

COUNCIL PROCEEDINGS OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT, LOUISIANA
MAY 14, 2002

The regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, was called to order by Chairman John David Stewart, at 5:40 p.m., Tuesday, May 14, 2002, in the Government Chambers in Government Plaza (505 Travis Street).

Invocation was given by Councilman Carmody.

On Roll Call, the following members were Present: Councilmen Huckaby (arrived during the meeting), Stewart, Carmody, Serio, Spigener (arrived during the meeting), Shyne (arrived during the meeting) and Burrell.
7. Absent: None.

Motion by Councilman Burrell, seconded by Councilman Carmody for approval of the Summary Minutes of the Administrative Conference of April 22, 2002, the Minutes of the Regular Meeting of April 23, 2002 and the Special Meeting of May 7, 2002. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Stewart, Carmody, Serio, and Burrell. 4. Nays: None. Out of Chamber: Councilman Huckaby, Spigener, and Shyne. 3.

Awards, Recognitions of Distinguished Guests, and Communications of the Mayor Which Are Required By Law. Mr. Dark: In view of what you guys have done this afternoon, we wouldn't dare have any other Communications. I will tell the other members of the Council what I told you, I'm going to have to leave you all in about an hour so if you have concerns of the Administration that come up after that time, please relay them to the Clerk and he will be happy to give that to me tomorrow.

Public Hearing: None.

Confirmations and/or Appointments: Motion by Councilman Burrell, seconded by Councilman Carmody to confirm the appointment to the Greater Shreveport Human Relations Commission: Rhonda Eizel, Michael Gibson, William Malpass, and Reverend Kenneth Paul. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Stewart, Carmody, Serio, Shyne and Burrell. 5. Nays: None. Out of Chamber: Councilman Huckaby and Spigener. 2.

Motion by Councilman Shyne, seconded by Councilman Burrell to confirm the appointment to the Shreveport Convention Center Hotel Authority: Reginald Abrams. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Stewart, Carmody, Serio, Shyne and Burrell. 5. Nays: None. Out of Chamber: Councilman Huckaby and Spigener. 2.

Public Comments: *Kenneth Schmidt* (416 Travis Street, Suite 501) Shreveport, Louisiana): I am before all of you just for a little simple issue. I have a development that I am trying very hard to work out, 9800 Norris Ferry Road and some of the opposition that is sitting behind me has raised a few concerns about traffic, drainage, density and whatever else they can think of.

My engineer is going to touch on all of those points for you all, if you all allow him to speak right after: traffic, the drainage problem that we saw with the 100-year retention basin and the density is just a non-issue. The City, actually this city council has approved numerous R-1D developments adjacent to large lots out there in this area already.

I just wanted to get in front of you and say that as a young man, a young businessman, an entrepreneur in the City of Shreveport, been trying to better not only myself but the City and trying to get some of my other buddies involved in business coming over from Dallas and such, it is easy for me to see why people want to leave Shreveport because a small group, in my case a small group of wealthy people are opposing a reasonable and legitimate development and from what I gather, this kind of stuff happens on a regular basis. If you all would, please allow my engineer to speak on all the technical issue of this time. I would appreciate it.

Councilman Shyne: I don't know whether this would go to you Mr. Mohr or to your developer. Could you give us the dynamics on, lets say if you would cut back on the number of developments in that particular area, would it be feasible or what I want maybe is couple of scenarios to look at. Maybe I think what I heard on yesterday that with the number that you have is going to increase the traffic and I guess if you live in Dallas or in Houston or some of these other, or Atlanta or New Orleans, I mean you are going to have a lot of traffic anyway. But I still have some sensitivity toward the people who live in that area about the traffic but that. . . . Mr. Mohr: I'll address that.

James D. Mohr, Sr. (6025 Buncombe Road, Shreveport, Louisiana, 71129) I talk slow, so it's going to take a little longer than 3 minutes. Now, regarding some of the issues, I'll do my best to be brief, but I'm gonna talk about drainage first.

This particular piece of land is flat. It's on top of the hill like a basin. When it rains water runs in all directions. The advantage of this development is that we collect the water on site so that water does not run off on the subdivision to the north, does not run off on the convent to the south, nor does it run onto Ellerbe Road. We have devised a plan that has been approved by the City Operational Services Engineers for our detention. The ditching requirements for the ordinances of the City of Shreveport is for the subdivisions to design for the ten year storm. We've designed for the one-hundred year storm.

The subdivision to the north of us just put on record only design for the twenty-five-year storm. Let me show you the difference between the discharge. Here's the discharge that they put in for the twenty-five-year storm. Here's my discharge for the one-hundred year storm. I don't believe there is anybody in that area that's gonna flood from the discharge of a six-inch pipe. And the beauty of it is, that I collect water that runs off onto other people and I put it in my subdivision and take it off them. The convent has water standing nearly a foot deep on the back northwest corner. We take their water and put it into us. We take all the water off the subdivision to the north and redirect it.

Now, the summary is we've done a design more than the ordinances call for by your ordinances that you passed, more than the engineers which you've commissioned and we have gotten their approval. I don't see how the drainage is an issue since we've overdone everything that they've asked us to do and gotten their approval.

I would like to go onto the tract. Yes, we're going to put 82 lots on this street. I would like to start with what this Council has done in the last few years. Not only was the subdivision approval down Norris Ferry Road, but what zoning you have just approved that's gonna throw traffic and the summary of it is, you didn't pay any attention to traffic for the hundreds of lots that you approved from Southern Trace North and including Southern Trace. You just approved about five hundred lots zoning down at east/west loop that's going to throw traffic on this thing and my little ole 17 acres, you're worried about traffic off my 17 acres?

Now, I'm gonna show you and traffic kind of ties in with my discussion about what this Council has done about the mix of lots. And the summary of it is. . .

This little map shows Southern Trace. Here's Norris Ferry running up the middle. Every time I've been down to the Planning Commission, they're adding on six to twenty lots in Southern Trace. The only place they've got to go is up Norris Ferry Road. Right next to Southern Trace, in 2000, this Council approved St. Charles Place that butts up to two edges of Southern Trace. These lots in this subdivision are 65 feet wide and there's hundreds of them.

Also there is a little subdivision name, I can't pronounce it, to the north that's been there since '96. It has acreage lots and you approved St. Charles Place right next to that big lot subdivision. Then in 2001, you

approved Norris Ferry Crossing right up next to these big lots and it has 70 foot wide x 130 foot lots and it goes that way, all the way up Norris Ferry Road. Not shown up here is the approved zoning. Mr. Mason got several hundred 65 foot wide lots approved at the southwest corner of Norris Ferry and the east west loop. You just did that last year and the first of this year, Mr. Aiello, just got a whole bunch of them approved, small lots, big lots.

Now, right over here is Hidden Trace. It backs up to lots that are 240 foot wide x 300 feet deep. Up here is an old subdivision, see those long lots running east west. Look at those little bitty rascals right by it there. You didn't do it, the Parish Commission approved that one. And so what I'm saying to you is, yeah, our little ole subdivision is going to put some traffic on Norris Ferry, but there is thousands of lots that this Council approved, in your term down Norris Ferry Road and nobody said anything about traffic problem.

Now Mr. Strong has presented a case of what the City is going to do and is doing to relieve the problems, but what happens is people don't recognize there is at least three exits besides Norris Ferry Road. The east-west drive up here leads over to Wallace Lake Drive which carries on north to the Industrial Loop. If I go on further north to this project, and this project is located with the outline here.

This is a subdivision, but a tract called Cliffwood. In Cliffwood are 5 acre to 15 acre tracts of land, they are not lots. Sometime ago, this subdivision Ellerbe Woods, there's Neesonwood Drive was created. The ratio of the size of these lots in this subdivision to what's in Cliffwood is like, these are 1/7th the size of these lots here and so the act of having large lots versus small lots has been in here for years.

My point is that the expectations of my client is that this Council and the Planning Commission would follow the same rules and same procedures that they've had for years down Norris Ferry Road and that is putting smaller lots next to big lots. There is not one place in this whole area, that this Council has turned down small lots versus big lots or big lots next to small ones. In fact, when Sherwood Forest came on the tract in '85, this five hundred lot, Ellerbe Road Estates was already recorded. Even the small lots next to Sherwood Forest and since they developed large lots next to small, surely you're not telling me that these Sherwood Forest people thought these small lots were detrimental. So I'm saying to you, the phobia of small lots next to big lots or big lots next to small lots doesn't exist.

Secondly, this Council just approved the first of this year, the Haven, a subdivision which is up by LSU-S, that client developed his lots with small. You know what he built, \$175 dollar in Kings Crossing. He's got 350-/\$400,000 house right next to it, so he don't see a problem with it.

So, based on what this Council has already approved for years, my client has an expectation of being able to have small lots next to big lots and the idea of them being detrimental to each other doesn't exist.

Earl Rayburn (9904 Oak Haven, Shreveport): I spoke yesterday with you gentlemen and ladies concerning these issues. We are adamantly opposed to any further dense developments in our neighborhoods in our immediate area along Norris Ferry Road, due to the fact that traffic congestion and as well as safety concerns for fire and ambulance as well as for the drainage and our traffic back ups that we displayed yesterday, which we won't be able to do today.

As far as the discussions that were related to the exits and the ingress and egress of the area, there are two. They dump out on Norris Ferry Road which goes into Ellerbe Road which junctures to Flournoy Lucas. Flournoy Lucas is the only way you can go east/west from our division. Unless you want to go south on Leonard Road and catch Youree Drive and come up the Youree Drive corridor. So we have basically two immediate exit areas or entrance areas and we're trying to limit the amount of traffic to further impede any type of vehicle whether it be personal or emergency.

Secondary, we think a high density program like this is not called for in our immediate area, the demonstration that was previously given is 2½ miles to the south of us. Across the railroad track and there are barriers and borders. We don't have those barriers and borders where we are. Cliffwood and Sherwood Forest and my subdivision which I speak for which is Wild Oak are all one acre or larger and we're trying to maintain that type of rural setting; so, I would implore that you please rescind the MPC vote on the Norris Ferry Winchester Court.

Councilman Shyne: I think I saw Margene, I don't know if you're prepared. The Chief was in here earlier. Do you all have any information on what he just mentioned. That's the first time, I've heard that about emergency vehicles being able to . . . Do you all have any information or that or would you have to go back and check that out? Mr. McCoy: We would have to check that out, but as far as congestion, I can't tell you whether there's any problem with congestion with emergency vehicles going on at this time, I know of one in the area that's going on. I was just trying to listen to what he says. If there is any it hadn't been reported back to me.

Councilman Shyne: How close, do you have any idea how close the nearest fire station to where we're talking about? Mr. McCoy: Well, there is one at Ellerbe Road and 19 is out on Ellerbe Road. You've got no 20 exactly 2 miles away from that which is all the way over to Flournoy Lucas Road down to Highway 1, that's the first two companies in the south part of town. I don't have any knowledge of any problem of getting an emergency vehicles in. But I would be hesitant to say that without going back and researching the medic units that run in that area. It's kind of hard to answer that for you, but I have no knowledge of it at this time.

Councilman Shyne: The reason I asked that question this is the first time it has been brought up and to be truthful with Councilman Serio, I'm not really that familiar with that area out there.

Councilman Stewart: Ms. Catherine Mitten. Let me say that on this information here, it indicates that you represent 32 families, is that correct? Ms. Mitten: Yes, sir.

