

Council Proceedings of the City of Shreveport, Louisiana
February 14, 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, February 14, 2006, in the Government Chambers in Government Plaza (505 Travis Street).

Invocation was given by Councilman Green.

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Councilwoman Robertson.

Councilman Lester: Again, we'd like to say good afternoon to everyone, and thank you for coming to our meeting. We ask that if you have any telephones or pagers or any other type of electronic devices, if you would either turn those off, or put them on vibrate or silent. Madam Clerk will you please call the roll?

On Roll Call, the following members were Present: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody (Arrived at 3:09 p.m.), Robertson, Green, Hogan and Jackson. 7.

Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Jackson to approve the minutes of the Administrative Conference, Monday January 23, 2006 and Council Meeting, Tuesday, January 24, 2006. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

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

Reports:

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

Councilman Lester: Under reports, we have the Convention Center and Convention Center Hotel, also a personnel report from SMG. Mr. Antee.

Mr. Antee: Mr. Carrier is here, I don't have anything further from yesterday's report Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Lester: Councilman Green has a question and then I'll go to Councilman Jackson. Councilman Green.

Councilman Green: Mr. Carrier - - -

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, before we go to SMG, I had a convention center question.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Carrier, will you yield to a question on the hotel?

Councilman Green: Yes sir.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you Mr. Chairman, thank you Councilman Green.

Just quickly, just wanted to be sure I'd asked Mr. Dark - - -

Mr. Dark: It should be on your place.

Councilman Jackson: Okay. Mr. Chairman, I think we may have it. I don't know if everybody has it, what we requested on yesterday- - -

Mr. Dark: You were the only one that asked for it.

Councilman Jackson: You don't Ms. Robertson?

Councilwoman Robertson: He just gave it to you.

Mr. Dark: You were the only one that asked for it.

Councilman Jackson: Oh, I didn't know if we didn't - - - I'm sorry. Maybe I'm the only one that got it.

Councilman Lester: No, I wanted it.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman wanted one as well. Alright, thank you Mr. Chairman and thank you Mr. Dark. Mr. Dark you might want to give the other Councilmen a copy as well.

Councilman Jackson: Alright. Thank you, this is it. Yeah, this is what I need right here. Thank you Mr. Chairman and thank you Mr. Dark. Mr. Dark, you might want to get the other Councilmen a copy as well.

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Antee, I was on my way to the meeting this afternoon from the north part of town, I was coming down Market. You know how they have the lanes blocked off from 4-2, and I noticed a lot of heavy equipment and steel, and scaffolding and all sorts of industrial equipment there in those two lanes, and I'm just wondering if there's any damage done to the road there? Are they going to cover that, the construction company?

Mr. Antee: Yeah, in the event there is any, they would be responsible for it.

Councilman Hogan: Okay, I would hope that we'll have someone, once everything is completed, not only on Market Street, the other street - - - is that Fannin or which ever other street that is, Caddo rather. And I would hope that we would have one of our City Inspectors go out or someone be responsible for checking that and making sure.

Mr. Antee: And the State is also, since it's a State highway, the State is also monitoring it. And anything we do, we've got to have permits or permission from the State in regards to closing lanes, opening lanes and any of that.

Councilman Hogan: Okay. Thank you. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Lester: Okay, Mr. Carrier, could you please come forward? State your business name and address for the record sir.

Mr. Carrier: I'm Mike Carrier, General Manager, Shreveport Convention Center.

Councilman Lester: Thank you, good afternoon. Councilman Green has some questions for you.

Councilman Green: Thank you. I'd like to first of all congratulate you all on the work that you all have done. But I understand that at this point and time, you don't have a Chef, and I was interested as to - - - did he quit, did he get fired - - -?

Mr. Carrier: No sir, he has - - - he and a friend of his have chosen to go into business together and open an establishment in Tyler, Texas.

Councilman Green: Okay. So, that's why he quit?

Mr. Carrier: Yes sir.

Councilman Green: There were no other problems?

Mr. Carrier: Not that I'm aware of, no sir. When he turned in his letter of resignation, I asked him about it. That was the response he gave me.

Councilman Green: Okay, thank you Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Jackson: Does he have a report?

Mr. Carrier: Pardon?

Councilman Jackson: You have the regular report? I didn't know if it was going to be needed for him to go sit down and come back up.

Councilman Lester: No, we're at that point, if you have any questions on the Convention Center or SMG, this is the proper time Councilman Jackson.

Councilman Jackson: I was just wondering Mr. Chairman if he had given his report, or if just we ask questions and he's available for the questions?

Councilman Lester: He's available for questions. Let me ask this question. Mr. Carrier, you normally provide us with a detailed personnel report in writing, and I didn't see one on in my packet. I think that's what Councilman Jackson was - - -

Mr. Carrier: I was not able to provide one. We're in the process of finalizing a tremendous number of part time personnel right now, and over the course of the last three weeks, its been catch as catch can on some of those things. But we will get you a detailed report of where we are now with all of our personnel, both full time and part time. But we're still in the final stages of processing some of that. Vendors and personnel pay

Councilman Jackson: Yeah, I know it's not a personnel issue, but I would share this with you since we're on this portion of it with regard to the Convention Center. I had a conversation with a concert promoter who was preparing to have a concert this weekend. He had suggested to me, he and one of my constituents that somehow or another they felt as if perhaps what was happening with them was a little different than they had anticipated happening with regards to a concert. He said that I think you all had had communications at some point and time and you suggested to him that based on your knowledge of what the ticket count was at that particular time, that you needed him to give you all of the money for the concert by a particular time and date, which I don't know if this expressed in the contract or not, but he suggested to me that there is language in that contract that has "may", not "shall", but that "may," and I was just trying to be sure because when he was explaining to me how things went on, I was a little - - - gotta tell you, taken aback a little bit because I discovered a couple of things in my conversation. Perhaps the Administration was aware of this, but I was not aware of this. That on the sale of their tickets, that on there, it does not say the Shreveport Convention Center, it says the CenturyTel. And it has on there CenturyTel, because it has CenturyTel on it, I may be wrong, but I'm of the assumption that whatever you can give me the correct terminology. And basically what amounts to a tax that we pay to the CenturyTel if you would go and purchase a ticket at their box office, there is whatever that particular amount that inures to the total amount of that particular ticket, some part of it retained by the CenturyTel Center. Is that correct?

Mr. Carrier: There is a box office fee for using the services of Ticket Master. Which was agreed to in writing up front when this first was discussed. That fee is a service fee. It goes on any ticket that is sold through Ticket Master. And that's the understanding I have of it, is that the tickets are a certain price, and there is a fee. I don't know if there is a sales tax on top of that, but there is definitely a fee on it.

Councilman Jackson: So, in other words - - -

Mr. Carrier: We do not have a box office. And so the agreement was made that in order to do the ticketing, that we would work through Ticket Master which is a national company and has outlets in a variety of locations here in the Shreveport/Bossier area. And so that was the arrangement that was made.

Councilman Jackson: Now I guess my question was then, why is it that the people that are going to buy tickets for this concert have to go to Bossier City, that are going to buy at one of the ticket windows that's not one of the outlets that's promoted, the Ticket Master outlet in Bossier City as the main drop point. I think the promoter even utilizes, I guess as the main drop point or whatever the case may be?

Mr. Carrier: That's the primary office for Ticket Master.

Councilman Jackson: The primary office - -

Mr. Carrier: In this market, yes sir.

Councilman Jackson: So, everybody that has something in Shreveport, if they're going to use Ticket Master, they've got to go to Bossier City is what you're telling me?

Mr. Carrier: That's my understanding, yes sir.

Councilman Jackson: Okay, well I'd like to clarify that because if we got a convention center, and I'm assuming the convention center will have a box office at some time, my concern was whether or not, if we're not, then we're going to continue to do ticketing business in Bossier City for events that are going on in Shreveport, and if we do, and maybe you can tell me or someone else can let us know, is some of the money that the person who goes to Bossier City to purchase a ticket for a Shreveport event staying in Bossier City, or is all of the money that is being transacted, is it in Shreveport? And I would assume that since you're going to Bossier City, that some of the money is inuring to the benefit of that box office and that facility, which in this case happens to be the CenturyTel Arena in Bossier City.

Mr. Carrier: I will find out the answer to that, I'm not aware of any of the tax staying in Bossier, but I will find out that information.

Councilman Jackson: Now, what about the status of the concert for Saturday, because the gentleman was concerned and he called me regards to having to cancel the concert after having spent money on promotions and those kinds of things. And I told him, I don't do concerts, I don't really know a lot about it. I'm certainly interested in what happens at the Convention Center, because certainly we cancel something tomorrow, it's not like we're going to book something by Saturday, so I was just wondering what the status was on that.

Mr. Carrier: The contract states that we would analyze ticket sales at a certain point and time, and based on the ticket sales at that point and time, if the revenue in the box office was sufficient to cover the rent and the anticipated expenses, if it was not sufficient to cover that, that we could require payment in full to cover the anticipated expenses. We have met on that, and that is what we have requested, is payment for the anticipated expenses. The expenses that neither the City nor SMG would be responsible for. Those are payment for police officers, security, the different crowd control personnel that have to be there, for food and beverage for the acts, and for a variety of other production expenses. We had met with the gentleman on the 7th, and on the 13th. Received reports from him on both of those days, and had received other ticketing reports from the box office as to the number of tickets that were sold and asked for the funds to

be provided to us, so that neither we nor the City are out for those expenses that have to be paid in order to produce the show. It's no different than we have done with any of the other shows in the building which paid in advance for the use of the facility.

Councilman Jackson: So as a result of your analysis, it sounds as if you said a few minutes ago, you analyze it, and then you make a decision whether or not to do it. Not something that is triggered as regarded to the contract?

Mr. Carrier: As called for in the contract.

Councilman Jackson: Right, but the contract does not say "shall" does it?

Mr. Carrier: The contract says "may".

Councilman Jackson: "May."

Mr. Carrier: But there is also a provision in the contract that says monies are due upon demand from the lessee.

Councilman Jackson: Okay, and my question becomes - - - I guess again, I'm back to what precipitates the demand. And my issue is if you've got a box office in Bossier City, and the people who are coming, lets just say, are predominantly citizens of the City of Shreveport, there are other outlets other than the CenturyTel, am I correct?

Mr. Carrier: That's my understanding.

Councilman Jackson: Local stores?

Mr. Carrier: Yes sir.

Councilman Jackson: But the analysis that you do, based on what I just heard you say, was at the box office. Is that correct?

Mr. Carrier: The analysis that we did was based on the information that this gentleman had provided to CenturyTel, we understand - - - in fact, he was over there earlier today providing more information to them. The information had been provided to them through that particular Ticket Master office and he provided no additional information to us as late as yesterday afternoon about any additional tickets which had been sold. We advised him of the number that we had been told had been sold, but he provided us with no additional information of any other tickets had been sold.

Councilman Jackson: So, if a person were to just say, well I've got \$20,000 and two other outlets, you don't have a way of measuring that?

Mr. Carrier: We would be glad to make a phone call and find out. But we were not advised of that when we met yesterday and asked about ticket sales, and advised him of what the balance was due on the contract in order to provide for the payment of the funds that need to be paid in order for the concert to move forward.

Councilman Jackson: So, in other words we did - - - trigger, whatever this was your analysis precipitated the demand, but it did not require the demand? It just is what you utilized to determine to make the demand?

Mr. Carrier: It is what allows us to require payment by the contract.

Councilman Jackson: But my point is, it's not something you have to do?

Mr. Carrier: Yes sir, we feel that it is something that we have to do of any promoter, whether it's a concert or a show. A trade show, consumer show it doesn't matter. When we have to commit to expend funds, that are the City's funds or SMG's funds, these are - - - we have to hire personnel to come in for this show. We have to hire stage hands, make a commitment for this several days in advance. We have to buy food for the artists. We have to provide for other services. You cannot simply go out on Friday and say, I've got to have all these things on Saturday and they show up. These

folks have other situations in which they are working. There were other promotional production expenses which were going to be items being brought in from Dallas, which were canceled at his request because there are other venues that are looking for these items or these personnel. So, we have to make commitments to people in a timely fashion. And in order to do that, promoters are required to either provide the dollars through the receipts in the box office or through payments to SMG and the City of Shreveport so that we can make payments for these things. We're not willing to take the risk, and I don't believe the City of Shreveport should be obligated to take the risk on a program of this nature or any nature or any nature for these types of expenses.

Councilman Jackson: So, it's not something we have to do, it's something we've chosen to do. Is that correct?

Mr. Carrier: It's something we do by contract. Yes sir.

Councilman Jackson: Okay. And so, we're not bound to it, we just can utilize it as a tool if you would to procure the funds prior (inaudible).

Mr. Carrier: To insure payment, yes sir. To insure payment, and this is not unusual in the least.

Councilman Jackson: Well, and so, you all had conversation with them, and where are you as of 3:15 today?

Mr. Carrier: As of 3:15 today, we still had not received the payment. We have a letter at our attorney's office that we are preparing to send dissolving the contract based on the funds not being provided as they were supposed to be by contract.

Councilman Jackson: And what's the total cost of the show?

Mr. Carrier: Our total cost is approximately, \$18,800.

Councilman Jackson: And so, but you've requested - - - what was the amount you requested from the promoter?

Mr. Carrier: \$18,300 (and some dollars) I believe is what it was. There had been a \$500.00 deposit given, so it was the balance of that amount less the deposit.

Councilman Jackson: Okay, so it was all expenses?

Mr. Carrier: Yes sir.

Councilman Jackson: So, do you all share in any of the benefits if they do other things. I understand they were not only having a concert, but having something else after that where they charge people to get in. And if they sell alcohol, as I appreciate it, you get a portion of all those things as well?

Mr. Carrier: We get a portion of the receipts from that, yes sir. But we do not get any additional gate receipts for any of this. All that remits to the promoter.

Councilman Jackson: But if we had a box office, we'd get some additional monies?

Mr. Carrier: Not necessarily. Depends on how the contract is negotiated. You know the box office fee that you were referring to earlier goes to Ticket Master for their services.

Councilman Jackson: So, the CenturyTel doesn't tack anything else on there to your knowledge?

Mr. Carrier: To my knowledge.

Councilman Jackson: Can you find out?

Mr. Carrier: I can find out.

Councilman Jackson: Because I was under the impression and the understanding

that the CenturyTel has a fee, that they place on their ticket as well, that obviously - - -

Mr. Carrier: I don't know if that's CenturyTel, or if it's just Ticket Master, I will find out.

Councilman Jackson: Okay, thank you Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Green: One other question. On the resignation of the Chef, was it verbal or was it in writing?

Mr. Carrier: It was in writing.

Councilman Green: Okay, I'd like to see a copy of it at your earliest convenience.

Mr. Carrier: I will check with our personnel officer. I'm not sure what can be released in these situations Mr. Green, but I'll check with our personnel office.

Councilman Green: What you can what?

Mr. Carrier: I'm not sure what can legally be released.

Councilman Green: I'll come to your office and read it, I don't have to - - -

Mr. Carrier: And I'm not certain that it can be released, but I will have to check with our personnel office and see what the law requires. I'll be glad to comply with personnel laws, and if I can do that, I will gladly let you see it.

Councilman Green: You're saying the personnel laws of SMG or the personnel laws - - -

Mr. Carrier: Federal sir. Federal personnel laws.

Councilman Green: Lawyer - - - Mr. Lafitte? If he can answer that.

Councilman Lester: Good afternoon Mr. Lafitte.

Mr. Lafitte: Good afternoon.

Councilman Green: Hate to put you on the spot, but are you familiar with resignations? Does the federal or the state law say if one turns in a resignation, it cannot be read, if that person is being paid with public money?

Mr. Lafitte: I mean as far as the Council is concerned, you have privileges to see anything.

Councilman Green: Okay. Did you understand that Mr. Carrier?

Mr. Carrier: Yes sir.

Councilman Green: Okay, thank you.

Councilman Jackson: I have two other questions, I guess maybe the Administration can answer the questions. Mr. Antee, what do we at the convention center, what do we charge for police service for an event, whether it be the Boat Show or concert or whatever the case may be?

Mr. Antee: It's \$25 an hour and that's set through the Police Department, not with the convention center.

Councilman Jackson: So, the convention center - - - if the convention center is charging \$30 an hour to the promoter, that's \$5 above what we normally charge, is that correct?

Mr. Antee: It'd be \$5 more.

Councilman Jackson: Than what we - - - should.

Mr. Antee: And I don't know, Mike do we have a mark up on security?

Councilman Green: He's gone. He just stepped out.

Councilman Lester: You didn't run him out, did you?

Mr. Antee: We'll find out, but there could be a mark up for coordinating and that sort of thing.

Councilman Jackson: And the other thing that the gentleman talked to me about yesterday, he was saying and I told him I'm sure there was something with regards to how we do catering and all that, that there is contract. I guess the term is concession. But he said that Mr. Carrier had informed him that there was an exclusive contract on the liquor for the facility. Is that correct?

Mr. Antee: All food and beverage is handled through SMG. That is correct.

Councilman Jackson: So, he said that it was - - - he told SMG, I mean an SMG representative, Mr. Carrier suggested to this gentleman that it wasn't him, that it was a local company that had exclusive rights to alcohol in the building.

Mr. Antee: No SMG F&B has the exclusion. Now, they subcontract with various companies and things, but the food and beverage contract is with SMG F&B.

Councilman Jackson: Okay, I wanted to just clarify that.

Mr. Antee: But they do use local people with as subcontractors, but the exclusive contract is with SMG.

Property Standards Report

Councilman Lester: We got a Property Standards Report in our last Administrative Conference meeting on yesterday, does anyone have any additional questions?

Councilwoman Robertson: Is Ms. Glover here?

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Bowie is here.

Councilwoman Robertson: I just have a quick question. I looked at it last night, and I know that I have on Marx, there was demolition to be done, and I don't see it listed on my demolition structures list.

Mr. Bowie: It's on Mark Street?

Councilwoman Robertson: On Marx.

Mr. Bowie: Yes, it's probably on there, it's probably being contracted out. Let me give you an answer tomorrow on that.

Councilwoman Robertson: Okay. That's fine. Thank you.

Councilman Lester: Any other questions for Mr. Bowie? Alright that takes us to Item 6, Public Hearing.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, a public hearing for Resolution No. 14 of 2006 was called and it was advertised, but the Public Hearing was inadvertently omitted from the agenda. A motion to add the Public Hearing to the agenda at this time would be in order.

Motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Jackson to add the Public Hearing to address Resolution No. 14 of 2006 to the agenda. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 7.

Public Hearing: 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.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Thompson having said that, where does that - - -

Mr. Thompson: If you're ready, you can call the Public Hearing to order and I believe that Bonnie Moore or somebody from Community Development will have a short presentation.

Councilman Lester: Okay, thank you. The public hearing on the proposed Shreveport Comprehensive Revitalization Strategies Addendum. The public hearing is now open. I believe that Ms. Bonnie Moore, our Interim Director for Community Development has a presentation for us. Would you please state your name and business address for the record.

Ms. Moore: I'm Bonnie More, Interim Director for the Department of Community Development, my business address is 1234 Murphy Street, Shreveport, LA)

Councilman Lester: Thank you Ma'am, the floor is yours.

Ms. Moore: As you may be aware, we engaged J-Quad and Associates in 1997 to conduct a comprehensive neighborhood assessment called the Comprehensive Revitalization Strategies. That included seven neighborhoods of the 16 party neighborhoods that we have slated on our Community Development Block Grant Program. In 1999, that particular report was updated to document slum and blight, because of the State Law 46-52. Last year, we did a cost analysis to add the remaining 16 neighborhoods. Because of the cost of that, we submitted that to the various Council persons, and two Council Persons decided to add two of their neighborhoods. The two neighborhoods were the MLK neighborhood, represented by Councilman Lester, and the Cedar Grove neighborhood represented at that time by Councilman Gibson. The strategies were revised. J-Quad and Associates was engaged again, because they were the originators of the plan. And that has brought forth before you for adoption and approval. The plan include a housing assessment and a community profile. In addition to that, we required them to do a project site and project opportunity category that's included in the document. Again, the document includes an assessment of the MLK area as well as the Cedar Grove area.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I would also add that it has been reviewed by the Metropolitan Planning Commission, and they agree that it is in conformity with the overall Master Plan of the City.

Councilman Lester: Thank you Mr. Thompson, thank you Ms. Moore. Are there any questions for Ms. Moore, by any Councilman. At this time, do we have anyone to speak in favor of the Shreveport Comprehensive Revitalization Strategies Addendum ordinances? Is there someone here to speak in favor of the Shreveport Comprehensive Revitalization Strategies Addendum ordinances? Does anyone wish to speak in opposition to the Shreveport Comprehensive Revitalization Strategies Addendum ordinances? Alright, hearing none, this public hearing is now closed. Thank you. We're going to move on to item 7, but before we do I would be remiss if I didn't recognize with us we have Commissioner Stephanie Lynch in the audience. Thank you so much for being here this afternoon.

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

Confirmations and/or Appointments.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Thompson, I see none.

Mr. Thompson: We have none.

Adding Legislation to the Agenda

Councilman Lester: Under adding legislation, I see three.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Chairman, could we take each of these items one at a time please?

Councilman Lester: That's fine.

