer Grove Village; thence run N86°07'19"E, along the N line of Lots 4-9, a distance of 520.66 feet to the SW corner of Lot 1 of Summer Grove Village Unit 5, thence run S82°22'05" E, along the S line of said Lot, a distance of 164.44 feet to the SE corner of said Lot; thence run S77°49'43"E for a distance of 100.00 feet to a point on the E line of Lot 11 for Summer Grove Village; thence run S12°10'17"W, along said line, a distance of 499.97 feet to the P-O-B, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana.

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

14. Development of the property shall be in substantial accord with a revised site plan showing parking to be submitted to and approved by the Zoning Administrator, with any significant changes or additions requiring further review and approval by 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.

#### **ORDINANCE NO. 118 OF 2004**

**AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 106 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES, THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT ZONING ORDINANCE, BY REZONING PROPERTY LOCATED ON THE EAST SIDE OF WALLACE LAKE ROAD 700 FEET SOUTH OF DALTON STREET, SHREVEPORT, CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA, FROM R-1D, 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 Lot 1, Block 7, Forbing Annex Homesites, property located on the east side of Wallace Lake Road 700 feet south of Dalton Street, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, **be and the same is hereby changed from R-1D, 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 stipulation:

1. **Development of the property shall be in substantial accord with a revised site plan to be submitted to and approved by the Planning Director showing landscaping and fencing as proposed at the June 2, 2004 Public Hearing, with any significant changes or additions requiring further review and approval by 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.

**UNFINISHED BUSINESS:**

1. SUBDIVISION APPEAL - S-52-04: Doug Shurling, Emberwood Homeowners Association, approval of Subdivision Request, dtd - July 7, 2004. (D/Gibson) (Postponed July 27, 2004)

Motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Carmody to postpone until the August 24, 2004 meeting.

Councilman Gibson: Mr. Chair, I expect in two weeks we do have a tentative agreement, but the developer of this property is putting together some information that will be brought before this body for review. And I think we have an agreement in principle between the group that appealed and the group that developed. So, I'm anxious to bring that before this body for a vote. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

2. Ordinance No. 100 of 2004: ZONING: C-31A-04, 1800 Nelson Street, Cambridge Court Limited Partnership, north side of Nelson at its intersection with Corporate Dr, from I-2 to R-2. (A/Lester)(Remanded to MPC)

Mr. Thompson: Item 2, Ordinance 100 is an ordinance that was remanded to the MPC, the MPC met since the last meeting and they've issued a report. And they brought the ordinance back. They now approve it and it has one amendment. Would you like for me to read the amendment?

Motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Walford to adopt the amendment.

Councilman Carmody: There is no amendment attached here, so if we could have the clerk read the amendment, I'd appreciate it.

Mr. Thompson: The explanation of the amendment and we can read the entire one if you'd like to. The ordinance was remanded to the MPC which approved the zoning with new stipulations. This amendment incorporates the stipulations and removes the reference to the previous denial by the MPC. I believe that one of the principles was up here earlier and said that

he had seen these stipulations and he agreed with them.

Councilman Carmody: Very good. Thank you sir.

Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

Motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Walford to adopt the ordinance as amended.

Councilman Walford: Just one quick comment before we vote and this has a bearing on a previous one as well. I think the idea of remanding and sending it back to the MPC and let them make zoning decisions as opposed to us on this council trying to second guess is the right way to go. I commend Councilman Lester for sending it back. Mr. Kirkland, you can pass my compliments along to the MPC for working it out as they did. I believe that's how it should be done. By zoning and not by the Council. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Carmody: I agree totally. But I would also say that the appropriate time to remand it back to the MPC is not after you've heard the whole thing twice. Just an observation.

