

Council Proceedings of the City of Shreveport, Louisiana
June 14, 2005

The regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana was called to order by Chairman James Green at 3:00 p.m., Tuesday, June 14, 2005, in the Government Chambers in Government Plaza (505 Travis Street).

Councilman Green: Before the meeting starts, if in fact, you have any cell phones, we ask that you would turn them off or put them on silent. We're going to ask that Councilman Theron Jackson ask that we do our prayer, and we're going to ask that Councilman Gibson would do our pledge, and we'll also ask that Councilman Gibson would say a prayer for Kenny Parr's daddy who is going to have surgery today. Councilman Jackson will also be saying a prayer for Leanis Graham. And also before the Pledge, we will pause to honor today as Flag Day. Thank you.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you Councilman Green. Let me say even before we get started that I offer this prayer as we do traditionally, but also at this time, as a City Council want to remember especially in our prayer as Councilman Green has said, Ms. Leanis Graham who is our Internal Auditor for the City of Shreveport and also while we're praying we want to remember Ms. Sharon Pilkinton who is part of our staff at the Council, whose son is also hospitalized today. So if you would lets pray.

Invocation was given by Councilman Jackson.

Councilman Green: We will now pause to honor Flag Day.

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Councilman Gibson.

Councilman Gibson: Thank you Mr. Chair. Ladies and Gentlemen, we have a tremendous amount of employees that serve and give their time and extra time. Kenny Parr is one of the hardest workers I have seen both with SPAR and the City of Shreveport. Unfortunately, Mr. Parr, (his dad) is having brain surgery as we speak at Willis Knighton-Pierrmont. I'd ask Lord that you give the Parr family the strength, the guidance. Also, I'd like to give praise to the wonderful technology that our physicians have in this community to bring healing to a wonderful man and bring him back to his family in a stronger better state. We ask this in your name. Amen.

On Roll Call, the following members were Present: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody (Arrived at 3:09 p.m.), Gibson, Green, Hogan and Jackson. 7. Absent: None.

Motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Jackson to approve the minutes of the Administrative Conference, Monday, May 23, 2005 and Council Meeting, Tuesday, May 24, 2005. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester,

Walford, Gibson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Out of the Chamber: Councilman Carmody. 1.

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

Councilman Green: Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Hightower: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I do have a couple of things that you mentioned earlier; in your remarks today it's Flag Day. Yesterday, I am not so sure that I had remembered that, but I received a call from the president of the American Legion, that asked if we would put together a proclamation in special recognition of Flag Day and I said certainly that I would do that and I would like to read it, but then I got home last night and I had it an even more visual reminder that today was Flag Day. I fly a flag out in front of my house every single day, and it's admittedly a little faded and tattered to say the least and when I got home last night my neighbor, Mrs. Porter, who was one of the owners of Porter's Cleaners dropped me an American Flag and I didn't have to write a poem to Channel 3 or anything else to get it. So, starting this afternoon, I'll have a new American Flag flying at my house but the proclamation reads:

***WHEREAS**, the first official flag of the United States was adopted by an act of Congress dated June 14, 1777; and*

***WHEREAS**, June 14th was designated Flag Day by an act of Congress on August 3, 1949; and*

***WHEREAS**, in 1982, the National Flag Day Foundation was chartered to conduct educational programs and to encourage all Americans to pause for the Pledge of Allegiance as part of National Flag Day ceremonies; and*

***WHEREAS**, Flag Day celebrates America's symbol of unity, a democracy in a republic, and stands for our country's devotion to freedom, to the rule of all and to equal rights for all.*

***NOW, THEREFORE, I, KEITH HIGHTOWER**, Mayor of the City of Shreveport, do hereby proclaim **Tuesday, June 14, 2005**, as: "**FLAG DAY**" in the City of Shreveport, and urge all citizens of America to pause for the Pledge of Allegiance at 6:00 PM and recite the Pledge in honor of our flag and our nation.*

***IN WITNESS WHEREOF**, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Seal of the City of Shreveport to be affixed.*

Mayor Hightower: So, Mr. Chairman again, I think it's certainly appropriate that this Council has started saying the Pledge of Allegiance at every meeting, today it's certainly more appropriate than usual, so, thanks for you leadership. The next thing I would like to do is I got a

special guest with us today and some of you may have meet them before and remember them from the Easter tornadoes that we had several years ago, that devastated our community, in particularly the Allendale area. Thank goodness we had citizens that quickly responded with time, money, sweat, all sorts of equity to help rebuild and repair lives that were affected in that tornado. One of those families is here today, it's James Madison Wood, James if you would stand up and he's got his mother with him. I thought it was his daughter when he first introduced me, and then he has also got his real daughter with him, Alden. And these are a family of folks that spend a lot of time and effort trying to help put lives back together on the volunteer effort, not only did they go out and clean up and pick up and work and spend their own money, they continued to do it since that 2000 Easter tornado, and they've continued to plant and clean-up, and restore, in particularly in the Highland Area and the Downtown area park. So, James it's just a quick thank you and tribute to you and Alden, and Mrs. Woods, we just want to say thank you. It takes people like you to continue to make our community a better place to live, the government certainly can't afford to do it all, it doesn't have the manpower to do it all and so again, thank you very much, from the City of Shreveport. And Mr. Chairman, one final thing and I won't read it all I think I said most of it but, also we would like to – I actually proclaimed today as Shreveport's Garden Day 2000, but in light of today being Flag Day, we are going to do tomorrow, how about that. So, anyway it's Shreveport Gardens 2000 Day, in the City of Shreveport, tomorrow and we will urge and encourage everyone to help James and Alden, and her grandmother to join in with them and get involved in doing something for your neighborhood, doing something for a neighbor, doing something to make you feel good about where you live and in turn it will spread like wildfire and make us all feel good about where we reside and what it looks like. Thank you very much (inaudible).

Councilman Green: Would you like to have a word? Come on to the – yes sir come on. I would like to say welcome and the mic is yours.

Mr. Wood: Appreciate it. If I may on behalf, I would like to ask my mother Helen Woods and my daughter Alden Woods to come up and the reason is because they participated and have participated in all the projects, from the tornado clean-up in 2000 to the garden projects. Over the last nine years, I probably worked with as many as 800 different DWI's from the City and the Parish to do garden work and then the tornado clean-up and very often because Alden had nothing else to do on Saturday mornings when her dad at the park she would come with me and she was the one that would tell the groups with the DWI's where to drop the dirt and where to dig the holes and they answered and they responded. My mother, Helen Woods was very much involved up in the physical labor several years ago and also the financial. We hope that we could continue to work in Columbia Park and other parks. I want to thank this council for its support, I also want to thank Mayor Hightower and especially Mrs. Liz Swain. I've never been able to – I've never written an email to Liz that I didn't get an answer back within 30 minutes. Often regarding advice and most of all whatever we approach the City for permission to do something there was red tape, there was never a well let's wait and see, sure go right ahead and without that kind of support we would not have been able to do it. Thank y'all for having me

Councilman Green: Mrs. Woods would you like to have some words of expression?

Miss. Woods: Well, I would just like to say thank you from my family. I wasn't really the person getting the dirt out (inaudible). If it (inaudible), dirty and stuff like that, I was just stay in my corner and say things to them like, Hurry up and stuff. I want to thank all of y'all.

Councilman Carmody: Spoken like a true manager.

Councilman Green: Thank you, very much. Thank you. Any other council member with any recognition?

Councilman Gibson: Yeah, Mr. Chair.

Councilman Green: Mr. Gibson.

Councilman Gibson: Thank you, Mr. Chair. One special thanks to the Downtown Shreveport Unlimited, for putting on a heck of a Mudbug Madness Festival, they did one heck of a job this year. In addition, I would like to recognize Coach Jordan, and the parents associated with the Demon McCoy swim met that was held this weekend. The Demon McCoy was the top swimmer in Louisiana unfortunately he passed away a few years ago because of cancer and the met attracts this year almost six hundred young men and women competing out at Southside Swim Club, in southwest Shreveport. Truly the parents from Arkansas, Texas, Louisiana, and Mississippi enjoyed their stay to visit both Shreveport and Bossier. They're still working on some of the economic impact, but it's one of the events that kind of goes unnoticed, although this year I appreciate the Shreveport Times and sports page for doing some stories on some of the stories behind the stories. We got some young men and women that are really emerging as some of the top athletes in the area, I never had the privilege and neither did my wife, my daughter swims some in the City of Shreveport swim team, but we weren't swimmers, but I have come to appreciate swimming in terms of what it brings to the table. In terms of exercise, and also discipline for the young men and women out there, but we had us the City of Shreveport, and the region competed extremely well against some of the top teams in Texas and Arkansas, Mississippi. But again, thank you to Coach Jordan and the parents for all the hard work that they put into that event, Friday, Saturday, and Sunday. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Councilman Green: Thank you, any other council member? We have also a special guest, Mr. Commissioner David Cox, and we have spoke with him, David would you all come on up? I believe he will introduce the other folk. He is going to give us an update on the Vicious Dog ordinance.

Mr. Cox: Good afternoon.

Councilman Green: Good afternoon. Want to give your name and address – or you don't have an address for the record.

Commissioner Cox: (2633 Lover's Lane.): I am here today just to give y'all an update. At this time I would like to bring up Dr. Dale, and Cpl. Collins, who is going to help us out. What we've done we took the initial group that we had, took that group the Mayor still have his but we took away from that and brought these gentlemen into a smaller group to get it going. And I'll be honest with you we worked about 20 hours putting more or less getting that thing done and a lot of weekend hours, a lot of afternoon hours and some people say they don't work on weekends. Well we did. Some of the ordinances that are going to be presented to you and the commission some people will not like, I can guarantee it. But, to have the Shreveport and the Caddo Parish the way we want it, to make it legal, to make it safe, these ordinances must be passed. So, when you see them I hope you have an open mind and if you have any questions, please feel free to give us a call and when we present it to you don't have a question unanswered, that's the way it's going to be. I got these two gentlemen here today, if you have any questions; please feel free to ask either Cpl. Collins who was very, very a good part of this group. Dr. Dale, who everybody knows he runs the Caddo Animal (inaudible) and if y'all have any questions right now as far as where we are headed, I will be more than happy to answer them for you.

Councilman Gibson: Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Green: Mr. Carmody.

Councilman Gibson: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Commissioner Cox again, I appreciate you and Councilman Green's leadership on this, but there is one thing that struck me in our early conversation. There was some original preliminary work that was done on this and you recognize there was a need to kind of broaden the group participation and I wanted to commend you for a true partnership between receiving input from the private sector, both from business and residential side and working in conjunction with the law enforcement and also the animal control side of things, with what I think what you have is a making of a good cross section of input to get that kind of legislation that would be meaningful and I want to commend you for that. Because that's the type of committees that are needed to get something done, and done in an expeditious manner and I commend both you and Councilman Green for working in that direction with the agencies. Thank you.

Commissioner Cox: It's been an rewarding, finding out what we can and can not do to have somebody with the experience that Dr. Dale has that came on board with the Animal Services not too long ago, and seeing the need that he could actually look at and say, we need to change this. And with the assistance of Cpl. Collins we've made the ordinance that we are going to present fair, but stern. If y'all want to go over a couple issues again at this time, if not we can come back during the day.

Councilman Green: Yes sir, Mr. Carmody.

Councilman Carmody: Thank you, very much. Gentlemen I'm sure y'all each received a copy of this American (inaudible). Basically they're concerns regarding I guess breeds specific type ordinances, I wanted to see if we had more or less moved into the direction of addressing vicious dogs as opposed to I guess the pit bills, which was the last thing that we had talked about.

Commissioner Cox: I'll let Dr. Dale answer that.

Councilman Carmody: Thank you, sir.

Councilman Green: Dr. Dale, would you state your name and address for the record, please?

Dr. Michael Dale: (1500 Bonnie St): I'm also a licensed (inaudible) for air medicine in the State of Louisiana. We have chosen not to try to be breed specific now some of the problem areas that we have especially the illegal drug traffic, they have chosen to be breed specific. But, I think if we attack a specific breed like pit bulls, not to mention the people that have pits in their back yard that they care for and take care of that are not vicious animals. The people that were (inaudible) on they just would go to a different breed. I think its places like New Orleans, certain areas of New Orleans that has – they have chosen to be breed specific. And some of the drug trafficking down there has gone from pit bulls to (inaudible) snakes (inaudible). You know, I can't really go into no great detail about what we've done, as far as a our little sub committee gathering information and talking about the changes we want to make with the ordinances and amendments that we would like to make. But I can tell you that the reason I can't tell you these things is because they haven't heard everything, we haven't discussed it at our committee meetings they haven't come up with any final rulings on some of the things that we want to change. But there's two areas that we have really taken an issue with and that's violent animals, you know if we could get some of these off the streets then a lot of our children and a lot of our elderly people would be a lot safer. I know probably if you don't know too much about the animal bite cases that we receive but just within the last month we've had a child's ear has been bitten off. Another child's finger has been bitten off, an elderly lady has been bitten so severely that here leg was broken and these are common place with us and we see more and more of it. So like I say we're bearing down on violent animals, I can't be breed specific many, many, times

it's going to be pit bulls, most of the time right now it will be the pit bull. But, if you specified pit bulls that would just go to something else. Another area that we are dealing with is animal nuisance, animals that bark too much in the neighborhood, we get hundreds of calls and there's never been any specific definition of excessive barking and we are trying to address those things. We are trying to address people that have too many dogs in a small yard; we are going to talk about how many dogs a citizen can take of in a certain size yard. Another thing that seems a little not so important but it is to those that are concerned with it is cats. As it is now cats can they can run loose if they've been spade or neutered and if they are property licensed. But, there's nothing to stop them, there's nothing to relate to cats being deflowered and these cats get up on people cars and they just scratch (inaudible), and we are going to address that to.

Councilman Carmody: I appreciate that Doc., I think it's a wise move not to be breed specific but to try to address the vicious animals and the owner of the property, the dog or whatever the vicious animal might be accountable for whatever the actions are. I certainly think that nobody wants to see anybody hurt by any dogs and for those of us that unfortunately been bitten in our lifetime know that is not pleasant and it is frustrating I think that I intent is to try and address a specific breed but without naming that breed right now. And I can certainly understand you logic in not wanting to push those persons into picking up some other form of protection that's outside of what we are writing. I will mention this and I want to verify with you that people have asked me this in the past, is there an ordinance that requires the owner of the dog to pick up behind their dog when they're walking? If they are required then to pick up whatever refuge is left that the dog walked.

Dr. Dale: That's correct we just, you know, it's just one of those that we haven't enforced.

Councilman Carmody: Who's responsible for enforcing that?

Dr. Dale: It's our, Caddo Parish Animal Services. But, we have to be notified of these things, we have to have a complaint and we will follow up on it. But that's been one of our problems, some of the time we have had adequate laws, we just have to enforce them drastically, and we are going to start doing that.

