

CC 3827
01 02 05

Council Proceedings of the City of Shreveport, Louisiana
December 27, 2005

The regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana was called to order by Chairman Calvin Ben Lester at 3:04 p.m., Tuesday, December 27, 2005, in the Government Chambers in Government Plaza (505 Travis Street).

Councilman Lester: Councilman Green, will you give us the invocation and Councilman Robertson, will you give us the pledge?

Councilman Green: Yes sir. Mr. Chairman, also I wanted to ask if it would be okay with you if all of us could pray today to close the year out? So, if we could get a prayer from everybody today.

Councilman Lester: Okay, at the closing?

Councilman Green: No, now. I just think that we've had a great year. I just think that we ought to close it out with prayer. We need to have a revival in our city, but most of all in our hearts.

Invocation was given by Council Members Green, Walford, Lester, Robertson, Hogan and Jackson.

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Councilman Robertson.

On Roll Call, the following members were Present: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Robertson, Green, Hogan and Jackson. 6. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Lester to approve the minutes of the Administrative Conference, Monday, December 12, 2005 and Council Meeting, Tuesday, December 13, 2005. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

Councilwoman Robertson: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to ask if we could suspend the rules at this time to consider Resolution No. 221, so that the signature page can be prepared during the meeting so that the Chairman and the Mayor can sign (inaudible) today.

Motion by Councilman Robertson, seconded by Councilman Green to suspend the rules to consider Resolution No. 221 of 2005.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you Mr. Lester. I'd just would ask - - - I didn't know what 221 was. The Chase equipment leasing deal?

Councilwoman Robertson: Yes.

Councilman Jackson: Alright thank you. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

RESOLUTION NO. 221 OF 2005

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO EXECUTE AN AGREEMENT WITH CHASE EQUIPMENT LEASING INC. AND OTHER NECESSARY PARTIES FOR THE FINANCING OF VEHICLES AND EQUIPMENT AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport , sometimes referred to herein as "Lessee" is a political subdivision of the State of Louisiana (the "State") and is duly organized and existing pursuant to the constitution and laws of the State.

WHEREAS, pursuant to applicable law, the governing body of the Lessee ("Governing Body") is authorized to acquire, dispose of and encumber real and personal property, including, without limitation, rights and interests in property, leases and easements necessary to the functions or operations of the Lessee.

WHEREAS, the Governing Body hereby finds and determines that the execution of one or more lease-purchase agreements ("Equipment Leases") in the principal amount not exceeding \$3,100,000 for the purpose of acquiring the property generally described below ("Property") and to be described more specifically in the Equipment Leases is appropriate and necessary to the functions and operations of the Lessee:

Brief Description Of Property:

Vehicles and Equipment for the Operational Services, Shreveport Public Assembly and Recreation, Finance, Police, and Fire Departments.

WHEREAS, Chase Equipment Leasing Inc. ("Lessor") is expected to act as the lessor under the Equipment Leases.

WHEREAS, the Lessee may pay certain capital expenditures in connection with the Property prior to its receipt of proceeds of the Equipment Leases ("Lease Purchase Proceeds") for such expenditures and such expenditures are not expected to exceed the Principal Amount.

WHEREAS, the U.S. Treasury Department regulations do not allow the proceeds of a tax-exempt borrowing to be spent on working capital and the Lessee hereby declares its official intent to be reimbursed for any capital expenditures for Property from the Lease Purchase Proceeds.

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

Section 1. Keith Hightower, Mayor is hereby authorized to execute and deliver one or more Equipment Leases in substantially the form filed and available for public inspection in the office of the Clerk of Council on December 27, 2005. The Mayor is further authorized to execute and deliver such other documents relating to the Equipment Lease (including, but not limited to, escrow agreements) as he deems necessary and appropriate. All other related contracts and agreements necessary and incidental to the Equipment Leases are hereby authorized.

Section 2. By a written instrument signed by the Mayor, the Mayor may designate specifically identified officers or employees of the City to execute and deliver agreements and documents relating to the Equipment Leases on behalf of the City.

Section 3. The aggregate original principal amount of the Equipment Leases shall not exceed the Principal Amount and shall bear interest as set forth in the Equipment Leases and the Equipment Leases shall contain such options to purchase by the Lessee as set forth therein.

Section 4. The Lessee's obligations under the Equipment Leases shall be subject to annual appropriation or renewal by the Governing Body as set forth in each Equipment Lease and the Lessee's obligations under the Equipment Leases shall not constitute a general obligation of the Lessee or indebtedness under the Constitution or laws of the State.

Section 5. The Governing Body of Lessee anticipates that the Lessee may pay certain capital expenditures in connection with the Property prior to the receipt of the Lease Purchase Proceeds for the Property. The Governing Body of Lessee hereby declares the Lessee's official intent to use the Lease Purchase Proceeds to reimburse itself for Property expenditures. This section of the Resolution is adopted by the Governing Body of Lessee for the purpose of establishing compliance with the requirements of Section 1.150-2 of Treasury Regulations. This section of the Resolution does not bind the Lessee to make any expenditure, incur any indebtedness, or proceed with the purchase of the Property.

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

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

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Walford to adopt.

Councilman Jackson: I just wasn't sure - - - I know we had done this and I was assuming based on the conversation I just heard previously, that this had something to do with a purchase of vehicles. Is that correct?

Mayor Hightower: That's correct.

Councilman Jackson: And I'm assuming also at one point, I guess about a month or two ago, we talked about we're going to be making a loan if you will, financing police cars. Are these those?

Mayor Hightower: (Inaudible)

Councilman Jackson: That's my question Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Mayor, my question is have we actually purchased the vehicles? I ask that question because if the answer to that is yes, my follow-up question would be was this purchase Fair Share (a client) do we have any minority vendors?

Mayor Hightower: The answer is yes. Whether there were any Fair Share or not, I don't know. I guess we need to get Tom to come in and tell us. I know that on vehicles in particular, we're always cognizant of that, at least to the point that we can be. Many times, the local dealers may tell us no, I can't match the corporate price and that type of

thing. But yes, Fair Share is in everything. We can get you a breakdown of what happened on which pieces of equipment if you want to do that.

Councilman Lester: I would like that information. Is there someone that we could get that before the end of the meeting? Okay. Alright.

Councilman Hogan: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Mayor, I read that- - - it says repayment will be over five years at 3.525% interest. I'm assuming that's a fixed rate? That's pretty good. Thank you.

Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, there were two amendments to the minutes, we wish that you could consider those. Do you have them in front of you. They're on the electronic agenda I believe.

Amendment No. 1 to the December 13, 2005, City Council Minutes as published on December 19, 2005, in the Official Journal.

Amend the December 13, 2005 minutes relative to Resolution No. 218, as follows: On Page 8B, Column 4, relative to Amendment No. 1, to Resolution No. 218, strike the 'Motion denied by', paragraph and insert the following:

Motion denied by the following vote: Nays: Councilman Lester, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 4. Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, and Robertson. 3.

Amendment No. 2 to the December 13, 2005 City Council Minutes as published on December 19, 2005 in the Official Journal.

Amend the December 13, 2005 minutes relative to Ordinance No. 166 of 2005, as follows:

On Page 12B, Column 1, strike Amendment No. 4, and insert a new Amendment No. 4, as follows:

Amendment No. 4 proposed by Councilman Green and Councilman Jackson to Ordinance No. 166 of 2005, An Ordinance Adopting the 2006 Capital Improvements Budget.

AMEND THE ORDINANCE AS FOLLOWS:

Before the first BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED paragraph insert the following:

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that paragraph 3 of Ordinance No. 166 of 2005 is hereby amended to read as follows:

3. The Mayor is hereby authorized to execute all contracts, deeds, grant documents and other legal instruments necessary to expend and receive the funds herein authorized, except that he is not authorized to execute such contracts, deeds, grant documents and other legal instruments to expend the funds appropriated for the Convention Center Hotel and the Fire Maintenance Facility until specifically approved by the City Council by resolution.

Motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Green to approve the Amendments No 1 and 2 to the Council Proceedings – December 13, 2005. Motion

approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

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

Reports:

Convention Center and Convention Center Hotel (To include detailed personnel report from SMG)

Mr. Antee: We don't have anything from the Work Session last week. But if anybody has any questions, we'd be glad to answer them.

Mr. Thompson: There's an employment update from Mr. Mike Carrier in front of you, he just passed out today.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, my question was for the administration with regards to what we talked about I guess two weeks ago, I think they were working on getting - - - it was information I think they already shared with us, but I was asking for a breakdown of who those, you know who those folks were. And I was just trying to see if they'd had that prepared yet. For example on the Convention Center, or in the Convention Center Hotel, either or - - - we were talking about what the percentages were and there's a report for example that was given to us that talks about the progress payments. And so what I'd ask is either they come broken down by category, like whatever - - - construction category it is. And I was just asking about - - - I think Mr. Chairman that the Administration is (inaudible), I just didn't know if it was prepared yet.

Mr. Antee: The hotel payout that is attached to, and I don't know if it was attached to the last one. We attach them when we get 'em. On the last page shows what individual companies get what. Now the Yates payout application on the Convention Center doesn't have that detail, and that's - - - we'll get that from Sam. They're working on getting those breakdowns. But the hotel one should have it on the back as to which companies receive what.

Councilman Jackson: Well, I think we just don't have the hotel one right before us, and it needs to be - - -

Mr. Antee: Well, the last report would have had their latest payout, and the last one or two pages of those, it should be reflected. But we can get that.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Property Standards Report

Councilman Lester: I think we had the Property Standards Report at the Work Session.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I don't believe that it was delivered at the last meeting, and I called Ms. Moore and she was going to try to get it down. I don't know whether or not she was able to. I just talked to her a few minutes ago.

Ms. Moore: Good evening. We were not able to determine if the property standards report was ever obtained. We've tried feverishly all day to get a copy for you, and as soon as we get it, we'll make sure that you get s copy.

Councilman Lester: Does any member have any Property Standards issues that they want to make Ms. Moore's department aware of?

Councilman Walford: Ms. Moore, if you would, I have a letter addressed to me regarding 3821 Dillingham and 654 Dudley. I know that 654 Dudley is in Mr. Carmody's district. I believe the Dillingham address is as well, but they were involving Property Standards, so would you make a note for Mr. Bowie on those two please Ma'am. Thank you.