Catherine Mitten (I live on Winding Ridge off Ellerbe Road): I'm a native Shreveporter and unlike Mr. Schmidt's comments, I am not part of a wealthy group trying to stop this development. I promote development, I'm all for it, but not when we haven't addressed the traffic issues and contrary to what Mr. Mohr says, there are traffic issues.

I'm a working mom and my husband and I go back forth down Ellerbe Road between work several times a day, taking children to and from school, ball practices, gymnastics, et cetera and it is already a disaster situation to try to get out. Often in the morning time, no matter how early you leave, you are stuck sitting at the end of your street trying to turn onto Ellerbe Road for ten minutes, fifteen minutes and you've got the problems again in the afternoon. Once you finally get onto Ellerbe Road, then you're in bumper to bumper traffic down at Flournoy Lucas. There are not turning lanes at Flournoy Lucas. And it's a difficult issue as a parent knowing that in a couple of years, I'm going to have a teenage driver that's also going to be facing the same issue.

I'm not part of any group that's got an agenda, I'm just a concerned parent that we don't do anymore regardless of what's been done in the past. I think that's immaterial. We're talking about this particular development and it's a high density amount of traffic that's going to add into our neighborhood and I just would appreciate your consideration in rescinding this MPC vote.

Councilman Shyne: Again you brought the traffic issue up, and because I've had some calls about the issue and I will have to admit that I don't live in that area and I really don't frequent that area and I really don't know anything about the traffic problems. But I am concerned and I was wondering if we have anybody here from the City who could, Is Mike Strong still here? Councilman Stewart: Is there a representative from the City other than Mr. Dark.

Councilman Shyne: Who could speak about the traffic problem. Councilman Stewart: Mr. Kirkland is here. Mr. Dark: Mr. Shyne, I'll take a shot at it while he is coming up if he wants to. Everybody understands that

traffic in Shreveport is difficult and it's most difficult in rush hour in the morning. The only thing that is long term that is going to help that is something that Congressman McCrery is working on, to try to get an I-49 interchange so that at least some of the people who go that way now will have another way to go.

Now there is also work being done by the state to widen Ellerbe just to Flourney and to do some work on the intersection at Flourney Lucas and Ellerbe and to make the Inner Loop more accessible but that only helps them once they get to Flourney Lucas, its not going to make much affect before then.

The longer term solution is the inter- change which is a few years off, but which appears to be getting funded as it needs to be.

Councilman Shyne: Charles, do you concur with that? Mr. Kirkland: More or less. One of the things we do well in the planning arena in Shreveport Louisiana is transportation planning. Regardless of the problems we are having now, we're not only the leader in the State, we are the leader in this region of the South. We have pre-planned and pre-built roads, but growth like it is occurring in this Ellerbe Road, Norris Ferry Road area has surpassed almost anything anyone would have guessed. Tom as you know, several years ago, we were working on this east west roadway and it's beginning to be there. We will have an interchange at I-49. There are going to have to be some improvements in the Norris Ferry Road/Ellerbe Road areas, no question of that. The question is really going to be, what improvements can be done. The closest thing we've discussed, we being NLCOG and the DOS and Parish Officials is three lan-ing Norris and Ellerbe Road. But I can tell you from meetings we've had in past years many of the residents of that area do not want those roads touched. They don't want them widened. Now, hopefully when we eventually do address the widening and it will have to come, because that is the only solution to handling the volumes of traffic.

There is another thousand acres, out in that area that is going to be developed. Now, that means even if you put two per acre, you're still going to have another two thousand something homes eventually, its just one of the growth areas for the city and the parish. So we will have to deal with that transportation issue. We are updating that transportation as I speak. We got a grant from the State of LA because were the leader in Louisiana in planning for roadways. So we will not behind the curve. We will definitely be a little bit off that mark in terms of handling the transportation needs that are there.

So it's valid that there is a transportation problem now, but it's not valid that, that problem isn't on its way at some point in the near future to being solved.

Councilman Shyne: Question. And I know the reason why it is so much growth out in that area is because they have such a dynamic Councilman and that is Councilman Serio. Of course now, when he gets off the Council it might now be that much growth out there, but question is why is it that some of the residents out there do not want the roads improved or want them widened?

Mr. Kirkland: This area is as I tried to say yesterday, this area specifically, if you take Overton Brooks on the south, Ellerbe Road on the east, and the railroad track on the west, and then come up to Norris Ferry and Ellerbe, if you take that more or less triangle, this is the last piece of property to be developed and it's somewhat understandable that these folks are real concerned about this last piece and there is a little bit more to add to this last piece, but not a lot. There is a little more to the west of Mr. Schmidt's proposal, but there is not a lot left in this quadrant. So I think that Mr. Shyne is why they are concerned with this specific area and if you look at a map, you can see why that makes some sense. Because some of the real relief valve, if you will, is going to be that east-west roadway going over that interchange of I-49 and that's below Overton Brooks, is where that will occur and relieve traffic. That is my only speculation to your question.

Councilman Shyne: I know the MPC members get an opportunity to go out in that area and look. And to be truthful, I don't want to say I'm confused and I don't know what I'm doing, but I would be more informed, Councilman Serio, if I had an opportunity to drive out and look and to be there physically. I get an idea from the map but I guess maybe I'm not that sharp, and I have a tendency to grasp things better if I can see it in person. Mr. Kirkland: I can pull a graphic from that screen if want me to.

Councilman Shyne: Could you. Mr. Kirkland: I believe, if Herschel turn it on. This is Overton Brooks, this is the railroad track that I was referencing and actually this map doesn't show it, but over in this direction in the east would be Ellerbe Road and Norris Ferry going right up in to about here is a about where that intersection would be and this section, all this drainage for example is winding up in this Cliffwood Lake, right in this area and even water that leaves this tract goes to the west, goes to the south (inaudible)and still goes back to that lake.

Councilman Shyne: Where would the exit be that would go into I-49? Mr. Kirkland: That would be to the south of here. You would go below Overton. See where this railroad track, if you were to continue on down to where the railroad track crosses Norris Ferry just about a few hundred feet to the south of that is where then you would go to the west to Wallace Lake and that would be what we what we call the east- west roadway.

Councilman Shyne: And that would go into I-49? Mr. Kirkland: Eventually that's what will go into I-49 and will be the interchange. But these folks as a rule in all probability will not go south, although they could. It is somewhat illogical for them to go that way.

Chairman Stewart: Mr. Kirkland, what is the time frame of completion on the east/ west issue to I-49 that you just mentioned. Mr. Kirkland: It's like most roadways Mr. Stewart, I wished I could give you a definitive time but it's a high priority, we have the funding if I'm not mistaken still left in the federal funding for the interchange.

One of the rules is that we have to build a roadway and we've got some roadway to build. Tom, you may know. I'm aware that we got the funding probably five years or more.

Mr. Dark: We have some of the funding to provide the roadway from Wallace Lake Road onto the interchange. I don't think we've got all of it, but the intention was to get that done at whatever point the feds told us we had to, to get the interchange done. It's a way off, five if you are lucky. Councilman Stewart: We would just need the facts. Mr. Kirkland: Five is a good guess.

Bob Brown (1509 Cambridge Street): I'm the Parish Commissioner for this area. So I will tell you that I have received zero calls in favor of this subdivision, every call I received is against it.

We have a problem with drainage. We have problems with traffic. We have problems with density. I think I should have said "yea verily" or something when Mr. Mohr was speaking because everything he said is the reason that this is a bad project. It reminds me of when my children did something wrong and their excuse was " well, so and so is doing it". So, this is what happened in the past. And this is what's happened here. We had so much density that now we have accumulative effect. I go up that way frequently, it is in my district. My son lives out near Southern Trace. For him to go down to the hospital in the morning, he must leave before 6:00 a.m. He cannot get there quickly, because the traffic backs up from the intersection of Norris Ferry and Ellerbe Road all the way back to the intersection of Overton Brooks. Once you get on Ellerbe Road, the traffic backs up all the way from Ellerbe Road to the intersection of Flourney Lucas. This happens for about an hour and a half period. Fortunately when I'm going out early in the morning to play golf, I'm going the opposite way, unfortunately I see the traffic at that time.

Right now, my main concern is the safety, safety from traffic getting in and out. There is too little traffic. There's too little provision for drainage. I understand that the lake that was mentioned across the street used to be four feet deep, it is not one foot deep from the silt and such that has been put in there. Safety is the main concern. I urge you to uphold the appeal and turn down the MPC approval of this project.

Councilman Shyne: Commissioner Brown, I see now why those people elected you in that area. You are an excellent speaker.

William J. Moser, (I live at the corner of Neesonwood and Norris Ferry/9802 Neesonwood Drive): If you would allow me to. There we go. That would be my house right there. And by the way, I don't care which way you go or which way you come in you can go all the roads you want to intersect with I-49, you got one place to enter and exit that subdivision and it's right at the corner, in the front yard of my house. I don't care what you do. They got one entrance. The traffic engineer told us there will be one hundred and twenty cars minimum, entering and existing from 7:00 in the morning to eight and five and six. My wife and I have four kids that play up and down that street on Neesonwood. The traffic alone would devastate my property. Period. I don't care what you say, yes, that's the exit and my house is right on the corner, Mr. Shyne.

Now, you talk about density and this thing, congruent with the other neighborhoods, Mr. Shyne, you just pointed at my house. Those lots you see there are 1.3 acres in size, that's 56,628 sq ft. Mr. Burrell, unfortunately I was here earlier today but said you were a math major, a good person in math. Now how any body can tell me that the lot 7200 sq. ft. is similar in size to something 56,628 ft., it doesn't work. If you can make that work in math then you really are a math genius because it doesn't work that way. (Councilman Burrell: He is talking about relativity.)

They are not similar in size. The houses in Cliffwood and Neesonwood, they are all at least twice the size on average of what's being proposed. This traffic issue is a big, big deal to me. It is a safety issue for children and it's just not right for the neighborhood. There are no lots similar in size from Overton Brooks to Ellerbe Road. They're not there. All the lots you drive down you can see and see those are all big lots. The density in this proposed subdivision is not right. I said from the very first time, Mr. Schmidt, heard me say it. Everybody has heard me say this, if he was proposing 18 lots on 18 acres, I wouldn't be here today. I wouldn't be here today. Do something that's congruent with what all of us invested a large amount of money.

Mr. Schmidt, -- about a brunch of wealthy people trying to protect their investment. It is about a brunch of wealthy people trying to protect their investment. A lot folks already left today: Todd Burns was here, a little bit ago, he employs one hundred people in Shreveport. I don't know how many folks you employ. These people that live out there are the people that make this city pump. We are the folks that are putting money in here and having jobs. You mentioned people leaving the area, people are leaving Louisiana at an alarming rate. You do something like this and you are sending a message to everybody in this room that Shreveport is not a place to invest a sizable amount of money in a house and it sure isn't a place to invest money in a business.

Mr. Lacy H Williams: The prior meeting lasted so long that it screwed up our presentation on the computer. Everybody saw it yesterday except Mr. Serio, so we're going to try to go through it off the screen.

Lacy H. Williams (I have a home at No. 7 Cliffwood Place and I represent these organizations to present this information for you). We are all opposed to this for those reasons you've already heard. Density, compatibility, drainage, and traffic and I want to show you some of the problems we have.