Councilman Gibson: Thank you Mr. Chair. I'd have to assume there was an amendment to Councilman Walford previous statement in 2003 regarding a zoning issue. So, I appreciate that amendment. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

## **NEW BUSINESS;**

1. ZONING APPEAL: BAC-72-04, 610 West 73<sup>rd</sup> Street, *Magnolia Stringer*, Jacqueline Stringer, South side of 73<sup>rd</sup> Street, 2004 feet west of Wallace, Special Exception Use in an R-1D District, Secondary Residential Structure. (F/Green)

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I believe that because of a notification issue, the MPC request that this matter be remanded to the MPC so that proper notices can be given. It will not be necessary for us to keep this on our agenda.

Motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Walford to remand BAC-72-04 back to MPC approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

## **REPORTS FROM OFFICERS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES.**

Motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Carmody to receive an infrastructure report passes by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Strong, you have three minutes.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Chairman, you've been serious all day, that was a good one.

Mr. Strong: Councilmen, before I get into the actual report. I've been reading some of the reports that's come out and some of the media that's come out on this and I have supplied them with information and for some reason, it hasn't all gotten into the media. So, I'd like to bring up some things that we had talked to them about. What I'm giving you now, if I can get the overhead on please. This is a report or a fact sheet that we gave to the EPA in May of 2001. This shows some things that this Administration and our office has done as it relates to environmental initiatives in the City. And if you will look through our Air Quality, Brownfield Solid Waste, Wastewater Program, this is what we presented to the EPA and where our monies were going for at the time that we were doing. One of the things that was there is talking about the water and sewerage side of it. The wastewater side, and I'm going to emphasize on this because the report that we're going to be giving is going to be more related to the water and wastewater because that's where most of the questions have come up this time as we will do with media report. But I think you will see. We're talking about the rate increase. Of what it will bring and what we will be using it for. So, this is a report that you have seen that we have been putting forth these last six years. We have also, and I handed this out previously to the City Council and this is some major accomplishments that have been done.

Councilman Carmody: This is your water and sewerage capital report?

Mr. Strong: This is more than water and sewer. This is everything that has been done since November of '98 and June 2004 by the Administration. I want you to understand that the Mayor and us have been working to get grants. If you'll look in here- - for the different grants that we have received. The different projects that we have been putting out. The monies that have been going for the project. We have said what we were going to do on Capital Projects. We have done it and I want to say that under this Administration, you can look back in time that in '93 when I was the water and sewerage director, we had a rate increase of the water and sewerage. Where we were going forth with something like \$48,000,000, this was the first monies that were actually started going towards water and sewerage maintenance. The monies that we have been spending over the last six years have been something that you can look back to the 80s of when - - - guess what? There were grants. We're doing it today without grants. You don't have the kinds of grants that you had back in the 80s, where they built the plants and went forth on it. So, we helped put a lot of effort during these last six years. One of the things that came in when I took over DOS, as it's called today and we're bringing in the water and sewerage side to it. When I first came here as Public Works Director. One of the things the Mayor gave me was basically marching orders that we are to follow the competitiveness program that was put out by a consulting firm in town. And what they had done is come up with recommendations for water and sewerage. We have done our management side of it in water and sewerage. I like what I heard with the police department, with this report what it's doing of looking at the manpower and where we're going. Where we're looking at is that we have already in the water and sewerage side of it, came up with a reduction in personnel. We have already reduced operating costs there in the neighborhood of \$3.3 million. Once we get the plants opened and all of the more modern equipment, you're going to see a further reduction of almost \$2,000,000. Reduction of personnel of approximately 120 positions have already been done. We've worked towards that. We're putting the money where it needs to be and that's in the ground. And that's what Mayor Hightower has pushed me to do, what he has pushed our department to do and that's where we've been going forth on it. When was it, year before last? We set a record on the number of projects