Councilman Hogan: Ms. Moore, I received a fax from one of my constituents this afternoon, and if you would just see me after the meeting, I just want to talk to you about it.

Public Hearing:

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

Confirmations and/or Appointments. *Items 1 and 2 (Postponed December 13, 2005)*

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, there were two that we just received today, and I was just trying to figure out if those were just for a matter of introduction - - - if they have to stay on here or were we moving on those as well. I don't know if you have them in front of you.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, under the rules, we're prohibited from placing them on the agenda until you've had them for two weeks, and the only way to get them on the agenda today would be for a member to suspend the rules and for the Council to add them.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Thompson, if that is not done, would these be on the agenda for the next meeting?

Mr. Thompson: Yes, I'm saying that assuming its two weeks away. I think that it is.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, I wasn't trying to add them, I just didn't know why we had them. I understand.

Shreveport Housing Authority – Mr. Richard King

Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Jackson to postpone.

Councilman Walford: Could we get a little discussion on why we're postponing again?

Councilman Jackson: Same reason we talked about on Thursday. Were you here? Excuse me Mr. Chairman; I don't know if Councilman Walford was here on Thursday.

Councilman Walford: Yeah, I was here.

Councilman Jackson: I tried to talk explicit about it on Thursday, and that's the same, at least for me. I don't - - - Councilman Green made the motion, and I certainly don't want to purport to speak for him, but I assume that's what he was talking about when he asked about the request to postpone.

Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: Councilman Walford. 1. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

Shreveport Regional Airport Authority – Dr. C. O. Simpkins

Motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Green to confirm the appointment of Dr. C. O. Simpkins to the Shreveport Regional Airport Authority. Motion denied by the following vote: Nays: Councilmen Robertson, Hogan, and Jackson. 3. Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Green, and 3. 1. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

Adding Legislation to the Agenda.

1. **Resolution No. 227 of 2005**: A resolution expressing support for the Chief of Police and for the implementation of plans to improve the effectiveness of the Police Department and otherwise providing with respect thereto. (D/Robertson)

Motion by Councilman Robertson, seconded by Councilman Walford to add Resolution No. 227 of 2005 to the agenda. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, we'll bring that up under the regular place on the agenda, unless you want to do it now.

Councilman Lester: I think we can take it up at its regular place on the agenda.

Councilman Jackson: And that would just be on Final Passage?

Councilman Lester: Second Reading and Final Passage. Right.

Public Comments (*Agenda Items to be Adopted*)

Mr. Terry Lee: (2604 Brownlee Road, Bossier City, LA.) Mr. Chairman, members, I'm representing Commodore Medical Services. And medical waste has been processed in this city for five years. And not one time have anyone called the City or the Department of Environmental Qualities, or the Department of Health and Hospitals about this particular process. For five years. Two years at a local hospital, and three years at 2105 Stonewall. Right there on the corner of Greenwood Road, right there at the Interstate, for five years, we've been processing medical waste here. So that would leave me to believe that there is no polluting going on here. No polluting, none whatsoever. Now, Mr. Chairman, members, the opposition stated last time that all sorts of body parts and things like this would be processed at 2000 Cedar. That's not true. If that generator put proper waste in the proper container, that particular waste is hauled up to Nashville, TN to be disposed of. There go the Louisiana regs right there Mr. Chairman, and members when you're talking about human body parts and stuff like that. That's what should be done with it. Buried or cremated. Now we will not have any type - - - that type of waste at 2000 Cedar. Now, furthermore Mr. Chairman, and members, the

opposition would lead you to believe that autoclave doesn't work. Well, Mr. Chairman and Members, that's the letter right there from Department of Health and Hospitals stating that autoclaving is approved by the State of Louisiana and it's approved in all 50 states. We only have two types of technology approved in all 50 states. That's autoclaving and that's incineration. And we will be autoclaving. All we're doing Mr. Chairman and Members is boiling water to generate steam to process the waste. That's why there's no polluting going on. We've been right there for three years, openly operating at Greenwood Road, Greenwood Road exit and Stonewall where everybody could see. Hadn't anybody called the City, nor regulatory agency in regards to our facility? Furthermore Mr. Chairman and members, the opposition led you all to believe on the 13th that we'd be riding around in their neighborhood in our trucks. That's not true. There goes a letter there from the City of Shreveport, Department of Operational Services stating that 2000 Cedar Street dead ends at the proposed location. 2000 Cedar. That's the letter right there. And also Mr. Chairman and Members, I included this in your information packets. So, it's right there. There will be no adverse affect in regards to the traffic. And Cedar dead ends at the proposed site, and the traffic operated by this plant will be less than the traffic being generated by the former occupants. So, and furthermore Mr. Chairman, I think Councilwoman Madam Robertson, you wanted to see our liability insurance just in case something goes wrong, this is a letter from the Shreveport Fire Department stating that they are trained to do deal with the type of material we process. That's a very, very confident letter from the Shreveport Fire Department. Now, Mr. Chairman, and Members we already have a permit to process waste in this City, all we're asking for is a vote to move 1,000 feet. If you would hone in on your MPC Minutes, Mr. Keagan made that point. Look you all only moving 1,000 feet. That's all we're asking is to move 1,000 feet to another location so that we can operate more efficiently. Now, members we got 27 lives that we're responsible for. Out of those 27 lives, 10 of them are employees. Two of 'em just bought homes for the first time, and they've been in this business for five years. They got in it, were able to purchase their homes for the first time. We got one of 'em that can afford to purchase his mother medication now. We got one 26 year old, got his eight year old nephew on his health benefits. We are real people, and all we ask is for you all to uphold the MPC's decision. We're talking about 23 acres. We're only using three or four acres. And Councilman Walford, you wanted to know about Yale Street last time. Yale Street's back end runs into the property. In other words, you got 20 acres that's away from Yale Street. Nothing's there. We're not there right at Yale; we've got 20 acres from where we want to operate our business down to Yale. That's 20 acres. There's nothing there. If any of you been over to the site, or you're familiar with it, I know Mr. Chairman, you've been there. And I appreciate you coming, but we're only going to use three or four acres. That's all we're using. And I ask that you guys, all of you. Excuse me Madam Councilwoman, that you all give these 27 lives the comfort in knowing that when they wake up, New Years Day that they will still have a job and they will still have benefits for their families. December 31st is our last day at our current location and we just don't have any other options. We've got to continue to operate. DEQ sent a team of people up, they visited the site. The Department of Health and Hospitals came up, visited the proposed location, matter of fact, they went back and sent us our permit to operate there. So, you have your regulatory agencies in place that are helping us, working with us.

They know that there is a need for this. And I just ask that you uphold their decision. Matter of fact, Mr. Chairman and Members, 2006 Cedar is zoned Heavy Industrial. During the MPC meeting Mr. Kirkland made it perfectly clear to the opposition a look a big cement company could come there and keep up all the noise they want and do whatever what they want, matter of fact, they can use the entire 23 acres, ain't nothing nobody can do about it. Nothing at all. But we are light industrial. That's why (inaudible) seeing any puffs of smoke coming from 2105 Cedars, cause all we're doing is just boiling water to generate steam to process. Just that simple. And for five years, we've doing it in this City. Have not had one complaint. And hadn't anybody called in to the City had anybody called in to Department of Health and Hospitals, had anybody called Department of Environmental Qualities about this particular process. We've been good neighbors. Very good neighbors. We were surrounded by four businesses. Right there in which we had to get their approval to allow us to come in and process waste. And they were open minded. Here goes the affidavits. Right here of the businesses that had to give us the okay to move in next door to them. And not one of the come over to complain about the traffic, complaining about the smell, complaining about the process. It's a clean process and I ask that you all uphold the MPC's decision. Any questions?

Councilman Green: Are you saying that unless we vote for this today, that December 31st that you all would be out of business?

Mr. Lee: In this particular State here, basically. That's it. We don't have any other options. As a matter of fact I was over at 2105 today and another company was moving into one part of the building. I think it's some company that builds barbeque pits or whatever. So, we're trying to move out and they're trying to move in and that's where we're at.

Councilwoman Robertson: Are you finish Mr. Green?

Councilman Green: Yes.

Councilwoman Robertson: Is there anyway you can get an extension for like a month or so, from the landlord of the building or anything?

Mr. Lee: No, he already got another tenant coming in. They're in the process of moving in now. And it's just a situation that we're in.

Councilwoman Robertson: Okay, so if you had to leave that building and you could put your equipment in to the new building and not use it, until the time that it was approved?

Mr. Lee: Right, we can't use the equipment until DEQ give us the okay. Well first you guys gotta t give us the okay to utilize the building. But Department of Environmental Qualities say when we can start processing the waste. As a matter of fact Madam Councilwoman, they're waiting on one piece of document from us to allow us to do that. But we can't provide the document to them until we get the okay from the City to occupy the building. But they're just waiting on us and I just told my contact guy down there I'll give them a call first thing in the morning and let him know.

Councilman Green: So, if you all don't do this, is there another company in town who does this?

Mr. Lee: No. We only have two treatment sites in the State. One in reserve and the one here that we have that's not operating right now.

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Lee, I know we met and spoke about this a while back. I was just wondering, you may have to refresh my memory, but your company was bought out. When did that happen?

Mr. Lee: I want to say April, but Mr. Freeman could tell you more exactly about that. He's here to speak also.

Councilman Hogan: Was that this year? It was sometime around the Spring of this year?

Mr. Lee: Yes. But I'm not for sure, but he could tell you.

Councilman Hogan: I don't need to know the exact date, just approximately. My question is when you were saying that there had been no violations or no complaints about your company; does this include the period of time from the spring until now?

Mr. Lee: Yes, it sure does.

Councilman Lester: Thank you Mr. Les.

Mr. Lee: Mr. Chairman, I would like to if it's okay to wish you all a Happy New year, including Mayor Hightower and Mr. Antee.