Councilman Carmody: The other thing that I've heard and they have I think (inaudible) to do with (inaudible) cats, but with animals that are basically predator the lost of songbird, that these (inaudible) animals take a major tow on, I guess on those songbirds that are traditionally seen in neighborhoods, that's what they start.

Dr. Dale: Well, I'm not – I don't know I can't answer that I mean to me it doesn't make sense.

Councilman Carmody: Yeah, but good luck to you with your work.

Dr. Dale: Thank you.

Councilman Carmody: Thank you.

Councilman Green: Anyone else. Thank you. David one question, the legislation will it be ready for the next council meeting.

Commissioner Cox: Here's the schedule that we have right now, the paper work itself is going back to be written up and then it will go in front of a full committee for a complete outline to go over pro's and con's. And then from that it goes to the commission and at the earliest convinces I want to try to push it though the commission as quickly as we can to get it back to you guys here, at the city council. And like I said I told you earlier that its amazing to get something changed (inaudible) red tape you have to go through and it's amazing but at the end of the road it is certainly well worth it. So, I will say that the City of Shreveport as a whole when it

comes to animal call-ins run about 95%, as opposed to 5% outside the city limits. So, when these ordinances come in I would really like the city council and I'm talking to the commission as well to do what we are going to do with Animal Services, and to enforce the law the way that they are going to be enforced. We are going to need to expand. We are going to need to bring on more personnel with Animal Services. So, that's when I will come back to not only the Mayor, but the City Council and ask for funds out of your budget along with our budget, along with Vivian, everybody that's within the Caddo Parish. I am going to go to each township and ask for the same thing so be thinking about that in the long run. It takes money to make sure that its done right, its been done right for a while but now its going to be done extra as far as the need of ordinances that are coming on, its going to take a while and this man can do his job better if we can get him in line for what's coming on. Cause if you drive out there one day, I mean (inaudible). It's a problem and we are going to have to – and if we do this and do it right we need to do it all the way so, I am going to be asking for your support on that as well. So, thank you.

Councilman Green: Thank you. Thank you, David. Thank you, Dr. Dale, Cpl. Collins, keep up the good work. At this time we will have Councilman Jackson, has a resolution – Thank you. At this time I would like to recognize a gentleman that in the audience, he is going to be speaking later on, on an item that's on the agenda, Mr. James Mohr. Mr. Mohr I would just like to, you can stand where you are, I'd just like to say thank you on behalf of our church family, myself, as to how you and Mrs. Mohr treated us, in purchasing the land from you, to build our new church. Certainly, you treated us like a Christian brother that you are and I would just like to say publicly thank you all and certainly my church is very proud and may God bless you.

Mr. Mohr: If you promise me that you won't sing realloud.

Councilman Green: Thank you, very much. At this time we will move to the reports

Reports:

Convention Center and Convention Center Hotel

Mr. Antee: On yesterday, Councilman Carmody inquired as to the RFP for the telecommunication services, that's being provided through a RFP pursuant to Louisiana revised statue 38:2237 and revised statue 39:1752-53 that states that those services can be provided. And I know it's not exactly what you wanted to hear but it can be provided through the RFP process.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Green: Mr. Carmody.

Councilman Carmody: I just want to make sure that Mr. Antee, what we are talking about was the telecommunications equipment is actually going to be assets owned by the City of Shreveport, correct?

Mr. Antee: That is correct.

Councilman Carmody: And although the budgeted allowance as far as \$340,000 that will not be a requirement to go to the public bid process.

Mr. Antee: Revised Statute, 38:2237 and 39 - - -

Councilman Carmody: Could you expound on those for me, tell me what those regarding?

Mr. Antee: I'll give you a copy of 'em.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Chairman

Mr. Antee: You want a copy?

Councilman Carmody: I'd love to hear what it says if you could read it.

Mr. Antee: Well, I don't have all of it. *The political sub-provision which is - - -*

Councilman Carmody: The City of Shreveport.

Mr. Antee: *A leased rent or purchase, telecommunications or data processing systems, including equipment, which is what we're talking about, and related services through a request for proposals which are conformed to the following requirements. And there's a list of requirements. The types of contracts permitted and the procurement of telecommunications systems and telecommunications services are defined in this part, and provisions of this part supplement provisions of 39:1551 through 1736.*

Councilman Carmody: Are those interpreted to be professional services?

Mr. Antee: I'll let you and your attorneys make that determination. I'm just reciting it to you what the statute says.

Councilman Carmody: I was hoping to draw on your legal expertise. I'm sorry Mr. Antee. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Antee: There is another sub-provision which says *'the office of telecommunications management through the State Purchasing Office may on behalf of any State agencies enter into telecommunication systems contracts in according with the following provisions: 1) Contracts of this type shall be entered into defined in this part.* And I think Ms. Julie Glass can probably provide a little more information as to that. But it is 100% in compliance with the State statutes and the State law on procuring telecommunication services.

Councilman Carmody: Thank you Mr. Antee. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Chairman, I was just going to ask that if there's any documents provided to Councilman Carmody, then I'd like to get copies as well.

Councilman Carmody: He's got a piece of paper over here for you.

Councilman Lester: Okay.

Councilman Gibson: Thank you Mr. Chairman. The key word there was could. We could put that out for a competitive bid also which we don't mix words. Public bid laws and competitive bidding - - - lets not get those two confused because I do remember at one time regarding Convention Center that we decided to go the alternative delivery system that wasn't competitive bid or wasn't going that route, and then we decided to put it out for competitive bid for the convention center and this Administration proudly announced how much money it would save the City. And I would suggest that - - - one of the questions that I had all the long regarding some of these ancillary non-construction issues where they can be competitively bid and I guess this is the first of a series that we'll see that we won't get the competitively bid. Things that happen within the hotel and the Convention Center. And again, it's unfortunate because I think competitive bids in this country do work. (Inaudible) broader scale of people to the table including DBE and I appreciate Councilman Carmody's questions on it, because again, something that we have stated several times, one of our concerns at least some of our concerns, amount to how we're going to expend money getting the most value for our taxpayer dollar out of this process. And I understand that the statutes are written that way, but there is alternatives. The alternative is to put out a competitive bid and advertise it as (inaudible).

Mr. Antee: Mr. Chairman, we'd be glad to have Mr. Tom Mattox, our Purchasing Agent provide a seminar to any and all Council Members as to what competitive bid, request for proposals and how the whole process works, since there's clearly a lack of understanding. A

request for proposal is asking and putting out and advertising and notifying anybody that if they want to submit a proposal with a price, then it's due by a certain day. Public Bid is in essence the same thing. But it's done a little different in that you specifically go with the low price. There are certain things like telecommunications that if you just put it out and say put us a phone system in, well, you may get the lowest price and it may be two dial-up phones. And you've got a phone system. That's why in certain areas, the State of Louisiana through the public laws provide for proposals rather than a straight bid. And I understand that may be a little much for some to understand. But sometimes, you've got to be more specific and you've got to take into consideration service, and other items. And that's why the State has allowed you to go out for proposals, rather than just putting out a bid like you're building. And if you would like, we could set that meeting up with Mr. Mattox for anybody that would like to learn more about the process.

Councilman Carmody: Just perusing the requests for proposals, but I don't see any indication here as to Fair Share participation.

Mayor Hightower: Everything we do is Fair Share.

Councilman Carmody: Although it's not specified as to providing along with your bid, the Fair Share component? Is that something y'all are going to ask for?

Mr. Antee: Well, if you'll read it also, I'm sure there's language in there that says it's got to comply with all the State ordinances, I mean the City ordinances. And a City Ordinance is complying with the Fair Share. Again, we can - - - that can be part of the tutoring process through Mr. Mattox.

Councilman Carmody: I just don't see that actually specified in here. But I'll take your word on it Mr. Antee. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Chairman, just one question. Mr. Antee, on yesterday, I know you talked about the interest rate. Fixing the interest rate at 3.7%. Is that right?

Mr. Antee: Well, that's what it was last week. Now- - -

Councilman Hogan: I thought it was 2.7 last week.

Mr. Antee: No, if we would have executed the swap on last Thursday, it would have been at 3.7%. Today it may be at 3.9 or it may be at 3.5. It varies. What we're doing is asking to have the permission to lock it in I think at no more than 4%, I believe is what the ordinance says. So that when the market is where we think we would want it to be, for example; last week, if we'd had that permission, we could've locked it in at 3.7 and it would have been locked in.

Councilman Hogan: Okay.

Mr. Antee: Cause it fluctuates daily.

Councilman Hogan: If you said it, you'll have to forgive me, but does it talk about the terms? On most long term loans like that, the rate is fixed for X number of years. For five years or ten years or whatever. Is this going to be fixed for a specified term of years or the whole terms.

Mr. Antee: It's going to be fixed for a specified term, and we'll have to - - - I don't know that information right off hand, but we'll have that to you before the next meeting.

Property Standards Report

Councilman Green: Are there any questions for Mr. Bowie or anyone?

Councilman Lester: Mr. Bowie, could you come forward please? We've talked about some problem spots in Allendale, and we had had a chance to ride around and try to get something going on. As I appreciate it, you have a report on some of those area. If you could read that for me please?

Mr. Bowie: Okay. One is the 1500 block of Portland Avenue. It was a two-story structure that you asked about. It was put back in the system March, scheduled for demolition around September. 2407 Portland Avenue, there was a care of premise problem we had, and deterioration of the structure. It's been closed up and we're looking at a demo candidate right now. Hopefully, we can have it in the system sometimes this month and before the end of the year it'll be torn down. 1101 and 1103 Kenneth Ave – Structures in system since the 2000 City Security. We've got a lien against it for that. And now, we've made it a candidate for demolition also.

Councilman Lester: Thank you Mr. Bowie, I really appreciate that, because particularly that last one, I've had a lot of calls about that house on the 1100 block of Kenneth. And I appreciate the department doing something about that. And also, I don't know if Chief Campbell is here, but I appreciate his response on trying to get some surveillance on that house. Cause as I appreciate it from the neighbors, it's being used for some criminal activity. So I appreciate you looking into that.

Mr. Bowie: Yeah, for the last four or five years, we've secured it twice. It's a demolition candidate because it's deteriorated to that point.

Councilman Gibson: Thank You Mr. Bowie. Good afternoon.

Mr. Bowie: Good afternoon.

Councilman Gibson: Could you give me an update on what's going on in terms of that fallen tree or bits and pieces of tree at Line Ave and 74th, I believe its. You had said there was a citation a couple of months ago. I guess the first question that I have, and the residents have is - - it appears that tree could be deemed in the easement because it's right there on the corner. Parts of it are on I think 74th and part of it's on Line Avenue there. And it just seems to me like there, that should be an easy thing to just see what we could do about it.

Mr. Bowie: Yes sir, well - - -

Councilman Gibson: Getting it picked up. Could you kinda send me an email to give me an idea. I've got a meeting with some residents out thee to see what we can do about it. Cause that's been out there for, Councilman Lester, at least a couple to three years?

Councilman Lester: At least.

Councilman Gibson: 1) if somebody were to lose control of their car they're going to hit - - - it's now, I'm going to turn it into a safety issue now.

Mr. Bowie: Okay.

Councilman Gibson: And not to mention it's unsightly. The other thing, if I could ask you to give me a report at the address of 228 Johnnie Drive, and you can contact Ms. Evelyn Hassell. This is a vacant house that's next to her. Her phone number is 797-0828.

Mr. Bowie: 0828?

Councilman Gibson: Yes sir. And she will be more than happy to meet you out there and show you what problems they've got. But this house has been vacant for about 4 or 5 months and it's becoming a safety issue out there in terms of both snakes and high grass and windows being broken out of the house. Alright thank you Mr. Bowie, thank you Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Bowie, I'm writing this down for you, I'm making it easy for you. Could you just step up here and get this for me? This is one that had been turned in. This

is an old mobile home that had been turned in to be torn down. The address and everything is on there. And if you could look at that and see when it will be scheduled to be torn down and notify the lady there. I would appreciate it.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Bowie, 910 Texas. We got a postponement, is that correct?

Mr. Bowie: Next Monday.

Councilman Walford: Oh next Monday?

Mr. Bowie: Yeah, the 20th.

Councilman Walford: Very good. Thank you.

Public Hearing: None.

Confirmations and/or Appointments, Adding Legislation to the Agenda, and Public Comments.

Confirmations and/or Appointments - Mrs. Rachel D. King – Assistant City Attorney

Motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Walford to confirm the appointment of Mrs. Rachel D. King. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

Councilman Green: On yesterday we talked about having some, Mr. Mayor do you all have - - -

Mayor Hightower: Mr. Chairman, we'd ask that those Board appointments lay over for two weeks.

Councilman Lester: So moved. Or do we need a motion?

Councilman Green: No. Thank you.

Adding Legislation to the Agenda

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, we have several. *The Clerk read the following:*

1. **Resolution No. 102 of 2005:** A Resolution ratifying the execution of documents by the Mayor accepting a grant on behalf of U.S. Support Company and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Hogan to add Resolution No. 102 to the agenda. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, we have several more, do you want to take them up individually or all at one time.

Councilman Lester: In globo Mr. Chairman. All at the same time.

Councilman Green: All at the same time.

The Clerk read the following:

2. **Resolution No. 103 of 2005:** A Resolution acknowledging and approving a request from the City of Shreveport to swap the variable interest rate to a fixed interest rate swap with respect to the aggregate principal amount of \$40,000,000 Louisiana Local Government Environmental Facilities and Community Development Authority Revenue Bonds (**SHREVEPORT CONVENTION CENTER HOTEL PROJECT**) Series 2005; Authorizing officers of the issuer to execute certain documents including a schedule to the ISDA Master Agreement and Trade Confirmation in order for AMBAC Financial Products, LLC to deliver the Swap Policy; and providing for other matters with respect thereto.
3. **Resolution No. 104 of 2005:** A Resolution acknowledging and approving a request from the City of Shreveport to swap the variable interest rate to a fixed interest rate swap with respect to the aggregate principal amount of \$30,000,000 Louisiana Local Government Environmental Facilities and Community Development Authority Revenue Bonds (**CITY OF SHREVEPORT/INDEPENDENCE STADIUM PROJECT**) Series 2000 and Series 2000A; Authorizing Officers of the issuer to execute certain documents including a schedule to the ISDA Master Agreement and Trade Confirmation in order for JP Morgan Chase & Co. to deliver the swap policy; and providing for other matters with respect thereto.
4. **Resolution No. 105 of 2005:** A resolution authorizing the waiver of building permit fees and authorizing the donation of building materials and supplies to 12 to qualified low income homeowners in the City of Shreveport and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
5. **Resolution No. 106 of 2005:** A Resolution welcoming the Weyerhaeuser Company to Shreveport and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
6. **Ordinance No. 98 of 2005:** An Ordinance to repeal Ordinance No. 27 of 2004: To rescind and cancel the servitude and encroachment authorized therein, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
7. **Ordinance No. 99 of 2005:** An Ordinance to enact section 42-217 of the City of Shreveport Code of Ordinances relative to license permits and business regulation and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Lester to add Resolution Nos. 103, 104, 105, and 106 and; Ordinance Nos. 98 and 99 to the agenda.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Chairman, under Resolutions 3 and 4 regarding the locking of the fixed interest rate, I certainly think that credit is certainly due where it's earned. I wanted to ask the Administration if before our next meeting or by our Work Session for the next meeting, if we could get a written report on the actual savings that have been realized by utilizing the financing method with the floating rate as well as a break down of the legal fees, consulting fees and all costs associated with this method of financing. And if we could get that broken down by each year since the bonds were originally sold. And if we could specifically have the

Fair Share participation notated. That would certainly be appreciated. It would be nice if we could get maybe our Bond Attorney to come in and provide us with that report here before the Council.

