

COUNCIL PROCEEDINGS OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT, LOUISIANA

JUNE 13, 2006

(As Amended on June 27, 2006)

The regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana was called to order by Chairman Jeffrey A. Hogan at 3:00 p.m., Tuesday, June 13, 2006, in the Government Chambers in Government Plaza (505 Travis Street).

Invocation was given by Councilman Green.

The Pledge of Allegiance was led by Councilman Lester.

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

Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Robertson to approve the minutes of the Administrative Conference, Monday, May 22, 2006 and Council Meeting, Tuesday, May 23, 2006. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Green, and Hogan, 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Jackson. 1.

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

Councilman Hogan: Mayor Hightower, do you have any communications or distinguished guests?

Mayor Hightower: Mr. Chairman, I do have a couple of guests here today. One being former Sheriff Hathaway is with us in the audience today, and want to welcome him to the Chambers and his guest sitting next to him is Mike Francis. You might have seen bus benches around town. He's running for Secretary of State, and he is with us today, and so Mr. Chairman, I didn't know if you wanted to give him the opportunity to say hello to the Council or not, but I did want to at least acknowledge he is with us today in our city.

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Francis, you're in the corner over there, could you stand please? Alright thank you.

Mr. Francis: Thank you for recognizing me. It's good to be back in Shreveport, I was raised down the road in (inaudible). I am a candidate for the Secretary of State election this fall, September 30th. I appreciate being here at the meeting. Thank you for recognizing me.

Councilman Hogan: Yes sir. Thank you for coming.

Mayor Hightower: Is somebody else doing BizCamp?

Councilman Lester: Maybe he's running a little bit late.

Ms. Pilkinton: Councilman Jackson is running a little bit late.

Mayor Hightower: Okay. That's all Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Hogan: Okay, we'll come back at another time, and recognize the BizCamp people. Does anybody else have anybody else to recognize?

Councilman Lester: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to just ask Mr. Francis just if I could borrow a couple of those bus bench areas. He seems to have monopolized many of them in District A.

Councilman Walford: And B.

Councilman Lester: And B. I might have need for just one or two, just for what it's worth.

Mr. Francis: We're happy to help the economy in Shreveport.

Councilman Lester: Right, right. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Reports:

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

Mr. Dark: Mr. Chairman, we provided you a written report on the hotel yesterday. Mr. Carrier is here if there is anyone with a question about the Convention Center.

Councilman Lester: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Carrier, I know that your portion deals with the contracting with the Convention Center, and I did get your report relative to your contracting and the spending, but what I did not get and we were given some information today, what I did not get was a breakdown on the total discretionary spending. In the letter that you submitted, you gave me the raw numbers, but I'd like to look at a more, more of a breakdown along the --

Mr. Carrier: Right, I have that here. Be glad to provide that for Council.

Councilman Lester: Okay, thank you. If you could provide that for Mr. Thompson, he'll make sure that we get copies. And I might have questions at a later date, but that would answer many of my questions, at least give me the information that I needed. Thank you. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Carrier: Yes sir.

Property Standards Report:

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Bowie, do we have a Property Standards Report today? Councilman Green has some questions. Could you come forward please? Welcome to the meeting.

Councilman Green: Mr. Bowie, how many inspectors do you have?

Mr. Bowie: We have 12. 11 presently, we're trying to hire another one.

Councilman Green: 11 presently?

Mr. Bowie: Uh hmm.

Councilman Green: As they go out into the fields to inspect, how many of them have computers in their cars?

Mr. Bowie: All of them at the present time.

Councilman Green: Sir?

Mr. Bowie: All of them do at the present time.

Councilman Green: Okay, and once they do it, then they compute it in, and then they send it immediately back to the headquarters or how does that work?

Mr. Bowie: We're having some problems. We have some software problems, and then some hardware problems, but the theory of it to work is you go out to put the violation into the computer, take it back and download it, and it goes right into the system, and it prints out a letter the next day to go to the constituents.

Councilman Green: So, that's how it's working now?

Mr. Bowie: No sir, it's not working like that. We're having field problems with it.

Councilman Green: So, okay it's supposed to be that you put it in the computer, but it's not working like that. You're having a field problem? What does that mean?

Mr. Bowie: Well, you have two systems that you're dealing with. ACCELA and Permits Plus, and also GIS. What we had to do was take one of them out of the system because all three of them weren't talking to each other correctly like it's designed to do.

Councilman Green: Okay. So, what has to happen for that to work?

Mr. Bowie: We're trying to get with DP to see whether they can make some recommendation to us so that we can solve this problem that we're having with this. That's one of our agenda items to sit down and talk with them and see if we can solve this problem, to make the inspectors more efficient.

Councilman Green: Okay, so basically with the process now, we really can't say that they can be efficient to the top dollar right?

Mr. Bowie: Correct.

Councilman Green: Okay, once they go out and they see the grass, how tall must it be before they write a citation?

Mr. Bowie: Over 12 inches.

Councilman Green: And then once that happens, what happens?

Mr. Bowie: They come back in, they write the constituent a letter, and it takes between 30 to 45 days to get it cut.

Councilman Green: Okay, so then once you cite the deal, then you send the constituent a letter. Then it takes about 45-60 days?

Mr. Bowie: Well, not that many. I'd say between 30-45 days to actually get it cut.

Councilman Green: And then normally, by that time, the grass is about how high?

Mr. Bowie: 2-3 feet.

Councilman Green: Okay. Say for instance, there's a burned structure. How long does that process take before we can actually tear that structure down?

Mr. Bowie: Between 6-8 months.

Councilman Green: Okay. So basically what is it that we've done to basically empower you to do a, I guess a speedy job?

Mr. Bowie: I guess I'm missing the question.

Councilman Green: I guess what happens is I looked, as I look at each Council Meeting, we have Property Standards Report, Property Standards Report, and you're basically the only, I'd say, Department Head, who we've got here that we put in the hot seat every week. So, I'm basically trying to see if in fact, we've empowered you to succeed more than anybody else, and we're keeping tabs to make sure that you have. Because nobody else comes up here. So I'm wondering if all of the rest of the Departments are working like clock work, and yours is the only one out of balance. So, I didn't say anything to you about it, I just wanted to ask these questions. Because just from me looking at it, then I've gone over this for months and months. You're the only one that comes up every week, and you're the only one on the agenda. So, one would assume that Property Standards is the only non productive office, if we just go by what's on the agenda. So, I just kinda wanted to ask those questions publicly so that people wouldn't think that your department is the only department out of sync whereas we understand that your department is actually out of sync, because we have not empowered you to succeed. We've got some stuff on paper, and we've revamped a lot of things, but your process is a very slow process. And I think that in order for us to, No. 1, help to empower you all to do what needs to be done, we need to get you the proper tools. So, that's basically I didn't know, I didn't want to put you on the spot. Wasn't picking on you, I just kinda wanted to bring some attention to something that more than Property Standards ought to be giving a report to this Council each week that we have Council Meeting. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Carmody: Thank you Mr. Chairman. Mr. Bowie, I'm not sure that you had a chance to look into this situation, we had a discussion last week regarding a nuisance pool on Swedes?

Mr. Bowie: 171 Swedes.

Councilman Carmody: Yes sir. Have we found out anything on that?

Mr. Bowie: Yeah, the citation was issued last month to the owner of the house, but we're having problems finding out in the Court System what's the docket number, so we can see when the court date was set.

Councilman Carmody: A number of the neighbors around that property had asked for confirmation of the date that the matter would be heard so that they could attend court to hear what is said, and hopefully to I guess seek justice, or -- at least correction of the problem.

Mr. Bowie: Well one of the neighbors witness, and also I got a confirmation from the Deputy that they served the papers to the owner. But we can't find it in the dockets at the court. So tomorrow, I'll walk over and see if we can find it and resolve that issue, and get the court date.

Councilman Carmody: And I told you I was going to do this yesterday, and so I'm going to say it again, that I think that you need to stand in front of us and bow up your chest with pride on the fact that you've come before this Body at least in the two terms that I've been here, and asked for the assistance of the Council in order to do your job, to address nuisance properties, inoperable vehicles, burned structures. And the Council's been very receptive including the formation of a Property Standards Committee in order to assist you and your department in facilitating resolution to these problems. Granted, you don't create them, but you work to try to get the appropriate legal owner to address the problem. If not, and we run our course of trying to follow the legal process to serve them notice and give them adequate time, then we take action in order to address the problem for the community. But I will tell you that I've been impressed with your work. I know it's thankless and I only have one correction for what was said already today. And that was a clarification that you gave me. Grass will not grow to 3 feet tall.

Mr. Bowie: It's weeds.

Councilman Carmody: It's only weeds that will grow that high. And so if you could follow back up with me sir on that situation on Swedes. And again, if I could ask you to please let the inspectors that are working at least in District C know that I'd like for them to widen up their scope and take in more of the District than just that one area we seem to be concentrating on, but I applaud y'all's efforts in the number of citations that have been written. Thank you Mr. Bowie, thank you Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Robertson: Since I have you here, I'll go on and say this, I was going to wait till the end, but I'd like to thank your department again today. One of the businesses had requested a building be looked into for demolition. And I understand it was demo'd yesterday and so they were very thankful down on Commerce. So, thank you.

Councilman Hogan: Thank you Ms. Robertson, anymore questions? Mr. Bowie, I want to thank you for taking care of the grass on South Brookwood and Blum for me a few days ago. I know you made a special effort on that, and I do appreciate it.

Councilman Green: I guess I didn't understand what Councilman Carmody was saying about a correction. When I say grass, over on your side of town, you might say grass, I might say weeds. All I know is he's not empowered to do a top of the line job because of the lack of equipment that they have. And what we've got to do is empower them to do what we asked them to do. And my next point was more than Property Standards ought to be standing before this Council each 2nd and 4th Mondays and Tuesdays, giving a report. That's my point. Thank you.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Chairman, very quickly, Councilman Green, it's a common mistake, it's one that I made and was actually corrected at a neighborhood meeting by Mr. Bowie, and that is that grass will not grow that high. It's actually weeds that will grow to that length. But I do think that any of us have the right to ask that any department had appear before us, but I think that the proper way to do so would be to address the question to the Administration, and then ask the Administration provide that person to come forth. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Hogan: Thank you Mr. Carmody. If there are no objection, we're going to go back to our earlier part of the meeting, Councilman Jackson was running just a little bit behind and we'd like to recognize the BizCamp group.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you Mr. Chairman. To my colleagues, please I ask your indulgence, and please my pardon, we beg your pardon for being a little tardy. But I was actually outside, and I didn't want to miss this part. Mr. Mayor, I don't know if, I guess Mr. Carrier may have left, I don't know if he's gone. When I looked around, I didn't see him anywhere and Councilman Lester did tell me he asked him a question or two and he was gone, so. And I did have something for him too Mr. Chairman, but I guess we'll have to wait another time for that. But more importantly, I wanted to recognize this group that's here today, who have come from the BizCamp program. It's not stranger to any of us who are here. All of us have seen them at least two or three times, those of us who've sat here, particularly during this term. Former Councilman Burrell, and now State Representative Burrell has been a long time advocate of the BizCamp, and was the founder of this effort. And they've gone each year, I think, to another level of accomplishment and achievement. And I wanted to again pause and take a little time to recognize not only their presence, but to give them a chance to make a small presentation. I know that they meet everyday, and they've got a lot of business to take care of, but they pause from their busy schedule as well to come by and to share with us in this Council Meeting, and so Mr. Chairman, with your permission and with the indulgence of this Council, I'd like to ask if perhaps first if Mr. Mike Grandenetti, who is the Consultant, who runs the BizCamp would come and as he comes, I think he has a couple of students who will make a presentation to us as well. And then I'd like for us to recognize all the young men and young women who are part of this group.

Mr. Grandinetti (Sacramento, California): They call me Mr. Mike. Again, it's good to be amongst friends and supporters. Mayor Hightower has been a great supporter, Mr. Jackson over years and time, I've been here before -- I come back again. And to tell you the truth, I was concerned this year, after our tragedy in the southern part of Louisiana, if I was going to be able to be afforded to come out here again. Certainly observing the tragedy from California, had a lot of empathy for the citizens of Louisiana, but it warmed my heart when your president in front of your statehouse said, we need more entrepreneurs. We've been doing it for seven years. We are growing these future entrepreneurs. It is about economic development. Mr. Burrell, State Representative Burrell, his motto for BizCamp is we're building America. We want to rebuild Louisiana. And the way we're going to do it is by growing future entrepreneurs. These young people have given up their summer vacation to spend two weeks to perform a mini MBA course, where everyday we work from 9:00 in the morning till 5:00 in the evening. And so I certainly am humbled by the generosity of the community to support this, but the students themselves who've given up the time to be and to challenge themselves and ask that question, 'Am I an entrepreneur?' And after only a day and a half of education, I can see we do have some entrepreneurs in this class. And so just to show you, I'd like to have two of the students make a few comments. And we'll be brief, because we have to get back and get back to work, but I think they can tell my story better.

Ms. Bicaisha Wright: I'm a student at BizCamp. And so far in BizCamp, because we're going to be entrepreneurs for the future. And what we learn in Mr. Mike's class is how to start our own business, and invest in our own business. And he tells us never to give up, strive. He says because the words 'I can't do it,' ain't the way. So he is a great teacher, and I enjoy being in BizCamp this summer.

Mr. Albert Wilson: I'm also a student at BizCamp as well. Mr. Mike is a real good teacher. He taught us about -- he's teaching us about leadership and how to run our businesses and take business to another level. Thank you.

Mr. Grandinetti: I do want to leave with this -- when I go back to California and tell them how entrepreneurship is alive and well, and I hope and I do believe you're creating a model not just for the Shreveport/Bossier area, but the whole state of Louisiana. No other state in the country is doing a project of this magnitude. But I do want to bring home when I see your great emblem, I see the Union, the fact that this BizCamp is united and this camp will never be together again. It's a unique combination. Also in your motto the fact of Justice. Entrepreneurship and business ownership is a true equalizer. We see that as a just cause. And the fact that these two young people at the last minute came up and showed you, they're gaining confidence day by day. And I invite you to come to any of our activities, our graduation ceremony, our market at South Park, you can come and buy some of our wares from our entrepreneurs, to show what we've done in a short amount of time. Give me a little more time, another class and we'll continue to grow our entrepreneurs for this great community. Again thanks for the support we've had in the past. We hope in the short amount of time, that we'll be able to see the fruition of our work, and not only will these be future entrepreneurs, may we have some future City Council Members here also. Again, thank you for your support. Looking for you to come to any of our activities

Councilman Walford: Could we ask all the BizCampers to stand up for a round of applause?

Mr. Grandinetti: We do have an instructor here. I had an emergency with one of my instructors, and I'm going to the hospital, we're not sure of the details, but our prayers are with her. We have one instructor hanging out. Her name Corra Rainey -- and so as a team, we work together.

Councilman Hogan: Thank you for coming today, I appreciate all that you do. And I'd just like to say that I, Councilman Carmody, I know had participated in this program as judges for have experienced first hand the quality of the program, and I applaud you for what you do, and I have just one favor to ask of you. When you go back to California, don't take any of our future entrepreneurs with you.

Mr. Grandinetti: Might even bring some from there out here, I think.

Councilman Lester: I just want to applaud you Mr. Mike and the young people. And I especially wanted to congratulate Representative Burrell. Many times in government, we get criticized for doing the wrong things or we get criticized for exercising our judgement. People don't agree with us. But it's not very often when we get it right, and this is one of the things that's been a passion of Representative Burrell, and he definitely got it right. And the proof is in the pudding. Every year, the group gets better and better and larger and larger, and you touch so many young people's lives. Not only for where they are right now, but I think the beautiful part about BizCamp is, it expands our young people's horizons beyond the four walls of their neighborhoods, and so I'm just excited for what you're doing. What you've been doing, and know that you continue to enjoy our support and have our tremendous respect, and our thanks for everything that you do for our young people. So, I just wanted to not let you go back to California, and not say again, thank you for everything that you do.