1. **Ordinance No. 19 of 2006:** ZONING: C-04-06: An Ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, The City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the northerly side of Dee Street at its intersection with South Pointe Parkway, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from R-3, Urban, Multiple-Family Residence District to B-3, Community Business District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (C/Carmody)

Motion by Councilman Jackson, seconded by Councilman Green to add Ordinance No. 19 of 2006 - Zoning C-4-06 to the agenda.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Chairman, I appreciate the motion and the second. I was going to ask though that we postpone this. I have not had a chance to talk to the owners of this property and my concern is that we're taking a 20 acre tract that is adjacent to the Clyde Fant Parkway which is presently zoned R-3, and asking it to be changed to a B-3 with no stated purpose for the development. And I would like the chance to talk to these developers to see really what they are talking about. Because B-3 of course allows anyone the widest range of commercial uses. And before we would go and take this action to add it to the agenda, I'd like to talk to these folks.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, I made a motion to add to the agenda, and I think that if we add it to the agenda today, I'm not sure if it's for introduction and final passage, but I would think that Councilman Carmody, at that particular time that it would be appropriate to postpone it. All we're doing at this time is adding it to the agenda for consideration at the appropriate time. So, I was thinking that perhaps what we would do is introduce it and then at that particular time, I certainly don't have any problem postponing with Councilman Carmody at that time, because I didn't see any names attached to it. Maybe, I'm sure it's probably in his district, so I would certainly concur with the postponing, I only moved to add it to the agenda so that at the appropriate time, if we need to table it or whatever, we could do so.

Councilman Carmody: And I agree with you Councilman Jackson. I guess my concern would be that we would add it to the agenda to take it up and I would ask that it be remanded back to the Metropolitan Planning Commission, which would delay possibly these developers and so my hope was that if we could not add it to the agenda today, it would give me a chance to talk to them and not stop them in their process except for this one two week delay.

Councilman Lester: Well, what I would suggest is Councilman Carmody, if you would offer a substitute motion to - - -

Councilman Jackson: It would have to be to not add.

Councilman Carmody: I'd like to do that, but I'm not sure that I can make a motion to postpone adding it to the agenda.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, It's not a motion to postpone it. It would be either to add it to the agenda or not add it to the agenda.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to withdraw my motion.

Councilman Green: I withdraw my second.

Motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Walford to not add Ordinance No. 19 of 2006 – Zoning C-04-06 to the agenda.

Councilman Lester: Question Mr. Thompson. Would this be a scenario where we would add the- - the Councilman for that area would ask that we add it to the agenda, and then ask for a no vote, as we have done with a lot of our zoning ordinances so that things would be clearer?

Mr. Thompson: On this we don't think it matters. This is not the actual ordinance. This is just whether we adding it to the agenda or not. It's just a motion.

Councilman Lester: Okay, I just wanted to make sure we were clear on that.

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

Councilman Green: I just wanted to say to the ladies that we have some seats up front if you all would like to come up and have a seat.

Councilman Carmody: I think that I realize why my electronic voting is not lighting up. I'm indicated as not present on the tote board. Could we have that removed?

Councilwoman Robertson: He's not on here.

Councilman Lester: We'll give him another chance.

2. **Ordinance No. 20 of 2006**: ZONING: C-05-06: 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 Burson Drive and Mansfield 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. (E/Hogan)

Motion by Councilman Hogan, seconded by Councilman Jackson to add Ordinance No. 20 of 2006 – Zoning C-05-06 to the agenda. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 7.

3. **Resolution No. 26 of 2006**: A Resolution authorizing the Mayor to enter into a Trade Confirmation, all in connection with bonds issued to refinance indebtedness of the Shreveport Airport Authority and providing for other matter in connection therewith.

Motion by Councilman Jackson, seconded by Councilman Walford to add

Resolution No. 26 of 2006 to the agenda. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 7.

Mr. Thompson: That's all we have Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Lester: Thank you Mr. Thompson. That takes us to item C.

Public Comments (*Agenda Items to be Adopted*)

Councilman Lester: As the Council can imagine, there are a number of folks that want to speak on several issues. And we would ask those in the audience if you could just bear with us, we're going to make sure that everyone that has filled out a comment card gets an opportunity to speak and be heard before the Council, if you would please bear with us.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Chairman, before Mr. Indig gets up here, could we ask (inaudible) our request to speak so that we're on the same subject on each one?

Councilman Lester: We've done that.

Mr. Indig: (*1545 Line Ave, but I live in Los Angeles*) I've been asked to address you to support the use of the old convention center as a film sound stage, and I just wanted to add my - - - whatever expertise I have an knowledge of the industry to encourage that. My experience was with The Guardian. I am the "A" School Productions Manager of the Guardian, a Walt Disney film shooting here in town, and I know that having a permanent sound stage facility in the area would be a benefit to the attraction of films to Shreveport. I didn't know I was going to speak extemporaneously on this subject, I thought I'd be answering questions, but maybe I could do that.

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Indig, could you state the name of your company again.

Mr. Indig: It's "A" School Productions. It's a Walt Disney company producing the film The Guardian, with Kevin Costner.

Mr. Hogan: And I appreciate you coming today and speaking. I had the opportunity to go meet with Nick, I'm not going to try and pronounce the last name, and he showed Councilman Carmody and Councilwoman Robertson and myself the set, the production out there. And so, it's very impressive. And I'd just like to ask you if you foresee in the immediate future other movies. Obviously, you probably know of some that you can't speak of that are going to be produced, but what can you tell me about the future and your company coming back to Shreveport to do business?

Mr. Indig: Well, I can tell you that this week, I've gotten three phone calls from other production managers and producers planning movies here in Shreveport. What their needs are, I'm not sure of exactly square footage or locations or stages that they need. But I know they're coming. As far as my company, "A" School Productions is formed for the production of one film, The Guardian. But we are a subsidiary of the Walt Disney Company. The Walt Disney Company has been and continues to be committed to making movies in Louisiana. We, I can't say that the next movie won't go to New Orleans or Baton Rouge, or - - - but it's competitive. And the reason I'm standing here today is to talk about it could be competitive in this market. And the reason that the convention center was attractive to film makers because it exist already. I don't have to try and find it. And that's it's the right size. It's the right location, it's air conditioned,

and you can market it. It's a brick and mortar thing you can put in a picture and send to executives and producers in Hollywood. So, I hope that answers your question.

Councilman Hogan: It does. Although there are no guarantees in the future, but I guess in your opinion, you see the Shreveport market and what we have to offer, and if indeed we pass this ordinance today authorizing the lease of Expo Hall, you would believe that would be - - - put us a step ahead?

Mr. Indig: Correct.

Councilman Hogan: In terms of competition for future movie production?

Mr. Indig: Right.

Councilman Hogan: That answers my question. Thank you.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Thank you Mr. Indig. I guess my concern was and I guess the people who were with Tru South Capitol and those groups who actually would be the people who need to be successful, not the City. We obviously would not be getting into that situation, but we certainly want to know that the people that we are in partnership, for lack of a better term through the lease, are going to be successful. And I'm assuming that having this asset would allow them to be more successful. Obviously, you all were here prior to the acquisition of this particular property. My question was most of the shooting that you did locally on location as opposed to sound stage, obviously we didn't have a sound stage per se, what did you use for a sound stage - - - did you use anything that was - - -?

Mr. Indig: We used a sound stage and a construction warehouse which is almost the same size as the convention center at Slack Industrial Park.

Councilman Jackson: So, you used a warehouse.

Mr. Indig: That's not to say we weren't very happy with where we ended up, but it took a lot of doing to find it, to negotiate it, and if it was the summer, it might have been a different story. So, and we were in a big rush because it was right after the hurricane, and if we didn't find a place to base ourselves, the movie would have been canceled. So, the idea that you have something already there, is very attractive especially when there is multiple movies coming in or television projects coming into town at the same time.

Councilman Jackson: And I guess my last question would be - - - I wondered and I didn't have a chance to talk to - - - I didn't ask this question to the TruSouth group, but I guess you may know as well as they. Is the geography of a sound stage inconsequential? Here's what - - - Slack Park versus downtown. Is the location of that sound stage really inconsequential, or it's just the inside, I mean the dimensions and the interior that's the most important thing?

Mr. Indig: It's not inconsequential. You certainly, anything within 10 or 15 minutes of the downtown in any area would be a good location. Being downtown in some ways makes it even better as long as there is still adequate parking, and sound proofing. Actually, it's in some ways a better location. People can literally walk from their hotels. It's actually cuts some expenses.

Councilman Lester: One of the things that has been discussed is from a production standpoint is we're bringing work crews, as I appreciate it, are the nuts and bolts of what you do. That expertise does not exist here in Shreveport/Bossier for the most part. And from what I understand, we're - - - and many of these productions are having to bring people in from the New Orleans area, from Atlanta and places like that.

If we, if the Council decides to go forward with this particular project as it relates to Expo Hall, what kind of recommendations could you make to us on the Council, and to folks like in our educational system to insure that there are jobs in this industry that are homegrown. Because from where I sit, everyone, literally and figuratively wants to have their name in lights, but if having the sound stage does not produce - - - you know the people that are here working behind the microphones and behind the cameras and things of that nature, then the secondary economic affects really aren't there. At that point, we're just bringing in and we have a lot of the "Gee, wow, they're filming a movie downtown." "Gee, wow, they're filming a movie at the Y," but there's no money left here. What type of - - -

Mr. Indig: Well, I could answer that a number of ways. 1) I respectfully disagree that there is a lot of money left here, even if a lot of the crew comes from other places. And if you just look at the history of productions centers around the country, let alone around the world, even in New Orleans 10-15 years ago, was kind of (inaudible) industry, didn't really exist that much. But when the tax incentive passed, a certain critical masses achieved of productions coming in, facilities available, crew that didn't live here all of a sudden started moving there. And all of a sudden, you had an explosion of production that supported the base of the crew that decided to go into the business, be educated in the business to move from other places, to live there. There are people from Hollywood who moved to New Orleans. Kinda of reverse migration, and the same thing has happened in Toronto, or Vancouver, or Chicago, or Miami, many other places where there was - - - when I started the business, there were two places you worked to make movies. Was New York and Los Angeles. And that is a different landscape right now, so I think there has to be a reasonable expectation of how much business would come to Shreveport. Shreveport is not Hollywood, it's not New York. I think you could have a reasonable expectation of attracting a certain amount of projects here and by doing so, attracting a certain amount of permanent work force here. And that's all to the good because as a film maker and producer, it's better for me to have homegrown people where I don't have to pay housing, or site tender per diem or hotel, But it's kinda of a natural market for us that occurs when the movies are here.

Mr. Robert Stroud: (952 Oneonta) I'm going to be short and sweet. And I have to deal with an ancillary issue regarding the conversion of the Expo Hall. And I appear before you in my capacity as President of the Shreveport Opera. However the comments I make are my own and really don't necessarily reflect those of the opera board as a whole. First and foremost, I want to congratulate you Honorable Mayor and also Honorable Council Members for the wonderful new convention center. We are all too familiar with the many trials and tribulations that were involved in this project, but the results are impressive, and its something that Shreveport will be proud of for years to come. Second, I'd like to further congratulate you on your foresight and wisdom in determining that the management of two venues for convention was not in the best interest of our city, and that you have availed yourself to the opportunity to convert our Expo Hall into a vehicle that will enhance and encourage our burgeoning film industry. I'm not here to concur or condone the action you are preparing to take today. As I'm not versed in the specific terms or alternatives. I am here however to extol you to address an issue regarding the utilization of the new convention center. The new convention center provides new unchartered opportunities for Shreveport in garnering groups to venture to

Shreveport and spend money. This is wonderful for our economic development. But as one of the many owners of this new building, I request that the goal of seeking these dollars from outsiders does not come at the cost of ostracizing our own. Specifically, the Shreveport Opera Guild has held its Boutique De Noel at the Expo Hall as a primary fundraiser for Shreveport Opera for many years. This four day event brings in over 100 high end vendors from across the nation. Although the vendor sales are not tracked by the guild, it's estimated that these vendors sell between \$10 and 25,000 each. Over a million dollars of economic impact of taxable sales to the City of Shreveport. The guild has enjoyed preferential treatment in the rental of Expo Hall, and we do so unapologetically. This is not the case today at the new convention center. Shreveport Opera is a vital member of this community who contributes to the quality of life of our community deserves preferential treatment as to the rental of the convention center as do many other local groups. As the employer of the managers of the convention center, I request the Mayor and the City Council establish guidelines which encourage the management of the convention center to provide preferential rates and services to our own local organizations. Thank you very much.

Ms. Shirley Roberson: *(3602 Greenbriar Drive)* I'm here to basically talk about the word polarization. We who live in the Western Hill, I mean the west part of Shreveport are very disturbed and insulted by fact that people are wanting to take a part of Shreveport that is becoming an upper middle class African-American neighborhood, and put in items that will devalue our neighborhood. West Shreveport has six basically thriving neighborhoods. You have the Pines Road Association, you have Long Timbers, you have the Western Hills neighborhood, you have Timber Knoll which is a new gated community. You also have Timberline and Quail Creek going out in that area, and you have Twilight Meadows, which is one of the older African-American affluent neighborhoods in that area. And it is being proposed that you call the modular homes, but really they are trailer homes with skirts, be placed in our community. Those are things that will devalue our neighborhoods. Many of the people who live in those neighborhoods were former residents of Lakeside and Queensborough and we fled those neighborhoods, because those neighborhoods were deteriorating. And we have moved to those other neighborhoods to start a neighborhood that is stable, that has an economic base. The average home in those neighborhoods can range, our neighborhoods now range between \$80,000 to \$300,000. And we are very insulted that the City would consider allowing trailer homes, or modular homes or pre-fab homes, whatever you want to call them, be placed in our neighborhoods. We see everything that the city considers of value being placed in South Shreveport. South Shreveport is growing and it's overgrown. Businesses are there, as though our dollars are not as green and do not spend as well. And so we are highly offended that the City Council, that people would come into our neighborhoods and place those types of structures in our neighborhood to devalue them. What is the benefit of having a stable, upper middle class Black neighborhood home ownership? Most of the people in those neighborhoods do not rent their homes, they're buying their homes and they're paying for those homes. The other thing is a stable neighborhood. We're trying to get neighborhoods and neighborhood schools where our children are safe and they can walk the streets. We're trying to attract business back toward Shreveport. Business that really should not have fled our side of town. So, I'm asking the Council, when people coming to our city or people who live

here make suggestions about devaluing our properties, that you will really consider not allowing those types of venues to be place din West Shreveport. We're growing, we're thriving, we're trying to maintain stability. And I think that, that is the goal of the City as well.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you Ms. Roberson for coming. Just as a matter of information for the purpose of getting out, and I recognize the point Ms. Roberson is making and I think a very valid point. I just wanted to be sure that we recognize the process. That we do have a process so people just do not do that. And that process began with the Metropolitan Planning Commission to get the appropriate zoning, and then it comes to the Council after somebody approves it or disapproves and then somebody appeals it. And so it only gets to our level, as it becomes an appellat situation. And so in this case, we're here to do just what you suggested, to make a decision about either being complicit with it or not. And so today is the day the decision will be made. So, I don't want anybody to think that it was something that the Council was complicit in or permissive of, but it is an opportunity to deal with it today. So, I appreciate you coming and certainly recognize and honor your sentiments.

Ms. Roberson: And Mr. Jackson, I hear what you're saying, but on the corner of Pines Road and Jefferson Paige, some of those structures have already been developed. There are about ten of those homes that have already been placed. I don't know what the value of a modular home is, but right beyond that neighborhood, you have \$100,000 homes. So, if you let ten in, you already have gone out- - I think it's called Southwest Shreveport. I can see it from 3132, you have a section of town that those modular homes are being placed in droves. If we want to do that, why don't we limit that part of the City, since there is a (inaudible) development there and stop it at that point?

Councilman Jackson: Let me say to you Ms. Roberson, that I wish I could have done something about the houses on the other side. That was prior this Council. The previous Council approved and allowed those homes there. As I said to those who are developing, I think Greenwood Acres Church and others who are developing that, that probably one of the most disgusting processes since I've been here was to know that there was nothing that we could do about that happening, because it certainly does not fit with the neighborhood. Those of you who've been down there recognize it. You almost have to close your left eye until you're a quarter mile down the street and then you see the neighborhood, the way it ought to look. And so, I'm sorry that that happened, but I wish that I was here when it did. Because I agree with you 100% that that is correct. But I think our job is to be sure that when we see issues like that, that we don't proliferate.

Ms. Roberson: Then take a stance Councilman that the buck stop here.

Councilman Lester: If we could, we want to be respectful to everyone that's going to speak, pro and negative. If you could just hold your applause until we get through our. We do appreciate it. And just for the record, what we're going to do, just let you in the audience know, after we have heard public comments from everyone on these issues, we're going to move these issues forward in our agenda, so that we can vote on it while you're still here, as opposed to waiting to the end. And so we're doing everything we can to expedite that process.

Ms. Debra Hall: (6210 Nottaway Drive) Basically Ms. Roberson said it all, so I don't really have too much to add to that. I was also interested in adding that in the future, like she said, we just don't need to keep letting these things develop and happen.

That's just something that we don't want, we don't agree with. Many of us have been there. I've been there for 20 years. I have no intentions of leaving. And my home is very valuable to me. So, I just need to know that I can depend on the Council, the Metropolitan Planning Commission to know in advance that we just are not interested in adding anything that is not of value to our community. And thank you.

Councilwoman Robertson: Excuse me Ma'am. By chance did you sign the petition?

Ms. Hall: I did.

Ms. La Tarchau Harris: *(6517 Dianne Street)* And I'm against the trailers on Pines Road also. Ms. Roberson said it all. I live on Dianne Street, and those trailers would be basically in my back yard. So, that's one reason. And another reason, I don't want my property value going down.

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Chairman, not a question, but I have a comment. I was just handed another petition of names that is probably a dozen pages thick. And yesterday there was one probably one 20 pages and I certainly don't want to discourage anyone from speaking, it's your right to come and speak for or against this development, but I'm familiar with the neighborhood, even though it's not my district. I don't know if I can speak for other council members, but I'm pretty sure that we have the votes to defeat this, and my vote will be a "No" vote in favor of the people that have already spoken. Ms. Roberson, you have said it eloquently already. So certainly anyone who wants to speak is welcome to come and speak, but I wish I could say with certainty, but I feel fairly sure that we have the votes to defeat this.

Councilman Green: I would just like to echo what Councilman Hogan just said. But I'd like to ask Mr. Thompson, Mr. Thompson at this point and time, if in fact the Council will have the votes to basically defeat this, would it be proper for us to call for the vote, or would it be necessary for everybody that would want to speak, to speak.

Mr. Thompson: I think the State law gives them to speak if they wanted to speak, so to vote before people have had a chance either for or against it, may not be the correct way to proceed..

Councilman Green: Okay then, let me ask another question. I guess I would just ask you all, if we're going to defeat this, would you all still like to speak?

Members in the audience: No.

Councilman Green: Well, Mr. Chairman, I'd like to call for the question.

Councilman Lester: Wait, hold on. Point of Order, point of order. Let's do this. We have three more request to speak. We have heard from two councilmen, and we've heard from some other folks. I think I know what the folks that are going to speak, want to say. But they have taken out of their schedule to come down here and address the Council, so at least give them the opportunity to speak or be heard. That might shorten the process, but we do have several others that want to be heard on the others. And I would just ask Council to allow those people to have their day in court, as it were. Something I'm familiar with. So, having said that, our next request comes from Ms. Josie Harris.

Ms. Josie Harris: *(6209 Nottaway)* I want to say good afternoon to you all. Pretty much everything has been said here today. I'm the one that brought the petitions in and we did have some more today. And I've been in the neighborhood like over 20 years myself. And I can remember that it was said that Western Hills would become the

next Queensborough. I vowed at that time, as long as I have breath in my body, it will not become that. So what we're seeing now is maybe that what appeared to me was that West Shreveport wanted to become the newest ghetto. We're not going to let that happen. We're there to stay. We do not want our property value to go down. Also we have subdivision in that area, is being built. We have one in particular, houses are ranging from \$300,000. How would you feel, a modular home next to your \$300,000 house. I don't think you would like that. We don't like that, and we appreciate everything that has been said here today, and we have confidence that our will, will be adhered to. Thank you very much.

Councilman Lester: Thank you Ms. Harris, and just for what it's worth, I understand the concerns of the residents out there, and I think that the points that they made are valid ones. I would just say, how can I put it? There are no trailer homes in Queensborough, and I would say that lets keep it focused on what we want to happen in our particular neighborhood, in terms of incapability of modular homes and site built, \$300,000 homes as opposed to casting aspersion on the people that live in Queensborough, because through their financial situation or their struggle, they might not be able to afford to live in a \$300,000 house. Because there but for the grace of God, go I. Just for what it's worth.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you. You pre-empted me Mr. Chairman. I wasn't - - I'm certainly not upset with anybody for what they may say, but I have the distinction, in my opinion, of representing both Western Hills and Queensborough. And all of them have some unique distinctions. And we're working on our best. And we're no better than our weakest link. And so we want to be sure that wherever a neighborhood is right now, that wherever it is, we just don't want it to go down, where it might be. We just want to keep it where it is.

Councilman Lester: Thank you Councilman Jackson, and I hope that you accept that in the spirit that it was offered. Our next request to speak is from Mr. John Bowman, Jr.