Mr. David Freeman: (Nashville, TN) I've come down here to answer any questions that you have and to ask for your support in our attempt to basically move down the street. We think that obviously the decision makes good business sense for us. We will be moving into a much larger facility. It is much more appropriate for what we do. We will basically have a five to ten acre buffer zone, rather than neighbors within a matter of feet. We think that the expanded space that we will have (inaudible) well for our growth in this area. Hopefully, the City will see that as a benefit for the City of Shreveport, both in your tax base, and what we hope to have increased employment within our company. We think that it will be a fairly simple move down the street, as Mr. Lee has said. We have been in this business for 14 years. Our company. We purchased another company in April. It was in April. We have operated a similar facility in Nashville, TN. We have owned it for three years. We have a spotless record there. The predecessor that we purchased also had a perfect record there. And when we came to Shreveport, one of our criteria was to create a similar situation. In Nashville, we operate in an industrial area, kinda at the end of the road, where we don't offend anyone. And we certainly don't want to offend anyone here. We recognize that the public perception of what we do is not exactly glamorous, but it is a necessary function. We, service the vast majority of the waste being generated within the City of Shreveport. We are the company that takes care of your hospitals, your nursing homes, and your doctors. And we certainly ask for your support in this matter. I'd be happy to answer any questions that anybody has.

Councilwoman Robertson: Mr. Lee mentioned that you're not working right now, processing and you won't be able to process until you get approval from us. What's taking place with the waste now? Is it being done in your reserve area or - - -?

Mr. Freeman: Right now, the waste is being shipped to Nashville. The delicate issue on the move from Stonewall Street is that we have a permit issued by the State of Louisiana and even though we made the decision that when we purchased this other company, that we did not like the technology, and we were not satisfied that it met what we wanted it to do. And we shut it down and have been transporting the waste to Nashville. Stonewall Street does have a transfer station permit. Which is a technical permit that we will not have at (inaudible) location until we get the Council's approval?

So we're in a kinda a delicate time situation, where even though we're not treating waste in Shreveport at the moment, our ability to transfer the waste and ship it out of town, we believe that expires in four days.

Councilman Lester: I have a question Mr. Freeman. You said that your operation in Tennessee I think you said is at the end of a road in a non-offensive area.

Mr. Freeman: It's in an industrial area.

Councilman Lester: Does the industrial area that you're operating in, in TN, is it bordered by more industrial areas, business areas, or residential area.

Mr. Freeman: A combination. We have - - - we're right next to two other industrial businesses. We are less than a mile away from a residential area. The entire process takes place within an enclosed building. The 23 acres that we've purchased includes a 20,000 square foot building. Within that building, we will only use a very small portion. There is a bout a 20 foot tube, and the waste is put into that tube. It's cooked at a high pressure temperature, using steam to disinfect the waste and then it goes to a local landfill as just regular municipal solid waste.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Freeman, talk to me about the penalties and violations that Commodore got I believe, was it in Michigan or Illinois?

Mr. Freeman: Illinois. Yes. Very similar to the situation I just described. We have a technical violation in the state of IL We have transporter permits for the State of Illinois. We believed and we were wrong and we accept the consequences of being wrong. We had not believed that we met the definition of needing a transfer station in the State of Illinois. Every state - - - our industry is relatively new. There are no federal regulations. So, we do not have uniformity in our regulations. What we have found much to our chagrin, is the southern states define a transfer station for the most part as a solid waste transfer station. Where municipal waste is actually dumped onto a great big tipping floor and then scooped back up and transferred into another vehicle. In our situation, we have boxes that are simply moved form a small truck to a bigger truck for transport to a treatment facility. We do not treat waste in the State of Illinois. So, it was our belief and our advice from outside counsel that we did not need a transfer license. We were wrong. We have been cited by the State of Illinois. They have proposed a fine, we have appealed that fine. Regardless of how that situation turns out, it is still a technical violation. There is not one allegation of mishandling of waste or improper disposal of waste.

Councilman Lester: Okay, that answers my question.

**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. 223 of 2005
A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING NOEL M. MIDKIFF & DELBERT SPEIGHTS
LOCATED AT 5895 JEFFERSON PAIGE RD., TO CONNECT TO THE WATER**

& SEWER SYSTEM OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, Noel M. Midkiff & Delbert Speights 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 Noel M. Midkiff & Delbert Speights, be authorized to connect the building located at 5895 Jefferson Paige Rd., to the water & sewer system of the City of Shreveport.

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

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

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Jackson, seconded by Councilman Green to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

RESOLUTION NO. 224 OF 2005

A RESOLUTION REJECTING THE BIDS RECEIVED FOR IFB 05-139, CAUSTIC SODA 25% FOR DOS WATER & SEWER, AMISS WATER TREATMENT PLANT AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO

By:

WHEREAS, Five bids were received as a result of solicitations on IFB 05-139 for Caustic Soda 25%; and

WHEREAS, the City has rejected all because they were over budget;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened that the bids received on IFB 05-139 be rejected;

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; and

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

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Jackson to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

RESOLUTION NO. 225 OF 2005

A RESOLUTION REJECTING THE BIDS RECEIVED FOR IFB 05-140, CAUSTIC SODA 50% FOR DOS WATER & SEWER, AMISS WATER TREATMENT PLANT AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO

By:

WHEREAS, Six bids were received as a result of solicitations on IFB 05-140 for Caustic Soda 50%; and

WHEREAS, the City has rejected all because they were over budget;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened that the bids received on IFB 05-140 be rejected;

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; and

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

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Jackson to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

ORDINANCES: None.

REGULAR AGENDA LEGISLATION

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

1. **Resolution No. 214 of 2005**: A resolution authorizing the Mayor to execute a cooperative endeavor agreement with the Louisiana Science Teachers Association and Louisiana Association of Teachers of Mathematics relative to holding its annual conference in Shreveport, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (*Postponed December 13, 2005*)

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Jackson, seconded by Councilman Green to adopt.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, we had talked sometime ago I guess the 13th at our last Council Meeting and the Mayor had requested, at least recommended that the

Council would not approve this. We have worked with this group a year or so ago, I guess, I don't know how long it's been, but earlier in the year. I guess to probably to put this on and as you know I think The Clerk reminded us that we had put the wrong date. We had to come back and look at it again. And now, in this second look, the Administration is brought up another issue with regard to the place and (inaudible). I think the Administration was working on something that they were going to share with us at some point and time, and so, I don't know what their position is at this time, Mr. Chairman, but if we could find out, maybe we'd know how to go forward with 214.

Mayor Hightower: Mr. Chairman, again, we are as Councilman Jackson said working on a particular location, but at the same time, we want to be sure that we're not competing against ourselves. We're building a \$152,000,000 facility downtown to host conventions and meetings and associations and such things as those. And That convention center is not built to compete against free, against ourselves. So we would just ask the Council not to approve this. We think we do have room, I think Mr. Carrier can confirm that we have room at the convention center, and we have other buildings, smaller venues that could be offered up in some sort of compromise, but we would ask that we not give away the EXPO Hall.

Councilwoman Robertson: I have a question. Since this was passed back in September 13, that it was approved, but it had the wrong date on it. Has the group been told that they were going to have the EXPO Hall?

Mayor Hightower: I don't know that, but I know we don't have a contract with them.

Councilman Jackson: And again, I absolutely do not disagree with the Administration. I think the Mayor is right. Obviously, last thing we want to do is be in a situation that he described. I only brought it out the last time, because it seems as if we had gotten into a situation where we had made a (and I don't want to use the term made a commitment), but we had voted on the issue and that was the technical issue with it, and we came back and we'd take a different approach on it. I mean, I would agree 100%, and I'm actually willing to take that particular position on this, but the question is whether or not the people were in anticipation of this happening. And I personally feel bad that because of that (inaudible) we have come back and done it. Because I want to be clear it wasn't my issue to try - - - I'm not interesting in trying to - - - you know us competing against ourselves. I think it makes no sense to do that. I just want the Administration to recognize that it was something that we were working on prior to the Convention Center and prior to knowing what could be booked into the Convention Center and those kinds of things. And so certainly it was nothing against not being able to utilize the Convention Center. I would certainly love to go back and have someone go back and talk to the group about being able. I think they would probably have a better event. I mean with regards to accommodations in the Convention Center, no doubt. But I just want to be clear about how it came about. So that we don't have any misunderstandings about how it came about. It was strictly - - - the Convention Center was not even an option at the time when they started talking to me about it. And I was the person who proposed this, so I'm certainly not against - - - if it's the Council's pleasure that we would remove it, I just think we've got to be in conversation with 'em right away, because people make plans and decisions about coming to the City. And the very last thing I'd like to do is have any association whether they be 30 or 3,000 to not want to come to our city because

of anything that we may have done. So again I would not reject that Mr. Chairman, I just think that the Council could think about this and if the Mayor is suggesting and Mr. Carrier is suggesting there is something we can do to help facilitate this, then I would be 100% for it.

Mayor Hightower: Mr. Chairman, if - - I know that this does put Councilman Jackson and the rest of the Council and all of us in a bad spot. And the last thing that we want to do is as Councilman Jackson said, run somebody somewhere else, because of something that we've done. So, let me suggest that we postpone this again and let our team work with the organization to see if we can work something out ahead of time, and then come back and if necessary we'll ratify the fact that you guys won't go along with (inaudible) if that becomes necessary. Otherwise hopefully we'll have something worked out and maybe we can just remove this from the Agenda next time.

Substitute motion by Councilman Jackson, seconded by Councilman Green to postpone.

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Chairman, one question. Mr. Mayor or Mr. Antee, you might know the answer to this. This is one that I recognize. Have they had a history with us as bringing the convention here to the City?

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I think that they move to different cities on a rotating basis.

Councilman Hogan: Well, if it was a situation where they had been coming here, obviously we'd want them (inaudible) renegotiate with them, so I sure hope we can save it. You know we can get them here. Some kind of compromise and I've got faith in you that you'll do that. Thank you.

Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

RESOLUTION NO. 220 OF 2005

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO EXECUTE AN AGREEMENT WITH SHREVEPORT CENTRAL STORAGE, INC. AND TO OTHERWISE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BY:

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport has a need for the services of a qualified company to provide a central location for the storage of wrecked and impounded vehicles; and

WHEREAS, the contract with the current operator, Shreveport Central Storage, Inc., expires on December 31, 2005; and

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport advertised for proposals for these services for the six-year period beginning January 1, 2006; and

WHEREAS, Shreveport Central Storage, Inc., was the sole proposer and met all City requirements.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in legal session convened, that it hereby authorizes the Mayor to execute an agreement with Shreveport Central Storage, Inc., substantially in accordance with the agreement provided to the Clerk of Council on December 13, 2005.