This is the subdivision that he's talking about. Mr. Mohr keeps talking about small lots, big lots. This area is Ellerbe Road Estate where Ms. Mitten lives. They have the worst problems of all and they are the ones that are really upset about this, because they cannot get out of their subdivision in the morning or get in the afternoon. But this subdivision will dump all this traffic this way and it will also dump all this water into our lake. This is a contour map showing Cliffwood Lake and these are our homes around it. Those are not 15 acre lots, by the way, some of them are 2 acres and some of them are 7 acres. Most of us moved out there 20-25 years ago to a rural area. His subject property slopes south and west on his contour lines. In the middle of this property is a large wet area that the Corps of Engineers has already investigated and it's approximately 5 acres that water stands on it all the time. This property that he is planning on developing will have 80 some odd houses, roofs and concrete and they're gonna take all that water instead of slowly coming out and coming back and most of it is staying here. They're going to take that water supposedly into a 100 year plan. He didn't tell you that he's going to start out with a 10 or 15 year plan and then he's going to do this and he's going to do that. What are we going to do if he goes bankrupt and doesn't complete the subdivision? Are we going to have to go in and take care of the drainage. Well anyway the water is going to come down to right here and that's where John Wilson's house is who you all saw yesterday. We're already having flooding in his back yard and then the water is coming into the Cliffwood with mud.

This picture is in the middle of Mr. Schmidt's subdivision. That's a wetland that's about 5 acres. That stays there all the time and he's gonna take that water and put it into the Braemar and put it into us.

This the last big storm, March 21st, I showed you this yesterday. This is mud and debris coming from Braemor. They have a 25 year plan that you all approved and yet it's not holding back the mud. And we've already lost 3 feet of our lake in the last seven years. The Parish paid us \$10,000 to dig it out the last time and I spent \$30 so I didn't get enough and I made big mistake not asking for more.

This is the mud coming into our lake and the next one shows what it looks like after the last big rain. It stayed this week three weeks. So you can see what kind of problem we're having.

As far as the traffic is concerned, Catherine really showed you what's going on. Fourteen hundred cars a day, we can't take care of that anymore and they certainly can't take care of it on Ellerbe Road. This is what's happening. Norris Ferry Road is full of cars in the morning as Mr. Brown showed you. This road is bumper to bumper and actually goes past Railsback and almost down to Overton Brooks where my son gets on every morning at 7:20 to take his kids to school.

One hundred and twenty cars would just decimate us. This is what it looked like yesterday morning at 7:15 a.m. This is Norris Ferry Road and he wants to put 120 more cars in there. And this is what it looks like going to Flournoy Lucas Road going north. Next one. This is like this going all the way past Norris Ferry Road. So you can see what our problem is out there. We already have the problem caused by the development and we cannot take anymore traffic.

So, for these reasons, I want to ask you all to vote this down, to not increase our problems. We're a small subdivision out there. We've given you, I think, 80 or 90% of the people out there have turned in a petition in opposition to this and you should not change us and give us all these problems that they propose and I thank you for your time.

Councilman Shyne: I do understand how you feel and I am sympathetic toward what you're saying. Have you all tried to work with the developer . . .

Mr. Williams: Mr. Shyne, can I address that about working with him. I know Kevin and I called him up and said I'd like to meet with you, Kevin. And he came to my office and we sat down with John Wilson and I told him I was all for entrepreneurs. That's what we do in our business. We're in the gas business. We want people to make money here and Mr. Cook is developing a lovely subdivision right next to him and he's able to do that and he's gonna have 13 lots on 18 acres and it's just gorgeous if you drive out there.

And for some reason, I say, why don't you just do yours that way and we'll work with you and try to get the drainage figured out so you won't have any problems. And he wouldn't even talk to us about that. We're all willing to have the subdivision like we have out there. We're not trying to stop development, we're just trying to stop development that's going to hurt his neighbors.

I want to mention one other thing. You talked about liability. We've got a big liability with that dam. Because when you, and I say you, I shouldn't say that, because you all weren't City Council Members then, but Ellerbe Road Estates is dumping a tremendous amount of water into our lake and the City approved those subdivisions without any retention ponds. And what's happening now is, anytime we get a 2-3 inch rain, we've

got water all over our roads. The water is as high as 3 ft. over our spillway. We've extended our spillway twice in the last nine years and we're still having problems handling it. And that, if that dam breaks, it's going to go south through Ellerbe Road and I don't know where the water is gonna go, but it's a significant problem and we don't need anymore significant water coming in there. So, those are other problems that need to be brought up.

Councilman Shyne: Question to you again and let's say, if Mr. Schmidt will be willing to work with you all in coming up with a plan that would fit into that area . . . I can understand what you're saying. . . Mr. Williams: Yeah, the zoning, it's the zoning. We want it to stay zoned the way it is.

Councilman Shyne: Yeah, right, I can understand your position and I can understand his position wanting to use his land, but I would hope that you all could agree on using it in a manner where it would not cause a hardship on the developers that are there now. Would you all be willing to maybe. . . cause I don't know, he might not be willing to cut it down. If he was willing to cut the number of lots down, is that possibility. . . ? Mr. Williams: What the area wants and needs, is to stay zoned the way it is and we all moved out there and built homes out there with it zoned that way. That property has been zoned that way. My property is zoned that way. And that's what should be left, because we all invested our money and moved for that kind of atmosphere and it should not be changed. What he wants to do is spot zoning and this is incorrect.

He has available the right to go in and build 1 acre home sites and no one is going to come up here fight that as far as the zoning is concerned. Now, he'll have to take care of his water, but that would be maybe 10-12 houses and 1/8 of the traffic and I don't think you're going to hear anybody complain about that, because we all feel he has a right to do that because we all moved out there with that right. But we didn't move out there with the idea that he was going to put 1400 cars in front of our entrance everyday.

Councilman Serio: Mr. Chairman, I've got quite a few issues, in fact I was planning on doing this at the end of the meeting, but with all the questions Mr. Shyne is asking . . . Mr. Williams: Are you through with me?

Councilman Serio: I might as well just go ahead, I think I can wrap up a lot of the questions (unclear) was asking.

Councilman Burrell: Mr. Williams, you may have already answered this. I think the gentleman right here may have also. What is the optimum size lot you are looking for out there? Because in listening the dialogue that you all have presented, there appears to be property that are different sizes anyway in that area. The question that somebody has two acres, somebody has five acres, somebody has seven acres. Even if you had that, there are different sizes in proportion to each other. Now, this is just an observation and if that be the case, then I guess the most logical question to me would be, what are you looking for? Mr. Williams: We're looking to maintain it just the way it is. It's zoned for one acre lots and that's the way they should leave it. That's what everybody on that street and that neighborhood -- for example, if you went down Fairfield today and bought one of those old houses, would you let them tear it down and put eight houses on one of those big lots?

Councilman Burrell: Well, I'd be praying for any type of urban development if that's the case. Mr. Williams: You would? Councilman Burrell: I mean, that would be a situation where it would be a matter of "what's" going out there. Is it a decent house, is it something that is within the range that is already there. The question that was posed yesterday, because it was brought up here about the cost of the property that's there, it came up that the houses or what have you, is a quarter of a million to \$500,000. And I posed the question "what will be the cost of the homes or the property whatever, for the new development ? They said \$200,000 and above, so . . . Mr. Williams: I'm sorry sir, we're not. . . I know what you're talking about. The people out there don't care how much those houses cost. What we're talking about is that we don't want to change the character of our neighborhood. This is a rural area. I got behind a tractor the other day coming in and . . .

Councilman Burrell: That's illegal on (unclear) streets. Mr. Williams: And an acre lot is what we moved out there for and this is the only little tract left. This is completely surrounded. I wish I could show this again. Councilman Burrell: I've seen, I have a good visual picture of what's going on. Mr. Williams: Well, I'd like to point out to you what you're talking about. There are no -- they keep talking about houses close to this. This is Ellerbe Road Estates. This does not border on what we're talking about. You have to go all the way to Ellerbe Road and go left and go down to get into this area. These houses do not enter into our subdivision. This is where the subject area right here.

Councilman Burrell: So Ellerbe Estate does not impact the tract that you're talking about?

Mr. Williams: Ellerbe Road is the disaster with all that traffic and that's what Ms. Mitten just told you. You know when she talked about representing 32 families here today. They live in Ellerbe Road Estates.

Councilman Burrell: And that's the upper left portion. Mr. Williams: Upper left right there.

Councilman Mr. Burrell: And that traffic does not exit out into the road that leads into the street . . . Mr. Williams: That does not exit on the Norris Ferry. Our traffic exits on the Ellerbe Road and we hit them in the morning and we all have this great big traffic jam out there.

Councilman Burrell: You're talking about where Ms. Mitten is? Mr. Williams: Yes, right there.

Councilman Burrell: Does that add to your traffic problem out on . . . ? Mr. Williams: Of course. They have several hundred houses in there and that's what we're saying. The City Council and the Planning Commission has approved all this high density development, but the City has not done anything about taking care of the transportation. Now Mr. Kirkland says, you all got a great plan, but you don't have any action. And five years from now, maybe we'll have something out to I-49. Well by that time, Catherine's children will be through high school if they survive. So, I think what we're telling you is, we don't want you to change it and we don't think it's right that should change it.

Councilman Burrell: But I hear Mr. Williams, that the people don't want the road widened. Is that true or not? Mr. Williams: Well, you know, some of these houses are pretty close to the road Mr. Burrell. And in fact all along Ellerbe Road, I think it's only about 50 or 60 maybe 60 ft. back or set back. You all would have to buy maybe 25 houses to increase Ellerbe Road side. Now the secret is, to this is, Mr. Serio has the answer and maybe he's going to talk about it, but if you'd widened Wallace Lake Road, that would give access, all south. But that really wouldn't help us much, because we have to get over there to get there. But as far as the whole area is concerned, that's the way you've got to go if you're going to be able to take care of all that land out there and going down Ellerbe Road and Norris Ferry Road is not a satisfactory answer.

Councilman Burrell: So you don't have a solution? Mr. Williams: We don't have a solution and the head of traffic told us that at the last meeting we had with him. He said, we don't have any plans to do anything about this out there at all.

Councilman Serio: Thank you Mr. Stewart. I don't know if we have any. . . how many people we got left to speak, but it may be in the. . . Councilman Stewart: How many people on this topic have not spoken please raise your hands. 1, 2, 3. One on the left . . . pardon?

Councilman Serio: I was going to say maybe an order of brevity, I could wrap up some issues and try to tie all this together if that is okay with the speakers. Councilman Stewart: Any objections? I see none. Go ahead sir.

Councilman Serio: Mr. Chairman, I'm going to go over a couple of issues. Go back to this same map. The issues that we've got in this neighborhood and of course we've had incredible development in the neighborhood for the last several years. We've seen more development in southeast Shreveport than anywhere else.

We've heard the discussion about density problems, traffic problems, drainage problems. It is killing us

right now. We have got so much growth taking place in District D. And especially in the southern areas cause people are starting to move further south into larger developments.

One of the things that we look at is density of this particular development compared to the other areas. What I have done is taken the map and put in some overlays, looked to see what comparable property, some of the larger lots completely with an overlay over this. And I'm getting a ratio of basically about 67 lots to 2 and I've got a very unusual density right here. I've got 67 lots to 2, when I'm taking the Cliffwood area. When I look at what's happening from Regency Blvd. and I'm taking these 7 lots on Regency Blvd. and comparing them to what I've got in this particular development. I've got a density of 48-7 and I've got another density, when I look at where Mr. Moser lives and of course in the house right here, in taking the two house next to his, in his particular neighborhood, I've got a 25-3 density comparison.

