

COUNCIL PROCEEDINGS OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT, LOUISIANA
JANUARY 24, 2006
(AS AMENDED ON FEBRUARY 28, 2006)

The regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana was called to order by Chairman Calvin Ben Lester, Jr. at 3:00 p.m., Tuesday, January 24, 2006, in the Government Chambers in Government Plaza (505 Travis Street).

Invocation was given by Councilman Hogan.
The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Councilman Walford.

On Roll Call, the following members were Present: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody (Arrived at 4:08 p.m.), Robertson, Green, Hogan and Jackson. 7. Absent: None.

Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Walford to approve the minutes of the Administrative Conference, Monday, January 9, 2006 and Council Meeting, Tuesday, January 10, 2006. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Out of the Chamber: Councilman Carmody. 1.

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

Reports:

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

Councilman Lester: I know we received some information on yesterday, is there anything additional that you'd like to provide for the Council?

Mr. Antee: No, I'd be glad to answer any questions if anybody has any.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Chairman, if I could, could we ask Mr. Carrier from SMG to come up? We had an event this weekend, and I think it would be good to get a report on that. Mr. Carrier, would you be able to give us a brief summary of the weekend?

Mr. Carrier: It was an exciting and somewhat tiring weekend, but all in all, I think it went extremely well. Anytime that you open a new building, it is always a challenge with activities and events and construction, and systems, etc., but we were extremely, extremely pleased. The process of opening a building like that takes a lot of effort by a lot of folks, and while I have the opportunity here, I want to publicly commend the Mayor and his Administration and City Council for the vision that has gone into this, and the hard work that you and all of your colleagues and the folks that you've worked with over the last several years to put into this. To see the looks on the citizens faces as they came through. I think people were surprised at the very least. I think it was a lot more than what most people had envisioned, and certainly carried out what the Mayor had been talking about. I also want to compliment the City. Having been through opening facilities like this, we received outstanding cooperation and support from the various city departments. I had the opportunity to say this to the Mayor very briefly, but everybody in the City in terms of the departments that we worked with for permitting, for fire safety, for police protection, for EMTs, for building permits, etc., all of those things worked extremely, extremely cooperatively with us to make sure that we followed the rules, that everything was ready and was done right, and they did it in a very professional way. And you don't find that in a lot of cities. So, I'm very pleased to be able to stand in front of you and talk about the city employees, and the way that they worked. And so we were very happy, the problems we had, as you saw in the paper, we had a few mechanical problems. That's to be expected. The leaks that we experienced in the rain Sunday. It's hard to find leaks if it doesn't rain. And unfortunately, the drought that we'd had, that prevented that, but I will tell you that it's 7:00 on Monday morning, the contractor had people out there correcting those problems, and I don't think we'll see them again. So, it was a very good weekend. KTBS had some very nice things to say, not only about the facility, but about the opening. So, we're very pleased and would invite you to come this weekend to the Landscape and Gardening Show, and next weekend to the RV Show. And it'll just continue from there. We're very pleased with it and look forward to continued improvement in the building as we move forward.

Councilman Walford: Do you have any numbers that you could share with us?

Mr. Carrier: The numbers that KTBS has talked about is right at 30,000. They did all of the ticketing and admissions, so we don't have an actual count yet. I suspect they'll be releasing that sometime later this week.

Councilman Green: At your earliest convenience, I'd like to see a copy of the contract and the total cost of the event.

Mr. Carrier: Okay. A copy of the contract with KTBS?

Councilman Green: Yes sir.

Mr. Carrier: No problem.

Councilman Green: And the total cost of the event.

Mr. Carrier: Alright, we'll be breaking that down shortly. We're in the process of doing settlement now, so we'll get that to you soon.

Property Standards Report

Councilman Lester: I believe we have a Property Standards Report in our packets, are there any other questions on Property Standards? Once again, they sent the A-Team.

Councilwoman Robertson: Were you by any chance able to find out if y'all had 442 Marks on your schedule?

Ms. Glover: Yes ma'am. The inspector has gone out and made an inspection. And you're correct. It's still there. The paralegal has contacted purchasing to contract out for demolition.

Councilwoman Robertson: Okay, and the only other question that I have is, will you have a report in our packet for my citations issue. I have no addresses. They just have a name. It's on page 8 of the citations issued for the 1st through the 19th.

Ms. Glover: I'll get that corrected for you.

Councilman Walford: If you would check on two things for me? If a contract has been let for the demolition on 142 Herndon. And also if we've ever been able to make service on 601 Elmwood with a citation? If you could just -- unless you have it with you, if you could email that to me if you would?

Councilman Lester: I understand that Councilman Green has a group of special distinguished guests. Sir, the floor is your.

Councilman Green: Yes, the President of the Neighborhood Association is here and she also has some of the members. Ms. Scott would you come up and tell us who you have with us today? And you all can come up along with her. They've got a big meeting scheduled for Thursday night. So, this is a neighborhood association who started recently and certainly, they've done a great job. And these members of Precinct 38, Concerned Citizens Coalition, Precinct 38 and certainly, they've been doing a wonderful job. Ms. Scott, just so that they'll have a record, just state your name and address for the record and tell us who you've got with you.

Ms. Scott: Good afternoon. My name is Linda Scott, my address is 446 Woodrow Street, here in the City. I'm President of the Concerned Citizens Coalition, Precinct 38. And with me I have the Corresponding Secretary, Ms. Hazel Marshall. The Secretary, Ms. Brenda Worthy. Our Chaplain, Mr. Percy Frazier. The young lady is Beatrice Potter, she is our Registration Chairperson. And we have also another member, Little Miss Shamara Worthy. And we're grateful to be here Mr. Mayor and to the Council. Councilman Green is our Councilman, for our District F, and we certainly appreciate being here and you allowing us -- we were organized February 22nd of 2005, and we've done a lot of things, we think. And we appreciate you all for all of what you do for the City of Shreveport.

Councilman Green: Would you like to tell them about the meeting?

Ms. Scott: Oh, on Thursday afternoon, we're having a town hall meeting at 6:00 p.m.. It will be held at 568 Sassafras Street in the Hollywood section at the Union Star Baptist Church Fellowship Hall, where the Reverend G. W. Odom is the pastor. We were using Caddo Career Center. Caddo Middle Career Technology School. We were notified in December from the Assistant Superintendent, Mr. LaVerne that we could no longer use that building for the school, because we need \$1,000,000 worth of liability insurance. And just starting a neighborhood organization, we cannot afford a million dollars coverage at this time. So, we're just meeting where we can. Hopefully, when the new library will be built at Union and Hollywood, Mr. Pelton then will let us meet there at our new library. Thank you.

Councilman Green: Again, thank you all for coming, and Ms. Marshall, if we had a better PA system, I'd ask you to do a solo, but we'll do it the next time. Thank you.

Public Hearing: None.

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

Assistant Director, Department of Operational Services – Ms. Anna Brown
Revenue Administrator – Charles Madden III

Motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Jackson to confirm the appointments of Ms. Brown and Mr. Madden. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Out of the Chamber: Councilman Carmody. 1.

Adding Legislation to the Agenda

1. **Resolution No. 18 of 2006:** A resolution in support of the Louisiana Department of Social Services Earned Income Tax Credit Initiative and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Hogan to add Resolution No. 18 of 2006 to the agenda. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Out of the Chamber: Councilman Carmody. 1.

Councilman Green: Mr. Chairman, I don't know where I was supposed to do this, but I had some -- we had some discussion yesterday that Councilman Jackson brought up about how we had been beat up in the media about SRAC. And I wanted to just verify some information, but I didn't know if I was supposed to do it up at the Communications at the top or if it's okay with you, I'd just like to do it now.

Councilman Lester: I will poll the Council. What is the -- is there a motion to allow Councilman Green to I guess ask his question? Make it in the form of a motion, and we'll discuss it. How about that?

Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Robertson to suspend the rules in order to enter into discussion relative to Shreveport Regional Arts Council.

Councilman Jackson: Yes sir, and obviously I agree with --, well, I don't agree with, I mean, but I understand where Councilman Green is coming from. I just think the agenda will give us a time I think most appropriate to deal with it without having to suspend the rules. And I was hoping that --

Councilman Green: So there is going to be something on the agenda about this?

Councilman Lester: As I appreciate it, there is no agenda item on Shreveport Regional Arts Council. So, if the Council wants to take that up, the Council, has two choices. 1) To vote to suspend the rules to allow Councilman Green to take up the matter at this point, or if that motion fails, then we would take it up during correspondence of Council or Comments by the Council at the end of the meeting. We have a motion on the floor to suspend the rules to allow Councilman Green to enter it into discussion right now.

Councilman Jackson: Just a question to Councilman Green. Does he not want to wait until that point--till Communications of the Council to do it?

Councilman Green: Right. It's only going to take about 30 seconds.

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

Councilman Green: Thank you Mr. Chair. I just wanted to read some stuff for the record, since we've been beat up by the media because of SRAC as to we doing them real bad. Basically at this time, we give them

\$440,000. They have a \$3.4 million budget. We give them a free facility. We give them \$15,508.52 (we pay their utilities). When they were having Art Break at the Expo Hall, we were paying \$7,350 for security and we were giving them the building. So, I just wanted that to go into the record that, that is the only civic organization that we do that for. And it's not like we're mistreating them, we're giving them more than we give anybody else and with a \$3.4 million budget, if you cannot find \$60,000 or \$76,000 for children, it's something wrong with your budget. Thank you very much.

Councilman Lester: Thank you Councilman Green. Alright, that brings us back to item 7C -- well, let me ask this. Mr. Clerk, is there any other legislation that needs to be added?

Mr. Thompson: That's all we have.

Public Comments (Agenda Items to be Adopted): None.

Mayor Hightower: Mr. Chairman, I hate to bust the bubble, but I would have done it in the Mayoral comments. In your efforts to move the agenda forward, I was not quick enough to get your attention. I've got a couple of things. I've got a group of people here that I talked about yesterday, that have come to talk a little bit about the sound stage. And with that instead of me talking about it, I'm going to ask David Myatt, who is the -- Mike's going to come? These guys are going to come. They are the partners of Louisiana Sound Stage in order to do a brief presentation and talk to the Council and the public a little bit about what their plans are and what they see, the needs, and what Expo Hall can do to help stimulate and hold on to the movie industry in Shreveport.

Councilman Green: Mr. Mayor, were you able to get Steven Segall to come?

Mayor Hightower: Arlena was working on that and I think she's still working. He's motivated though.

Mr. Moorehead: My name is Mike Moorehead, I'm with the TruSouth Capital Partners, and I'd like to thank you guys all in advance for giving us the opportunity to come here today and shed a little light on the project that we're working on. Myself and my partner Mr. Myatt will come up here in a few minutes, have spent probably the better part of the last 16 or 18 months looking at ways in which we might bring to Northwest Louisiana a segment of Louisiana's booming film and television business. We're here today obviously to discuss ideas with you, answer any questions you might have. I guess over the last year and a half, we've learned a lot about the industry and subsequently put together a group of local folks who are prepared to make a significant capital investment necessary to not only attract, but retain what we think is our share of this lucrative film and TV business for this part of the state. With me today, I have Mr. Myatt. He's going to come and explain to you the big picture aspects of how our plans fit together. It's more than just a sound stage. It's kind of an integrated business model. We have Mr. Lampkin Enochs, whose done a great deal of film and TV work here in the state as Line Producer. He's currently considering significantly assisting us with our efforts, and we have Mr. Mark Smith, the former head of the Governor's Film Office and chief architect of the state's highly successful strategy to bring Hollywood to Louisiana. So, at this point, I'll let Mr. Myatt give you the broad brush strokes of the plan to see how this all fits together. Thank you.

Mr. Myatt: We'll do this pretty quick. I think all of us understand the state is allowing the film industry

--

Councilman Lester: Mr. Myatt, I'm sorry. Could you state your name and address for the record.

Mr. Myatt: It's David Myatt, 1311 Leonard Road. But the state's allowing a 25% tax credit to the movie industry. So, if you make a movie in Louisiana of \$10,000,000, you get a \$2.5 million tax credit against state income tax. And the movie industry can't use that because their home office, corporate offices are not located in Louisiana. So, the state says that's okay. You can market those tax credits to people within the state that pay a Louisiana State Income Tax. That's how this all got started about seven years ago. And Mark Smith is going to visit with you a little bit, really got the ball rollin' on it. But that's what we're faced with today. We've all been buying the state's tax credits for our personal state income tax sake. We've been paying about .85 on the dollar. One of the things we thought we could do was put a group of investors in North Louisiana together that are paying a pretty significant state income tax to buy those tax credits directly from the movie producer, rather than having finders' fees and brokers' fees, and accounting fees, buy them direct. Which would in return leave more money for the production companies. We thought that'd be a good tool to bring 'em to North Louisiana. Another asset we needed was a sound stage. And Mark Smith has guided us through that direction. First of all, when Mark first told us about the sound stage, Mike and I were going 'what's a sound stage?' But we now know what that is. We've made several trips to L.A. We've toured a lot of those facilities. And the Expo Hall is very adequate to be used as a sound stage, and it's big enough actually to have about three separate sound stages involved. It's another tool to bring that industry to North Louisiana. The real critical point is how we keep the crews, the film crews that are here now producing the movies here in Shreveport and Bossier City. And when I say here, I mean living here. Right now, those crews are charging the production companies a per diem per day for room and board, and it's expensive. On a \$5,000,000 movie, it cost you about \$150 or \$200,000 extra to shoot in Shreveport versus shooting a film in New Orleans, because they don't have to pay the per diem. So, the critical point is not just having a sound stage or production service company. It's also figuring out how we get these crews to move to North Louisiana. And the way you do that obviously, is have film business for them to work into. There was a recent article in the paper I know that Jim McCullouch talked about the reasons not to do the Expo Hall. One of them was that when the hurricane was over, these sound crews and production guys would all go back to New Orleans. And he's right on. They're going to go unless we give them a reason to stay in North Louisiana. The other point he brought in that article is that sound stages are meant for L.A. Because actors that go to sound stages, when they finish work, they want to go home. And he's right there again, now, about 99.9% of them are in L.A. But North Carolina has sound stages. Orlando has a sound stage. New Orleans has the Nims Center, a sound stage, and we think there's room in Shreveport to have a sound stage. It's a critical part of putting the whole package together. So, what we've tried to do is put a group together that can buy the credits direct from the motion picture folks to put a production service company, a relationship there with Lampton to service the industry which means he's the guy that puts the grips, the lighting, the sound guys together, actually figures out the budgets for each movie and that's a cost driven factor. Those guys in L.A. now look at the bottom line. And if Shreveport looks better than North Carolina or Canada, they're going to make their movies here. So, it's very important that we keep the sound crews here, and the sound stage here, as well as having a production service company to do the work of analyzing the budgets for the movie guys. The only other thing I'd tell you is that I know Jim McCullouch had some good reasons why not to do this, but I can't help but think about his dad, who made movies here years ago, before there was ever a tax credit or credit on employment of film crews here. He made 'em because he believe in his ability, and his desire to make a movie here. So, we've got a lot of good things going for us, they're obviously here because of the hurricane, but while