Mr. Bowman: (*3833 Southern Ave*) I'm here to speak for the Belle Cherri Land Company, which is applying to rezone. This parcel was left between several subdivisions. It's bounded on three sides by residential subdivisions and on the north by a dedicated road. I have a little subdivision plat here that is proposed. One of our subdivision of the small parcel. The application is to rezone the property from B-1 to residential property to place a house on this property, instead of a commercial development. Surrounded by a fire station on the left and residential properties on the south and the east. It's just kinda a little track that was landlocked between several developments. And the purpose of the developer is not to necessarily move in manufactured homes, I mean, we could place restrictions as to stick built homes, several restrictions, but it's just a rezoning to a residential district from a B-1 zone. And that's the application that we're trying to provide here. It has the utilities, water and sewer along Walton Drive. Lawton Drive is the asphalt drive that ends, dead ends on the east side of this property. It has to be a cul-de-sac place to access the lot as it's shown here. The MPC, the zoning shows the adjoining zoning of this property as it exist, R-1-D on the east, R-1-D on the west, R-1-D on the south, and the dedicated road cuts it off from the other existing B-1 zoning. So, that's really all I have today. If I could answer any questions, I'll be glad to.

Councilwoman Robertson: I do have a question. There seems to be, and I know that you said that the stipulated type of home or whatever, but these people somehow either got the impression or listen at MPC or whatever, that they were modular or mobile homes, that type of thing. Was that ever discussed or brought up with this group of people?

Mr. Bowman: Well, modular homes existing on the R-1-D two blocks to the south.

Councilwoman Robertson: Right. Does the same company own that piece also?

Mr. Bowman: I think they did develop those lots, yes.

Ms. Stephanie Lynch: (*5037 Waters Place*) I'm actually speaking on Zoning Appeal C-1-06.

Councilman Lester: That's it. Jefferson Paige, Pines Road?

Ms. Lynch: No, no.

Councilman Lester: Oh okay, you wanted to speak on the North Shreveport.

Ms. Lynch: I'm sorry, I put the wrong thing on there.

Councilman Lester: Okay, 92-05. If you could hold on one second please.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Chairman, I assume that Mr. Bowman was the last request to speak, but I was going to ask and I think he may have departed the room, if we could have at least those persons that are in the Chamber that maybe did not get a chance to speak that are here in opposition, to please stand. And then to give those that are in favor, that did not get a chance to speak to please stand, so at least the Council can see.

Councilman Lester: Okay, I think that's appropriate. All those that came that are in favor of the zoning appeal or in favor of the development, and upholding the MPC as Mr. Bowman has requested, please signify by standing to your feet. Those would be in favor of the Zoning C-1-06. And all those that are here that are opposed, please signify by doing the same by standing to your feet or waving your hand as the case may be.

Councilman Carmody: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, I want to and I don't know how to clarify this, there's probably no way to clarify it, considering the vote. I just wanted to be sure that it seems as if the people, everybody who came to talk were in opposition of the homes. The quality of the homes and the type of homes. And not the people. Is that your understanding Mr. Chairman?

Councilman Lester: That would be my understanding.

Councilman Jackson: Alright.

Councilman Lester: I think we got that clear. At this time, we're going to take up the other matters to speak at this time.

Mr. James Thrower: (*1825 Willow Point*) Good afternoon. I'd like to hand out these ten points that I'd like to highlight, and a rendition of what we're proposing.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, could we wait until we get all this. I don't want his time to necessarily run out.

Councilman Lester: Ms. Pierce, if you could reset the time, please Ma'am.

Mr. Thompson: She said that's her old name.

Councilman Lester: Oh that's right. Well she snuck off and didn't tell us. Came back with a new name. Same Bea, just a new name. New and improved.

Mr. Thrower: This is a subsidized housing needed very bad in this City. It's a \$4,000,000 project that creates jobs and tax revenue for the City and Parish. We're

including a Class A day care with a curriculum that teach 3 and 4 year olds how to read. We're providing supporter services which will include peer mentoring for teens, job placement, home ownership training, and case management services as needed. According to SPD, crime statistics department, there has been no increase in crime since the last development in 2002. There has been no decrease in property values since the last development in 2002. According to traffic data, there has been no significant increase in wrecks and other vehicular accidents. There is overwhelmingly comparative land usage within 100 meters of or a couple hundred meters of our property, there are three other developments. And none of them look like ours. As I said before there is a significant need for affordable housing and the quality of units exceed the quality of existing units. And lastly, tax credits have been approved by the Louisiana Housing Finance Agency for this particular project. We just received official word. That's all I have.

Councilwoman Robertson: I see the SPD crime statistics. Were y'all the developers on another unit in that area? Is that what you're saying, and so since y'all developed that one, there hasn't been a change?

Mr. Thrower: No, that was the previous development prior to ours. And we went to the SPD Crime Statistics to get that information, since that 2002 development. And there has been no increase at all in crime.

Councilwoman Robertson: Okay. And another question is and I've asked one of the gentlemen that was with you earlier, but your name is on the dotted line for this development? You're putting a vested interest in it?

Mr. Thrower: I want to put to bed all the rumors that are out there. 1) We are fronting for someone else. That's bologna. We own- - we're developers and owners of this property. And I don't know how and why this particular rumor would have the wings that it has.

Councilwoman Robertson: And what is your background that - - -

Mr. Thrower: I'm a Social Worker. I'm a licensed Social Worker, and I've been practicing for 12 years now.

Mr. Dock Voorhies: (*10014 Brittany*) I'm going to have to use these, times have changed. I also might add that I had the privilege of hiring Mr. Thrower at the VA, and he's an outstanding Social Worker. Thank you for the opportunity to share the views of an adopted son to the City of Shreveport. Not only an adopted son, but also a very grateful son. One who has been truly blessed by being a citizen of Shreveport. Shreveport has much to be proud of and I truly feel that the best is yet to come. As most of you are aware, I have spoken numerous times before the Council, but never on behalf of a project or proposal that would benefit me personally or financially. This is also true today. In no way will I derive any personal gains from this affordable housing project on North Market that is being proposed. Also a guiding principle has always been, what is in the best interest of Shreveport. The last time I addressed the Council, I was President of Hope for the Homeless. Which generates approximately \$3,000,000 annually in HUD funding for the City of Shreveport. Contrary to the will of most of the members of the board of Hope for the Homeless, I vehemently supported the decision of the City Council to eliminate a \$25,000 grant to Hope for the Homeless, which would have been derived from the gaming revenue. Because in my humble opinion, I felt that the needs of the City as a whole were much greater. Today, I come before you putting the needs of the City

before all others. As a strong advocate of affordable housing, I need only remind the Council that affordable housing should not be designated for particular streets, city, or section of the City. We should not allow our stereotypical views or prejudice and even our fears to dictate what is in the best interest of the citizens of Shreveport. Affordable housing does not mean nasty, dirty, or less than. We must not discriminate against our fellow citizens, based on their income and their income alone. We must preserve choice. Hopefully, “not in my backyard” or “not in my neighborhood” is a divisive tool that will not be welcomed in the City of Shreveport. This housing proposal on North Market offers supported services, case management, job readiness training, budget planning, and day care service, and according to HUD, that’s a model program. So without any further ado, this project is a win-win for Shreveport.

Mr. Mark Prevot: (*710 Robards*) I’m here to speak in favor of the project. That what they’re planning is a quality development with 40 units, which is a pretty low density for the site. And I’ll answer any questions you have about the project.

Councilwoman Robertson: How far off the street is it?

Mr. Prevot: Well, there’s an area along North Market that will not be developed at the current plan, and so the units are approximately 150-200 feet back from the main roadway.

Councilwoman Robertson: So, they won’t just be visible right when you pass by.

Mr. Prevot: No Ma’am.

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Prevot, I thought of this just now, but Mr. Thrower perhaps could have been the person to answer the question, but maybe you’ll know. I know in terms of HUD properties, there is a contract on properties. It could be 20, it could be 30, some I think could be 40 years. Do you know how long the HUD contract is on this property? I see Mr. Thrower coming forward.

Mr. Prevot: No sir, I’m not. I don’t know the particulars on that.

Mr. Thrower: 15 years.

Councilman Hogan: It’d be a 15 year contract. Okay. And after that, it could become - - -

Mr. Thrower: It could become market value. Fair market rent.

Mr. Carlton Smith: (*1752 Willow Point Dr*) I appreciate this opportunity to speak before you. One of the things you’re going to hear about from the opposition is as we’ve mentioned crime, and the crime is really going to increase in our neighborhood, and property value is going to decrease. And also I recall hearing at the MPC, traffic concerns. The data does not show that. I reiterate what Mr. James said. When you take out those three elements, all you have and I’m sure you might hear that unless the script has been rewritten as people and the stigma that the opposition would imply these people as a reason to oppose this development. But I say who among us here aren’t an illness, or loss of a job, or catastrophic event away from needing subsidies to sustain life. I believe in the human spirit to overcome. History has shown this to be true. Maybe that’s why we’re so excited about the unlimited possibilities of this project. Simply opposing this development because you don’t want it there isn’t fair at all. Citizens of Shreveport have the right to affordable housing, that will not isolate poverty (inaudible) communities. I’m asking for your support in upholding the decision of the MPC. Thank you.

Councilwoman Robertson: And I understand it, you’re one of them that’s got

your name on the dotted line?

Mr. Smith: Yes, I'm one of the developers.

Councilwoman Robertson: Okay, and what are your credentials?

Mr. Smith: I'm an educator, 20 years, retired educator, Caddo Parish, and one of the developers.

Ms. Stephanie Lynch: *(5037 Waters Place)* I got the right case this time. I'm not here to speak for or against this development. 1) it's not in my district, and I would not take that liberty of privilege of speaking to that, that's going to be up to you all. Whether you want to do that or not, but I do want to say two things. 1) that all people who rent are not bad. There are some people that want to rent. I didn't buy my house until I was in my 30s. It wasn't because I didn't have a high school diploma, it wasn't because I didn't have college degree, it wasn't because I didn't have a "good job." I didn't want to mow a yard, I like beautiful landscaping, but I kill plants. So, it was not something that I chose to do until that time. I guess most of you all know me for being willing to call a spade a spade, and its not without seriousness that I come before you today. This is not like I said, saying one thing or the other about the development, but I am here to vouch for the two gentlemen who are the developers on this project. They both live in my district in the Cross Lake area. These are some, and as business owners, they do live in my district and as business owners, each of you know that the credibility of the business owner is a factor in a lot of decisions that are made. And I'm saying that these are two outstanding gentlemen. And I do believe that if they make the representations that they have made regarding this development, that they will follow through with it. That I can say, and I don't vouch for a lot of people. But I will do that in this case. And so that's basically what I came to say regarding this development. I live in the Mooretown area, I live in a high rent community, on the street where I live in the immediate area where I live, and we know as elected officials that a lot of the houses in our district, that people are renting are not even up to any kind of code. They're - - - if they had to be evaluated, on whether it's even a place fit to live, they wouldn't make it. And so as developments are spring up over the city, that is just another choice. Not whether they are renting. Like I said, some people choose to rent, but they can live in a nice home that is up to code, and somewhere that they can be proud to live. Thank you.

Councilwoman Robertson: Do you by chance, have you known of any other developments that they've done or anything like that? Have you ever had to work with them or you just know them through this?

Ms. Lynch: No, I've known them for several years, even before I was elected to office and found out that they are actually in my district. I just know them through their community work. And I'm not sure if they've had any other developments or anything like that. I'm just saying what I know of their character and their (inaudible). Has nothing to do with this development necessarily that they are in my district, but just good people.

Mr. Melvin Armstrong: *(4756 North Lake Drive)* I'm standing here before the Council today because I'm against this particular project. And some of the reasons why I'm against it is because of crime, safety and property value. I've lived in this particular neighborhood for about 26 years, and I'm a retired postal worker of over 30 years, and I've been retired for about five years. One of the things that me and my wife do, and she is sitting right there, in the last five years we actually ride our bicycles around the

neighborhood. That's what I do to just kinda stay active. And in riding my bicycle, I have a tendency to have encountered over the past few years, because of the other three apartments there, North Side Villa, Northwood Lake, and Coventry Place. Those are the apartments that's currently there right now. And they have a large influx of people constantly coming in and causing crime, causing safety problems, and just on yesterday me and my wife encountered several young people from the Northwood Lake Apartments actually breaking into my neighbors back yard, just yesterday. And they were actually planning on getting - - - it's a little mobile, a little go cart is what it was, and they actually confessed to the fact that they were fixin to get it. Okay, there were actually between 11 and 14 years old. And me and my wife actually stood out there and talked to these gentlemen for about an hour. Because I'm tired of seeing young people just being incarcerated every time they do something. You know the jails are over crowded with young people. We actually talked to them, me and my wife are Sunday School Teachers, and we actually talked to them trying to reach their inner being as to doing the right thing. We didn't even call the police, and the neighbor actually came home. I knew she was getting ready to come home, so we actually detained them just to see what she wanted to do. And she actually really wanted to call the police, but for some reason, I guess her heart was touched because they were so young and what not, she didn't call them. But she said if they come again, that she was going to call the police. But my particular problem has been in the past whereas just even riding my bicycle, I've encountered young people smoking dope, cursing me and my wife out just on our bicycles. Talking - - - you know and we asked the kids "where are you from?" "Well we're from these apartments over here, but we're not going to tell you which one we live in." But it's just been so demeaning to see these young people come in and cause these kind of situations you understand, and cause property value to go down or what not. And my concern and my heart really go out to these young people. And we're trying our best to cultivate and atmosphere of love and peace and happiness in our community, but with these three apartments that we already have, they're actually less than a football field away from our neighborhood, the three that we already have, adjacent to our properties. And to have another one to come in, we would have an over influx of low income properties, really with a lot of young people coming in you understand. And believe it or not, the seven individuals I talked with yesterday, did not have a father in place to really keep their hands on. So, I am really concerned about another project coming in my neighborhood right now. I really commend Mr. Thrower, and his partner for wanting to do something like this, but there should be a criteria set up whereas you only have a certain number within a certain distance of a community. Are we going to let ten come, 15? Where is it going to stop? And I for one, am on a fixed income, and I cannot - - - I don't have a running mentality. I'm a Viet Nam Veteran, and I just don't know how to run. I just stand and fight for what I believe in. So, with that said, I hope that the Council would just look at this situation thoroughly. And I know there is a place somewhere for this particular project. But with the three that we have adjacent to our properties already, within a football field away, I pray that we don't get anymore in. And this is my stand on this particular project. Thank you.

Mr. Herbert Goad: (*960 Whispering Lake*) Thank you. I live in the North Lakewood Subdivision, I am currently president of the neighborhood association. The one thing that has stood out and everybody supporting these building of these apartments

is no one has given any consideration to the 110 homeowners in the North Lakewood Estates. We are people who are trying to maintain our homes and pay for them. There are many people, who as Mr. Armstrong stated are on fixed incomes such as myself. We cannot just get up and move when we wish. There are a lot of homeowners who have move in there and are currently buying these homes and they do not want to see their property deteriorate. As far as the crime statistics, I'm not sure where they're getting - - - they say they're getting these from different Shreveport Police Department. There are a lot of crimes that occur that people don't report. And a good example is the gentleman recently had approximately \$100 worth of damage done to his truck. He is currently renting there or living on the property that you used to live in Councilman Lester. As far as these homes are, the apartments not being able to be seen from North Market, they would have to put up a 20 foot fence. Because they're going to be in full view when you drive down North Market, if you have any eyesight at all. If I stand on my back patio, I can look at them where they are proposing to build them. I don't want anymore. Neither do the other homeowners. Because we are tired of having to fight to keep people from stealing things. When I'm working in my yard, I cannot even leave my work tools in the yard when I take a break and go in the house, because somebody will steal them. So is that the kind of neighborhood you think we should have to live in as homeowners? I'm sorry that people have to rent homes, but there are approximately 900 plus rental apartments from the City limits of North Shreveport down to Hearne Avenue and along Hearne Ave, a corridor of one mile wide on either side of North Market. I hope that y'all looked at the documentation that I provided you. Whenever I turned in the appeal for our neighborhood association, there is one problem that I feel is far as the day care. They have in the past had a day care there, but they had a liquor store that the property owner adjoins it on two sides. I do not see how you can have a day care in a situation such as that. On one corner of this property is a high voltage power line that runs across. It has 100 foot right of way, and no apartments can be built under that power line. I know it is a very high voltage. I wear a pace maker, and I can walk under that power line, and it puts it in neutral. So it has a very high electromagnetic field. And so there is just too much aspects there. The other thing that I noticed, these people are not proposing to build any of these apartments in their subdivision that they live in. North Shreveport is absolutely overrun. It appears to me that boy, we have vacant land in North Shreveport, so we'll just put some more apartments up there. I think the City Council needs to consider some type of diversity where these apartments are spread throughout the City.

Councilwoman Robertson: In this particular subdivision, they are wanting to put up a gated 40 units. You don't think that that would deter the kids that are in that unit? I mean, they have to walk out and go back in - - -

Mr. Goad: No, they can come out. That's not going to deter - - - the gated unit will not stop the problem. Unless you keep the gates locked.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, with all due respect I would ask that, I think you may have made a comment about it before. I think in deference to the deliberation as well as to those that come to speak, while I recognize people perhaps are in opposition or in favor of, I think the appropriate decorum for this Council Chamber will not be for everybody to speak at one time. But in deference to those who are speaking, that we would in fact keep the decorum by allowing one person to speak, whether we're in favor of it or not. I just ask that we were to keep the appropriate decorum for this particular

meeting.

Mr. Wayne Woodson: *(4841 North Market)* I'd like to thank the Council for allowing us this time. I spoke to Chairman Lester for a few extra minutes, over three minutes, and he allowed me that opportunity, and I just want to thank him for it. Since November 7th, I have like others attended seven meetings. The first meeting was at the library at the 4800 block of N. Market, where Mr. Thrower and his partner and three other people attended that meeting in favor of these projects. It was two Black men, two White men and a White woman. Mr. Mark Prevot, I believe his name, was one of those at that meeting, and this is the first time we've seen him since Mr. Thrower was trying to promote the meeting. In the outcome of that meeting, was just out of control, people yelling and screaming. It was over about 40 people there, and one thing I remember real good, see Mr. Thrower and Mr. Mark when we were coming out of the meeting, made me rush to my truck, because it was something I would say looked like threats because Mr. Thrower told me say, "Don't antagonize me." And big as he is and looked at me, I really understood what he was saying. And Mr. Mark bristled, so I kinda of hurried to my truck to get out of the way of this. The second meeting was at Mr. Lester's office. And Mr. Lester was kind to us. And he heard us, and he said, "However this comes out, I'd like for all of us to meet on both sides and talk about it." So we all agreed. The third meeting was the MPC Council where we told the MPC that we had counted 19 low income housing development groups from 12 Mile Bayou out past 4851 N. Market, with this 40 North I believe the last one we counted on each side N. Market. So we felt like we had enough of low income apartments in North Louisiana. We're not in competition to get the majority of the minority. We would like to spread it out throughout this city, yet I would ask you - - - let me ask you something. If I showed this to you, and the Mayor and everybody. What do you see?

Councilman Lester: Mr. Woodson, you got to talk on the microphone so we can pick you up.

Mr. Woodson: Okay, thank you very much. I certainly do thank you. Okay now what do you see? A black dot. All of this is good here, and what people see is this dot. That's bad. North Shreveport is a beautiful section of town. It's landscaped and people are leaving going to Bossier. So, what I would like for us to do is to try to stabilize what we have and lets get some good advertisement. I hear something on the radio and T.V. say we can talk Shreveport up and keep it in Shreveport. The race track wanted to come to Shreveport, they didn't want it. The Schlitz Company down there on Common Street, they didn't - - - lot of places go to Bossier, and they will go from Haughton to Minden if we don't try to stop it. So what we need to do as a city, I think for these houses. People gotta live some place. We could put them somewhere. Well, I called Councilman Carmody. Councilman Carmody's daddy was down on Texas in the old Commercial Building, where AM South. Art Carmody, Jr. is my friend. Charles Peatross is my friend, so he got a good start. I left that on his message today.

Councilman Carmody: Well thank you Mr. Woodson. I appreciate it. That's the nicest thing I had anybody say down there.

Mr. Woodson: Okay, now you will have that on your - - - now your secretary took that down today. I called everybody. I was able to get everybody. I called Ms. Cindi, I called Mr. Hogan, called Rev. Green, and I was unable to get Rev. Jackson, because I got Southern University off this list here. So, we have enough low income

apartments in North Shreveport. Now, what point that maybe can help us. There is some out of areas that you could recommend for development. And the City could designate a bus to go down to a certain point and turn around and bring these people to their grocery stores or whatever. Same with the way they did with Western Electric. They didn't put Western Electric in the city, and you can do it as a City Councilman. And I speak from the heart with you. Let's do not rush the judgement, because our kids gotta come up, and Shreveport is built to be a great city. And the government is the one to try to make it be what it should be. So we're here asking the Councilmen to really consider is it making this a better city. I love Shreveport. I've been since 1976, right across the street where the library is, we'd start to fighting that, the projects in 1978. Finally, we got a nice location. Time will bring. Not rush the judgement. So why we gotta rush this in there? Lets think about this stuff and lets build a better Shreveport. And I want to thank you for your time. And I want to thank the Mayor, see he's doing some good things. It's some good publicity, because they always talked bad about Shreveport. They sent me to New Jersey and how bad Louisiana was. But I live in Louisiana. I left here, but I came back cause Louisiana is a good place, and Shreveport is a good place. And so we want to encourage to consider what we said. Enough is enough. And I think we all understand that. Thank you very much.

Ms. Catherine Hall: *6635 North Park Circle*) It would be embarrassing if you said no.