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

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

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Walford to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

RESOLUTION NO. 222 OF 2005

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE ACCEPTANCE OF A DONATION IN THE AMOUNT OF TWENTY FIVE THOUSAND DOLLARS FROM THE AEP/SWEPCO, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BY:

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport desires to support leisure activity programs in the C. Bickham Dickson Park which serve the public and render a public service; and

WHEREAS, AEP/SWEPCO desires to support the growth and use of the C. Bickham Dickson Park and the surrounding area; and

WHEREAS, AEP/SWEPCO desires to donate an amount of Twenty-five Thousand dollars (\$25,000.00) to be used to repair or replace the fishing pier at C. Bickham Dickson Park; and

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport has established an Enrichment Fund as a trust fund for donations of funds and/or goods by any persons or groups. The Enrichment Fund ordinance is contained in Section 26-186 et seq., of the Code of Ordinances; and

WHEREAS, the ordinance provides that donations over \$5,000.00 shall be accepted only with the approval of the City Council.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened that Keith Hightower, Mayor, is hereby authorized to accept a donation in the amount of Twenty-five Thousand Dollars (\$25,000.00) from AEP/SWEPCO and to execute any and all documents on behalf of the City of Shreveport relative to the receipt of the said funds.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the funds donated by AEP/SWEPCO shall be used to repair or replace the fishing pier at C. Bickham Dickson.

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

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

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Robertson to adopt.

Councilman Hogan: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Shelly, you don't have to come up, but if you can just nod your head or shake your head, it would be fine. Is this \$25,000 going to be enough to redo the pier? Okay, I might get you to come up then.

Councilman Jackson: I think Councilman Hogan's got another 25.

Councilman Hogan: I didn't hear. Is it going to take a - - -

Ms. Ragle: (Inaudible) an additional about \$23,000. The total bid was about \$48,199 and we've identified money in our operating budget to add to this to get the pier fixed.

Councilman Hogan: Okay. I'd looked through this paperwork and I didn't see that. But it'll take \$23,000 on our part.

Ms. Ragle: (Inaudible) part of this ordinance. This is just to accept the donation from SWEPCO.

Councilman Hogan: When will that be done? Do you know?

Ms. Ragle: We have a notice to proceed from March 1st.

Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, you had one that was added.

The Clerk read the following:

RESOLUTION NO. 227 OF 2005

A RESOLUTION EXPRESSING SUPPORT FOR THE CHIEF OF POLICE AND FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF PLANS TO IMPROVE THE EFFECTIVENESS OF THE POLICE DEPARTMENT AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

By: Councilman Robertson

WHEREAS, the Shreveport Police Department has used the results and recommendations of the 2004 Patrol Staffing Assessment study by its consultant, Mr. Peter Bellmio, to devise a policy and plans to improve the effectiveness of the department; and

WHEREAS, the policy includes setting a maximum response time for priority one calls, achieving thirty percent pro-active time for patrol officers, and having an adequate number of patrol units available for service calls; and

WHEREAS, in order to implement that policy, the department must maintain a sufficient number of officers and corporals on patrol and must increase their efficiency. The department is working to implement plans to achieve those goals, such as realigning the patrol districts to better distribute the workload, realigning shift hours, implementing a new alarm ordinance, and holding at least two police academy classes annually.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened that the Council hereby expresses its support for Chief of Police Mike Campbell and his plans to improve the effectiveness of the Shreveport Police Department.

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

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

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Robertson, seconded by Councilman Green to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS *(Not to be adopted prior to January 10, 2005)*

1. **Resolution No. 226 of 2005**: Authorizing the Mayor to accept a donation from Caddo Bossier Office of Homeland Security and Emergency Preparedness and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Walford to introduce Resolution No. 226 of 2005 to lay over until January 10, 2005 meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

INTRODUCTION OF ORDINANCES *(Not to be adopted prior to January 10, 2005)*

1. **Ordinance No. 217 of 2005**: An ordinance to enact sections of 30-91 through 30-93 of the City of Shreveport Code of Ordinances relative to Fire Prevention and Protection and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
2. **Ordinance No. 218 of 2005**: ZONING APPEAL – C:93-05: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance by rezoning property located on the northwest corner of Ardmore and Youree, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from SPI-3 (B-1) Commercial Corridor Overlay (Youree Drive) (Buffer Business) District. To SPI-3-E (B-1) Commercial Corridor Overlay (Youree Drive)/Extended Use (Buffer Business) District, limited to “A Beauty Salon”, ONLY, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (C/Carmody)
3. **Ordinance No. 219 of 2005**: ZONING – C-94-05: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance by rezoning property located on the south side Terry Bradshaw Passway (Hwy 3132), 2600 feet west of Jewella Avenue and being just west of Summer Grove Baptist Church (South Park Mall), Shreveport, Caddo Parish Louisiana from R-1D, Urban, One-Family Residence/Extended Use District, limited to “A Safety Training Town for School Aged Children ONLY, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (E/Hogan)

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Robertson to introduce Ordinance No(s). 217, 218, and 219 of 2005 to lay over until January 10, 2005 meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

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

1. **Ordinance No. 206 of 2005**: An ordinance closing and abandoning the portion of Arkansas Avenue running between West College Street and to a point located ½ Block south of Lakeshore and closure and abandonment of the portion of the adjacent alleyway located between Lots 1 and 20, Block 7 of the Queensborough Addition Subdivision in the SE/4 of Section 3 (T17N-R14W), Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
(G/Jackson)(Postponed – December 13, 2005)

Having passed first reading on November 29, 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 Walford to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

2. **Ordinance No. 211 of 2005**: An ordinance amending the 2005 Retained Risk Fund Budget.

Having passed first reading on December 13, 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 Robertson to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

3. **Ordinance No. 212 of 2005**: An ordinance amending the 2005 General Fund Budget.

Having passed first reading on December 13, 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 Green.

Amendment # 1 to Ordinance No. 212 of 2005

AMEND THE ORDINANCE AS FOLLOWS:

In Section 1 (Estimated Receipts):

Increase Miscellaneous by \$300,000.

Increase Intergovernmental by \$700,000.

In Section 2 (Appropriations):

In Public Assembly and Recreation, increase Contractual Services by \$150,000.

In General Government, increase Contractual Services by \$25,000 and Other Charges by \$700,000.

In Operational Services, increase Contractual Services by \$125,000.

Adjust totals and subtotals accordingly.

Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Hogan to adopt Amendment No. 1 to Ordinance No. 212 of 2005.

Councilwoman Robertson: Seeing the one that was handed out, they increased the intergovernmental by \$700,000 has to do with FEMA. And then it's saying that for State funds passed through the City to U.S. Support Company. Is that something that we didn't know about when we did the amendment originally?

Mr. Dark: Ms. Robertson, the \$700,000 is something that - - - that's not FEMA money. That's a pass through from the State Department of Economic Development which we didn't think we were going to get this year. Looks like we are going to get it this week, so we had to go ahead and appropriate it. We were going to wait until next year when we got the money, but we're going to get it this week. So - - -

Councilwoman Robertson: Oh, okay. I just saw FEMA on the bottom of the - - -

Mr. Dark: Yeah, FEMA is the other part of the money.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, my question is we're increasing miscellaneous, but we're going to appropriate money in several ways and I see contractual services are predominant ways of doing this. This funding that comes from the anticipated FEMA reimbursement, is that money that comes from FEMA that we're anticipating from FEMA for the use of EXPO Hall or something?

Mr. Dark: We believe we have a little over a million dollar in FEMA money coming in. We had not appropriated all of that when we did the last amendment cause we didn't know how much we were going to get. This is just appropriating a little bit more of it.

Councilman Jackson: Okay, do we have something that puts us in that state of anticipation? Something - - -

Mr. Dark: Yes sir.

Councilman Jackson: We do have something?

Mr. Dark: We do have approved requests; it's just a matter of getting the money. It may not be shortly, but we'll get the money eventually. And we still haven't appropriated all of it, because you never know. But we've tried to appropriate most of it at this point.

Councilman Jackson: Okay, well I hope we're not spending it on anything very important or anticipating, even though the rate of speed that we've seen them operate over the last year, I certainly hope that we're not counting our chickens before they're hatched.

Mr. Dark: It will be shown as a receivable in the 2005 financial statements. That's the way it's most likely gonna end up and as long as we get the money at some point, that will cover us.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, just for the record, let the record state I'm nervous.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Dark, my question is on the appropriations side, we're increasing contractual services by \$150,000 for Public Assembly and Recreation. What is that for?

Mr. Dark: Paying Shelly's electric bills. Shelly's electric and gas bills actually.

Councilman Lester: Why didn't we pay her electric bill before?

Mr. Dark: Well we thought we had enough money in there and it turned out she had two bills outstanding, I didn't know I had. In order to keep them from having to hold money into January or to hold bills until January, just taking advantage of the fact that you've got an ordinance on second reading going ahead and appropriating. Same thing for DOS. Basically, the original amendment is allowing us to pay bills in December instead of having to defer the money into next year.

Councilman Lester: I guess my question is, I mean we just had some lengthy conversations about the budget for all of these departments. Why didn't that issue of \$150,000 electric and gas bills for SPAR, and \$125,000 I guess what, utilities and landfill charges, why weren't those issues addressed in those perspective departments budgets at that time? Obviously they had to know that they had them.

Mr. Dark: Well, they don't always know how many bills they've got outstanding either. In SPAR in particular, we thought we had only two bills left in the year, and we had three. They paid two of them last month, and basically, it didn't leave enough money to pay this months. So we went ahead and we're just trying to cover 'em. I mean, accounting frankly is going to pay 'em this year when they do the close out, one way or the other, but they'd like it a whole lot better when we budget enough money to do it. Same thing with DOS. Their street light electricity, and traffic signal electric bill, thought I had three of 'em, I thought I had two left and I had three left. It's a hundred and some thousand dollars a month to pay that one. I just didn't get 'em all perfect. All we're trying to do right now is cover the shortages that we've got for the month of December.