we have them here, we need to take advantage of that and see if we can't establish a film crew based in North Louisiana with a sound stage and with a production service company. The other really neat fit in all that is BPCC. BPCC's got a great two year course out there. We want to do some internships with those kids too. Right now, when you graduate from BPCC, you really have one choice and that's going to the TV stations for a job. This gives them another opportunity. We've also talked to Centenary too, because they have a great drama class there, and you're always needing extras in the movie side of the business. It's not a slam dunk, and it's not easy. The Expo Hall in our opinion, has a great fit with this. We also have a fund with the state that was approved for about a million dollars worth of improvements on it. We're not going to spend that money until we know what to spend it on. In other words to see who comes, and what improvements they need at the Expo Hall. There's not enough amps there, there's not enough insulation. We know there are some things we're going to have to do. But it's an awful good start. It's a good building. One of the key points is that it has a chilled water air conditioning system which to my knowledge, no other sound stage outside L.A. has which takes the humidity out of the air. I might mention one other little quick point, and that's that we met with the Mayor and Mark Indig whose here with Disney were in discussion with those guys to see if there is a possibility of leaving the wade pool here, that they're using to film the Guardian. Now originally, that was to be tore up and filled back in, but Mark Sealy was also in the meeting who owns the property there. We think it's another great asset that will help tie into a sound stage and a production crew and a production service company. It's the only one like it in the world. It actually has the turbo motors in it to make it waves. There's one in Mexico that they used in the Titanic and one in Canada. So, we're hoping that something can be worked with that. We've also talked to the Coast Guard about using it for a training facility. But we have to get through the liability side of that, and there's some work left to do there. But we hope that you'll consider the Expo Hall, and this group. I don't think we'll disappoint you, I wish I had a lot of business to tell you about we had signed up to go, but we don't have any. It's truly a build it and hope they come kinda deal. But we think it's a risk worth taking, and we hope you guys will see our way, and give us an opportunity to put it together.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Myatt, if you could hold on for just a second. Gentlemen, you can come on up. Councilman Green.

Councilman Green: Yeah, I wanted to ask a couple of questions. One is what is the definition of 'industrial enterprise?' That's in the contract. What does that actually mean?

Mr. Myatt: What's that mean Ben? Ben's our lawyer.

Councilman Green: It's called Industrial Enterprise?

Mr. Warren: My name is Ben Warren, and I live at 2646 Longlake Drive. It's any type of enterprise, that has industry involved.

Councilman Green: Okay, so if you -- are you saying that if in fact a part of the deal that you wanted to do some type industrial stuff, that that's what that's talking about?

Mr. Warren: No, no. The contract is limited to entertainment, the motion picture, the film industry activity, which is industrial enterprise, because it's industry is the film entertainment industry.

Mr. Myatt: We can't sublease the building for some other function.

Councilman Green: On the tax credit, who all in the deal makes money?

Mr. Myatt: The production service company. They're really the driving force. They're really the guys that get the grip and crew together that actually monitor the payroll for that and all the expenses. You only get the tax credit on what you spend in the state. So they monitor all that. Then it has to be certified by the state. Mark Smith can probably answer this a lot, but the service production company would provide the paperwork for the certification and then the state would issue that tax credit to the production company who in return would sell it to the production service company.

Councilman Green: Okay, and then it's like what? .83 cent on a dollar or something like that?

Mr. Myatt: Right, I'll tell you. They vary a lot. The first ones I bought I paid .70 for them in 1999. The last ones I bought this year, I paid .85. .85 cents is kinda of where it's leveled out. The production service companies are paying about .75 cents on the average for those credits. We think by having individuals that can buy them direct, we can give the production company .77 to .78 cents, which means that they get another .02 or .03 cents out of their credits, which means this is a good place to go to make my movie. Now Baton Rouge is probably fixin to do the same thing we're doing. They've announced a sound stage and they're putting a group together to kinda do it the same way. In the past, you did have a broker, and a lot of times you had a finder's fee, and you had a lot of other fees in there. But we're seeing this to shrink this down. It's not going to mean that as individuals we pay less, we probably going to continue to pay the .85, but the production service company will have some cents in there to cover it's cost for issuing the credits and all and certifying.

Councilman Green: Once, say once this deal is done, how much minority participation will you have?

Mr. Myatt: The company that we're looking at, we don't have a lot of employees. Lampton can answer that better than me. I'll get them up here. We're probably looking at six or seven people, okay? I can tell you this. The crews for Thief shot at my house two or three different times, there were a lot of Black folks out there.

Councilman Green: No, I'm talking about once you put the whole deal together as to doing the contractual work, you know when you contract the work that's going to make the money?

Mr. Myatt: Yeah, Fair Share, I mean we'll use Fair Share, but my point is we don't have a lot of Fair Share to go around. We have a building that we have to keep clean. We have one maintenance guy, we have to put on. But we don't have many people come from the production service side of it.

Councilman Green: Let me make sure I'm clear. You said, you don't have a lot of Fair Share to go around? Did I understand you right?

Mr. Myatt: Just explain Fair Share. I mean, as far as the maintenance on the building, upkeep on the building, we have no problem with that. That's the only thing we're going to be paying for. We lease this to the production company. You follow me? And they're the guys that bring in the union group to make the movie. We don't have any control --

Councilman Green: No, no. Listen to what I'm saying. You said in this deal, and I want to make sure I hear you correctly, you said you don't have a lot of Fair Share to go around other than cleaning up the building?

Mr. Myatt: Well, we have maintenance on the building, then we have cleanup on the building. We could have projects like bringing in more amps which we'll have to do, but we don't know the answer to that yet. We would have sound proofing. We don't have a problem in using Fair Share in our bid process or any of that.

Councilman Green: Okay, let me ask you another question. Probably you're not familiar with Fair Share, but Fair Share is not just with Black folk. It's a whole group and I'll get you some information, so you'll be knowledgeable of it. But when you said there were a lot of Black folk in the movie, were you saying that there we a lot of Black folk getting paid? Top dollar? Or were you just saying they're in the movie?

Mr. Myatt: Oh, no, no, no. These are the crews that make the money. They're union, and they're a member of -- why don't you come up here and talk on this a little bit too. Starting pay there was I think \$22.00 and hour plus benefits. Now, I don't know the per cent, I mean I'd rather have -- let me introduce you to Mark Smith, and maybe he can help answer --

Councilman Green: Well, I really don't want to put Mark on -- is Mark your boss or you his boss?

Mr. Smith: I work for the State.

Councilman Green: I don't want to put -- okay, he works for the state, so --

Mr. Smith: My name is Mark Smith, I'm with the Department of Economic Development in Baton Rouge, LA. To go to your question, actually, one of our initiatives at the state level with the film industry is actually to increase the participation of minority workers, and contractors and entrepreneurs in the industry. Let me expound on that. When the industry really started in South Louisiana, and specifically in New Orleans, specifically before the hurricane and before the flood, obviously, we had a disproportion number of African-Americans working in low wage employment opportunities. Also, a lot of single head of households like women also working at a low wage. So one of the initiatives that was started through our office was to say we have this (inaudible) blue collar industry which has averages wages of \$25-30 an hour that also paid medical and pension, how can we get some of our disenfranchised work in the industry. We started first with some highly training programs with some local state senators in that area to get women and minorities work in the industry. We've also -- that encouraged more activity by the group to work in the industry. Then the next level we were trying to do was to get more minority contractors and entrepreneurs to get up by the initiatives that were in the industry, like catering, like security, and other aspects. So, one of the things we wanted to see, not only in South Louisiana, but also here in Northwest Louisiana is this same type of application when we really talk about the community, we're getting all the people participating in this potential growth industry. Because we believe it's the one industry left in the United States that could address poverty issues, blighted area issues and other issues that are obviously impacting economic development in our state.

Mr. Myatt: And we have Fair Share in our agreement.

Mr. Warren: Yeah, there is a Fair Share clause in the lease agreement.

Councilman Green: Are you familiar with -- I thought I saw Mr. Sam Gilliam come in. Did he come in or did he leave?

Councilman Lester: We could ask for him.

Councilman Green: I wanted to give you -- so that you'll understand the definition of Fair Share, I would have Mr. Gilliam, get him to give you the definition of it, so you'll be aware of it. Because it just doesn't consist of Black folk. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Lester: I don't know if anybody else has any comments, I know we kinda stopped you in the process of your presentation. If there was someone else that you'd like to bring up at this time.

Mr. Myatt: Well, we might let Lampton visit with you too. My point again is we don't have a lot of jobs in this group. Okay? The jobs come from the production company, and the crews, the film crews themselves. And we don't pay them. We don't pay their payroll or any of that. We just give them a facility to use, and hopefully buy the tax credits from the producers of the movie.

Mr. Enochs: My name is Lampton Enochs, my address is 1121 Leotine Street, New Orleans, LA., currently. I think what I can hopefully provide for you guys is some ideas of why this really is a viable industry for Shreveport and this area. Why what David and his associates are trying to do does make sense. Dave referred to a movie actually, when he said we will build it, and they will come. And essentially, that is the case here. And I think what really exemplifies that is the fact that Mark Smith and the state government, put in this tax incentive legislation four years ago, and I'm sure you guys are all aware that this has been an absolute explosion of filming in Louisiana, outside of L.A., this is the biggest production center in the United States. Prior to this, of course most of that filming took place in New Orleans, and I should say prior to Katrina, that is essentially motivated because that's where the film crews are based. Now New Orleans is a very filmic city. People like to come to New Orleans, they like what they shoot there, but it's really a crew driven business. It's a very bottom line driven business. What David told you about the (inaudible) of bringing crews outside of New Orleans is actually the case, but this is why I think it is viable in Shreveport, and this is why I'm talking to you today. I came up here post Katrina, about two weeks after the hurricane hit with a film project I was doing for FX Cable Channel, called Thief. I'm sure you guys all saw the signs around town. We filmed here for about I think 40 days total. We came up here with a very gritty urban drama. Which we were originally going to shoot in New Orleans along the river front in the warehouse district. This is a television show about professional thieves, hideouts, downtown -- you know places where these guys are doing their nefarious business. We came up here because we wanted to keep the project in Louisiana. There was obviously no chance of doing it in New Orleans, completing it in New Orleans. And what we found was extremely pleasing. We had a very wonderful experience here. We had a lot of support from the City. But we also found what we needed to shoot here. Which again, we shot in your downtown, which is a wonderful looking downtown. We shot all over the City. It worked very well for us. We made a really good recovery. At the same time, you had a Disney feature, a big Coast Guard feature, the Guardian is shooting here. You have a feature called Factory Girl which is shooting 1960s New York City here, and two or three other projects, Road House and Premonition which is about to shoot. I think that indicates that there is the infrastructure here to shoot, that makes sense for us to be here. What is missing here right now is the infrastructure of a sound stage. The infrastructure that we need to shoot, and the crew base. But again, I think the fact that we've come up here, and we've had this good experience and if you do add some of these elements to the package, you will attract crews. I think crews will eventually come here. And the other advantage of shooting in Shreveport right now is we can shoot year round. Which regretfully, we're not able to do in the southern part of the state. I think there is still too large a fear factor of dealing with hurricanes, and business interruption. So, I think there are a lot of pieces right now that are coming together to make sense for Shreveport. And the other thing that I think maybe will help this decision making process is what my experience was in New Orleans. Since early 2004, I've been producing movies essentially as a production services company for Disney Channel and ABC Family, which is again a couple of cable networks that produce a lot of television movies. Since January 2004, up until Katrina hit we produced seven television movies for ABC Family and Disney Channel. They're budgeted around \$4.5 million. We put Louisiana payroll from each of those projects into -- for Louisiana citizens at around \$1.5 million per project. We probably spent an additional \$750,000 per project on goods and services, hotels, lumber, everything that we need to film our movies. So, all toll in a year and a half, I think I had payroll of 10 1/2 Louisiana citizens, and probably spent somewhere around another \$6 or 7,000,000 on goods and services. So, it is a very good business. These are very good jobs. We do have I would say a good track record of hiring minorities. It can always improve and

there are ways that -- we're going to work with Mark to improve that. But it's an equal opportunity occupation. Again the wages are between \$25 and \$30 an hour. They have benefits. They're very good jobs, I think for the citizens of Louisiana. So, I think that is essentially what I thought would help you guys. If there are any questions about what we do, or --

Councilwoman Robertson: You may or may not be able to answer this. But isn't -- you mentioned about not being able to film because hurricane season and that type of thing, and that would be the advantage of the North Louisiana, but isn't there insurance liability that there's going to have to be so many years or something before y'all can go back to New Orleans because of the levies and the hurricane issues?

Mr. Enochs: You know, there are going to be insurance issues. You can obviously have a film bonded and insured. My understanding, and I can't say that I've actually vetted this myself. My understanding is that the bonding companies will probably not be bonding a lot of projects during hurricane season. I think this may change over time. I think right now everything is very fresh. You know filming will go back to New Orleans, and we hope that it does. We want it to stay in the state. I think what has happened now is we have seen that there are other viable locations. Shreveport being one, being really the main one that the film companies took advantage of. But I think it will be difficult, especially in these next years when Katrina is very fresh in everybody's mind to insure, to bond, and to actually film as much as anything, it's just the interruption, the evacuating the cast and crew. You know, you've built your sets, they're there, they're ready to go, and you can't use them. But those are the hurdles that are going to be hard to overcome right now.