Councilman Lester: Oh, no, no, no.

Ms. Catherine Hall: In the interest of brevity, we'd like that. I have many neighbors who live out that way. I've been living out there 36 years. We do love our area. We do have as my neighbor said, three subsidized housing units within a stones throw of this one. Now really, we've seen the picture. It's looks like a nice establishment. All we ask is that you tell the developers to find another place to put it. Thank you.

Ms. Gloria Prelow: *(6042 Alaska Lane)* Good afternoon. I've lived in this area of North Shreveport for the past 16 years, and been active in my community. We have a mobile home park right next to where I live, and we've had problems there, but through management with our homeowners association, we were able to work things out, and our property value is still on the increase. I would venture to say that most of us here today have been in low income brackets at some point in time. I haven't always had a Bachelors Degree, and a Masters behind my name. I've worked on minimum wage jobs for minimum wage pay. We all had to start somewhere and being in a low income bracket or low income family doesn't mean you have to stay there and always be there. I believe that educating these tenants in this proposed apartment complex, giving them the opportunity to increase their income and their ability to purchase a home is paramount. We need more of these type of subsidized apartments around the city. Subsidized apartments are in North Shreveport, South Shreveport, East and West Shreveport. I believe is Shreveport is to thrive and prosper, we have to include the low socioeconomic people, the disadvantaged, the elderly, the poor, the good, the bad and the ugly. I'm here to support the proposed subsidized apartment complex on North Market and Devereaux. And I believe that it will be an asset to the area. There are several businesses proposed and several businesses that have come to North Shreveport since I've live there. That includes MacDonald's, Family Dollar, Dollar General, a car wash, a car lot, Sonic. So

we're not being left out as far as businesses are concerned, we are still on the grow. As I read the *Inquisitor*, in reference to crime, I see in North Shreveport more homeowners and people who live in houses names and addresses than I do people who live in subsidized apartments. Thank you.

Mr. Jerry Barnette: (8225 *Creekdale Street*) I own a business, a self storage business at 4577 North Market that is situated adjacent to this proposed development. I also am a real estate appraiser. But before I get into that, I would like first to thank you for the opportunity to speak. Also, I think it would be a good idea if we could get Ms. Roberson up here to represent us from West Shreveport. All the things that she said to you apply to us as well. You know we're - - - short of having her speak for us would like to maybe consider a trade. We'd take her mobile home park in a heartbeat over what's proposed here. The concentration of low income housing where we are, and I do differ with Mr. - - - I forget the name, forgive me that, Thrower, excuse me. He is proposing 40 families in a four acre tract. I live on a three-quarter acre tract, or site, and the typical site is about a third acre in the City of Shreveport. So, this is high density housing and the other three projects that are already there are extremely high density. As far as property values are concerned, I have been appraising in Shreveport and Bossier for 21 years. North Shreveport is the flattest area in the Shreveport/Bossier metro area. And it has been for some time. Now Mr. Thrower again said there is no elements to show that property values have decreased. And I tend to agree with him. It's flat. North Shreveport is flat as can be as far as property values are concerned. Especially in the immediate area of this development. Another thing - - - whenever we do appraisals we have to take into consideration the makeup of the neighborhood. And by that I mean single family occupancy as opposed to multi-family. North Shreveport in that immediate area of this development has such a high concentration, that it has to have a negative impact on all the properties in the immediate areas. And I'm speaking primarily on single family residential. So, I differ with him on that as well. We have another issue that has not been brought out. There is going to be a day care at this place. There is the quick pantry that is adjacent to this as well, that sells alcohol. And that's a primary source for most of the people in that immediate area to go and buy alcohol. So, this is something that needs to be considered as well. Lastly, I would like to say that this is case, what has happened here is spot zoning. This is a commercial area that has been dissected, not dissected - - - an area that's taken right out of the middle of it to put residential into it. This is going to be surrounded for the most part by commercial property. And if I wanted to come before zoning, and wanted to do the reverse, if I wanted to into a neighborhood and put business in the middle of a residential area that was not wanted by the people around it, it certainly wouldn't fly. And I don't know how this has gotten this far. Because nobody in North Shreveport wants this. And it's obvious that everybody that has spoken with the exception of this one lady, is opposed to it. So, I've gone over my time. I thank you for being heard, and I hope you will take this into consideration.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, seeing that when we actually get to a point of debate on this particular subject, I recognize that this is not the appropriate time. But I wanted Mr. - - -, the last speaker, Mr. Barnett, since he was there for a clarification on something that he said, so that when we do get to a point of deliberation, perhaps I'll have more clarity on what it was he had made a comment about. Mr. Barnett? Cause I represent West Shreveport, you were saying that we would trade saying that you would

take the mobile homes and trade them against the apartments. What's the philosophy behind that?

Mr. Barnett: Well sir, 1) speaking as an appraiser, manufactured homes, if I had to appraise a house in one of the developments in the immediate area there with more high density housing, low income apartments or multi-family, or however you want to appraise this, whatever is proposed here, as opposed to a manufactured homes development, I would not be inclined to make a negative adjustment. But as far as the, I guess the best way to say it is that the density of multi-family housing that is located there now, is at a critical point. If it becomes much greater, the people that live in that are in single family are going to run into difficulty in getting financing for their homes. Not only that, but their property values are going to begin to decline.

Councilman Jackson: So, let me ask you. Are you suggesting, as an appraiser, that five acres of mobile homes is better than those 40 units of apartments?

Mr. Barnett: It would certainly depend on how it was structured no doubt, but I would have to say - - -

Councilman Jackson: But wouldn't it be congruent to the value of the mobile homes, and then those people who live there - - -

Mr. Barnett: That's what I meant by how it was structured.

Councilman Jackson: So the value of the mobile homes, but as you well know, if it is a manufactured home or mobile home park, we don't put a limit on what the amount of the mobile homes could be, you know the base value - - - what they could be. So you could in essence have the same kind of scenario where people who even though may be buying a mobile home or someone who could rent those mobile homes out, of ending up still with the same socioeconomic inhabitants. But you would suggest to me that it's a physical presence of the mobile homes that would be better for the community than the apartments.

Mr. Barnett: I'm suggesting to you that if the mobile homes were owned by individuals as opposed to people who live in subsidized housing - - -

Councilman Jackson: But what if they were renting the mobile homes instead?

Mr. Barnett: I'd have to say that you'd be right back in a similar situation.

Councilman Jackson: So with those structures - - -?

Mr. Barnett: If they were subsidized.

Councilman Jackson: But according to what you said, it will not though affect the property value, because they would still be mobile homes notwithstanding who lives in them. Is it who lives in it that affects the property value, or the structures that you put on the land.

Mr. Barnett: This is not an issue of who lives in them so much as it is what type of housing. Multi-family. You're talking about increasing multi-family in an area that is saturated with multi-family. Manufactured homes would not be considered multi-family. So from an appraisers standpoint, a clinical look at it, you would be better off to have the manufactured homes. That's why I made the statement that I did.

Councilman Jackson: Okay, so it would be better to have five acres of manufactured homes or mobile homes if you will, even if somebody were renting them. Property values, right?

Mr. Barnett: Right.

Councilman Jackson: So, you've clarified that. You said that even if they were

renting them, it still wouldn't affect the property value. The mobile home, is that correct?

Mr. Barnett: Well again, and I qualified that statement by saying it depends on how it was structured. And when I say structured, what type of amenities were put there, and what type of requirements - - - ;you know there are mobile home developments, and there are mobile home developments. You have some that are gated even. You have some that are restricted to double wide. You have some that are restricted to single wide. And depending on what was put there, has a great bearing on it.

Ms. Rose McCulloch: (2509 Kemp Lane) Councilman Lester, I have come before this City Council today to just kind of express my concerns about the development. I met with these citizens on several occasions in regards to their opposition. I don't know if you all have a copy of the letter that was submitted to MPC in regards to the opposition of this particular development. Did you all get a copy of those letters?

Councilman Lester: We have the packets.

Ms. McCulloch: It should have been a part of the MPC packet. My concern has been, and I'm sure it's the concern of some of my constituents as well, is, let me first of all Councilman Lester commend the City on some of the housing developments that have been brought into District 2. Of course Rosenwald is one that you all are very familiar with that you all voted 6-0 in spite of the overwhelming opposition and support of other people that wrote letters in regards to the opposition. The development came through anyway in spite of how the people felt, in spite of how I felt as the representative and as a resident that resides in the area. I want to thank you again for your efforts in bringing housing and affordable housing and I guess some of would say affordable low income housing into our district, but right now at this point and time, we are becoming overwhelmed with low income. And so, I think the concerns of the citizens at this point is you know we have some low income now, give us something else. Because in other districts, they are bringing in other types of housing other than low income. I had several citizens come to me regarding my support of this development. I am not opposing this development, but I oppose the location of this location. I've had lawyers to call me for a letter of support because you were submitting a letter of support. I don't know if you were, did you submit a letter of support regarding this development?

Councilman Lester: There is no letter from me on record, and I might add I spoke to Mr. Woodson, Mr. Goad, and our constituents and made it quite clear that I am opposing this development, just for what it's worth.

Ms. McCulloch: Okay, well my concern is I am not.

Councilman Lester: Just so we're clear on that issue.

Ms. McCulloch: I am not opposing the development, but I am opposing the location. Based on some issues that were expressed by the citizens at a most recent meeting, and that was based on the water supply that they have within the community. This additional development would not - - - they would not be able to accommodate this development at this time, because they are not really able to accommodate what they have. I also understand that there are some electrical concerns as far as accommodations go. So, I'm asking this body, based on that it seems as if though we have a little bit more than what we can stand. If I can recall, if I recall correctly right now in District 2 as a minority district, and that's my concern - - - that all of the low income is coming into District 2. You know, and that is a big concern of mine. And an expression from my

constituents is that give us something else. You know the Mayor is saying bring our children, we want our children to go home. I'm educating all of mine. I'm sure you've heard this, it sounds like a song. But all of my sons are in college in Atlanta, GA. How can I tell them to come home and purchase low income housing. And I understand some need low income housing, and I understand the plan of the City to bring in these developments, but I'm asking this body to please put a stop to anymore additional low incomes coming into District 2. Because we have more than what we can stand. I understand that we are rich in land, and you have expressed that Councilman Lester as a realtor. We are rich in land, but we don't just want to utilize our land for low income developments only. So, please consider the low income developments going in other districts. Of course based on the Caddo Parish Commission, we have 12 other districts. 12 other Commissioners that should be possibly interested in low income, if we're talking about the welfare of all people. So, please consider voting this down to come into District 2 on behalf of the citizens that voted you and myself both into office. And thank you.

Councilman Lester: I'll reserve my comments until the end.

Ms. Sylenda Dixon: (3967 Titwnell Ave) I was coming in support of the project. I'm an educator, I teach now at Green Oaks, I've been teaching in the Parish for almost ten years. I think that it would bring a lot of social services to the area. They have from what I understand that they are going to have several job training services that will come to this area like tutoring for the children in the evening. And they're going to have some persons there to do some counseling and student training, and I think that that's what we need in this area. I think this would be a good project for them. And I think with the screening, that they plan on doing for the people that are going to be living there would be good for them too as long as the screening, the background checks and everything checks out, I don't see any problems with the project coming to the area. That's all I have to say.

Councilman Lester: This concludes public comments on agenda items to be adopted. At this particular time, the chair would move to suspend the rules to consider the zoning appeal C-1-06.

Motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Robertson to suspend the rules to consider the zoning appeal C-1-06.

Councilman Hogan: Pardon me Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Lester: This is just to suspend the rules to take this up.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, question. Tell me which number is - - -

Councilman Lester: C-1-06. Number 8 on the agenda.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, I thought that when we talked about it, we were talking about suspending the rules to deal with the two zoning cases that we've heard most of the - - -

Councilman Lester: That's correct. These are the two.

Councilman Jackson: Oh, I just heard one.

Councilman Lester: No, no. We're going to take - - - well, if you would like, I was going to suspend the rules for each one.

Councilman Jackson: I would think if we could suspend the rules, Mr. Chairman.

I don't know if the Clerk - - -

Councilman Lester: I'll offer it as a substitute.

Substitute motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Robertson to suspend the rules to consider the zoning appeals C-1-06 and C-92-05. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 7.

8. **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)

Having passed first reading on January 24, 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 Lester, seconded by Councilman Jackson to adopt Ordinance No. 8 of 2006.

Councilman Lester: I'm asking first to put it on for consideration, but I'm asking for a "NO" vote. Procedurally, because it's an MPC zoning ordinance, procedurally, you have to ask for it's adoption, and vote "NO" to overturn it.

Councilman Hogan: This is the mobile home deal?

Councilman Lester: Yes this is the mobile deal.

Councilman Walford: Of course you get first debate. Do you want to - - -

Councilman Lester: I will give first debate and then I will turn the dais over to anyone else. On this item, I think it's very clear on this particular issue, one of the problems that we had, not just in this district, but in others, is our definition of what is allowed under residential. And one of the problems is that residential allows manufactured homes and mobile homes. And many times, what happens is people have something that is zoned residential, and they are allowed to put basically what they want to put. We're fortunate in this particular instance, because this particular piece of property is zoned Business. If it were not zoned Business, then we would not be having this discussion, because they would have a right to put manufactured site built housing here. Now that is an issue that we as a council have to deal with over and beyond this particular issue. But those are the facts, that's what brings us here today. I think it's very clear to anyone that lives out there, anyone that has traveled that area, that mobile homes or manufactured homes are completely out of character with that neighborhood, and I think that the residents have been very clear and I agree with them that we should not continue building mobile homes in this particular area. So, I'm asking the Council to vote with me, to vote "NO" on this particular item. So, we might not be able to get rid of the mobile homes that are there, but at least we can stop without pouring anymore gasoline on the fire. And that's what my request is of the Council.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Chairman, I just have a problem with voting no. I

agree with the residents. I support them in not wanting the - - - I'm not sure of the politically correct term - - - modular housing, thank you. But this is a down zoning, and I find it very hard not to support the MPC, but I think we would be much more effective in remanding this back to the MPC for reconsideration and stipulations to be placed on it before it comes back to the Council. I think that would be the prudent thing for us to do, and I would support that. And after the debate, I might very well give you a substitute motion to do that.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, we have for today, particularly for this period of public comment heard what I think are cases that while I think someone tied them together. The truth is that they are diametrically opposite from each other, at least in my opinion. Mr. Walford was talking about remanding it back to the MPC or whatever the correct body would be. I think it's clear in this scenario that it's an issue of compatibility. We do as the Chairman said, have this opportunity because we're converting as Councilman Walford has said, a down zoning. But I do think that if you look at the history of what's happened, there've been cases before, at least one that we are aware of most recently, where the court did in fact uphold this kind of a scenario, because we did what we thought was in the best interest of the particular community with regards to land use and compatibility. I think this is clearly one of those cases, and while I can appreciate where Councilman Walford's concerns may be, I would just that I would be prepared Mr. Chairman, and would encourage us to move forward to put this one and put all of - - - you know everything that we deal with today, to come up with some final decisions and put it behind us.

Councilman Carmody: Thank you Mr. Chairman, and Mr. Jackson, I think I see your side as well as I see the concern that Councilman Walford has. And it reminds me of a situation that we had in the past, where there was an area of town that were all stick built homes, and yet there were empty lots. And so we had an application come before us where the person said, I'd like to put a manufactured home in this neighborhood, this empty lot, but the neighbors around that lot said it's out of character with the rest of the neighborhood. I do believe that we're going to have to do some work in our zoning as far as how we're going to either establish some sort of areas that in which these types of manufactured homes are allowed as opposed to stick built homes because the residents in this case have all stated, and I think we all understand that their concern is it's a negative economic impact on the value of their homes to have these types of modular homes or manufactured homes, or trailers or whatever we want to refer to them as placed in close proximity to their site built homes. But I'm not sure that we're putting ourselves in jeopardy of allowing the property owner/developer to come back and seek a legal recourse against us if we just vote it down today. And I guess I would defer back maybe to our legal counsels to give us an opinion on that.

Ms. Glass: Well, Mr. Carmody in a zoning case, I think the standard is did the Council have a rational basis for what they did? Was what you did arbitrary and capricious or was it not? The other I guess problem is you know possible arguments of equal protection. Are you treating them similarly situated alike? And if the zoning ordinance made the distinction in what was already on the books, it might make it easier. But I guess those would be the two legal points that might come up in a challenge, and I don't know if I could tell you what could happen.

Councilman Carmody: Right, and I appreciate that Ms. Glass. Thank you Mr.

Chairman.

Councilwoman Robertson: If I could, is Mr. Kirkland here? I've got a couple of questions that I think you could maybe answer for me. I think one of the things that I understood too from the people in their opposition was that if they were homes built and not the mobile/modular or whatever, then they would be satisfied with that. If we were to remand this back as Mr. Walford was saying, to zoning, if it went back there, would those stipulations go along with that, if we denied it completely, they'd have to wait a year. Is that right? To try to come back to do that again?

Mr. Kirkland: That's correct to the latter part of your question.

Councilwoman Robertson: Right, but if we sent it back to you, what happens then?

Mr. Kirkland: I don't know of anything that the MPC can legally do that would preclude an owner the right to put whatever legally can go there. And that would include a factory built home. Factory built has a certain very clear distinction. It's no dimension less than 20 feet. Has to be on a permanent foundation. It's what is commonly called by the public as a double wide. But you won't see the single wide mobile home by right in an R-1-D district. But you will see by law since it's allowed a double wide if you will. But subdivision covenants that are put by developers of subdivisions are what normally preclude housing that's brought in, whether it's an old home out of Highland, hauled out to a new site, or where they say "double wide." But I don't know of anything legally the board could attach to the down zoning request that the zoning law would allow that would say because you're only a breath away from how big does the home have to be? Does it have to 1200 square feet, 2,00 square feet? What? You're probably talking 1500 square feet or 2,000 if we're trying to say well it's got to cost "X" thousands of dollars. The MPC doesn't get into that. I don't think a remand in this case - - - the prerogative is yours. If you think B-1 zoning is more compatible, vote for that. In other words vote against the motion. If you think a home is better there, whether it be a double wide or what, then vote for the motion to uphold the MPC. I hope I didn't confuse that.

Councilman Jackson: I was glad Councilwoman Robertson asked the question because what we're dealing with today is very basic in my opinion. We vote to maintain the B- - - this particular zoning only because, downgrading it as Councilman Walford referred to - - - a down zoning, while it would open it up as an R-1, it may seem like something that's easy to do. It also will potentially fly in the face of what the community wants and does not necessarily have to be compatible to the degree that the neighbors want it to be. So I think it serves as a protection for that particular neighborhood to retain the existing zoning until such time as someone comes in - - - and I tell you, if they came in with a different kind of development that was more compatible with that area, then a down zoning I think would be a no brainer. I think in this case protecting the interest of the neighbors who have the concern about compatibility, which they would not be able to control with a down zoning.

Councilman Lester: I would just say this and again to reiterate, this is one of the quirks in the zoning law that because this - - - you have a change in zoning, it allows us to have this discussion. And because it allows us to have this discussion, it allows the neighbors to get involved, and it also allows us to express what our desires are from a Council standpoint. I don't think the equal protection argument is necessarily accurate because quite obviously we have situations where you can go to different parts of the

districts, my district and some others where you have businesses that are noncompliant in terms of zoning situations. But because no one put a finger on them and they had not been compliant for a period of five years, they're allowed to continue to operate, even in the face of the zoning ordinances. So, in this particular case, I think we are fortunate that this was a B-1. Because if it wasn't, we would not be having this discussion, and we would be sitting at a neighborhood association meeting about another site built manufactured home coming into the neighborhood. So, I would vote and I would ask my colleagues to vote "NO." I understand what Councilman Walford is saying in terms of the broad scope of down zoning in terms of putting a residential structure. But I think it's pretty clear from the comments that I think Mr. Bowman made, that as a developer, everything around this was in fact manufactured or what's the politically correct term?

Councilwoman Robertson: Modular.

Councilman Lester: Modular housing, so there is nothing that tells me that the same folks doing the same development in the same area won't come back with another modular housing scenario. And there is nothing that says they would do otherwise. Maybe if this was a whole nother group of people doing a whole nother development with a completely different site plan, I would have a comfort level. But given the fact that they've done it five times or four times, I think a fifth time, it's pretty clear what's going to be there. And to the extent that we don't want it there, I think we should take advantage of in this particular case, the zoning laws and the zoning ordinances being in our favor and lets vote "NO."

Councilman Walford: Based on what Mr. Kirkland said, that certainly changes my opinion, and I will vote with you Mr. Chairman. Now, please you know that I am very consistent in voting with the MPC and the ZBA, so you guys don't give me a bad time since I'm going to deviate this one time.