And the problem we've got is that in southeast Shreveport, we've been growing pretty quick and we've been growing with large houses and big houses and we've been growing with more and more developments. And one of the nice things that's happened is that we're growing. We've seen it in the population, District D has grown more than anywhere else in the City, but we haven't built the infrastructure. We haven't built the roadways. How do we get to it? What do we have to do? This particular development, I think is going to hurt the developments that are already there. We've got people that have lived out there 18-20 years. Joe asked the question a while ago, "Why not just widen the road"? I think you hit on the answer just a second ago. Widen the road means you have tear down brick walls, you're going to have to tear down rod iron fences and you're going to have to go through and tear out nice wash gravel concrete driveways, brick driveways, things of that nature. Well, quite frankly, for the City of Shreveport to go in and tear that up, it's going to be an incredible expense for a three lane highway or a four lane highway or five lane highway. We literally need a five lane highway.

The other problem in the area quite frankly comes back to Wallace Lake Road is the only area that we can get out of the district and widen it and only impact half a dozen houses. If I go up this particular street and I go up and I try to tear up Norris Ferry and Ellerbe Road, I'm going to impact hundreds of houses at a very incredible expense. Wallace Lake Road unfortunately is one of those roads that isn't completely in the City. It meanders in and out of the City of Shreveport and the Parish. This is going to take an inter-governmental problem to resolve. It's not going to be a City of Shreveport problem and it's not going to be Parish Government problem. It's going to be an inner-government problem. And sooner or later, we're going to have to work with the Parish to find a way to get this roadway widened. It is the only way we're going to be able to completely get this roadway finished and get the problem resolved as far as traffic.

The particular development, it doesn't match. You can look at the development, you can look at the comparables around it, it doesn't match. I asked Mr. Schmidt first time he came into my office, I said tell me you can remove about 70 units and you and I can work very fine. It's not going to happen. Most of the units, most of the development in the area, I have asked to approve. This one in particular, if it was comparable with the other developments, I wouldn't have any problems with it. If you look and you go back to the maps and you look and most of you've seen these before, we've looked for density, we've looked for comparables in all of our neighborhoods in trying to keep our neighborhoods growing, and continue to grow, I'm going to ask you to vote against this one. This is the reasons why, I'm going to ask you to look at these and look at the maps and I'll just. . . Mr. Chairman, can I just leave this up here? Councilman Stewart: Certainly fine with me unless there are objections from someone on the Council or among the audience.

John Wilson (489 Regency Drive): I want to mention just one thing. I want to expand on this drainage issue some. We've heard that there was no drainage problem. We've been told that at some of the meetings. Yet, yesterday, you were told that the Parish and the City is putting up \$50,000 each for a drainage study. Why? Because they don't have any solution. You already have a problem. And I live across from my neighbors in the Cliffwood Lake. I've seen their lake be destroyed and I've seen water in my backyard. I have seen it yet much higher even lately and here, we're going to pipe the water eventually in their hundred year pond, it will be piped down the hill again.

Now, the photographs you saw, one in Lacy's presentation, that wetlands area. That water generally percolates, and just sits there until it dries out. You say how do you know? Well, just look at the vegetation. Took samples of the vegetation, we sent them off to the Corps of Engineers. So we're not talking now about some kind of wild accusation. I submit to you that the Parish engineer has told me "we can't fix the problems, we don't have the money", city engineer. And you know what they said the only solution is, (1) To do a study, which could last eight months. (2) Go to the Federal Government. That's the kind of money that you've got to get to fix what you have now with no additional development. Thank you for your patience and all in this late afternoon.

Joseph L. Hargrove, Jr., (9639 Norris Ferry Road): I thank the Council for the opportunity to speak. I've been called one of the small group of wealthy people, while I appreciate the compliment, Mr. Schmidt, I'm really one of a large group of neighbors who opposes this horrible idea.

I've lived where I live for 18 years. The area is not an urban area. I want to put this in the context of the zoning statute. This zoning change seeks to go from RA to R-1-D for a PUD (a Planned Unit Development.) It's very placement in the statutes is under urban development. This is not an urban area. This is a suburban area if not a rural area. Therefore, it's simply the wrong thing to put in this part of Shreveport and I'm talking about the neighborhood north of Overton Brooks, to Norris Ferry Road's intersection with Ellerbe Road. All the stuff south of Overton Brooks and the railroad tracks don't have anything to do with this tract, they're not even comparable.

I'd like to close by pointing out the very essence of what this zoning statute should be looked at by the City Council and anybody else who interprets the statute. The ordinance states and I quote "in interpreting and applying the provisions of this Chapter, they shall be held to the minimum requirements for the promotion of the public health, safety, and general welfare." These are minimal requirements. You've heard about the problems that the drainage and traffic will create. Now, if the public health is going to be injured because of the drainage and the possible flooding; if the public safety is going to be harmed because there's going to be more wrecks with the traffic; well if both of those things are going to be harmed, there is no way that the general welfare of this City will be promoted by this poorly planned subdivision.

The Chairman recognized the requests of *Billy Doyle, Hersey Turner* who had left the Chamber.

Councilman Serio: Mr. Chairman, I would like to make the motion to disapprove this particular legislation that was approved by the MPC. So the motion on this would be a motion for denial.

Chairman Stewart: One minute please, before we have a second. We have some indications from the Clerk.

Mr. Thompson: I might have been out. Have we suspended the rules to bring this up at this time? Councilman Serio: I think we need to.

Chairman Stewart: Thank you very much for reminding me. I think that's something we discussed earlier in order to allow people to excuse themselves.

Councilman Burrell: Mr. Chairman, given the opposition that's here today, where is Mr. Mohr and Mr. . . I guess the developer? Would you come forth? You've heard the comments associated with the lot size, that's what I'm hearing most in this issue, because some of the other things that we're talking about in terms of traffic, in terms of flooding, I guess we could've said that about the development before this one. But it was not done

even though those lots may have been large. Given what has been put here today, I'm hearing that your density is too great.

Mr. Schmidt: Could you show that map again. All of this, if these people are so concerned about density, they would not have built these large lots on R-1-D that is already there, that just would not have done it and they did.

If the City Council and the Metropolitan Planning Commission in its wisdom has approved the exact same thing that I am doing. Well, I might not be exactly right by your house sir. I'm not asking for anything different and that is why I won unanimously at the MPC.

Councilman Burrell: Well, let me pose this before the vote is taken. Would a reconsideration of a larger lot size be possible? Mr. Schmidt: When I met with Mr. Williams . . .

Councilman Burrell: I'm not saying acre per se. Mr. Schmidt: Oh, no, there's no way I could. There is just entirely too risky for me. I'm just . . . I don't have the risk, the money to do that. Is that all you need?

Councilman Serio: Mr. Chairman, if I may just make one comment. The development, these point to fronts onto Ellerbe Road and Norris Ferry (inaudible) so it opens up into a different street.

Ms. Glass: Mr. Chairman, just for clarification, your normal procedure on a zoning. Did they vote to suspend? Mr. Thompson: No Ms. Glass: Never mind. My comments comes after you consider whether to consider the rules.

Motion by Councilman Stewart to suspend the rules for the consideration of this issue and any other issues of similar measures so that these people who have been here throughout the entire deliberations may see it come to fruition. Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, for the record, I believe it's for Ordinance No. 51.

Councilman Stewart: Ordinance 51. Is there any other ordinance that we would have to approve that needs to be discussed this evening? Mr. Thompson: Mr. Kirkland would have to answer that.

Councilman Stewart: Mr. Kirkland, is there anything else to your knowledge? Mr. Kirkland indicates no. So we would be suspending the rules for the consideration of the vote so that these people, who have stayed with us can hear the results and then leave for the evening.

Motion to suspend the Rules, seconded by Councilman Carmody and approved by the following vote: Councilmen Pearl Huckaby, Stewart, Carmody, Serio, Spigener, Shyne and Burrell. 7. Nays: None.

Councilman Serio: Motion to deny the zoning appeal, No. 51. Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, I believe Ms. Glass has a comment about the motion. Ms. Glass: Yes, because you have an ordinance pending on your agenda, your normal procedure is for someone to move for the adoption of the ordinance, and then Mr. Serio would be asking you to vote against it.

Councilman Serio: Then I move for the adoption of No. 51? Councilman Stewart: And your recommendation? Councilman Serio: My recommendation is to vote against this one.

Councilman Stewart: Is there any further discussion? For clarity, please Mr. Thompson tell us the impact of a positive vote and a negative vote. Mr. Thompson: If you vote yes, You're voting to approve this zoning change. If you vote no, you are voting to leave the zoning as it presently is and to deny this ordinance. Councilman Stewart: And your recommendation Mr. Serio is to vote no?

Councilman Serio: My recommendation is to vote no. *Ordinance denied by the following vote: Nays: Councilmen Huckaby, Stewart Carmody, Serio, Spigener, Shyne and Burrell. 7. Ayes: None.*

Councilman Stewart: Ladies and gentlemen, please clear the chamber for those who are leaving so can address the next issue. Mr. Thompson, could you give us guidance at this late hour. Thank you ladies and Gentlemen, it's 6:55 p.m. Thank you for your understanding and allowing these people to come forward. I think it was for the benefit of all.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, there are a number of people at least who want to speak on an ordinance that I think Mrs. Spigener is going to introduce a resolution rather, but she's left the Chamber. *It is: A resolution endorsing and supporting Senate Bill No. 72 of 2002, Regular Session of the Louisiana Legislature, concerning 1/4 cent sales tax for fire and police.*

Councilman Stewart: Anybody here that would like to speak to this issue? We have two over here, is that correct. Mr. Thompson, would you guide us. What is the appropriate motion at this time. Mr. Thompson: You may want to allow them to speak and if Mrs. Spigener wants to introduce this later, she can do it.

Chairman Stewart: Do we need to suspend the rules? Mr. Thompson: I believe we are at this point on the agenda.

Kirk Rice (I live at 329 West Maple in Blanchard): I'm thankful and happy to tell you, I'm here not represent any political agenda. We have come here to hear about a 1/4 cents sales tax which will be proposed according to state Legislature Bill No. 72 which will allow for fire and police and others to benefit from that sales tax.

Our simple request is that we as classified employees representing 1500 other city employees which cover the whole diversity of race, religion and otherwise that we be included in that sales tax proposal. The request is actually that you just simply add, in addition to fire and police departments, the classified and service employees to be on this referendum.

We appreciate and acknowledge the services of the Fire and Police Departments especially when it's rendered to those who are helpless and hurting, however, we all have recognize since 9/11 that these are high profile professions and so they deserve a lot of dignity and a lot of credit and reward. However, there are hundreds of others that work behind the scenes. City employees just like they are that also deserve recognition and reward.

So, that is what we're here for is to request that these too, would be included and be recognized as dedicated City Employees just like the fire and police departments and that they also would be taken into account when there is benefit being passed out to fellow city employees that we also be considered as well and that's our simple request, that you would not forget about us.