Councilman Lester: Well, I would have a question on this issue. As the person that puts the things together from a production services company angle, I remember hearing someone say earlier that you had to deal with a per diem because this is in fact a crew driven business. And in New Orleans, you have obviously a level of experience for the crews, because obviously the industry existed there, where here in Shreveport, it did not exist. Assuming that the Council moves forward with this, what steps are you prepared to make to make an investment to insure that those jobs are going to stay here, or that we're not getting in a situation where basically your industry is a carpet bag industry where essentially what you're doing is -- okay, we have these shoots, and we get a group of people from New Orleans that move to Shreveport which is a good thing for the people who rent houses, and for our hoteliers, but for the people who live here and pay taxes here on a consistent basis, we talk about the jobs -- well, these are great paying jobs, but no one in Shreveport has the ability to get them. What types of steps are you making or would you be willing to make to grow this industry here? And I say that given the fact that I know from personal knowledge, I know Southern University, Shreveport is here. We've got Centenary, we've got two high schools, that I just can think of in my district, Booker T. Washington High School is the Technology Magnet for Caddo Parish high schools, and as I appreciate it, Green Oaks High School is the Performing Arts high school, what types of outreach are you going to do to germinate a seed in our children, and our young people to make sure that industry grows here?

Mr. Enochs: Well, probably two things. Two ways to address that. One is you were talking about college kids, kids who are in these sort of classes. What I did in New Orleans with (inaudible) we have an affiliation with the University of New Orleans, which has a good film program. We had an internship program probably on every film that we did, we have anywhere between 4,7, maybe 10 interns in various vacant shoes in their discipline, what department they wanted to work in. They may work in my art department, they might work in my production department. Some would work on the sets as P.A.s and so that is a good way for a college student who is really just taking classes to get their feet on the ground to see what this occupation really is about, and broaden their horizons. What it did for me is, I eventually got some really employees out of that. I had some people who once they graduated, they had come to work for me, maybe done one or two films. I just told them as soon as you graduate, you call me, I'll get you a job. The second way we're going to address that, and I think again, Mark is probably more knowledgeable about these programs and what our hope is for the future. But there are funds for training. And we desperately need training in this industry in Louisiana because we are a bottom line driven industry. I don't want to say the word carpet bagger, but it's a bottom line driven industry. Without the tax incentives in our --

Councilman Lester: We wouldn't be here.

Mr. Enochs: Absolutely. And I think that applies to many industries. But that applies to car factories. They get tax incentives. This is how we attract new business to the state. I think fortunately this state has made a decision that this is a good industry, that this could be a permanent infrastructure, not a fly by night company, not come to shoot several movies here. We've had great experience in the last four years. It's been a tremendous amount of business. When I started crewing up a project into 2004 for Disney Channel, I think New Orleans was about -- I'd say a crew and a half deep. There were probably 100, between 100 and 150 solid crew members who had experience, who could get jobs on these sort of projects. I think just prior to Katrina, the roles of the (inaudible) were probably up around between, or closer to between 4-500. That added a lot of jobs, and again, very good paying jobs, with benefits and so forth, to you know, the infrastructure of New Orleans. I think the same thing can happen here. I think that Shreveport is again, I think all of these elements can come together to make this a permanent part of the infrastructure here. It's going to take state support which for all my understanding, the state is solemnly behind the tax incentive programs, and maybe even stronger than ever. It'll take continued city support from the City of Shreveport, which again I through Arlena Acree and through the Mayor's office, we've had great support which is so helpful to all of the film companies. And I speak for myself, but I know from my associates. You don't take all of those elements, but there's strong potential.

Councilman Lester: Before Mr. Smith comes up, are you -- is your role in this going to be -- are you going to be a sole source, I guess for lack of a better term excuse me if I use an improper term -- an agent for lack of better term. I'm trying to determine your relationship as the production services company vis-à-vis either, cause I have several other questions to TruSouth or to Stage Works that we're actually contracting with, is your relationship that's going to be one that's exclusive with this group or are you going to be out there trying to put as many deals together separate and apart from these guys, how is that --

Mr. Enochs: What is my personal aim or what would I be doing?

Councilman Lester: Right.

Mr. Enochs: A productions services company is essentially a producer which is what I am. It's essentially if you're working in Louisiana, what we're trying to do is attract business. We're trying to bring business. So, again my experience before was with Disney Channel/ABC Family. These guys for the last 20 years of making cable television movies have made them in Canada, New Zealand, South Africa. They go where they can get a film produced for the best possible price. What happened was when Mark introduced me to the production executive there, and we started introducing her to Louisiana, and we said here is the tax incentive. Here is the Nims Center in New Orleans, which is the sound stage and offices. Here is a crew. They realized we

can make these movies in the United States which they would prefer to do. Believe me they would rather come to Louisiana, than to go to Vancouver or Toronto. Here are the elements. You can come make this movie here. That's what my intention is. That's what my job is, is attracting that business, and once I attract that business putting the crew together. So, I convinced Disney Channel to come here. What I have to show up with is 85-100 people who are skilled, who are members of the union, who can perform these jobs. I have to make sure that the infrastructure is there that they need -- offices, sound stages, everything they need to get this show made. So that is essentially my job as a producer, it would also be my job as a production services company.

Councilman Lester: Well, let me ask a better question. A better question, and I appreciate you for educating me on that. What would be your business relationship, i.e., the tax credits? Because I think what I heard earlier was that this group of investors is going to purchase the tax credits directly I would imagine from you. So, I guess my question was would you be in the process of bidding the tax credits out once you got the project to -- lets say -- I hit the lottery, and I had \$25,000,000, and I said you know what? Sir, I need to -- I want to buy some tax credits from you, would you deal with me? Or, is your relationship locked in exclusively to this organization?

Mr. Enoch: Well, I should say not to speak for these guys, but at this point, we're a little -- we're still a little bit early in the game. These guys are trying to put together the infrastructure up here that's needed to bring the business. I'm production services, I want to bring the business to Louisiana, but there's still pieces to the puzzle that are not pulled together at this point. We have to find out what's going to happen with the sound stage. We have to find out what's going to happen (inaudible) --

Councilman Lester: My question presupposes that the sound stage is there and they are there, and that's -

Mr. Enoch: This is the way I personally, as a business person look at it right now. What David and his group bring to the table enhances what I do for a living. What I do for a living will enhance what (inaudible) to do. It makes sense for both of us.

Mr. Myatt: There's a whole lot more tax credits out there to go around. I mean, we'd be happy to sell all the tax credits we can. We don't have enough in this group to buy all the tax credits. We have an accounting firm that we're working with, they buy about \$8,000,000 worth a year. We think that between the two of us, we can buy \$12 or \$15 million. That equates to probably \$80 or \$90 million worth of dollars spent in North Louisiana. But we're selling credits to anybody that wants them.

Councilman Lester: Okay, I mean that was my question. I was just trying to understand the nature of the relationship, and I think you have explained it. You are not standing as someone that has a relationship with them, you're speaking in general as an expert in the industry?

Mr. Enochs: Who hopes to have a relationship with them and hopes that this will fit together as basically a business model.

Mr. Myatt: You have to approve these credits. If they're not approved, we don't want to buy them, and we don't know how to do that. That's what Lampton does with the state. And Mark Smith and their group, they sign off on them and they're good. We're going to buy all we can, but there's no way we're going to use all these credits. The other thing you've got to remember, when Lampton goes to FOX or whoever, and they say we're going to make a \$10,000,000 movie, there is \$2.5 million in tax credits, you'd better be ready to give him a letter of credit or cash. They're not interested in 'well, I'll pay you when you get finished with your movie.' So that's an ongoing process. The other point he brought up I think was on sound stage, we're willing to do that with anybody. It doesn't have to be a production that Lampton is involved in. We may have -- well, I'll give you a good example. ESPN, I had those guys through there, they're making a second movie here, and they need a sound stage. Lampton is not going to do that probably from production service company, but we want them to use the sound stage. We want to bring all the business we can bring, but we know to market it, you really got to have a close tie with a production service company to bring them to the sound stage, to get the credits approved and do 'em right.

Councilman Lester: I'm going to have some other questions, but what I wanted to do is ask the Council is did the Council have any other questions for Mr. Lampton?

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, I don't think that my question perhaps would be appropriate for them. I had questions with regard to the lease which we had talked about I guess a little bit.

Councilman Lester: Okay, and for the Council's knowledge, my desire is to allow them to get through as much of their presentation, cause I know that I have several questions as it relates to the lease, but to the extent that they're here, they have some questions about the business itself, I wanted to make sure we had a chance.

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Myatt, perhaps you may be the one to answer this question. Are you the general partner or whatever of Stage Works? Is that right?

Mr. Myatt: Yes sir.

Councilman Hogan: I would just be interested to know who composes Stage Works of Louisiana, L.L.C.? Can you go over who the members are?

Mr. Myatt: We'll give you a list. Let me tell you, these are the people that we have met with and explained the process and what we're trying to do and expressed a strong interest in doing this with us. We want to see if we get this put together before we raise any money from them okay? But I do have the list of people here. Right now, TruSouth or Stage Works is Mike and myself. These are the groups. David Toms, Fred Phillips, -- you got a copy?

Councilman Lester: No, she's going to make a copy.

Mr. Myatt: Oh, okay.

Councilman Hogan: Okay, so you and this other gentleman may have the company, but you're going to take on investors which may not -- are they going on an equal percentage of the company? Based on their investment?

Mr. Myatt: Yeah, based on their investment. Yep. It's like starting up any company, where you dole out the shares, and they own 10% or 5% or whatever?

Mr. Myatt: That's right.

Councilman Hogan: Okay. I'm not too familiar with the tax credits. I'm involved in real estate, but I've never done a project like that. I'm just curious to know if we're on a timeframe with this, and they expire or they're offered by the state during such a period and time?

Mr. Myatt: The answer to that is yes. There are actually two tax credits. The 25% is on the cost of the movie. You get an additional 10% against your Louisiana payroll. So all the folks, that equates to 35% basically on the payroll, if you're a Louisiana resident. And the 25% is good till the next five years Mark? Till 10? And then it's reduced to 20% till for 2 1/2 years, and then it's reduced again to 15%. So, yeah, it's --

Councilman Hogan: It's a graduated declining scale. Okay, in terms of our competition, I know you could probably speak a long time on this, but you mentioned New Orleans, North Carolina, Florida -- I'm assuming, of course North Carolina and Florida, they're offering similar tax credits? Is that correct?

Mr. Myatt: They do. Arizona also, Rhode Island is fixin to --

Mr. Smith: If I could just add to that. Our competition, I'm glad you asked that question. It's a very good question. Our main competition is not necessarily in the United States. We're competing against countries. There's Canada, New Zealand, Australia, South Africa, Prague, Czech Republic, that's who we're competing with. And the opportunity for Louisiana and the success we've had thus far is that we're now on a global platform. Give you another example. A few years ago, Louisiana was the only U.S. jurisdiction invited to speak at the Canton Film Festival. We were on a panel with Germany, the UK, Ireland, Italy and South Africa talking about our incentive program. Because what we've created through the support of the state legislature, and your delegation and the Governor, Governor Foster and now Governor Blanco, is an opportunity to create a new economy for the state that is a clean industry, and that could state wide. So, when you think of the competition, it's not necessarily we're competing against Mississippi or Texas, even though other states are now trying to duplicate what we're doing or replicate. And if we don't build the infrastructure, and I (inaudible) back to that is tax credits are the necessary means to get the end product which is about really building an economy. And if we don't build an infrastructure, and that includes sound stages and work force, places like Georgia, i.e. Atlanta, New York, Rhode Island, Providence and those areas that already have crew based and infrastructure in place will take this business away from us. And what we started will be a flash (inaudible). And so that's why, there is a timeline. Because if we don't -- we have a window. And this window is probably this year. Whether it's Shreveport, whether it's New Orleans, whether it's Baton Rouge and we don't move forward, it doesn't matter what kind of incentive we offer, it becomes too costly to do business here, because we don't have the base of activity here to make it worth my value. And I want to also go back to Shreveport/Bossier to your question Ma'am, regarding if New Orleans gets back online. I've been coming up to Shreveport/Bossier for the last few years. I met Mayor Hightower I think several years ago, cause I would come to these meetings on behalf of the film office here, in terms of the funding of the film office. Well, Shreveport/Bossier has been in place that the business has been looking at. Yes the hurricane/flood made it an opportunity, but when they got here, they recognized you have great potential here. So even if New Orleans or South Louisiana gets back online and that is still a question mark, you'll be able to have a market share because there's no other facility that has the potential, whether it's the Expo Center or any other place here, to really be able to accommodate businesses that want to come here, but not only business that you want to attract here, your own filmmakers that you want create here through your own educational and training programs that we're trying to do here. BPCC is obviously in place right now and they're doing a great job. But one of our initiatives at the state level is to do more Work Force Development so not only we're attracting business here, we're outputting business. But you have to have a facility where I can produce my content. I can edit my content, I can record my music, all the things that you want to do to be able to be a competitor, not against another state, but in a global market place. I just wanted to get up and make sure that we understand, it's a global business, and not just a -- I mean with other states. And Louisiana is in a premier position right now.

Councilman Hogan: Okay, I'm glad you explained that. You made some good points. Mr. Myatt, you could have mentioned it earlier, but I missed it. What do you expect your total investment to be?

Mr. Myatt: We don't know. And the reason I say that is because we don't know whose coming to the sound stage. As far as the sound stage is concerned, the Expo Hall, that's going to depend on what they require. Do they need a 15,000 foot stage, or do they need a 30 or do they need the whole thing, and if they do, if they don't rather, how do we divide that up? Then we go, we get involved in footing sound proof walls between the two, we could have to insulate each one of the sound stage. We will probably going to have to bring in about 2,000 more amps, which is about twice what's there. We have budgeted for budgeting purposes about \$1,000,000 to be spent. We have to secure the perimeter. We have to put a fence up. But we really don't want to do any of that until we get a commitment and a contract with somebody. And if we're real, real lucky, you get a series. And there's been two pilots made, fixin to be a third pilot made. This one's going to be made in New Orleans, and it's FOX network, FX, they've toured this facility along with Lion's Gate, and one other one. ESPN, Disney, they've all been there. But if you're fortunate to get one of those in a series, then you've knocked a homerun. Then you've got a customer that's renting by the year, and not by the month from you.