Councilman Lester: And the \$700,000 is the pass through for U.S. Support?

Mr. Dark: Yes sir.

Councilman Lester: So, let me ask this question. If we did not get the \$700,000 pass through for U.S. Support, would we still have done this amendment, i.e. the \$300,000 or I guess that would be - - -

Mr. Dark: The \$300,000 was the amendment as it started out this morning, when Arlena came in and said they called and said you're going to get your check wired tomorrow. Can you get us a way to appropriate it so we can pay the bill this year? That's when this amendment was changed.

Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Walford to adopt Ordinance No. 212 of 2005 as amended. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

4. **Ordinance No. 213 of 2005**: An ordinance amending the 2005 Budget for the SPORTRAN Enterprise Fund

Having passed first reading on December 13, 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 Walford to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

5. **Ordinance No. 214 of 2005**: An ordinance creating and establishing a no through truck route on Ockley Drive between Line Avenue and Fairfield Avenue and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (B/Walford)

Having passed first reading on December 13, 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 Robertson to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

6. **Ordinance No. 215 of 2005**: An ordinance declaring certain adjudicated properties to be surplus and to authorize the Mayor of the City of Shreveport to sell the City of Shreveport's Tax interest in certain surplus adjudicated properties and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (B/Walford/D/Robertson)

Having passed first reading on December 13, 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 Robertson to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

7. **Ordinance No. 216 of 2005**: An Ordinance to amend Section 62-78 of the Code of Ordinances relative to Tennis Center Fees and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on December 13, 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 Walford to adopt.

Councilman Jackson: Just wanted to clarify that that's just a \$.25 increase. Is that correct? Thank you.

Councilman Lester: Ms. Ragle is nodding yes.

Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

8. **Ordinance No. 208 of 2005:** ZONING – C-89-05: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the northwest corner of West 63rd and Linwood Avenue, 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. (F/Green)(Postponed – December 13, 2005)

Having passed first reading on November 29, 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 Robertson to postpone. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

The Adopted Ordinances and Amendments follow:

ORDINANCE NO. 206 OF 2005

AN ORDINANCE CLOSING AND ABANDONING THE PORTION OF ARKANSAS AVENUE RUNNING BETWEEN WEST COLLEGE STREET AND TO A POINT LOCATED ½ BLOCK SOUTH OF LAKESHORE DRIVE, AND CLOSURE AND ABANDONMENT OF THE PORTION OF THE ADJACENT ALLEYWAY LOCATED BETWEEN LOTS 1 AND 20, BLOCK 7 OF THE QUEENSBOROUGH ADDITION SUBDIVISION IN THE SE/4 OF SECTION 3 (T17N-R14W), SHREVEPORT, CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, today the Property Management Section of the Department of Operational Services has received a request to close and abandon a portion of the above identified alleyway; and

WHEREAS, Water and Sewerage Engineering has reviewed this request and has no objections to this portion of the alleyway being closed and abandoned.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened, that the portion of Arkansas Avenue running between West College Street and to a point located ½ block south of Lakeshore Drive, and closure and abandonment of the portion of the adjacent alleyway located between Lots 1 and 20. Block 7 of the Queensborough Addition Subdivision in the SE/ 4 of Section 3 (T17N-R14W), Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana and as shown and as indicated on the plat attached hereto and made a part hereof, is hereby closed and abandoned. Utility and water servitudes will be retained.

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

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

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

ORDINANCE NO. 211 OF 2005

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

BY:

WHEREAS, the City Council finds it necessary to amend the 2005 budget for the Retained Risk Internal Service Fund to transfer funds to the General Fund 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. 155 of 2004, the 2005 budget for the Retained Risk Internal Service Fund, is hereby amended as follows:

In Section 1 (Estimated Receipts):

Increase Transfer from General Fund by \$500,000.

Increase Transfer from Water & Sewerage Fund by \$700,000.

Increase Transfer from Airports Fund by \$29,000.

In Section 2 (Appropriations):

Increase Personal Services by \$924,000.

Increase Materials and Supplies by \$1,000.

Increase Contractual Services by \$2,000.

Increase Other Charges by \$302,000.

Adjust totals and subtotals accordingly.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the remainder of Ordinance No. 155 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. 212 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 Taxes and Special Assessments by \$1,800,000.

Decrease Miscellaneous by \$100,000.

In Section 2 (Appropriations):

In Public Assembly and Recreation, increase Personal services by \$100,000 and Other Charges by \$25,000.

In Finance, decrease Improvements and Equipment by \$100,000.

In General Government, increase Operating Reserves by \$825,000, Transfer to SporTran by \$150,000 and Transfer to Retained Risk by \$500,000.

In Fire, increase Personal Services by \$200,000.

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 # 1 to Ordinance No. 212 of 2005

AMEND THE ORDINANCE AS FOLLOWS:

In Section 1 (Estimated Receipts):

Increase Miscellaneous by \$300,000.

Increase Intergovernmental by \$700,000.

In Section 2 (Appropriations):

In Public Assembly and Recreation, increase Contractual Services by \$150,000.

In General Government, increase Contractual Services by \$25,000 and Other Charges by \$700,000.

In Operational Services, increase Contractual Services by \$125,000.

Adjust totals and subtotals accordingly.

ORDINANCE NO. 213 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 \$150,000.

In Section 2 (Appropriations):

Increase Contractual Services by \$150,000.

Adjust totals and subtotals accordingly.

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. 214 OF 2005

AN ORDINANCE TO CREATE AND ESTABLISH A NO THROUGH TRUCK ROUTE ON OCKLEY DRIVE BETWEEN LINE AVENUE AND FAIRFIELD AVENUE, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BY:

BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due,

legal and regular session convened that Ockley Drive between Line Avenue and Fairfield Avenue

is hereby created and established as a No Through Truck Route and it shall be unlawful for trucks

exceeding fifteen thousand (15,000) pounds gross vehicle weight to use any portion of Ockley Drive

between Line Avenue and Fairfield Avenue except for local pickup and delivery.

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 resolutions or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

ORDINANCE NO. 215 OF 2005

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

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport has a tax interest in the herein below described properties which have been adjudicated for the non-payment of City property taxes; and **WHEREAS**, the herein below described properties are not needed for public purposes and should be declared surplus properties; and

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

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

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED, that the City Council of the City of Shreveport does hereby authorize the sale of its tax interest in the herein below described properties for an amount not less than the offer as indicated below

Property No. 1 Legal Description - Lots 195 & 196, Bellview Subdivision, a subdivision in the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, as per plat thereof recorded in Book 50, Page 677 of the Conveyance Records of Caddo Parish, Louisiana, together with all buildings and improvements located thereon.

(GEO#171411-029-0216-00) Municipal Address -2206 Carleton Street

AMOUNT OFFERED: \$300.00 APPRAISED VALUE: \$600.00 DISTRICT B

Property No. 2: Legal Description - Lot 6, Block 13, Oakview Subdivision, a subdivision in the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, as per plat thereof recorded in Book 150, Page 279, of the Conveyance Records of Caddo Parish, Louisiana, together with all buildings and improvements located thereon.

(GEO#171425-036-0006-00) Municipal Address - 460 East 75th Street

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

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

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

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

ORDINANCE NO. 216 OF 2005

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND SECTION 62-78 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES RELATIVE TO TENNIS CENTER FEES AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO

BY:

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport has established

tennis programs at Bill Cockrell Tennis Center, Querbes Tennis Center and Southern Hills Tennis Center which are managed by tennis professionals; and

WHEREAS, it is important to provide a high level of tennis instruction, league play, tournament recruitment, and a professional pro shop staff at the City's Tennis Centers, to maximize the City's investment in them and keep them attractive to individual tennis players, league tennis players, and to local, regional, and national tennis tournaments; and

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport recognizes and acknowledges the economic impact of hosting these tournaments and the importance of maintaining a professionally run tennis program for citizens and visitors, and that this requires a level of revenues beyond that which is available from the current fee structure.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, legal and regular session convened, that Section 62-78 of the Code of Ordinances relative to tennis fees is amended and re-enacted to now read as follows:

Sec. 62-78. Fee schedule.

A fee schedule for activities, rentals and uses in the department of public assembly and recreation is hereby established as follows:

Tennis Fees

Membership Fees

All fees listed below do not include applicable tax. When applicable, taxes will be applied to any charges listed below.

Memberships

Memberships shall not be pro-rated, but may be purchased on a semi-annual basis at half the annual rate. Semi-annual memberships purchased January 1 to June 30 will expire June 30. Semi-annual memberships purchased July 1 to December 31 and annual memberships will expire December 31.

Memberships			
Annual Regular (18-61)	\$240.00		
Annual, (Senior/Junior, Disabled/City Employee/Military)	\$170.00		
Family (2 in same household-dependent)	\$375.00		
Additional Family Member (in same household-dependent)	\$70.00		
Senior Family (2 in same household-dependent)	\$275.00		
Court Fees			
Regular, per hour	\$2.07		
Senior/Junior/Disabled/Military/City Employee, per hour	\$1.38		
Supervised High School Team Practice (tennis balls must be purchased from tennis center)	No Charge		

All fees listed below include applicable tax.

Tournaments	
Entry Fee, pro assisted standard tournament	\$10.00 per person
Entry Fee, non pro assisted	\$ 5.00 per person
High School Tournament (tennis balls must be purchased from tennis center)	No Charge
Lessons	
Group (3 or more) per person per hour	Up to \$10.00

Junior Group per person per hour	Up to \$6.00
Private Lessons	
Tennis Director	\$45.00 per hour
P-1 Instructor	\$40.00 per hour
P-2 Instructor	\$35.00 per hour
P-3 Instructor	\$30.00 per hour
League Fees	
Pro assisted	\$10.00 per person, plus court fees
Other Fees	
Racket Ball Courts	Same as tennis
Ball Machine Rental	\$5.00 per hour, plus court fees

FURTHER ORDAINED that if any provision or item of this ordinance or the application thereof is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect the provisions, items or applications of this ordinance which can be given effect without the invalid provision, 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 resolutions or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

Ordinance No. 93 of 2005: To amend and reenact 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. (Introduced – 6/14/05 - Tabled on July 12, 2005)

Mr. Thompson: There’s been no indication that Ordinance No. 93 is to be taken from the table.