Mr. Grandinette: If you'll forgive us, we're going to go back. We've got some work to do. So we'll leave the Chambers. So excuse us for invading the Chambers like this, but they're going to start invading the neighborhoods. The entrepreneurs will be out there, so look for us, give us some business, and we'll continue to grow with you, and we thank you.

Public Hearing: None.

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

Confirmations and/or Appointments: None.

Adding Legislation to the Agenda:

1. **Resolution No. 100 of 2006:** A Resolution authorizing the release of mortgages and cancellation of promissory notes executed by Shreveport Publishing Corporation (now Snap Property, LLC) in favor of the City of Shreveport in connection with the neighborhood improvement leveraging project and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
2. **Resolution No. 101 of 2006:** Amending the Fire Department Pay Schedule for the Municipal Fire Civil Service Personnel and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Jackson to add Resolution Nos. 100 and 101 of 2006 to the agenda. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

Councilman Green: Before we go to Public Comments, I wanted to ask the City Attorney a question. Ms. Glass, it's actually in Councilman Hogan's district, but it just abuts my mine. There is a railroad track, just by Westwood School on Jewella, that's basically become a safety hazard. The track has basically separated from the highway. If there is an accident there, whose liable, the railroad, or the City of Shreveport.

Ms. Glass: Well Mr. Green, that would depend on the facts. You know who caused or neglected to fix the whatever caused the accident. So, I can't really tell you that, if it's going to depend on whether facts relate to that accident.

Councilman Green: Okay, basically what happened is when you hit the track, if you're unaware of it, there's a piece up high, and then the street is down low, so there are some people who've had some blowouts, and they keep calling me. And of course, sometime ago, I talked to Mr. (inaudible), and he said that it was on track to be fixed by the railroad, but they have not fixed it and no action has been taken. And if you're driving at the speed limit, then basically when you get to that track, then you're basically going to hit it hard, throw your car out of line or whatever. If somebody is behind you, it's going to cause you to hit brakes, and they're going to hit brakes, and it's going to be a serious accident. So, what's the proper --?

Ms. Glass: Well, I would say in that case, that it is a problem with the track and not with the road, then it would be on the railroad to fix it. I don't know if the City has a Standard of Procedure to notify the railroad, or exactly what we normally do, but it would be their responsibility to fix the track part of the crossing.

Councilman Green: Okay, so what's the best course of action for us to take?

Ms. Glass: I'd be glad to research that, look into how best to get the -- I know that it is sometimes difficult to get the railroad to do what they're supposed to do, but I'm sure that the City has a procedure for talking to them about it.

Public Comments (Agenda Items to be Adopted)

Mr. James Touchet: (10010 Rocky Knoll Cir): I'm the President of Shreveport Fire Fighters Association. Thank y'all for letting me speak. The first thing that I'd like to say is I'd like to thank the Mayor and the City Council and the citizens of Shreveport for everything that they've done for the firefighters over the years. We've had a great relationship with the Council, the Mayor, and the citizens, and I really feel like the firefighters have tried hard to do a good job. We've had a problem with our proposed pay raise. And it's been in the newspaper, and a few other places, and what I wanted to just say was truly how the Shreveport Fire Fighters would be grateful for this pay raise. We've had a member of our department embarrass us greatly, but I wanted everybody to know that the hard work of the men and women of the Shreveport Fire Department shouldn't be overlooked because of that one individual. They run in house fires everyday. They also go to EMS calls, they're exposed to AIDS and hepatitis, and I really believe that they deserve this pay raise. I believe that they're grateful for it and I believe that they are appreciative to everyone. When it comes before y'all today, I would truly appreciate, and so would they that y'all vote for it, that y'all support the pay raise. If y'all have any questions for me, I'd be more than happy to answer them.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Touchet, I really appreciate the comments that you made. You know when we heard on yesterday about this idea of one individual unilaterally deciding whether or not the pay raise was -- I don't want to say constitutional, but legal, it kinda gave me pause, because it brings to question, if you're in the process of doing something fair and equitable for all of the employees, which is what I believe this Council's opinion was, and I thought was giving a pay raise across the board, then why would we be in a position to allow

one person to dictate to the rest of the employees what is and is not right. And I would think that, that would set a dangerous precedent. One person deciding unilaterally 'this is not legal', and 'this is not right'. And the idea of supplemental pay is a good idea obviously because, while I believe all of our city employees are important, it's true that the supplemental pay deals with hazardous issues, that our sworn officers have to deal with. Because let's be honest, none of us are going to go and take a bullet for anybody except for our families, and if you're asking us to run into a house fire, asking us to run for anything is going to be a lot, let alone run into a burning building. So, we know that's not going to happen, but the idea that we have to on the City Council, have to be concerned about what happened in Baton Rouge to determine how we deal with our employees is an idea that I don't want to buy into, and I don't think the Council wants to buy into either. So, I just want to say and I also want this to go the person that sent me the anonymous email on yesterday. I made a commitment to give the pay raise to all of our employees across the board. And we did that, and nothing that I've heard about what's happening in Baton Rouge or what may not happen in Baton Rouge is going to affect that. This is one Councilman that's not going to be an Indian giver, and I suspect that most of the Council feels the same way, at least I hope that's the way that they feel. So, I'm encouraged that our Union, as the President is coming before us certifying that you guys are in fact thankful for what we're trying to do and appreciative that we are trying to recognize the hard work and the service that you guys give everyday. And this idea that one monkey wants to steal the show, that's beyond crazy to me. So, I thank you for coming and clarifying some of those issues for me.

Councilwoman Robertson: Did I understand also from the Mayor that everything that we discussed yesterday had been cleared up as far as the firefighters?

Mayor Hightower: Yes. That's the reason that we asked you to introduce the firemen's portion of the pay chart revision along with Police and Classified. So, we feel it's rectified. I've actually, Jaime and I have been working for two days now on this along with Mike Carter and both Chiefs. And also I actually got a call from the individual that sparked the debate in the first place, and he actually did back up and apologize and say that he was sorry if there was any misunderstanding, he was just trying to get some clarity. So, I think we're all on the same page now and the Fire Union this morning brought me a letter of support from the Fire Union in case after the vote, there was some sort of lawsuit filed by any member of the Fire Union, that the Union itself would help defend the City. So, I think that we're all on the same page.

Councilman Jackson: I just wanted to state Mr. Chairman, and for the record, and to you Jaime as well, that I heard us talking and the different times we expressed perhaps some dis -- members of the Council expressed some discontent because it seems like if we vote a raise, then we expect people to appreciate it. I think we really vote a raise because we think it's right, not because we want to be appreciated, but because we think it's right. Certainly we can't afford to pay you in my opinion what we ought to be paying you, but we do have a responsibility in my opinion to look at the budget and to be responsible. I think the actions of this Council are such that after having looked at a source of revenue or a source of funds that we could in fact expend for that raise. And the Council did what they thought was right. And while it's always nice for folks to be nice, them appreciating it and being nice is not a pre-requisite. I think we did it because it was the right thing to do. And so, I'm not discontented, I just wish we could do more. And so I want to express to all of the city workers that I feel like it's our responsibility to do the best we can. At this time, this was our effort to do the best we could. And whether or not it's appreciated, I've come to learn over four years, it's not why you do it, to be appreciated. You do it because you think it's the right thing. And so, we hope that everybody who was there will understand that. Whether they appreciate it or not, that this council gave its best effort to do what we thought was right.

Mr. Touchet: I understand it and like you say, you may do it with the expectations of people being grateful, but we had a Union meeting last night at 5:00 and we got another one tonight. And I want you to know that from that membership, and we had a very large turnout last night, they are grateful, and they are appreciative, and anything that came across in anything other than grateful or appreciative, I'll apologize for personally to all of you all. This wasn't necessary. It shouldn't have happened this way, and it's just something I hope we can put behind us quickly.

Councilman Green: Yes, if this is any encouragement, you all could use us as a model. We had somebody that didn't think we should get paid. And we just looked over it and kept moving.

Councilman Hogan: Thank you Councilman Green, we'll keep that in mind. Before you speak, I just have one quick comment. Mr. Mayor, do you suppose it would be possible to distribute a copy of the letter that was sent in this morning to you before we actually vote on it later in the meeting? Personally, I'd like to see the letter. Thank you. Welcome to the meeting Mr. Washington, state your name and address for the record. You have three minutes.

Mr. John Washington: (3217 Redstone) Thank you Mr. Chairman. I'm here with regards to Zoning Appeal Case No. SC-23-06. I and my neighbors who are all property owners who live in this neighborhood, simply want to endorse the recommendation from the Metropolitan Planning Commission, and they made a decision on May 3rd to deny an appeal case from a developer. And so we just simply want to endorse that recommendation from MPC. There are a lot of issues surrounding this. I assume that all of that is a part of MPC's record, and perhaps you have access to that, I don't know. But at any rate, we did send a letter and signatures of all the residents in our neighborhood. And we hope that you will uphold the decision of the MPC. That's all I wanted to say.

Mr. Stanton Dossett, III: (101 Milam Street) I'm here to appeal the MPC's decision that Mr. Washington was just speaking about. I'm Vice-President of Red River Corporation, the owner of a 20 acre tract adjacent to Mr. Washington's property. We filed for a or applied for a subdivision for that 20 acres. It's properly zoned for housing. The subdivision submitted corresponds to all of the rules and regulations for that zoning. The decision that was given by the MPC, citing that the site density was incompatible with the neighborhood and that the design created dead end streets, the Board voted 7-0 to deny the application. Those were the two reasons we were given for why our application was denied. In fact, as I said, it is -- the lot sizes are as the zoning requires, a minimum of 5,000 square feet. It is compatible with the majority of those surrounding housing developments, and in fact, it doesn't create any dead end streets are they are already existing. And in fact the subdivision plan that we submitted also has turn around in it that were okay'd by the City Engineer. So, essentially, there are two reasons that were given to us for why it was denied. Neither of those we see as actually existing. That is the density is compatible with the majority of the houses around there, and it does not in fact create two dead ends. So, that's all I need to say. And we encourage you all to overturn the MPC's decision.

Mr. James Mohr: (6025 Buncombe Road) Actually, I'm here to help in the -- if there is a presentation by the owner, so if I may, I will only support what he says to save time. I don't have a presentation. I don't want to usurp theirs.

Mr. Johnson Walker: (3178 Bluebird Lane, Keithville, LA) And we were here concerning the Blount Brothers operation on Hearne. We do quite a bit of concrete work here in the City of Shreveport for private industries around. And we use their area to dump concrete. Concrete (inaudible) dirt that we remove from city streets, private driveways, what have you. And being that close where they are, helps us to do the job that we're doing without a great expense to the city and other people that we work for. And we would think that voting that down would kinda hurt our operation. And we would like to see that the City let us stay there without moving so that we can use it for our purposes.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Walker, I just want to clarify, you're not an employee of Blount Brothers, you actually have your own business?

Mr. Walker: Right, right.

Councilman Carmody: And so in the course of your business, you deal with slag concrete or basically rock?

Mr. Walker: Rock.

Councilman Carmody: Okay, and so if you did not have a facility in which you could take this concrete at no costs, then what are your options? Where would you dispose of it?

Mr. Walker: Well, the City of Shreveport has a landfill out on -- out in the country really. Way out.

Councilman Carmody: Our Woolworth Road landfill?

Mr. Walker: Woolworth Road, right. And it would cost us to haul it there. Therefore, having you pay for hauling it there, we'd have to charge our customers, including the City being one of our customers. And therefore we might be able to continue our operation, and might not (inaudible)

Councilman Carmody: But to clarify, you could take it to the Woolworth Landfill, you'd have just the cost of hauling it, or you'd have to pay to --?

Mr. Walker: Pay to dump it also.

Councilman Carmody: Oh, at the current facility you do not pay to bring that material in?

Mr. Walker: No.

Councilman Lester: Thank you Mr. Walker. The place that you're using on N. Hearne, that's not the only rock crusher in the city is it?

Mr. Walker: No, it's not.

Councilman Lester: Okay, and it's not the only rock crusher that the Blount Brothers have isn't that correct? Don't they have another one somewhere in the southeastern part of town?

Mr. Walker: They do, they do, they do.

Councilman Lester: Okay, so if this one were to close, that would not --

Mr. Walker: I mean, we could use the other one. All I'm saying is, it just cost us the price of gas, and you know. I mean, the truck -- transportation is costing us more to take it to that end of town when we're working on N. Market.

Councilman Lester: Right, okay. But I just want to be clear. I don't want anyone to leave here thinking that if this were to close, this were the only rock crusher in town.

Mr. Walker: No, no, no. Matter of fact, there are several, and there are quite a few, and some of them even use theirs for their own use. Everybody don't just let you dump concrete.

Councilman Lester: Okay, thank you sir.

Mr. Russell Wray: (327 North Blvd, Baton Rouge, La) I'm here today representing Blount Bros Construction. I'll be brief and specific with you. Recycling of waste concrete is what happens on N. Hearne where Mr. Blount's operation is located. That's an important issue, and an important consideration in the economic development of the City of Shreveport, and in particular in the area around the particular site. Now, we've presented to you additional information in the form of affidavits from some of those surrounding landowners. Also from another contractor, Mr. Horton who uses this facility. And also this affidavit from Mr. Blount and Mr. Mohr discussing the economics of this particular facility and recycling concrete for the city. Also in the process, we've learned more about the concerns of the MPC, and more about the concerns raised in the neighborhood. In doing so, we also -- after the discussion yesterday, followed-up with Mr. Kirkland, and believe that there is a real opportunity to find common ground and resolve this matter if the Council would remand this matter back to the MPC. The owner is willing and ready to continue that discussion, and find ways to resolve the issues. And we ask that this Council remand to MPC for that opportunity to occur. Thank you.

Mr. Tom Arceneaux: (828 E. King Hwy) I'm proud to have Mr. Carmody as my Councilman. I'm here about a project that's in Mr. Lester's District. Lady, and gentlemen, I sent each of you a letter today, I've talked to most of you. Mr. Lester, thank you very much for returning my call, I had to be in court this afternoon, so I missed your return call.

Councilman Lester: I understand.

Mr. Arceneaux: But thank you very much for getting back so quickly. My main reason for being up here, I am on MPC Case No. C-16-06. The applicant contacted me just this morning for assistance in presenting materials to you. Obviously, I have not had a chance to dig into this, and my main reason for being here today is to simply ask your indulgence in tabling the matter until the 25th of July. There are four reasons that are stated in my letter. The main one today is, I'd like the opportunity to do my job and present some information to you. I'm not prepared to do that on such short notice, that's not your fault, but it is my circumstance. So, I ask your indulgence. The second thing is that there are a couple of items that I think will be important for your consideration. We don't have in hand yet. One deals with the financing, and the other one deals with a wetlands issue that was a concern of Metropolitan Planning Commission, and I think we will be able to address that, but we'd like to have the evidence of it. It will not be here until probably sometime in July. So, my main reason for being here today, I'm not prepared to discuss the merits of the case. I'd like to have that opportunity later, but we simply ask you to postpone the matter from your agenda today. Give you one less thing to do and take up today, and go on to some other matters. Be happy to answer any questions that you have.