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Enochs, I have a question for you, if you don't mind. This could be a difficult question, but in the foreseeable future, do you think the Expo Hall is big enough. It's 60,000 square feet roughly. If we hit a homerun, if this thing does as best as we can expect it to do, is it going to be enough?

Mr. Enochs: I think it is. You know right now the only sound stage in all of Louisiana is the Nims Center in New Orleans, which is associated with the University of New Orleans. The Nims Center is comprised of two stages. An 18,000 square foot and a 9,000 square foot stage. With the company that I was doing the Disney Family and ABC Family projects through, we occupied the 9,000 square foot stage basically for the last year and a half. And the larger sound stage was used by the bigger features that came into town. What exist at Expo Hall right now is at least two 15,000 square foot stages, and an additional 15,000 square foot could be broken up into smaller stages. So it's an excellent start. The building has a lot of features that are advantageous for putting the sound stage in. And with a certain amount of improvements, its an excellent start, and it would be a very good facility to have.

Councilman Lester: Are there any other questions? Mr. Myatt, if you have any other folks that you want to bring up to address this, you can do that at this time. If you want to make any other statements or wrap anything else up, you still have the floor sir.

Mr. Myatt: Well, I think we've about covered everything. I might throw this out for an example. Because we are going to compete within our state, we know what happened in South Louisiana, but this is actually I think, the best thing we can do for our state right now. Cause it helps us kinda bridge the gap until these guys get back on their feet. Baton Rouge has announced a sound stage, the Nim Center is already located in New Orleans, and I think it's back up and operating. The sound stage business is a very, very competitive business and it's very tough. What did you pay for your rent at Nims on a monthly basis? Maybe I shouldn't, but I mean, I just want to give an idea what --

Mr. Enochs: Well, I had offices in the sound stage, I think around \$17,000 a month.

Mr. Myatt: Okay, now this is bigger. We'd have three or four sound stages, but it's tough to figure out. You've got \$400,000 a year overhead to keep this thing up and running. We're going to obviously have to do better than that. Plus reinvest some capital back in it to take care of the demands that they want. But I'll be honest with you there too. We're not going to go spend all that money and not to expect to get it back some

way. And a lot of times, the production companies will split costs like that with you. If you need to bring in amps in there, and it's \$50,000, they'll say 'we'll split it with ya.' You do have fiber optic over there, we have to put the office space together upstairs, which is about 6,000 feet. That's not enough, there's an additional 5,000 feet upstairs in storage right now that probably will have to be converted to office space as well. As long as we get 'em here. And the crew base is just so critical in making that happen. So I thank you guys for listening to us, and ladies, and Mr. Mayor, and if there's anything else you need to ask us, we'll try to answer.

Councilman Walford: I've got one last question. I think it's going to be for Mr. Smith. Talk to me about spin off from this. What else can we expect? We hear about catering, and just give me an idea about what else. I mean I know we can get the crews hopefully, what else can we look for that's a benefit to the city?

Mr. Smith: I can give you a good example. I was here I think last week or two weeks ago, and you know visiting and doing the film 'The Guardian' here. And I went to their set where they built a big water tank, where they're doing a lot of the water activity, with Kevin Costner and the other crew. And while I was there, I was with some folks, they were saying this is a good example really to show individuals how the industry really multiplies. I got there, we saw all the cranes there. Well, the cranes were leased and purchased here in Shreveport/Bossier. The gravel that was brought in was actually taken from a contractor here. The sets that were built was lumber that was purchased here in Shreveport/Bossier. The crew that was here actually, were actually obviously not from Shreveport/Bossier, all were from South Louisiana, but some of them have lost their homes and now their contemplating relocating here. Also in terms of other opportunities, production accountants, lawyers for example. I'm a lawyer so lawyers have an opportunity. Producers (inaudible), hair, make-up, security, stunt coordinators. The potential is great, but also all the other support businesses that can also benefit from this. I can give you examples of restaurants that have been close to shutting down, have been used in the film, or have been used by the crew as a place to go after hours, obviously when they finish shooting, have been able to rebound as a result of that, those areas have become new tourist attraction. Then you get a residual benefit. Give you another example. Let's take New Zealand. No one knew what New Zealand looked like until after they saw the movie 'Lord of the Rings.' As a result of the success of those films, people now are flocking to go to New Zealand to experience that (inaudible). That's some of the things we could benefit whether it's in Shreveport/Bossier or anywhere, of all the films that are being shot here. Natchitoches is a good example of that with Steel Magnolias. People still remember that film and watch that film want to visit the area. So the opportunity is endless. If you're an entrepreneur and you're creative and you have the willingness to put the time and investment in, the dollar opportunity is wonderful. And it's the only thing that we've seen thus far that our young people, and young could be of any age, or any mind that are excited about Louisiana and when they hear about this potential. I was staying at the Holiday Inn in Bossier Parish, a few years ago, and I had at that time, my Governor's Office of Film and Television Development shirt on. And the two people that were basically checking me out said, 'oh wow, what is that?' I said, 'well, you know I'm involved with the film industry here in Louisiana,' and I asked them a question. "Are you aware that the movie Ray, Misfit 3000 and other films were shot here in Louisiana?" And they said to me, "they were?" And I said, "yeah, they were shot here in Louisiana?" And their response was "Louisiana rocks!" Their whole perception of Louisiana just changed because of that. Because when we think of ourselves here, we don't always have a positive image. Well, this is an opportunity, where we can create a buzz what real hard jobs, and real opportunities for small businesses to really (inaudible) additional, not a sole, but an additional revenue stream. So, and what we're trying to do our very best to really allow this industry to grow. But I want to add, It's not just film location, but it's also the computer generated aspect of the industry that we can go after. The visual affects business, the digital media side of it, the video game industry that is now intertwined with the film industry. The music, the sound recordings, those are the other aspects of the industry that are -- we haven't touch yet, but we have incentives that allow for that. And why not here in Shreveport/Bossier? Why not?

Mr. Myatt: The multiplier too which is about what 2, 3 --

Mr. Smith: It depends on which economist you talk to, but the rippling affect obviously is the dollars continue to recycle back and forth. But I'm really conservative, I just try to look at direct impact. I want to know what dollars were spent. Who was hired from Louisiana, and where did you spend your money. And the more we have on the ground, the more I'm able to buy here in Louisiana, lease here in Louisiana increases the economic impact. That's the bottom line, it's that simple. So, if we don't have anything here, I have to import crew, I have to import services, I have to import cranes, then (inaudible) the incentives becomes less of a value, becomes more of a headache, and it's easier for me to stay in Los Angeles or go to Vancouver, or go to Atlanta, GA.

Mr. Myatt: And as long as that multiplier is 2 or 3 to 1 against the tax credit, it means it's a good thing for the state. We're getting back two or three times what we're giving away in tax credits. And that's about where we are with that.

Mayor Hightower: Mr. Chairman, one thing that we were talking about a little bit earlier, and that was job opportunity. And I know some of you had an opportunity to visit several of the sets, and those that haven't and would like to, but I've been amazed to go out especially, Mark was talking about the Guardian set a while ago. Out on the Guardian set, how many people came up to me that were "Mr. Mayor, we appreciate y'all doing this," that were from Shreveport. Actually from Shreveport. Now some of them had worked in the film industry before and had welcomed the opportunity to come back. Others were people like Teamsters that were crane operators. Others were in the electrical union, that were doing the electrical, the wiring, the lighting and all those things on the job. So, we have the opportunity, we have a little bit of a base here, that now, you know even that electrician that may not have had film experience until the Guardian came, now has film experience. So we're starting to build those crews, but the only way we're going to get Shreveporters on the crews is because again is what they talked about. They don't have to be paid the per diem to stay in a hotel, because they're going home that night. They don't have to be paid for that extra meal, because they're eating at home. So, the more -- the incentives are there for the producers, for the production companies to hire locals when they can and the more we can get on the jobs, it just continues to snowball. The more movies we have, the more they need to hire, So the crane operator that's working at the Guardian, can't work at Premonition and Factory Girl at the same time, so they get two more. So now we got two more people that are trained and experienced. So, it just continues to snowball. But it's all the way from crane operators to extras, to runners, to the vendors. They bought out Home Depot, the whole lumber supply they had to build the blue screen at the Guardian, it's equipment companies that's on, and on, and on. But the reality is, its' like Mark and Lampton said, those guys that do have the experience follow the work. And as long as the bottom line in Shreveport is better than the bottom line in Baton Rouge or Vancouver or wherever it may be, those people that have been working in that business, they're going to make their home where the work is. Whether that's New Orleans or Rhode Island. Right now, it happens to

be here, and we've got a lot of people that have made a decision to move from New Orleans to live in Shreveport, just like people in L. A. moved to New Orleans to live in New Orleans because that's where they could get the most work at the best rate. So bottom line, it really is -- we know we have competition. There's one fixin to go up in Baton Rouge, we know there's one in New Orleans, so there is competition statewide as well. This truly is a build it, and they will come or it's as simple as don't build it, and they'll come to Baton Rouge, and they'll come to New Orleans or they'll come to Vancouver. So, either we're going to get in it, or we're going to get out of it. So we're going to have an opportunity in two weeks and you know, again, I just encourage the Council to continue the dialogue and lets get as educated as we can. Along with David and his group, and I applaud them for stepping up and I think he's told you today, "I don't know, " a couple of times, but what I do know is that, that group is our hope to land our share of the movie business in Northwest Louisiana. The rest of the groups in the state are looking to open up in Baton Rouge, another is looking to open in New Orleans, and for the movie companies to have to come here and have to add to their production costs to send most of the work back to L.A. to have it edited and put together and all the things that have to happen to it. So, we just have to get busy. And where we can outperform New Orleans, and outperform Baton Rouge, is we're up, we're ready to run, we've got the facility, we've got the movies here, we've got the ears, we've got the eyes of the guys that are making the decisions already, and our track record's good. And I think you heard Lampton say that. And in two weeks, you'll hear some of the other experts that have been in town, the decision makers say that they love the opportunity that they've had here and they appreciate the cooperation and it's something that they've had here that they haven't had in New Orleans in particular, so again, I just encourage you over the next two weeks, let's get this thing hashed out, and get it going, turn the keys over to these guys and lets get busy and build a film industry in North Louisiana.

Councilman Carmody: Just one last question. I know that I got another call this morning from a constituent that had asked me to verify what cost for the Expo Center was and when it was built. Have we had that information confirmed yet?

Mayor Hightower: I think it was opened in 1975. Is that correct?

Councilman Carmody: I think it was the Bicentennial.

Mayor Hightower: It opened in 1978, do we have a cost?

Councilman Carmody: I appreciate it, I'm sure we'll get it. I just thought I would ask again for that information. Mr. Chairman, If I could, I do have one other thing. I think several of you have certainly heard and the Council keeps up with what's going on in the Police Department, and certainly statistics are important and measurement and productively are important and the Police Department does a good job of doing that. And I would say I'm pleased to announce, but I think the Chief was pleased to announce a couple of weeks ago when we got the final numbers in on 2005, what the crime rate looked like in the City of Shreveport. So, what I'd like to do Chief, is if you could come up, I'd like to read this proclamation that says:

Whereas the year 2005 marks Shreveport's lowest crime rate in 25 years according to Part I Crime Statistics;

Whereas Part I Crime which includes violent property crimes have only been near this level three times in the last two and a half decades, and never this low;

Whereas the men and women of the Shreveport Police Department deserve a community thank you for their never ending efforts in making our community safer, both by being proactive in preventing crimes and successful in solving them;

Whereas the citizens of Shreveport also played huge role for safety by being neighborhood sentinels and by helping our police department with information about the locations of those people involved in crimes;

Now therefore, I Keith Hightower, the Mayor of the City of Shreveport, along with this City Council do hereby proclaim Tuesday, January 31st (which will be the Police Banquet Night) as Shreveport Police Department Day in the City of Shreveport and urge our citizens to recognize what these brave men and women do everyday in their pursuit of keeping our city a safe place. So, I'd encourage each and everyone of our constituents to thank an officer, pat him on the back and encourage him to continue to do what they have done in 2005 to make our city safer than it has been in 25 years. So, Chief, congratulations.

Chief Campbell: I'd just like to give credit to those who make it possible for bringing in those numbers and that's the employees of the Shreveport Police Department, along with the community. Worked very hard, but I will tell you this, there's a lot of room for improvement next year. So, we'll continue to work towards those goals and we appreciate the acknowledgement, thank you.

Councilman Lester: Any other communications from the Mayor? I apologize, we were kinda in a rush there. Okay, thank you.

**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. 11 OF 2006

A RESOLUTION REJECTION BIDS RECEIVED ON IFB #05-129, WALLACE LIFT STATION IMPROVEMENTS PUBLIC WORKS/ENGINEERING AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BY:

WHEREAS, three (3) bids were received as a result of solicitations for Wallace Lift Station Improvements for the PUBLIC WORKS/ENGINEERING, IFB #05-129; and;

WHEREAS, the City has rejected these bids because they are over budget;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened that the bids received on IFB #05-129 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.

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

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Carmody to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 7.

ORDINANCES: None.

REGULAR AGENDA LEGISLATION

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

RESOLUTION NO. 6 OF 2006

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO EXECUTE AN AGREEMENT WITH THE SOUTHERN HILLS BUSINESS ASSOCIATION AND THE PARISH OF CADDO AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

By: Councilman Hogan

WHEREAS, the Southern Hills Business Association was organized in 2001 to bring together business owners and managers in the Southern Hills area for the purpose of promoting community renewal, revitalization, new business development, and economic development of the area; and

WHEREAS, the Southern Hills Business Association is dedicated to assisting local government and its agencies in the promotion of economic well-being for the Southern Hills area and for the city and parish; and

WHEREAS, the City and Caddo Parish own a building formerly used as a branch library, which is vacant and not presently needed for city or parish purposes and the city and parish wish to allow the Southern Hills Business Association the use of the building for its economic development, community renewal, revitalization, and new business development purposes.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened that Keith P. Hightower, Mayor, be and is hereby authorized to execute an agreement between the City of Shreveport, the Parish of Caddo and the Southern Hills Business Association substantially in accordance with the draft thereof filed in the Office of the Clerk of Council on January 24, 2006.