Mr. Antee: Mr. Chairman, the Finance Team plans to be here to give a full report.

Councilman Green: Sir?

Mr. Antee: The Finance Advisor, the financial advisor and Bond Attorney will be here, plan to be here for that next meeting with a full report and presentation.

Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

Mr. Antee: One other thing Mr. Chairman in regards to the costs as I understand it, of course it'd be part of the presentation, that all of the costs is rolled into the actual rate and there are no other costs actually applied. So we won't pay X number of dollars and then the rate. It's all rolled in, is my understanding, but they'll be here to explain all of that.

Public Comments (*Agenda Items to be Adopted*)

Mr. James Mohr: (6025 Buncombe Rd) I'm here to speak in regard to an appeal of a zoning matter. Is that what it says? What we have - - - I may be out of order in that I thought the folks appealing would speak first.

Councilman Green: No, it doesn't matter.

Mr. Mohr: What we have is Mr. Mackey who has Double Eagle Land Company, stand up Mr. Mackey, and he is here to answer any questions in regard to the particular property. Mr. Mackey developed the Cedars which is around Southwood High School starting about 35 years ago. And he has come to develop another unit of a subdivision. However, many years ago, we had the tract of land zoned R-2TH for Townhouses and now he's trying to get it down zoned to R-1D which is like most of the other land in Southern Hills. However, we've had someone appeal that. The Planning Commission approved it, but somebody's appealed it. And so what we're asking you - - - in the appeal mentions the need for a fence to be built along the edge of Mr. Mackey's property in regard to the neighbors. And I've submitted a package to you, and I don't know how to turn this on or need to know whether it's appropriate or not. But the matter is that we feel that it's inappropriate. Mr. Mackey's not trying to build a subdivision next to these neighbors. He's just trying to get his land down zoned from a very dense like from ten units an acre down to three. Secondly, the petition signed by seven people actually of the seven that signed, only four or three of the people that signed the petition are adjacent to him. There are people east and west of him that are on the petition that have no land next to him. And lastly, one of the landowners adjacent to Mr. Mackey's property is zoned R-2. Mr. Mackey is trying to get down to R-1-D and the other zoning that is R-2 is like ten units an acre. But the petition says they want Mr. Mackey to build a 8 foot high wood fence next to his south line which is adjacent to them just to get the property zoned. And we're saying this is - - - this is - - - you know the carts before the horse. He's not down there trying to build a subdivision, if he were, it would be a valid question to debate. Secondly, I'd like to point out that one of the neighbors adjacent to Mr. Mackey is already with an R-2, and yet he wants Mr. Mackey who is trying to build single family detached to build him an 8 foot fence. And that's basically - - - and then lastly what we have is the fact that one of the four people that's adjacent to Mr. Mackey's property didn't sign

the petition. All the people that are adjacent to Mr. Mackey have houses that are like 700 or so feet away, so why should they need an 8 foot fence. I'm reading, it says 'while clearing and developing, the Double Eagle Land Company (this is their petition) will be required to erect an 8 foot privacy fence of treated timber along the south boundary of his 9 acres. And so, it seems that they are worried about protecting adjacent properties, livestock and (inaudible). I don't know that we've got any animals that can jump an 8 foot fence or a 6 foot fence or a 4 foot fence, and why should we build an 8 foot opaque fence for somebody that lives 700 or so feet away. So we think it's an inappropriate appeal of an approved MPC approved zoning. And we hope that you will find, and I'll be glad to answer any questions.

Mr. Dick Perkins: (3242 Bert Kouns) James, it's nice to see you again.

Mr. Mohr: Thank you sir.

Mr. Dick Perkins: The 8 foot dimension that we were suggesting happens to be the dimension of the fence that Mr. Mackey erected on the townhouse subdivision immediately adjacent to this property. That was the reason that term 8 foot was selected. The objection that we're worried about is the - - - first off, with the addition of the subdivision, we are enthusiastically in favor of the subdivision. We're not objecting to somebody doing it. Because it takes that land which is now wooded that Mr. Mackey owns on there and put some good use to it. All we want is some protection from the back end of the lots. Now, when I was down here previously speaking, Mr. Mackey made the comment, and I'm sorry to say Mr. Mackey, I don't know whether you made it in here or outside, but whichever, I'm sorry, I don't remember which it was - - - that 'nobody uses the back of this property anyway'. We all bought five-acre lots. Some of us bought a lot and a half, so we'd have seven acres, so that we could have horses. I bought a few cows or put in a fishing pond, or have a place for our children and grandchildren to play. Now, does my finger point? Now, there we go. This is my property right here. Adjacent to it is Dr. Burk and other neighbors. This is the wooded property in the back. Mr. Mackey made the comment to me that nobody uses those back lots anyway. If you will look at it, you will see that there are gardens all the way up to the back property line. It's not waste woods. We're not asking Mr. Mackey to make a major contribution in cost of an 8 foot fence just for the fact that it would be pretty, nobody's going to see it. If we had some type of security that when he does develop the property, that is a screening fence. Chain link, big chicken wire, I don't care what it is. But to keep neighborhood dogs from running back into our property frightening my grandchildren which they have done on numerous occasions. Chasing Mr. Burk's little calves which they've done on numerous occasions. We've had to report the wild to the Animal Control Center. We have a liability. We have to pay our insurance, so that if somebody else comes on our property, our liability insurance takes care of any injuries that they have. All we're asking is let's cut down the possibility of a bunch of neighborhood kids moving in that (inaudible). But let's keep 'em on their own property. The terminology of an 8 foot high fence was only because that's what Mr. Mackey had done at the adjacent subdivision where (inaudible), I think it is, those townhouses back there. The same type of 8 foot fence is behind the cedars which is down here all the way across up to Walker Road. This little 800 foot stretch, we're asking that there be some consideration when he starts to develop it, to putting in some security screening, so that our animals and our neighbors who are going to live back there are not in danger. That's what we're asking for. Mrs. Perkins, did you want to submit any additional information? If I may Mrs. Perkins is a licensed real estate agent. I am no longer a licensed agent, but she may have something to add.

Mrs. Alma Perkins: (3242 Bert Kouns) And I'd like to ask Mr. Mohr which property is he referring to that is zoned R-2. As far as I know, none of them are. One of them had been, but it's been change,. That was Dr. Burks' property. Does it say here?

Mr. Mohr: Those properties right there.

Mrs. Perkins: It is not now zoned R-2.

Mr. Mohr: I received this map from Dorothy just last week and that is the zoning R-2.

Mrs. Perkins: Well, I hate to disagree with you (inaudible) the property, and it had been that, but it had been changed back to R. And Mr. Gene told me it was when I talked to him this last couple of weeks. In any case, he's not using it as such. He's using it as rural agricultural, and he would like to have it no doubt back to RA, like he seems to do. In any case, that's one thing that Mr. Mohr brought up. The other thing was that somebody had not signed the petition. And that was the one I believe that was right next to Dr. Burk and he had said that he would, would be glad to, but he just doesn't have time to get to it before it had to go in. But anyway, I just wanted to let you all know that we certainly are in favor of the rezoning of the property and we think that in the petition, and the only thing that we wanted to do was extend the fence that was in the back of our property. About 20 years ago when the - - - they're actually garden houses were put up by Mr. Mackey's company. That's what he did. And we fully expected that that's what he would be doing in the next segment if it is not done at this point when they were changing the zoning. Then if he sells the property, then what happens? Is there anything that would make the new owner respect the fact that that fence should be continued on behind the properties like they are already, and had been done 20 years ago when he first developing back there. It didn't even occur at the time that this came up that he wasn't going to do that. And then my neighbor asked me about it. And I said, well I guess we'd better find out. And so this what has come up. Now, I thought that it was a given that he would continue the privacy fence, is what they call them. And certainly anybody owning one of those houses would be happy to have the privacy fences probably there particularly seeing that most single family homes will have children. And children are very curious. They're going to want to get out and play with the calves. They're going to want to go try fishing in the ponds that are back there or mess around in so and so's garden. And so that is a matter of privacy that we've enjoyed all this time, and would like to continue to enjoy. And we're afraid of the liability particularly people getting in there and getting themselves hurt.

Councilman Hogan: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Mohr or Mr. Mackey, would you come forward please? Yes sir, since this is in my district, I feel a responsibility here to step in. The Perkins family had called me and talked to me about this. And I've been listening as we go. I'd like to make a suggestion. Obviously, Mr. Perkins spoke to you, and y'all are on speaking terms and we're all on the same page in terms of the development itself. But I think for the sake of - - - I don't mind us going through this on the Council, but I'd just like to make a suggestion to see if maybe right here on the spot, if y'all would agree to maybe we could sit down and talk about this. I have a couple of ideas in mind to compromise.

Mr. Mohr: I understand, but we're just trying to get zoning. We're not trying to build houses behind these people.

Councilman Hogan: Yes sir. Well in light of their concerns, I'm familiar with the property. It was started as I remember Mr. Mackey, in 1980. Somewhere right around there, about the time I graduated from high school, that's when those houses were going up. And as I recall, there is a fence around the outer development. And so, it does seem to make sense that the fence would be continued on. Yes sir.

Mr. Mohr: But we built a fence when we developed next to it. We're not trying to develop next to it now. When we come back to you with a subdivision. And we're going to put lots next to them. That's the time to talk about a fence. Not now that we're trying to get zoning.

Councilman Gibson: Mr. Chair, my suggestion, and I don't know if we have anybody here from the Planning Commission and Zoning, but if what you said, and I have no reason not to believe it Mr. Mohr, but it seems to me like when you get the zoning, then when you come back with your plans, the residents could stipulate before the MPC and the ZBA a stipulation that there would be those provisions in there to be able to accommodate some of the concerns about that situation. But I think we're a little bit, it sounds to me a little bit ahead of the game, but that's just one observation in terms of that process. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Mr. Mohr: Has anyone –

Councilman ??: Thank you, Councilman Gibson.

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Chairman, may I speak.

Councilman Green: Yes sir, Mr. Hogan.

Councilman Hogan: Is there anyone here from Planning Commission, Mr. Jambor? Thank you for coming forward, what we have before us here is the issue over the zoning and in order to, and you enlighten me on this, you know, but the appeal is for the zoning and even though they are in favor of it, the only stipulation they are saying is the fence and so can you give us some guidance on this?

Mr. Jambor: Certainly, it seems to be an unusual request, continuant for a down zoning for the effort to give away rights that he already has that he would make some sort of improvements over the way it exist today. Now keep in mind that he is asking to subdivide the property which is what Mr. Mohr is alluding to, but even then, you know, once again if the appropriateness of whether the fence is a proper condition or not would come up at that point, but it don't what I am saying, is that I wouldn't necessarily increase the funds of that.

Councilman Hogan: Okay, with the application was a plat submitted in all that?

Mr. Jambor: No sir.

Councilman Hogan: Not yet, okay.

Mr. Jambor: This is simply to down zone, let's say that –

Councilman Hogan: Okay, so it would be another process then, once they get the plat and get their plans. That will be another application you will have approve, MPC will have to approve it. Right?

Mr. Jambor: It'll come up in front of you and in front of the design review committee, etc. But once again, keep in mind the application is for is to give away rights that he currently has.

Councilman Hogan: I understand.

Mr. Jambor: Density rights. Giving 'em back.

Councilman Hogan: Okay. Mr. & Mrs. Perkins, anyone that is opposed to this just strictly on the fence itself, will have another opportunity once the plan is submitted for the actual subdivision.

Mr. Jambor: Both the preliminary and the final plat.

Councilman Hogan: Okay. Her question was how would they know? They would receive notification (inaudible)

Mr. Jambor: Yes sir, they will be notified.

Councilman Hogan: Just like you do on all - - -

Mr. Jambor: It's a little different, but it has to do with the notification method that we utilize. For a subdivision, it's adjacent property owners.

Councilman Hogan: Okay, okay. Mr. Perkins, would you come forward for a second. You had couple of concerns. The way I appreciate it, when they come back for an application, you will be notified and the adjacent property owners will be notified.

Mr. Perkins: (Inaudible) so we should be being notified on there. And we have no objection to that.

Mr. Cliff Ashton: (4925 Willowchase Dr., Benton, LA) I don't know if this is the appropriate time for this, but just a couple or three brief comments about the committee that y'all are proposing to reduce the false alarms. I just wanted to, I don't know where y'all are at. I kinda got all this information last minute. I'm representing Brinks Security, you might know, it's a household name, here in this nation, based in Dallas, TX. We definitely recognize that false alarms are a problem in this industry, and we want to see police resources go to good use. Us more than anybody. Most of y'all probably know that most false alarms are caused by user error and a lack of a good verification process. We've made some great strides in this area over the years having cancel features, training, DVDs and VCR tapes that we provide our customers. There's a two call process before we dispatch, before dispatching or calling the police to dispatch. And basically just to sum all this up, real quickly, we will be in a position to volunteer anything we can do in helping out this committee as far as making suggestions. One of the things that we support and many other states have this. And I know that I'm not speaking for the industry in this area, cause they're probably not going to like me, but alarm permits, identifying official alarm users that would generate revenue for the City as well as reduce the number of trips that the policemen make to these alarm users that are not officially recognized. So anyway, I didn't have a lot to say, I just wanted to let y'all know who I was and I got a call last minute. And Brinks is definitely concerned and we want to help out anyway possible to help rectify this ongoing problem, which is a nationwide problem. Not just our area.

Councilman Carmody: Sir, I appreciate you coming down here. I was going to ask Brinks Security provides alarms as well personnel to provide security, don't y'all?

Mr. Ashton: In different areas.

Councilman Carmody: When you said that there is a two call process, could you explain that to us?