Nettie Brown (I live at 3522 Penick Street, 71109-4102): Yeah, that's my message, but I have just a couple of words. I know I've been here since 2:00 so, I'm tired, I haven't had any breakfast, lunch or dinner so I'm getting ready to go home and eat a lot, but in the meantime. I work for the City of Shreveport as Laboratory Supervisor in Water Purification.

As I was listening to all the information about Ellerbe Estates and those places, yeah we visit those places, we test that water in that area every week to make sure that it is safe for those people to drink as well as people in Allendale, Lakeside and all those other places I've heard a lot of "isms" in here today, sexism, I mean no sexism, racism, separatism and all that, but we don't want to have a separatism, a couple of new terms, civil service -ism and classified service -ism. We're City employees and I don't want you all to put it in your words, Mrs. Spigener, just *don't make any hasty decisions without being completely informed* as to what is expected of us as employees and how we all relate as one body here to serve you.

And I don't want you all to be ill-advised. I want you all to know everything before you make your decision, so we just ask you to take that little document, and just add three words, "and the classified service," and we appreciate you if you would do that.

If you are not going to vote on today, we would be lobbying you in getting a chance to tell you all, all the things that we need to tell you. So that you would be more informed to make a more intelligent decision. So I thank you respectively. Don't forget about us.

Councilman Spigener: Maybe I missed something, but I thought we were just allowing the people who

wanted to speak on certain issues. Had we suspended the rules to deal with that resolution?

Councilman Burrell: Well, we're coming down to adding legislation to the agenda if that's appropriate. Mr. Thompson: I think there are two ways that you could proceed. If Mrs. Spigener, if you wanted to add your resolution to the agenda, or want to suspend the rules to add it, at this point, you could do so and whatever disposition is made of that would be made while the people are still here. But I think on the agenda, you are at, Public Comments. Councilman Spigener: Right, okay.

Councilman Burrell: Well, before you do that then let's see if we've finished with Public comments first. I have a Donald Hunter. Are you here? Mr. Hunter would you come up please?

Donald Hunter (2452 Pleasant Drive): My issue here with the City is more of a health concern, I'm from the Warner Park Community. And in our backyard, we have an oil refinery there Pennzoil, Calumet now. And the health concern is this, our right to breath clean air, I mean, it's not there. I'm also with the group that was just formed, Residents for Air Neutralization, there was some others here, but they left. I've been here since 2:30.

But, I lived there for eight years. I moved there in '93. I was in perfect health when I moved there and 2 years ago, I was diagnosed with cancer. It's called multiple myeloma cancer and it's a type of cancer only two people can get. You have to be an extreme toddler or you have to be so far up in age, if you're diagnosed with it, you say, well, what the heck, just make me comfortable. And so the concern was with my case is being a 44 year old man, how did I get it? And the way you get it, is from exposure. And we do know that they are working with Benzine and the lady over. well you said you test the water, but I had my water re-tested in Werner Park and I was told it wasn't fit to rinse vegetables off with.

But, I know that the Refinery has a right to produce their petroleum, we have a right to breath clean air and I know the City knows what is going on. But when their rights infringe on my rights, then I feel they don't have any rights. My wife, she is ill also and I had to move away from that community a year ago in order so I could breath and have perfect health. I'm still fighting cancer. I was given like 3 ½ years to live. I'm on a second year now. I'm getting treatment, but it's been an up hill climb, up hill climb.

For some reason or other, the City. . . we want to know how can the City let such a facility go on. And on my property over there, there is a flaring unit. I understand about refinery operations. When they make a bad batch of fuel over there, if you ever go down I-20, you can't ignore the stench that's in the air, they have holding ponds over there. When they get a good rain over there, that water over flows. We can't barbeque, we can't have outings in our back yards because it's bad, its bad. And when they make a bad batch of fuel, they shoot it out through the flaring unit so it doesn't mix with the good stuff, and it goes up in the air and what goes up, must come down.

So I've experienced going out in my yard seeing dead birds, some of the neighbors over there experiencing their pets dying and stuff like that; I could go on and on and on. I got health problems, I've got stuff installed in my chest now to receive medicine and stuff, which I believe is from that plant. And I've done research in the neighborhood, I'm not the only one who is suffering with cancer, but I've been through so much agony, that I've literally asked the good Lord, to let me die.

And we need help out there in that area. Something needs to be done with that place out there. Our homes, you can't sell anything out there, you can rent, but you can't sell anything. Through other research, that I've found out, the houses on Clark Street, some of those are contaminated and some of the homes over there are not even worth a dollar. And you've got kids walk, catch the bus, walk to Werner Park School breathing in the stagnated water that's running across Corbitt Street, they catching the bus there and stuff like that. If anybody on the Council think's that's fair, I challenge you to change residence with some of us over there for one week and you'll see exactly what I'm talking about and go through the agony that I've gone through. Chemotherapy and all this here. It's from exposure, it is from exposure

I speak for the group, the Residents of Air Neutralization and I speak for the residents over in that neighborhood also. And if it's anything that you all can do as for as that place is concerned, we would be most appreciative.

Councilman Burrell: Excuse me, have you had anyone to address that issue? I know we had several meetings or should I say, it was several meetings at Morning Star. I've gone to a couple of those meetings. What has been done to address the issue there from the State, because we're talking about Environmental Quality, I'm sure and that's a State function more so than a City function, but we do have this part of our DOS Department I believe that, not have any connections so much, but is involved in some of that work. I know Mike Strong came from the DEQ.

Councilman Stewart: Yes, that is correct, he was with the DEQ, State of Louisiana.

Councilman Burrell: What has been done so far. Your councilman is not here, I believe that's over in District F. Where are you all with this issue? Mr. Hunter: We're fighting. The DEQ and there have been some State Officials who've come to some of our meetings, but there's been a lot of back and forth in conversation and stuff like that. We're not getting any help. Now, a few years ago, they bought out some lots, I would imagine, I counted 18 vacant lots along side the road behind the refinery that runs up to Midway and in those homes, there were all white families lived there. They bought all those out. Those people are gone. But around behind there, we have a lot of black families, who are fighting, who are fighting. What they want out, they can't get out. And we can't take our homes and put them on our backs like a back pack and walk to somewhere else with it; so, we see a lot of discriminating factors when it comes down to the refinery.

Councilman Burrell: So you're saying that you were not offered that? Mr. Hunter: No. So the only thing that I'm concerned about right now is our property over there and getting my health straight.

Councilman Burrell: What was the last evaluation they gave on the situation you all are in? Mr. Hunter: I missed the last couple of meetings, I have just got able to where I can get around. I get tired very quick and I heard about the Council Meeting and the group was supposed to meet with you all today. They were here, but it was a pretty long wait, but I said that I was going to stay, so we're going to have another meeting on Thursday.

Councilman Burrell: Well, it's my understanding that they did, that the DEQ came out more than once and ran some tests around there and they did not find anything or should I say as far as their records are concerned or the evaluation that they made that, the particles, I guess the air particles, I'm not that familiar with that particular area, but that it was not enough to harm humans which is a matter of question, I guess, but has anything else come where that has changed?

Mr. Hunter: No, but I can tell you this. No matter what they come up with as far as their testing is concerned, it all determines on a person's immune system. See they ran tests and they say, well, whatever is out there, it's enough for the human to tolerate, but everybody's immune system is not the same. I'm a prime example. And once your immune system changes and you engulf some of this stuff over there, then, hey, I was one in a million. There is another young man over there in his early 40s who contracted the same thing that I got.

Councilman Burrell: So, you're saying that based on the evaluation that your doctor gave you, are they tying it to that specifically? Mr. Hunter: I was asked about my living environment. I was asked had I been exposed to anything harmful. And I did remember, after I left, that yeah, the Refinery, yeah. I have been questioned about it and they were wondering why did a man of my age get this type of cancer and there's only two people that can get it: toddlers and senior citizens.

Councilman Burrell: Okay, well I guess what I'm trying to see if whether or not there is any medical support

for your claim. Mr. Hunter: Well.

Councilman Burrell: Not necessarily from the DEQ, but from your doctor who should have your best interest at heart. Mr. Hunter: Yeah, he should. I'm still under the doctor and most doctors, they don't want to get involved.

Chairman Stewart: Madam Clerk, can you tell us where we are on the agenda so we can move forward please. Ms. Lee: We're at Adding Legislation to the Agenda and I believe that Councilman Spigener had a piece of legislation.

Adding Legislation to the Agenda: Motion by Councilman Spigener, seconded by Councilman Burrell to add Resolution No. 47 of 2002 entitled: *A resolution endorsing and supporting Senate Bill No. 72 of the 2002 Regular Session of the Louisiana Legislature, or similar legislation, which authorizes the citizens of Shreveport to approve an additional 1/4 cent sales and use tax for salaries, benefits, equipment and personnel for the Fire and Police Departments, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.* Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Stewart, Carmody, Serio, Spigener and Burrell. 5. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Huckaby, and Shyne. 2

Councilman Spigener: And Mr. Chairman, we heard some classified employees speaking to this issue, but it's my understanding that Senate Bill 72 is strictly for the fire and the police and so I don't know with the way the bill is written that's my understanding now. If any of you, have any or want to ask questions of anyone, that might be appropriate, but that's my understanding.

Councilman Stewart: I have a motion, is there a second. Or would you like to have Mr. McCoy to come?

Councilman Spigener: Yes, I think we should have Mr. McCoy to come and ah. . . Chairman Stewart: We have a motion and a second. Would you please join us before the vote Mr. McCoy for any questions and for any directions.

Councilman Spigener: He has been keeping up with this Bill a little more closely than I and I think he can shed some light on where we're coming from here.

Councilman Burrell: I guess my question to Margene . . .ah. . .is there any. . .is this strictly for fire and police? Because we did have some employees that came up and I assume that they were talking in the light that we modify it or something that we add it to it, but from where you stand, right now, it's strictly fire and police, is that correct.

Mr. McCoy: The Senate Bill 72 to answer your question was put in for fire and police and it's because of several studies that have been done that shows fire and police in Shreveport, are way behind other cities, but other employees are comparable.

But let me say this, the vote that you all are doing now, is simply a vote to support the measure and the Legislature and the reason I came to you and asked for that is Representative Jackson and Baylor and Glover and several others, just wanted a nod from the City Council to go ahead with the measure at the time. Its still got to come back to the City Council.

The reason we do this is, as you know before the City can levy any tax, the Legislature has to raise the ceiling and this only raises the ceiling to 8 .25 which is equal to Bossier City; that's why we're doing it this year.

The session is set up to where you have a every other year fiscal session so if this measure is not looked at or the nod has gone ahead from the Legislature, then the City Council can't do anything for two more years. And this is only a resolution because our delegation in Baton Rouge asked that you all do that. Now, if you all do that, they'll go ahead and go with a measure and this is still gotta come back before the Council for you all to put it on the ballot. This is just a nod that they asked me to come to you all with and that's what I'm doing.

Councilman Burrell: So, as it relates to the other employees, I assume there would be something we would need to get the Mayor to address and have some input on.

Councilman Stewart: Time for a vote? Ms. Lee: Yes sir.

Councilman Stewart: Ms. Spigener, you recommend an affirmative vote?

Councilman Spigener: Right and of course, this is just on Introduction, we will have more information if we need it on the next Council Meeting. Ms. Lee: I believe it's just to add it to the agenda.