Councilwoman Robertson: Now will this come off by - - - since this is the end of the year?

Mr. Thompson: No.

NEW BUSINESS:

MPC Approval Appeal:

C-85-05: *Commodore Medical Services of LA, L. P.*, for MPC Approval in an I-2 District of property located at the end of Cedar Street, 1734 feet west of Park Street. (A/Lester)
(Postponed – December 13, 2005)

Motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Robertson to postpone.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, I don't want to ask about what the reason for postponing is, let me just make a statement that I think Mr. Lee and Mr. Freeman, I don't know if the names are correct, were talking about the fact that there was something that happens on the 31st. That somehow or another triggers something that is going to be negative or their corporation or what have you. And I guess that would be my un-readiness with all deference to the Chairman. My un-readiness would be in regards to postponing, would be the fact that they have indicated or declared perhaps that there were some date sensitive or time sensitive issues with regard to their business. And so, that's - - I wanted to express what my uneasiness about postponing would be. And I don't know what the will of the Council is, but I just wanted to consider that at least two or three times in this conversation. In their conversation, the idea of the time sensitivity kept appearing as an issue. And I certainly want to be sensitive to that particular issue, unless there is something that we don't know about.

Councilman Lester: I'm glad that you asked that question, and I can be very forthright, direct and honest on this. Obviously this is a matter of some concern to these gentlemen, because they've traveled from a great distance to address this issue. This is a matter that is within the confines of my district. I have taken an opportunity to visit the site. I've spoken with Mr. Lee. As of the last meeting, I had some questions that surrounded the whole scenario from Illinois, in terms of getting a definitive answer from the Attorneys General's office as it relates to what the exact nature of the violation was. Was there any pollution and that whole nine yards. Quite obviously, I'm concerned, they have some issues in terms of business and I'm very sensitive to that. But at the same time, we're talking about 27 lives versus the lives of the neighborhood. And I would much rather err on the side of the caution. My major concern is finding out the technical nature of the violation. Now, I have exhausted several efforts in terms of getting information from the Attorneys General's office in Illinois. I've had some correspondence. Probably the reason I haven't gotten the information is because we're talking about a state agency during the holiday season. Again, I'm very sensitive to Mr. Freeman and I'm very sensitive to Mr. Lee and their situation in terms of regulations. But at the same time, I have a fiduciary duty, and my duty to my constituents in my mind outweigh the time sensitive nature of their situation. Because quite obviously I didn't set the wheels in motion in terms of termination of their lease. That's something that I have absolutely no control over. And I would dare say that the idea that you would terminate a lease and begin to do work on a facility before you have complete regulatory approval, puts that business in a precarious situation because it almost presupposes that the government is going to be a rubber stamp in terms of what they're going to do, and I don't think that's our responsibility. Again, I am very sensitive to what Mr. Lee is going through. I'm very sensitive to what Mr. Freeman is going through. I have the utmost concern about the 27 people that are working there. But my responsibility far outweighs my responsibility to the 27 folks because one of the things that Mr. Freeman said was, in their plant in Nashville, it's at the end of the road and not in an offensive area, and there is a mile between the residential area and the industrial area. In this particular instance, the residential area is right next to this industrial area. So I mean you're talking about literally the fence that runs the property line, you could see through to the neighborhood. So when you talk about putting an industrial area, that close to a neighborhood, you have to be in my mind, very circumspect. And an issue has been raised. Mr. Freeman went on

about they have a perfect record in Nashville, a perfect record here, but again, there is a cloud. There is a question, and I can't in good conscious vote for an organization that has at some point shown itself not to be a corporate citizen. Now, if in fact the situation that happened in Illinois, can be factually distinguished from their operations here, in other words, if what happened in Illinois was an apple and what we're talking right her is an orange, that gives me a level of satisfaction that I can explain this to the residents in the neighborhood, and say your concerns are justified, they have been heard. But in Illinois that situation was this and this situation is something far and apart. We have all the procedural safe guards in mind. But we haven't gotten to that point, because I haven't gotten that information. I'm very sensitive again to their scenario in terms of a business, but I have my duty that I have to do. Now obviously, if they had not terminated their lease as of December 31st, I don't think we would be in the time crunch that we're in, because obviously they would be able to continue to operate or what have you. But my level of sensitivity toward this business does not rise to the level of my sensitivity towards my constituents, and that's why I'm asking for a postponement. I have no ill will against Mr. Lee or Mr. Freeman or their company. I just have to be able to in my mind, if I'm going to support this, justify to my constituents, this is what the situation is. Because obviously, if I'm wrong, the cost or the negative far outweigh anything to the 27 people. And so that's why I'm asking the Council for a postponement.

Councilman Green: Mr. Chairman, I don't know if they would be familiar with it, but I'd like - - - I see members of the fire department is here. Maybe they could answer your question on pollution. Could you all come? Sir, I hate to put you on the spot - - -

Councilman Lester: But - - -

Councilman Green: Tell me how much pollution; you've heard the discussion of this, how much pollution is involved in this?

Cpt Hawthorne (EMS): To be honest with you, I'm not that familiar with this corporation. I am familiar with medical disposals on the hospital level as far as incinerators go, but as far as this one goes, this is out of my league. I could talk to Chief Cochran and see if we could find some information for you.

Councilman Green: Fine, thank you. Is there anybody in the Chamber that knows anything about pollution? Mike is not here.

Councilman Walford: Ramon just stood up. Now, he's sitting back down. Mr. Chairman, I'm going to have to share some of Councilman Jackson's feelings. I'm very uncomfortable putting 27 people out of work. And postponing, we've got a decision that was made by the Metropolitan Planning Commission approving this. If I understand correctly the property is already zoned I-2 and there are any number of business that could go on the property by right, which could certainly could be a lot more intrusive and I guess we can use the word offensive than what this business is going to be. And we're talking about a business only moving, and if I understood right, only a thousand feet. But my biggest concern is presenting 27 employees with unemployment for the new year. I have a real problem with that. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Hogan: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Certainly not always do we go along with the Councilmen's requests in that district, but I'd like to give you the benefit. But on this one, I read in the paperwork here that there was 328 people opposed to it. If anybody's here, raise your hand if you're one of those 328 people. I'd just like to know if there's anybody here today. It's in there. I read it. I'd have to go back - - - somewhere

I read it in some paperwork that there was opposition to it. Nonetheless, my point is this. Nobody is here today to oppose it. So, the permit would be for one year Mr. Jambor? Is that - - - do you know how long the zoning would be approved for?

Mr. Jambor: (Inaudible) stipulated.

Councilman Hogan: There is none? Is there a way- - -? I understand your concern Councilman Lester. Is there a way that we could put a limit on the approval? And just say for the sake of time right now. Because time is of the essence, and we could - - - my understanding is we could set any type of limit that we want on approval. I might leave that at your discretion if you have an idea on what you'd feel comfortable with?

Councilman Lester: Are you asking me to respond to that now?

Councilman Hogan: Yes sir. Do you have any opinion on that?

Councilman Lester: Sure. First of all, I'm going to say this again. The exigency of the situation was not created by this Council. Lets be very clear on that. Calvin Lester and the residents of Allendale did not tell Commodore to postpone or disban their lease in December 31, 2005. Okay? To answer your question as to why the Chamber isn't packed. I will tell you that at the last meeting that this matter was taken up, there were a number of people from the neighborhood that were here that spoke against it. There were a number of people that spoke against it at the MPC meeting. And just for the record, I have no ill-will against the Metropolitan Planning Commission, I think they do an outstanding job, but at the same time, we routinely as a Body overturn MPC decisions almost in due course. So the fact that the MPC has agreed to something, I don't think that is necessarily instructive, nor do I think it's something that guides this Body. Again, Gentlemen and Lady, lets be clear about this. The exigency was created because the Commodore Medical Services terminated their lease, they leased another building before they had gotten regulatory approval from the State of Louisiana, and before they got regulatory approval from the City Council, almost presupposing that this Body would automatically vote 'yes'. Now, I don't know why that is. I do not subscribe any negatives or intent to that company, because I know Mr. Lee. I do not know Mr. Freeman, but I know Mr. Lee to be an honorable gentleman. Okay? Yet at the end of the day, my concern obviously is with the 27 people that are employed by this company, but at the same time, I have a duty to the people that live in that neighborhood that have expressed to me as their representative a legitimate concern. Now, if this Council decides that it wants to move forward and completely ignore the concern that they have raised and I as their representative have raised, I will not like it, but I will be fine with that. But please understand when you have a situation where you're talking about placing an industrial situation right next to a neighborhood, and I'm not going to get into the issue about the industrial site being next to a neighborhood. I would dare say my Council District is one of the few council districts that would have an industrial and yours, and probably yours would be the only districts in the City that would have an industrial development right next door to a residential neighborhood. I'm quite sure wouldn't happen in District E, or District D, and parts of District C or District B. That happened before Calvin Lester and a number of other people. So the idea that anybody could come in there, that's true. But we're not talking about anybody. Again, I have not taken a position necessarily for or necessarily against it. My question is if you have a company that is in this type of business that deals with medical waste and there is an issue about

them in another situation, i.e. pollution. And it could be as Mr. Freeman said. It could be a strictly technical issue with a licensing situation. But as the representative for those people in Allendale, I don't get a second (inaudible). Because if something negative were to happen, they have been licensed, and I have put them in that situation. So again, I understand their (inaudible). I understand their desire to get this over with and move on. I understand that they could lose money. But if I'm made to choose between juxtaposed about 27 people and the lives of the neighborhood that I represent, that's not even an issue. I'm going down with my neighborhood every time. And I would ask simply that this Body allow me to get that information. Now, if that information has not been gained by me, and I don't see why it wouldn't be, and again, I have called the folks at the AG's office, I've called Secretary of State's office, and again, I think a reason why I haven't gotten the information was - - - we're doing this at the end of the year, and this is the holiday season and these are State employees. But again, if the information is not there, and I can't verify it, next meeting, we'll vote on it. But I in good conscious cannot vote in favor of this situation with that issue being out there. Because regardless of whether there were 20 people out there or five people or one person, they put me here to take care of their business in their absence, and they have made it perfectly clear to me as their representative that this is something that they want me to deal with. And obviously, if like I said, if we could factually distinguish what happened in Illinois as being something separate and apart from what they're doing here, I have no problem being supportive of this. But if what happened up there in terms of the violation and it wasn't just a technical violation, and it was a pollution issue, and that's similar to this, I can't support it. And I dare say none of you would support a company coming in your backyard that has a history of negative outcomes, i.e. pollution. I don't think any of us would vote for that. Now again, that's what my position is on the record. And if you chose to vote to postpone, great. If you chose not to, that's fine, but this is a District A matter and I would ask that you honor that.