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

9. **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)

Having passed first reading on January 24, 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 Lester, seconded by Councilman Green to adopt.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, as I said a minute ago, and I respectfully, I respect the motion by the Chairman, and his request for a "NO" vote, but with all due respect to the Chairman, I think that in my opinion, a "NO" vote may not be the right vote. And I say that because the issue as again is before us was compatibility. I've heard the opponents as well as the proponents say that in the proximity of about a hundred

yards or so, exist apartments already. Is that correct? And that those apartments are older and this set of apartments that we have seen the renderings on, are obviously a \$4,000,000 project that seems to be a quality project. They seem to me to be a quality project. 167 feet. Somebody said that they could see it when they were doing something, but 167 feet as a setback, as many of you know is five times plus what the requirement is for a structure, for a legal set back. And it seems to me that my concern is that I thin the setback being is far as possible helps because my concern would be the safety of the people who live in that particular complex. They in fact have a gated community, or gated apartment is what it was. And I thought that this level of quality that was presented to us today, and we've seen several presentations of apartments and single family homes since I've been here and this is not the level of quality that we've seen before. This seems to be again, to me, a higher level of quality. I would say to people who have come today that you got a right to be in opposition, just as others have a right to be supporters. I really take issue with, and my personal issue as many of my colleagues already know, is that while I don't mind talking about products, but when we start talking about people, I got a problem with that. The reason I've got a problem with that is because perhaps of all of the councilmen who are here, I'm the only one who has the distinction perhaps of a product of public housing. Same kind of people that folks are concerned about. What we're going to do to your property value and all those kinds of things. And I want to tell you, that I have a real serious issue. One of the best arguments we can make is about the socioeconomic status of individuals. Where is the place? Someone said well, we've got enough. Got enough of what? Got enough of the housing, or we got enough of the people. Someone came today and said that we've got - - - again, I tried not to rebut when everybody else was speaking and tried to give deference to the people who spoke. And so, I would say to you, that someone has said to me that, "you know they're thieves." I don't know, I hadn't thought about it, maybe my colleagues can help me, I don't know where the right place is to house thieves are besides jail. And the fact is that everybody who lives in or who may be socio-economically advantaged, does not steal. I certainly take exception to that, and I certainly oppose the very idea of someone saying it. Someone said to me, well Mr. Jackson, because nobody ever said anything before today, to me about it, but said, Mr. Jackson as they made their presentation today, there is a liquor store not far from it. We've had issues before where a library was located where a liquor store, where people sold, an issue becomes in those cases we were a lot more sensitive, because of where children were and because of where the consumption of alcohol was. Not the purchase, but the consumption of alcohol. And what I've seen and again, with all due respect, what I've seen is that people make arguments that appear to be emotional without the benefit of understanding both the zoning laws, or some intellectual ascent that would suggest to them that perhaps that people who live 167 feet off the street would not be affected by a liquor store that's 200 feet away. Whether that's there or not, I don't know. Don't know anything about that particular site, where the liquor store is supposed to be. People have said we need to spread across the city public housing, or we need to spread the low income developments across the city. Well, I don't know maybe if somebody missed this or maybe someone's been misguided, but every district I know around here and every person whose up here represents a district where there is low income housing. My district's been talked about today, because of socioeconomic scenarios that people I represent. So, what I'm saying to you is that I'm

not asking anybody to agree with what I agree with. But I am saying that I take exception to people making broad suppositions about the socioeconomic status of an individual. A community will never be defined by what it did or what it does for the people who are most able to help themselves. Communities are defined by what they are able to do with the least and the people who do not have and the those who are left behind very often. I don't want to debate philosophies for municipal government. That's my belief, that's what I believe. Councilman Lester, and I do not, I have not heard the argument versus apartments. I mean if you renting a mobile home versus renting an apartment, I don't know how that makes you any better. If the concern is not about the inhabitants, and it's just about the dwelling, somebody puts up a \$4,00,000 structure that's going to bring down the value of housing, the value of housing? To me that is diluted perception of what development is about, and I don't understand, what do you put up? So a million dollar house brings everybody's property up? And my issue becomes at the end of the day, if you got a \$4,000,000 property that's four times a \$1,000,000 house that's you're not going to get. And so the issue becomes to me, where is the land? People want to know why North Shreveport? I don't have the luxury or the distinction of representing North Shreveport, but I can tell you that if you've got a assemblible available land, that's where everybody is going to look first. That's being the unfortunate situation for Councilman Lester and those who may oppose this. But the truth of the matter is that you can't assemble and you can't have land available with just doesn't exist. And the issue becomes to me, is this legal. When we make a decision today, Councilman Walford just talked about we go to court. If we were to go to court with this scenario, the question becomes when we looked at it, were we arbitrary and capricious, or did we look at whether or not this is a legal land use for this kind of a development? And it would be hard pressed to stand before a court with legitimate jurisdiction and suggest to them that with an apartment there, there and there, that somehow or another, this apartment becomes immediately incompatible, when it has other things to offer which include social services, which the other apartments don't have. When it includes a gate, which the other apartments don't have. When it includes amenities that the other apartments don't have, to argue incompatibility is only a legitimate argument if you say, we don't want anything that's better. But if you're saying we want something that's the same or substandard to that, this project is not substandard to Villa Norte or whatever the apartments are that are in that particular area, it's not substandard to those. So, I don't know how we could from a legal perspective, and Councilman Lester, you may have talked about that, but I think we're in a safe place to approve a development at this particular level and at this particular scale. For those who got a problem with low income individuals, I hope and pray that they'll get through that. And that they'll get over that. And recognize that our job is not to decide whose going to live in them. Our job is to decide whether or not the physical building meets the land use and the requirements of land use by law. I think we meet that challenge if we would vote "YES."

Councilwoman Robertson: If I could ask Mr. Prevot to come up, I've got a couple of questions. There were two statements in the last person that spoke, one being about an electric line and being within 100 feet of it and one about water issues. Have those all been - - - have y'all talked about those, and the site plan and all? Have those been take care of?

Mr. Prevot: Yes Ma'am. The electric power line has a 100 foot right of way and

we cannot build any structure within, and our plan does not propose any structures within that right of way. The 100 feet. You cannot build within that 100 feet. We are not - - - the closest building is probably 50 feet from the wires.

Councilwoman Robertson: Okay, and she mentioned something about water problems?

Mr. Prevot: I've heard contrary information pertaining to that, but I don't have independent research about that.

Councilwoman Robertson: Is Mr. Strong here? Can he just nod yes or no? I hate to put you on the spot with not knowing, maybe this particular section, but you know water is dear to me. Is there water problems out there?

Mr. Strong: The only thing that I know about water issues out there is when we had some problems with the North Hearne water main. Where it was blowing out, where it was knocking out water in that area. But I don't know of any water pressure issues that we have in that area, other than when we had those problems and the water went down. But that's the one that we did, I think the first 1500 foot and that North Hearne line is on full replacement.

Councilman Carmody: I just wanted to clarify. Mr. Prevot, before you step back. The statement you made in response to Ms. Robertson's question. The closest structure is built 50 feet from the wires themselves, not from the 100 foot right of way, correct? Cause the illustration we have here, it indicates that there is a dashed line that indicates the 50 foot setback from the center line?

Mr. Prevot: Correct. Right.

Councilman Carmody: You don't have any of the buildings built in that right of way, it looks like you've used it for pavement and parking, but there is a structure that looks like it's about 10 feet from the dashed line?

Mr. Prevot: Yeah.

Councilman Carmody: So that would be 60 feet?

Mr. Prevot: Yeah, 60 feet from the wires themselves.

Councilman Carmody: Just wanted to make sure that we were - - -

Councilwoman Robertson: That was 160 feet from the wires?

Mr. Prevot: No, it's 60 feet from the wire.

Councilwoman Robertson: So, you're within the 100?

Mr. Prevot: No Ma'am. It's 50 feet each side the center line of the wires.

Councilwoman Robertson: Oh, okay.

Mr. Prevot: And that's a SWEPCO requirement to maintain the power line.

Councilman Carmody: I appreciate that. I just wanted to clarify that. Thank you Mr. Prevot.

Councilman Green: Mr. Thrower, will you come forward please? I don't mean to put you on the spot, but what did you say your job was? What do you do?

Mr. Thrower: I'm a licensed Social Worker, and I also own a social service agency, Carlton Smith.

Councilman Green: Where were you raised?

Mr. Thrower: I was raised in Illinois. I grew up in subsidized housing for the first 15 years of my life. So did my brother who is a Major in the Air Force, and my sister who graduated from college and is doing very well in Dallas. So, I'm all too familiar with the conditions of growing up and seeing my friends not have the support

that I had with a mom and dad.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Goad, you wanted to make a statement, please come forward sir.

Mr. Goad: Yes sir, I would like to enlighten y'all on a couple of things. 1) I don't know whether y'all read the articles that I attached whenever I appealed it about electromagnetic fields. Electromagnetic fields are created by power lines. And they have found that within 600 feet of power lines, that children suffer a higher incidence of cancer, brain cancer. If anybody has ever seen a child with brain cancer, you would not want to see it again. The other thing in adults, they have found a large number of tumors have occurred in the brain as well as, (these are malignant tumors), as well as lung cancer. So, I think y'all are putting a project there which possibly in the future could come back to be a legal problem for you since you have these electromagnetic fields. I have tried to reiterate this to the MPC and to y'all. It needs to be addressed. My wife and I live within that 600 foot. I have had heart problems which is probably electro-conductivity problems which was probably caused by electromagnetic fields. My wife is a survivor of breast cancer. I have (inaudible) which I love and I have had eight over the last 29 years to die at this location. So, there is something in that area that causes some problems. The other thing with the water pressure, when I moved there 29 years ago, we had 60-65 lbs of water pressure. We were on the north end of the line. I have been checking it on a weekly basis and if I have 42 lbs of water pressure, I'm doing real good. So that is my point. You do not have - - - cannot continue to put people out there that are going to use a lot of water and continue to have water pressure that is adequate. Eventually, the fire department is going to say, "hey I can't fight a fire because I don't have any water pressure out here.

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Thrower, could you come forward again please? Thank you Mr. Thrower. If you have gone over it before, forgive me but, who is actually going to run the property? Who is going to - - - you're going to be an owner?

Mr. Thrower: We're the owner, developers and we're going to do property management.

Councilman Hogan: Okay, but who is going to - - - will you have someone on the property managing it? And as I look at the drawing, I see a community center, I see a day care center, I don't see an office. Will there be an office.

Mr. Thrower: The community center will also have a dual purpose.

Councilman Hogan: It will. Okay, anyone wanting to rent or apply for apartment will come to the community center?

Mr. Thrower: Right, the community center will be used at certain times of the day.

Councilman Hogan: Now whoever is running that office, are they going to be living on site, or not?

Mr. Thrower: Right now, no. Due to the tax laws. We have to have 100% subsidized.

Councilman Hogan: Okay. Will there be anyone there for - - - I know you can't call it a - - - you have to call them a courtesy officer of night manager. Would there be someone there perhaps that would qualify to oversee any problems for security?

Mr. Thrower: We hope to add something like that, later on. But as for now, we hadn't decided on whether we'll have someone there 24 hours. We are considering up to

midnight, 12 midnight. But we hadn't decided on whether we'll do it 24 hours.

Councilman Hogan: Okay, you sound uncertain whether you're considering it, really you're not sure. It just remains to be seen. You just hadn't made the decision?

Mr. Thrower: We hadn't made the decision yet. I mean, I'm just being honest with you. We hadn't made a decision on whether we're going to do it 24 hours or not. And I don't have the - - - I've yet to even speak with my partner as to how we're going to do it as far as security, in depth the security we're going to have. And we don't know if the funds are going to be there.

Councilman Hogan: Perhaps you might even wait and see if you have problems or whatever. The gate in my opinion will do something - - -

Mr. Thrower: That's the purpose of the gate, yes sir.

Councilman Hogan: And what will be the hours of the gate?

Mr. Thrower: The gate will be closed - - - well let me tell you when it will be open. From 6:30 to 9:30 in the morning to accommodate students going to school. And then after that it will be closed until 2:30 till 4:00 to accommodate students coming from school. And after that it will be closed. But as long as the day care will be open, we plan on doing 10:00 to day care, however, we're planning on 10:00 for the day care to be open, 10:00 p.m., we're going to have security there until that time.

Councilman Hogan: Okay, and is your day care going to be restricted only to the tenants children or is it going to be open to the public or what?

Mr. Thrower: It's going to be open to the public. The supporter services that we're going to be providing will be for the individuals that are living there. But it will be restricted to the individuals living there. However, for the day care will be open for the entire city. We see no reason to insulate such a needed program from the city, for those that are in need.

Councilman Hogan: Right. One final question. I'm interested to know if you had purchased the property yet or not?

Mr. Thrower: Yes we have.

Councilman Hogan: You have?

Mr. Thrower. We have.

Councilman Hogan: I do have one more comment Mr. Chairman. Mr. Woodson, you had called my house this evening. No need for you to come forward. And I just wanted to say something to you on the record. I have had lots of calls especially about the deal on Pines Road. You were the only person that contacted me about this development this morning by phone. And in a rush to get out of my house and come to the meeting here, I took your call and I heard what you were saying. It wasn't clear to me which development you were talking about. And as I said to other people that called me this morning, I did vote "NO" for the other development. I want to apologize to you, because I am voting in favor of. I told you I would vote "NO", and I misunderstood why you were calling. So, I want to apologize to you on the record for that.

Mr. Woodson: Mr. Chairman, can I say just one thing?

Councilman Lester: Hold on Mr. Woodson.

Mr. Woodson: I was limited at time, but I would just like to say that the meeting at the library. It was two ladies asked Mr. Thrower was the land or the property already zoned? He said yes. This is a courtesy call. So to take someone to get up here and say all these wonderful things, a man to his word and what he is going to do is what he is

measured by.

Councilman Lester: Any other questions or comments by the Council? I'd like to make a few statements, if I might. In light, timing is everything. I believe that if we could go back in time, 10, 15, or 20 years, and these gentlemen were to come forward with their project, having not had the three projects that are already over there with the program that they have, it probably would garner the support of the neighborhood. However, that's not the situation that we live in right now. Where we're sitting right now is people that live in North Lakewood Estates, and I used to live over there, have been literally assaulted by the apartment complex that adjoins their property. You have had a change in ownership, and the new apartment owner has literally declared war on the neighborhood. The first thing this person did was tore down the fence that was in bad need of repair that ran the length and width of their property. Literally exposing everybody's back yard to an apartment complex. This Council voted to change the rules. We enacted an ordinance that requires if you have an apartment complex and your apartment complex abuts a residential neighborhood rendering to development, you have to have a privacy fence. But again, we were not able to do that until this situation presented itself. And in fact, we're working with our (inaudible) department to get some redress to this particular apartment complex, because one of the findings in the statute says, any material change or alteration. And from where I sit, fixing up doors, doing some painting and things of that nature, that's enough in my mind to trigger the idea of any material alteration such that they have to put that fence back up. I say that because this particular development that is before this council does not and cannot operate outside of a vacuum. It has to be considered in light of everything that's there. You have had situations of across the street, there are several apartment complexes and I have had many a heart literally skip a beat by trying not to hit a child as they run across the street going back from one side of the road to the other, crossing between the apartment complex. We fought and it seems like when we get SWEPCO to finally come out and put some lighting there, the lighting is there for a while and then the lights go out for one reason or another. And it just creates a bad situation. I know that people are - - - some of the comments that have been made by the relates are related to the "these people" scenario. And I understand where Councilman Jackson is. I'm very sensitive when we talk about "these people", particularly given the fact that more often than not, these people look like me to people that don't look like me. And the arguments about these people have been used to keep people like me in certain situations as opposed to giving them opportunities to survive. So, I don't think that the "these people" argument is what we should be standing on. I think what we should be standing on is given everything that's going on in this particular area, this probably is a good project, but given everything that's around there, given the problems that we're having from the North Lakewood Apartments right behind it. Given some of the issues that we've had with apartment complexes just to the other side, another apartment complex over here, just doesn't make any sense. And I would ask the council to vote against this. Regardless of whether you have five people here or 20 people here, or if you get 20 calls or one call, you know, it only takes one person to tell you what the right thing to do is for you to be sensitive to it and listen to it. And I think that the residency has been clear and unequivocal - - - it's not that they have anything against folks that don't have or aren't blessed. It's a matter of what is over here. We're being inundated. Now, I will say this, and I do want to clear something up.

Reference has been made to Rosenwald. Lets factually distinguish Rosenwald from this particular development. Rosenwald is a development of single family homes. 1500 to 1700 square feet. This ladies and gentlemen is an apartment complex. Apples and oranges. Just so we be clear, because I don't want us leaving here thinking that the only thing that we're doing is throwing up low income housing, or apartment complexes. In fact, in this particular area, and we're going to talk about the Martin Luther King area, we've done Rosenwald. We've also done Shepherd Place. Shepherd Place is the first low to moderate income gated community for homeownership in the inner city, not just in the city. Not just in the State, in the United States. So we know it can be done. And that's some of the things that we're working on. And hopefully we can bring more to it. Again, I believe is we were talking about doing a Rosenwald or a Shepherd Place or something like that, where you have single family attached housing and if it was low income, I think it could be supported, because you don't have the density issue. You have people living in homes. People going to work everyday supporting themselves and trying to upkeep a house as opposed to an apartment complex where you've got any number of people coming in and out. And I want us to be clear and factually separate those two things. I don't want to leave any confusion on that. At the end of the day, I would just ask my Council colleagues to put themselves in the position of folks like Mr. Woodson, folks like Mr. Goad and folks like myself. He mentioned that the housing I live in, 945 North Lakewood, now that the gate is gone, you literally have, and this is no hyperbole, you literally have people walking from North Lakewood, right beside your house, right through your yard to the apartment complex, with no barrier. I've had situations where you're coming home and you're pulling up to get your groceries out of the car and somebody just walks past you and looks at you like you're in the wrong place. And it's wait a minute. I'm at my house. And they just look at you like "what's up," and just walk right past you through your yard, through your fence over what's left of your fence and goes to the apartment complex. And it is completely antithetical to anything logistical or logical for us to put anymore of this up here. I think it's clear that this probably is a good project, but this is the proverbial straw that broke the camel's back. And I would just ask the Council not to go forward with this and vote no.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, I want to just say again, the spirit of what you said, to tell you how I voted before. Rosenwald came up, there were some people at Council Meeting, Commissioner McCulloch talked just a little bit ago about folks were in opposition, we went forward, we forged on, we did it. Not only that, there was some housing that predated us with regards to MLK right next to Lake Bethlehem Church. And everybody said look at this junk. And we went over Rosenwald and there were people in University Park that said look at this junk. And we moved forward with both of those, even you know, even though we may have bristled a little bit, we moved forward in the idea that people needed somewhere to live. And then we came back and we put Shepherd's Place in and the reason we were in favor of Shepherd's Place is because it wasn't a repeat of Rosenwald and it wasn't a repeat of what's next to Lake Bethlehem. It increased the quality of the houses that were moving into the same area. What I'm suggesting to you is that what we're doing right now is looking at an increased quality project that we're putting in the middle of other projects that people oppose. And we're putting a better level of project in that which is the same thing we did on the other part of MLK. I'm only suggesting that it just follow suit that we would continue to do the same

thing that we've already done. We've voted for it, we forged forward. It hasn't been popular, but as you know and as some of the people there know, every person that lives in those houses are appreciative of the fact that those house now exist. Because they can have a certain level of dignity and the quality of life that may not have been afforded to them before. It's not a single detached home. It is a multi-family dwelling. Everybody can't afford to live in a single detached home, but I hope that this becomes a spring board for people to be able to live in a multi-family dwelling and then be able to get a credit rating and do other things that will allow them to move up, move out and to be able to better themselves. I hope that, that's the spirit with which we approach this. Not about who the folks are. We've done it before and for me, it would seem like we would be arbitrary if we do the same thing, in another area, and we don't do it in this area. And that's much of the reason and much of the logic that's guiding my decision in this particular area of trying to put quality developments even in the midst of things that are not so much quality. And I don't want to punish the latest developer for the sins of the past developers. I don't think that's fair to do that. So I would ask us, if you would, with all due respect to the Chairman, because I respect that and I think that the Chairman represents the area and certainly knows what the constituents in that area think. Our responsibility is to look at this thing to make sure that legally it fits the land use, and we're doing something that's compatible. I think it meets those particular requirements and for that reason, I would suggest that we would be in support.

Councilman Green: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to call for the question.

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

Councilman Lester: Alright. Debate has been limited. There is a motion on the floor to uphold the - - - to adopt I believe Ordinance 9.

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Chairman, I wanted to just clarify that a "YES" vote would be in favor of the development?

Councilman Lester: A "YES" vote is in favor of the development. A "NO" vote which is what I'm asking is against the development.

Motion to adopt Ordinance No. 9 of 2006 approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 5. Nays: Councilmen Lester and Carmody. 2.

Councilman Lester: Alright. That brings us back to our Regular Agenda.

Mr. Thompson: Yes, Consent Agenda legislation, 8A and 8B. We don't have any ordinances or resolutions. That would bring us to 8B, Resolutions.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Thompson, would it be orderly for us to take a 5 minute recess to allow the Chamber to - - -

Councilman Jackson: Stretch?

Mr. Thompson: Some members are going to take it anyway.

Councilman Lester: Okay. Well, I'll entertain a motion for a five minute recess.

Motion by Councilman Robertson, seconded by Councilman to Hogan to take a five minute recess. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Green, and Hogan. 6. Nays: None. Out of the Chamber: Councilman Jackson. 1.

The meeting recessed at 4:52 p.m. and reconvened at 5:05 p.m.

Councilman Lester: Alright thank you ladies and gentlemen for that extended 5/15 minutes recess. We're back on record. I think we suspended the rules, (and just to track where we are), to consider items 8 and 9, under - - - I believe it's the Consent Agenda Legislation. And now where we are - - - I'm sorry under Regular Agenda Legislation. Right now, we're back on and as I appreciate it, we are at 8A, Consent Agenda Legislation.

**CONSENT AGENDA LEGISLATION
TO INTRODUCE RESOLUTIONS AND ORDINANCES:
RESOLUTIONS: None
ORDINANCES: None.**

Councilman Lester: Mr. Thompson?