Ms. Josie Harris: (6209 Nottaway Dr) I need to take a minute to calm myself down a little bit. What I heard earlier, money, and all this stuff is more important than our health. Now today, we are here. Blount Bros have had an awful long time to get whatever business they need to get in order. We're hear today that there are some things that they needed done, they did not have the time. Let me tell you that they've had plenty of time. I'm not sure how long they've been operating at that site. But they have been operating illegally. They probably still would be at this moment. They were cited. They do not have the integrity to come forward and ask for this

zoning issue. So now, they're asking for more time? I even heard about money. What is more important? This man losing more money, or our health? I think you need to send a message today. Is it only for the poor, or is it for the rich. These people have not been abiding by the law. Had it been less fortunate people, they wouldn't be given a second opportunity. I want you all to search your hearts today, and make a decision. A fair decision. What's more important? Money, people's health, rich or poor. I think this decision (inaudible) that is here today.

Mr. Herman McCuthen: (4614 Givens, Bossier City, LA) Blount Bros plays a part with me because I haul all their (inaudible) at both sites, and I keep their metal. That plays a big part with me, because that's part of my little salary. And they give it to me. And it plays a big part in my life, because you know that's how I do. But I got other little odd jobs, but that's one of them. But I would rather see 'em stay.

Councilman Hogan: You're in favor of them keeping the rock crushing --

Mr. McCuthen: Yes sir.

Councilman Hogan: Councilman Walford, I recall that you had a request to suspend the rules, do you still want to do that?

Councilman Walford: Yeah, if the Council would indulge me and do that, I may have to leave for a few minutes, and I don't want -- this is a case where the parties were here two weeks ago as well.

Councilman Carmody: I'll second the motion.

Motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Carmody to suspend the rules to hear item No. 71. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

10. **Ordinance No. 71 of 2006**: ZONING APPEAL: C-27-06 – An ordinance mending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the south side of Rutherford, 180 feet west of Creswell Avenue, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from R-2, Suburban, Multi-Family Residence District, to R-2-E, Suburban, Multi-Family Residence/Extended Use District, Limited to “a driveway for access to the adjacent parking lot only, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (B/Walford).

Having passed first reading on May 23, 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. 71 of 2006

Delete the ordinance as introduced, (which limited approval to “a driveway for access to the adjacent parking lot only”) and substitute the attached ordinance, (which limits approval to “a parking lot” only.)

Mr. Thompson: There is one amendment, and Julie might be in a better position to explain the amendment.

Councilman Walford: I'll be glad to explain the amendment.

Motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Carmody to adopt Amendment No. 1 to Ordinance No. 71 of 2006.

Councilman Walford: This was a case involving the Columbia Café, where Mr. Lynn had applied for essentially a circular driveway, that would have ingress and egress in a residential area. It was denied by the MPC, and I realize that it's very out of character for me to consider overturning the MPC, but after Mr. Kirkland and I had met with the neighborhood, the Mayor's been involved, and I think we've come up with a very good compromise with the neighbors. So, very quickly, just to tell you, what we propose to do is re-zone a portion of the tract that will allow Mr. Lynn three more parking places, and there are six stipulations that will be put on this. The first is development in accordance with the site. The second is a 6 foot privacy fence would be constructed which will screen the back of the restaurant and the restaurant operation from the residential area. The third stipulation requires -- . Backing up, there'll be no pedestrian or vehicular access from the residential area. The fence must be installed within 30 days. The applicant must obtain the proper permits for construction. The fifth item is no employee parking shall be allowed on Rutherford Street, and No. 6 is that this approval is for 24 months only. Any extension would have to involve a new application to the MPC. And again, we've met with the neighbors. I think this is a good compromise for everybody. It helps the restaurant operator because he gets three additional parking places. It helps the neighborhood because they get the screening fence that screens the restaurant and the back of it from the residential side. So, I would encourage you to support this amendment. I think it's been a good compromise. It helps everybody, and so I would ask for a yes vote please.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Walford, I was curious. I know that in other cases, where we've put a time frame on an applicant, that we have basically waived their fee to come forward at the end of that time period in order to reapply. I did not know if that might have been a consideration?

Councilman Walford: No. Basically, this was a 24 month period. The applicant has purchased other property on Kings Highway that's properly zoned. This is to give him an opportunity to get his hard surface parking in, to become legal in his total number of parking places with his other property. So that was the reason for the 24 months.

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

Motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Carmody to adopt Ordinance No. 71 of 2006 as amended. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

Councilman Walford: Thank you Mr. Chairman for suspending the rules.

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

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

The Clerk read the following:

RESOLUTION NO. 80 OF 2006

A RESOLUTION SELECTING THE TIMES AS THE OFFICIAL JOURNAL FOR THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT FOR THE PERIOD COMMENCING JULY 1, 2006 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2007 AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport is required by its Charter and State Law to select an Official Journal to publish minutes, ordinances, resolutions, budgets, official notices, advertisements, and other official proceedings of the City of Shreveport for the period July 1, 2006 through June 30, 2007; and

WHEREAS, The Times has submitted the following proposal:

All printing of required legals in the Classified Section - \$0.27 per agate line (7 point);

All printing of required legals in the Retail Section - \$6.58 per column inch;

All other (non-required) ads in the Classified Section - \$1.83 per agate line;

All other (non-required) ads in the Retail Section - \$42.70 per column inch; Affidavits: \$20.00 each; and

WHEREAS, it is recommended that The Times be selected the Official Journal for the City of Shreveport to provide the services required by law for the prices described above.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, regular and legal session convened that the proposal of The Times is accepted and The Times be and is hereby designated the official journal of the City of Shreveport for the period July 1, 2006 and ending June 30, 2007 and the Mayor of the City is hereby authorized to execute an agreement with The Times under the terms and conditions described above.

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

RESOLUTION NO. 81 OF 2006

A RESOLUTION ACCEPTING DEDICATION FOR FORUM DRIVE IN THE FORUM LOT SUBDIVISION, 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 Forum Drive in Section 22, (T18N-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 Forum Drive 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.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Walford to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

RESOLUTION NO. 82 OF 2006

A RESOLUTION ACCEPTING DEDICATION FOR ALINE AVENUE IN THE ROSE OF SHANNON PLACE, 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 Aline Avenue in Section 21, (T18N-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 Aline Avenue 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.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Walford to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

RESOLUTION 84 OF 2006

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO ACCEPT A DONATION FROM THE SHREVEPORT FIREFIGHTERS AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO

WHEREAS, the Shreveport Firefighters have raised funds and commissioned a monument to be built in honor of all firefighters; and,

WHEREAS, the Shreveport Firefighters desire to donate the monument to the City of Shreveport for display at the Dallas W. Greene Central Fire Station; and,

WHEREAS, the monument is valued at sixty thousand dollars (\$60,000.00); and,

WHEREAS, Shreveport City Code Chapter 26-187 requires City Council approval for acceptance of any donations valued in excess of five thousand dollars (\$5,000.00)

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due regular and legal session convened, that the Mayor be and is hereby authorized to accept the donation of property referenced herein and execute any necessary documents to complete the donation.

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 application of this Resolution which can be given affect without the invalid provisions, items or application and to this end the provisions of this Resolution are hereby declared severable.

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

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Carmody to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

RESOLUTION NO. 85 OF 2006

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR'S SIGNATURE ON AN AGREEMENT FOR INSTALLATION OF AUTOMATIC TRAFFIC LIGHT POWER BACK UP SYSTEM AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO

WHEREAS, investigation into commercially available emergency power sources for traffic signals disclosed that all were found to be inadequate for the needs of the City; and

WHEREAS, City Engineering and Traffic Engineering came up with the concept of an emergency back-up generator for traffic signals; and

WHEREAS, Powerup Electric, LLC has turned this idea into an automatic traffic light power back-up system to provide back-up emergency power to traffic lights in the event of power failure;

WHEREAS, Powerup shall furnish and install for the City three automatic traffic light power back-up systems at three intersections designated by the City and the City will purchase a minimum of twenty units; and

WHEREAS, because the concept of these devices is unique, Powerup agrees to compensate the City for its idea.

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 and empowered to execute an Agreement for Installation of Automatic Traffic Light Power Back Up System, substantially in accordance with the document filed along with the original copy of this resolution in the Office of the Clerk of Council on xxx, attached hereto as Exhibit A.

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 Jackson to adopt.

Mayor Hightower: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to let Mr. Dark handle this discussion.

Mr. Dark: Is Mr. Strong in the audience? There you are hiding behind the pole again. You have some folks you want to recognize. We talked a little bit about this yesterday, and I believe there's at least two employees here you want to talk about.

Mr. Strong: I really do. If I could get Robert, Mike and (inaudible). Mr. Chairman, going back to 2001, back to a time when we had an extreme ice storm in our area. Where the City was knocked out power in almost every area of town. During that period of time, we looked at it, we also know that during periods of time, we have outages of power in certain areas of town. And sometimes for hours at a time. And sometimes in 2001 for days at a time. On some of the large intersections, what we had to do was place police officers out. Our traffic engineer had to put out signage. There was an extreme cost that goes with that of keeping somebody out there during these periods of time. Well, what we did, I tasked Robert Westerman, who is Assistant City Engineer, and Michael Erlund, our Traffic Engineer to come up with something that would work in there. Only thing we could find on the market was some portable unit that would be pulled into the intersection, in the middle of it. Just setting on a trailer with a light sitting in there that you would have that would work from that point, and it would run off diesel fuel. Not to say anything about Shreveport drivers, but I didn't think that was going to stay in the middle of that intersection very long. So they came up with an idea. And in doing this, they approached Randy Smith with Power Up Electric over in Bossier, and said, 'here's our idea.' So what they did was what if we had this unit that was automated, that was setting at each intersection that we wanted to do, that was operated

off natural gas. When the power goes off over a short time or period, it would automatically cut on. All the signals would be operating as it was designed to do. Well, between this public private agreement that we have before you today to let us go into, is what it's going to be. The City of Shreveport is going to start out with three units, go to 20. We've become a partner in this with Power Up. We have the opportunity to receive a little money off this if it works. There is no other unit like this that is known, I believe I'm correct on that. They have the patent on this. It was developed here in the Shreveport-Bossier area. And with my two employees, I did everything possible to figure out how I can get them some money. Can't do it as City Employees. So a good pat on the back of saying thank you for what you've done, and all I was asked was remember me at evaluation time. So, we will do that. But I would like to say right now, and what I would like to do is congratulate Robert and Michael, and let you know, these are the type of employees that we do have in city government, that comes up with this, and have worked together and have created this public private agreement that is now before us. So my thanks to Robert and Michael to begin with. And what I'd like to do right now is ask Randy Smith with Power Up to come up here and kinda say some things. I think he has some brochures that we can hand out to the Council on this, and I'll take those and give those out while he says a few words.

Mr. Randy Smith: (3080 Nolan Drive) We install back up generators for homes and businesses and I feel honored to be able to work with the City on this particular project through the forethought of some great guys that are employed by the city. They came to us with an idea and we took that idea and took it from an idea stage and developed it into a product that is what we think is going to be a very important step and developed it for the city and other cities also. It's been almost eight months in development, but we had a prototype that's available and ready to go in the October-November timeframe.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Smith, I very well remember 2001, in the fact that so many of us were without power for so long, and it -- I'm sure there was quite a run on your particular product. And people were saying that's not going to happen to me again. And I think it is commendable that y'all got together and looked at the home application and said well maybe we can do this in conjunction with traffic signals. And I guess I want to clarify though and I'm not sure that you can tell me this, maybe Mr. Strong or our traffic engineer or our other engineer might be able to tell me, if we're going to start as a pilot, those intersections, have they been identified? And those are I'm assuming city streets and not state highways?

Mr. Strong: I will tell you right now, that is correct, but I'm not through with the state yet. The larger intersections are where?

Councilman Carmody: All state highways.

Mr. Strong: Okay, we're going to be working with them on down the line, but we've got some of the key city intersections that's in place, but --

Councilman Carmody: This has all been patented and copyrighted before we let the cat out of the bag?

Mr. Strong: Well, lets put it this way. What you're about approve for us to have the agreement, which is giving us whole city status, and when you go on any of your conferences or anything like that, you mention this, because it helps both that's in here or where we're going with it. So, that's what I'm looking forward to. But the answer is city streets right now, we will have states on it before it's over with.

Councilman Carmody: I would imagine you'll have many states on it before it's all over with.

Mr. Strong: Oh, I hope it works.

Councilman Carmody: I do too. I do too.

Councilman Jackson: I wanted to commend you all. Obviously the ingenuity is obviously stuff you work with everyday. And that's where the people I think who have the greatest ideas are the folks who see it everyday, and could understand what some solutions may be. So, I want to thank you for the ingenuity. I think these are the kinds of efforts that ought not to go unrewarded, let me say. And so, while I enjoy being able to gloat in saying we have city employees, as Mike has said, like these two gentlemen. Certainly, if it's popular, I don't suspect that they'll be city employees a long time. And I just wanted to see if maybe there's a way I could get in on it before you get too big. Congratulations, and thanks a lot.

Councilwoman Robertson: Ditto what's been said, but I was wondering is this something that y'all will be marketing to other cities at the different not only in our states, but in other states also.

Mr. Smith: As soon as possible.

Mr. Strong: Anytime that we make this, it will definitely be a part of (inaudible).

Councilman Green: I'd just like to say congratulations, and I really felt bad as did Councilman Jackson, that we can't reward you, but certainly like to thank you for a great job, and hopefully you'll get a break on your car insurance.

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

RESOLUTION NO. 86 OF 2006

A RESOLUTION RATIFYING THE MAYOR'S EXECUTION OF AMENDMENT NO. 2 TO THE COOPERATIVE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT AND THE LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF NATURAL RESOURCES FOR THE IMPLEMENTATION OF A CLEAN CITIES PROGRAM AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO

WHEREAS, the U. S. Department of Energy (USDOE) has developed an initiative, known as the Clean Cities program, which is intended to develop markets for alternative fuels for motor vehicle fleets throughout the nation, in order to reduce U. S. dependence on foreign oil and to improve air quality; and

WHEREAS, the Louisiana Department of Natural Resources (DNR) has offered to extend the term of an existing grant agreement to June 30, 2007, allowing additional time for the City to utilize the grant for the purpose of participating in the Clean Cities program and for promoting the use of alternative fuel vehicles in this area.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of Shreveport, in due, regular and legal session convened, that the execution by Keith Hightower, Mayor, of the attached Amendment No. 2 to the Cooperative Agreement between the State of Louisiana, Department of Natural Resources, and the City of Shreveport, is hereby ratified.

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

RESOLUTION NO. 87 OF 2006

A RESOLUTION ACKNOWLEDGING THAT THE CITY COUNCIL HAS REVIEWED AN INTERNAL "MUNICIPAL WATER POLLUTION PREVENTION REPORT" CONCERNING THE NORTH REGIONAL AND LUCAS WASTEWATER PLANTS

By:

WHEREAS, the state permits under which the North Regional and Lucas Wastewater Treatment Plants operate require an internal survey form to be completed annually and submitted to the City Council for review; and

WHEREAS, forms for the past year have been completed by City administrative personnel, after consultation with engineering and operational personnel, and are attached hereto;

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

That the City Council acknowledges that it has reviewed the attached survey forms, and that the ongoing capital projects at the North Regional and Lucas wastewater treatment plants, in conjunction with ongoing collection system work, are intended to maintain compliance with the conditions of the plants' permits.

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 Walford to adopt.