that we put out in 2002. We went to the A & E and put forth onto it. When y'all came onto the Council, in fact you were at your first budget session. In fact, you were not even in office yet, I handed out a study that we had done going back to April 2001. In this, we talk about \$230,000,000 that needs to be spent over the next 10 years and where we are on spending at this time and what we were looking at. That's a very good study that we had worked on. The mid-year report you have received and we sent out on the 30<sup>th</sup> of July, which is already on our web page fore the public to see goes into talking about our infrastructure, talking about asset management of getting into that and the systematic process of looking at all of our inventory and what to do with it. We are now in a position where we have got better records, better ability to use those records to present where we're at. We're talking about asset renewal, terms we have never heard in years past. We're talking about the infrastructure that we have never heard. A lot of our infrastructure, water and sewerage especially is the hardest thing to understand. Because most of it is buried. Very few people come in contact with this infrastructure. We put out charts to let you see what we've got and this is on page 11 that you have got setting out, if we get the overhead back on. You will see this chart. It gets into and explains our situation with the overall, talking about the renewal of the overall infrastructure, \$33,000,000. And you see where we're setting at, at the \$19,000,000. We will probably come over that amount this year a little bit when we look at it overall and why? Because of the wastewater treatment plants. We're putting and investing more money into those and they're still coming up. This is from the \$70,000,000 that we have gone out and received a revolving loan. Now, what this does is kinda throw things off and say 'well, you look from that point'. But on page 14, of the same report, start getting into the mains. This is where we're coming in under our renewal. This is where some of our problems are that we're seeing and that's where you start looking at it. You have to look at it by individual areas, sewerage mains. Where you need to be investing into that and into the water mains, and into the which we put the lift stations into the main side of it. That's the kind of areas that are lacking at this point and time. Water plant needs more funding going to it eventually and we'll be talking about that. But the overall collection system, the sewer piping, you see again we're under where our estimate is. So, you follow these charts in our presentation and you will see that. 1997 and '98 actually, we developed a finance plan of where we were going to be pushing forward with it, with our personnel and our fiscal resources, capital investments in the water and sewer rate of where we were looking at and coming up. That's where we came up with what needed to be done and the first are the rate increase where we put into affect actually in 2002. Where we were seeing that, by regulatory requirements and where we were being pushed, the priority plan was to go forth at the water and the sewer plants. Sewer plants under the regulatory side. And the water plant to insure that we met with the unfunded mandates to come down on an annual basis that we have to meet. And we're still looking forth on that. We have since refined it. We've come up, we know where our total infrastructure assets all start and where we're looking at and where we're looking at going into the renewal side. But where we come up. The last six years, we've been putting forth. We have prioritized, we have seen where we're coming to on our capital costs. I don't know of any time in Shreveport other than during the grant days of where the plants were built, we have done any more into the water and sewerage as far as the investment with where we're going forth. And I think that we have done a good job. We've also done a good job getting out reports that you can see it better today than you ever have. But where are we going? On July 6<sup>th</sup>, we did a memo that went into some great details of the things that we were doing as far as our deteriorating infrastructure was different, EPA orders that we had more stringent regulation, the expansion of the infrastructure our master platting, talking about the plats and the general construction that were

going on in our different meetings with the regulators. We presented to you some of our priority needs that goes to \$125 million that we feel like needs too spent over the next eight years, we talked about our renewal on the water and sewer side, were talking about in the neighborhood of \$14 million a year. We feel like the budgets need to be implemented, they can start the process of putting this forth and letting us see our infrastructure getting worked on, on a regular basis, that's where we are. You've got the reports, we've got pages after pages of priorities of where we need, we need more investment into the water plat. We need more investment into the water and sewer main, there here you see it every day – went to lunch yesterday, drove down Line Avenue, we got four barricades sitting out in different areas, just going down that way, and their all over the City. So we are seeing it and why is it? It's because of the fact not this administration, not the last administration, not the administration before that, but it goes back we built, we enlarged, we had a very aggressive annexation policy at one time in previous administration where we took in areas. We didn't put the money forward to do maintenance, but I think we and Mayor Hightower, and the work is done to attempt to get us some grant funds, and we're still trying to do that on our infrastructure, and trying and the ITS are on the signals, I mean these are top priorities in trying to get the funding for. We've done a descent job were moving forward, now were to the point that we need to began an aggressively spending more money. This was a quick report to you, you've got a lot of paper I didn't want to keep you much longer, but I will between Ron Norwood and myself we'll attempt to answer any question that you may have, but I mean this is it. You got a picture of where we are today, and we will have our report at the end of the year of that process and be going through our budget process, in fact we're working on it right now, so –

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Jackson: Yes sir, Mr. Carmody.