Mr. Thompson: We have no Resolutions, and we have no Ordinances.

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

The Clerk read the following:

RESOLUTION NO. 19 of 2006

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING LONNIE BRUCE CORNER & BOBBIE BROOKS CORNER, LOCATED AT 6600 WOOLWORTH RD., TO CONNECT TO THE WATER & SEWER SYSTEM OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

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

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened, that Lonnie Bruce Corner & Bobby Brooks Corner be authorized to connect the building located at 6600 Woolworth Rd. to the water & sewer system of the City of Shreveport.

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

invalid provisions, items or applications, and to this end, the provisions of this resolution are hereby declared severable.

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

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Hogan to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Green, and Hogan. 6. Nays: None. Out of the Chamber: Councilman Jackson. 1.

RESOLUTION NO. 20 OF 2006

A RESOLUTION REJECTING THE BIDS RECEIVED FOR IFB 06-007, RE-BID OF THE BARNWELL MEMORIAL GARDEN & ART CENTER CONSERVATORY RENOVATIONS FOR SPAR PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO

By:

WHEREAS, Three bids were received as a result of solicitations on IFB 06-007 for Re-Bid of the Barnwell Memorial Garden & Art Center Conservatory Renovations, and

WHEREAS, the City has rejected all bids due to a recommendation by SPAR Planning and Development for being over budget.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened that the bids received on IFB 06-007 be rejected;

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

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

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Walford to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Green, and Hogan. 6. Nays: None. Out of the Chamber: Councilman Jackson. 1.

RESOLUTION NO. 21 OF 2006

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE PURCHASING AGENT TO DISPOSE BY PUBLIC AUCTION OF CERTAIN SUPPLIES, MATERIAL, EQUIPMENT, AND VEHICLES AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO

WHEREAS, the Purchasing Agent, after consultation with various department heads, has determined that certain supplies, materials, equipment, and vehicles as shown in Exhibits A & B (attached) hereto are surplus, obsolete, or unusable for present and future City needs; and

WHEREAS, Ordinance No. 108 of 1980 authorizes the Purchasing Agent to dispose of certain supplies, materials, equipment, and vehicles determined to be surplus;

WHEREAS, the City Council desires to retain responsibility for the disposition of all surplus supplies, materials, equipment and vehicles having an acquisition value of \$10,000.00 or more; and

WHEREAS, the City desires to dispose of, by public auction, the supplies, materials, equipment, and vehicles described in Exhibits A & B attached hereto and made a part hereof, which have been determined to be surplus, obsolete or unusable for present and future City needs; and

WHEREAS, the City Council concurs in the finding that the supplies, materials, equipment and vehicles described in Exhibits A & B are surplus and no longer needed for public purposes and that the acquisition value of said properties are greater than \$10,000.

NOW BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened, that the Purchasing Agent is hereby authorized to dispose of, by public auction, the surplus supplies, materials, equipment and vehicles instruments described in Exhibits A & B attached.

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 Hogan: Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Lester: You have a question before we vote?

Councilman Hogan: I do. Right quick, sorry I'm a little late. Just one quick question for the Administration. Do we conduct the auction ourselves, or do we hire someone to do that?

Mayor Hightower: It's a auction company that does that.

Councilman Hogan: Lawler usually does those for us?

Mayor Hightower: Right.

Councilman Hogan: Okay, thank you Mr. Chairman.

Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Green, and Hogan. 6. Nays: None. Out of the Chamber: Councilman Jackson. 1.

ORDINANCES: None.

Councilman Lester: Are there any additional resolutions Mr. Thompson?

Mr. Thompson: No resolutions and no ordinances under this item.

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

The Clerk read the following:

RESOLUTION NO. 6 OF 2006

**A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO EXECUTE AN
AGREEMENT WITH THE SOUTHERN HILLS BUSINESS ASOCIATION 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 Walford, seconded by Councilman Carmody.

The Clerk read the following:

Amendment No. 1 to Resolution No. 6 of 2006

In the NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED paragraph, delete the date January 24, 2006 and substitute the date February 14, 2006.

Motion by Councilman Hogan, seconded by Councilman Green to adopt Amendment No. 1 to Resolution No. 6 of 2006. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Green, and Hogan. 6. Nays: None. Out of the Chamber: Councilman Jackson. 1.

Motion by Councilman Hogan, seconded by Councilman Green to adopt Resolution No. 6 of 2006 as amended. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Green, and Hogan. 6. Nays: None. Out of the Chamber: Councilman Jackson. 1.

Councilman Lester: Congratulations Mr. Hogan.

Councilman Hogan: Thank you fellow Council Members.

Councilwoman Robertson: It's been a long road.

RESOLUTION NO. 14 OF 2006

A RESOLUTION TO ADOPT THE SHREVEPORT COMPREHENSIVE REVITALIZATION STRATEGIES ADDENDUM TO ADD TWO NEIGHBORHOODS TO THE SHREVEPORT COMPREHENSIVE REVITALIZATION STRATEGIES REPORT AND GENERAL REDEVELOPMENT PLAN OF 1999, TO ESTABLISH THOSE NEIGHBORHOODS AS REDEVELOPMENT AREAS AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BY: COUNCILMEN LESTER AND ROBERTSON

Whereas, in 1999, the City of Shreveport, out of concern for the current and future condition of its neighborhoods undertook the development of a general redevelopment plan as contemplated by the Parish Redevelopment Law (R.S. 33:4625); and Whereas, by Resolution No. 307 of 1999 the City Council adopted the original General Redevelopment Plan, which was based on the Comprehensive Revitalization Strategies Report for seven target neighborhoods which were found to be suffering from slum and blight; and

Whereas, in 2004, several City Council Members sought to determine if the current General Redevelopment Plan needed to be amended to include two additional neighborhoods; the Cedar Grove and Martin Luther King, Jr.(MLK) neighborhoods; and

Whereas, the Department of Community Development then engaged J-Quad & Associates, LLC to assist the Department to determine if the Cedar Grove and MLK neighborhoods are suffering from slum and blight conditions as defined by the "Parish Redevelopment Law (R.S. 33: 4625 et sec)" and if so, to develop comprehensive revitalization strategies for these neighborhoods as an addendum to the General Redevelopment Plan; and

Whereas, the attached report styled "Shreveport Comprehensive Revitalization Strategies Addendum, prepared by the Department of Community Development and J-Quad & Associates, LLC, determined that the Cedar Grove and MLK neighborhoods are suffering from slum and blight conditions as defined by law, and it contains specific recommendations to address revitalization efforts in each neighborhood; and

Whereas, the continued existence of these conditions of slum and blight in these neighborhoods, will create social and economic liabilities for the City; will impose

onerous burdens on the City; decrease the tax base and reduce tax revenues; depreciating property values and thereby depreciating further general community values; and Whereas, revitalization of these two Shreveport neighborhoods in accordance with a sound plan for stabilization, enhancement, renovation, reinvestment, and redevelopment using powers and tools provided by R.S. 33:4625, the Parish Redevelopment Law, is desirable and necessary; and

Whereas, the prevention and elimination of slum and blight and their causes is a matter of public policy and concern.

Whereas, in accordance with the Parish Redevelopment Law, the Shreveport Comprehensive Revitalization Strategies Addendum was submitted to the planning commission of the municipality for review and recommendation as to its conformity with the general plan for the development of the municipality as a whole, and said document was unanimously adopted by the Metropolitan Planning Commission on December 7, 2005.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened the Shreveport Comprehensive Revitalization Strategies Addendum, by the Department of Community Development and J-Quad and Associates, LLC, dated August 2005 and filed with this Resolution, be adopted by the City of Shreveport as a part of its General Redevelopment Plan as contemplated by R. S. 33:4625, the Parish Redevelopment Law, to also guide revitalization actions in the two additional Shreveport neighborhoods designated as redevelopment areas herein.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the City finds that the two neighborhoods studied to produce the Comprehensive Revitalization Strategies Addendum, and defined therein, are found to be areas of slum and blight or areas likely to become such areas in the future without concerted action; and are hereby declared to be redevelopment areas in need of the full range of tools provided for the prevention and elimination of slum and blight.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the Comprehensive Revitalization Strategies Addendum and the General Redevelopment Plan are in compliance with the General Plan for the City of Shreveport.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that the City Council has held a public hearing on the redevelopment plan, after public notice in the manner required by law.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that in accordance with R. S. 33:4625(G) (2), the City Council is satisfied that adequate provisions will be made to re-house displaced families, if any, without undue hardship.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the Shreveport Redevelopment Agency, in cooperation with the Department of Community Development, the Metropolitan Planning Commission, and other departments and agencies as necessary are authorized and charged with carrying out the strategies in this plan to the prevention and elimination of slum and blight within Shreveport.

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

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

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Green to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Green, Hogan. 6. Nays: None. Out of the Chamber: Councilman Jackson. 1.

RESOLUTION NO. 15 OF 2006

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO EXECUTE GRANT DOCUMENTS WITH THE UNITED STATES U.S DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, AND OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO

WHEREAS, the U.S Department of Justice has invited the City of Shreveport Police Department and the Caddo Parish Sheriff's Office to file a joint application for grant funds under the Justice Assistance Grant Program; and

WHEREAS, the award, if approved will be for a total of \$157,561 and requires no cash match by the City of Shreveport. The funds will be split equally between the Shreveport Police Department and the Caddo Parish Sheriff's Office, with the City of Shreveport receiving \$78,780.50 and the Caddo Parish Sheriff's Office, receiving \$78,780.50.

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport shall make a joint application to receive an award as part of the Justice Assistance Grant Program to prevent and control crime based on local needs and conditions. The funds received by the Shreveport Police Department will be used to address crime trends throughout the City of Shreveport through the use of personnel overtime. The Caddo Parish Sheriff's Office will use their funds for the purchase of law enforcement equipment such as vehicles.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, regular and legal session convened, that it does hereby authorize the execution by Keith P. Hightower, Mayor, those grant documents necessary to apply and receive funding established within the program administered by the United States Department of Justice.

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 affect 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, Carmody, Robertson, Green, Hogan. 6. Nays: None. Out of the Chamber: Councilman Jackson. 1.

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 INTERESTS OWNED BY THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BY:

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport may own certain mineral rights underlying the following described property, to-wit:

Tract 1: A tract of land located in the Southeast Quarter (SE/4) of Section 23, Township 16 North, Range 14 West, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, and being more particularly described as follows:

Commencing from the Southeast corner of Section 23, Township 16 North, Range 14 West, Caddo Parish, Louisiana; thence North 00°45'33" East along the East line of said Section 23, a distance of 693.35 feet to a point on the Southerly Right of Way line of Southern Loop, being the Point of Beginning of the tract herein described;

Thence along said Southerly Right of Way line the following five courses:

North 73°23'49" West a distance of 44.83 feet;

North 67°34'24" West a distance of 280.70 feet;

North 66°50'42" West a distance of 210.98 feet;

North 59°00'14" West a distance of 119.24 feet;

North 68°39'35" West a distance of 206.42 feet to a point on the Easterly Right of Way line of Linwood Avenue, as recorded In Book 298, Page 218, Conveyance Records of Caddo Parish, Louisiana;

Thence along the arc of a curve to the right (Delta = 08°22'21", Radius = 1,095.92 feet, Chord= North 21°20'27" East, 160.00 feet) along said Easterly Right of Way line, a distance of 160.14 feet to the Northerly Right of Way line of Southern Loop;

Thence along said Northerly Right of Way line the following five courses:

South 68°39'35" East a distance of 156.42 feet;

South 75°28'00" East a distance of 168.74 feet;

South 79°29'46" East a distance of 82.48 feet;

South 70°14'45" East a distance of 196.50 feet;

South 74°21'47" East a distance of 167.27 feet to a point on the East line of said Section 23;

Thence South 00°45'33" West along said East line of Section 23, a distance of 262.63 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Said tract herein described contains 167,213.29 square feet or 3.838 acres.

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport has received a written request from JPD Energy, Inc. that the City seek public bids for an oil, gas and mineral lease covering said property; and

WHEREAS, the Louisiana Department of Natural Resources, State Mineral Board is available upon the request of the City of Shreveport to lease the aforesaid property for oil, gas and other minerals if requested to do so by the City of Shreveport.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Shreveport City Council in due, regular and legal session convened, that the Louisiana Department of Natural Resources, State Mineral Board be and it is hereby requested and authorized to seek public bids for an oil, gas and mineral lease covering the property described hereinabove.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that any such lease contain a no surface operations provision as follows: Lessee, its successors or assigns, may produce oil, gas and other minerals from the leased premises by drilling from a surface location on other lands, but notwithstanding any other provision of this lease, Lessee, its successors or assigns, shall not use the surface of the Lessor's property for drilling or any other operations without

prior written permission of Lessor, which permission may be withheld at Lessor's discretion.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that any such lease contain a horizontal pugh provision as follows:

Notwithstanding anything to the contrary herein contained, at the end of the primary term or any extension thereof by operations, if the Commission of Conservation of the State of Louisiana establishes a drilling unit which includes a part of the land herein leased, the production of oil, gas and other minerals from such unit shall maintain this lease in full force and effect only as to such portions of the leased land embraced in said pooled unit; and this lease shall expire as to that part of the land herein leased not included in such unit; and lessee, its successors and assigns agrees to relinquish by formal instrument any portion of the leased land not included in a unit created by the Commission of Conservation while this lease is in effect.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that any such lease contain a vertical pugh provision as follows: Upon the expiration of the primary term hereof or any extension thereof by operations, this lease shall automatically terminate and be of no further force or effect except as to all that part of the leased premises then included within the geographical boundaries of a producing unit duly established by governmental agency or authority having jurisdiction, from the surface of the earth to a depth of 100 feet below the deepest depth from which any well commenced during the primary term hereof on the leased premises or on lands pooled therewith is completed and from which there is production in paying quantities, such depth determination to be made on a unit by unit basis. In the absence of units so established, this lease shall terminate except as to 40 acres around each producing oil well and 160 acres around each producing or shut-in gas well located on the leased premises, in as near the form of a square as is practicable, from the surface of the earth down to a depth of 100 feet below the deepest depth from which said well or wells are completed and from which there is production in paying quantities, such depth determination to be made on a well by well basis.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that any such lease contain a minimum royalty provision as follows: Royalty of not less than 1/4th or 25%.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that any such lease contain a minimum bonus provision as follows: Bonus of not less than \$250.00 per acre.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that any such lease contain a maximum term provision as follows: Primary term of lease shall not exceed three (3) years.

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

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

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

Councilwoman Robertson: I know that in my area, in District D, that there are a

lot of different companies that are trying to do the mineral rights and all. Is there a particular reason that this particular JPD Energy or whatever was picked?

Mayor Hightower: No, we actually bid that out.

Councilwoman Robertson: Oh, you do? Okay, that answered my question.

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

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 SEWAGE TREATMENT SYSTEMS IN THE CROSS LAKE WATERSHED AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO

By:

WHEREAS, Cross Lake is the City of Shreveport's drinking water supply source; WHEREAS, faulty private sewage treatment systems in the Cross Lake watershed can contribute pollutants such as bacteria and nutrients to the lake; and WHEREAS, the city has been awarded a grant by the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality, through funding made available by the U. S. Environmental Protection Agency, for the purpose of assisting with the cost of repairing or replacing these systems and reducing the risk of pollution of the lake from such systems; NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of Shreveport, in due, regular and legal session convened, that Keith Hightower, Mayor, be and is hereby authorized to execute on behalf of the City of Shreveport a Cooperative Agreement with the Louisiana Department of Environmental Quality for the improvement of private sewage treatment systems in the Cross Lake Watershed, in accordance with the terms and conditions contained in the draft of said agreement which was filed for public inspection with the original draft of the resolution in the Office of the Clerk of Council on January 24, 2006.

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

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

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

Councilman Lester: Mr. Strong, can you give us a brief synopsis on this, because I've had some questions by some constituents in and around Cross Lake area. First of all, clarify this has nothing to do with any dredging of Cross Lake, correct?

Mr. Strong: No sir.

Councilman Lester: Okay, that answers that first of my phone calls.

Mr. Strong: 1) there's not enough money.

Councilman Lester: Well, I kinda figured that, but I had a number of questions so I wanted to relay that question to you. Could you kinda in a nutshell explain to us and to our constituents what we're dealing with this?

Mr. Strong: This actually is for the individual sewerage systems, the septic tanks in and around the lake where we were able to get a grant which allows us to buy some tools that we can use to actually locate and count the number of septic tanks, sewer systems in and around the lake no. 1. But will also allow us if we encountered some manned systems there and there's not sufficient money to do it, that it could be used as a grant as long as they come up with 50% of the money to do that as long as the money holds out.

Councilman Lester: How are we going to determine - - - I guess once you determine after you take a look at someone's septic system, whether or not it's up to our, I guess DEQ standards, and it needs repair. How are you going to determine - - - are you going to give them a bill or are you going to tell them that we fix it or are they going to get a certain time limit to bring their septic system up to the code? How is that going to work?

Mr. Strong: This will be through our inspectors getting orders out, if we encounter some of the bad situations that are on the lake. We know of some but this gives us some leave way, that they may not have the money to do it, that we can work with them on it.

Councilman Lester: Okay.

Mr. Strong: Understand that this is not probably a sufficient amount of money, but if this program is successful, we may get some more later on once we identify, because the biggest portion of it is going to identify all of the (inaudible) around the lake.

Councilman Lester: Well, I'm pretty sure you're going to get more calls. Cause I've gotten several. I'm sure Councilman Jackson has gotten some too!

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

RESOLUTION NO. 22 OF 2006

A RESOLUTION ACCEPTING DEDICATION FOR CEDARS COURT IN THE CEDARS UNIT NO. 18, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, legal, and regular session convened, that the dedication for Cedars Court in The Cedars Unit No. 18 in Section 5 (T16N-R14W), Caddo Parish, Louisiana, and as shown on the plats attached hereto and made a part hereof, be and the same is hereby accepted as dedicated to the public for public use in the City of Shreveport.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the original plat reflecting the dedication for Cedars Court be recorded in the official records of the District Court for Caddo Parish, Louisiana.

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 ordinance are hereby declared severable.

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

Mr. Thompson: I guess that's a street dedication.

Councilman Hogan: On which one?

Mr. Thompson: Number 22.

Councilman Hogan: That was an annexation, I was thinking it was a new development in my district.

Mr. Thompson: No, this is dedication of Cedars Court. I think it's a street. Is that right Mr. Strong?

Councilman Lester: Mr. Strong, could you come up?

Councilman Hogan: I've not been to the site. But I know it's a new development, there's some construction out there. It's a new street being put in right?

Mr. Strong: Yes, this is dedication of the new plat, Cedars Unit No. 18.

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

7. **Resolution No. 23 of 2006**: Adopting the System Survey and Compliance Questionnaire required by the Legislative Auditors Office of the State of Louisiana and otherwise to provide with respect thereto.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Walford to postpone for two weeks or until the next regular meeting.

Councilman Hogan: What's the purpose of postponing?

Councilman Lester: I'd like to find out, get some more clarity on exactly what this is because I think we're adopting some - - -

Councilman Hogan: Well, we have our Internal Auditor here, our director.

Councilman Lester: So, is this something that one of your Internal Auditors - - -

Councilman Hogan: It's something that we don on an annual basis.

Mr. Thompson: But there are certain questions the Council Members need to look at to make sure the answers that we have given are correct.

Councilman Lester: Well let me ask - - - I'm postponing because I want to make sure. Now if the members of the Audit and Finance Committee have said that they have vetted this, then I'm comfortable with it.

Councilman Hogan: We've not - - - If I may speak?

Councilman Lester: Councilman Hogan:

Councilman Hogan: I just wanted to say during the meeting earlier, I went over and asked Ms. Graham about it. As I recall it's something that we've done every year. It's something that will (inaudible) with KPMG.

Mr. Thompson: That's correct.

Councilman Hogan: It's something that's conducted by KPMG Internal Auditor.

Ms. Graham: The Finance Department actually completes that and Liz maybe able to tell you more about that.

Ms. Washington: As Councilman Hogan says, this is an annual something that is prepared by the city. It's required by the legislative auditors and it's something that KPMG uses in conducting it's audit.

Mr. Thompson: I think the question is do they need to do it today or can they wait two weeks?

Ms. Washington: If there are any questions, I'll be glad to ask them, but I don't think it will matter if you wait two weeks, but it does need to be done in a timely manner. I'll be glad to answer any questions.

Councilman Carmody: Could we get a copy of what has been done?

Mr. Thompson: It's on the electronic agenda.

Councilman Carmody: Yeah, but I can't open it.

Councilman Lester: Well, given that, can we just move to postpone?

Councilman Walford: You did.

Councilman Lester: Well we have to vote on it.

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 28, 2006)*

1. **Resolution No. 24 of 2006**: A resolution ratifying the Mayor's execution of Amendment No. 1 to the cooperative agreement between the City of Shreveport and Louisiana Department of Natural Resources for the implementation of a Clean Cities Program and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
2. **Resolution No. 25 of 2006**: A resolution authorizing the Mayor to execute a cooperative endeavor with the Junior League of Shreveport, Trends and Traditions: A Spring Market and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (D/Robertson)
3. **Resolution No. 26 of 2006**: A Resolution authorizing the Mayor to enter into a Trade Confirmation, all in connection with bonds issued to refinance indebtedness of the Shreveport Airport Authority and providing for other matter in connection therewith.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Walford to introduce Resolution No(s). 24, 25, and 26 of 2006 to lay over until the February 28, 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 28, 2006)*

Mr. Thompson: You have 11 through 17 and one that was added.