Councilman Walford: That didn't say that we fully comprehend, it just said --

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

RESOLUTION NO. 88 OF 2006

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO EXECUTE A FEASIBILITY COST-SHARING AGREEMENT AND PROJECT MANAGEMENT PLAN BETWEEN THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT AND THE DEPARTMENT OF THE ARMY (ARMY CORPS OF ENGINEERS) FOR TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE ON WATER SUPPLY ISSUES, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers ("the Corps") has technical and engineering expertise in the field of water supply planning and management which is beneficial to the City;

WHEREAS, the City has worked with the Corps on planning issues pertaining to Cross Lake and has received valuable input from the Corps;

WHEREAS, the Corps has received an appropriation from Congress to be utilized for planning, technical and engineering work to enhance the lake as a water supply source for the City and to otherwise assist the City with water supply planning needs; and

WHEREAS, the Corps proposes to provide the City with continued planning assistance on matters pertaining to Cross Lake and the water supply needs of the City; and the City wishes to utilize the services of the Corps in this regard;

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 Feasibility Cost-Sharing Agreement with the U. S. Department of the Army, in accordance with the terms and conditions contained in said agreement as filed for public inspection in the Office of the Clerk of Council on or about May 17, 2006, for the purposes of providing technical and engineering expertise to the City in order to assist with the City's water supply planning needs.

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.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Robertson, seconded by Councilman Green to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

RESOLUTION NO. 89 OF 2006

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO EXECUTE A COOPERATIVE ENDEAVOR AGREEMENT WITH THE LOUISIANA ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION AND STAGWORKS OF LOUISIANA, LLC IN CONNECTION WITH AN ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT AWARD PROGRAM LOAN; AUTHORIZING AN ASSIGNMENT OF THE LEASE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT AND STAGWORKS OF LOUISIANA, LLC TO THE LOUISIANA ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION FOR PURPOSES OF THE LOAN;

AUTHORIZE THE MAYOR TO EXECUTE ALL DOCUMENTS ON BEHALF OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT WITH REGARD TO THE LOAN; AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, StageWorks of Louisiana, LLC (“Company”) has leased the L. Calhoun Allen Exposition Hall (the “facility”) from the City of Shreveport (“City”) for the performance of one or more of the following permitted uses: a) a film, sound, light, movie, television, broadcasting, recording and arts production studio and/or other uses related thereto; (b) industrial enterprises which would have an economic impact upon the Shreveport, Louisiana area or the State of Louisiana; (c) economic development; (d) industrial inducement; or (e) activities which are described under Louisiana Revised Statutes 47:1122, *et seq.*, the Louisiana Motion Picture Incentive Act; and

WHEREAS, the lease of the facility was authorized by Ordinance Number 2 of 2006; and

WHEREAS, Company has been awarded a \$1,000,000.00 no interest, twenty (20) year term Economic Development Award Program (“EDAP”) loan from the Louisiana Economic Development Corporation, acting through the Louisiana Department of Economic Development (collectively “LED”); and

WHEREAS, the loan funds will be used by Company to cover the costs of certain capital improvements to convert the facility to a start-up film-television-video studio complex; and

WHEREAS, use of the EDAP loan funds for this purpose will result in the creation of nine (9) new jobs by December 31, 2008, which is a public purpose; and

WHEREAS, the City will act as a conduit or pass-through for the loan funds with Company as the recipient of the funds; and

WHEREAS, the loan funds will be paid to City by LED as reimbursement to Company for eligible project costs and expenditures in accordance with the provisions of the Cooperative Endeavor Agreement and regulations applicable to the Economic Development Award Program; and

WHEREAS, the loan will not be amortized for the initial term of seven (7) years following the execution of the lease of the facility; and

WHEREAS, EDAP program regulations require the City to assign the lease agreement between City and Company to LED for purposes of the loan.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened that the Mayor of the City of Shreveport is hereby authorized, on behalf of the City of Shreveport, to execute a Cooperative Endeavor Agreement with the Louisiana Economic Development Corporation and StageWorks of Louisiana, LLC in connection with an EDAP loan substantially in accord with the draft hereof filed for public inspection in the Office of the Clerk of Council on May 23, 2006.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City of Shreveport is hereby authorized to assign the Lease Agreement between the City of Shreveport and StageWorks of Louisiana, LLC to the Louisiana Economic Development of purposes of the EDAP loan.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Mayor is hereby authorized to execute any and all documents on behalf of the City of Shreveport relative to the EDAP loan and with regard to any authority granted by this resolution for purposes of the loan.

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

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

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Jackson, seconded by Councilman Carmody.

AMENDMENT TO RESOLUTION NUMBER 89 OF 2006

Amend ARTICLE I, paragraph 2 of the Cooperative Endeavor Agreement to now read as follows:

ARTICLE I. PURPOSE

The Loan herein awarded will be a deferred payment loan, in the principal amount of \$ 1,000,000.00, represented by a Promissory Note, signed by the SPONSORING ENTITY, as Borrower, and by the COMPANY, as Co-Maker, in solido, bearing no interest, for a term of twenty (20) years, and will not be amortized for the initial term of seven (7) years following the execution of the Lease of the Complex, but will be repaid as follows: At the end of this seven (7) year term following the execution of the Lease transaction, the Note will be repaid by applying to the principal due on the Note offset credits equal to **6%** of the “total aggregate payroll” of the Studio Complex direct permanent full-time jobs during those seven (7) years, plus offset credits based on film productions’ “total aggregate payroll” as submitted either by letter from the producer(s) of the project or on a final “audited cost report” to the State’s Film Office for film/tv/video projects which utilize the complex during that seven (7) year term following the execution of the Lease of the Complex. In the event the film productions are certified to receive Louisiana Film Tax Credits, the offset credits will be calculated at **4%** of that project’s “total aggregate payroll”, if that figure is less than \$ 3 million (a small project); or the offset credit will be calculated at **3%** of that project’s “total aggregate payroll”, if that figure is more than \$ 3 million (a larger project). If a project is not receiving the Film Tax Credits, then the offset credits to principal will be calculated at **5%** of that project’s “total aggregate payroll”.

Amend ARTICLE XXIII, paragraph 2 of the Cooperative Endeavor Agreement to now read as follows:

The Loan will be a deferred payment loan, represented by a Promissory Note, signed by the SPONSORING ENTITY, as Borrower, and by the COMPANY, as Co-Maker, in solido, bearing no interest, for a term of twenty (20) years, and will not be amortized for the initial term of seven (7) years following the execution of the Lease whereby the SPONSORING ENTITY leases the Complex to the operator, but will be repaid as follows: At the end of this seven (7) year term following the said Lease execution, the Note will be repaid by applying to the principal due on the Note offset credits equal to **6%** of the “total aggregate payroll” of the Studio Complex direct permanent full-time jobs during those seven (7) years, plus offset credits based on film productions’ “total aggregate payroll” as submitted either by letter from the producer(s) of the project or on a final “audited cost

report” to the State’s Film Office for film/tv/video projects which utilize the complex during that seven (7) year term following the execution of the Lease whereby the SPONSORING ENTITY leases the Complex to the operator. In the event the film productions are certified to receive Louisiana Film Tax Credits, the offset credits will be calculated at **4%** of that project’s “total aggregate payroll”, if that figure is less than \$ 3 million (a small project); or the offset credit will be calculated at **3%** of that project’s “total aggregate payroll”, if that figure is more than \$ 3 million (a larger project). If a project is not receiving the Film Tax Credits, then the offset credits to principal will be calculated at **5%** of that project’s “total aggregate payroll”.

Amend paragraph 2 of the Promissory Note to now read as follows:

At the end of this initial seven (7) year term following the date hereof, this Note will be repaid by applying to the principal due hereon offset credits equal to **6%** of the “total aggregate payroll” of the Co-Maker’s Studio Complex direct permanent full-time jobs during those seven (7) years, plus offset credits based on film productions’ “total aggregate payroll” as submitted either by letter from the producer(s) of the project or on a final “audited cost report” to the State’s Film Office for film/tv/video projects which utilize the said complex during that seven (7) year term following the date hereof. In the event the film productions are certified to receive Louisiana Film Tax Credits, the offset credits will be calculated at **4%** of that project’s “total aggregate payroll”, if that figure is less than \$ 3 million (a small project); or the offset credit will be calculated at **3%** of that project’s “total aggregate payroll”, if that figure is more than \$ 3 million (a larger project). If a project is not receiving the Film Tax Credits, then the offset credits to principal will be calculated at **5%** of that project’s “total aggregate payroll”.

Motion by Councilman Jackson, seconded by Councilman Green to adopt Amendment No. 1 to Resolution No. 89 of 2006. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Robertson to adopt Resolution No. 89 of 2006 as amended. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

RESOLUTION NO. 94 OF 2006

A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE PAY PLAN FOR GENERAL CLASSIFIED EMPLOYEES TO PROVIDE A \$1,800 ANNUAL PAY INCREASE AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the City Council, upon the recommendation of the Mayor, has amended the City’s 2006 budgets to include funding for a \$1,800 annual pay increase, effective on July 1, 2006, for general classified employees of the City; and

WHEREAS, the salary schedule attached hereto as Appendix “A” reflects said level of increase.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in legal session convened, that the salary schedule attached hereto as Attachment “A” be and is hereby approved, effective July 1, 2006.

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

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

Amendment No. 1 to Resolution No. 94 of 2006

Delete the original “Attachment A” and substitute the attached “Attachment A.”

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Robertson, to adopt Amendment No. 1 to Resolution No. 94 of 2006.

Councilman Lester: Very briefly. Thank you Mr. Chairman. I’m asking for your support on this. Since we’ve been on the Council, we’ve given our employees a couple of pay raises. And every time we do that, unbeknownst to me, I’ve been approached by a number of members that have been working for the city for a good period of time, that are at the end of the pay plan, and unbeknownst to us, what happens is, they get part of the increase, but it’s only a one year type scenario. And it’s like we give them something, but then the next year, it does not remain effective, because they’re at the end of the pay grade. Because our scale only goes up 10 steps. By adding these two steps, I think it helps to further tell those employees that have been with the city for a long time, and have provided us with a good bit of institutional knowledge to move forward in expertise, I think this is something that rewards them for their years of service. And as Mr. Dark has indicated in this particular fiscal year, this is not going to have any additional budgetary impact. And I think it’s something that we should do, and I urge your support on this amendment.

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

Motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Green to adopt Resolution No. 94 of 2006 as amended. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Green, and Jackson. 6. Nays: Councilman Hogan. 1.

RESOLUTION NO. 95 OF 2006

A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE PAY PLAN FOR MUNICIPAL POLICE CIVIL SERVICE PERSONNEL TO PROVIDE A \$1,800 ANNUAL PAY INCREASE AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the City Council, upon the recommendation of the Mayor, has amended the City's 2006 budgets to include funding for a \$1,800 annual pay increase, effective on July 1, 2006, Municipal Police Civil Service personnel of the City; and

WHEREAS, the salary schedule attached hereto as Appendix "A" reflects said level of increase.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in legal session convened, that the salary schedule attached hereto as Attachment "A" be and is hereby approved, effective July 1, 2006.

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

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

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

RESOLUTION NO. 101 OF 2006

A RESOLUTION AMENDING THE FIRE DEPARTMENT PAY SCHEDULE FOR THE MUNICIPAL FIRE CIVIL SERVICE PERSONNEL AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO BY:

WHEREAS, it is the recommendation of the Mayor that the current pay schedule for the Municipal Fire Civil Service personnel be adjusted to reflect a change in the civil service pay schedule, effective July 1, 2006, provided funding is made available and appropriated for such a purpose.

WHEREAS, the proposed pay schedule attached hereto as Appendix "A" be and is hereby approved, effective July 1, 2006.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened, that the pay schedule attached thereto as Appendix "A" be and is hereby approved, effective July 1, 2006.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that if any provision or item of this Resolution or the application thereof is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions, items or applications 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 Lester to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Green, and Jackson. 6. Nays: Councilman Hogan. 1.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS *(Not to be adopted prior to June 27, 2006)*

1. **Resolution No. 96 of 2006**: A resolution authorizing the Mayor to execute a contract with Metro Management Associates for Management Services for the City's transit system and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
2. **Resolution No. 97 of 2006**: A resolution authorizing the employment of special legal counsel to represent the City of Shreveport, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
3. **Resolution No. 98 of 2006**: A resolution authorizing the granting of a right of passage to Hugh and Glenda Ilgenfritz on a portion of land adjacent to Cross Lake owned by the City of Shreveport, and otherwise providing with respect thereto. (A/Lester)
4. **Resolution No. 99 of 2006**: Authorizing the Mayor to accept a donation of immovable property from the Dutton Family, L.L.C., and Sorensen-Naylor, LTD., and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
5. **Resolution No. 100 of 2006**: A Resolution authorizing the release of mortgages and cancellation of promissory notes executed by Shreveport Publishing Corporation (now Snap Property, LLC) in favor of the City of Shreveport in connection with the neighborhood improvement leveraging project and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Walford to introduce Resolution No(s). 96, 97, 98, 99, and 100 of 2006 to lay over until June 27, 2006 meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

INTRODUCTION OF ORDINANCES *(Not to be adopted prior to June 27, 2006)*

1. **Ordinance No. 72 of 2006**: An ordinance amending the 2006 General Fund Budget and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
2. **Ordinance No. 73 of 2006**: An ordinance amending the 2006 Budget for the Police Grants Special Revenue Fund and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
3. **Ordinance No. 74 of 2006**: An ordinance amending the 2006 Budget for the Community Development Special Revenue Fund and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
4. **Ordinance No. 75 of 2006**: An ordinance amending and reenacting Sections of Ordinance No. 96 of 1980 as amended by Ordinance No. 22 of 1981, Ordinance No. 333 of 1983, Ordinance No. 158 of 1989 and Ordinance No. 199 of 2002 relative to the levy and collection of sales and use taxes, by continuing to levy the tax of one-fourth of one percent (1/4 %) upon the sale at retail, the use, the lease or rental, the consumption and the storage for use or consumption of tangible personal property and on sales of services, in addition to all other existing sales and use taxes, all as defined therein, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

5. **Ordinance No. 76 of 2006**: Declaring certain adjudicated properties needed for a valid public purpose and otherwise providing with respect thereto. (B/Walford)
6. **Ordinance No. 77 of 2006**: An ordinance amending Section 22-62 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport by providing that swimming pool drainage systems must discharge to the City's sanitary sewer system: and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Walford to introduce Ordinance No(s). 72, 73, 74, 75, 76, and 77 of 2006 to lay over until June 27, 2006 meeting.

Councilwoman Robertson: On 76, on yours for a valid public purpose, that's to go in sync with Louisiana Law statute that was passed?

Councilman Walford: Right.

Councilwoman Robertson: Thank you Mr. Chairman.

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

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

1. **Ordinance No. 57 of 2006**: An ordinance authorizing the lease of City-owned property to Magnolia Baptist Church of Shreveport, Inc., and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (A/Lester)

Having passed first reading on May 9, 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.

Councilman Hogan: Councilman Lester, I just had a quick question for you. I read your legislation, and it talks about a community outreach program. It's something that I'm not familiar with. Could you give us a brief overview?

Councilman Lester: Sure, in fact, better than that, I could ask Rev. James to come up for it. If you could just briefly, Rev James and his designee. Mr. Chairman, thank you for that question. This matter has come to us from a very fortunate situation and circumstance. As you know, at our last meeting, we approved a measure that would allow an expansion of programming at the Allendale YWCA. And so, having expanded those programs and moving people from this particular small center, which is Allendale Park, we have a building that is basically vacant. And rather than have that building be vacant and go to ruin, I spoke with Rev. James and mentioned to him that there would be a possibility of his church using that building for community outreach in terms of the programs that they do with children, after school tutorial programs and things of that nature that the church is already doing. But they are having some challenges, because they don't have the space. Well, the fortunate situation is this particular piece of property is directly next door, separated only by an alley about as wide as my shoulders, and so they said, yeah. They would jump at the opportunity to use this building to continue the outreach for this building. So, when we say community outreach, we're talking about some of the things that Rev. James and the church have been doing in the community for a number of years, and this will give them a facility that they can do that. And program at an even greater fashion, take a building that basically would be vacant that could become a problem because if it's a problem, people are hanging out there, and then we have to get the police involved. But the church can do more programming, and it's an efficient use, because again, we're taking people away from the building and moving them right around the corner for the YWCA. So, that's what the community outreach is and maybe if you ask Rev. James some questions about some of the programs or some of the ideas that they have, he might be able to enlighten you further.