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 Hogan, seconded by Councilman Green to adopt.

Councilman Hogan: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Ms. Glass, I appreciate you going the extra mile to get this worked up today. I had reviewed it, I just had a couple of small questions for you. On Page 2 of the agreement, it says the Southern Hills Business Association agrees that the building will be used only for economic development activities. It will not be used for (inaudible) of any private, trade or business, nor shall it be used for any political purposes. When you said political purposes, I'm assuming that would be someone whoever succeeds my position cannot run their campaign out of the office of something like that. Next Tuesday night, the Association will have their monthly meeting, and he was just in here just a few minutes ago. Jerry Jones is going to be our speaker, he is a candidate for Mayor. And so, I'm wondering if that, we won't have the building ready obviously by next Tuesday, but there'll be other people that we have to speak, which is our custom. We take an interest, the Association, I'll speak for them, they take an interest in who serves in political office, so would that stop someone from speaking?

Ms. Glass: I guess that would be a matter of interpretation of the agreement. Since we are in this with the City and the Parish, we wanted to make sure we were in agreement with the Parish on that interpretation. Now one interpretation would mean that someone could not have their campaign offices there. Another interpretation might be that it not be used for political speeches or whatever. So, I don't know that -- if you wanted to make sure that that's clarified, we might need to clarify that language. I'm going to ask for a postponement?

Councilman Lester: Is that a substitute motion?

Councilman Hogan: Yes it is.

Substitute motion by Councilman Hogan, seconded by Councilman Green to postpone. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Out of the Chamber: Councilmen Carmody, and Jackson. 2.

Councilman Hogan: Ms. Glass, there is one more thing that I'll talk to you about later. The term and termination part of the lease, and I'll cover that with you later.

RESOLUTION NO. 7 OF 2006

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

WHEREAS, it is the desire of the City of Shreveport to retain the services of outside legal counsel to handle matters involving the City of Shreveport in litigation and all other matters involving Pastor Rick Edmonds, et al vs City of Shreveport, Suit No: 473,628, Brian S. Sexton, et ux vs City of Shreveport, Suit No: 473,850 and City of Shreveport vs SGB Architects, L.L.P., et al, Suit No: 498,371.

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 8.03 of the City Charter, the City Attorney recommends that Neil T. Erwin, with the law firm, Jeansonne and Remondet, Attorneys at Law, be retained for the purpose of said representation.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened that the mayor be and he is hereby authorized to execute, for and on behalf of the City of Shreveport, a retainer agreement with Neil T. Erwin, with the law firm, Jeansonne and Remondet, Attorneys at Law, substantially in accordance with the terms and conditions of the draft thereof which was filed for public inspection, together with the original copy of this resolution in the office of the Clerk of Council on January 10, 2006.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this contract shall be paid out of the general government legal expense fund.

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

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

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Walford to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Out of the Chamber: Councilmen Carmody, and Jackson. 2.

RESOLUTION NO. 8 OF 2006

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

WHEREAS, it is the desire of the City of Shreveport to retain the services of outside legal counsel to represent the interests of the City of Shreveport and its officers and employees in claims and lawsuits involving personal injury and workers' compensation claims at a set hourly rate;

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 8.03 of the City Charter, the City Attorney recommends that RONALD LATTIER, Attorney at Law, be retained for the purpose of said representation.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened that the mayor be and he is hereby authorized to execute, for and on behalf of the City of Shreveport, a retainer agreement with RONALD LATTIER, Attorney at Law, substantially in accordance with the terms and conditions of the draft thereof which was filed for public inspection, together with the original copy of this resolution in the office of the Clerk of Council on January 10, 2006.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this contract shall be paid out of the general government legal expense fund.

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

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

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Lester to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Out of the Chamber: Councilmen Carmody, and Jackson. 2.

RESOLUTION NO. 9 OF 2006

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

WHEREAS, it is the City's desire to retain the services of outside legal counsel to provide assistance to the Department of Community Development in connection with the implementation of policies and procedures which will include reviewing and analyzing federal and state laws and upon request prepare internal departmental procurement policies and;

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 8.03 of the City Charter, the City Attorney recommends that Danye W. Malone, with The Malone Law Firm, be retained for \$115.00 per hour not to exceed a total fee of \$25,000.00 for these services.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened that the Mayor be and he is hereby authorized to execute, for and on behalf of the City of Shreveport, a retainer agreement with Danye W. Malone, with The Malone Law Firm, Attorneys at Law, substantially in accordance with the terms and conditions of the draft thereof which was filed for public inspection, together with the original copy of this resolution in the office of the Clerk of Council on January 10, 2006.

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

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

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Lester to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Out of the Chamber: Councilmen Carmody, and Jackson. 2.

RESOLUTION NO. 10 OF 2006

A resolution giving preliminary approval to the issuance of not to exceed Twenty-Three Million Dollars (\$23,000,000) aggregate principal amount of Airport System Revenue Refunding Bonds of the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, providing certain terms of said bonds; making application to the State Bond Commission for approval of said Bonds; and providing for other matters in connection therewith.

WHEREAS, upon the written request of the Shreveport Airport Authority, the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana (the "Issuer) desires to incur debt and issue not to exceed Twenty-Three Million Dollars (\$23,000,000) aggregate principal amount of its Airport System Revenue Refunding Bonds (the "Bonds") in the manner authorized and provided by Section 14-A of Title 39 of the Louisiana Revised Statutes of 1950, as amended, and other constitutional and statutory authority, for the purpose of refunding the \$7,390,000 Airport System Revenue Bonds, Series 1997A (AMT-Subject) and \$18,610,000 Airport System PFC Revenue Bonds, Series 1997B (AMT-Subject) (collectively, the "Prior Bonds") and paying the costs of issuance thereof; and

WHEREAS, the Issuer desires to confirm the employment of the underwriter and bond counsel;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, acting as the governing authority of said City, that:

SECTION 1. Preliminary Approval of Bonds. Preliminary approval is given to the issuance, in one or more series, of not exceeding \$23,000,000 aggregate principal amount of Airport System Revenue Refunding Bonds of the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana (the "Bonds"), to be issued for the purpose of refunding the Prior Bonds, said Bonds solely from a pledge and dedication of the revenues of the Shreveport Regional Airport, including passenger facility charges and such Bonds will not constitute a debt, liability or obligation of the Issuer or the State of Louisiana. The Bonds shall bear interest at a rate or rates not to exceed seven percent (7%) per annum or a variable rate not to exceed twelve percent (12%) per annum, to be determined by subsequent proceedings of this City Council at the time of the sale of the Bonds, and shall mature over a period not exceeding thirty (30) years. The Bonds shall be issued in fully registered form, shall be sold to the purchasers thereof at a price of not less than 97% of the principal amount thereof, plus accrued interest, and shall have such additional terms and provisions as may be determined by this City Council at or prior to sale.

SECTION 2. Employment of Bond Counsel. This governing authority finds and determines that a real necessity exists for the employment of special Bond Counsel in connection with the issuance of the Bonds. Casten & Pearce, A Professional Law Corporation, Shreveport, Louisiana is hereby employed as Bond Counsel to perform comprehensive legal and coordinate professional work as Bond Counsel with respect to the issuance and sale of the Bonds. Said Bond Counsel shall prepare and submit to this governing authority for adoption of all of the proceedings incidental to the authorization, issuance, sale and delivery of such Bonds, shall counsel and advise this governing authority as to the issuance and sale thereof and shall furnish its opinion covering the legality of the issuance of the Bonds. The fee of said Bond Counsel shall be fixed at a sum less than the maximum fee allowed by the Attorney General of the State of Louisiana's fee schedule for comprehensive, legal and coordinate professional work in connection with the issuance of revenue bonds and based on the amount of the Bonds actually issued, sold, delivered and paid for, plus "out-of-pocket" expenses, said fees to be contingent upon the issuance, sale and delivery of said Bonds. A certified copy of this resolution shall be submitted to the Attorney General of the State of Louisiana for his written approval of said employment and of the fees herein designated, and the Director of Finance is hereby empowered and directed to issue vouchers to said Bond Counsel in payment for the work herein provided for upon completion of the work herein specified and under the conditions herein enumerated.

SECTION 3. Appointment of Senior Managing Underwriter. Stephens Inc., of Baton Rouge, Louisiana is hereby appointed as senior managing underwriter in connection with the issuance, of the Bonds, any compensation to be subsequently approved by the Issuer and to be paid from the proceeds of the Bonds and contingent upon the issuance of the Bonds, provided that no compensation shall be due to said senior managing underwriter unless the Bonds are sold and delivered.

SECTION 4. Employment of Financial Advisor. Government Consultants of Louisiana, Inc. is hereby employed as financial advisor to the City in connection with this transaction any compensation to be approved by the City and contingent upon the closing of the transaction.

SECTION 5. State Bond Commission. Application is hereby made to the State Bond Commission, Baton Rouge, Louisiana, for approval of the issuance and sale of the Bonds and for consent and authority to proceed with the issuance and sale of the Bonds as provided above, and Bond Counsel is directed to make application to the State Bond Commission in accordance with the foregoing on behalf of the Issuer.

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

Councilman Lester: Question by the Chair. Mr. Antee, on item 10, on yesterday, I asked the question about the employment of minority counsel as it relates to this, do you have any information on that?

Mr. Antee: Yes Mr. Chairman, I believe the gentleman's name is Clifton Davis.

Councilman Lester: Okay, are there any other questions?

Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 7.

RESOLUTION NUMBER 12 OF 2006

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

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

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

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

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

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

Lot 217, Coleman College Subdivision Geographic Number 171421-031-021700 Municipal Address: 3733 Crosby Street Council District "F"

Lot 37, Concordia Park Annex Geographic Number 171305-034-003700 Municipal Address: 1828 Martha Street Council District "B"

Lot 27, Block J. Hill Crest Subdivision Geographic Number 171414-093-002700 Municipal Address: 1716 Vivian Street Council District "B"

E. 15 Ft of Lot 46, Land O' Trees Subdivision Geographic Number 171513-017-005200 Municipal Address: 51085 None Council District "A"

Lot 47, Land O' Trees Subdivision Geographic Number 171513-017-004700 Municipal Address: 11386 None Council District "A"

Lot 14, Two Bridges Subdivision Geographic Number 171330-104-001400 Municipal Address: 856 Ascalon Street Council District "D"

S. 55 ft of N. 155 ft of the East 140 Geographic Number 181416-014-032800

Ft of Lot 249, Jones-Mabry Subdivision, Unit #3 Municipal Address: 93085 None Council District "A"

Lot 63, Good Friend Subdivision Geographic Number 181421-035-006300 Municipal Address: 1813 Legardy Street Council District "A"

Lot 4, Mobile Estates Geographic Number 161417-005-000400 Municipal Address: 3116 New Moon Dr. Council District "E"

Lot 5, & East 8 ft of Lot 6, Block A Geographic Number 171403-102-002800 Jefferson Heights Municipal Address: 3219 Stonewall Street Council District "G"

Lots 58, 59 & 60, Gary Subdivision Geographic Number 171401-026-008400 Municipal Address: 1555 Gary Street Council District "A"

Lot 44, Winnsboro Subdivision Geographic Number 171403-030-004400 Municipal Address: 2805 W. Maple Street Council District "G"

Lot 26, Block 16, Parkhurst Addition Geographic Number 171415-048-002600 Municipal Address: 3102 Parkhurst Street Council District "F"

Lot "A", Less the E. 3 ft thereof, Deuce Sub Geographic Number 181435-075-000200 Municipal Address: 2006 Garden Street Council District "A"

Lot G, Partition of Lot 485, Jones Mabry Geographic Number 181420-013-000800 Sub Unit #8 Municipal Address: 2027 Stanley Street Council District "A"

Lot 138, Carver Heights Subdivision Geographic Number 181421-033-013800 Unit #2 Municipal Address: 1913 Simpkins Drive Council District "A"

Lots 42, 43, 44 & 45, Henderson Iron Works Sub Municipal Geographic Number 181425-041-006700 Works Sub Municipal Address: 251 Simms Street Council District "A" The North 28 feet of Lot 22, Freewater Subdivision Geographic Number 171305-077-006400 Municipal Address: 2119 Freewater Street Council District "B"

Lot 88 & Easterly ½ of Lot 87, Valencia Sub Geographic Number 171317-006-021700 Municipal Address: 3044 Dallas Street Council District "B"

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 Robertson, seconded by Councilman Green to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 7.

RESOLUTION NO. 13 OF 2006

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE INSTITUTION OF EXPROPRIATION PROCEEDINGS AGAINST CERTAIN DESCRIBED PROPERTY WITHIN THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT IN CONNECTION WITH THE NEIGHBORHOOD STREET IMPROVEMENTS - 1996 BONDS (SOLO HOOD AREA), PROJECT NO: 96-C009, PARCEL NO: P-7, AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport has developed the Neighborhood Street Improvements - 1996 Bonds (Solo Hood Area); Project No: 96-C009; and

WHEREAS, the property described in the legal description, and more fully shown on the plat map marked as Exhibit "A" attached hereto, is situated in said development; and

WHEREAS, all attempts to amicably acquire fee title to the property comprising Parcel No: P-7 have failed; and

WHEREAS, public necessity dictates that this property be owned by and subject to the use by the City of Shreveport.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened, that the expropriation of this property is necessary for the public interest; therefore, the City Attorney be and he is hereby authorized to institute expropriation proceedings against the owners of record, as they might appear at the time of filing suit, of the property described in Exhibit "A" attached hereto as Parcel No: P-7, to be acquired in fee title for street right-of-way.