Mr. Ashton: What we do, most alarm companies or monitoring centers out there, and a lot of the - - - unfortunately a lot of the monitoring is done of course out of the state. It's not even local or anything. And what they do is, they call the house first. You get an alarm, you want to try to recognize whether or not the user just accidentally set it off, open up the back door in the morning when they went out to do something or let the pet out. Besides calling the house, if we don't get an answer, we're calling the very first numbers, cell phones most appropriately in today's society or work numbers. We have a great verification process when it comes to getting a hold of the customer. Resident 1 and Resident 2 both. Husband or the wife in this case, before dispatching the police. Now, you won't be able to enforce that as far as I can see. But I'm just letting you know one of the things that we do to help alleviate false alarms.

Councilman Carmody: I know that in the past that the alarm companies that I've been familiar with actually contracted with private security companies to answer their calls. Is that something that's still being done in the industry of if they'd completely eliminated the middle man and now the police departments do the responsibility regardless of the calls.

Mr. Ashton: There is some as far as I know.

Councilman Carmody: Sir?

Mr. Ashton: There is some in the nation, and I can't tell you exactly where it's at, but they will have their private guard services respond to the alarms. Personally, in my opinion that's not practical.

Councilman Carmody: As I recall, I can remember having to meet with representatives of a security company that was under contract with the service provider for the alarm system, that was there to pick up the call. But you don't see that anymore now, it's the policeman that actually responds. Thank you sir. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Frank Thaxton: (8585 West Wilderness) The first item is a zoning matter. It's listed as item no. 76 on the agenda. I do represent the owner of the property. This is a second phase of the development. Phase I had already been approved both by the MPC and this Council, and is now complete. The MPC heard the zoning request from Phase II. There was no objection with any of the adjoining property owners. And there was no objection at the MPC and the MPC unanimously approved that zoning request. The second item is item no. 77. Likewise it was a zoning request for a mixed use development which included low to moderate duplex housing. Market rate apartments, and single family patio or garden homes for home ownership. This matter came before the MPC, there was no objection. There was support by the adjoining property owners. The unanimous vote of the MPC was for approval of the MPC. To date, I've not heard any objection from anyone on either of these developments and either of these requests. Only the support that was expressed at the MPC hearing. And I'll be glad to answer any questions if you have any. I'd like to keep my time to a minimum. I know it's valuable to all of you. But I'm here if you need me.

Mr. Jason O'glee: (801 Dalisa Cr) Really I just didn't know if I need to sign that paper when I came in to be able to speak if I needed to when our topic came up about Louisiana Cheernastics, is actually why I'm here at 2533 E. 70th Street. That's really what I'm here about. Just waiting on a vote really, but to sign the paper to make sure I could speak if I needed to.

Mr. Hixie Taylor: (2573 David Raines Rd) First of all I want to thank you for allowing me the opportunity to speak for my husband in his absence and myself. We're asking the Council to give us permission to build a retail center in the Martin Luther King Drive area. We would like to thank Councilman Lester for his support and we solicit his continued support in the future. And then lastly, we would like talk about a section of land at the corner of Martin Luther King and Audrey Lane. And this property was purchased and acquired by the State Representative Cedric Glover when he was a Councilman. And we would like for the City to donate and I'm emphasizing 'donate' us this little piece of land that's on the corner of the land that we're purchasing, and we would keep it beautified and landscaped, and keep it up with our regular property.

Councilman Lester: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I would like to thank Ms. Taylor and for those that don't know, that's Carlos with her. We go way back. Her husband, Rev. Louis Taylor is not here today, because he's in Baton Rouge speaking on behalf of the Cedric Willis Bill before the Louisiana legislature, otherwise he would have been here himself. I just wanted to say, I'm very supportive of what the Taylors are doing as a family. I'm very encouraged. People have said for the longest time that our community in the Martin Luther King area needs retail development. And what these folks are doing is they're putting their own resources up. They're purchasing a tract of land. They're getting it rezoned, and they're going to give it a go on their own sweat of their brow. As I appreciate it, they're doing a lifestyle center that's going to have a barber shop, a washerteria I believe, another space for some other retail development.

All of which are sorely, sorely needed in that community. So, we're very excited about the fact that you have chosen to invest not just in our community, in their community because they live there, and they're brought up there. And we're just excited about what they're doing and we pledge our full support. Don't know if we can donate the land to you, but I'm sure we can make some type of reasonable accommodation in terms of a purchase. Obviously because we have certain requirements from the constitution as it relates to donating land. But I just wanted to say, I really appreciate what you guys are doing in investing in our community and we pledge our support to that effort.

**CONSENT AGENDA LEGISLATION
TO INTRODUCE RESOLUTIONS AND ORDINANCES**

RESOLUTIONS: None.

ORDINANCES: None.

TO ADOPT RESOLUTIONS AND ORDINANCES:

RESOLUTIONS:

The clerk read the following:

RESOLUTION NO. 96 of 2005

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING ROBERT A. MACKEY, JR. & KENNIE SUE PATTERSON MACKEY, LOCATED AT 10200 STONEHEDGE DR., TO CONNECT TO THE WATER SYSTEM OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, Robert A. Mackey, Jr. & Kennie Sue Patterson Mackey 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 Robert A. Mackey, Jr. & Kennie Sue Patterson Mackey, be authorized to connect the building located at 10200 Stonehedge Dr., 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 Carmody to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

ORDINANCES: None.

**REGULAR AGENDA LEGISLATION
RESOLUTIONS ON SECOND READING AND FINAL PASSAGE OR WHICH
REQUIRE ONLY ONE READING**

The Clerk read the following:

RESOLUTION NO. 89 OF 2005

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO ENTER INTO AN INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT WITH THE PARISH OF CADDO FOR THE PURPOSES OF PROVIDING ENGINEERING SERVICES AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport and the Parish of Caddo share a common interest in providing services to the citizen's of Caddo Parish, Louisiana; and

WHEREAS, the Parish is in need of professional engineering services; and

WHEREAS, the City has engineers on staff available to assist Caddo Parish; and

WHEREAS, the City has agreed to provide professional engineering services to the Parish on an as-needed basis at a rate of One Hundred Dollars (\$100.00) per hour with the understanding that should additional engineering staff be required to fulfill this agreement the agreed upon fee may be adjusted by amendment with the consent of both parties;

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 enter into an Intergovernmental Agreement with the Parish of Caddo for the purposes of providing professional engineering services.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, legal and regular session convened, that it authorizes the Mayor's signature on the Intergovernmental Agreement Between the City of Shreveport and the Parish of Caddo and; after due notice thereto and after the effective date of this Resolution, the Mayor of the City of Shreveport is hereby authorized and empowered to execute and deliver, for and on behalf of the City of Shreveport, an instrument of Intergovernmental Agreement between the City of Shreveport and the Parish of Caddo, substantially in the form of the document filed along with the original copy of this Resolution in the Office of the Clerk of Court on May 18, 2005 and, attached hereto as Exhibit A.

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

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

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

Read by title and 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, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

RESOLUTION NO. 90 OF 2005

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING AND PROVIDING FOR A RIGHT OF PASSAGE AND UTILITY EASEMENT ON A PORTION OF LAND OWNED BY THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT AND ADJACENT TO CROSS LAKE IN CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA, BY MICHAEL AND PAULA GOLEMON AND BOBBY AND CAROLYN WRIGHT, AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO

WHEREAS, Michael and Paula Golemon are the owners of record of the following tract of land which is more particularly described in the deed recorded in Conveyance Book 3746, Page 704, attached hereto as Exhibit A: A tract of land in that part of Lot 2 of Section 23, Township 18 North, Range 15 West, in Caddo Parish, containing 0.265 acres; and

WHEREAS, Robert and Carolyn Wright are the owners of record of the following tract of land which is more particularly described in the deed recorded in Conveyance Book 3746, Page 701, attached hereto as Exhibit B: A tract of land in Lot 2 of Section 23, and of Lot 1, Section 26, Township 13 North, Range 15 West, in Caddo Parish, containing 0.284 acres; and

WHEREAS, the two tracts of land are contiguous; however, the tracts do not have access to a public right of way, as the tracts are landlocked by a strip of land in that part of Lot 2 of Section 23, Township 18 North, Range 15 West, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, lying south of North Lakeshore Drive, which is owned by the City of Shreveport and adjacent to Cross Lake containing 0.055 acres, more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at a found brass cap at the intersection of the common line of Sections 23 and 26 with the 172 foot contour traverse line between angle point 1 in Section 26 and angle point 31 in Section 23, thence measure north 16 degrees 00 feet 00 inches west, along said traverse line, a distance of 162.88 feet to a found ½ inch iron rod being said angle point 31; thence measure north 66 degrees 45 feet 00 inches west, along the 172 foot contour traverse line, a distance of 96.59 feet to a set ½ inch iron rod and the point of beginning of herein easement/servitude described:

Thence continue along said traverse line north 66 degrees 45 feet 00 inches west a distance of 30.89 feet to a found ½ inch iron pipe; thence leave said traverse line north 09 degrees 27 feet 54 inches east a distance of 60.68 feet to a set ½ inch iron rod located on the southerly right of way line of North Lakeshore Drive; thence measure along said right of way line north 53 degrees 55 feet 03 inches east a distance of 42.84 feet to a set ½ inch iron rod; thence leave said right of way line south 09 degrees 27 feet 54 inches west a distance of 98.62 feet to the point of beginning. Said easement/servitude containing 2,389 square feet or 0.055 acres.

(See plat attached hereto as Exhibit C.)

WHEREAS, a request has been received from Michael and Paula Golemon and Robert and Carolyn Wright for a right of passage to build, maintain, inspect, repair, alter and rebuild a driveway, and to utilize said driveway to access their adjacent, landlocked property, over, through, upon and across the aforementioned described property owned by the City of Shreveport and adjacent to Cross Lake; and

WHEREAS, an additional request has been received from Michael and Paula Golemon and Robert and Carolyn Wright for a utility easement to lay, maintain, inspect, repair, alter and relay utility lines on, over, through, upon, across and under said property owned by the City of Shreveport and adjacent to Cross Lake; and

WHEREAS, Michael and Paula Golemon and Robert and Carolyn Wright shall neither commence construction of the driveway, nor lay utility lines on, over, through, upon, across and under said property owned by the City of Shreveport and adjacent to Cross Lake without first obtaining the approval of the City of Shreveport, Director of Operational Services. Any such approval by the City of Shreveport shall not be unreasonably withheld; and

WHEREAS, Michael and Paula Golemon and Robert and Carolyn Wright promise that if the right of passage and utility easement is granted, they will not construct any additional improvements on said property; and

WHEREAS, because the Golemon's and Wright's property is landlocked, the proposed right of passage and utility easement created shall be a real right running with the land; and WHEREAS, any successors and assigns agree to be bound by all provisions of the right of passage and utility easement, as well as this Resolution, including, without limitation the prohibition against the construction of any additional improvements on said property; and NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, legal and regular session convened, that it hereby authorizes the Mayor's signature on the Right of Passage and Utility Easement and; after due notice thereto and after the effective date of this Resolution, the Mayor of the City of Shreveport is hereby authorized the empowered to execute and deliver, for and on behalf of the City of Shreveport, an instrument or Right of Passage and Utility Easement, substantially in the form of the document filed along with the original copy of this Resolution in the Office of the Clerk of Council on May 18, 2005, attached hereto as Exhibit D.

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 Walford to adopt.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Strong, could you come up on this. Just a quick question Mr. Strong. We're talking about a utility right of passage and utility easement that adjoins Cross Lake. Are we having any environmental issues or any concerns as it relates to this cross proximity to Cross Lake?

Mr. Strong: No sir, we are not. And what this is, we've had one other case. We're in the actual 172 contour line (inaudible) which is on fairly high land. It was bought back in the '20s, and what it is, they can't get to their property without going across a portion of our property there. So there's not a problem with this.

Councilman Lester: Okay. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

RESOLUTION NO. 91 OF 2005

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO EXECUTE AN OPTION TO LEASE AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO;

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport, as lessor, entered into a lease agreement with J. B. Beard Company, Inc., as lessee, on August 2, 1962, as recorded in Conveyance Book 970, Page 226, Registry Number 303553, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, wherein the City did lease certain immovable property located in Caddo Parish to the said Lessee, which property is more fully described in the lease, attached hereto as Exhibit A; and

WHEREAS, Beard Industries, Inc. is the successor in title and interest to the said original Lessee under the Lease; and

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport entered into an amended lease agreement with Beaird Industries, Inc. to amend the terms of the aforesaid lease agreement, as recorded in Conveyance Book 2772, Page 507, Registry Number 1320268, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, attached hereto as Exhibit B; and

WHEREAS, Beaird Industries, Inc., as Assignor, assigned all of its right, title and interest in and to the aforesaid Lease to Beaird Company, Ltd., (“Beaird”) Assignee, and Assignee accepted such assignment to fully perform Assignor’s obligations arising under the lease, as recorded in Conveyance Book 3722, Page 655, Registry Number 1948879, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, attached hereto as Exhibit C; and

WHEREAS, MB Industries, LLC (“MBI”) is in the business of designing and manufacturing specialty steel buildings for offshore, nuclear and petrochemical applications, as well as supplying the Department of Homeland Security and Department of Defense and other high-risk markets with blast and ballistic rated building; and

WHEREAS, since MBI decided to secure a facility and workforce able to meet its demands in Shreveport, Louisiana, on September 16, 2004, MBI entered into a Sublease Agreement with Beaird, which is attached hereto as Exhibit D, whereby MBI sub-leased office space and access to 200,000 square feet of fabrication area that Beaird is currently leasing from the City; and

WHEREAS, MBI is in the process of securing large contracts for production and manufacturing that could extend several years and desires to protect its interest should Beaird default on its lease with the City of Shreveport; and

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport desires to have MBI establish and maintain a manufacturing plant in the community and agrees to assure MBI that should Beaird default under the terms of the Agreement and Lease, that MBI will have the exclusive right and option to lease the same premise under the same terms and conditions set forth in the Agreement and Lease and the Amendment to same; and

WHEREAS, MBI’s right to exercise its Option to Lease shall commence immediately upon any uncured default by Beaird and shall remain effective for a period of six months from the date of default; and

WHEREAS, MBI agrees that nothing in this Option to Lease shall limit Beaird from exercising any and all rights under the Agreement and Lease and the Amendment to same, including Beaird’s right to assign its rights under the Lease, provided Beaird is not in default of the Lease and has failed to cure said default.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, legal and regular session convened, that Keith P. Hightower, Mayor, be and is hereby authorized to execute an Option to Lease between the City of Shreveport and MB Industries, LLC, substantially in accordance with the draft thereof filed in the Office of the Clerk of Council on May 18, 2005, attached hereto as Exhibit E.

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 Carmody, seconded by Councilman Gibson to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

RESOLUTION NO. 93 OF 2005

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE SIGNATURE OF THE MAYOR ON A PERMANENT RIGHT OF WAY AND EASEMENT DOCUMENT, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO

WHEREAS, Section 4.17 of the Charter of the City of Shreveport contemplates the adoption of a resolution prior to the Mayor's execution of any contract and/or agreement in which the City of Shreveport is a party and/or has an interest.