Rev. John James: (312 E. 81st Street) I'm the pastor of Magnolia Baptist Church which is as the Councilman said, (inaudible) boys club, and we would love to keep up the things that are already been going there. And actually be an asset to us, the community to take this on. Something that started many years ago. I remember sometimes, I talk with one of the guys that organized this club (inaudible) Johnson, and he thought it would be a good idea also. So, we'd be glad to take it up.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Chairman? Rev. James, could you enlighten us on the programs that y'all provide at this community outreach?

Rev. James: We want to provide whatever's been in the past, we're going to continue that. The same thing you know with our church workers, we'd love to do that.

Councilman Carmody: After school programs, to assist children to read? Could you give us an idea of what programs you offer?

Rev. James: Well, my secretary is here, but you know, I'd like to do that later, if you'll let me.

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

2. **Ordinance No. 62 of 2006**: An ordinance closing and abandoning of all the east 120 feet of the 16 foot-wide Calcoate and all of the 10 foot-wide Kelly Street bordered by Allen Avenue, and Pete Harris Drive bounded by Abbie and Milam Streets in the Kelly Estates Subdivision TAL 3 located in the south ½ of section 36 and SW/4 37 (T18N-R14W), Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (A/Lester)

Having passed first reading on May 23, 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 Carmody to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

3. **Ordinance No. 63 of 2006**: An ordinance closing and abandoning of all of the 66 foot-wide Battle Street right-of-way running southwesterly of Spring Street and located between Blocks "H" and "J" in the Roland Jones Subdivision in the NW/4 of Section 31 (T18N-R13W) Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (B/Walford)

Having passed first reading on May 23, 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, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

4. **Ordinance No. 64 of 2006:** An ordinance closing and abandoning the east 148 feet of the 15 foot-wide alleyway bordered by Missouri and Arkansas in the Queensborough Addition Subdivision located in the SE/4 of Section 03 (T17N-R14W), Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (G/Jackson)

Having passed first reading on May 23, 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 Carmody to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

5. **Ordinance No. 65 of 2006:** An ordinance amending Section 74-27 of the Code of Ordinances relative to solid waste containers and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on May 23, 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 Robertson, seconded by Councilman Walford to adopt.

Councilman Carmody: Just to clarify for the public that's watching the meeting or those that are in the Chamber. Yesterday during our work session, we discussed this, and basically, this is an action by the City Council to clarify that basically you're entitled to place on the curb the municipally issued trash cart, and a number of people I guess that have taken trash carts and then have a number of trash carts that they're using. And so, this basically you are to use the one that you are provided, and not to be taking your neighbors. So, thank you Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, what is the --, and I don't know maybe you'd elaborated on it and I didn't hear it yesterday, but what is the system for or process for enforcement?

Councilman Hogan: That wasn't discussed on yesterday. Mr. Strong, can you speak to that please?

Mr. Strong: What we will do is, in the past that we have not had anything. We said that you would have the one container that you would be given, and then you would have another container that you pay for. So, you would have two containers. We know which ones are listed, because we have those on and they'll purchase the extra container. So, what we will do when we go there, and they have more than the two containers, then we will be taking the other container. They will be notified, and they will take the containers.

Councilman Jackson: So, we'll just take them? And so we're authorizing the ability to remove them?

Mr. Strong: That is correct.

Councilman Carmody: And just to clarify Mr. Strong, if someone finds that their cart has been taken, or is damaged. How do they go about getting a replacement cart?

Mr. Strong: They call our Solid Waste at 673-6300, and they report that it has been stolen or damaged and we will go out and bring the damaged one in, or (inaudible).

Councilman Carmody: And you will document that number that is (inaudible) municipal address so that we know where it is. Thank you very much.

Mr. Strong: Well now, as far as that specific location for that, we do not document that. If they purchase a new container, we do document that.

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

6. **Ordinance No. 66 of 2006:** An ordinance amending Section 94-16 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport by enacting provisions allowing the City to terminate a customers water service in the event of a leak which creates a public nuisance; and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on May 23, 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 adopt.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Strong, This is going to be the Mike Strong Show today. Maybe you can answer and Ms. Glass can answer to help as well. If we're dealing with an emergency situation where a leak is causing a public nuisance, why do we still have to wait the ten days?

Mr. Strong: I think what we're looking at here, is that a situation, and Ms. Glass can come in later on, is that we have certain areas that are really not causing an emergency, but they are causing a nuisance area that's in there, because we have had an issue where it was actually going across the sidewalk, and was causing a safety issue, and we immediately went out and notified them to do something about it. But these are the ones that do not, we do the same thing with the sewer. We ran into an issue that we were kinda questioned, but it did not fall under the emergency, or the safety type factor that would come before us in the ordinance. But yet, we couldn't touch the water side. So that's all this is doing, is to allow us to continue.

Councilman Lester: Okay, so if you have a scenario where someone like the one, the situation I had in the MLK community where someone had a sewer problem that was affecting their neighbors behind them and everybody else, do we still have to wait for the ten days if that is a nuisance, but maybe does not rise to the level of public health?

Mr. Strong: Legal will tell me you have to go through the written process first. Now if it becomes an emergency situation, I think that's a different situation.

Councilman Lester: But this is not for emergency situation, this leak is just causing a nuisance, and we're not dealing with public safety.

Mr. Strong: Going across somebody's property is not really causing anything, I only ask you for the area of somebody's property soggy that's in there, we have not been able to address it before. Now, you know me, if they're paying their bill, I'd tell 'em that was good. But --(inaudible) problems with that in other areas.

Councilman Carmody: And Mr. Strong, this is just to clarify. These are for leaks that are actually on the property owner's service line side of the meter, because we have the authority to basically address those leaks on our side of the meter?

Mr. Strong: That is correct.

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

7. **Ordinance No. 67 of 2006:** An ordinance proposing an amendment to the Charter of the City of Shreveport, 1978, as amended, relative to employees of the City Council, ordering and calling a Special Election to be held in the City of Shreveport to present to the electors of said City the question of whether said amendment to the Charter shall be adopted and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on May 23, 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 Lester to adopt.

Councilman Jackson: I'd as you know a while back put this on the agenda, during the same time when I'd committed the sacrilegious act of suggesting that perhaps the Council should not be compensated, and I think it was taken out of context. My interest was in having served on the Council measuring the impact that any kind of compensation has on our district. In a conversation with constituent and a friend of mine who asked me about it, asked them a question, and then kinda entertained a question myself at whatever the rate \$14,000, whatever the amount that we are compensated right now, if in fact that we were given \$50,000 next year, would we in fact do more work? And I asked the question to myself, and I thought about that. So, what was really driving the conversation? I would suggest to you that I would not do anymore work than I currently do now, if I were given \$50,000. Because, and again I can't speak for everybody, but I believe people are doing, people who serve on this council are doing a yeoman's job and way more than any kind of compensation could possibly do, and so I recognize that. And so, I wanted to put it in context for people who I spoke with, with regards to money, that it wasn't being driven by that. But I wasn't trying to bring that to light, because based on the structure of what we have now and serving in our council as opposed to other cities and not all cities. All cities are relatively different, but in this city, my question became impact and how we best impact best our district. Many of us have the benefit and the burden and we make these decisions about serving with regard to what time we spend as we serve, and how we use time, and how we spend our time. And it's just difficult to be 24 hours a day, if you work and do other things as many citizens do, most citizens do, and still have the opportunity to serve. And my thought was under the same I guess model, that the state legislature and our state representatives and our state senators and others who are in government positions, who are "not fulltime employees," as well have a model where in fact there is someone who works as a constituency liaison. Who is there from 8-5. Who is able to return and respond to a call in 30 minutes from 9-10:00 where one of us may be in a meeting, God forbid, that we're not able to respond as quickly. I think one of the benefits of having an administration like we do, is that we're able to call on the Administration (inaudible) department heads, and they're able to respond whenever we're able to reach them. But I just think that so often there is a chasm between the constituent and the time that they can be served based on the time that we have. But it would be more prudent if you would, that we might even have liaisons or people who work. The law doesn't allow us to do that. I personally think that the law is to some degree, I guess it was written in 1978, but I don't want to use the term archaic, but certainly something that ought to be a flexible instrument, the charter that is, a flexible enough instrument to meet the needs and times that we are currently living in. And so that's why I bring this up and I just ask for your consideration, because I think it's something that if we talk about getting it done, and we're serious about how we budget for these purposes, that when you talk about impact in our districts, if I juxtapose a \$15,000 raise, and the ability to have an individual who can work from 8-5 who serves in our district on a fulltime basis, I can tell you, the impact in our districts immediately would be felt overnight by having someone who is also there who works along with us, if you will, versus just making more money, and how that would impact our districts. So, that's my logic. I'm asking that you would at least give it some consideration. I think that people who are citizens of this city can make the decision. And my request was to allow the people who live in this city to make this decision. They're ultimately who we work for, not ourselves. And while we have our own opinions, and our own beliefs, and I think one of the good things about a democracy is that we're able to put it before the people, and allow the people to weigh in on this conversation as well through exercising their right to vote, whether or not they think it's a good idea. And so, in many situations, we don't have an opportunity on everything we vote on, to offer referendum. There are some things like this that we have no choice on, and we're forced to put out in the form of a referendum or a public vote, and so, mines was an ordinance that simply is asking that we would in fact amend the charter or get the right from the citizens of Shreveport to amend the charter if in fact they think this is a feasible process.

Councilwoman Robertson: I have a two fold question. So you're proposing seven additional people to be compensated through the Council office, basically is what you're trying to do?

Councilman Jackson: Well, as it stands right now I don't know, I believe the law allows us to just employ people in the Council office. I would as I said to Mr. Thompson before, I'd be glad if we could have three more people employed in the Council office. It doesn't necessarily have to be seven, but if it's going to be any configuration as I talked about earlier, and in fact it would take, and what I don't want to do is skirt around the law. If the law needs to be changed, then we ought to change the law. But if in fact, it does not, and we can get it accomplished that way, but do know that right now, as it stands, with folks currently affixed in the Council office, it would be impossible for them to do the job that they already do, and I might add, do a yeoman's job at doing, and then also expect for them to respond at the level -- I mean right now Mr. Burton is a model, is an example of a person that we utilize, and right now, every meeting, we've got to schedule our meetings so that--like Mr. Hogan and I one night had meetings at -- fortunately, we had meetings at the same place. So we've got to have a person from the Council office arranging those things, and running back and forth from one meeting to the next, and he did a good job at doing that, but I just think that, that's unreasonable to believe that we ought to

expect people to do that. And I mean, you get what you pay for. So that's my concern. Doesn't necessarily have to be seven to answer your question.

Councilwoman Robertson: Okay, second portion is do we know the expense of putting this onto a ballot?

Councilman Jackson: We already, if I'm not mistaken Mr. Thompson, since there is a general election, already, it's just a matter of putting it on the ballot.

Councilwoman Robertson: Okay. It just said special election, so I didn't know.

Councilman Carmody: Thank you Mr. Chairman, and if you don't mind, I know it's appropriate to ask the question through the Chair, but if I could just ask the author of the legislation, it might be easier, if the Council would agree to that.

Councilman Hogan: Certainly.

Councilman Carmody: Councilman Jackson, the way that I read it and I think that my fellow Council Members maybe took it the same way was the way it reads would be to allow that the amendment would allow an employee of the City Council to be assigned to an individual member. Would you then envision that the staff of our City Council Office, and the Clerk Staff I should say, would then be basically assigned to individual Council Members in order to work fulltime for them?

Councilman Jackson: And I think that's a model. That's one of the possibilities. And again all the amendment will be doing -- what voters would not do -- what voters would not be going to the polls to say, they will authorize the Council to amend the charter to be able to do whatever the council desires. Right now, we can't do it, is what we're saying. We don't have the authority to do it. So, what I was asking Mr. Thompson how to get the authority to do it, whether you fund it or not. Because the voters won't vote into law something that we are then mandated to fund at that point. But we don't even have that option at this point. So, that's what I was trying to accomplish.

Councilman Carmody: Well, I guess it would -- but what I was looking at was I didn't know if the intent would be that future elected council members would have the discretion to hire a person that would then be assigned to them through the Clerk of the Council's office. And I don't know that I'd be in favor of that and as I sat and listened to you talk about it, I'm sure that you could probably fill this chamber with people that would tell you that I had not gotten back to them in what they considered to be a satisfactory time in seven years of service here. But in the same way, I'm not convinced that having a person assigned to assist me in performing my duty would make me any more productive. And again, that's just my personal feeling about it. Not that the public doesn't have the discretion to decide how they want to do it, but my vote is going to be "NO," and I don't feel like this would be something that I would like to see future councils do.

Councilman Lester: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I think the -- this idea and this legislation is probably one of the single best things that this Council can do, and I'll tell you why. Ours is a legislative body, and we are the only legislative body that I can think of, probably in the state that does not provide assistance or help for each and every individual council member. You can go back to 1978 and you can ask why? Many people would probably give you reasons. I don't know why. I would suspect that part of that would be because there was an effort to not allow this council to be all that it could be, which is a living, breathing, very respected organization that deals with peoples issues on a day-to-day basis. When you talk about the Louisiana legislature, whether you're talking about the House of Representatives, or the Senate, or you talk about our Congressional representation, whether it be the House of Representatives or the Senate, each and every one of those legislative has at least one person that is either a Chief of Staff, or a legislative assistant and depending on where you are in terms of the level of government, you have multiple staff members to deal with a multiplicity of issues. Lets be honest, I think we're doing a good job as council members. People might not always agree with the decisions that we make, but I think we're doing a good job. I think by allowing us to have assistants, that would allow us to do an even better job. An even more professional job. Because let's be honest. When one of our constituents has a problem, we should not be so naïve or narcissistic to believe that I'm the only person that can handle that problem. Because I'm not. My constituent calls me because I work for them, and my job is to handle their business. Plain and simple. If I am doing what my first obligation is and regardless of what any of us says, our first obligation is to our families. Each one of us has a family. And I don't think at any point our constituents would expect us to neglect our families in order to do our job here, although we do that a lot, and you could ask our wives and our husband. They will tell you probably -- well, that's another lecture. But at the end of the day, if we had a legislative assistant, you could, as Councilman Jackson said, you could improve the curve in terms of handling constituent issues. I don't see -- it would be the same as saying we elect someone to be Mayor, and we expect the Mayor to handle all of the business. We don't need a Chief Administrative Officer or we don't need assistants, or we don't need department heads. And I would take it even one step further. Well people would say, what (inaudible) with offices are we talking about giving private people money? No. Each one of us has at least one recreational center, SPAR Center in our district. Some of us have two or three. You could provide an office, and I would dare say, each and every one of those centers, has at least one space whether it's as big as a closet or big enough to put a table and two chairs, and run a phone line in where our assistant could meet with our constituents on a daily basis. So that if we are doing our jobs as whatever it is that our job is personally, if our constituents have a problem, they can go to that office, and say 'I have a problem with my water at such and such address,' or 'this is going on, and I need someone to get on that,' and that legislative assistant can respond to that constituent's problem immediately, and not wait until we finish with court or with a meeting, or with a with -- I'm dealing with this sales issue, or I'm dealing with this church issue, I'm dealing with these other personal issues. That allows us to become a more professional body. And I don't see anything that's wrong with that. In fact, I would say that for us not to do that is for us to say either we're scared to do the work, or we're scared to be held accountable. I don't have a problem with it. I think our constituents deserve the best that we can give, at the highest level of service that we can give. And by adding an assistant to the mix, that will allow us to do that. Any of us know that when it comes down to getting things done in the Council office, we have an excellent staff that deals with all seven of us. But lets just be honest. It's more than a handful to deal with one of us at a time, but when you have seven of us asking for five different things at the same time, it's taxing our staff tremendously. And they have to deal with things that are on a deadline as it relates to the notes and the minutes of the meeting. Keeping all those things flowing. It will again, it's not something that we're trying to expand our offices per se for public aggrandizement. The purpose of it is to allow us to become that much more effective in our representation of our constituents. In our private jobs, we are attorneys, we are college administrators, we are real estate agents, we are property owners, we are business owners, and each one of us has an assistant in our private office. Not for public aggrandizement. We have a system where -- well, you're shaking your head, but --

Councilman Carmody: I don't. That's alright.