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

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

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

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, I was interested in what exactly was happening here. I'm sure Mr. Strong or someone could talk to us. For many years, I'm sure most of you all know and I think it's in Councilwoman Robertson's district, for many years, this certainly has been a very neglected, for lack of a better term, area. And I didn't know if this represented some significant improvements. For years, the people who lived in that community and I can remember being involved 8 or 9 years ago in an effort to try to help lift the level of the standards in that particular area, and I guess my question was when I saw it, was did this basically very simply just go to make significant improvement in that area particularly with streets?

Mr. Strong: Councilman, what this is doing is strictly is in our research. And in looking at the roadways in that area, the roads are not necessarily in the right of way. And what we're doing this one area here is a lot, it goes through that the road has been there for many years. And what we're trying to do is to get it all squared up. There is some work that is going on, but it is being done in the private. But what we're trying to do is, if the traffic starts flowing in there, we need to do something, we're actually not in possession of the right of way that the road is in. And all I'm trying to do is straighten that out and make us legal in all aspects.

Councilman Jackson: So, this doesn't necessarily speak to the improvements in that area?

Mr. Strong: No sir, I don't have anything to do or know of anything exactly with all the improvements.

Councilwoman Robertson: If I could, they have started clearing some land and like he said, it's privately owned and so we're thinking and it hasn't been disclosed yet, but someone will try to pull permits and want to try to do something over in there. But no permits, or nothing's gone to MPC and there's no permits been pulled for any new construction or anything like that?

Mr. Strong: No, but there is a lot of talking going on with work that's going on Flournoy Lucas and Ellerbe and Flournoy Lucas and the intersection down there.

Councilman Jackson: I just was interested, I thought maybe it was some good signs. Folks back there have been in a bad situation for a long, long, long time. And there've been significantly neglected. And so I thought that this was some sign of something improving, but that's all I wanted.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Strong, very quick question for you. I know that originally they city had looked to do a thru Mt. Zion Road from Ellerbe Road through Slack Industrial Park over St. Vincent's and I think at some point the decision was made to abandon that particular project. I appreciate what y'all are trying to do is to actually locate the roads inside the right of way that the city maintains in that area, but I was curious. Was that 1996 Bond, Solo Hood area, was that part of that Mt. Zion project, do you know? Excuse me. Mt. Zion Road Extension project?

Mr. Strong: Tom, that's not a part of it, either I'd have to look at it or --

Mr. Dark: I don't think so. I think the roads in Solo Hood have been there for a long time and as Mike said quite often they're not where the street dedication is. I think that's what we're doing here.

Mr. Strong: Right, but I do know that we still have the right of way, but --.

Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 7.

RESOLUTION NO. 18 OF 2006

A RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF THE LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES EARNED INCOME TAX CREDIT INITIATIVE AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

By:

WHEREAS, the Louisiana Department of Social Services has implemented the Earned Income Tax Credit Initiative in an effort to make taxpayers aware of their eligibility for the earned income tax credit; and

WHEREAS, the tax credit is a refund or federal income tax credit for working people with low or moderate earned income; and

WHEREAS, many families and working people are losing out on significant benefits available to them by failing to claim the credit.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened, that the Louisiana Earned Income Tax Credit Initiative by the Louisiana Department of Social Services is hereby supported and the City of Shreveport, through its Mayor, may offer assistance to the Louisiana Department of Social Services to publicize the availability of the earned income tax credit in accordance with applicable provision of law.

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

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

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Jackson, seconded by Councilman Lester to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 7.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS *(Not to be adopted prior February 14, 2006)*

1. **Resolution No. 14 of 2006**: Adopting the Shreveport Comprehensive Revitalization Strategies Addendum to add two neighborhoods to the Shreveport Comprehensive Revitalization Strategies Report of 1999, to establish those neighborhoods as redevelopment areas and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
2. **Resolution No. 15 of 2006**: A resolution authorizing the Mayor to make application with the United States Department of Justice Office of Justice Programs.

3. **Resolution No. 16 of 2006:** A resolution authorizing the Mayor to request the Louisiana Department of Natural Resources, Office of the State Mineral Board, to lease certain mineral interest owned by the City of Shreveport, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
4. **Resolution No. 17 of 2006:** A resolution authorizing the Mayor to execute a cooperative agreement in the amount of \$154,077 between the City of Shreveport and the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality for improvement of private sewerage treatment systems in the Cross Lake Watershed and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Carmody to introduce Resolution No(s). 14, 15, 16, and 17 of 2006 to lay over until February 14, 2006 meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 7.

INTRODUCTION OF ORDINANCES *(Not be adopted prior to February 14, 2006)*

1. **Ordinance No. 4 of 2006:** An ordinance amending the 2006 Budget for the Police Grants Special Revenue Fund.
2. **Ordinance No. 5 of 2006:** An ordinance amending the 2006 Capital Improvements Budget.
3. **Ordinance No. 6 of 2006:** ZONING – C-98-05: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance by rezoning property located on the south side of Bert Kouns Industrial Loop 880 feet west of Walker Road, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from R-1D, Urban, One-Family Residence District, to B-3, Community Business District with MPC Approval, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (E/Hogan)
4. **Ordinance No. 7 of 2006:** ZONING – C-2-06: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance by continuing the B-2-E, Neighborhood Business/Extended Use District Zoning limited to auto repair/filling station, auto sales of 6 cars only, on property located on the northwest corner of Creswell and Olive, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (B/Walford)
5. **Ordinance No. 8 of 2006:** ZONING Appeal – C-1-06: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance by rezoning property located on the east side of Pines Road, 1010 feet north of Jefferson Paige Road and being 370 feet east of Pines Road, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from B-1, Buffer Business District, to R-1D, Urban, One-Family Residence District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (A/Lester)
6. **Ordinance No. 9 of 2006:** ZONING Appeal- C-92-05: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance by rezoning property located on the south side of North Market 650 feet east of Devereaux Road, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from B-2-E, Neighborhood Business/Extended Use District to R-3-E, Urban, Multiple Family/Extended use District and B-2 Neighborhood Business District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (A/Lester)
7. **Ordinance No. 10 of 2006:** ZONING C-3-06: An ordinance to amend Section 106-1127 (5) of the City of Shreveport Code of Ordinances, the Zoning Ordinance and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. ¹

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Jackson, seconded by Councilman Walford to introduce Ordinance No(s). 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, and 10 of 2006 to lay over until February 14, 2006 meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 7.

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

1. **Ordinance No. 1 of 2006:** An ordinance authorizing the Mayor to execute an act of donation of the McNeil Street Pumping Station from the City of Shreveport to the State of Louisiana and otherwise providing with respect thereto. (B/Walford) *(Not be adopted prior to February 14, 2006)*
2. **Ordinance No. 2 of 2006:** An ordinance authorizing the lease of L. Calhoun Allen Exposition Hall to Stageworks of Louisiana, L.L.C., and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. *(Not be adopted prior to February 14, 2006)*

Having passed first reading on January 10, 2006 was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Carmody to postpone Ordinance No(s) 1 and 2 of 2006.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, I think that now would be an appropriate time since we are postponing this particular issue with regard to the lease rather than waiting until next week and never have the questions answered with regard to some questions with regard to the lease, if the Chair thinks that that is appropriate.

Councilman Lester: I think that it's appropriate. So, if there are any questions, Councilman Jackson, you have the floor.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, thank you. And just as a matter of asking, what I said, I didn't want to get into when other folks were making their presentation. And the Administration perhaps if they're not prepared today, we can get some of the questions answered between now and the next meeting. Because there are several things from yesterday when I did get the copy, and I did get a copy of the lease. A couple of my questions are real basic, real fundamental questions, and they were -- somebody, I think maybe Councilman Green began to allude to it today. And maybe there is a reason why. It seems that in the first portion of the contract with regards to what the folks at the sound stage would be doing, that there was a rather expansive category of things. A, B, C, D, and E, which included in that A & E which I thought were both made good sense. D, I assumed, when he talked about industrial inducements, and maybe if the clarify for as Councilman Green was saying, the language could be confusing. I understand it and appreciate it to mean that particular

¹ The title of Ordinance No. 10 of 2006, was inadvertently omitted from the published minutes on January 30, 2006 of the Official Journal. The Minutes were amended at the February 28, 2006, Council Meeting to insert the correction.

industry, and inducements to that particular industry. But maybe we'd want to clarify that language. But in the two categories, economic development, and the other which was industrial enterprise which would have an economic impact upon Shreveport, LA area or the State of Louisiana. I didn't know if D and B were redundant, unnecessarily redundant, or they spoke to two different things. And I'm assuming that D was as we said, that movie industry inducements, then if that is the case, then what in fact does B speak to? My first concern, and then D, when we use the term, or C, let me say when we use the terms economic development, obviously that's a very expansive category, when you say economic development, that could mean anything. And could be of no limit. So, I don't know if whether or not we could put our arms around a term like economic development and as you know, we've had some problems in the past with folks saying that the Riverfront Development Fund, for example was for the purpose of economic development. Then we started doing civic appropriations and everybody said, well, where did all this come from? This doesn't have anything to do with the RiverFront, and then we say it falls under the expansive category of economic development. And so, I don't know if we intend to bring it down that alley again, if you will, but those are a couple of things that I had questions about in that particular area. And I don't know if you all have an answer for that or if the appropriate time may be some time outside of this for you to answer that. That's my first question Mr. Chairman.

Mayor Hightower: What I'll do on that Councilman, is we'll get them to better define B and D, and I'll ask what the reason is for C, and if there's not a good reason, we'll take that out.

Councilman Jackson: Well, we might want to strike C, if we can't get a better reason. Because I would think that A & E both cover what that industry and with inducements, that we cover a wide range of things in that. My second question Madam Chairwoman, went to the term, Mr. Mayor. In the terms of the lease, particularly in Section 2, there are questions with regard to basically the term. And I was confused because there was something that I wasn't sure about. In Section A it talks about the initial term of the lease. And it said that the initial terms will commence on the day following the execution of this lease agreement by all parties and shall end at midnight on December 31, 2020. So basically that's just to say a 15 year lease. But down in the C section after you read the C section, it suggest that the lease agreement shall be revocable by city at anytime that the leased premises are not being used by the tenants for a public purpose, that is the permitted use as set forth herein which is what we talked about just a few minutes ago. But down at the bottom of that, it said -- one of the final statements says to this end, the city hereby agrees that the right to revoke this lease agreement upon tenants not using the lease premise for a public purpose, that is what we just described, and a declaration of another public use shall only be exercised by the city. But then 365 days or one year of the expiration of the initial term or the renewal term of this lease. Now the initial term was 2020. As a layman, as I read it, it suggested to me that we couldn't revoke this or move to revoke this under these terms given in Section C until what would be December 31, 2019. Is that correct?

Mayor Hightower: Right. That's correct.

Councilman Jackson: So, that would mean that we would be into the contract before we could (and that's just me reading that), that I was under the impression from reading it, that we could be in the contract 14 of the 15 years before we could actually do anything about it particularly if we felt as if they were not even having a permitted use. So, my question was from my perspective that they get 14 years to not use it for those purposes, and then at the end of the 14th year, then we could say well now we're going to revoke this lease, and we take it back after having been engaged in this lease for 14 of the 15 years.

Mayor Hightower: My understanding of that is when you go back up to the top of C, that this lease shall be revocable by the city at anytime a public use of the lease premise shall be found to exist by the Shreveport City Council. That section goes back to what we talked about before. If they don't use it for movie business purposes, within a year, it would come back before the City Council, and they're going to have to explain to the City Council that is sitting at that time, why it has not been used. Now, assuming that they do go to the term, the initial term which is 15 years, if we want them out, we have to give them a year's notice. To give them an opportunity to reschedule, to rebuild assuming this is an ongoing business for 25 years instead of 15, it gives us the opportunity to do that.

Councilman Jackson: I would think that that would be terminating the lease then for some cause, is that correct?

Mayor Hightower: Terminating the lease for cause would be what we talked about initially. If the cause would be they did not use it for a movie.

Councilman Jackson: That they're not using it for permitted purposes--

Mayor Hightower: Or for a year.

Councilman Jackson: Or didn't do anything at all?

Mayor Hightower: For a year. Right. And then we decided we wanted to take it back and do whatever we want to as a city. We can do that.

Councilman Jackson: We have 45 days. We have to give them a 45 day notice according to another section of the lease which talks about what they could do, how we could terminate for cause or terminate in other -- I think the other term besides cause was 'convenience', okay, but when I read through it, it seemed as if our hands are tied. I guess here's my scenario. Lets just say we get involved in this lease tomorrow, and then we go for 18 months or 20 months. And then they say, we're trying to do some things, not feeling it, y'all take it back. And so when they come to us today and say, you got \$400,000 overhead, we're helping you out with this thing, you don't have to pay this \$400,000, you can save this money and we're going to take all the risks, all those things are great, but in 18-20 months when they give it back to us, do we not then receive it back with all the overhead that has ever existed before? So in other words, we get it back with overhead, it comes back to us with overhead. Now as a city and as a body, as you know, we have not budgeted for that. So now we get it back, the white elephant becomes our possession again, and we have not budgeted for it and it throws the council, whoever maybe the council at that particular time, whether it be four years from now, eight years from now or whatever into a tizzy because they have the right to walk away from it and just give it back to us, and we just receive it back. And I talked to Chairman about some other alternatives that perhaps there needs to be some language in there that protects us against that, and guarantees that somehow or another we recover some costs so that we're not left hanging. Because right now according to the terms of the lease, they can walk away. And the white elephant becomes ours again and we've got to not only keep it, we've got to feed it and nurse it and everything else that we're doing to this point, that this project is suppose to help us alleviate. So, my question becomes as we look at this lease, we've got to figure out some way to correct that. That portion of it because just the same, if we wanted to take the building back, and they were two years into it, and we said 'hey, there's some reason we need to take the building back, they're going to have some costs, they're going to have some cost that are stranded and perhaps there needs to be some reciprocal language that suggests that nobody's going to be

hung out there. But right now, I see, and maybe I'm wrong, and that's why I'm asking questions, and you all can show me, because I couldn't find it here, where we have that literal type of protection.