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport has been requested to grant a permanent Right of Way and Easement to Southwestern Electric Power Company (SWEPCO) in association with the construction of the Shreveport Convention Center, attached hereto as Exhibit A.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, legal and regular session convened, that it hereby authorizes the Mayor's signature on the abovementioned permanent Right of Way and Easement.

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 Carmody to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

RESOLUTION NO. 94 OF 2005

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE SIGNATURE OF THE MAYOR ON A PERMANENT RIGHT OF WAY AND EASEMENT DOCUMENT, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO

WHEREAS, Section 4.17 of the Charter of the City of Shreveport contemplates the adoption of a resolution prior to the Mayor's execution of any contract and/or agreement in which the City of Shreveport is a party and/or has an interest.

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport has been requested to grant a permanent Right of Way and Easement to Southwestern Electric Power Company (SWEPCO) in association with the construction of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineer's Visitor's Center, attached hereto as Exhibit A.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, legal and regular session convened, that it hereby authorizes the Mayor's signature on the abovementioned permanent Right of Way and Easement.

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 to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

6. **Resolution No., 97 of 2005**: A resolution creating a False Alarm Committee to assist the Police Department in lowering the amount of false alarms received by the City and otherwise providing with respect thereto

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Hogan to adopt.

Councilman Gibson: Thank you Mr. Chair. This committee was or this legislation was requested by the security industry who had come to me saying that they appreciated that there was some work done by the Police Department to look into some of the problems we're dealing with, (inaudible) alarms. Obviously the (inaudible) alarms and the amount of false alarms associated with that have created an undue burden on the police department. This committee is not and work associated, would not be something that would be designed to generate revenue, but a process that would assist law enforcement in focusing their resources on protecting the public. This can be obtained by a cross section of security industry, law enforcement, business and Council Members. Obviously the Council represents the citizens of the business community. If you'll look on the legislation, we're suggesting that the Chambers of Commerce of Shreveport, The Greater Shreveport Chamber of Commerce and the African-American Chamber of Commerce because obviously anything that comes out of it would affect their particular businesses. There's also concerns from non-profit organizations in terms of some of the things that affect their particular interest in this particular issue. Obviously we heard earlier today from Councilman or Commissioner Cox, on the vicious dog committee, they had a great cross section composition of membership to work to provide a broad base of input for a solution to a community issue. And I think that this particular committee would be just in line with that particular situation in the fact that legislation dealing with this particular matter needs to have a broad form of input from and as you see the composite make up being the state wide Louisiana Life and Safety and Security Association, which a member would come from them, a member of the local Louisiana Life and Safety and Security Association, the Chambers of Commerce, and obviously the City of Shreveport along with City Council representatives. I understand that, and I saw the comments in the paper from the Chief. I'd ask for a copy of the minutes of some of the work that they had done. He said that there were no minutes taken, but instead he gave me a timetable of some of the things that took place. He also stated that I attended one of those meetings. I wasn't aware that, that was a particular committee that met. We met over at Kon Tiki one night, in fact Councilman Walford and myself were invited, and I was the only one that showed up for the Council for that particular meeting. But at that meeting, the security industry is the one who said, don't you think it would be prudent to have a Council Committee made up of business and industry along with legislative and law enforcement people? And that's where I took my lead thinking that this Council has created a variety of committees in the past and have brought what I consider great forms of input, whether it be Code Enforcement, whether it be

Sexually Oriented Businesses and other things like that. And I think the intent would be to have this committee on a fast track to take what the law enforcement people have put together over the last year and blend in input from both business and industry along with the City Council to take input from the residential side of things. And see if we can bring a fast solution to the table in order to assist our law enforcement who is spending and the Administration is very much aware of, spending at least 20% of their resources tracking down false alarms. But that is the intent gentlemen. That is only the intent and again, it's not to recreate the wheel. A lot of work has already been done by law enforcement in the Chief's department, but at the same time, we have some tremendous people and I saw only one security company that was met with in the list of information that was provided by the Chief. And I believe that was Guardian Alarm. But as we've heard from Brinks, there are several other groups out there that feel like they could lend their assistance to this which I think will only better what the intended output would be and that is to reduce the overall false alarms in Shreveport and provide more resources for the Police Department to focus on our citizens.

Councilman Walford: Captain Floyd, could I get you and Corporal Adams to come forward please?

Councilman Green: Would you all state your names, so that she will be able to recognize you in the minutes?

Cpt Floyd: Captain Steve Floyd, Shreveport Police Department, 1234 Texas Avenue.

Cpl Adams: Corporal Jeanie Adams, Shreveport Police Department, 1234 Texas Avenue.

Councilman Walford: Let's clear the air on a couple of things. First of all, I'll ask you to confirm that we have not ignored the alarm operators, we have not limited our conversations to one operator. Would you please confirm that.

Cpt Floyd: I have a list here and we talked either face-to-face or by telephone or met with Acadian on Watch, had a good conversation with them. Alarmtec, we had a pretty good conversation with them. Bayou Security Systems, Communications One, Guardian Alarms and Interface Security Systems.

Councilman Walford: And I understand that if we go forward and introduce the ordinance, the next meeting or the following meeting that there were at least two of those companies that would come forward and speak in support of the ordinance?

Cpt Floyd: Yes sir.

Councilman Walford: Do you mind? I'll summarize if you'd like or but - - - I'll do it. We started shortly after the consultant came and told us about the time that was being spent. But I guess we really got going in earnest about the first of the year?

Cpt Floyd: Yes sir.

Councilman Walford: So, we have about six months of serious effort into this new ordinance, and would you agree with me that we're two or three weeks away from being able to present it to the Council?

Cpt Floyd: We anticipate it being ready for the next Council Session at the end of the month of June.

Councilman Walford: I'm not going to put you on the spot and ask you why somebody is trying to get Mr. Gibson to look otherwise, but would it be safe to say that we put some onness now on the alarm operators, some responsibility in this ordinance?

Cpt Floyd: Yes sir, and I believe that one of the reasons why it's taking us so long is that we've tried to look at the responsibilities of all the entities involved which would be the user, the

alarm business, the monitoring companies, the police department, as well as our finance department with the City is also affected by this. The billing of the false alarms and so forth. So there's several entities involved in this. And getting all these people together at one time, is almost impossible. So we had met with different sections over a period of time (inaudible)

Councilman Walford: Well, I certainly appreciate your efforts and I really enjoyed working with you on this. I've enjoyed reading the ordinances from other cities, including some you didn't furnish me, that were furnished by the State Association. Clearly, they don't want our ordinance. They want no ownership on the operator is what it's coming down to I think. I did take your figures that you gave me yesterday for the man hours involved, annualizing 2004, if we got rid of the false alarms completely, we would essentially have 11 more officers on the street.

Cpt Floyd: Somewhere in that area, yes sir.

Councilman Walford: Cause we had 21,087 hours, I don't want to say wasted, but since they were false alarms, that's the best word I can come up with. We wasted 21,087 hours responding to false alarms. We used somewhere we had the fuel usage - - - \$42,493 worth of fuel at \$1.87 per gallon to respond to these. We're not including the wear and tear on patrol cars and so on. We've put an awful lot into it. Why are you laughing about my \$1.87 per gallon?

Mayor Hightower: I'm not, I'm not.

Councilman Walford: So, I think it's safe to say that we can come forward with an ordinance that we truly believe is ready to help reduce the false alarm problem without putting an undue burden on the businesses, without putting an undue burden on the alarm businesses or the businesses and the residences that have alarm systems. Are you comfortable with that? I am.

Cpt Floyd: Yes sir. (Inaudible) objective was try again. We looked at all the entities involved in it and tried to look at the responsibilities of each. And in crafting the ordinance we tried to make each responsible for what they should be responsible for as far as the user of the alarm system, the monitoring businesses as well as the police department and our communication center in how we dispatch and do the whole sequence down the line. We tried to make it as we think fair for everybody. The user, the alarm business, as well as law enforcement and again, when we say law enforcement, but there's a lot of other entities involved with our financing and everything.

Councilman Walford: Let me ask you a loaded question again. This is asking for an opinion, but based on our conversations with alarm operators, (inaudible), is it safe to say that most agree with what we've come up with?

Cpt Floyd: It's probably about 50-50 I would think, and that's a rough estimate. Some that we have talked to are comfortable with the alarm ordinance as we had written it. There were some that wanted us to go to a permitting system which we were against. It creates an unnecessary system. It also adds costs to the user or a business on their alarms. Having to have a permit, it just adds cost to that. And we didn't think that was fair or right, and we didn't think - - - we don't have the funds, we don't have the personnel or even the civilian personnel to create a whole alarm unit that we would have to have using this permitted system. We just don't have it.

Cpl Adams: As long as it's not a false alarm, it really isn't a police concern. It's the alarms whether they're real or false. How many people have alarm systems in the City is not a law enforcement issue. It may be an alarm association issue, but it is not a law enforcement issue.

Councilman Walford: Let me ask you to address one other thing that we discussed and Councilman Jackson and I had had a discussion on this some time back. And that is addressing what might not be a false alarm if there was indeed an attempted entry, and an appeals process

for those who are billed for a false alarm to have some opportunity for their day in court, so to speak, with an administrator who can waive that fee.

Cpl Adams: And we have worked that through the system. When you talk about we didn't really get into gear until after the first of the year, everything before the first of the year was (inaudible). And our alarm coordinator unfortunately doesn't have an alarm in her house. So, we have worked that issue with her, making sure that she understands. The alarm's doing it's job if go to your business and you find marks at the back door. The alarm did it's job. That should not be fined. We've also gone to the extent to include and for the alarm company that we talked to had minor things. In fact Communications One suggested that we allow a waiver of an alarm if they have their alarm serviced. Which only benefits the police department. As long as your alarm is in good working order. So, we've put that in there also.

Councilman Walford: Thank y'all very much. Gentlemen, the long and short of it is I appreciate where Councilman Gibson is coming from. I've had I don't know how many telephone calls from the gentleman that he's dealing with. We have a good ordinance. I intend to introduce it in two weeks. I think that to establish a committee now would be going backwards. You're welcomed to read it as with any ordinance, you can attach amendments if you want to. If there's something you don't like, but these folks have done a tremendous job, the Chief has done a great job working with us, and I think we have a good product and I'll introduce it to you in either the next meeting, no later than the meeting following that. So, I would urge a no vote on the committee. I don't think it's necessary right now. And I would be glad to share any of my notes, any of my information with any of you.

Councilman Green: Let me ask one question. What is considered as a false alarm?

Cpt Floyd: Whenever a alarm goes off at a residence and that is transmitted to a monitoring company. The monitoring company calls the police department and tells the police department we have an alarm at such and such residential address. We dispatch police officers to that address in response to that alarm. We get there and there's nothing wrong. That's a false alarm.

Councilman Green: What if somebody kicked the door, but of course you didn't see the print, but they were actually trying to get in, but they didn't succeed? Of course that person, once the alarm goes off, that person is gone. So, is that still considered a false alarm?

Cpt Floyd: No sir, it is not.

Councilman Green: But once the police officer gets there, then the guy is gone, there is no evidence that - - - you can't see a print, but in order for that to go off and something either had to hit the back door or the front door, but the person once they hear the alarm, they're gone. So, how do we justify that? Or is there any - - - I don't want to put you on the spot.

Cpl Adams: Well, I have an alarm in my house. And I have a child. A friend of ours comes and knocks on the back door too hard. That's the on the glass. I have a glass break sensor. It goes off. I'm going to be charged with a false alarm for that. However, alarm technology is so advanced not, that it's a sensitivity issue. Just like if your dog sets off your motion sensor. Technology is to the point that I have a nine pound dog who goes and sets my motion sensor off. Now if I had an alarm system that hadn't been updated in 20 years, certainly that would happen. So, when you talk about if a guy comes and hits the door too hard, now if there's marks on the door, if there's damage, and as a police officer, if I check your business, I don't know your business like you do. I may look around, I may call it a false alarm. You get there Monday morning, you find a pry mark on the back door. Didn't do anything that makes a mark, but you noticed. Then you call and that's what Councilman Walford's talking about. We

had a constituent with that issue, and was charged and they should not have been. Because the alarm's doing it's job. Somebody attempted to get in and it detected it.

Cpt Floyd: And that's part of the appeals process that's built in there. If that should occur, they bring that to the (inaudible) administrator who is the Chief of Police or his designee and show you, "I got a pry mark on my house". Of course, that would be taken out of a false alarm.

Cpl Adams: Now, is the system perfect? No sir, it's not. Like I say, that child knocks on my back door, I'm going to be charged for that until I correct it.

Councilman Green: We're going to go to Councilman Jackson, and then we'll go to Councilman Carmody and then Councilman Gibson, but before we do that, as I can appreciate it, this is not - - - we're not debating on the ordinance today, where we are is about forming the committee. And I would like to apologize to Councilman Gibson, and to Councilman Walford because I didn't know that you all had done as much work as has been said. And when I talked to Councilman Gibson on last Friday, he said there was some work being done, but I didn't know that you all were at this stage here. So as being Chairman, I said to Councilman Gibson, go on and make the connections because I'm out of town, but I didn't know that you all were ready to bring a product to the Council. And I think whatever we're debating about now should be the debate come three weeks or whenever we bring the ordinance. But we'll start with Councilman Jackson and then we'll go to Councilman Carmody, and then Councilman Gibson.

Councilman Jackson: Well and maybe, and Mr. Chairman, maybe my comments may be premature. If that is the case, I'll just say then defer to Councilman Gibson and then suggest that maybe based on what I've learned today from this conversation, this communication that it may be that this particular resolution, and I'm assuming that Councilman Gibson may be aware already of what the police department is doing. Maybe he wasn't before he started this resolution. Because it seems that maybe the resolution may be premature if we've already put man hours behind it, doesn't mean that we may not need this because it may come back when the resolution is presented at such time to say 'these are some holes, and we think there are some problems and the best resolution may in fact be to put a committee together who can shine some light on some of the issues that all of us here have limited experience with. So, it's not necessarily that this is a bad resolution, it just may be premature in light of the fact that the police department has expended and it seems like the essence of this is how we save money. And make sure we have the highest and best use of the police department, the police force's time. I'd hate to be hypocritical and say the time you spent didn't mean anything, cause that'd be again tantamount to a waste of some department's time. So, I would certainly request rather than what Councilman Walford talked about a no vote. I don't know if that's necessary. Perhaps what we can do if this Councilman who is the sponsor, Councilman Gibson so chooses to hold out until we see the ordinance and perhaps consider this resolution at that time.