Councilwoman Robertson: We've got a couple of things, so could we take them maybe one at a time?

Councilman Lester: Well why don't we do this. Which is the one that you have

questions for?

Councilwoman Robertson: I have two questions on 16 and 17.

Councilman Lester: Can we entertain a motion to introduce 11 through 15?

1. **Ordinance No. 11 of 2006**: An ordinance mending and replacing Ordinance No. 2 of 1966, creating Stop Intersections, and otherwise providing with respect thereto. (C/Carmody)
2. **Ordinance No. 12 of 2006**: An ordinance amending the 2006 General Fund Budget.
3. **Ordinance No. 13 of 2006**: An ordinance declaring a certain adjudicated property to be surplus and to authorize the Mayor of the City of Shreveport to donate the City of Shreveport's tax interest in a certain surplus adjudicated property and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (A/Lester)
4. **Ordinance No. 14 of 2006**: An ordinance declaring certain adjudicated properties to be surplus and to authorize the Mayor of the City of Shreveport to sell the City of Shreveport's tax interest in certain surplus adjudicated properties and otherwise provide with respect thereto. (A/Lester/B/Walford/D/Robertson/G/Jackson)
5. **Ordinance No. 15 of 2006**: ANNEXATION - TAG NO: 05-06: Enlarging the limits and boundaries of the City of Shreveport – a tract of land located south of the Shirley Francis Road in the NE/4 of Section 5 (T16N-R15W), Caddo Parish, Louisiana, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (G/Jackson)

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Walford to introduce Ordinance No(s). 11, 12, 13, 14, and 15 of 2006 to lay over until February 28, 2006 meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 7.

6. **Ordinance No. 16 of 2006**: ANNEXATION – TAG NO: 05-09: Enlarging the limits and boundaries of the City of Shreveport – a tract of land located along the East Kings Highway in the SW/4 of Section 34 (T17N-R13W), Caddo Parish Louisiana, and an additional portion of East Kings Highway Right of Way, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (D/Robertson)

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Robertson, seconded by Councilman Green to introduce Ordinance No. 16 of 2006 to lay over until February 28, 2006 meeting.

Councilwoman Robertson: Yesterday at our Work Session, there was a question that came up. This is an annexation of a subdivision that I previously had a question about the water issues with it. Mr. Strong has gone back and they're passing out some information. They have found out that this is on the highway one side so that the water main is not an issue as far as water pressure to southeast further out. So, Mr. Strong do you have anything else to add?

Mr. Strong: And we could ask that we go ahead and be put on and we look at it as an annexation.

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

7. **Ordinance No. 17 of 2006**: ANNEXATION – TAG NO: 05-10: Enlarging the limits and boundaries of the City of Shreveport – two tracts of land located along the Flournoy Lucas Road and a portion of the I-49 in the E/2 of Section 12 (T16N-R14W), Caddo Parish, Louisiana, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (D/Robertson)

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Robertson, seconded by Councilman Green to remove Ordinance No. 17 of 2006 from the agenda.

Councilman Walford: Is that the appropriate - - - or to not introduce?

Councilman Lester: I think they want it removed, and it's supported by DOS.

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

9. **Ordinance No. 20 of 2006**: ZONING: C-05-06: 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 Burson Drive and Mansfield 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.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Walford to introduce Ordinance No. 20 of 2006 to lay over until February 28, 2006 meeting.

Councilwoman Robertson: And where is that on our agenda?

Mr. Thompson: It was one that was added. There was one that was not added and one that was added to the agenda. And this is rezoning property on the northwest corner of Burson Drive and Mansfield Road.

Councilwoman Robertson: And where is that on our agenda?

Councilman Lester: All we're doing is for introduction.

Mr. Thompson: It was one of the three that you considered.

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Chairman, this is actually a down zoning. The guy that lives on the property there. He wants to down zone it to residential. So, it's not a big issue. I don't think it should be. But would encourage you to introduce it and support it at the appropriate time.

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

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to make a motion to reconsider adding item 1, Zoning C-04-06.

10. **Ordinance No. 19 of 2006**: ZONING: C-04-06: An Ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, The City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the northerly side of Dee Street at its intersection with South Pointe Parkway, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from R-3, Urban, Multiple-Family Residence District to B-3, Community Business District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Walford to add and introduce Ordinance No. 19 of 2006 - Zoning C-04-06.

Councilman Carmody: Thank you Mr. Chairman. After talking with Mr. Kirkland, he had suggested we go ahead and move forward and I will make an effort to contact these developers and to ascertain what their intentions are with this rezoning, and we can take up the discussion and debate in two weeks.

Mr. Thompson: So, is the motion to add and introduce it?

Councilman Carmody: Correct.

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 March 14, 2006)*

1. **Ordinance No. 18 of 2006**: An ordinance authorizing the lease of City-owned property to Paxton Youth Boxing Club, Inc., and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Carmody to introduce Ordinance No. 18 of 2006 to lay over until the March 14, 2006 meeting.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Thompson and Mr. Walford, as I appreciate it, because this is a lease, this is a three-reader.

Mr. Thompson: That is correct.

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

ORDINANCES ON SECOND READING AND FINAL PASSAGE

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)*(Postponed – January 24, 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 adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 7.

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. (*Postponed – January 24, 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 Green.

Amendment No. 1 to Ordinance No. 2 of 2006

Delete the original Fact Sheet, Ordinance and Lease Agreement and substitute with the attached copies of the Fact Sheet, Ordinance and Lease Agreement.

Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Walford to adopt Amendment No. 1 to Ordinance No. 2 of 2005.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman and to the Administration. At the last meeting, we had concerns about issues in the contract, with particular regard to the city's ability to revoke and/or to regain complete use of that particular facility. It was some issues that I talked to the Mayor about with regard to the 14 year period. In our conversation, we talked about it and he said that it had been taken care of. But I don't know if you've seen it or not, but it didn't look as it had been taken care of.

Mayor Hightower: In the contract, the contract term is for 15 years. We can cancel with cause at any time during the 15 years. In an effort, and I think you'll recall when you and I talked about this later on, we talked about going back and changing it to five year periods and that was not sufficient for StageWorks to be able to feel comfortable in landing long term contracts with production companies. So we went back to the 15, but again we can cancel the contract for cause anytime during the 15 year period.

Councilman Jackson: But didn't we change the definition of what that cause was? We talked about public use at one place and then we came back, and in the amendment, I'm not - - - I think perhaps it's listed in the amendment with regard to that terminology or perhaps something that we received. But I think the real concern was that at that particular time, it would be the 14th year before we could invoke any kind of scenario that would cause even if it was for public cause, that we could get it back. And that was an issue the last time. And so, I'm saying that has principally anything changed, I know that some language been re-worded, but has principally anything changed about being able to do anything before the 14th year?

Mayor Hightower: Not without cause. Now if you wanted to be sure that we could cancel the contract in the 15th year and not be subject to being mindful and

watchful so that we would have to issue the 365 day notice, essentially we could offer that up the day after the contract was signed and it would be more than 365 days notice that we wished to terminate the contract at the end of the 15th year. But again StageWorks had a problem with shorter terms than the 15 year original proposal. So it is still 15 years. If for some reason StageWorks does not have production use in the facility for any length of time over one year, then they are subject to termination with cause. And that would be determined by City Council at the time.

Councilman Jackson: Okay, what is that specific language that speaks to that, because I'm looking at I guess it would be C, the C part. And again, I'm not in opposition, that was one of the concerns that we had last time and I wanted to be sure it was addressed. I think y'all had addressed everything else with regards to the - - - my other concern in regard to the type of movies and all those kinds of things. But the bottom line is at the last meeting, we were stating that the City could not revoke the lease for 14 years. Okay, and if the lease is renewed until the last year of the renewed term, then - - - I guess my question is principally as I said earlier, the net affect is the new language is the same thing as the last?

Mayor Hightower: It is. And when you and I met, I told you that we'd gone back to address your concerns, and the City Attorney's office had moved the 15 year term back to three five year terms renewable at the end of the third five year term. That clause was not agreeable by StageWorks, so we left that particular item as was. The only thing that we did do is clarify that we can terminate for cause the agreement within the 15 year term with notice so that we don't - - - so that we're not locked into 14 years if nothing is going on in the building. So, it's up to StageWorks and I think their attorney is here, and I don't know if Terri is here or not. Shelly and Ben (inaudible) are here, and they worked on it together. Shelly representing the City and Ben Warren representing StageWorks can maybe clarify it a little bit better. I think that I'm explaining it correctly. But - - -

Ms. Stone: Termination for cause is in Section 16. B talks about that termination for cause. When we went back to talk to them about your concerns, the concern is as much with them as in their ability to go to someone and say please come put your set or your production in our facility. If that production company has to worry that we're going to worry that we're going to revoke it without cause at any time. That's what became their concern. Last time we talked about the money they're putting into the building and all that being their concern. The concern is they have to show this contract to a production company and if we have public purpose revocation at anytime, the concern was why would I invest as Disney or a production company (inaudible) a stage or sound studio or whatever you call those, why would I do that if the city can kick me out at any time. And so this was - - - we changed this language three or four times, and what always came back was the best for us. Because we also didn't want financial penalties for the city. That's the other thing we were trying to avoid is you know if we revoked for no cause and had people invest this money, initially StageWorks, the production company, how was the best way, and all the way around and we came back to this same language.

Councilman Jackson: So, what is the benefit to the city under this particular language?

Ms. Stone: The benefit of this language (inaudible) or - - -?

Councilman Jackson: Right.

Ms. Stone: I think when we started looking at shortening the time period, they wanted to start looking at pay back for capital improvements, the production company set up sound stages or they set up sets for movies or for if we landed a series here in this building, and we didn't feel when we were working on it with legal, we didn't feel like it would be right for them to put some kind of financial burden on the city, we felt this was a better burden than the financial burden that might be on the city for repayment of capital improvements for work on the building by the production company. We were trying to find the best compromise for the city as well as for StageWorks.

Councilman Jackson: Okay, I just wanted to see because it seemed to me that if obviously this was going to be a bargaining chip for StageWorks to be able to go out and say, you've got complete site control for a period of X amount of years, and nobody going to talk to the dais is going to say do you have 15 years, because we need 15 years. That's not going to happen obviously, but on a project by project basis, they need whatever the amount of time may be. And I'm assuming that most people don't close the deal in February, wanting to start shooting the beginning of March. Would that be accurate, or does it work on that short a lease and the time frame is just like that?

Ms. Stone: I know we've been approached already. And somebody, there may be somebody here to answer that better.

Councilman Jackson: No, no. Here's what I'm saying. I'm saying that you don't run on the kind of schedule where if you had a movie that you wanted to do in March, that you called Shreveport in February, and say do you have this or is that something that happens? I mean I don't know, I'm asking.

Ms. Stone: I can't answer that for you.

Councilman Jackson: Okay, well maybe nobody here can answer. The reason I'm asking is because I would think language that's embedded in the contract would be such that puts us in a position where it's a win/win for both parties. That doesn't tie it up too long in case the city had some public use that was necessary. By the same token, that does not prejudice against that studio that says, "I need to do it," I'm assuming that - - - you know I don't know if that window is 90 days, 9 days, 10 days. My question is as a point of education. I think it would be good for us to know because if that's the case, if they work like this, then I would concur that perhaps that's what we need to do. Leave that language because probably make them feel safer if they plan like that. But if they're six months out, nine months out and those kinds of things, and I think that could shape how we would embed the language with regard to when we need it. And I don't think anybody would be in a position to want to say, we dangle this carrot, let's take it back. There are some people out there who may think (inaudible). We obviously we get involved and want to see it work to the benefit of everybody that's going to be involved. I just want to be sure that the language is there, that is mutually beneficial. And not just so- - - cause what the detractors who are out there saying. They're saying, "well, you're giving them - - - so, and so, and so." What I'd like to be able to give to them the mutual benefit and articulate what the mutual benefit is, so that the city is going to be benefited by this as well as the partners. And I called them that earlier. I guess technically our partners in the sense that we want them to be successful. It does us no good for them to not be successful at all. We want - - - we move forward with this, we need them to be successful. My question is that, it's not my responsibility for them to be successful, but it is my responsibility to be able to go back to our constituents and the taxpayers who own

it and say, “this was the best case scenario, it was a mutual benefit for all involved.” And that’s the reason I asked the question.

Ms. Stone: And I will tell you that we did spend a lot of time trying to verify which way was the best way. We wrote several drafts of public revocation. And the 365 days if they’re not doing business in the film business, the city can take that back. We have the right to take it back at any time. But the way we thought we could solve that for people who were investing and moving their sound stage there, their set or moving a series to that building was to say if you’re in business, and you’re doing this business, we’re not going to - - - all of a sudden, we’re not going to come in and say, “okay, the city has decided they want the building back.” And it took us a long time to make this full circle over the last, I would say six weeks to get back to this. We looked at depreciated values and that each year that we cancelled, we have to pay them, not only StageWorks for the depreciated value on the improvements they had made, but we also looked at what if there was a production company in there, what would our cost be if we asked them to relocate because we decided the city needed it. And this is how we worked back to this language. I don’t know that, that really answered your questions. Mr. Moorehead may be able to answer your question on how quickly these production companies work. I know we’ve been in a unique situation in Shreveport, we’ve had to work really, really fast since Hurricane Katrina. We’ve moved several movies here and we get calls - - - Premonition probably happened in the last three months. The Guardian happened in weeks. So, they may be able to answer that if you’d like them to.

Councilman Jackson: No, you understand why I was asking - - - what my point was. Because I think we ought to make decisions based on some information of how the industry works. If they work on a whim, then we have to have the language that will benefit the people who work on a whim. If we know 90 days or 120 days before, I was just interested for my own personal edification. I don’t know and that was the reason I was asking the question. The last thing Mr. Chairman that I had was with regard to this agreement that we have to sublet space in the Expo Hall. We’d be subletting space for storage, I believe it is?

Ms. Stone: That’s for us.

Councilman Jackson: No, I said we would be subletting - - - I guess technically we would be - - -

Ms. Stone: They would have to allow us to continue to store equipment there or they would have to find us storage within the B-4 Central Business District.

Mr. Antee: We’re retaining the use.

Councilman Jackson: Okay the language says sublet. Is that incorrect?

Mr. Antee: No.

Councilman Jackson: Technically we would be subletting.

Mayor Hightower: At no cost to the city. And it’s at the option of StageWorks to either provide current city employees with office space or find us office space. Storage - - - current storage at Expo Hall or provide us storage, like Shelly said in the B-4. So that, we left that carrot dangling with StageWorks. Either they can let us continue to use the building and make room for us, or at their expense, they can provide us B-4 coverage for our current uses.

Councilman Jackson: And that would be for the personnel? Space for our personnel.

Mayor Hightower: Personnel, tables, - - -

Councilman Jackson: The next space talks about 5,000 square foot of storage space for our use either on the leased premise or at a location within the B-4, is be in the same building that you had the other that was built with the \$200,000?

Mayor Hightower: They could make it go anywhere they wanted to.

Councilman Jackson: So, this would be a different setting? The \$200,000 would be for - - -personnel.

Mayor Hightower: Correct.

Councilman Jackson: And then the 5,000 square feet would be something for storage that may not necessarily be - - -

Mayor Hightower: Different.

Councilman Jackson: Incorporated in that particular building, but maybe somewhere else.

Ms. Stone: Yes sir.

Councilman Jackson: At whose choice, do they choose?

Ms. Stone: But it has to be within that B-4 district.

Councilman Jackson: It's in the B-4, but it's at their choosing, is that correct? Without our acceptance, or without our - - - I mean, they can just choose if the 5,000 square feet - - -

Ms. Stone: Only the warehouse space they can choose with some specifications on warehouse space. It may be an office building where we have tables and chairs.

Councilman Jackson: Right, so you have some language that suggest that, because it doesn't say it. It just says for city's use either on the leased premise or at a location within the B-4 at tenants expense. But it doesn't say - - -

Ms. Stone: But doesn't it say warehouse space though?

Councilman Jackson: Well, I didn't see it in mine, in Paragraph 2 of Section 4, entitled Administrative Storage and other Space.

Ms. Stone: I think it says under B, Storage Space. I know that there is says warehouse space, and we called it storage space in the lease, not warehouse space.

Councilman Jackson: Well, I just want to be clear that the spirit of what you were saying was certainly going to be acknowledged by the tenants and by the city that this is what we're talking about particularly, I guess warehouse space, or appropriate space for storing specific items.

Ms. Stone: I think we communicated to Mr. (inaudible) what type of space we were looking for, for storage in nature to what we want to store like files and records, tables, chairs, staging equipment for all of our (inaudible) facilities.

Councilman Jackson: I'm sorry Mr. Chairman, I did have one other question. In section 29, a new section requires the city to remove all signs from the leased premise within 60 days of the execution of the lease agreement which identifies the property as L. Calhoun Allen Exposition Hall. Is that by and large the marquis?

Ms. Stone: No, the marquis is not coming down.

Councilman Jackson: But it does have L. Calhoun Allen on it, so my question was if the marquis was the exception? It didn't say it in the language, it just says all signs from the leased premise within 60 days. And so I assumed that, that meant that marquis as well.

Ms. Stone: Does that say all signs affixed to the building or all signs?

Councilman Jackson: It says all signs from the leased premise within 60 days of execution of the lease agreement which identifies the property as L. Calhoun Allen Exposition Hall.

Ms. Stone: And I think where we're - - -

Mr. Antee: The next sentence does state that tenant shall be permitted to use any electronic signs which is the marquis and they may at their expense erect other signs stating the name of the business.

Councilman Jackson: Okay, I had what they sent to me from Terri Scott. I didn't - - - I guess it was a new point that she's adding. So, I didn't see.

Ms. Stone: And the other thing you don't have the advantage of is in here the map that shows the leased premises, that is actually - - - that piece is outside the - - -

Councilman Jackson: Say again?

Ms. Stone: You don't have the advantage of the map that shows the leased premises is actually outside the leased premises. And that's why we put in they could use it because the sign is actually outside the leased premises. You know it sits between the street and the sidewalk. The sign is actually outside the leased premises. And that's why we were specific about putting in they could use it.

Councilman Jackson: Right. That answered my question. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Carmody: The questions regarding the signage and the requirement to de-identify the building basically. Then is the tenant going to be responsible for maintaining those signs or will those signs be provided to the city and the city will be the repository signs for those signs. If at such point that we come back and take possession of the Exposition Hall - - -

Ms. Stone: We're going to remove those and store those.

Councilman Carmody: The City of Shreveport is. Alright, I have a couple of other questions Mr. Chairman. I had asked our Director of Spar if she could provide me some financial information about the facility, and I think that we'd been through and acknowledge that the Exposition Hall was actually built in 1980 at a cost of about \$9,000,000. And what I'd asked is if we had the financial information on the income that was actually produced as rental for the facility and correct me if I'm wrong Shelly, but I believe it - - - y'all could go back as far as 1997 which was the highest year which we had in our records for rentals, which generated approximately \$101,000 in rent.

Ms. Stone: \$191,000.

Councilman Carmody: I'm sorry, \$191,000. But that based upon the actual rental that had been received over the last few years, if you basically averaged it out over the lifetime of that particular municipal venue that it's probably generated in direct rentals about \$2,000,000. And again, we're not talking about the cost of actually keeping the facility open an operating maintenance, insurance and everything else, but I think there is a point to be made here because our conversation actually started on the financial burden that the city has in maintaining this facility. And that there is a cost associated with anytime municipalities go into the business of creating public venues for rental purposes. It's very difficult to qualify economic impact if you look strictly at direct rentals. But there is a cost associated over and above just the direct rental you received as far as staffing, maintenance, taking care of the building, making sure that it is ready to go for the next facility, and all that has to weigh heavily on what we're talking about here. As I

had mentioned to some other Council Members, I think the risk is really on the tenant in this respect. Someone had contacted me and said they were very concerned about the fact that it appeared to be a give away by the city. And I'm not sure that you could actually say it's a giveaway. It's simple enough to look at the lease and say, "well, they're only paying \$100.00 a month," but there also by the terms of the agreement that we have in front of us responsible for all the expenses tied to the operation of the facility. And if I remember correctly, when the Mayor first brought this idea to us, that it was basically to save the City's general fund approximately \$400,000 a year. Okay? And again, so you have to weigh it from the standpoint of it's not a giveaway to these people. They're the ones that are going to put their money into this risk and then have to try to find people to cover their cost. And if I remember correctly, approximately the cost is \$40,000 a month to basically have ownership or should I say have possession of that facility. And we are in a unique opportunity in Shreveport right now and based on the conversations with those in the industry to say if the facility was here, it would be another amenity to the City of Shreveport to attract productions. Television, movies, music, and granted we're not in the business of making a profit. As we all know by the time we go through our budget, but I think we are in the position of trying to facilitate economic development. And this is actually a bird nest on the ground, in my opinion, to the City of Shreveport. And it's unfortunate that as a result of the tragedies of other Louisiana citizens, but be that as it may. Have one other question for you, and I don't see it here in the agreement. We do have a concessionaires contract from municipal venues. Is the concessionaires contract terminated by the lease of this property to StageWorks?

Ms. Stone: Yes, theirs is language in their contract that says if we were to close the facility or not operate the facility, that that part of the lease would be terminated.