Councilman Lester: Oh well somebody is --

Councilman Carmody: I just wanted to make sure that we're stating facts.

Councilman Lester: Well, I stand corrected.

Councilman Carmody: Yes sir.

Councilman Lester: But I would say that there is someone at that office that deals with some things for you in an assistant type of way?

Councilman Lester: You're looking at him.

Councilman Lester: Okay, well --okay, well you're the man.

Councilman Carmody: Thank you.

Councilman Lester: Having said that, we still have, most of us have assistants in the businesses that we do, and it's a routine type situation. And for us to say, that we can do that in our private business, but we can't handle our public business in the same fashion, I think it's saying that we would give a level to our personal business that we would not give to the business of our constituents, which I think is just as important, if not more so. So, I would say that this was a great idea. It's one whose time has come. Mr. Chairman, one of the recent editorials in our local newspaper ask where are the statesmen, and where are our Jeffersons? Well, I think this piece of legislation by Councilman Jackson probably qualifies as a Jeffersonian movement because it definitely expands and looks beyond our reach to deal with something that's a serious issue, and I would urge your support. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Green: Thank you. One is that I'd like to commend Councilman Jackson for doing this, and 2) is that on this council our history is to see what the people have to say. And I think this empowers the people to make that decision as to whether or not they want some more help or not, and I don't think we ought to deprive them of that. When constituents, all seven of us, when they have problems, they don't ask for the State Senator, they don't ask for the Representative, they don't ask for the Congressman, they ask for the City Councilman. So, therefore every issue, whether it's a school board issue, or whatever kind of issue they say call your councilman. We're a legislative body. It's a shame that we have to put such a burden on our council staff to do everything. And all seven of us want Robert Burton to be in one place at one time, and if he's not there, we want him now to be taking care of some concerns, but we also want him in the camera room. And then after he gets out of there, he's got to put it all together and do whatever else we want. And I just think that it's unfair, and I think as to what I said about Mr. Bowie, we expect for every lot to be cut, every car to be ticketed, everything to be done, but we've failed to empower them with what they need. And I think it's about empowering people to have the proper service. So, I'll be supporting this to say to the people 'hey, you could empower me to do a much, much better job or we can leave it like it is.' But I don't think that we ought to deprive the people. I remember some time ago, when were trying to get the hotel. The discussion was let the people decide. Lets do a referendum. The people need to decide. And now it comes for us to give the people an opportunity and my fellow council members say he wouldn't be in favor of giving the people the opportunity as to saying 'I got to protect the people from themselves.' And I think that's very unfair, but I think that we ought to be consistent in whatever we do. If we were consistent about and I see you shaking your head. Maybe I'm mistaking it. Mr. Mayor, do you recall the discussion about the hotel that there were council members wanting a referendum for the people to decide? Am I stating that right?

Mayor Hightower: I do think there was some discussion about that. Yes sir.

Councilman Green: And that was about a hotel, this is about taking care of their business to make sure that it's impossible for a council member or any elected official to answer every phone call, to answer every request. It's impossible for us to put that burden on our staff members. I mean we expect them, and when they don't, we have a way of putting them in their place. And I just think that, that's very sad. And I don't think we ought to hold our staff hostage. Even Mr. Thompson, we expect him to be at -- if I need him, and the six need him, whose he going to first? So, I just think that we ought to empower this council to do a better job. And again, thank you Councilman Jackson. I didn't make the comment about the pay, but I think you hit the mark on this one. So, you did a great job on this. So, at least I get a chance to keep my check and hopefully, I can get some help. So that when you call me since you live in my district, I'll be able to serve you better.

Councilman Hogan: Councilman Jackson, I have one question. I'm assuming that if your legislation passes, you want to put it on the September 30 ballot?

Councilman Jackson: Sure.

Councilman Hogan: And I just had a comment. Personally speaking, my philosophy has generally been that smaller government -- I don't want to necessarily grow government, I don't know if that could be classified as growing government. But it's been quite a struggle for myself. I had plenty to do in my business as all of us do. And we have families to take care of. I guess you end up pulling it all together at the end of the day, most of the time. There is some weeks that I could have a full time person for 40 hours, but there's some weeks, they would be sitting there with their hands in their pockets. They wouldn't have anything to do. So, would hope that if this passes and the people approve it, perhaps it might be a number less than seven. And those people would be able to float around to different offices and do different things, much like Mr. Burton does. Sort of neutral in this I guess, but I would be in favor of putting it in the hands of the people and letting them decide. I could take it or leave it. But I would be in favor of letting the public have a vote on it. And you had final comments on Councilman Jackson?

Councilman Jackson: Thank you Mr. Chairman, and I think you've said a few things, and everybody's made comments. And I don't want to chide anybody about their remarks because again one of the joys we have in democracy is we don't have to agree. And we all have an opinion. And I don't think anybody ought to be blasted necessarily for their opinion. But I will tell you that as Councilman Hogan just talked about this -- you know there's always pressure around. There's a reason why in 1978 people constructed it the way that they did in my opinion, and that's just my opinion. And the idea, I think is called a strong Mayor-Council form of government. But the truth of the matter, it's a strong Mayor, weak Council form of government is what is basically set up to be. And I might add, on many occasions it functions in just that manner. And I think my issue is to get back to what order have been, in my opinion, done which is to -- if you look at anywhere other than Shreveport. I mean there's a saying that the seven last words of most great institutions that die is, "we've never done it that way before". Because we get caught up in the only thing that -- we keep doing what we've always done, and we expect greater and greater results of more and more yield from that. But Einstein says that's insanity to suggest that we keep doing things with what we have and expecting better and different results. Perhaps the people in the city are saying "I'm satisfied with the results that we've been getting, like it the way it is, let's keep it the way it is." Maybe they're saying that. The problem is nobody on this dais know that they are

saying that or not. And what I'm suggesting is -- you know what I'm saying, I know what Councilman Carmody's saying, Councilman Green, and those who have spoken, I know what they're saying, but as much as we may -- you know in our own moments of self aggrandizement believe that we speak for everybody in our district, the truth is we don't hardly speak for our own households all the time, but so the issue becomes what do the people say. We do not have the ability in most instances, and I know in some cases, it would be easy to say 'lets give it to the people.' We don't have the responsibility of having a referendum or the ability to have a referendum all the time. But in this case, we have no alternative, but to have referendum, if in fact we're going to make any move in this regard. So, I guess my concern is have we ever looked at other cities, and have we considered ours a best practice, a best model? And do we owe it to the people that we represent to try to give them the highest and best use of taxpayer dollars. And when was the last time we looked to see if our current form was highest and best use? 1978? It's the last time something has been done to say it's highest and best use. We've gone out to vote to amend our charter before, only because different members of the council or the administration or whomever have said, I think there is something that we can do to amend this because this will serve people better. We continue to amend it because it's a living document, much like our constitution, much like our state constitution. This home rule charter is a living document that is amendable because the city doesn't look like it looked in 1978. The district size is not the size that they were in 1978. I would guarantee if you go back and look at the numbers. You look at the demography or demographic information and even the geography, the city is different. In 1978, some of the areas we represent were not even in the city in 1978. And so what I'm suggesting to us is that it's not far fetched to look at this document in what I think is a logical and intellectual way and to suggest that if it is in fact -- there are areas of this document that was drawn up in 1978, that we perceive to be steeped in antiquity, if you will or something that does not fit the current pattern or flow of life in 2006. And we ought to have the ability, not unilaterally. So, we have to send it back out to the voters. All I'm asking to do is to consider allowing the people to say what they want to say. Everybody here has a right to say whatever you want to say about it. Nobody in the audience has a -- I mean unless they say something in public comment, that's the only way we hear it. We haven't heard anybody say anything today. So, the seven voices while they may be legitimate voices are not the omnipotent voices that speak for everybody in the city per se on some of these issues. So, I would just ask that we would give this opportunity, because there are a lot of things and a lot of ways that we are lagging behind in other cities. Interestingly enough, I think he's left already, but Jaime Touchet and I were sitting in the State Capitol about three weeks ago, maybe a month ago, during a legislative session talking about -- I don't know, this came up and I think the pay deal came up. And one of his colleagues from Lafayette was sitting with us. And we started talking about the structure. We started talking about all those things that we would consider. And the guy said "wow, well you'd love Lafayette." And he started talking about the level of compensation and started talking about the different kinds of -- I guess for lack of a better term the (inaudible) that went along with that particular office, and the resources that were available in order to be able to actually do their jobs in that particular city. And so while I don't know that he was bragging so much, but he was saying "seems like you all are farther behind than I would have anticipated because you're a much bigger city than we are." Again, it's not about geography, it's not about the size of the city. I think sometimes it's just about how we're able to think outside of a box, and how a small city can have a larger mindset and a bigger view or a big city can have a small mind. And Councilman Lester I believe has said it time and time again over the course of the last several years we had to make a decision. And I think his statement is "if we're going to be a town, or are going to be a city?" And the truth is very often the people who have occupied the seats on this dais have been people who have been in favor of having a town rather than a city. Because in order to have a city, it means that we've got to continue to grow, we've got to stay on the cutting edge, economically development wise, and quality of life. We've got to do things a little differently than we've done in the past. And if we lack in my opinion, the vision and perhaps the fortitude to take those risks, then we do in fact secure for ourselves a town in perpetuity. And so I'd ask if you would, at least consider allowing the voters to have a word and a say on this issue.

Councilman Hogan: Just one final comment I'd like to make. I believe that it's important to note that assuming your legislation passes today, and assuming the public passes this as well, it does not necessarily dictate that it's something that we have to do every year. We can try it, and if we try for three people one year, and we don't think that's enough, I understand what you're saying, the number can be adjusted, right? Okay. And so if we feel like it doesn't work, we can totally wipe out the program as well.

Councilman Jackson: Same process.

Councilwoman Green: I was just going to say that you all could call me and I'd make sure that it's working Councilman Jackson.

Councilwoman Robertson: Would the funding come through our regular budgeting process that we would do to fund for the salaries for the -- like we do for the Clerks office?

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, same process. It would be the same system of appropriations as anything else in the Council's budget. It would just be on the Council's side of the budget.

Councilwoman Robertson: And would we need like the same type of criteria for hiring assistants or whatever, that we would go through the hiring process for someone if we needed to replace at the council office present?

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, I don't have the unilateral authority to say, but if it were me making the recommendation, I think the Council needs to be out of the hiring business as individual city councilmen. And that we follow the city's personnel rules for hiring staff as we do in the present.

Councilwoman Robertson: Okay, that's what I was meaning. Do we have to go through what any other employee that was hired.

Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Robertson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 5. Nays: Councilmen Carmody, and Walford. 2.

8. **Ordinance No. 69 of 2006:** ZONING APPEAL: C-16-06 - Amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the northwest corner of Hilry Huckaby and Russell Road, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from R-A, Residence-Agriculture District, to R-1H (PUD) Urban, One-Family Residence (planned unit development) District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on May 23, 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.

Substitute motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Walford to postpone until July 25, 2006.

Councilman Walford: In the way of discussion and I will say that I seconded only because we were handed a letter asking, plus the comments that Mr. Arceneaux made and I can understand his concern being hired today.

Councilman Lester: I can give some background Mr. Chairman, if I might. Thank you Mr. Chairman. This is an issue that is before the Council today, but it was appealed from a meeting in May, an MPC meeting. It's been on our agenda for at least two meeting, this is the second meeting. It has lain over the proper time. I know Mr. Arceneaux, a good guy. But for us to say that we have to stall the process now, because he was just hired when the proponents could have hired him and sought to move forward to or do something like that, they had plenty of time to do that to make any presentation that they would have, and I think it sets a bad precedent, because basically what we're dealing with is a stall scenario. One of the background issues that's going on as it relates to this development is dealing with Louisiana Housing and Financing Authority and tax credits. And quite obviously one of the issues is postponing this measure so the proponents can get their tax credits and then come back to this council in a scenario whereas now we have our tax credits, even though the MPC has voted NO, we still want you to vote YES. Now we have the tax credits and so now we have a financial stake. I just think there is no reason to delay this. My mind hasn't changed. I think the MPC made a very careful consideration of all the issues at the time, and their decision is the proper one. And for us to delay this any further puts and I think a negative situation because we're investing, or vesting someone in a property right financially, where it's not necessary. One of the comments that I think I saw from the letter basically indicates that if we move forward and uphold the MPC, then they're not going to move forward with their scenario down there. And I don't think that this council should be beholding to a developer when a developer moves forward before it's properly zoned, or all of the variances and things are necessary. I think that's a backwards way to conduct business. And so for that reason, I would ask that you deny Councilman Carmody's motion to postpone. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Hogan: We're voting on the substitute motion to postpone for how long Councilman Carmody?

Councilman Carmody: I think Mr. Arceneaux would have the ability to take a look at his information and get back to us in two weeks.

Councilwoman Robertson: They're asking for July 25th.

Councilman Carmody: Oh, I'll go with July 25th then.

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

9. **Ordinance No. 70 of 2006**: ZONING APPEAL: C-18-06 - Amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the east side of north Hearne, 1540 feet north of Hilry Huckaby Avenue, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from R-A, Residence-Agriculture District, to R-A-E, Residence-Agriculture/Extended Use District, limited to "a concrete crushing and product storage", only, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on May 23, 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 remand to MPC.