Councilman Carmody: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I do think that it would be helpful if you could go ahead and circulate the draft of the legislation to those alarm companies that are licensed to do business here in the City of Shreveport and at least let them have a chance to peruse that information first. My suggestion though and I've discussed this with the Chief, was that our 911 Communications Center has certainly got enough ability to tract the municipal addresses for where the alarms occur. And I would think that if we would place the responsibility on the service provider, the alarm company pay those fees, then they could in turn bill their subscriber. As I appreciate it, any alarm owner is given three false alarms at no cost by the City?

Cpl. Adams: Currently, yes.

Councilman Carmody: So, we must be tracking how many times we're going back. But it would appear to me that if we had the ability then to communicate that to their provider, whoever the alarm company is that's licensed to do business in the city to say alright for this particular address, we've now been there three times, these are the dates in which we've responded to false alarms. The next time, we'll have to charge, but we'll will be charging you and maybe do that as part of their occupation license when they renew. And again, I think the motivation then would be that if they were going to take on a new subscriber that they were going to make sure that the system that was in that property was up to their standards to make sure that they weren't going to have lightening strikes or thunder claps that caused the system to activate is my suggestion. As far as forming the committee, I would almost be more interested today gentlemen in letting us see this draft of the proposed legislation. And then at that time decide whether or not we wanted to pursue a committee. Thank you Mr. Gibson.

Councilman Gibson: Thank you Mr. Chair. Cpt, your boss gave me a timetable. Only one company was listed, and that was Guardian Alarms. This two page outline going back to the very inception of how this took place. I was aware that work was taking place. At the meeting that he stated that I was at, which I was and you were there too, I would say at least 80% of the companies that were present in that room were the ones that said, 'Councilman to be fair and equitable to everybody, would you consider a Council Committee'? That's when I contacted Councilman Green. And again, it wasn't to ignore the hard work. Y'all've done a tremendous job on this thing. I don't want anybody to walk out of this room thinking that this was an effort to say let's start from scratch. I think I've already stated that it would take - - - this is obviously going to affect both residential and business in town. And again, this Council is out there representing the constituents, the Chambers of Commerce represent the business community, both the African-American and the White community. And I felt that it was one of those things to kind of bring it full circle and make sure that we didn't leave any stone unturned. Based on the input, I'm not carrying anybody's message. I can speak for myself in terms of what's going on out there. But it was to bring a broad cross section of which, again, I only see one company listed that was visited with. I do see here that on April 29th, that alarm companies were given copies of the alarm ordinance draft to review and provide input. Is that correct?

Cpt Floyd: Yes sir.

Councilman Gibson: So every registered alarm company in Shreveport has a copy of this draft?

Cpl Adams: Those seven that were mentioned to you and that's my mistake. The rest of the companies were emailed or telecommed. They did not have time to meet with us.

Councilman Gibson: We do they have a copy of the ordinance as we speak?

Cpl Adams: Yes they were either emailed or mailed a copy of the ordinance.

Councilman Gibson: Well again, Brinks' representative was here and I don't know if he got a copy, but he obviously stated he wanted input. Obviously, the more input we can get from the security firms out there which y'all work real closely with, obviously that was my interest in this process. And again I would not have one problem in postponing this in order to see the ordinance. Just disappointed we had not gotten that a little ahead of time. Because again premature or not, maybe we could have looked at that, and then gone back and done some reviews. I do appreciate Chief Campbell on June 7th providing me detail. I asked in an email to hem to provide me the minutes to the meeting. He stated that there were no minutes taken of those meetings, that they weren't required to like City Council. Which again, Council

Committees - - - that's one thing I like about Council Committees. That somewhere down the line, there's going to be another group of people up here. Whether it be five years, 10 years or 15 years down the line, and it would be nice to track the thought process that went through. And when minutes were taken of what's going on, and when a Council Committee just like with Sexual Oriented Business and Vicious Dog Committee and things of that nature, there's some minutes. It may not be the most detailed in the world, but it's pretty detailed to where somebody can at least read through there and see the thought process to where they wouldn't have to recreate that wheel and pick up where y'all left off. And so, again as part of the spirit of my legislation on this situation. But again, I have no problem postponing this thing and actually, Mr. Chair, I'll make a motion that we would postpone this in order to have a chance to review the legislation.

Substitute Motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Jackson to postpone this resolution. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 6. Nays: Councilman Carmody. 1.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, we have another resolution that can be adopted at this time. Would you like for me to read it?

Councilman Green: Yes sir.

The Clerk read the following:

RESOLUTION NO. 106 OF 2005

A RESOLUTION WELCOMING THE WEYERHAEUSER COMPANY TO SHREVEPORT AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO

By: Councilman Theron Jackson

WHEREAS, the Weyerhaeuser Company, an international forest products company with annual sales of \$19.9 billion, was founded in 1900 and currently employs approximately 53,646 people in 19 countries; and

WHEREAS, the mission of the Weyerhaeuser Company is to improve the quality of life in communities and increase understanding of the importance and sustainability of forests and the products they provide to meet people's needs; and

WHEREAS, the Weyerhaeuser Company began its operation in the state of Louisiana in 1996; and

WHEREAS, the Weyerhaeuser Company has operations in Shreveport and in other places in Louisiana, which employ 2,000 people; and

WHEREAS, the Weyerhaeuser Company will have a meeting on June 15th, at Sam's Town Casino in Shreveport.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened welcomes the Weyerhaeuser Company to Shreveport, and recognizes and thanks the Weyerhaeuser Company for being a good and valuable corporate citizen of Shreveport and of Louisiana.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Council also thanks the Weyerhaeuser Company for meeting at Sam's Town Casino in Shreveport, and invites the corporate officers to hold regular meetings in Shreveport and to visit this City often.

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.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Gibson to adopt.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, just prior to doing this, let me say thank you to Council for considering this today and these individuals who will be here will be the Board of Directors for Weyerhaeuser and this is a tribute to Shreveport in a lot of ways. And I think that it is symbolic of what the future will be. I believe with people choosing this as a destination because of what's happening in Northwest Louisiana, and the potential of what will happen in Northwest Louisiana. Just FYI, this company is a Louisiana based company started in Louisiana, but is a multinational company and a very large company. It's the first time, even though they were started in the State of Louisiana, this was the first time that they've had their Board Meeting in the State of Louisiana. And as their first Board in Louisiana, I think it's an honor to have it here in Shreveport. And I was having some discussions with some people in the Department of Forestry yesterday, and it was brought to my attention that they indeed were coming to Shreveport. And I just thought it appropriate for us as both Council and we as citizens to welcome them to Shreveport and certainly hope that they will choose to come back one day real soon. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS:

1. **Resolution No. 98 of 2005**: A resolution authorizing the employment of special legal counsel to represent the City of Shreveport and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
2. **Resolution No. 99 of 2005**: A resolution authorizing the employment of special legal counsel to represent the City of Shreveport and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
3. **Resolution No. 100 of 2005**: A resolution acknowledging that the City Council has reviewed the internal "Municipal Water Pollution Prevention Report" concerning the North Regional and Lucas Wastewater Plants.
4. **Resolution No. 101 of 2005**: A resolution authorizing the Mayor to enter into a contract with the Southern Hills Business Association and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (E/Hogan)
5. **Resolution No. 102 of 2005**: A Resolution ratifying the execution of documents by the Mayor accepting a grant on behalf of U.S. Support Company and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
6. **Resolution No. 103 of 2005**: A Resolution acknowledging and approving a request from the City of Shreveport to swap the variable interest rate to a fixed interest rate swap with respect to the aggregate principal amount of \$40,000,000 Louisiana Local Government Environmental Facilities and Community Development Authority Revenue Bonds (**SHREVEPORT CONVENTION CENTER HOTEL PROJECT**) Series 2005;

Authorizing officers of the issuer to execute certain documents including a schedule to the ISDA Master Agreement and Trade Confirmation in order for AMBAC Financial Products, LLC to deliver the Swap Policy; and providing for other matters with respect thereto.

7. **Resolution No. 104 of 2005**: A Resolution acknowledging and approving a request from the City of Shreveport to swap the variable interest rate to a fixed interest rate swap with respect to the aggregate principal amount of \$30,000,000 Louisiana Local Government Environmental Facilities and Community Development Authority Revenue Bonds (**CITY OF SHREVEPORT/INDEPENDENCE STADIUM PROJECT**) Series 2000 and Series 2000A; Authorizing Officers of the issuer to execute certain documents including a schedule to the ISDA Master Agreement and Trade Confirmation in order for JP Morgan Chase & Co. to deliver the swap policy; and providing for other matters with respect thereto.
8. **Resolution No. 105 of 2005**: A resolution authorizing the waiver of building permit fees and authorizing the donation of building materials and supplies to 12 to qualified low income homeowners in the City of Shreveport and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Hogan, seconded by Councilman Lester to introduce Resolution No(s). 98, 99, 100, 101, 102, 103, 104, and 105 of 2005 to lay over until June 28, 2005 meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None

INTRODUCTION OF ORDINANCES:

1. **Ordinance No. 84 of 2005**: An ordinance amending the 2005 Capital Improvements Budget
2. **Ordinance No. 85 of 2005**: An ordinance amending the 2005 Budget for the Police Grants Special Revenue Fund.
3. **Ordinance No. 86 of 2005**: An ordinance creating and establishing the intersection of E. 85th Street and Panatela Lane as a stop intersection and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
4. **Ordinance No. 87 of 2005**: An ordinance declaring the City's interest in certain adjudicated properties as surplus and otherwise providing with respect thereto. (A/Lester/C/Carmody)
5. **Ordinance No. 88 of 2005**: An ordinance closing and abandoning a 15 foot wide parcel of land located behind lots 162 and 163 in the Forest Oak Subdivision located in the SW ¼ of Section 21 (T17N-R14W), Caddo Parish, Louisiana and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (F/Green)
6. **Ordinance No. 89 of 2005**: An ordinance closing and abandoning a 20 foot wide alleyway in the 5800 block of Southern Avenue abutting lots 1 thru 11 and a part of lot 12 of Block "C" and running adjacent to I-49 on the west side of the south side Park Subdivision located in Section 24 (T17N-R14W), Caddo Parish, Louisiana and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (C/Carmody)

7. **Ordinance No. 90 of 2005**: An ordinance amending Sections 1179 of Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
8. **Ordinance No. 91 of 2005**: Amending and reenacting Section 26-243 of the Code of Ordinances relative to the Architectural And Engineering Selection Process and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
9. **Ordinance No. 92 of 2005**: Creating Section 22-28 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport Portable Storage Containers, that sets the rules for use, sets a fee for the licenses, and sets penalties for failure to abide by standards, and otherwise providing with respect thereto
10. **Ordinance No. 93 of 2005**: An ordinance amending and reenacting Section 3.01 of Ordinance No. 96 of 1980 relative to exemptions and exclusions from sales and use taxes and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
11. **Ordinance No. 94 of 2005** - ZONING – C-43-05: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinances by rezoning property located southeast of the intersection of East 70th Street and Dixie Meadows Drive, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from R-3, Urban, Multiple-Family Residence District and B-2, Neighborhood Business District, to R-3, Urban Multiple-Family Residence District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (C/Carmody)
12. **Ordinance No. 95 of 2005**: ZONING – C-45-05: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinances, by rezoning property located on the southeast corner of Greenwood Road and West Bert Kouns Industrial Loop, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from R-A, Residence-Agriculture District, to B-3, Community Business District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (G/Jackson)
13. **Ordinance No. 98 of 2005**: An Ordinance to repeal Ordinance No. 27 of 2004: To rescind and cancel the servitude and encroachment authorized therein, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
14. **Ordinance No. 99 of 2005**: An Ordinance to enact section 42-217 of the City of Shreveport Code of Ordinances relative to license permits and business regulation and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Hogan to introduce Ordinance No(s). 84, 85, 86, 87, 88, 89, 90, 91, 92, 93, 94, 95, 98, and 99 of 2005 to lay over until June 28, 2005 meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None

INTRODUCTION OF ORDINANCES

1. **Ordinance No. 96 of 2005**: An ordinance creating Section 22-28 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport, Portable Storage Containers, that sets the rules for use, sets a fee for the licenses, and sets penalties for failure to abide by standards, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

2. **Ordinance No. 97 of 2005**: An ordinance authorizing the use of the Cargill Soccer Association/SU and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (G/Jackson)

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Lester to introduce Ordinance No(s). 96 and 97 of 2005 to lay over until July 12, 2005 meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None

ORDINANCES ON SECOND READING AND FINAL PASSAGE

1. **Ordinance No. 28 of 2005**: An ordinance amending Chapter 14 of the Code of Ordinances, styled Animals, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (F/Green) (Postponed – May 24, 2005)

Having passed first reading on March 8, 2005 was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Carmody to postpone. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

2. **Ordinance No. 47 of 2005**: An ordinance amending Ordinance No. 40 of 2003 relative to changing the name of the Shreveport Blanchard Road from the Roy Road to North Hearne Avenue to Hilry Huckaby III Avenue and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (A/Lester) (Postponed – May 10, 2005)

Having passed first reading on April 12, 2005 was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Green to postpone. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 4. Nays: Councilmen Walford and Carmody, and Gibson. 3.

3. **Ordinance No. 72 of 2005**: An ordinance amending the 2005 Budget for the Fleet Services Internal Service Fund.

Having passed first reading on May 24, 2005 was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Lester to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

4. **Ordinance No. 73 of 2005**: An ordinance amending the 2005 General Fund Budget.

Having passed first reading on May 24, 2005 was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Carmody to adopt. *The Clerk read the following amendment:*

Amendment No. to Ordinance No. 73 of 2005

AMEND THE ORDINANCE AS FOLLOWS:

In Section 2 (Appropriations):

In City Marshal, reduce Personal Services by \$10,000 and increase Materials and Supplies by \$10,000.

Motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Walford to adopt Amendment No. 1. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

Motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Walford to adopt Ordinance No. 73 of 2005 as amended. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

Councilman Gibson: Mr. Chairman, my vote should have been a “NO” on item 47, and I registered it as “YES”. It was up on the screen, when I pushed “NO”.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, are we to change that vote?

Councilman Walford: I have no objection.

Councilman Green: Yes.

Councilman Gibson: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

5. **Ordinance No. 74 of 2005**: An ordinance amending the 2005 Budget for the SPORTRAN Enterprise Fund.

Having passed first reading on May 24, 2005 was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Jackson, seconded by Councilman Hogan to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

6. **Ordinance No. 75 of 2005**: An ordinance amending the 2005 Budget for the Water and Sewerage Enterprise Fund.

Having passed first reading on May 24, 2005 was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Carmody to adopt.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Chairman, if I could ask Mr. Strong to come forward. Good afternoon Sir. This ordinance is amending the 2005 Budget for Water and Sewer Enterprise Fund. Specifically transfer funds within the Water and Sewer Budget to cover the overall effect of taking on the Bioset operations of the wastewater, sludge disposal site. Contractual services

are reduced by \$1.9 million. That is a reduction of what we would be paying to Bioset to perform the function out there on the sludge field?