Councilman Carmody: Thank you, sir. Mr. Strong, I appreciate your report I'd like to concentrate on the Department of Water and Sewerage infrastructure needs at this point, if you don't mind. What additional percentage rate increase would be necessary in each of the next three years in order to fully fund the budget needs that the Department of Water and Sewerage?

Mr. Strong: I have not looked at the percentages on that.

Councilman Carmody: I know that we are coming into the budget, and I would appreciate it if we could kinda of at least have an idea of what we anticipate that we would have to have. I know that we had talked about an accelerated rate increase which this Council has put forth, but based upon the information that's been presented here we see that the need is much greater than the ability to pay for it. I guess what we've done a pretty good job of quoting one another here today, I guess the Mayor had said we need to down to reality, and I guess that's where we are trying to get with this particular department and it is Enterprise Fund. Currently included in the most recent rate increase acceleration, Dallas is expected too only have revenue to make it through the end of the year, and that's only because all the capital improvement projects had been stopped, this means that we can assume the funds balance is zero beginning in 2005, according to Mr. Dark. Rather than waiting to see if the Administration presents a 2005 budget it only provides for a minium of operation and maintenance, could the Council be presented a budget that provides for the full funding of operational and maintenance, the current capital needs, and the deferred capital needs, a company by suggestion for reoccurring funding sources that would reach into 2007?

Mr. Strong: Can we do that? I mean we can – we'll work with, Tom Dark and the Administration in putting together what you wanting, I mean what your asking for is the full funding for all capital – if only (inaudible)

Councilman Carmody: Well if we looking at just three years, okay, now through 2007, that

would be a sufficient period of time to plan the fund of the first phase of it the most immediate deferred capital needs, I think that's approximately \$ 60 million. Is that correct?

Mr. Strong: I guess it depends on how your looking at it, if you're looking at it as the capital needs of a \$125 million, then you would start the first three years as the design process and look at how that would be recurring coming later.

Councilman Carmody: Okay, but approximately about 60 million, I guess what we're looking at is a replacement period. We've looked at the need over the next foreseeable – lets say five or six years, but –

Mr. Strong: Will you be giving me these questions?

Councilman Carmody: Yes sir, I will give them to you. I just wanted to make sure that at least we were having the getting down to reality discussion while we're here because of course the committee is receiving the report, but I think that we also need to let the community know that we're trying our best too as a City, to work toward addressing this particular Municipal asset. And I say it as a Municipal asset because I treasure my water and sewer service the City provides to me, but I also understand that right now it's kind of a liability because its more money that we had to fix what we got or to at least upgrade and improve. Y'all have done a tremendous job, there's no doubt about it, about trying to address the plats on the beginning of the process as well as the plants on the end of it, and of course that's one of our first conversation that we've had when I first came on the council was that I had asked the question to you, well I don't understand if we got a section of town where the system keeps failing us, why don't we just replace that section, I think if I remember correctly the explanation was, if you fix just that section then the next week the link is bust out next, it would better to start at the sources and at the end, and then work our way back toward the middle, which is I guess, what we are talking about now?

Mr. Strong: You look at the whole system as a whole versus one area.

Councilman Carmody: Correct, so what I'm asking for if we can be presented back with what needs of Dallas are going to be pressing for the next three years and I guess the deferred maintenance being the greatest, y'all have done a good job of kind of qualifying what those needs are my understanding is I think it's estimated about 60 million is what we need over the next three years, and based upon the fact that Department of Water and Sewerage's revenue is approximately, I think 36 million – 37 million, is that right?