Mr. Thompson: Matter of clarification. Mrs. Spigener, do you intend to vote on the resolution today or to carry it over to the next meeting? Councilman Spigener: Can we vote on it today? Mr. Thompson: Yes.

Councilman Spigener: Well, if this is not an urgency to get to Legislature, maybe we need to vote on it next time when we sometime to research this.

Mr. McCoy, Mrs Spigener, if I may, it is pretty much an urgency. We're getting well into a short session and it is an urgency. You're talking about two more weeks before we even start this Bill through the Legislature. It was introduce it on the last day that you could introduce Bills, the Legislature started the 29th. It's been going on for quite a while. It's only a 45 day session in the fiscal session, so it is important to go ahead and get our delegation a nod on this legislation where we can go ahead and run through the process because it's a Senate Bill and it hadn't even come to the Senate side. We're holding it to hear that. So, it is some time frame involved in getting this piece of legislation through the process. It's only a 45 day session in the fiscal year.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, Mrs. Spigener, I have the Bill in front of me, I just want to be sure that the Council understands that, the proceeds of the tax must be used for salaries, benefits, equipment and personnel for the fire and police departments of the City. And if the Bill is approved as introduced, then it could not be used for any purpose other than for the fire and police departments. I just want the Council to understand that.

Councilman Burrell: Well given that then what we're passing today is only supporting them putting this Bill on; right? Mr. Thompson: It's asking the Legislature to approve the Bill.

Councilman Burrell: Okay, but it doesn't necessarily say, *approve this Bill as is*. If there is any additional or tack on or anything like that? I'm trying to get a clarification from Mr. Thompson. Mr. Thompson: I think what you're asking them is to approve the Bill as written.

Councilman Burrell: *As written*, well, that's what I'm trying to get a clarification on. Okay, now. . . .

Councilman Spigener: Okay, I would assume this hasn't been approved by the Legislature, so that doesn't mean they're going to approve the Bill as it is; that just means to say that, we are in support of the Bill.

Councilman Burrell: Okay, is that correct? Mr. Thompson: Yes, the resolution says that you support the Bill as it presently is written, however, it does not prevent the Legislature from amending the Bill if the Legislature chooses to do so. Councilman Burrell: Well, that was the point that I was trying to make. It doesn't limit it by us passing this resolution, this is only to support the Bill.

Councilman Spigener: Since this Bill is for the fire and police for salaries, benefits and equipment. It's not just for salaries and benefits, it also . . .is it for equipment and it's for the personnel of the fire and police department. I guess my concern would be that if this is only 1/4 sales tax, if we split it up into so many entities, would that dilute that tax so that it really wouldn't be of benefit to anybody. You know I'm not the mathematician at all, but you are, so, I think that we need to consider that. I think I haven't had time to think about this. All the other classified employees or services; so, I guess that's my concern.

Councilman Burrell: But when we're talking about the 1/4 cents sales tax here, we're only dealing with what's I guess what's in the legislation that's there, there is nothing in there about any other any employees other than fire and police so you won't be splitting up anything unless something is added.

Councilman Spigener: Right that is what I'm thinking and since this came to us for this benefit, I know that certainly that all employees need salary increase but I don't know if that is something that. . .

Nettie Brown (3942 Penick Street, 71109-4102): We're not talking about being greedy or anything like that. We're talking about. . . I talked with Lydia Jackson of the Legislature, this morning and she explained to me that the Legislature does not care who the money. . . they set the ceiling. The Council are the ones that she told me to go back to you. You are ultimately responsible for deciding who will get what. They don't care, they just set the ceiling. They don't care what you spend the money for. You really didn't, I don't think you really had to introduce the resolution in the beginning. All you had to say was, we want a 1/4 cent sales and they either approve it or disapprove it. You can find this out for yourself. That's why I'm saying don't hastily run through something until you know all the facts.

This is for you to decide whether or not you're going to take care of a segment of your employees or take care of all of them at the same time. We're not saying that we want the 50% of it, we're not saying we want 80% of it, we're saying however you decide to do it, we just want to be on the ballot. Let the citizens decide whether or not they want to take care of all the employees.

And as far as incentives, I didn't want to get off into this, but firemen have a lot. They have educational incentives. My job requires a degree, a Bachelor's degree in chemistry plus classes for water treatment, but we don't get educational pay and they do. So, I don't want to get into that sort of thing. All I'm saying is whatever the money is, we want to be able to share into it. And we're 1500 employees, 1500 voters and 1500 city servants who are doing work for you everyday, not just when we have a fire. And I want to see one fireman put out the fire without the water we send to them and I didn't want to get into that, okay. And I want to see them get down the street when the garbage men have not moved the garbage cans, okay. And the other services like the Finance Department and SPAR and all those other departments, we are one body and that's all we're saying. We want to be on the ballot. Let the people decide whether or not they want to give us the 1/4 cent sales tax.

Councilman Serio: I'm confused as to whether or not, this is an issue, that all the City employees can be added to it and I think we need to contact someone at the Legislature and find out and get a clarification. Ms. Brown: Yeah! And it's that simple. That's great, thank you sir.

Councilman Burrell: But then I want to go back to Margene. Are we dealing with a deadline with this? I think that was the question that Councilwoman Spigener brought up and I think we need to address that. Ms. Brown: It's my understanding, well maybe he knows something more than Ms. Jackson told me this morning, but it's up to you, it's not up to the Legislature.

Mr. McCoy: Well, it's a 45 day session that started the 29th of April so we're 14-15 days into it. We got 30 days left of the Legislature and that's all we got. A Bill on a fast track takes 10 days to go all the way through, if it is on a fast track. If you're talking about waiting 14 days, we're just about running out of time. It's a short session this year, it's a fiscal session. If this instrument is not passed, if this instrument is not passed then you can't even consider it for two more years. This is strictly an instrument to raise 1/4 cents sales tax to put us even with Bossier. It's something that several Administrations have talked about, getting us to the South Central Region Average and this won't be enough money to do that. A 1/4 cent will not be enough to do that, but it's a step in the right direction through a lot of meetings with the Mayor, we've come to this point with his approval and we've got--we really done our homework, worked hard, I've worked the Legislature. Even went to our Republican Senator who is against taxes all the way, but he made an exception for this particular tax and that's why I assume Senator Max Malone is handling this piece of legislation. So we put a lot of time and a lot of work. It's been a lot of years coming.

I could do a lot of talking about different prices. I know this lady here is concerned about her people and I know how that. . . Firefighters are below the average and we're making some sort of attempt to do that. We went to the Mayor. He said the money is not there. If you're going to do it, you've got to get some additional revenue. That's what we've worked for, for a long time, to get to where we're at right here. The Bill needs to, you all need to give some of the Legislators that have questions about it, and Ms. Lydia is one of them, give them the nod to go ahead and let this piece of legislation go on through or we're going to be dead in the water for two more years. And today is, I guess, the 13th, 14th, 15th day of the Legislature. The 16th day of the Legislature; so, we're running out of time as far as time goes in Baton Rouge.

Councilman Burrell: Since you introduced it, Councilwoman Spigener, what is your opinion?

Councilman Spigener: Well, the, you know the intent of the legislation as it is written, and I would assume Senator Malone's representative would be to, this is for fire and police. As I said, if we run out of time on this, then there's two more years before we even have any hope that we could get this back. I'd just like to hear some more discussion from you all of where you think we need to come from.

I guess what I don't want to do is for this bill to be so diluted that nobody, including the employees, classified employees would see any benefit; that's my concern. I certainly not want to exclude anybody, but I think the intent was, and I certainly support this, but I do think probably it's imperative that we go ahead and deal with this today just because of time constraints of the Legislature.

Councilman Carmody: Councilwoman Spigener, my comments on this is I don't know how we fund taking care of all of our city employees. It's a priority, there's no doubt about it. I'm not comfortable passing to the Legislature that I think it's a good thing for us to increase our taxes even by a 1/4 cent sales. I commend the Mayor saying we need to find other sources of revenue other than our taxes.

I understand where Mr. McCoy is coming from as far as his representation of the Fire Fighters Union, but I think it comes back down to this Administration and this Council looking to find the money to do what we need to do for all of our city employees.

Councilman Spigener: Mr. Carmody, I don't think this resolution would say that the Council could raise the tax. The Council would have to pass an ordinance, I guess it would be to get it on the ballot where the people would make that decision. It would have to come back to Council for approval if we chose to do this and then it would have to be approved by the people. It would just give the people an opportunity to say do we want more sales tax to fund this or do we not. So, I think that, this is not saying we're going to do that.

Councilman Burrell: But it does say we give them that support to do that, is what it does and that is a signal that it sends from the Council.

Councilman Burrell: Councilwoman Spigener, I ask you your position, again, this is what you are introducing. This is only on introduction, as I understand. Mr. Thompson: I think if the Council wants to vote on it today, they can. And if there are no objections it would be like suspending the rules. You can vote on it now or you could vote on it later in the agenda; so, it's up to the Council or you could let it layover. It's up to you.

Councilman Spigener: I would like to go ahead and see that we vote on this today, one way or the other. I feel that we have protection to do, when it comes back to us, if it does, to do what we see fit, I guess because Councilmen has to approve anything that deals with raising sales tax. I know this is probably going to be the major source of more funding.

Councilman Burrell: So it appears that you are in support, at this point, to move forward at least to take a vote on the resolution to move this forward to recommend that the Legislature raise the ceiling 1/4 cent; that is what I am understanding.

Councilman Spigener: That's what I'm understanding.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Spigener for passage, seconded by Councilman Carmody.

Councilman Spigener: I don't want us to rush anything through but I understand the time restraint on getting this to the Legislature or it is another two-year period.

Councilman Spigener: I realize that we have three Council members who are not here. I don't know if they were familiar with this situation or what, but I...

Councilman Burrell: Well, if push comes to shove, we could have a special, I would hate to go through this, but I guess we would be able to call a special meeting on it because three of the four is not here to address this issue. And Councilman Carmody talked about the raising of taxes, Councilwoman Spigener said she doesn't have a problem with it, and Councilman Serio really hasn't addressed it per se. I don't have a problem with it myself. Councilman Serio, do you have any comments before we move forward?

Councilman Serio: One issue that I think is important, and I think the issue, I wish we had all the representatives here, all the Council representatives, here at this time. Also, I realize this is an endorsement. It's not a binding piece of legislation. It's nothing more than an endorsement. And as an endorsement it allows for the Legislature to understand that we are looking to find ways to support the Police and Fire Departments. I have only one question and that is all the city employees be added into this. But this is nothing more than an endorsement, it does not cost the City of Shreveport anything, it does not bind the City of Shreveport to anything. It just lets our Legislature know that we will look for and we are giving them the opportunity to look for ways to help us support our policemen and firemen. It's not a piece of legislation that is going to slap a tax on the citizens at this time. Maybe in the future, there may be a time for a tax to be voted on, but at this time, right now, it is not.

So, I think if you want to move forward with this as a resolution or endorsement, I have one question: can all city employees be added to this? I'm seeing nods yes and I am seeing nods no, but I'm also realizing that we have the time constraint.

Councilman Burrell: Well, this particular resolution will not add anyone else as part of the endorsement of the legislation as it stands right now, that's my understanding. Is that correct Mr. Thompson? Mr. Thompson: That's correct. If the Bill is approved as written, then it states who can receive the funds, who can benefit from it and the dates the election must be held; so, it is pretty specific in what it does.