Councilman Lester: I have some brief discussion Mr. Chairman. You know one of the things that never ceases to amaze me is the hypocrisy by which many of us on this council conduct our business. When it's a scenario where we are wanting to make something happen in our own districts, we stand hard and fast on the rule that says 'this is something that's in my council district, I've spoken to my constituents and I'm asking for support or what have you.' The thing that bothers me about this particular scenario is I believe the MPC made the proper decision. There were two meetings that were held, one in May, in fact one in April. There were some questions that were asked relative to getting some additional clarity with their decision that was made in May relative to their reason. And for reasons for, I want to say for due diligence purposes, I am asking that this be remanded to the MPC. But please make no mistake Mr. Kirkland. When this is considered again, I will be there again, and I will be in opposition again. My mind has not changed, the position of my constituents have not changed. It does not matter who is trotted out, and it's offensive in many ways on several levels when you a scenario that deals in certain parts of town, you have such disrespect for that particular Councilman and those folks, that you have to bring certain folks to testify as if no way that this person could vote against something if the people that are supporting it have a financial interest from a job perspective happen to be the same race as that particular person as if you have so little understanding of the issues and so little integrity, that, that is what makes up your mind. It's more than offensive, it's intellectual insulting. And this council is better than that. It also bothers me from a standard and practice type scenario when a proponent wants to do something in another council person's district. And the Council Person who comes to the MPC meeting to make their objections known is the last person that's notified. I mean if I had an issue, if I was a business person, and I had something in District E, if the Councilman for District E came to an MPC meeting and spoke against it, you can best believe the first person I'm going to call is the Councilman for District E. Cause I want to know why does that Councilman have an objection. I'm not going to talk to the Councilman from District A, and then talk to the Councilman from District B, and then talk to the Councilman from District C, and then talk to the Councilman District G, and then talk to the Councilman from District F and then a day before the Tuesday meeting, place a phone call and say 'well, I tried to call you.' But it's not necessary, because I've done everything I can to secure the votes in another direction. So, I just don't believe I have to talk to you. That's insulting. And we've got to get passed that. There is one Shreveport. It's not Black, it's not White, it's not rich, it's not poor. It's a city that deals with it's zoning issues fairly, it deals with it's processes fairly, and it respects people, irregardless of the neighborhood that you live. Now, I might be crazy enough to believe that, that Shreveport exist, but that's the Shreveport that I'm working toward, and that's what my vote is going to reflect. So, please don't misunderstand. I don't agree with much that our President says, but I do agree with this. Once your mind is made up, that's the way it is. There is no flip flopping in my decision. I'm asking to remand this so that we can get some

clarification of the decision that was made. Because I do believe that there is going to be litigation following this. Because why else would you go get a hired gun from out of town? That says you're getting ready to -- in the legal terminology, you're ready to boot up. So, having said that, my motion is to remand this to MPC, but understand that I will be at the MPC meeting making the same objections when that meeting comes in the future.

Councilman Walford: Mr. chairman, I'm going to support my colleague in that remanding. And I did let my colleague know and I'll let the rest of you know that if you want to know about running a rock crusher, I will fancy myself as the Council expert. As a young Army Engineer Captain, I ran a rock crusher, and I'm sure that my hours are at least triple digits and maybe four digits. So, I have some experience on a rock crusher.

Councilman Green: Yes sir, I just wanted to say that Mr. Dark and Councilman Carmody and I were in a little discussion that Captain Mark Holley could leave. He won't have to explain about the cameras, and Councilman Carmody said he would be my assistant. As to what Councilman Jackson was talking about, we needed a system, and he would go and tell the Chief, so that the Chief could tell Cpt Holley. So, he's already assisting.

Councilman Hogan: Okay. I'm not sure what that had to do with No. 70, but thank you for those comments.

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

The adopted ordinances and amendments follow:

ORDINANCE NO. 57 OF 2006

AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE LEASE OF CITY-OWNED PROPERTY TO MAGNOLIA BAPTIST CHURCH OF SHREVEPORT, INC., AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BY:

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport ("City") is the owner of certain property located at 1500 Anna Street, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana; and

WHEREAS, this property was formerly the location of the Allendale Recreation Center; and

WHEREAS, the City has received a request from Magnolia Baptist Church of Shreveport, Inc., ("Lessee") to lease the property for use in its community outreach program and other lawful purposes; and

WHEREAS, Lessee is a duly organized Louisiana non-profit corporation; and

WHEREAS, the lease provides for an initial term of five (5) years, more or less with the option to renew for up to three (3) additional terms of two (2) years each; and

WHEREAS, the property is not needed for public purpose; and

WHEREAS, the lease of this property is in accordance with the provisions of LSA-R.S. 33:4712.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT ORDAINED, by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, legal and regular session convened, that 1500 Anna Street is declared to be surplus property not needed by the City of Shreveport for a public purpose.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the City of Shreveport is authorized to lease 1500 Anna Street, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana (generally referred to as the old Allendale Recreation Center) to Magnolia Baptist Church of Shreveport, Inc., for use in its community outreach program and other lawful purposes.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that Mayor of the City of Shreveport is hereby authorized to execute, for and on behalf of the City of Shreveport, any and all documents relative to the authorization contained herein, provided such documents are substantially in accord with the draft hereof filed for public inspection in the Office of the Clerk of Council on May 9, 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

Jeffrey A. Hogan, Chairman

Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council

ORDINANCE NO. 62 OF 2006

AN ORDINANCE CLOSING AND ABANDONING OF ALL OF THE EAST 120 FEET OF THE 16 FOOT-WIDE CALCOATE AND ALL OF THE 10 FOOT-WIDE KELLY STREET BORDERED BY ALLEN AVENUE AND PETE HARRIS DRIVE BOUNDED BY ABBIE AND MILAM STREETS IN THE KELLY ESTATES SUBDIVISION TAL 3 LOCATED IN THE SOUTH ½ OF SECTION 36 AND SW/4 37 (T18N-R14W), SHREVEPORT CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

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

WHEREAS, Water and Sewerage Engineering has reviewed this request and has no objections to this closure and abandonment.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened, that the East 120 feet of 16 foot-wide Calcoate and all of 10 foot-wide Kelly Street

bordered by Allen Avenue and Pete Harris Drive bounded by Abbie and Milam Streets in the Kelly Estates Subdivision TAL 3 located in the South ½ of Section 36 and SW/4 (T18N-R14W), Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana and as shown and as indicated on the plat attached hereto and made a part hereof, is hereby closed and abandoned. Drainage, utility, water and sewer servitude is hereby retained.

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

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

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

Jeffrey A. Hogan, Chairman

Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council

ORDINANCE NO. 63 OF 2006

AN ORDINANCE CLOSING AND ABANDONING OF ALL OF THE 66 FOOT-WIDE BATTLE STREET RIGHT-OF-WAY RUNNING SOUTHWESTERLY OF SPRING STREET AND LOCATED BETWEEN BLOCKS “H” AND “J” IN THE ROLAND JONES SUBDIVISION IN THE NW/4 OF SECTION 31 (T18N-R13W) SHREVEPORT, CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, today the Property Management Section of the Department of Operational Services has received a request to close and abandon the above identified alleyway; and
WHEREAS, Water and Sewerage Engineering has reviewed this request and has no objections to this closure and abandonment.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened, that the 66 foot-wide Battle Street located between blocks H and J in the Roland Jones Subdivision of NW/4 of Section 31 (T18N-R13N), Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana and as shown and as indicated on the plat attached hereto and made a part hereof, is hereby closed and abandoned. Drainage servitude is hereby retained.

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

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

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

Jeffrey A. Hogan, Chairman

Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council

ORDINANCE NO. 64 OF 2006

AN ORDINANCE CLOSING AND ABANDONING THE EAST 148 FEET OF THE 15 FOOT-WIDE ALLEYWAY BORDERED BY MISSOURI AND ARKANSAS IN THE QUEENSBOROUGH ADDITION SUBDIVISION LOCATED IN THE SE/4 OF SECTION 03 (T17N-R14W) , SHREVEPORT, CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

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

WHEREAS, Water and Sewerage Engineering has reviewed this request and has no objections to this closure and abandonment.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened, that the 15 foot-wide alleyway located in the Queensborough Addition Subdivision located in the SE/4 of Section 03 (T17N-R14N), Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana and as shown and as indicated on the plat attached hereto and made a part hereof, is hereby closed and abandoned. Utility and sewer servitudes are hereby retained.

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

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

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

Jeffrey A. Hogan, Chairman

Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council

ORDINANCE NO. 65 OF 2006

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND SECTION 74-27 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES RELATIVE TO SOLID WASTE CONTAINERS 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 74-27 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport is hereby amended to read as follows:

Sec. 74-27. Containers.

* * * * *

(f) It shall be a violation of this chapter for any person to possess any city provided wheeled cart not authorized by subsection 74-27 (b)(5). For any such unauthorized cart(s), a duly authorized employee of the city shall be authorized to remove such cart(s) without notice being provided. Further, each unauthorized cart shall constitute a separate offense of this chapter.

* * * * *

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.

Jeffrey A. Hogan, Chairman

Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council

ORDINANCE NO. 66 OF 2006

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND SECTION 94-16 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT BY ENACTING PROVISIONS ALLOWING THE CITY TO TERMINATE A CUSTOMER'S WATER SERVICE IN THE EVENT OF A LEAK WHICH CREATES A PUBLIC NUISANCE; AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

By:

WHEREAS, leaks from private water lines can create nuisances to the public, including safety hazards for streets and sidewalks, health hazards due to standing water, etc.

WHEREAS, such a hazard can be eliminated by the City's termination of water service to the address creating the nuisance:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, legal and regular session convened, as follows:

Section 94-16 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport shall be amended so as to read as follows:

Sec. 94-16. Responsibility for water leakage.

(a) All property owners, or their agents and tenants, shall be held responsible as consumers for loss of water due to leakage in the pipe or plumbing beyond the discharge side of the meter or on the property. If lost water is not paid for according to the rates provided in this chapter when the amount becomes due, the water service shall be discontinued until all amounts due are paid. Service will not be restored until all leaks have been repaired to the satisfaction of the department.

(b) In the event that a leak in the pipe or plumbing beyond the discharge side of the meter is causing, or may cause, a public nuisance, the City may terminate water service to the property, upon 10 days prior written notice to the owner and occupants of the property. In such event, service will not be restored until all leaks have been repaired to the satisfaction of the department.

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.

Jeffrey A. Hogan, Chairman

Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council

ORDINANCE NO. 67 OF 2006

AN ORDINANCE PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE CHARTER OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT, 1978, AS AMENDED, RELATIVE TO EMPLOYEES OF THE CITY COUNCIL, ORDERING AND CALLING A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT TO PRESENT TO THE ELECTORS OF SAID CITY THE QUESTION OF WHETHER SAID AMENDMENT TO THE CHARTER SHALL BE ADOPTED AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

By: Councilman Jackson

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

Section 1. Under authority conferred by Article VI, Section 5 of the Constitution of the State of Louisiana, 1974 and Article 15 of the Charter of the City of Shreveport, 1978, ("Charter") the City Council hereby proposes the following amendment to the Charter of the City of Shreveport, 1978, as amended by Ordinance No. 174 of 1990, as approved by election on November 6, 1990 and as amended by Ordinance No. 96 of 1994, as approved by election on October 1, 1994. Said amendment shall be submitted to the electors of the City at a special election, as hereinafter provided, in the form set forth in Section 15.05 of the Charter, which shall state the nature of each amendment as set forth after the text of the amendment below:

Amendment to City Charter Section 4.12

Amend Section 4.12 of the Charter of the City of Shreveport, 1978, to read as follows:

Section 4.12. Employees of council.

The council may employ and fix the salaries of only such employees as are necessary for the exercise of its function as set out in this Charter. Such employees shall not be subject to the provisions of Article 14 of this Charter.

Statement of Nature of Amendment No 1.

Amends Section 4.12 of the City Charter relative to employees of the City Council by deleting the provision that all such employees shall serve the council as a whole and shall not be assigned to any individual member.

Section 2. Under the authority conferred by Article VI, Section 5 of the Constitution of the State of Louisiana, 1974 and Article 15 of the Charter of the City of Shreveport, 1978, the applicable provisions of Chapters 5, 6-A and 6-B of Title 18 of the Louisiana Revised Statutes of 1950 and other constitutional and statutory authority, a special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana (the "City") on Saturday, September 30, 2006, between the hours of six (6:00) o'clock a.m. and eight (8:00) o'clock p.m., in compliance with the provisions of Section 541 of Title 18 of the Louisiana Revised Statutes of 1950 (R.S. 18:541), and that at the said election there shall be submitted to all registered voters qualified and entitled to vote at the said election under the Constitution and Laws of this State and the Constitution of the United States, the following proposition:

Proposition

PROPOSITION TO AMEND SECTION 4.12 OF THE CHARTER OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT TO DELETE THE PROVISION THAT EMPLOYEES OF THE CITY COUNCIL SHALL NOT BE ASSIGNED TO ANY INDIVIDUAL MEMBER OF THE CITY COUNCIL

Shall the following amendment to the Charter of the City of Shreveport, 1978, be adopted:

An amendment to Section 4.12 of the Charter of the City of Shreveport relative to employees of the City Council. The amendment deletes the provision that all such employees shall serve the council as a whole and shall not be assigned to any individual member.

For the Charter Amendment _____

Against the Charter Amendment _____

Section 3. A Notice of Special Election shall be published in the official journal of the City, once a week for four consecutive weeks, with the first publication to be made not less than forty-five (45) days nor more than ninety (90) days prior to the date fixed for election, which notice shall be substantially the form attached hereto as "Exhibit A" and incorporated herein by reference the same as if it were set forth herein in full. Pursuant to Section 15.04 of the Charter of the City of Shreveport, the Clerk of Council shall cause to be published the full text of the proposed amendment and the statement of the nature thereof appended thereto, twice in the official journal, the first publication to be not less than twenty and the second publication not less than five days before the date of the election ordered herein.

Section 4. This Council, acting as the governing authority of the City, will meet at its regular meeting place, Government Plaza, 505 Travis St., Shreveport, Louisiana, on Tuesday, October 10, 2006 at three (3:00) o'clock p.m., and will then and there in open and public session proceed to examine and canvass the returns and declare the result of the said special election.

Section 5. The polling places set forth in the aforesaid Notice of Special Election are hereby designated as the polling places at which to hold the said election, and the Commissioner-in-Charge and Commissioners, respectively, will be those persons designated according to law.

Section 6. The officers designated to serve as Commissioner-in-Charge and Commissioners pursuant to Section 5 hereof, or such substitutes therefor as may be selected and designated in compliance with Section 1287 of Title 18 of the Louisiana Revised Statutes of 1950 (R.S. 18:1287) shall hold the said special election as herein provided, shall make due returns of said election for the meeting of the Council on Tuesday, October 10, 2006. All registered voters in the City are entitled to vote at said special election and voting machines shall be used thereat.

Section 7. The Clerk of Council be and he is hereby empowered, authorized and directed to arrange for and to furnish to said election officers in ample time for the holding of said election the necessary equipment, forms and other paraphernalia essential to the proper holding of said election and the Mayor, Director of Finance and/or Clerk of Council are further authorized, empowered and directed to take any and all further action required by state and/or federal law to arrange for the election.

Section 8. Certified copies of this ordinance shall be forwarded to the Secretary of State, the Clerks of Court and Ex-Officio Parish Custodians of Voting Machines in and for the Parish of Caddo and the Parish of Bossier, State

of Louisiana, and Registrars of Voters in and for said parishes, as notification of the special election herein called in order that each may prepare for said election and perform their respective functions as required by law.

Section 9. Application be and the same is hereby formally made to the State Bond Commission for consent and authority to hold the aforesaid special election as herein provided, and that a certified copy of this ordinance shall be forwarded to the State Bond Commission on behalf of this Council, together with a letter requesting the prompt consideration and approval of this application.

Section 10. 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.

Section 11. BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that all ordinances or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Jeffrey A. Hogan, Chairman

Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council

ORDINANCE NO. 71 OF 2006

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 RUTHERFORD, 180 FEET WEST OF CRESWELL AVENUE, SHREVEPORT, CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA, FROM R-2, SUBURBAN, MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENCE DISTRICT, TO R-2-E, SUBURBAN, MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENCE/EXTENDED USE DISTRICT, LIMITED TO "A PARKING LOT" ONLY, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO

SECTION I: BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, in due, legal and regular session convened, **that after having earlier been considered and denied at a public hearing by the Shreveport Metropolitan Planning Commission of Caddo Parish, Louisiana,** that the zoning classification of property located on the south side of Rutherford, 180 feet west of Creswell Avenue, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, legally described below, **be the same is hereby changed from R-2, Suburban, Multi-Family Residence District, to R-2-E, Suburban, Multi-Family Residence/Extended Use District, limited to "a parking lot", only.**

A certain parcel of land containing 0.020 acres, more or less, situated in Lot 116, Bon Air Addition, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, being in Section 7, T17N-R13W, being more particularly described as follows: Commencing at the NE corner of said Lot 116 and proceed S00°04'42"W along the E line of said Lot 116 a distance of 20.00 feet to the P-O-B; continue thence S00°04'42"W along the E line of said Lot 116 a distance of 62.44 feet; thence leaving said E line proceed N89°47'03"W a distance of 40.03 feet; thence proceed N59°55'26"E a distance of 34.73 feet; thence proceed N00°04'42"E a distance of 45.00 feet; thence proceed S89°19'57"E a distance of 10.00 feet to the P-O-B.