Mr. Strong: Thirty-nine.

Councilman Carmody: Thirty-nine, and then you got a cost to operate this enterprise fund which – and when I say operate, you got to pay the personnel, you got to make sure they got the equipment to do what they got to do, and that's hopefully a pretty set price, the (unclear) price and the unknown factor is how much maintenance have you got to do, because as we talked about many, many, many times y'all have your hands full in just trying to put out the fires where the leaks issue report them as a pop up, and so you can't really know just how much money you got to put in the maintenance because it might be more in one year and never seems to be less, but I –

Mr. Strong: Well it can be less, depending on how you spend the money on the capital.

Councilman Carmody: Correct. But of course, my concern here is the Administration done a good job in building up a rapport with the EPA and the DDQ on letting them know that this community is serious about addressing what we've got that they have oversight of, and that we have a plan to show how we are doing it. And of course, our plan was that were are going to do these particular things and worked to do those things, we found ourselves in an upside position in which we've got to – at least for 2005 I guess up to this point, we stopped the projects that we've

got cause we don't have the money to continue to keep that process going it's – My concern is my concern is how long can we have down time of not showing them that we have a plan to keep moving forward before somebody might step in and say, and as they've done in other communities, well we will mandate that you do these things, and know that you'd said they're kind of unfunded mandates, I guess that's what they do, is if they tell you, as I think that the report that you've given us, show that in some communities that there is an additional charge on people's water and sewer rate, and I'm trying to see where that is describes as being an impact fee, no it is not impact fee –

Mr. Strong: They do have impact fees but –

Councilman Carmody: But it's called something else, Mr. Strong you can help me with that, but in essence what they do, is they basically say you are going to spend this amount of money, and you do it regardless of what – how you do, we don't care, but you will do it, and then of course as the Enterprise Fund that would mean that all 67 thousand of us that utilize Shreveport water meters will bare that cost, whatever it may be. So, and this is a difficult discussion to have, because we're talking about getting down to reality, you don't have enough money to continue to do the plan that we had laid for – we've done everything that we can to bring ourselves back to rights including bringing up the water rate and talking about how we gonna try to get to a zero balance at the end of the year, well lets not just look at the year 2005 if we can, lets look at what we can do over the next thirty-six months, and the reason I think that would be prudent is that, that would go past the current terms of these council members and this administration and at least give another plan – excuse me, another group of community leaders the fact that the ground work had been laid and I'm not sure how many more years we can look to Mr. Strong to stay with the City, but I would tell you that I like the idea of having somebody that's got a plan long term and it puts it forward. It's not an easy thing to do as you well know, and it's not an easy thing to hear from constituents who say that it's unfair of y'all to continue to increase the myth of the service that we pay for, its just water, but we all know that yes it is a cost associated with delivering fresh clean water, and then taking it away and disposing of it properly, that's a cost, and that cost don't go down. I mean not the way that it is operated in order to do it by mandated regulation, so that's what – I'm making that suggestion to you, I will certainly give you my questions, but I'm hoping that when we get to the budget that we can see where you're breaking it out as to what you know, as far as your fixed cost, and that of the 39 million or so that you break, that we know how much is actually going to be left that you're planning on utilizing as that maintenance and then a plan for trying to figure out what capital improvements can be addressed not just in 2005 but 2006, 2007. And as I say it brings up another very difficult discussion – Mr. Carmody this is how we have to do it, these are the things that we will do that will be the most present, we don't have the money to do it, I understand that – what would it take for us to get the money to do it? And when I say that I know what a full knowledge of that means, that my water bill every month is going to end up going p, but I can't look to someone else to pay for that service to cover me, and if that money fairy is going to float through Shreveport, dropping off money tell him to bring few hundred million for the Department of Water and Sewerage, because there seems to me that I think the number that you had expressed to us, I thought was 230 million in needs for the system.