Councilman Burrell: I have a question. From my perspective, this piece of legislation was really put forth for Fire and Police. Given the fact that another issue has been brought before us considering the other employees, I know we're under time constraints. The only thing I can recommend at this point and hopefully it will push the time constraints, but it will give us an opportunity to address the issue a second time and that would have to be on some sort of special meeting. If I can get comments on that, then I could push this thing forward to either, I wouldn't say, postpone it, but introduce it, I guess that would be the proper motion. Mr. Thompson: It's already been introduced.

Councilman Burrell: If it's already been introduced then, then a special call meeting can be put forth to address this issue at a later date prior to the next Council meeting which may wind up pushing the deadline because the next Council meeting would not give us enough time, per se or should I say push that deadline down in the Legislature on this issue? Can I get a comment from Councilman Serio as it relates to us having a special Council meeting to address this issue giving an opportunity for the Mayor to come back as well as three other Council members?

Councilman Serio: Mr. Chairman, I'm prepared to vote on this today.

Councilman Carmody: I feel it would be very important for the rest of the Council to be in attendance and also to have the Council and the Mayor here.

Councilman Spigener: It seems all these decisions are coming down to me today, doesn't it?

Councilman Burrell: Well, we are all being a part of it, it must be your lucky day.

Councilman Spigener: It's been my lucky week.

Councilman Carmody: Can I offer at least, my thoughts on this? That obviously, there's been a lot of groundwork laid for this. I haven't seen it until now. Therefore, I'm unfamiliar with exactly what we're being asked to endorse other than I see it as an endorsement of a tax increase for the municipality. If the groundwork has been laid, then I would imagine that our legislative bodies from this area knows that it's about to come. But we've raised some questions today, including trying to compensate city employees, if it is the will of the people to do so through voting of the tax which would be put on.

And so, I hate to say that instead of a special meeting that we just allow it to be introduced today and to be considered at the next City Council meeting. Again, I hate to have these people kind of on pins and needles in Baton Rouge, whether or not to go there, but the action of the four of us today, as we say, we're being asked to consider different things from all different directions; I'm not sure really if that's really the appropriate way to proceed.

Councilman Spigener: Okay. We will postpone this until our next Council meeting.

Mr. Thompson: I take it, Mrs. Spigener is withdrawing her motion to adopt and the new motion is to postpone and if that gets a second, you can vote on it.

Motion by Councilman Spigener, seconded by Councilman Carmody to postpone the resolution until the May 22, 2002 special meeting

Mr. Kirkland: Mr. Chairman, may I make a comment? This is not my forte, but I've worked on budgets in this City for many years. I've been part of the team that has dealt with the last ½ cent sales tax, when that increased.

In the scheme of things in budget, not belittling the other Shreveport employees, this 1/4 cent sales tax is not going to pay a lot. And all it is really going to say, I think, that it's going to be a dedicated tax, that, that amount of money will have to go to Fire and Police. But you can still, through your authority as Council, adjust that budget to deal with other city employees because it's going to produce a finite amount of money if the voters were to approve it in a tax election. So all you're really doing is, no matter how you want to cut it, is raising that ceiling of sales tax, going to the 8.5% sales tax and pumping more revenue. You'll still decide where the going difference, if I understand it correctly, is that 1/4 percent is absolutely mandated to go to Fire and Police. But it does not remove your discretion to deal with the rest of that budget. My advise is, for whatever it is worth, go on and pass this resolution and still keep in mind your commitment to other city employees. You're not speaking against other city employees.

Mr. Thompson: Since Mr. Kirkland spoke his preference, I'd like to speak mine if I may, which I don't normally do before this Council.

Councilman Burrell: What position are you speaking from?

Mr. Thompson: As a citizen. I talked with Mr. Dark today and he tells me that next year we're going to be laying off people. And if there is going to be additional money coming in, and if that's true, I think we need to look at the entire budget picture and determine whether or not if we do get an extra quarter percent sales tax, do we need it to just keep the status quo. I mean, I think this is a serious issue that we need to look at and look at the entire budgetary process and then make a decision after looking at the entire budgetary process. If I'm wrong, I still think there's time to correct it. If I'm right, then we'll not have sent the wrong message to the Legislature.

Councilman Burrell: Given that scenario that you've just painted, how does that affect the time factor that we're dealing with as it relates to the legislation being passed down to the Legislature? Mr. Thompson: I

think with a special meeting on the 22nd or we could also add this to the agenda if we wanted to. We will also, the Friday after that, we will have a work session. It could be considered at that time. I think there are times that we can deal with it. And we will have sufficient time to investigate the real issues here and determine whether or not this ought to go just directly for fire and police or whether we need it to keep the status quo for all of the City.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Thompson, I'm going to ask you to put on your Clerk of Council's hat at this point in the meeting. We have a motion and a second. Is that not correct? Mr. Thompson: Yes, to postpone. Councilman Carmody: I would ask that we go ahead and please vote.

Councilman Spigener: If we postpone, that does not mean we have to postpone until our regular Council meeting? Mr. Thompson: That's correct.

Councilman Spigener: We can deal with this at our special meeting that we already have set or that we've already called for another matter. Is that correct? Mr. Thompson: Yes and we could add it to the agenda.

Councilman Spigener: And that's the 22nd? Mr. Thompson: The 22nd. That's correct.

Councilman Spigener: Okay, maybe that's the best course of action that we need to take since we already have the meeting set up. This will not be that much of a delay. At least it won't be a two week delay that perhaps that's the way we need to go.

Councilman Burrell: Based upon all the input that's here and not disregarding Mr. Brown out there, you'd have another chance to address the issues so we're going to be postpone it.

Motion to postpone approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Carmody, Serio, Spigener and Burrell. 4. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Huckaby, Stewart and Shyne. 3.

CONSENT AGENDA LEGISLATION:

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS AND ORDINANCES ON CONSENT:

RESOLUTION: None.

ORDINANCE: None.

ADOPTION OF RESOLUTIONS AND ORDINANCES ON CONSENT:

RESOLUTION: None.

ORDINANCES: None.

REGULAR AGENDA LEGISLATION:

RESOLUTIONS:

RESOLUTION NO. 42 OF 2002

A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE BUDGET FOR THE CADDO-SHREVEPORT SALES AND USE TAX COMMISSION FOR THE FISCAL YEAR BEGINNING JULY 1, 2002 AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the Caddo-Shreveport Sales and Use Tax Commission was created by the City of Shreveport and the Caddo Parish School Board to provide for the joint collection, enforcement and administration of sales and use taxes levied by the City and School Board; and

WHEREAS, the Sales and Use Tax Commission is required to submit its proposed budget for the ensuing fiscal year to the City Council for approval; and

WHEREAS, the Commission has submitted its proposed budget for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2002, a copy of which was filed with the Clerk of the City Council on May 14, 2002.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in legal session convened, that the total operating budget of \$925,250 and the capital budget of \$23,000 proposed by the Caddo-Shreveport Sales and Use Tax Commission for the fiscal year beginning July 1, 2002, are hereby approved.

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 Serio passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Carmody, Serio, Spigener and Burrell. 4. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Huckaby, Stewart and Shyne. 3.

RESOLUTION NO. 43 OF 2002

A RESOLUTION ACCEPTING DEDICATION FOR GARDERE DRIVE, AVIGNON LANE, BACCARAT DRIVE, AND CALLIOPE LANE IN THE BRUNSWICK PLACE UNIT NO. 4 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 Gardere Drive, Avignon Lane, Baccarat Drive, and Calliope Lane in the Brunswick Place Unit No. 4 Subdivision in Section 33 (T17N-R13W), 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 Gardere Drive, Avignon Lane, Baccarat Drive, and Calliope Lane be and 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 Serio, seconded by Councilman Spigener passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Carmody, Serio, Spigener and Burrell. 4. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman

The Deputy Clerk read the resolution by title: **Resolution No. 47 of 2002** by Councilman Spigener: A resolution endorsing and supporting Senate Bill No. 72 of the 2002 Regular Session of the Louisiana Legislature, or similar legislation, which authorizes the citizens of Shreveport to approve an additional 1/4 cent Sales and Use Tax for salaries, benefits, equipment and personnel for the Fire and Police Departments, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Spigener, seconded by Councilman Carmody to postpone the resolution until the May 22, 2002 special meeting. Motion to postpone approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Carmody, Serio, Spigener and Burrell. 4. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Huckaby, Stewart and Shyne. 3. (Clerk's Note: A thorough discussion of this issue was held under Adding Legislation to the Agenda.)

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS:

1. Resolution No. 44 of 2002: A resolution authorizing the Mayor to donate communications equipment listed in Appendix "A" to the Southern University Shreveport Bossier Police Department in Shreveport, Louisiana and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
2. Resolution No. 45 of 2002: A resolution authorizing the Mayor to make application with the United States Department of Justice, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
3. Resolution No. 46 of 2002: A resolution to authorize the Mayor to execute an intergovernmental agreement on Air Quality with the City of Bossier City, Caddo Parish Commission and Bossier Parish Police Jury, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Spigener for Introduction of the Resolutions to lay over until the May 28, 2002 meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Carmody, Serio, Spigener and Burrell. 4. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Huckaby, Stewart and Shyne. 3.

INTRODUCTION OF ORDINANCES:

1. Ordinance No. 62 of 2002: An ordinance amending the 2002 budget for the Police Grants Special Revenue Fund and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
2. Ordinance No. 63 of 2002: An ordinance amending the 2002 General Fund Budget and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
3. Ordinance No. 64 of 2002: An ordinance amending the 2002 budget for the Metropolitan Planning Commission Special Revenue Fund and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
4. Ordinance No. 65 of 2002: An ordinance amending the 2002 Airports Enterprise Fund Budget and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
5. Ordinance No. 66 of 2002: An ordinance amending the 2002 budget for the Riverfront Development Special Revenue Fund and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
6. Ordinance No. 67 of 2002: An ordinance amending the 2002 Capital Improvements Budget and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
7. Ordinance No. 68 of 2002: An ordinance amending the 2002 budget for the Community Development Special Revenue Fund and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
8. Ordinance No. 69 of 2002: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the northeast corner of Hollywood Avenue and Mansfield Road, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana from B-2, Neighborhood Business District to B-2-E, Neighborhood Business/Extended Use District limited to an auto towing dispatch office and vehicle storage for a maximum of 10 operative vehicles and 1 inoperative vehicle only,
9. Ordinance No. 70 of 2002: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the west side of Glenmora Drive, 800 feet south of Loch Ridge Drive, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana from R-1 (TH), Suburban, One-Family Townhouse Residence District & R-3, Urban, Multiple-Family Residence District to R-1 (TH) PUD, Suburban, One-Family Townhouse Residence/Planned Unit Development District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
10. Ordinance No. 71 of 2002: An ordinance to amend Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, as amended, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by amending Section 106-1130 (f) (2) a., by modifying the requirements for telecommunication towers allowed as specific permitted uses, and by otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Serio, seconded by Councilman Spigener for Introduction of the Ordinances to lay over until the May 28, 2002 meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Carmody, Serio, Spigener and Burrell. 4. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Huckaby, Stewart and Shyne. 3.

ORDINANCES ON SECOND READING AND FINAL PASSAGE:

1. Ordinance No. 42 of 2002: An ordinance to repeal certain provisions of Chapter 90 of the City of Shreveport Code of Ordinances; to amend Section 90-273 of the City of Shreveport Code of Ordinances and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on April 9, 2002 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Spigener, seconded by Councilman Carmody adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Carmody, Serio, Spigener and Burrell. 4. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Huckaby, Stewart and Shyne. 3.