Councilwoman Robertson: I have two questions. 1) I know that we had a question about the terminology last time, and there was an industrial use, and industrial enterprise and that type of thing. And I'm looking at it, and I guess y'll've gone through it and changed it in here it's saying permitted uses under the Louisiana Revised Statutes. Is that still going to go back to the industrial enterprise and all?

Mayor Hightower: I think all we did was just change the language because the Council had a problem with industrial, and we didn't want a cotton gin in there or something. And so industrial use, the definition of that is the industry. The industry being film production, sound business.

Ms. Stone: And if you look in Section 1, Paragraph 2, she defines what that is and says that it will be referred in the rest of the lease we use the words permitted uses. But if you see the first - - -

Councilwoman Robertson: It says not limited to activities which qualify for an exclusion on credit under Louisiana Revised Statute, and I think that's what they originally had taken the words from and it had that industrial enterprise in it.

Ms. Stone: But I think in the first sentence, she says the leased premises shall be used by tenants for the operation of production studio and/or activities and uses related to the development of film. And that's how she wanted to define it there, so that it would be clear. That those are the only uses that they could have.

Councilwoman Robertson: My second question, Councilman Jackson touched on it, but we had discussed about the type of film being used that were there. Was that put anywhere in here?

Ms. Stone: Yes.

Councilwoman Robertson: Okay. He had mentioned it, but I didn't hear an answer, so.

Ms. Stone: Prohibited activities is in Section 18.

Councilman Lester: I have a question and maybe someone with the development can speak to this. Paragraph 26 deals with cooperation by the city. It says upon tenant's request, the city shall without cost to tenant promptly join in and execute any instruments as tenants may from time to time request to enable a tenant from time to time to use the leased premises in accordance with this lease agreement provided the tenant's request is in reasonable and customary form and does not cause the leased premises to be encumbered as security for any obligation, does not otherwise expose the leased premises to any material risk or forfeiture during the initial term or renewal term of this lease agreement. What led us to this? Because I'm trying to - - - it makes the point of saying that it shall not limit or otherwise affect the review of such application by the City of Shreveport or any department thereof charged with the responsibility for the review, and it shall not imply guarantee that such application will be approved by the City of Shreveport. What led us to require that we have to - - - I'm trying to understand why would we need a clause in there that says cooperation by the city? What kind of uses or I guess whatever would be contemplated by that?

Mr. Warren: If there's any third parties that require some confirmation as to what the City and the tenant believe the lease says, this clause was designed so that they can - - - the city can come in and agree with the tenant as to what the use and permitted purpose is. So that third party can rely on that signed document by the city and tenant. That's the reason for the clause.

Councilman Lester: So, lets XYZ Corporation wants to come in and use the facility for its intended purpose, i.e., a sound stage. What this paragraph or this section says that the lease showing XYZ Corporation, the lease isn't enough, they would want an additional guarantee by the city that the - - -

Mr. Warren: Not so much a guarantee as it could be a clarification as to a paragraph that might be seem ambiguous to a third party. And as long as the city and the tenant are in agreement, then such document can be signed acknowledging that.

Councilman Lester: I guess my next question would be to Ms. Glass. And thank you for that explanation. Procedurally what would the Council's position be within the idea of review. It says it shall not limit or otherwise affect the review of such application by the city or any department. Is this something that by agreeing to this, we are authorizing the Mayor to sign or have the CAO or someone with the Mayor's office sign any such agreement, or does that require if in fact there is a document that needs to be reviewed to support something that this group is doing, that had come back to the council?

Ms. Glass: I think normally on things like this, when it says the city, if what is being requested is within the scope of the contract, then the Mayor as the Administrator or administering the contract has the authority to make those decisions. If it's something that goes beyond the scope of the contract, then it would probably need to come back to council.

Councilman Carmody: And I might readdress this to the attorney. You couldn't do this in the form of Aslope certificate to basically acknowledge that both parties are in

full compliance with the terms and conditions of the agreement?

Mr. Warren: You probably could. That's just how the City Attorney chose to address it.

Councilman Carmody: I mean and I could see a scenario in which you were going to, and I just throw this out, that a tenant would basically be looking to finance acquisition of personal property to be placed inside the facility. And therefore the lender would want to know that they have some guarantees that everybody was in full compliance with the terms and conditions of the lease. But the way that I read it almost sounds as if and I hate to speculate this, but the tenants would be coming back to make a loan with the city, and ask for us to actually review that to provide them with some economic incentive, and I'm sure that's not what the intent is.

Mr. Warren: No, it's just to clarify what the terms and conditions of this lease agreement. That's all.

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

Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Walford to adopt Ordinance No. 2 of 2005 as amended. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 7.

3. **Ordinance No. 4 of 2006**: An ordinance amending the 2006 Budget for the Police Grants Special Revenue Fund.

Having passed first reading on January 24, 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 Carmody, seconded by Councilman Walford to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 7.

4. **Ordinance No. 5 of 2006**: An ordinance amending the 2006 Capital Improvements Budget.

Having passed first reading on January 24, 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 Jackson, seconded by Councilman Walford.

Amendment No. 1 Ordinance No. 5 of 2006.

Amend the Ordinance as follows:

In Program C (Streets Improvements):

Increase the appropriation for **Sidewalk Program and Curb Cuts (01C029)** by \$250,000. Funding source is 1999 GOB Prop. # 4.

Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Carmody to adopt Amendment No. 1 to Ordinance No. 5 of 2006. Motion approved by the following

vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 7.

Amendment No. 2 to Ordinance No. 5 of 2006

AMEND THE ORDINANCE AS FOLLOWS:

In Program C (Street Improvements):

Increase the appropriation for **GIS Map Development (01-C030)** by \$20,000. Funding source is 2001 GOB.

In Program H (Airports Improvements):

Change the title of Project (06H008) to **Rehabilitation of Lighting on Taxiway “E”-Regional Airport** with no change in funding.

Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Walford to adopt Amendment No. 2 to Ordinance No. 5 of 2006. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 7.

Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Walford to adopt Ordinance No. 5 of 2006 as amended. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 7.

5. **Ordinance No. 208 of 2005**: ZONING – C-89-05: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the northwest corner of West 63rd and Linwood Avenue, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from R-1H, Urban, One-Family Residence District, to B-2, Neighborhood Business District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (F/Green)(*Postponed – January 24, 2006*)

Having passed first reading on November 29, 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 Green, seconded by Councilman Walford to postpone. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 7.

6. **Ordinance No. 6 of 2006**: ZONING – C-98-05: 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)

Having passed first reading on January 24, 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 Hogan, seconded by Councilman Walford to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson,

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

7. **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)

Having passed first reading on January 24, 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 Jackson, seconded by Councilman Walford.

Amendment No. 1 to Ordinance No. 7 of 2006.

In the title and in Section I of the ordinance, delete the phrase “6 cars only” and substitute the phrase “3 cars only”.

In Section II, amend stipulation No. 2 to read as follows:

2. The maximum number of automobiles for sale shall be limited to no more than three on the site at any one time. Only the three vehicles allowed for sale may be displayed in front of the business. All other vehicles must be stored in the fenced area behind the business except during business hours when they are being worked on.

Motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Carmody to adopt Amendment No. 1 to Ordinance No. 7 of 2006.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Kirkland, if you would for the benefit of the council, I had drafted this amendment to go along with what we did last year. But in my discussion with you during the recess, it sounds like we are creating more of a problem with this amendment than we’re solving.

Mr. Kirkland: There was a view of the Planning Commission, Mr. Cooper has been on conditional approval now for going into I think the fourth year. And there were some problems that Mr. Cooper was not following zoning law, but within the last year or two, we’ve got no indications that he’s violated the law. There are allegations that he’s parking some of his cars for sale in other parts of the neighborhood. You are familiar with the site, as am I. Some of the other councilmen may be. It’s an old service station site. It could easily accommodate 10-12 used cars for sale at the site. Three is almost so minimal a number that he really can’t say that he’s in business. One of the arguments at the MPC level was lets give the man a chance to run a bona fide business. Six cars limit is what the board approved, thinking that would be a reasonable number and maybe if he has been parking cars elsewhere in the neighborhood, maybe he’d put ‘em all on site and the point is trying to be reasonable with the businessman, give him an honest chance to make a success. I’m not saying it’s right if he parking cars elsewhere to condone that in any way. But that was the reasoning of the boards is to give him a reasonable number. He can easily do that without overcrowding the site.

Councilman Walford: Okay.

Mr. Kirkland: And so that’s why we’d recommend strongly the board’s action be

approved by you.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Chairman, with that I'd like to make a substitute motion to remove Amendment No. 1.

Motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Lester to remove Amendment No. 1 to Ordinance No. 7 of 2006. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Out of the Chamber: Councilman Green. 1.

Motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Carmody to adopt Ordinance No. 7 of 2006 and uphold the decision of the Metropolitan Planning Commission. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Out of the Chamber: Councilman Green. 1.

Mr. Thompson: We've done 8 and 9 and we're now on No. 10.

10. **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.

Having passed first reading on January 24, 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 Lester to adopt.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Kirkland, as I appreciate it, this deal with the new convention center?

Mr. Kirkland: It essentially takes the MPC out of having to require the City of Shreveport to apply for a Zoning Board of Appeal approval. It's really a no brainer for the board. Mr. Walford, as you know, if the City of Shreveport is going to run the establishment of the business, and I'll use an example, the Mariner. There is no reason in the world for the ZBA to put the city through that process when the end result is the City of Shreveport's got the Police Department to enforce laws. If they're not going to abide by the rules, nobody is. So, the bottom line is - - -

Councilman Lester: I don't know about that.

Mr. Kirkland: It's removing a hassle in our opinion that's not necessary (inaudible) some ordinance amendments that will allow you to continue doing what you're doing, which is name the venues that are okay for consumption of alcohol. So that's essentially it.

Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Out of the Chamber: Councilman Green. 1.

The adopted ordinances and amendments follow:

ORDINANCE NO. 1 OF 2005

A 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.

WHEREAS, Act 545 of 2004 of the State Legislature authorized within the Department of State the creation of a museum at the McNeil Street Pumping Station (Exhibit A); and

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport approached the State of Louisiana in 2003, requesting that the State of Louisiana take the McNeil Pumping Station into the State of Louisiana's Department of State Museum System (Exhibit B); and

WHEREAS, the 2004 legislative session approved the acceptance of this donation; and

WHEREAS, LSA-R.S. 33:4712 requires that notice of this ordinance be published at least three (3) times within fifteen (15) days, one week apart; and

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport desires to give, grant, convey donate, assign, set over and deliver unto the State of Louisiana the McNeil Street Pumping Station, more particularly described in the Act of Donation attached hereto as Exhibit C;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED 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 Act of Donation of the McNeil Street Pumping Station from the City of Shreveport to the State of Louisiana, substantially in accordance with the document filed along with the original copy of this ordinance in the Office of the Clerk of Council on December 8, 2005, attached hereto as Exhibit C.

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

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

ORDINANCE NO. 2 OF 2006

AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE LEASE OF L. CALHOUN ALLEN EXPOSITION HALL TO STAGWORKS OF LOUISIANA, L.L.C., AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BY:

WHEREAS, City is the owner of immovable property located at 400 Clyde Fant Parkway, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, together with all buildings, structures, and other improvements located thereon, commonly referred to as "Expo Hall", and the adjoining property located at _____, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, commonly referred to as the "Vendor's Parking Area", the said property more particularly described in Exhibit "A", attached hereto and made a part hereof, and any or all furniture, fixtures and equipment contained in Exhibit "B" attached hereto and made a part hereof, all of which said property is hereinafter collectively referred to as the "Leased Premises; and

WHEREAS, the said property is not needed by City for a public purpose; and

WHEREAS, StageWorks of Louisiana, L.L.C. "(Tenant)" desires to operate a production studio and/or activities and uses related to the promotion or development of

the film, sound, light, movie, television, broadcasting, recording and arts industries including, but not limited to activities which qualify for any exclusion or credit under Louisiana Revised Statutes 47:1122, et seq., the Louisiana Motion Picture Incentive Act; and

WHEREAS, Tenant has requested and City desires to lease the said property to Tenant for the purpose(s) stated herein for an Initial Term of fourteen (14) years with the option to renew for one (1) fifteen (15) year Renewal Term and subject to the terms and conditions set forth in the Lease Agreement; and

WHEREAS, City has determined that Tenant's use of the Leased Premises for the purpose(s) stated herein will have a positive economic impact upon the City of Shreveport, including the promotion of employment, the promotion of the film, sound, light, movie, television, broadcasting, recording and arts industries in the City of Shreveport, and general stimulation of economic development in downtown Shreveport, the value of which has been considered by City, along with the value of the Expo Hall, in entering this lease agreement; and

WHEREAS, City declares and confirms that the use of Expo Hall for the purpose(s) stated herein constitute a use for public purpose and a cooperative endeavor between City and Tenant for a public purpose as provided under Article VII § 14(C) of the Constitution of the State of Louisiana; and

WHEREAS, LSA-R.S. 33:4712 requires that notice of this ordinance be published at least three (3) times within fifteen (15) days, one week apart.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened, that the City of Shreveport is hereby authorized to lease L. Calhoun Allen Exposition Hall to StageWorks of Louisiana, L.L.C., and the Mayor is hereby authorized to execute any and all documents on behalf of the City of Shreveport relative thereto provided such documents are substantially in accord with the draft hereof filed for public inspection in the Office of the Clerk of Council on January 10, 2006.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that a certified copy of the lease authorized herein and all Exhibits attached thereto, or an extract thereof, shall be filed and recorded in the conveyance records of Caddo Parish, Louisiana.

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

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

Amendment No. 1 to Ordinance No. 2 of 2006

Delete the original Fact Sheet, Ordinance and Lease Agreement and substitute with the attached copies of the Fact Sheet, Ordinance and Lease Agreement.

ORDINANCE NO. 4 OF 2006

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2006 BUDGET FOR THE POLICE GRANTS SPECIAL REVENUE FUND AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BY:

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

WHEREAS, the City Council finds it desirable to amend the 2006 budget for the Police Grants Special Revenue Fund, to appropriate new revenues and for other purposes.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in legal session convened, that Ordinance No. 175 of 2005, the 2006 budget for the Police Grants Special Revenue Fund, be amended and re-enacted as follows:

In Section 1 (Estimated Receipts):

Fiscal Year 2006 Revenues:

Appropriate Fire Act Grant at \$150,000.

In Section 2 (Appropriations):

From Fiscal Year 2006 Revenues:

From Fire Act Grant, appropriate \$150,000 to Improvements and Equipment.

Adjust totals and subtotals accordingly.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the remainder of Ordinance No. 175 of 2005 shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

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

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

ORDINANCE NO. 5 OF 2006

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2006 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS BUDGET AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

By:

WHEREAS, the City Council finds it necessary to amend the 2006 Capital Improvements Budget to transfer funds between projects and for other purposes.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in legal session convened, that Ordinance No. 166 of 2005, the 2006 Capital Improvements Budget, be further amended and re-enacted as follows:

In Program F (Sewer Improvements):

Increase the appropriation for **Woolworth Road Landfill Sewer Outfall (01F005)** by \$175,000. Funding source is 2005 URB.

Decrease the appropriation for **Corbitt Street Water and Sewer Mains (02F009)** by \$175,000. Funding source is 2005 URB.

In Program H (Airports Improvements):

Increase the appropriation for **Land Acquisition for Security Purposes (99H002)** by \$315,000. Funding sources are Shreveport Airport Authority \$15,000, State Grant \$15,000 and Federal Aviation Administration \$285,000. Do not change the total appropriated for Program H.

Adjust totals and subtotals accordingly.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the remainder of Ordinance 166 of 2005, as amended, shall remain in full force and effect.

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

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

Amendment No. 1 Ordinance No. 5 of 2006.

Amend the Ordinance as follows:

In Program C (Streets Improvements):

Increase the appropriation for **Sidewalk Program and Curb Cuts (01C029)** by \$250,000. Funding source is 1999 GOB Prop. # 4

Amendment No. 2 to Ordinance No. 5 of 2006

AMEND THE ORDINANCE AS FOLLOWS:

In Program C (Street Improvements):

Increase the appropriation for **GIS Map Development (01-C030)** by \$20,000. Funding source is 2001 GOB.

In Program H (Airports Improvements):

Change the title of Project (06H008) to **Rehabilitation of Lighting on Taxiway “E”-Regional Airport** with no change in funding.

ORDINANCE NO. 6 OF 2006

BY:

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

SECTION I: BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, in due, legal and regular session convened, that the zoning classification of Lots 5 & 6, Dean Terrace Subdivision, Unit #1, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, located on the south side of Bert Kouns Industrial Loop 880 feet west of Walker Road, be the same is hereby changed from R-1D, Urban, One-Family Residence District, to B-3, Community Business District, with MPC Approval.

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

1. Development of the property shall be in substantial accord with a revised site plan that complies with all ordinance requirements. This plan shall be submitted to and approved

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

2. Site shall be platted into one lot prior to the issuance of any permits.

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

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

ORDINANCE NO. 7 OF 2006

BY:

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, AN AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO

SECTION I: BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, in due, legal and regular session convened, that the zoning classification of Lots 6, 7, & S. 25 feet of Lot 5, Block D Texarkana Annex, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, located on the NW corner of Creswell and Olive Streets, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, be and the same is hereby continued as B-2-E, Neighborhood Business/Extended Use District, limited to auto repair/filling station, auto sales of 6 cars, only.

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

1. Development of the property shall be in substantial accord with the site plan submitted with any significant changes or additions requiring further review and approval by the Planning Commission
2. The maximum number of automobiles for sale shall be limited to no more than six on the site at any one time.
3. No body work shall be done at this location.

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

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

ORDINANCE NO. 9 OF 2006

BY:

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

SECTION I: BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, in due, legal and regular session convened, that the zoning classification of property located on the south side of North Market, 650 feet east of Devereaux Road, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, legally described below, be and the same is hereby changed from B-2-E, Neighborhood Business/Extended Use District to R-3-E, Urban, Multiple-Family/Extended Use District, limited to apartments, community center, and a day care, only, on the southern portion of the property, with the northern portion of the property zoned B-2, eliminating the "E" classification on said portion.

Property legally described as follows: **B-2-E to R-3-E**: A tract of land located in the E/2 of the NW/4 of Section 4, T18N-R14W, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana and being more fully described as: Commencing at the SE corner of the SW/4 of the NW/4 of said Section 4, measure N00°53'11"E for a distance of 813.30 feet to a found 1¼ inch iron pipe and the P-O-B of tract herein described. From the P-O-B measure N89°40'17"W for a distance of 385.58 feet to a found 1¼ inch iron pipe; thence N00°59'57"E for a distance of 393.85 feet to a set ½ inch iron rod; thence measure S89°18'21"E for a distance of 384.07 feet to a point on the W line of North Lakewood Estates Commercial Sites, Unit No. 3; thence measure S00°46'49"W along the Western line of said Unit No. 3 for a distance of 391.38 feet to a found 1¼ inch iron pipe which marks the S Western most corner of Lot 3 of said Unit No. 3, and the P-O-B.

B-2-E to B-2: A tract of land located in the E/2 of the NW/4 of Section 4 T18N-R14W, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, and being more fully described as: Commencing at the SE corner of the SW/4 of the NW/4 of said Section 4, measure N00°53'11"E for a distance of 813.30 feet to a found 1¼ inch iron pipe; thence measure N00°46'49"E for a distance of 391.38 feet to the P-O-B of tract herein described. From the P-O-B measure N89°18'21"W for a distance of 228.82 feet to a found ½ inch iron pipe; thence measure N01°04'02"E for a distance of 166.70 feet to a set ½ inch iron rod on the S'ly R-O-W line of Louisiana Hwy. 1 (also North Market Street); thence measure along said R-O-W line, S59°02'36"E for a distance of 263.73 to a found 1¼ inch iron pipe marking the NW corner of Lot 1 of the North Lakewood Estates Commercial Sites, Unit No. 3; thence measure S00°46'49"W along the Western line of said Unit No. 3. for a distance of 33.79 feet to the P-O-B.

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

1. Development of the property shall be in substantial accord with a revised site plan to be submitted showing the security gate, a 6-8 foot screening fence that shall screen the

entire R-3-E portion of the property, and all other improvements noted at the January 4, 2006 Public Hearing. Any significant changes or additions shall require further review and approval by the Planning Commission.

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

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

ORDINANCE NO. 10 OF 2006

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.

BY:

BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, legal and regular session convened, that Section 106-1127 (5) of the City of Shreveport Code of Ordinances is hereby amended to now read as follows:

Sec. 106-1127. Alcoholic beverage uses.

(5) In legally permitted areas the following uses are exempt from the provisions of this section if in full compliance with all provisions of this chapter and the criteria specified:

c. Any use, serving or selling beverages of low or high alcoholic content for on-premises consumption in any city-owned building or facility when such use is operated by the city or a city-approved concessionaire, subject to compliance with all requirements contained in Chapter 10 of the City of Shreveport Code of Ordinances.

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

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

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 – C-95-05: 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: The two items on the table, I don't believe there is any indication that they are going to be removed.

NEW BUSINESS:

Taxi Driver License Appeal: Mr. Roderick Lott (Employer: Golden Stripe Cab Co, 1940 Texas Avenue, Shreveport, LA 71103)(A/Lester)

Mr. Thompson: We took care of that matter yesterday Mr. Chairman.

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES: None.

CLERK'S REPORT: None

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting adjourned at approximately 7:40 p.m.

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

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