Mayor Hightower: And you do make a good point there, and I guess if we're looking at (inaudible) and says everyday they take it off of our hands, they save us, you know \$30,000 a month, whatever the number may be, and then you're right, if they gave it back to us in July, we have to figure out a way to pay \$30,000 a month for the next six months. What I might suggest that the Council do, for 2006, we do have operational money budgeted, I don't know whether it's \$400,000 or what that number is, but we might want to take that \$400,000 and not unbudget it, continue to escrow it for years to come, so that if the scenario happens as you suggest, that \$400,000 could be set aside to take over immediate operation of the building should the city ever receive it back.

Councilman Jackson: Well, I don't disagree with that. I just think that perhaps a better financing strategy might be, just like we have employees there and they're going to give us \$200,000 to help build a facility because we need to relocate our employees and so they have agreed in principle to say we'll help. If you all say it cost \$200,000 to put 'em somewhere else, to build something, to whatever, we'll be willing to do it. I would suggest that maybe the \$400,000 be their money that we escrow rather than our money, and then we allow the city to budget its money for other things, because we don't have, I don't think we can afford to as a municipality to keep money in escrow that we could use in some other areas, particularly in streets and other areas that -- sidewalks, that's a bigger budget than our sidewalk budget that we would have in escrow. So, my question would be whether or not that's a good -- I mean that may be a good scenario, but maybe that's something we ought to ask them to do. Because for \$1,200, we're not asking them to do a lot. Except they are going to have to take all those costs and all those things and I just want to be sure we make sure in this lease situation. And I'm not even suggesting that they need to do that or that the city ought to do it. But we are going to be exposed if your scenario, or whatever doesn't happen. We do have that gap. We do have that exposure that's still there. And so just something that I hope over the next couple of weeks, we can think about how in fact we can close that gap. Or how we can do something about that exposure that I feel like we have in that scenario. And those areas were two of the most -- the two that jumped out at me the most and I'm sure my colleagues, I'm sorry, but I won't dominate the time, but those are two that I thought we at least need to think about because of the city's interest in this project and to limit the city's both liability and exposure.

Mayor Hightower: The first set of things that you talked about, I certainly think we can address and can have those. I don't have an answer to what happens if that happens and you're (inaudible) and obviously there are risks on both sides. I think the city's risk in this contract is severely limited. There's just not much that can go wrong. Again, if they keep the thing for one year, it saves \$400,000 that we ought to look and say well, if we have to take it back, we ought to be able to afford it in 2007, if that's the case. But no matter what happens, I think that would be a budget decision that the Council and Mayor at that time have to deal with. And hopefully, that they city or the Council at that time decided that they wanted to take the building back from the City's standpoint for a higher and better use, that those cost would have been thought out ahead of time, and that they would have a tenant that was ready to take those on. So, I'm not real sure that in the contract we're going to be able to address what your concerns are. Certainly understand what your concern is, but you know again, there's no reason to believe that these guys aren't going to make it for 15 years, and certainly no reason to believe they won't make it for one. And if they make it for one, and they give it back to us in year 2, I've got to say we're still \$400,000 better off that might be a cash crunch at the time to come up with a \$400 to afford the utilities for that year, but we're still much better off, everyday they keep the building.

Councilman Jackson: Sure. Mr. Chairman, I'm sorry, but what I did, and I'm sorry Mr. Mayor, but I left this area. The bottom of this paragraph that says that the City hereby agrees -- I think I understood what you were saying at the beginning and I think we agreed about the 45 days and all that, but that bothers me at the bottom that's clearly or explicitly here at the bottom, that the City hereby agrees that the right to revoke this lease agreement upon tenants not using the leased premise for a public purpose. That is the permitted use as set forth herein and a declaration of another public use shall only be exercised by City within one year or 365 days with an expiration of the initial term or renewal term of this lease agreement. That maybe, I don't know if it's necessary language or it's something that could come out, because juxtaposed to what is above it, it looks like it's contradictory.

Mayor Hightower: We'll look at that.

Councilman Hogan: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Mayor, I don't claim to be an expert on these types of contracts. I understand a lease agreement in rental property, that's what I do, but in just reading over this, I had a question, there's probably a simple explanation for it. I just need you to go over it with me. On the fact sheet, it talks about the purpose. It list StageWorks of Louisiana, L.L.C, on into the agreement in the actual ordinance itself, it says whereas, StageWorks of Louisiana, L.L.C. ("Tenant") desires to lease Expo Hall, etc. in the agreement again, it talks about StageWorks, However, at the bottom of the fact sheet, it says no other studio or venue currently exist in North Louisiana, so on and so forth, and to this end SoundWorks of Louisiana, L.L.C., (Tenant) desires to lease Expo Hall from the City. Now, should this not say desire to sublease Expo Hall from StageWorks? Because they're actually going to be leasing. If I'm understanding it right, SoundWorks is going to be subleasing it from StageWorks. Am I missing something here?

Mayor Hightower: I think it should probably say, StageWorks on both. However there will be subleases. I'm not sure of why it says SoundWorks here instead of StageWorks, but that may just be a typo. We'll get with Terri Scott who drafted this.

Ms. Stone: It is. It's a typo. We did talk about the public purpose, revocation a lot. Do you want to talk about this, and how we came to this language.

Ms. Stone: We talked a long time about public purpose revocation with the contractor. We talked about some of your concerns if we get it back, what legal came to the conclusion was that it would not be -- they said if we had to take it back, and they had invested their million to two million dollars in it, how would they recoup those costs. And that's why we decided it was better for the City not to get into having to repay if we took that building back sooner, those costs for improvements. Cause we did talk about that for a long time, about looking up the cost of improvements and how we would cost those improvements out over some of the years, if we cancelled the lease early, would the city then be liable for paying you for those improvements, and we just thought it was not, Terri did not feel like (inaudible) we were talking to their attorneys, it would be in the best interest of the city to get us into some kind of financial consideration if we cancelled early.

Councilman Hogan: I defer to Councilman Jackson.

Councilman Jackson: My question was just on what she said, just right then. Would not then the improvement of Expo Hall be a relative improvement, because if its improved to specifications for a sound stage, then to suggest that it is improved is relative. Because if you got somebody coming here that wants to do a

sound stage, it's super. But if you now decide the sound stage business is not really working, and now I gotta go with a circus on the inside, and it's not really, then you got to gut it out and you got to move things, so I'm sure there'll be some moderate improvements that are general improvements that will help long term. Certain types of sound. But all of the sound, we wouldn't need if we were doing something different. And that was my interest in saying maybe we need to be sure that whatever cost we can recoup, and then they may have an interest in recouping some cost as well, and that may be --

Ms. Stone: (Inaudible) that's where it got into the discussion. And that's how this language came to be. (Inaudible) if we put \$X in it, the other thing that they had a problem with, because they took our first copy of the lease that had a public purpose revocation to some studios and that made them nervous about investing and building a set and they were saying that you could revoke this lease at anytime without any cost considerations. That's where we got into all this discussion about how to make it win for both of us. And that was what we were trying to do with this public purpose revocation, the way it's written.

Councilman Hogan: Ms. Stone. I'm done, thank you for explaining that. Y'all are going to correct the typo I'm sure. But Mr. Mayor, just one other comment. I liked the part about what you said, that it's low risk for the city. And I think in terms of risk, we've reached probably in my opinion our capacity or maximum for risk. But anyway, one of the things I've admired about you is that you've always been willing to take a risk. And you never get anywhere without doing that. And I just wouldn't want to be a part of the investment group here. And my thing, and they're going to have the highest level of risk, it'd be much too high for my comfort. But anyway, I'm very interested in this. I'm not going to commit to voting for it today, but I'm very interested in and it sounds like from what I understand, a good idea. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Lester: Ms. Stone, I had a question, I didn't want to lose my train of thought. I would like to at some point to be a party to a conversation or get some information about the conversations that you had, Ms. Scott, as well as their attorney as it relates to the out clause. The interest that I have and I think Councilman Jackson alluded to it earlier, if we have a scenario where they make improvements and there is a public purpose or there is a public need that dictates us taking this building back, I think there should be something that's built in that appreciates the fact that 1) the investors made material alteration to the building that have been approved. That value has improved and to the extent that some of those are improvements that cannot be removed because as Councilwoman Robertson just pointed to me, there is a clause that speaks to the removal of certain things from Expo Hall from the building. So to the extent that those things that can't be removed, that are permanent fixtures, I think that there should be some, I guess for lack of a better term, credit or something or some consideration given particularly if we come back for a public purpose after a certain period of years. And I think that there should be some way to gradually step down because quite obviously, if they make the improvements, they're going to gradually depreciate their value. And so for tax purposes, they're going to be able to appreciate that. And so I would think that lets say, if something happens and we need the building in year 10, then there should be a sliding scale saying based upon this level of improvements, and I don't think it would be difficult, because we could get an accountant or somebody look at the value of improvements, and give them X percentage based upon its depreciated value in this year. Conversely, if we have a situation that Councilman Jackson is concerned about, and I am too, where lets say they don't make the improvements or they make certain improvements, and they decide, you know what? It didn't work. Now it's yours. And now, we have to deal with this building now, I think there should be a sliding scale that appreciates to our benefit as well, because here we have a scenario where we have made certain budgetary considerations and we entered into this lease for 15 years or initial term. In the year 5, you know what? It's back to us. And so I think that I would like to be a party to find out what the conversation was as to the consideration angle. Because that's a concern of mine for future councils. What happens if, now we have it back after 2 years or -- and I don't think we should get as much back in year 5, as we do in year 2, and we should not get as much back in year 10 as we get back in year 5. There should be something, some formula that makes sense. And I would really be interested to know that, and I think that can be done in such a way to at least alleviate some of the fears of the business. Because quite obviously if you turn the roles around, I would be concerned if I'm going to make significant improvements, and there was just something that just said, if for a public purpose, you can come in and snatch this building back. But if there was a financial component or a dollar figure placed to that, I would know that okay, if this happens, then I have to pick up my things, but I'm going to get this back, and I can make certain considerations. So I would really like to know what that conversation was as it relates to consideration. And I just want to leave you with that point before you left.

Councilman Green: Let me ask you this. Is there anything in our charter that says, we entered into an agreement like this, and say, we're saving \$400,000 now. Say they gave it back to us in a year. Is there anything in our charter or an ordinance that would relate that now say this building has become a liability and now we're in a financial crunch, and we cannot afford to pay the \$400,000, is there anything that would prohibit us from just demolishing the building?

Mayor Hightower: The City Council would have to declare it as surplus at that time. If the City Council declared it as surplus, they can do what they wanted to do with it. If they wanted to sell it, they could demolish it, do what they wanted to do.

Councilman Walford: This is to the Administration. Yesterday, you and I had a discussion about other uses of the building. The way I read the lease, it doesn't prohibit other uses. B, C, and D, under the grant of use, to me opened it up to any B-4 activities. It isn't limited to -- no it doesn't. It does say that in A, and it does that E, but B says industrial enterprises which would have an economic development impact on the Shreveport, LA area or the State of Louisiana, C says economic development, D says industrial inducements.

Mayor Hightower: Well, probably what we need to do there is as Councilman Jackson says maybe we need to be redundant in that case, and I think you heard Mr. Warren who represented StageWorks describing industrial enterprises as that industry. And we define the industry in A and B instead of spelling out sounds, lights, movie, television, broadcasting, recording and arts production. It just says industrial referring to the above.

Councilman Walford: I think if we could just get a wording change, I would be much more comfortable with it.

Mayor Hightower: We'll just have them define industrial. We may have to be redundant again, and put A & B and spell it out. But industrial, the definition of industrial in this instance refers back to A.

Councilman Walford: Typed to the film industry?

Mayor Hightower: Correct.

Councilman Walford: Instead of leaving it open to any B-4 use, and believe me, there are some B-4 uses that would be considered a bit objectionable.

Mayor Hightower: Well, that's absolutely not the intent.

Councilman Walford: Oh, I know that, but it's -- it's better to cover ourselves now than to regret it later.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Mayor, I don't know if we -- I thought about this as well, I know at one point that the group was talking about -- building a facility and being located at the Port or something like that. Obviously it would be great for the Port and all of those things. I think the advantage to the City if it wound up at the Port, and I'm not advocating being out at the Port, just leads me to my next question. If they were out at the Port or anywhere like that, other than downtown in the Expo Hall, they'd be paying taxes. Question is since we own the building and there'll be private business going on in there, are we paying the taxes as a city, or are they paying the tax? I mean, it's not -- it won't be any taxes, just taxes on what?

Mr. Thompson: Well, I think the lease says that we would be responsible for any taxes the City would ordinarily be responsible for. Which I assume would be none. But they would be responsible for any taxes because of the new use that they are bringing to it.

Mayor Hightower: But they wouldn't be responsible. Not property tax.

Councilman Jackson: That's what I'm saying, it's not the same thing as a property tax. And certainly not as appealing as a property tax if you would, then I just wanted to see if we were going to -- because what it said, we're going to be responsible for taxes. I just want to be sure that that doesn't mean we're going to have a tax liability as a city.

Mayor Hightower: (Inaudible) no more tax liability than we have now. And I'm not too sure that even if they were at the Port, they're certainly tax free zones, and that's the reason people take advantage of the Port properties, is the lack of tax obligation out there. So, again I don't think we're going to be any worse off than we are today, that's our goal, and certainly our goal is that we're much better off as a result of them using this facility, and we'll get it back in the same condition. And if it last 15 years, you know we're all going to jump up and down and be tremendously happy. If it last one year, hey we're going to be \$400,000 (inaudible). But again, it's our opportunity to take advantage of an industry that's here now, and we see the competition running our way. So the quicker we can get up and running, you know the better off we are. So, I hope it is long term, but I think part of what we have to look at is an economic development opportunity and a debt and liability release, at least for the short term for the City. And not contract it for debt. And I think we can do pretty much everything that has been suggested or questioned here today, again, with the exception of how we address Councilman Jackson and Councilman Lester's concern of what happens if they give it back. How do we take up the slack, but hoping through budgeting and fiscal management, there's always that risk that we get it back. There's always a risk in maybe -- maybe that's part of Risk Management. You know a contract fell through, and we had to pay, and maybe that's where the dollars come from at that point. But again, that'll be up to future councils and mayors. I'm confident that these guys will be successful. They're putting up a lot of their own money, and in general they're not apt to fail, and I think you heard the experts talk today about how likely and how important this is to happen, whether it's 1 year or 15 years. None of us know. None of us here today know what we'll be doing 15 years down the road, and if our businesses will be as viable as they were or if we'll be interested in them. So, there are risks, but I think that they are just so minimal to the city, and again, timing is important. I hope we can dress and clarify everything that's been answered today, and the only thing I am concerned about telling you that we can clarify is some sort of stagger, or some sort of 'what if' down the road and who swaps dollars. I think that's going to be tough to iron out.