Mr. Strong: Over a ten year period.

Councilman Carmody: But that's in today's dollars, and just like we're all familiar with the – if you wait 20 years to get that money – what was 230 is exponential, the cost never goes down, and so I'm here to say that I'd like to try and work with you and continue to work with you,

because I think we've always work well together. I understand that this is not an easy thing to do but it also will take putting pen to paper and getting realistic about what it's going to cost us to do this, and in trying to figure out what this Council and this Administration need to do to fund that.

Mr. Strong: I really think you have it know, I mean we can send down there and we can put it in a form or whatever but I mean for what we are recommended and looking at throughout, I mean we've been going back and reports on this, and it is going to come down to a funding issue, and it's how you go about spending it, do you hit it with a bond issue type on the capital and back down on your renewals each year or how you go about doing it, I think it's different processes that you look at.

Councilman Carmody: I agree with you, there are different processes that you have to look at, but I'm hoping that we can look at with a bigger view as opposed too just a 12-month snap shot, if there's a possibility of doing that, because I do think that Council needs to have the ability to know what were looking at. We've talked about this when we were laid out scenario of accelerating rate increase that in all likelihood would only get us too through the end of 2005, and that's realistic to tell us that, it's not pretty it's just the way the chips fall where they may. Now what were saying though is okay are we looking at trying to implement something while were still on this council to address the problem and to lay the course for future administration, so that it doesn't become that political hot potato that – oh wait I'm in my first term and I sure don't want to be the councilman to raise that City water rate, none of us want to do it, but it's got to be the last thing a Mayor ever wants to say, cause again it's the commodity that affect us all and we can't live without it. But there's nobody else that's going to come and save this scenario, we've got to save ourselves, and in order to do that's going to be the fact that each of us have to pay, pay to play, or pay to use water and get rid of your waste, that's what it occurs, and as I say I'm not sure how much long your tenure is going to be with the City, mines I think is approximately 24 more months, 25 more months – but I like to think that when I finish my tenure on the Council that at least we'll have set forward a process by which the next Mayor, the Council will already have – the game plan as to how to follow a way to get to the end of all the good planning that y'all have done. I had one question about this fight though in – I was just curious there was one year 1995 and 96 where the annual waste water collection system infrastructure renewal went above the five million rate, do you recall what occurred then, I mean where we doing an expansion or what were we doing?

Mr. Strong: This is in the pipes systems?

Councilman Carmody: Yes sir, annual rate waste water collection sewer piping.

Mr. Strong: We had just passed the new rate increase back in '93

Councilman Carmody: Okay.

Mr. Strong: We did the maintenance jobs, that's what I said we were going forward with the maintenance project and that's where we were putting forward the funds to work on the piping systems. And what had happen was after all that money was gone and now were coming back to get it back up and then what were spending now is over on the plant side. Councilman Carmody: So when the rate increase was implemented it was specifically to address the sewer piping?

Mr. Strong: The different projects that we had out, yes sir.

Councilman Carmody: Okay, but –

Mr. Strong: And then we also had water side too.

Councilman Carmody: Okay, but then those increases were not continually earmarked and utilized for those needs, because it appears that they dropped back off to a point in, I guess when you came into the City or the year before that we were only spending \$1 million a year.

Mr. Strong: Councilman, understand that what we were doing those increases are paying debit service for what you were doing these jobs today, that's what we're paying for. The \$70 million and the rate increase that were doing we're paying for our debit service.

Councilman Carmody: They're paid for the work that we've already undertaken, that is in the process?

Mr. Strong: That's where we were going – is to pay for that, you will see the spike go up once the jobs have been completed, then the monies no longer being spent on those specific jobs, so it will come back down.

Councilman Carmody: But that rate increase does not come back down. What happens to the money that was (inaudible) –

Mr. Strong: It's paid debit service.

Councilman Carmody: It's paying debit services?

Mr. Strong: Over the 20 plus years.