Mr. Strong: Yes sir.

Councilman Carmody: You are increasing your personnel costs by \$188,000 to pay for five employees. Is this just for the half of the year?

Mr. Strong: No sir.

Councilman Carmody: How long will \$188,000 employ these five individuals?

Mr. Strong: Well it'll go for the full amount of time that we have set up there. When it came in, be slightly over a year.

Councilman Carmody: But this would just be through the budget year 2005, right?

Mr. Strong: That's correct.

Councilman Carmody: Okay, and then materials and supplies increased by \$350,000 to cover site expenses. What are they?

Mr. Strong: Yes sir. That's the materials and supplies. This gets into some of your chemicals and things of that sort. As a matter of fact, that's what it'll be for.

Councilman Carmody: Okay, improving equipment increased by \$455,000 to allow for the purchase of the equipment to replace the leased equipment used by Bioset?

Mr. Strong: That's correct.

Councilman Carmody: And then increase by \$553,500 notes payable, this is the City of Shreveport assuming the debt obligations of Bioset attaining it through the fiscal year or I should say budget year 2005?

Mr. Strong: That's what it's set up for. Now that decision has not been reached yet.

Councilman Carmody: That was why I wanted to ask. Because I know that we've got consideration of hiring legal counsel. We've made no payments, but is it premature to budget to make those payments if we've not retained legal counsel yet?

Mr. Strong: I don't think it's premature, I mean, the money will be there in an account for whatever comes out. If we don't use it, it stays there. And that's the same thing with the equipment. Currently right now we are just leasing the equipment on a month-to-month process until we decided exactly what we will do. At that time, we will go forward and purchase or not purchase.

Councilman Carmody: Are we concerned about liens being filed against our sludge field? Is that why we're taking this action? That's the background information that's listed here.

Mr. Strong: This is to put the money in the correct items of the budget. I mean it's all under one area right now which is under the contractual services, and this is to put it in each line item where it should be.

Councilman Carmody: Gentlemen, I'm still very concerned about the City of Shreveport continuing the operations of this particular business without having seen the first blade of grass. But I can appreciate the Director of Operational Services (inaudible) to budget for it. Thank you Mr. Strong.

Mr. Strong: And Councilman, I'll say something too on this. I mean, you say you're concerned about operating the facility. We've got to do something with the sludge.

Councilman Carmody: Yes sir. I understand.

Mr. Strong: So, you've got to do something. Now if you don't operate it here, whether or not you're growing the grass is one thing, though which I'm still upset about that, but the point of the matter is, you've still got to handle your sludge.

Councilman Carmody: Right, but I guess my point would be that if we're going to go ahead and add chemicals to spread the sludge around, and still not receive any benefit from it, what would be the harm in spreading the sludge without the chemicals and five new employees with (inaudible)? And again, I'm not trying to - - - I'm sure that the gentlemen out there with Bioset are quality employees and are doing a good job at what they were doing, it's just a doggone shame that the responsible parties didn't fulfill their obligations to the contract. But to go from one type of sludge to another type of sludge and still be in the process of (inaudible), we seem to be taking on additional major costs to do that function. As you said, we still have to do it anyway. Correct?

Mr. Strong: I'm going to question whether we taking out a lot more additional costs. Because we can look at different ways of handling. You're going to have a lot of it. One of the things that we are not doing right now is the situation with the (inaudible). That decision has not been made. That's a legal issue that's going to be looked at down the line. But the issue that we're doing right now, if you put the sludge on the ground out there without some sort of a treatment process that we are doing with this, then you're going to have issues that we had before. (inaudible) or the way we're doing it right now, is free. Free of (inaudible), you're not getting that. So the bacterial is not there. This is more of a product that's in there. Do I like to put it in there? No, I don't like to put it in there, I'd like to use it, I'd like to sell some of it. We're still trying to do that and get that set up with the LSU AG Center. That's being worked on right now. And if we can come up with that. If you're going to haul it to the landfill, there is an enormous trucking cost. Then there's the disposal cost that goes into that too. So, it's going to be a costs one way or the other. And so, I don't want you to think that this is what we're doing is throwing away money, because it's not. There's some environmental issues that goes along with the way that we're proceeding right now. So, I'm comfortable with where we are right now, and I think you'll be comfortable once we get to the end of the legal process or to a portion of the legal process.

Councilman Carmody: Try to get comfortable with it Mike. Thank you Sir. I appreciate it.

Mr. Strong: Yes sir.

Councilman Lester: Thank you Mr. Chairman. As I appreciate it, the reason why we're in the situation is the person we contracted with walked away from this contract, walked away from the whole nine yards to let the City hold the bag. Is that not correct?

Mr. Strong: 100% correct.

Councilman Lester: So, now it's not our fault that we have to operate the sludge is because Bioset or whoever they were, be they the Louisiana Bioset L.L.C or Bioset Texas, just dropped the ball, isn't that correct?

Mr. Strong: That is correct.

Councilman Lester: So, now our choice is one of two things. 1) we could throw up our hands and sit on our hands and say "oh no, it's me, what do we do"? or we can take what we have which is now a municipal asset as I appreciate it, work the contract and do what Bioset was supposed to do in the first place. Isn't that correct?

Mr. Strong: That's what we're doing. We're not to the sod growing yet, we're still working with that. We're talking about it. There may even be a possibility that we go out and look at another RFP. I have more proposals submitted in for a different process. We don't know yet.

Councilman Lester: But the reason why you're having to make these judgement calls is because Bioset walked away from the contract.

Mr. Strong: Totally walked off (inaudible)

Councilman Lester: Let me ask this question. What if the City would have said, okay Bioset has walked away from it's contract this issue clearly is going to be litigated and I think we've put in motion the idea of hiring legal counsel. What would have happened if we would have said 'lets do nothing'? I mean, when I say nothing, I mean absolutely nothing. Just turn the locks off at the plant, put the keys away and done nothing, what would have happened?

Mr. Strong: We would have backed up with sludge, we would have had to done something with these 15 tons of (inaudible) sludge per day that would have been coming in.

Councilman Lester: Would there have been a cost associated with dealing with that sludge?

Mr. Strong: That is correct. There was a cost before when we were operating the sludge field. We've got the undigested sludge that would be going out there, of whether we spray it on the field or whether or not we would had to purchase the dryers and presses to have handled it so we could then haul it to the landfill. There is a cost with anything that you do.

Councilman Lester: So, let me get this straight. If we would have done nothing. Turned the power off, locked the door, walked away from it like Bioset done, we still would have had the cost of dealing with the sludge and I would imagine we probably would be starting to get some calls from the EPA and DEQ as it relates to environmental issues, wouldn't that'd be something right around the corner?

Mr. Strong: Without a doubt. That's why we got out of doing it the way that we were doing it before to go to bringing it up to a Class A standard.

Councilman Lester: Now, as I appreciate it this whole deal with Bioset, without getting into the minutia, if Bioset would have worked the contract as it was originally contemplated by this particular point in the contract, not only would they have had the specific performance as it relates to growing the sod, which is a product that they can sell or give to us. They would have also had a Class A material that could be used as a fertilizer, so that's two products. Isn't that correct?

Mr. Strong: That's correct.

Councilman Lester: Now, if Bioset can use this process and get two products that can be sold on the open market in Shreveport or whatever and generate income, are we prohibited from getting sod and fertilizer that can generate income?

Mr. Strong: No sir. That's what we're looking at doing ourselves in doing this. Even if they had stayed on the site in operated it, we would have been making a fee off that, because we were in a profit sharing - - -

Councilman Lester: Okay, so because they've gone and its fallen to us, instead of it being a profit sharing, as we move through this process, we could basically get the complete revenue of the sod and the secondary product?

Mr. Strong: This is why I'm working with the LSU AG Center. To find us some potential customers that we could sell the bulk. And this is a lime-based fertilizer that we have, to some of the forestry companies that are wanting it now. So, instead of sharing and us getting 20%, we could very well get 100%. But I hope I get 100% of something, rather than 100% of nothing. That's what we're trying to (inaudible).

Councilman Lester: And so basically, what you're saying is anybody that's an entrepreneur, there are costs associated with doing whatever business that you do. And as I

appreciate it, there was a contract of services payment of \$1.9 million. What did the \$1.9 million represent?

Mr. Strong: This was based upon the price per ton that we were sending into Bioset that would cover the full operations. Which would go for the operation and maintenance of the facility to treat our sludge and then also to go to sod and market.

Councilman Lester: So now, even if Bioset was still there, we would still be paying the \$1.9 million as per the contract, correct?

Mr. Strong: Say that again?

Councilman Lester: If Bioset was still operational, would we still have the expense of \$1.9 million in contractual services?

Mr. Strong: Yes sir.

Councilman Lester: So, at the end of the day, the \$1.9 million as opposed to spending it on Bioset, we're now using that same amount of money to invest in the business ourselves to take care and stand in Bioset's shoes?

Mr. Strong: Correct. And it will actually be in essence less because some of this is going into some of the other areas that we may not even spend.

Councilman Lester: Okay, alright. So, I was just trying to understand because I hear us saying that we are uncomfortable with the Bioset deal, but in point of fact, an expenditure that we're talking about of \$1.9 million is the same expenditure that we would have had if Bioset would have done what they were contractually obligated to do. So, an important fact, we're not spending an additional dime, isn't that correct?

Mr. Strong: This is all in the budget today, yes sir.

Councilman Lester: Okay, I just want to be clear. I mean it's funny to some people but I just want to make sure that our uncomfortableness is based on real facts as opposed to throwing around a lot of figures. But at the end of the day, the same money we would have sent to Bioset had they done what they were supposed to do is the same money that we're spending. We're just having to do it because they didn't do it. Not us?

Mr. Strong: We're not increasing the budget from what was passed in December of 2004. All this is to do is to take the same money and move it. It was a line item square that we can spend it properly.

Councilman Lester: Thank you Mr. Strong. No further questions.

Mr. Strong: If you're interested or have any constituents or businesses out there that would like to buy some of our lime-based fertilizer, they can call 673-7660, our office, we'll sell it to 'em.

Councilman Carmody: Good on tomatoes.

Councilman Green: Mr. Strong, would you say we're getting stuck in the sod?

Mr. Strong: I'm not going there sir.

Mayor Hightower: And I think it's also important to know and I think Mike will verify that while we are working through this issue and we've asked the Council to give us the opportunity to hire a couple of attorneys to be sure that we have a direction and we know where we're going, and we're recovering what we ought to recover. Even the \$1.9 (million) that you may not feel comfortable with is less money than we would have been spending had we never gone the Bioset direction. Part of the reason we went the Bioset direction was not to buy and rehab the treatment plants with new digesters. I don't remember or recall what that number was.

Mr. Strong: \$26,000,000.

Mayor Hightower: \$26,000,000 to do that versus what were doing on the Bioset with at least a potential upside on the grass. So even in the straits that we're in with this particular situation, we're still better off than we would have been had we bought digesters to re-outfit the plant. So, we still have an opportunity to win in this deal. It's not fun and it seems to be something that just happens and is beyond our control. But Bioset did walk away and we've got at least somebody here that's been with the DEQ, understands the process that's doing what we need to do to be sure that we don't have problems with the DEQ or the EPA, and again continue to work us through this. And he spent a bunch of time and hours doing it along with the legal team. So, it's bad, or it's sad or is willingness to take an opportunity to jump on somebody or something that went south, Mike I just want to publicly say I appreciate what you've done to this point to salvage the operation, to continue to stay within budget and to continue to be sure that we have something to do with our sludge that keeps us out of trouble with the EPA. And you're doing it without costing us a penny more and continue to costs us less than it would have cost us had we used the digester system in the first place.

Councilman Carmody: Hear here.

Councilman Gibson: Thank you Mr. Chair. We're the only one in Louisiana doing this, right?

Mr. Strong: As far as the Class A?

Councilman Gibson: Right.

Mr. Strong: I believe there are - - - there's at least one more that is in the Class A. But we are above the curve with the environmental agency on the Class A.

Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

7. **Ordinance No. 83 of 2005**: An ordinance authorizing the purchasing agent to dispose of surplus real property and otherwise providing with respect thereto. (B/Walford) (**not to be adopted prior to July 12, 2005**)

Having passed first reading on May 24, 2005 was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Gibson to postpone. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

8. **Ordinance No. 76 of 2005**: ZONING – C-32-05: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located 220 feet west of N. Market and 1313 feet north of Nelson, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana from I-2, Heavy Industrial District to R-3, Urban, Multiple-Family Residence District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (A/Lester)

Having passed first reading on May 24, 2005 was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Hogan to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

9. **Ordinance No. 77 of 2005**: ZONING – C-33-05: 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 Shreveport-Blanchard Hwy., and Roy Road, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from R-1H, Urban, One-Family Residence District to R-2, Suburban, Multi-Family Residence District and R-3, Urban, Multiple-Family Residence District, and R-1D, Urban, One-Family Residence District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (A/Lester)

Having passed first reading on May 24, 2005 was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Lest4er, seconded by Councilman Gibson to postpone. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

10. **Ordinance No. 78 of 2005**: ZONING – C-34-05: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the southwest corner of Martin Luther King and Audrey Lane, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from R-1H, Urban, One-Family Residence District to B-2, Neighborhood Business District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (A/Lester)

Having passed first reading on May 24, 2005 was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Gibson to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

11. **Ordinance No. 79 of 2005**: ZONING – C-35-05: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the north side of Ford Street, 200 feet west of Allen Avenue, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from B-2, Neighborhood Business District, to B-3-E community Business/Extended Use District. LIMITED TO “STORAGE OF INOPERABLE VEHICLES,” ONLY, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (A/Lester)

Having passed first reading on May 24, 2005 was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and 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, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

12. **Ordinance No. 80 of 2005**: ZONING – C-36-05: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance by rezoning property located on the north side of Sherwood, 300 feet east of Fairfield, 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. (C/Carmody)

Having passed first reading on May 24, 2005 was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Gibson to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

13. **Ordinance No. 81 of 2005**: ZONING – C-37-05: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the northeasterly side of Shreveport-Barksdale Highway, 400 feet north of Knight Street, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from B-1, Buffer Business District, to B-1-E, Buffer Business/Extended Use District, LIMITED TO “AUTOMOBILE RENTALS”, ONLY, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (C/Carmody)

Having passed first reading on May 24, 2005 was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and 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, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

14. **Ordinance No. 82 of 2005**: ZONING APPEAL – C-38-05: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the south side of Cedar Creek Drive, 1400 feet east of Dean Road, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from R-2TH (PUD), Urban, One-Family Townhouse Residence (Planned Unit Development) District, and R-A, Residence – Agriculture District, to R-1D, Urban, One-Family Residence District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (E/Hogan)

Having passed first reading on May 24, 2005 was read by title, and 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.