Councilman Lester: I just want to throw these out. I'd like for Mr. Lafitte and Mr. Gilliam to give me some information relative to how the city would stand in this project as it relates to Fair Share. I understand, and Councilman Green asked the question, and I don't think that the gentleman understood. I think that Mr. Myatt understood. I think what, and not to put words in Councilman Green's mouth, but I think one of the concerns that I know that I have is, not just from the jobs angle, but I'm concerned about contracting opportunities as well as the potential for minority investment. And whether or not there are folks that have the financial wherewithal that can be a part of this particular project. I was encouraged to hear them say that as it stands, they only have two people. And they have a proposed list of investors, but that will crystallize apparently once the decision has been made, that's Council's. So, I would like something that you could tell me what would be vis-à-vis on that footing. The other question that I had is what is the guarantee of investment? In other words, I know that they are going to be buying the tax credits, and obviously they're going to do, they're saying that they are going to do the sound stage, but I also heard Mr. Myatt say that he wasn't going to commit to any or make any financial commitments in terms of enhancements to the building until they got commitments, which in one sense make sense. My question was, what level do we have that says 'we're going to make this level of investment by this particular time?' And if we don't, how does that square with they haven't done anything with the building. Now I know the flip side of that is if they don't, then hey we save \$400,000. Which is I think a legitimate argument, but at the same time, my question is what guarantees do we have that they're going to actually go out there and hustle to make this happen, because in one respect, if I understood their business model, it is quite possible that they could purchase tax credits, and sell tax credits, but the production does not actually happen at the sound stage. And so, then where are we at that point. So that's a question I'd like to have answered. Ken?

Mr. Antee: I think one of the things Mr. Chairman, is that they want to buy more tax credits, and in order to buy more tax credits, there have to be more movies filmed in Louisiana, preferably in North Louisiana, and in order to film more movies, you got to have the infrastructure. So, they're stepping up to provide the infrastructure, so that more movies would be filmed, so that they can then buy more tax credits. And they're willing to bet by investing a good bit of money, they've invested a lot of money to get to this point, and they'll invest more depending -- they'll have to do some to the building before they ever get started anyway. So that'll be more invested. And they're willing to bet on that investment that it's going to create the demand for more movies to be filmed there, which gives them the opportunities to buy more tax credits.

Mayor Hightower: But some of it's kinda of a chicken or an egg scenario. And you heard I think David and Mark say that there was some hesitancy from the studios to strike deals. He said he had no contracts. For hesitancy to strike deals because they did not have a long term contract, that they felt was solid enough to keep them, and I'm talking about the production companies from moving their stuff in, and then having to move out in connection and jointly with the sound stage people if the City Council decided to kick them out. So, probably what will happen, and again, the contract as soon as we sign it, the year starts ticking. If he doesn't go out and put contracts together and have productions underway in a year, the Council is going to take a look and say, how much longer we need to give you. We gave you a year, you've done virtually nothing, that we can see, other than give us \$100 a month, at that point I think we got a decision to make. But these guys aren't doing it to sit around for a year. They're confident that they are going to be able to sign contracts. You heard 'em say they've marched Disney, A&E, FX, I don't remember who else they said virtually, ESPN, several companies through the

facility to say 'hey, I think this will work, and yeah, we may be interested in contracting with you.' So, that's the risk that they take. And again, he may not invest the million dollars or two million until he has a signed contract. And I don't think many of us would go do it on spec either. We'd want a contract in hand before we go do the enhancements, that may indeed have to be ripped out because they didn't need a 15,000 square foot, they needed a 45,000. So, I think part of what we have to believe in is that the group of guys that we're dealing with, 1) they're pretty much all from here. I think Karl Malone, I guess he doesn't live in Shreveport and James Davison lives in Ruston. But every other person lives in Shreveport. So we have to have some confidence that this list of people have the wherewithal and the reputations and the desire to continue to keep those good reputations in the City of Shreveport. So, it's not a fly by night deal, because none of these guys want their reputations damaged, (inaudible) that we did something that took advantage of the citizens of the City or this City Council, or this Mayor. They're not going to do that. And that's why I'm comfortable bringing this deal. If this would have been some junk bond guys from New York that flung in here with a brief case, we wouldn't be having this conversation. But these guys truly have civic compassion, and they truly want to see something good happen for the state, but more importantly for Shreveport and Northwest Louisiana. So we have to have a little confidence and we have to understand that if it does fall apart in a year, we get our building back. We saved \$400,000 and then you know, you can start rat killin in some other direction at that point. So --.

Councilman Lester: Thank you Mr. Mayor and the other questions that I had, I think have been articulated as it relates to the out clause for public purpose. The other question that I had some questions about relates to sublessors, and a potential non-competition agreement because you know, what's to say that during the interim, and the reason why I think some of us, the language and the usage scenario came about was what if in the interim, they're trying to put some deals together, and nothing is happening, and someone approaches them and says 'hey, I need a 60,000 square foot building, and I'll pay you \$20,000 a month and you know -- this will help pay some of those bills and you know, deal with some of this overhead you guys are getting into. And this lease, at least on it's face says industrial development, economic development purposes, and these guys quite obviously are businessmen. And I know that they have a certain financial wherewithal, but no one wants to be in a business where privately you're losing money hand, after hand, after hand, after hand, at some point, you're going to have to stop the bleeding. So, I think that's why some of us had some, at least I know I did, with that particular language. Because whose to stop one of the guys saying at a shareholder's meeting, 'hey guys, I understand, but look our lease says we can do this deal for economic development, this is economic development, it's a permitted use, and then which ducktails into someone having a sublease in a building with a use that's incompatible with something that's B-4, and then when they come before MPC, no you can't do it. But then they appeal it to us, and we say no. But then we're party to a contract that says they could. And so, that's why flowing it that way, at least for my purposes, that's why I have such heartburn with that particular language.

Mayor Hightower: It will be our intent to strike the economic development unless I come back to you with some reason that I don't foresee. We'll strike that. Our intent again is if they were in dire straights and somebody came and said I need a building that big, you know as long as -- if somebody came to them and said that I want to open a cotton gin in there, obviously that doesn't fit. But if they came in there and they said I got a bunch of production equipment that's getting wet and I need to store it, they could do that. If it was movie lights, and speakers and stuff or a production trucks. I guess they could do. Again that's not their intent. We've got to have some belief that they're going to try to make this thing do what they say they think it can do. But we'll go back and we'll strike the economic development and again tighten it up so that B, C, and D, I believe it will all have specific language that spells out what industrial use means and what economic development means.

Councilman Lester: And again, it's nothing against these guys, but I'm a lawyer and we write the language ambiguously to give our clients a back door, just in case, when the building is on fire, they can get out quickly. So, that's why that alarm raised in my mind. I think that was the last of the questions that I had.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Mayor as far as the improvements that can be made by the tenant, under the lease agreement, do we have any control as far as approval over any exterior improvements to the building? The reason I say so, that if they were to go, and again, I'm trying to find it in the agreement itself, but if they were to go and to do some modification to the exterior of the building which we found aesthetically unattractive or not in conformity with what we're trying to do on the Riverfront or if God forbid, if our two casinos found it objectionable, what ability do we as the lessors have in control over the aesthetic appearance of the property over the term of the lease?

Mayor Hightower: Aesthetically, we know essentially what they want to do is put up a rout iron fence all around the perimeter to protect their investment and their equipment that has to stay outside in particular. And obviously we ordinances that control what sort of fencing. We have ordinances that control what kind of signage, we also talked about and this is small, but just to give you an idea of what their thinking is as well, they're going to leave all the Christmas decorations up on the building. The only thing they're interested in doing is some signage to denote who they are. The other signage issue that we talked about was the electronic sign out front. The face of it may be changed as well. Other than that I think we were pretty specific about the landscaping, and everything else that was in there. We don't give them a lot of ability to change the outside of the building. I think they could put up an awning or something over their entrance if they wanted to. Is there anything you had in mind?

Councilman Carmody: Obviously what their real intent is, is to modify the interior of the Exposition Hall for their purposes. Which their purposes (inaudible) as a production studio ability. But I guess what my concern would be is that somebody either decided that for whatever reason they didn't like the color of the outside of the building and it would look better as hot pink, then I don't know that that would be something that we would really want to see done to a municipal building, that we would have to take back and then recover the cost to return it back to it's original --

Mayor Hightower: And I believe there is a clause in there that they have to have city approval --

Mr. Antee: It is, that's under paragraph 5B, it says plans and specifications for alterations, additions or improvements to the leased premises of whatever nature shall be submitted to the city for approval at least ten working days prior to commencement of the work. And then it goes on to --

Councilwoman Robertson: I have one and actually I should have been quicker on with Mr. Myatt. But he mentioned about having to make the offices up stairs, and he said there was another 5,000 square feet that he was going to have to use for offices that were upstairs in the building. And in here it's saying that they're supposed to maintain the 5,000 for storage for the city.

Mayor Hightower: Well, what we've done, and I'm not sure if this copy says it or not. The contract -- there's two areas of concern to us as a city. What do we do with the employees that we currently have there? And I mentioned to you yesterday that it's our hope that they're going to give us a couple of hundred thousand dollars and we remodel the depot on the Festival Plaza. That is an option that we would like to see happen. The other thing that we would like to see happen is for them to either rent us a building, provide storage for us somewhere in the vicinity of Festival Plaza, downtown to store the tables and those type things that are at Expo Hall that are essentially in their way. However, we'll give them incentives -- we want to give them incentive that if they don't want to remodel the offices at the depot, then our guys stay placed where they are at Expo Hall. Now that creates a little bit of a headache for them for security and hours and that type of stuff. And the same thing with the tables and the equipment. I want to give them an incentive to let us keep 'em there. Because SPAR happens to think Expo Hall is perfectly located as far as transporting equipment back and forth to Festival Plaza, Barnwell or wherever it is they have to use it. So, we want to give them incentive and the incentive is either they go rent us a building to store stuff in or they find us a place in Expo Hall and let us keep it there. Same thing with the offices there. That they give us \$200,000 to build out the depot, or they let us keep our offices where they are. And so we'll just see how important it is to their business as to whether we totally vacate the building or not. But that's just where we are with them at this point. Their initial thought is that they're gonna want us out. Now they may rethink that, and decide different. We'll see. But we'll give them that -- we'll put that monkey on their back and let them decide how they want to spend their money. How important privacy is to 'em.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, I want to find out and I tried to consult with counsel and with the Clerk counsel with regards to -- one of the things that happened today when he came, and I think the Mayor reiterated just now, that the potential for making movies include companies such like Disney and A&E and other studios, but my concern was that historically one of the issues that we've had in the city has been the level to which we lift or stoop. And I wondered if we could find out in this contract or at least place as a cause in this contract that there are certain movies that we're interested in not being involved in as it relates to that industry. Because nothing in this contract prohibits them - - are you saying that A&E, and Disney, nothing prohibits Larry Flint, Playboy Channel and all the other folks to also do the same thing. And for a company who has a sound stage, means at the end of the day it's money. And so it's a production, notwithstanding that, and so certainly people have First Amendment rights, but I think if we enter into an agreement contractually, that the citizens will consider this best use with regard -- I mean it may be some dividing line somewhere with regard to people's level of whatever. But I wondered if it would be in our best interest to add a clause that may say that there is certain level to which we are willing to go. With regard to pornography and that kind of thing. I mean it's a legal industry and as the contract is written now, there is no prohibition, and that was just my concern.

Councilman Green: Councilman Jackson, are you saying they would have to go next door to do it?

Councilman Jackson: Well legally, they couldn't do it next door. So, I just want to make sure legally they would just have to come next door to get it done.

Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 7.

3. **Ordinance No. 3 of 2006:** An Ordinance closing and abandoning the dedicated 20 foot-wide alleyway running between Caddo and Fannin Streets located in Block 56 of the Town of Shreveport, City of Shreveport, in Section 37 (T18N-R-14W) Caddo Parish, Louisiana.

Having passed first reading on January 10, 2006 was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Carmody to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 7.

4. **Ordinance No. 208 of 2006:** 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 – January 10, 2006)

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 Jackson to postpone. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 7.

The adopted ordinance and amendments follow:

ORDINANCE NO. 3 OF 2006

AN ORDINANCE CLOSING AND ABANDONING THE DEDICATED 20 FOOT-WIDE ALLEYWAY RUNNING BETWEEN CADDO AND FANNIN STREETS LOCATED IN BLOCK 56 OF THE TOWN OF SHREVEPORT, CITY OF SHREVEPORT, IN SECTION 37 (T18N-R14W), 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 20 foot-wide alleyway running between Caddo and Fannin Streets located in Block 56 of the Town of Shreveport, City of Shreveport in Section 37 (T18N-R14W), Caddo Parish,

Louisiana and as shown on the plat attached hereto and made a part hereof, is hereby closed and abandoned. Sanitary sewer and utility servitude 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.

Calvin Ben Lester, Jr. Chairman

Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

1. **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 – June 14, 2005 - Tabled on July 12, 2005)
2. **Ordinance No. 220 of 2005 - ZONING APPEAL:** Amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, to rezone property located on the Southwest corner of Cleveland and Jewella Avenues, from R-1D, Urban One-Family Residence District to B-3, Community Business District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (F/Green)(Introduced – Dec 27, 2005 – Tabled January 10, 2006)

Mr. Thompson: There are two items under Unfinished business, I don't believe there's been any indication to remove them from the table.

NEW BUSINESS:

Taxi License Permit Appeal: Mr. Leonard Streeter, Employer - Golden Stripe Taxi. (F/Green) Decision rendered – January 23, 2006.

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES: None.

CLERK'S REPORT: None

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

Motion by Councilman Walford, to adjourn.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting adjourned at approximately 5:57 p.m.

Calvin Ben Lester, Jr. Chairman

Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council