Councilman Hogan: Well, that's a little longer answer than I want or was asking for, but just to clarify, the answer would be, No – that you wouldn't be - - - that there wouldn't be a period of time that you would feel comfortable with in extending or rather granting the zoning?

Councilman Lester: Not until I got that information. I mean, to be honest with you Councilman Hogan, if I get my questions answered to a level of satisfaction, then I would probably be in favor of moving forward with this development. But I just have to get those questions answered.

Councilman Hogan: Okay, I was trying to see if we could come to a compromise on it, if you perhaps felt comfortable with 3 months, 6 months, or whatever. But I accept what you're saying. Mr. Freeman would you come forward for a moment please? Thank you. You heard the concerns of Councilman Lester. I could have misunderstood you a few minutes ago, but I thought that you had answered the question about what type of violation it was, and whether or not that it was indeed a technical violation. I could have misunderstood you.

Mr. Freeman: The best way of answering this is that on January 1st, if we were to move our operation to Cedar Street with the transporter permit that we have, and with the treatment facility permit that this State will issue us, we still would be missing the transfer station permit. And that is what got us in our technical situation in the State of

Illinois. The distinguishing characteristic is that in four days, we're in danger of becoming in violation of that same regulation in the State of Louisiana. If we continue to do business here, the way that we are continuing to do business here, or we could end up - - - I'm not sure what our situation is with the lease. And just to clarify, because I know it wasn't addressed, when we bought the company based out of Oklahoma, and tried desperately to keep that business based here in Louisiana, the December 31 deadline was something that we were able to work out with the landlord rather than being forced out in April, because we did not have - - - the landlord had to consent to the building continuing to be used. The landlord did not have the greatest of experiences with the other companies. It wasn't a procedural issue, it was more of a 'I'm the landlord, I'd like to be paid on time.' The landlord was also very upset about the fact that he has an adjoining building that he cannot find a tenant for, for the exact reasons that we would like to move down to Cedar Street. It's - - - as a landlord, it was very difficult for him to find a tenant that wanted to be in a building on the exact same piece of property. So, he was gracious enough to extend our lease to December 31. But this is not a lease that we terminated, this was a lease that was terminated by the landlord, and he gave us eight months to work out our situation. I absolutely understand Councilman Lester's concerns, they're very legitimate concerns. The only thing I can tell you is that I'm being honest with you on our situation in Illinois. We have been cited for failing to obtain a transfer station permit, which allows us to take a box off a small truck, put it on a big trailer so that we can transport it. There are simply - - - there simply are not allegations or charges or citations that revolve around a pollution issue. A pollution issue, one that I would describe as 'hey this company has neither negligently, intentionally nor otherwise polluted the environment. Waste has been left on the ground. Waste has been put into the water system. That is not the situation. Certainly not to minimize our situation in our citation in Illinois, but simply to try to paint an accurate picture. We believe we're very good corporate citizens. We're certainly not perfect. We stub our toe every now and then, and we try our best to correct it immediately. The situation in Illinois for example was corrected to the State's satisfaction within 24 hours when we received word. And we actually contacted the State. We received word that our interpretation was incorrect long before the citation was issued. And we immediately shut down the transfer station and have gone to great expense to do things correctly in the State of Illinois.

Councilman Hogan: That's good. You've answered my question. I just wanted to be sure that not getting your transfer station permit is not a situation that would endanger the lives of the citizens of this area.

Mr. Freeman: It either puts us in a situation where we violate our lease, we violate the law, or I don't see any other way to legally operate in the State of Louisiana, doing what the regulations technically require here.

Councilman Hogan: And one more thing I wanted to be clear on. It wasn't your choice or it wasn't Mr. Lee's choice to terminate the lease. It just ran out and the landlord gave you eight months notice saying I'm not going to be renewing your lease.

Mr. Freeman: When we purchased the company that was a triggering event under the lease that allowed the landlord to immediately terminate. And what we negotiated was an eight month period to allow us to find a place to move to, to allow him an opportunity to find a tenant. For better or worse, he has found that tenant, and from what Mr. Lee said, apparently they are moving in. Because we have almost vacated the

premises. We use the back loading dock so that we can be in technical compliance with the Louisiana regulations. And obviously that's not the best business situation.

Councilman Hogan: Okay, you've answered my questions Mr. Freeman. I appreciate you, but you've answered my questions. I don't know if anybody else has any other questions. But I'm done.

Mayor Hightower: Mr. Freeman, can I ask you a question? My understanding is that you guys are vacating your current location. What's happening to the waste stream today?

Mr. Freeman: Today the waste stream is being transferred as described from small box (inaudible) where it comes from your hospitals, nursing homes, doctor offices, is being transferred into tractor trailer rigs, and is being done at the Stonewall address where we have the technical permit to do that and it's being shipped all the way to Nashville. So, what has happened there is we have laid off people back in the fall when we made the decision to shut down the local operation temporarily. And it's our hope that we will be able to hire back not only the ones that we laid off, but a significant number of additional employees if this becomes a permanent efficient operation.

Mayor Hightower: It would seem to me that 1) that you have a Councilman that represents the District that is struggling over making the right decision. And he's awaiting some paperwork from Illinois State government that I would suppose you have in our file somewhere. If I were standing in your shoes today, I would help him obtain the information. He's out working on his own to try to protect his constituency, and has apparently had no help from you guys. I think he along with the rest of the Council see the benefit of you guys operating the facility in our facility. Landfills are big business, and that's essentially what you operate is Step I of a landfill process. The second concern in this whole conversation brings to mind something that the Council should consider is we have a flow control ordinance. So, while you think that it may be okay to transfer currently, you're currently violating a City of Shreveport Ordinance. And I sympathize with your plight, but flow control means that all of the garbage in the City of Shreveport goes to our landfill. Be it medical or otherwise. We - - -, and I understand that presents a different set of problems. But the flip side of that is we don't necessarily I think want to have to deal with that other set of problems and eventually have that waste transferred out and the Nashville landfill take advantage of money flowing out of our community. So, from that standpoint, we see the value. But I also see the value that Councilman Lester talks about and says that if there is a problem, and its an issue no matter where you go. And you know it. There's one other site in the state in reserve, and landfills are few and far between all over the country. Because of the 'not in my backyard' syndrome. All I would suggest to you that is you guys are in the dire straits that you seem to be in. I don't know what happens to the waste stream other than transferring at this point, but clearly something needs to be resolved quickly. And if I were in your shoes, I would help him resolve the issue by producing the paperwork, whatever it may be. If the company is as clean as you guys claim it is and I don't have any reason to believe it isn't. Show him the work so that we can get the company going. 27 jobs are at stake, the waste stream is at stake, this company - - - I see this company as being able to be a huge, huge business. Not only in this city, in this state, but in this region, because of the 'not in my backyard' syndrome, that's prevalent throughout the country. So it could become a huge deal. But that's even, I think, a more reason to satisfy Councilman's concerns over how the process

works, what happens to the waste, how it's treated, how spills are treated, contamination, the body fluids, whatever may be involved. And I know that you guys obviously have to do it right, because you're regulated by the DEQ. I know you have to do it right, because the Willis Knightons, and the Schumperts, and the LSUs of the world aren't going to let some fly by night take liability out of their hospital and spread it across the neighborhoods. So, we know you're regulated, but I think it's incumbent upon you to help this man understand and be able to convey to his constituency that what you guys are doing is correct, it's legitimate, it's done in a proper manner under all the regulations.

Mr. Freeman: Yes, I agree, and we are certainly more than happy to fully cooperate and provide documents. And yes you're right. We are regulated by the DEQ and have been for the several years that we have been in this state, even though we just acquired the company that has the treatment facility on Stonewall Street in April. Commodore has been doing business in this state for three or four business, and DEQ I think, I know that we've received no violations from DEQ, and yes, generally, we don't disclose customer names, but you're right, there are very prominent hospital systems that do not do business with companies that do not take care of their waste stream. Because they have liability also, and they would not entrust us with that if there was any question.

Mayor Hightower: Well, again, I would suggest to you that you have come here today and on December 13th with a problem that as Councilman Lester said, this Council or this City didn't create. It was created over an eight month period apparently where you guys have come down to the final wire and are asking the Council to make a decision over something that all the information hadn't been gathered on. And I would just simply suggest that you come not with a problem, but with a solution to help them get through this. This Council and this City is as pro business as any group I've worked with. And they're not sitting here to detour or to make you jump through hoops, but they are elected by 27,000 constituents each, and as Councilman Lester said is that your business (inaudible) from Nashville or my constituency in my neighborhood, and I certainly sympathize and I do think that you guys have put them in a situation that they probably shouldn't be put in coming down to the wire. And again, any help that you can give them, again, we want you here.

Mr. Freeman: I appreciate that.

Mayor Hightower: We want you to be able to survive here. We believe that it is business growth opportunity for this community, and certainly 27 people have realized that so far, and hopefully more will, but just help the guys and I think everything will be alright. So, I don't know what happens in a two week interval if the waste stream can't be processed, but that maybe something you talk to Councilman Lester about and see if we can't work. We don't want you out of business in two weeks over delays, but at the same time, if the customers can stockpile the waste stream, then maybe there is a solution there. I don't know what kind of volume you're talking about.

Mr. Freeman: There are certain customers that we pick up every single day of the week, and stockpiling would certainly create probably health issues at your healthcare facilities here in town that I don't think our customers (inaudible). I'm not sure if there is some kind of - - -

Mayor Hightower: I don't disagree with you, and I think that probably does, I'm sure that compounds the problem, but at the same time, what I would ask you to do to help these guys, especially to help Councilman Lester is offer up some solutions instead

of saying I'm out of business in three days. And again, it's not these guys fault. So, help 'em help you. That's all. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Green: Along with what the Mayor has just said, were you aware that Councilman Lester was trying to obtain information from the AG when you came?