Councilman Walford: Question. Are we upholding the appeal? Is that what you're asking?

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Chairman, may I?

Councilman Green: Mr. Hogan.

Councilman Hogan: Thank you Mr. Chairman, I clarified this with Mr. Thompson just a few minutes ago, that we need a yes vote to approve the zoning change here. And the application, the fence issue that the people were here for earlier, that'll come up again - - -

Councilman Walford: Right,.

Councilman Hogan: When they apply for their application for the subdivision.

Councilman Walford: So, we're voting to uphold? I don't mean to interrupt you, but that's what we're going for?

Councilman Hogan: Yes.

Mr. Thompson: We're voting to adopt the ordinance. The only reason this is on your - - here as a zoning appeal is, it would be here anyway, somebody appealed it, so we want to alert you that this is an appeal. So, you're voting up or down on the ordinance to rezone the property.

Councilman Walford: Okay.

Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

The adopted ordinances and amendments follow:

ORDINANCE NO. 72 OF 2005

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2005 BUDGET FOR THE FLEET SERVICES INTERNAL SERVICE FUND AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BY:

WHEREAS, the City Charter provides for the amendment of any previously-adopted budget; and WHEREAS, the City Council finds it necessary to amend the 2005 budget for the Fleet Services Internal Service, to shift funds among expenditure categories and for other purposes.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in legal session convened, that Ordinance No. 156 of 2004, the 2005 budget for the Fleet Services Internal Service Fund, be amended as follows:

In Section 1 (Estimated Receipts):

Increase Transfer from General Fund by \$388,000.

In Section 2 (Appropriations):

Increase Materials and Supplies by \$50,000.

Increase Contractual Services by \$338,000.

Adjust totals and subtotals accordingly.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the remainder of Ordinance No. 156 of 2004, as amended, shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

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

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

ORDINANCE NO. 73 OF 2005

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2005 GENERAL FUND BUDGET AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BY:

WHEREAS, the City Charter provides for the amendment of any previously adopted budget; and WHEREAS, the City Council finds it necessary to amend the 2005 General Fund budget, to appropriate additional funds, to transfer funds among expenditure categories and for other purposes.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in legal session convened, that Ordinance No. 154 of 2004, the 2005 General Fund budget, is hereby amended as follows:

In Section 1 (Estimated Receipts):

Increase External Service Charges by \$630,000.

In Section 2 (Appropriations):

In Public Assembly and Recreation, decrease Personal Services by \$90,000. Increase Materials and Supplies by \$60,000 and Transfer to Fleet Services by \$30,000.

In General Government, increase Transfer to SporTran by \$100,000.

In Police, decrease Personal Services by \$175,000. Increase Materials and Supplies by \$175,000 and Transfer to Fleet Services by \$50,000.

In Fire, increase Materials and Supplies by \$100,000.

In Operational Services, decrease Personal Services by \$100,000. Increase Materials and Supplies by \$172,000 and Transfer to Fleet Services by \$308,000.

In City Marshal, decrease Personal Services by \$7,000 and increase Materials and Supplies by \$7,000.

Adjust all totals and subtotals accordingly.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the remainder of Ordinance No. 154 of 2004 shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

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

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

Amendment No. to Ordinance No. 73 of 2005

AMEND THE ORDINANCE AS FOLLOWS:

In Section 2 (Appropriations):

In City Marshal, reduce Personal Services by \$10,000 and increase Materials and Supplies by \$10,000.

ORDINANCE NO. 74 OF 2005

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2005 SPORTRAN ENTERPRISE FUND BUDGET AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BY:

WHEREAS, the City Charter provides for the amendment of any previously adopted budget; and WHEREAS, the City Council finds it necessary to amend the 2005 budget for the SporTran Enterprise Fund to provide additional funding and for other purposes.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in legal session convened, that Ordinance No. 167 of 2004, the 2005 budget for the SporTran Enterprise Fund, is hereby amended as follows:

In Section 1 (Estimated Receipts):

Increase City of Shreveport by \$100,000.

In Section 2 (Appropriations):

Increase Contractual Services by \$100,000.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the remainder of Ordinance No. 167 of 2004 shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

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

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

ORDINANCE NO. 75 OF 2005

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2005 WATER AND SEWERAGE ENTERPRISE FUND BUDGET AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the City Charter provides for the amendment of any previously adopted budget; and WHEREAS, the City Council finds it necessary to amend the 2005 budget for the Water and Sewerage Enterprise Fund to transfer funds among expenditure categories and for other purposes.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in legal session convened, that Ordinance No. 166 of 2004, the 2005 budget for the Water and Sewerage Enterprise Fund, is hereby amended as follows:

In Section 2 (Appropriations):

Increase Personal Services by \$188,000.

Increase Materials and Supplies by \$600,000.

Decrease Contractual Services by \$1,903,900.

Increase Operating Reserves by \$117,400.

Increase Improvements and Equipment by \$445,000

Increase Notes Payable by \$553,500.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the remainder of Ordinance No. 166 of 2004 shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

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

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

ORDINANCE NO. 76 OF 2005

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 106 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES, THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT ZONING ORDINANCE, BY REZONING PROPERTY LOCATED 220 FEET WEST OF N. MARKET AND 1313 FEET NORTH OF NELSON, SHREVEPORT, CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA, FROM I-2, HEAVY INDUSTRIAL DISTRICT TO R-3, URBAN, MULTIPLE-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 220 feet west of N. Market and 1313 feet north of Nelson, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, legally described below, be and the **same is hereby changed from I-2, Heavy Industrial District, to R-3, Urban, Multiple-Family Residence District.**

A tract of land located in Section 14, T18N-R14W, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, more particularly described as follows: From the common corner of Sections 14, 15, 22, and 23 T18N-R14W, run thence run N89°35'03"W along the S line of said Section 15, a distance of 123.10 feet to a point within 8.00 feet of the toe of the Twelve Mile Bayou Levee; run thence N19°37'27"E along a line 8.00 feet E to the toe of the Twelve Mile Bayou Levee a distance of 871.53 feet to the P-O-B of the tract herein described: Continue thence N19°37'27"E a distance of 502.55 feet, run thence N30°56'30"E a distance of 118.00 feet; run thence N55°23'E a distance of 29.73 feet (the preceding three courses being along a line 8.00 feet E of the toe of the Twelve Mile Bayou Levee). Run thence S24°40'45"E a distance of 290.32 feet; run thence N65°19'11"E a distance of 220.00 feet to a point on the SW'ly line of North Market Street, as dedicated, run thence S24°40'45"E along said SW'ly line of North Market Street, as dedicated, a distance of 60.00 feet; run thence S65°19'11"W a distance of 220.00 feet; run thence S24°40'45"E a distance of 160.10 feet; run thence N65°19'11"E a distance of 19.72 feet; run thence S24°40'45"E a distance of 166.81 feet; run thence S65°19'11"W a distance of 497.88 feet; run thence N24°40'45"W a distance of 245.84 feet to the P-O-B.

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 Zoning Administrator, showing parking and landscaping to ordinance standards, 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. 78 OF 2005

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 106 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES, THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT ZONING ORDINANCE, BY REZONING PROPERTY LOCATED ON THE SOUTHWEST CORNER OF MARTIN LUTHER KING AND AUDREY LANE, SHREVEPORT, CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA, FROM R-1H, 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 Lot 1 and the E/2 of Lot 2, Millen Subdivision, Unit 2, Less R-O-W 181420-28. Lot 21 and Lot 22, Millen Subdivision, Unit 2, located on the southwest corner of Martin Luther King and Audrey Lane, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana **be and the same is hereby changed from R-1H, Urban, One-Family Residence District, to B-2, Neighborhood Business District:**

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

1. Development of the property shall be in substantial accord with a revised site plan to be submitted to and approved by the Zoning Administrator, showing a solid wood fence along the south property line, with any significant changes or additions requiring further review and approval by the Planning Commission.

2. Waiver of solid wood screening fence requirement along the west property line is granted until such time as the adjacent property is developed residentially.

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. 80 OF 2005

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 106 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES, THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT ZONING ORDINANCE, BY REZONING PROPERTY LOCATED ON THE NORTH SIDE OF SHERWOOD, 300 FEET EAST OF FAIRFIELD, 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 73 and the west 48.17 feet of Lot 74, Southern Heights Subdivision, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, located on the north side of Sherwood, 300 feet east of Fairfield, **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 stipulations:

1. 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.

2. The two existing lots shall be replatted into one lot prior to the issuance of a building permit.

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. 81 OF 2005

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 106 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES, THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT ZONING ORDINANCE, BY REZONING PROPERTY LOCATED ON THE NORTHWESTERLY SIDE OF SHREVEPORT-BARKSDALE HIGHWAY, 400 FEET NORTH OF KNIGHT STREET, SHREVEPORT, CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA, FROM B-1, BUFFER BUSINESS DISTRICT, TO B-1-E,

BUFFER BUSINESS/EXTENDED USE DISTRICT, LIMITED TO “AUTOMOBILE RENTALS”, 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 Lots 455, 456, and NE’ly 22 feet of Lot 457 lying adjacent to Lot 456, Anderson Island Subdivision, Unit 6, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, located on the NW’ly side of Shreveport-Barksdale Highway, 400 feet N of Knight Street, **be and the same is hereby changed from B-1, Buffer Business District, to B-1-E, Buffer Business/Extended Use District, limited to “automobile rentals”, only.**

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 the site plan submitted, which shows appropriate fencing as noted at the May 4, 2005 Public Hearing. Any significant changes or additions shall require further review and approval by the Planning Commission.

2. Hours of operation shall be from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 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. 82 OF 2005

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 106 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES, THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT ZONING ORDINANCE, BY REZONING PROPERTY LOCATED ON THE SOUTH SIDE OF CEDAR CREEK DRIVE, 1400 FEET EAST OF DEAN ROAD, SHREVEPORT, CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA, FROM R-2TH (PUD), URBAN, ONE-FAMILY TOWNHOUSE RESIDENCE (PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT) DISTRICT, AND R-A, RESIDENCE-AGRICULTURE DISTRICT, TO R-1D, URBAN, ONE-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 south side of Cedar Creek Drive, 1400 feet east of Dean Road, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, legally described below, **be and the same is hereby changed from R-2TH (PUD), Urban, One-Family Townhouse Residence (Planned Unit Development) District, and R-A, Residence, Agriculture District, to R-1D, Urban, One-Family Residence District.**

A tract of land in the S/2 of the NW/4 of Section 5, T16N-R14W, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, said tract more fully described as follows: From the W common corner of Lots 249 and 250 of The Cedars, Unit 3, run S252+/- feet to the S R-O-W line of Cedar Creek Drive, being the P-O-B. Thence from said P-O-B, run S650 feet to the N line of L.E. Walker Subdivision; thence run W’ly along the N line of said Walker Subdivision, 645 feet to the SE corner of Cedar Square Subdivision, thence run N’ly along the E line of said Cedar Square Subdivision 600 feet to the S R-O-W line of said Cedar Creek Drive, thence run E’ly along said S R-O-W line about 660 feet to the P-O-B.

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

1. Development of the property shall be in substantial accord with the 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.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: None.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Letter of Appeal: BAC -26-05 – Louisiana CheerNastics, LLC, 2533 E. 70th Street, Variance required parking in B-3 District .

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Chairman, if I could call Roy Jambor to help us with this case. Good afternoon Mr. Jambor. I believe that we had discussed this yesterday at our work session, but I just wanted to make sure that all the Council Members were aware. Basically, the applicant had requested a variance in the required number of parking places be provided for this specific type of business (inaudible) by regulation, they were required to have 89?

Mr. Jambor: I believe there were 84.

Councilman Carmody: They have provided all but- - -

Mr. Jambor: All but 20.

Councilman Carmody: 20. Thank you sir.

Motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Gibson to overturn the ZBA's denial grant a variance in the parking requirements contained in the Zoning Ordinance of 20 cars subject to the following stipulations:

1. **Development of the property shall be in accord with the site plan dated June 10, 2005 submitted to the City Council;**
2. **The tenant's use of the parking and driveway provisions on lots 12 and 13 shall be specified in a lease agreement or other equivalent covenant between the land owner and tenant for the same term as the lease of the building and improvements on lot 11; and**
3. **The variance is granted for a one year period only, with any extension requiring re-application to the Zoning Board of Appeals. A request for extension shall be at no fee to the applicant if submitted prior to the expiration of the time period.**

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Chairman. Thank you Mr. Chairman. I know the tenant Mr. O'glee, he had been up here earlier and was going to speak to the issue, but I'm not sure if now is the appropriate time if he - - -. Do you have anything to say Mr. O'Glee? No, okay. I just wanted to see if he did. That's fine, thank you,

Councilman Green: So, you're asking us to vote 'Yea'?

Councilman Carmody: Right.

Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

Councilman Carmody: And Mr. Chairman, let me just please remind the Cheernastics folks know that, that stipulation of the one year approval, you really need to mark your calendar and make sure that you come before that date and make sure that our fee is waived. But that will give a chance to review to make sure that we haven't experienced any problems with the lack of that additional parking. Yeah, you could come forward.

Councilman Green: Just so they could identify you in the records, just state your name and address again for the record.

Mr. Jason O'Glee: (801 Dalisa Circle) Yesterday we had mentioned about maybe possibly some rock in the back portion, being hard concrete in the front for that new entrance, but possibly doing some crushed rock in the back, we wondered if that would be okay?

Councilman Carmody: I checked and I would ask or call back Mr. Jambor to address it. But the Council doesn't have the authority to grant you that privilege. What my motion did was in essence give you the variance for the parking that is going to allow you to do that. If you need some additional parking as I appreciate it, Mr. Jambor please jump in there anywhere you want to, you can or your landlord can provide that additional parking in excess of what we've granted you for the variance. But we don't have the authority to tell you as to what type - - - right.

Mr. Jambor: All required parking has to be hard service. You established the parking requirement being 64 cars. Anything beyond that 64 can be any surface at all.

Councilman Carmody: So, you follow where we're going? Thank you. Thank you Mr. Jambor. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Chairman, I just had to make a quick comment. I had met Mr. O'Glee last year. My daughter was one of his students. And I can testify that I don't think we'll have any trouble and that he will comply with what you proposed Mr. Carmody. That he runs his business that way, he runs a good business and he's a Christian. And I tried in fact to find him a place in my district for that, but was unable to. And so, I'd just like to say a word of commendation to him. He's running a great business, a thriving business and I know he runs it right and by the book. So, I don't expect that we'll have any trouble at all from that. Thank you.

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES:

Councilman Gibson: Mr. Chair, the Infrastructure Committee will be meeting over the next two weeks.

CLERK'S REPORT: None.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting adjourned at approximately 6:33 p.m.

//s// James E. Green, Chairman

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