SECTION II: BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the rezoning of the property described herein is subject to compliance with the following stipulations:

- 1. Development of the property shall be in strict accord with the site plan dated May 31, 2006, with any changes or additions requiring further review and approval by the Planning Commission.**
- 2. A six-foot solid wood privacy fence, facing Rutherford Street, shall run from the east property line of Lot 116, Bon Air Addition, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, to the front edge of the applicant's residence at 615 Rutherford Street, and shall have no openings whatsoever allowing pedestrian or vehicular access from the parking lot to Rutherford St.**
- 3. All fencing shall be installed within 30 days of the effective date of this ordinance or said approval shall become null and void.**
- 4. Applicant shall obtain all permits required for construction of the fence prior to commence of construction.**
- 5. No employee parking shall be allowed on Rutherford Street at any time.**
- 6. Approval of the parking lot is granted for a 24-month period only. Any extension of the 24-month period shall require re-application to the Planning Commission prior to the expiration of the approval period.**

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.

Jeffrey A. Hogan, Chairman

Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

1. **Ordinance No. 93 of 2005**: To amend and reenact Section 3.01 of Ordinance No. 96 of 1980 relative to exemptions and exclusions from sales and use taxes and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (*Introduced – 6/14/05 - 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*)
3. **Ordinance No. 68 of 2006**: ZONING APPEAL C-28-06: Amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance by re-zoning property located on the southwest corner of west 84th Street and Wallace, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from R-1D, Urban, One-Family Residence District to I-1, Light Industry District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (D/Robertson) (Remanded to MPC – May 23, 2006)

Mr. Thompson: There's been no indication that any of that is ready to be moved.

NEW BUSINESS:

Property Standards Appeal:

Ms. Pearline M. Caldwell, 2726 Hope Drive, Shreveport – *HBO0500089* (4045 Powell, Lot 2828, Cora Snowden Subdivision)

Mr. Bowie: This particular case is 4045 Powell Street. This particular case entered our system back in 2002 at the request of the present Councilman Green. It started out as a Care of Premise violation. Went to an inoperable vehicle violation. Went to a weed abatement problem. And then in August 29, 2005, the house sat vacant so long that it turned into a demolition candidate, so we started proceedings for that. A certified letter was sent to the owner, and it was returned. The tax interest owner signed for the letter and sent it back. We had a Board Hearing on the house on October 25, 2005. The Board at this particular meeting, the owner's son and step-son showed up and represented the owner and asked for additional time to rehab or demo the house. And what was given was additional 90 days. This 90 days ceased on January 25, 2006. No substantial work had been done to the house at this particular point. The owner meanwhile went and took a permit out in the Permit Section in October 4, 2005 and this particular permit expired on April 2, 2006. After this happened, the extent of the work was done. The main question at hand is the type of construction. The integrity of the work and the techniques being done. The house has asbestos siding on there, because of the old city codes we used to have, and a lot of it was removed, and there is questionable where it is disposed of. Also the electrical and plumbing is questionable too, because they do not have a City permit to do this particular work which, the majority of the work has been done within the last 60-90 days. If you count back from the time that the letter was sent out from my department from August 29, 2005 up until the present day, eight and a half months have been given to the owner to rehab this particular house. This house has been a nuisance in the neighborhood, and our testimony here, we believe that this house, the owner is moving very slow at rehabbing the house, and the construction techniques are questionable. Any questions?

Mr. Richard John: (3646 Youree Drive) I'm here on behalf of Ms. Burns. Ms. Caldwell is how she's listed, and that's her maiden name, and so I referred to her as Ms. Burns and I apologize if there is any discrepancy there. I have some documents I'd like to provide to the Council. Shall I provide them to you Mr. Thompson? I'm going to retain the original until I get through. Ms. Burns has eight children, she lived in this house several years ago in the '80s. She raised her children there. One of her children, Bill was in an accident in the '80s, and had a -- was paralyzed from the neck down. As a result of that accident, there was a lawsuit, and some money was attained, and she was able to through Bill's trust purchase a house that he could get around in. So the house that she presently lives in now is on Hoyt Drive, and it's actually his home. She has maintained this house which is her home throughout that time period. And she maintained it as a rental house. It has obviously decayed, and has obviously fallen into disuse. They had a renter in it and they had trouble getting him out of there, and he had junked up the house quite significantly. And they spent a lot of time trying to get rid of the junk and get rid of him, etc. They do intend to rehab this house. They have tried to rehab it. My understanding is the October 2005 meeting they had some misunderstanding of how long they had. They had obtained the permit in October 2005, and they were doing the work. I think they -- anybody whose tried to rehab a house that's not their main residence, can understand that there's money issues and there's time issues involved that don't always turn out in their favor. During this time period the decision was made by Ms. Burns, one of her other children Tim who is a carpenter to move back in town and to rehabilitate the house and to live in the house. And he has done the work on the house that is seen. I have included some photos I have with the original, I have the color photos that would be Exhibit 4, which shows that more work has been done, and some of them are similar. Some of them are similar photos, the front of the house has some different photos. But let me before I jump to that. The packet I provided you and don't want to bore you with it, but I tried to make it as simple as I could. In the first exhibit, the rehabilitation plan that Tim has put together and the time frame that he feels he would need to do with each of these. The second issue is the building permit that was obtained in October of 2005. The third exhibit is invoices that shows the money they've spent, which they spent since October \$4,000 for rehabilitating the house. And the last one is a petition which has been provided by the residents in the area. And I understand that some residents oppose it, but there are other residents who have signed the petition who know the Burns family and who supports their being able to bring this house up to code and Tim being allowed to live in the house. We certainly appreciate the Council's time, and we appreciate Mr. Thompson and his help in guiding me through this process, as you all know a familiar face is before y'all. Most of my work is done for the (inaudible) but certainly appreciate your time, and I appreciate y'all giving this some consideration. What Tim would like to do is like I said in Exhibit 1, he shows certain work that needs to be performed to the house to the exterior, the roof, and the interior. And he would ask for 90 days to do it. If there is an issue with the work being performed in a timely, I would maybe ask the Council to give him some deadlines to do certain work, and by the time that deadline has not been met, then the Council can push towards the demolition. But we would ask that they be given the time to rehab this house and Tim be given the time to do this so that he can move into the house, and then instead of losing the house that Ms. Burns has done her best to maintain all these years, it would be rehabilitated, and may not be a blight on the community, and will actually be a functioning house in the

community. And if you have any questions, I would certainly be agreeable to answer them. And if you have any questions concerning the actual construction, Tim is here and he is certainly more qualified to answer any questions concerning construction and how the work is done.

Councilman Green: Lawyer, my first question would be, have you been inside of the house?

Mr. John: Yes sir I have.

Councilman Green: Would you state how it looks inside?

Mr. John: The house needs a lot of work, but it also --

Councilman Green: Wait, just hold on. Have you any certificates in this package for termites?

Mr. John: No sir. There has been a termite inspection.

Councilman Green: Do you have the certificate?

Mr. John: No sir, I do not.

Councilman Green: Who would have it?

Mr. John: The termite --

Councilman Green: Are you aware that 1) the roof is going to cave in? 2 is this. If you're rehabbing a house, why would you tear boards off the side and when they tore the boards off the sides, there were so many termites that come out of that house until the neighbors had to go inside of the house until they put a board back on? If you in fact rehabbing a house, would you start, when the roof is caving in, would you start on the side?

Mr. John: Sir, I have absolutely no construction ability whatsoever and I'm not qualified to answer that question.

Councilman Green: No sir, that's just a general question, and I know you're the lawyer, and you're getting paid.

Mr. John: Well actually, I'm not getting paid, I'm a friend of the Burns family, and I'm here to help them out.

Councilman Green: So, my question is when you say you're here to help them out, if this was your mama, would you put her in that house the way that they're doing it? Since you're here to help them out. And I'm just asking you a direct question. You're a lawyer. I expect the integrity from you to answer the question on a human side, not on a lawyer side. But would you put your mama -- ?

Mr. John: With all due respect, I'd be happy to answer the question, but I'd like to make sure I can actually answer it. (Inaudible)

Councilman Green: The question is the way that they are reconstructing this house, after it was finished, if it's finished, would you put your mother in there?

Mr. John: I have seen Tim's work in other areas --

Councilman Green: Sir, I ain't talking about that.

Mr. John: Then I can't answer the question.

Councilman Green: I'm asking the question, as the work is going now, as what you could see has been done, that the roof is caving in, but instead of fixing the roof, they are nailing some boards, they're cutting some boards, and nailing them on, pulling some old boards off that have rotted and taking some other boards and nailing them on. You say you've been there. Would you start on a side taking rotten boards off when the roof is falling in?

Mr. John: Again I'm not qualified to answer that question.

Councilman Green: Okay, thank you. Well then you can have a seat.

Mr. John: Are there any other questions or am I?

Councilman Green: Because here again, if you came with this document and you're being fair with us, if you're not qualified to answer these questions, I don't think you ought to be representing them. Because half of the story is being told. And I don't think that's right. And as what you said, you're a friend of the family, and I respect that.

Mr. John: With all due respect, if you would allow me to answer the questions, I'd be more than happy to answer 'em. But what you want is a one worded question that falls into your favor, and I can't give you a one worded answer. I'll be happy to answer the question. Would I allow my mother to move into the house? If Tim finishes the work and he says that it's done, I trust him that Tim will do the work which is competent, and which will be safe. And so at that point and time, yes sir I would. But as the house is now, I don't think that it is inhabitable because it's in the middle of -- it has deteriorated and it is in the middle of being rehabilitated. And so no, if the answer would I allow my mom to go in there right now? No sir, I would not.

Councilman Green: Thank you.

Mr. John: If the answer is after it's been rehabilitated, and do I think that Tim does sufficient work and knows what he's doing, then yes sir I would.

Councilman Green: So, my question again would be or my statement, if whoever is doing this work, know what they are doing, why would they pull the boards off the side of the house and cut something look like some ply boards to just nail on that with cracks in there when I don't know anything about carpenter work, I'm not an expert, I'm like you. But I may not know when tis, but I know when taint, and that taint the way to do it.

Councilman Hogan: I have a couple of questions Mr. John. I just want to verify that some of the bids you've received from C&M Construction, I notice it's the same address as Ms. Burns.

Mr. John: That is Mr. Burns, that's Tim Burns.

Councilman Hogan: Okay.

Mr. John: And to say it's a bid, no, I asked Mr. Burns, I said what the City Council needs to be provided is -- I mean I can't just go in there and tell them 'oh, they're going to get this done.' I've dealt with this in the past with Minden City Council was very gracious to people and knew that they wanted to rehabilitate homes, but they always required them to 'tell me what you're going to do. Don't just tell me you're gone do it, tell me what you're going to do, give me some timelines as to what are realistic. And that's what I asked him to give me. So, it's not a bid in the sense of this is going to be done for this amount of money, it is in a sense of this is what needs to be done to rehabilitate the house and the timeframe that he believes it would take.

Councilman Hogan: That's fine, that's fine. I just thank you for clarifying that. If you said it before, excuse me, I didn't hear it.

Mr. John: Oh no sir, and I don't want to misrepresent that. I make sure that you understand that I wasn't trying to misrepresent that.

Councilman Hogan: That's fine. I noticed Exhibit 2, it says building permit obtained on October 25, 2006?

Mr. John: That's a mistake, I was typing this afternoon, that should be 2005. And if you notice on the building permit itself, it is dated October 25, 2005.

Councilman Walford: I did have a couple of questions, I noticed as the Councilman was alluding to the building permit expired April 2nd, but most of these receipts that you've given us for materials were at least three weeks after that. Has work been going on without a permit?

Mr. John: I can't answer that. I think that was part of the issue that arose, was when they tried to get the permit re-done, they were told that the house had been slated to be demolished.

Councilman Walford: As I understand this from Mr. Bowie, this goes back to 2002, that the house has not been maintained.

Mr. John: I believe that's when the tenant was in the house.

Councilman Walford: And I also noticed that all of our notifications are going to an (inaudible) owner that's a tax sale buyer.

Mr. John: That has been redeemed.

Councilman Walford: So the property was sold at tax sale obviously.

Mr. John: Yes sir, and I have a redemption, and a lot of the notices were going to the property address where Ms. Burns does not live. She lives at the Hoyt Drive address and the notices to my understanding they were being, I believe from talking with Mr. Thompson, they were being delivered to the Powell Street address.

Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Robertson to uphold the decision of the Property Standards Board of Appeals. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Robertson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

Zoning Appeals

1. **Case No. SC-23-06** (Subdivision request) *MERIDIAN COURT, LLC*, Enoch J. French, Jr., north side of MLK Drive, approximately 750 feet west of Shreveport- Blanchard Hwy, **R-1H (SPI-2)**

Motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Green to uphold the decision of the Metropolitan Planning Commission.

Councilman Lester: We're dealing with a site that maybe two years ago, there was another proposed development at this exact same site, almost the exact same scale in terms of development issues. The people in the neighborhood made it clear that they believe and I agreed with them that, that development plan was out of kilter with the neighborhood in terms of density, size and other health and other safety issues. This Council, so that we make sure that we're not arbitrary and capricious voted against moving forward with that particular development. And in voting, I said to the proponents at that time, which was a different group of people, same parcel of land, that if they could find another parcel of land in the Martin Luther King community, I would do everything in my power to help get that project built, and that's exactly what happened. A project was denied on the exact same location, a new location was found on Round Grove and David Raines that has been constructed very successfully. We've been very successful in doing affordable housing in the Martin Luther King community. We've build a number of units that are outstanding that give a tremendous sense of pride and have lifted property values out there. So much so, that I'm going to brag for a minute, that our school board has said that out of the three areas in the Parish that are growing that need new schools, one of those areas is the Martin Luther King community. So there is something to be said for our process and procedure as it relates to affordable housing and building houses in the Martin Luther King community, despite what other people have said, they think that this is a (inaudible) situation, but there is planning that goes into this. So, I would say that for the same reasons that a developer was denied two years ago, I would think that so same issues still apply here, and I would ask that we be consistent and uphold the MPC's decision denying this. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Jackson: I've been trying to figure out where this is.

Councilman Lester: This is behind Michaud and Redstone, behind those apartments, behind that University Terrace neighborhood. If you continue start at the corner of Huckaby and (inaudible) west Martin Luther King. You get to Michaud, right? Okay, just passed there, there is an open parcel of land that lies between this subdivision, this parcel of land is between that subdivision and Ironwood and that neighborhood back there. If you go Easy Living, you have to make a right turn on Huckaby and go further. It's not quite to Easy Living.

Councilman Jackson: It has nothing to do with it, I'm just trying to visualize where this property is.

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

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES: None.

CLERK'S REPORT: None.

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

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting adjourned at approximately 5:58 p.m.

Jeffrey A. Hogan, Chairman

Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council

Clerk's Note: "Ordinance No. 69 of 2006" was postponed at the June 13, 2006 meeting. However, Ordinance No. 69 of 2006 was inadvertently titled "Ordinance No. 69 of 2005," in the City Council Minutes and published

on June 19, 2006, in the Official Journal, and advertised as an adopted ordinance. This amendment to the June 13, 2006 minutes was made at the June 27, 2006 City Council Meeting to correct this error.