Mr. Freeman: No, Councilman I was not. I was made aware that there was some opposition based on that. But it was I guess my understanding that those that were opposed had obtained the relevant information and had passed it along. That was a bad assumption on my part.

Councilman Green: The information that we're talking about in Illinois, you have that. I know you wouldn't have it with you today, but you have it at your disposal, right?

Mr. Freeman: Yes sir.

Councilman Green: And you would be able to get it to the Councilman in two weeks. My question would be - - - he has said that once he got the information that he would be prepared to vote within ten days. And I guess my question, excuse me to you would be, would you be able to find it in the goodness of your heart to keep your employees safe and sound as to assisting them, because they didn't create it.

Mr. Freeman: Absolutely.

Councilman Green: Within that ten days.

Mr. Freeman: Absolutely. We are committed to being here. We want to be here, and I appreciate the Mayor's comments saying he wants us to be here. We have kinda from a business standpoint, from a financial standpoint, we've kinda suffered through for eight months, so two more weeks is not an issue with us at all. The problem that we're running into is that we have a landlord that says you will be out on December 31 because I already have another tenant and we have this State, and I guess basically the State is looking to the Shreveport City Council, that says you cannot move over to Cedar Street without Council approval. So our dilemma is caused by a landlord that says 'we've got the property rented, be out in four days.' And the inability to get a permit without your approval. And the last thing we want to do is end up in the newspapers again on a technical violation which obviously we would be. And I honestly have no suggestion for the dilemma that Councilman Lester faces if he is concerned about our business practices.

Councilman Green: So my next question would be to Councilman. The information that he has available, if in fact he can get you the information before the AG gets it to you, would you accept that from him as well as from them? Or whoever gets you the information?

Councilman Lester: Thank you. What I want to do is get the report from the AG's office. If you have that report, I can independently - - -

Mr. Freeman: I can have it faxed to you this afternoon.

Councilman Lester: I mean, that's fine. I mean again, where I am on this is quite obviously you have a group of residents in a neighborhood that are fired up against it. And they've made me aware of the violations. And what I have said all the long is and I've been very clear, and I've told Mr. Lee and everybody if in fact this violation was not pollution based, and you can factually distinguish what happened in Illinois from what happened here, that's an apple and orange type situation and that's something that I can explain to the residents of that neighborhood and say 'listen, yes this is a company, yes they had a problem, but it is different from what we have here.' The issue is independent verification. If I wanted to take the word of the opponents, I wouldn't have voted to

postpone it. I would have said 'I believe them, I don't believe the big business, vote no.' my position is I'm trying to get the information so I can independently verify and make an informed choice. Because yes, I want to protect the citizens, I also am sensitive to where businesses are. But at the same time, I need to have the information so that I can make an informed decision. That's the only the thing I've been asking for throughout this entire process. That's it. So, to answer your question, if you can give me that information, I can do what I need to do and move forward at our next meeting.

Councilman Green: I wasn't finished Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Lester: Okay, go ahead and finish.

Councilman Green: So, you'll be able to get him the information within the ten days, within our next Council Meeting?

Mr. Freeman: I could have it faxed or I could have it overnighted for delivery tomorrow if that helps and could certainly get a copy to all seven members.

Councilman Green: And to my understanding this is your first knowledge as to what was needed or wanted?

Mr. Freeman: Yes, in terms of I was not aware that Councilman Lester was looking for additional information.

Councilman Walford: Before you go away, several points I want to make. I'll go to you first. 27 people are not going to be permanently unemployed if we postpone until January 10th?

Mr. Freeman: No sir, they're not.

Councilman Walford: That was my concern, thank you. Let me tell you one more thing, and I distinctly remember Councilman Lester stating that he had requested the information from Illinois at our last meeting, when you made the request for postponement. So that information did get out. I'm sorry it didn't get to you, but if we're not talking about putting 27 people out of work, I'm going to support my fellow councilman in his request and I can understand where he is coming from. So, I'm hoping that we don't put anybody out of work, and I hope that we have a favorable decision for you based on the information that Mr. Lester gets on January 10th. Thank you.

Councilman Jackson: Yes, thank you Mr. Chairman. And I would hope that certainly in light of what's been shared today, with who had what, who was able to obtain what and all those kinds of things. I was of the thought that as it was stated earlier, that the folks jobs was on the line. I don't know enough about your business. They Mayor knows how to talk trash, I don't. So, I didn't know enough about the specifics of your business to be against it from that perspective. My concern was driven by the employment of people who live in our city. Your company may not be based in our city, but those people live in our city, and that's my concern. I don't represent the district, and so I don't have the same impetus that Councilman Lester does. My general impetus from the city's perspective is I'd like to see as many people working as is possible. He has a lot more intimate concern, because he represents that area. I'm familiar with all of his concerns because I in my district have the same kinds of issues that have been there a long time. But I will say to you that I think, I mean not to you, but let me say to this council, that I think that what we have to do is be sure that we are, we move, and I think that maybe the Chairman has said it today, is my question that I had just jotted down was whether or not waiting on those folks from wherever they are, if in fact they do not respond in the timeframe that we see as timely, because I don't know if they have a real -

-- they may not see a real sense of urgency connected with our case as we do particularly as the Councilman who represents that district does. And maybe Mr. Chairman, I don't know if we'll be prepared at that time, if they do not move with the sort of dispatch necessary and if Mr. Freeman's document is not sufficient and there needs to be more verification other than his document that he's offered to give us, would we be prepared at the next meeting to make a move on it, because while those jobs are not obviously at stake, there still is a sense of as the Mayor says 'trying to be supportive of businesses in our area,' and our customs and practices of trying to aid and assist our businesses to move forward in our areas. Notwithstanding where they may be located. So, that was just my concern whether or not if that is the case, we'd be in a position to do something on January 9th or 10th, whichever date that is.

Mr. Freeman: Is there anyway to (inaudible)

Councilman Jackson: No, I was actually addressing that to the Chairman.

Councilman Lester: Thank you Mr. Jackson. I will say this. My un-readiness goes back to answering this question as it relates to the violation. Quite obviously, if I am given information from their office, and it is what they say that it is in terms of a technical violation, I would imagine that they would provide me with the reports from the Attorneys General's office, and all of those associated documents. And to the extent I don't talk trash like the Mayor, but I do talk the law which is about the same thing, I can decipher what's what and get down to the nitty gritty of the situation. My concern in this whole matter has been, and I've been very honest and circumspect with you and Mr. Lee and everybody distinguish for me what happened in Illinois from this. Let's get to the real nature of what the violation was and if it's different, then we can move forward. If it isn't, then I have a concern. And I've been 100% singing from the same tune from the first time the issue of pollution came up. And again, like I said before, if my concern was just to go with the neighborhood, the easiest thing to do would be 'you know what, the neighbors are against it, I'm against it, lets vote no.' But I'm sitting here saying give me the information so I can make an informed choice. That in and of itself should speak to the fact that I'm trying to extend myself to be fair to you and to the people that work there. And again, the exigency was not created by me, it was created by the company. Now to answer the question as to at our next meeting, I'm quite sure if the folks from Commodore overnight me a package that has the reports from the Attorneys General's office then I can do what I need to do in terms of independently verifying that, I feel comfortable about moving forward. That's where it is. And if they get me the information, I'm willing to move forward. Again, many times when we have issues, particularly zoning issues and neighborhood issues, that's when people's emotions come into play, those are the toughest decisions that we can make. And I try at least as this Councilman, to try to use as much information to make my choice and as little emotion because again, the emotion choice is to say 'I represent a district that's sick and tired of being sick and tired. Every time we turn around you want to dump something in our back yards and this is just another corporation from out of town coming to dump something in our neighborhood, I ain't for it. No.' It's a (inaudible) happen for years and years, and years. But versus doing that, I have said give me the information so that we can independently verify what happened there and what happens here. Bottom line, and I think I've been more than fair. And I think I'm being fair to you guys. Again, the exigency in terms of December 31st, that's not something that this Councilman created.

And I'm sympathetic to those folks. Cause as I can recall at least maybe one or two of those folks live in my district. So, I'm concerned about them as well. So, give me the information. I feel comfortable that we can move forward, and again, if it is what you say it is, I don't see us having any problems. Just equip me to help.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you. I just wanted to thank the Chairman for an answer. I think he sufficiently has answered my question Mr. Chairman, and I appreciate that. With that I'd like to call for the question.

Motion by Councilman Jackson, seconded by Councilman Walford to call for the question and end debate. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Chairman, I want to clarify. This is to postpone until the next meeting?

Councilman Lester: That's correct.

Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

Property Standards Appeal:

Mr. Wilford Claville – HBO0500149 (3552 Lakeshore Drive, Shreveport, LA)
(G/Jackson)

Mr. Thompson: The Property Standards Appeal was decided at the Administrative Conference on the 22nd.

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES: None.
CLERK'S REPORT:

Letter of appeal: C-95-05 - Mr. & Mrs. Wilford and Margaret Claville, property located on the southwest corner of Cleveland and Jewella from R-1D to B-3.
(F/Green)

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, the first item is a letter of appeal, C-95-05. We had the ordinance that would actually go on the agenda placed in our electronic data base, but we failed to put it on the agenda. At this time, I would like to ask you to consider suspending the rules. And we passed it out to you.

Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Jackson to suspend the rules in order to consider an ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinance of the City of Shreveport concerning C-95-05.

Councilman Walford: That was to suspend the rules?

Councilman Lester: To suspend the rules for this purpose only.

Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, we would the Council to consider adding this ordinance to the agenda.

Motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Jackson to add Ordinance No. 220 of 2005 to the agenda. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

Letter of appeal: C-93-05 - Mrs. Louise W. Burton, property located on the northwest corner of Ardmore and Youree. (C/Carmody)

Mr. Thompson: Thank you Mr. Chairman and the Council. The only other matter under the Clerk's report is the letter of appeal, C-93-05 and I believe that it is on the agenda.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting adjourned at approximately 5:19 p.m.

//s// Calvin Ben Lester, Jr. Chairman

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