Councilman Carmody: Okay. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Jackson: All right.

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Hogan.

Councilman Hogan: Just a couple of quick questions. Mr. Strong, I heard you talk about a study that was done in the 80's, you didn't elaborate on it very much other than just saying that they found – that study proved that there was a \$230 million need for improvement, you were here through the 80's I know that you left at some time in there, but could you – I'm just curious to know what to that study?

Mr. Strong: Not in the 80's, I mean this is the study that I'm talking about is the one that was done in April – what did I do with it, April of this – there it is, in April 30, 2001.

Councilman Hogan: Okay, I may have missed understood you, I heard you talking about –

Mr. Strong: This is the one that goes into the report, this is the one that I handed out to you all –

Councilman Hogan: Yes sir, I've got a copy of that, that's fine –

Mr. Strong: That's the one.

Councilman Hogan: Maybe I just misunderstood you said you'd talked about a study that was done in the 80's.

Mr. Strong: No, in the 80's is what I was saying is that the majority of the grants that we received –

Councilman Hogan: We received a grant.

Mr. Strong: To do the plat –

Councilman Hogan: I heard that.

Mr. Strong: We're doing that.

Councilman Hogan: That's fine, maybe I misunderstood you, but I also wanted to draw your attention to another point. Do you get a copy of this magazine, The American City and County magazine?

Mr. Strong: Yes sir.

Councilman Hogan: I was reading back a while some time ago in the March issue of this year, there was an article, a very interesting article in there about sewers and it talked about a new technology called CIPP technology, are you familiar with that?

Mr. Strong: (inaudible) place.

Councilman Hogan: Yes, it was very interesting it seemed like something that could be

feasible for us.

Mr. Strong: We used it before.

Councilman Hogan: We are already using it?

Mr. Strong: Yes sir.

Councilman Hogan: Okay, with what type of results are we having?

Mr. Strong: I mean it's a good process, but now what we run into is that in cases where we can use it, where we can get through the pipe. But when it is deteriorating to the point that, you know, you can't get through then you have to start looking at whether you go in the pipe bursting side of it or whatever, but that's what would be considered the trans(inaudible) technology. So yes, we are using it, in fact we've used a good bit of it, throughout the City.

Councilman Hogan: Before I leave I'd like to give you this, if you didn't have a copy, but it also talked about San Antonio, Riley, North Carolina, a lot of the same problems that we're facing and how they've dealt with them – I'll leave you this after I finish. I'd also, Mr. Chairman if I may, there's a section in here, I'd like to inject just a little bit of humor in this discussion, we hadn't had a lot much humor lately.

Councilman Jackson: Please be my guest.

Councilman Hogan: It says, if you know you have a sewer problem, when three separate things: when you sewer maintenance supervisor wins the blue ribbon at the State Fair for the largest easement grown vegetable. Number two; the Mayor campaigns on the platform, a back flow prevention veil for every home, okay. Number three; your maintenance staff refers to a manhole, as Oh Faithful. Would you – thank you? Mr. Chair, just a very little bit of humor there, I tried.

Councilman Carmody: Just a real quick point. I think Mr. Hogan was actually referencing the contract in which we went through and evaluation of the productivity of the department, and through those recommendations we downsized personnel went to zones.

Mr. Strong: Right.

Councilman Carmody: I think that's what –

Mr. Strong: And that was in the 90's –

Councilman Carmody: Yes sir.

Mr. Strong: That was just recently, the EMA process of talking about the downsizing, is that the report that you were referencing?

Councilman Hogan: I think so.

Mr. Strong: Okay, yeah that was the EMA report where we did what we call a competitiveness study or the re-engineering of the department, so –

Councilman Jackson: Is that it? –

Councilman Hogan: Yes, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Jackson: Any other comments, questions, all right, thank you, Mr. Strong.

**CLERK'S REPORT:** None

There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting adjourned at 7:03 p.m.

//s// Theron Jackson, Chairman

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