2. Ordinance No. 45 of 2002: An ordinance amending the 2002 budget for the Environmental Grants Special Revenue Fund and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on April 23, 2002 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Burrell, seconded by Councilman Spigener for adoption. The Deputy Clerk read the following amendment:

Amend the Ordinance as follows:

In Section1 (Appropriations), appropriate \$15,000 for Ozone Flex Grant.

Motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Spigener for adoption of the amendment. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Carmody, Serio, Spigener and Burrell. 4. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Huckaby, Stewart and Shyne. 3.

Motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Spigener for adoption of the ordinance as amended. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Carmody, Serio, Spigener and Burrell. 4. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Huckaby, Stewart and Shyne. 3.

3. Ordinance No. 46 of 2002: An ordinance levying various taxes totaling Twenty and Seventy-Six One Hundredths (20 and 76/100ths) mills per dollar on all property subject to ad valorem taxation, within the City of Shreveport, for the Year 2002 in the amounts and for the purposes described herein and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on April 23, 2002 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Serio adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Carmody, Serio, Spigener and Burrell. 4. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Huckaby, Stewart and Shyne. 3.

4. Ordinance No. 47 of 2002: An ordinance levying a tax of Thirty and Fifty-Four One Hundredths (30 and 54/100ths) mills per dollar on all property subject to ad valorem taxation, within the City of Shreveport, for the Year 2002 for the purpose of paying principal and interest on the outstanding General Obligation Bonds of the City and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on April 23, 2002 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Serio adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Carmody, Serio, Spigener and Burrell. 4. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Huckaby, Stewart and Shyne. 3.

5. Ordinance No. 48 of 2002: An ordinance levying a tax of Seven and Ninety-Nine One Hundredths (7 and 99/100ths) mills per dollar on all property subject to ad valorem taxation, within the bounds of the Downtown Development District of the City of Shreveport, as defined by Act 554 of 1978, as amended, for the purposes as set forth herein, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on April 23, 2002 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Spigener, seconded by Councilman Carmody adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Carmody, Serio, Spigener and Burrell. 4. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Huckaby, Stewart and Shyne. 3.

6. Ordinance No. 49 of 2002: An ordinance authorizing the Purchasing Agent to dispose of surplus real property, Lot 21, University Park Subdivision, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on April 23, 2002 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Burrell, seconded by Councilman Carmody to postpone the ordinance until the May 28, 2002 meeting. Motion adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Carmody, Serio, Spigener and Burrell. 4. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Huckaby, Stewart and Shyne. 3.

7. Ordinance No. 50 of 2002: 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 Milam 100 feet west of Arkansas, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana from B-1, Buffer Business District to B-1-E, Buffer Business/Extended Use District, limited to "a restaurant" only and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on April 23, 2002 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Burrell, seconded by Councilman Carmody adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Carmody, Serio, Spigener and Burrell. 4. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Huckaby, Stewart and Shyne. 3.

8. Ordinance No. 51 of 2002: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the west side of Norris Ferry Road at intersection with Neesonwood Drive, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from R-A, Residence-Agriculture, to R-1D, (PUD) Urban, One-Family Residence District (Planned Unit Development) and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on April 23, 2002 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Serio denied by the following vote: Nays: Councilmen Huckaby, Stewart Carmody, Serio, Spigener, Shyne and Burrell. 7. Ayes: None. (The vote on this ordinance occurred early part of the meeting, under Public Comments.)

9. Ordinance No. 52 of 2002: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the north side of Ford Street, 200 feet west of Allen Avenue, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from B-2, Neighborhood Business District, and B-3, Community Business District, to I-2, Heavy Industrial District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Councilman Burrell: Mr. Thompson, Mrs. Huckaby is not here. But she mentioned something on yesterday.

Councilman Burrell: I see Mr. Mahoney is out there. Do you have any, or can we do that? Arthur Thompson: You'll have to suspend the rules to allow anybody to speak.

Councilman Carmody: I would ask that we don't suspend the rules at this point. I appreciate that Mr. Mahoney has been here all day but we don't have the

Councilperson who represents his District to help us in this situation.

Councilman Burrell: Roy, that's the normal procedure. If your Councilperson is not here to address it then there would be no need to even talk to us about it at this juncture. And hopefully, you'll be back with us. Mr. Thompson: You will automatically be on the next agenda.

Having passed first reading on April 23, 2002 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Shyne, seconded by Councilman Spigener to postpone the ordinance until the May 28, 2002 meeting. Motion adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Carmody, Serio, Spigener and Burrell. 4. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Huckaby, Stewart and Shyne. 3.

10. Ordinance No. 53 of 2002: 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 Gladstone Boulevard, 220 feet west of Thornhill Avenue, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from R-2-E, Suburban, Multi-Family Residence Extended Use District to R-2, Suburban, Multi-Family Residence District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Councilman Serio: Mr. Chairman, Numbers 53 and 54 are both in Councilman Stewart's District. It would be proper to postpone both of those until he is here.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Chairman, before he left he did ask if we could go ahead and move. His recommendation was that we go ahead and approve both of these.

Having passed first reading on April 23, 2002 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Serio adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Carmody, Serio, Spigener and Burrell. 4. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Huckaby, Stewart and Shyne. 3.

11. Ordinance No. 54 of 2002: 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 Olive Street 120 feet east of Buckner Street, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from B-1, Buffer Business District, to B-2, Neighborhood Business District, with MPC and PBG approval, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on April 23, 2002 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Serio adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Carmody, Serio, Spigener and Burrell. 4. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Huckaby, Stewart and Shyne. 3.

12. Ordinance No. 55 of 2002: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance by rezoning property located on the West side of Youree Drive 150 feet south of Albert Avenue, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from SPI-3 (B-2) Commercial Corridor Overlay (Neighborhood Business District) to SPI-3-E (B-2), Commercial Corridor Overlay/Extended Use (Neighborhood Business) District, "limited to auto glass sales and installation" only, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on April 23, 2002 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Spigener adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Carmody, Serio, Spigener and Burrell. 4. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Huckaby, Stewart and Shyne. 3.

13. Ordinance No. 56 of 2002: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the north and south side of McCarey Street, 2000 feet west of Linwood, 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.

Having passed first reading on April 23, 2002 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Serio, seconded by Councilman Carmody adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Carmody, Serio, Spigener and Burrell. 4. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Huckaby, Stewart and Shyne. 3.

14. Ordinance No. 57 of 2002: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance by rezoning property located on the northeast corner of Hearne Avenue and Morningside Drive, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from B-1, Buffer Business District, to B-1-E, Buffer Business/Extended Use District, with MPC Approval for a Residence, limited to "automobile sales for a maximum of two cars and a residence" only and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on April 23, 2002 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Burrell, seconded by Councilman Carmody to postpone the ordinance until the May 28, 2002 meeting. Motion adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Carmody, Serio, Spigener and Burrell. 4. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Huckaby, Stewart and Shyne. 3.

15. Ordinance No. 58 of 2002: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located within the Greenwood Villa Townhomes Unit #1, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from R-3 (PUD), Urban, Multiple-Family Residence District (Planned Unit Development) to R-3-E (PUD), Urban, Multiple-Family/Extended Use District (Planned Unit Development), limited to "a day care center for the residents of the Greenwood Villa Townhome Development" only, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on April 23, 2002 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Burrell, seconded by Councilman Carmody adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Carmody, Serio, Spigener and Burrell. 4. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Huckaby, Stewart and Shyne. 3.

16. Ordinance No. 59 of 2002 an ordinance revising Chapter 10 of the Code of Ordinances and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on April 23, 2002 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Spigener adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Carmody, Serio, Spigener and Burrell. 4. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Huckaby, Stewart and Shyne. 3.

17. Ordinance No. 60 of 2002 by Councilman Spigener: An ordinance amending and reenacting Section 2-28 of the Code of Ordinances of the city of Shreveport to provide for an increase in the salary and other compensation to be paid to the Mayor, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on April 23, 2002 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Spigener, seconded by Councilman Carmody adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Carmody, Serio, Spigener and Burrell. 4. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Huckaby, Stewart and Shyne. 3.

18. Ordinance No. 61 of 2002 by Councilman Spigener: An ordinance amending and reenacting Section 2-29 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport to provide for an increase in the salaries of members of the City Council, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Councilman Serio: Mr. Chairman, I've got a question. The way this is written there's an inflation clause for someone who is elected for every four years. I don't know. I'm not particularly fond of this particular piece of legislation. I don't know if it's something we can hold up at this time and visit in the future or if it's something that has to be voted on today. I don't like the idea of a constant inflation clause for the next four years. What you're doing with that is if, you get the maximum inflation you literally could raise, the maximum five percent could raise the salary 20% for the term of the office. If you continue this every four years you could actually double the salary in a couple of terms which I don't know if that's the intent of the Council.

Councilman Burrell: So am I hearing you say that if you have maximum inflation then the Council shouldn't be entitled to it?

Councilman Serio: I don't mean entitled to it. I think you're elected for a four year term and you know what you're getting going in that four year term. That as you watch this increase, if this increases with maximum inflation, you can have an exponential increase that could amount to about 20% over a term now. I don't think, for the elected officials, I mean as we're debating the issue of the firemen and city employees I don't think this is a good example to set quite frankly.

Councilman Spigener: Mr. Chairman, we had some assistance in doing a pretty thorough study and our Mayor and Council have not had an increase, if I'm correct, I believe since 1992. Councilman Burrell: About eight years. Councilman Spigener: It's been a very long time. Our Mayor is very far behind in salary increase from what's the norm is for this part of the country or cities our size. If we do not make some provisions for this then it'll be at least another four years before this can be addressed.

Councilman Serio: Mr. Chairman. I don't have a problem with the increase in salary but the cost-of-living increase, I think, needs to be addressed.

Councilman Spigener: After discussing it with Mr. Thompson, I know this kind of an issue has to be introduced or voted on, passed, six months before the end of our term. Mr. Thompson: That's correct.

Councilman Spigener: When is that? Mr. Thompson: Ms. Glass and I were just talking about that. It's my recollection that it needs to be done today. The ordinance needs to be adopted today.

One other thing, if I may, I would point out that this would be good only for the next four years and then it would have to be re-addressed at that time.

The other thing is that it's a maximum of five percent, but it would be what the employees get with a maximum of five percent, which means that, it's very likely going to be less than that and as a practical matter, I don't think it's going to be 20% over the next four years and it does not keep going after that point. It has to be re-addressed by the Council at the end of the four years, six months before the end of that four-year term.

Councilman Spigener: Is there anyone who can address what has been the average of the increases for city employees because this cannot be a bigger percentage than what the city employees are getting? Mr. Thompson: I believe that Mr. Burrell, will remember that, we haven't given a cost-of-living except recently.

Councilman Burrell: You mean, city employees, I know we didn't get any. Mr. Thompson: I mean for the employees. We went to a merit pay increase and we have not been generally giving cost-of-living for classified employees. I think we might have done it once or twice in the past few years but no, I don't have the exact figures.

Councilman Spigener: Another question then or statement. The increase to Council members other than what we're doing today could be only if city employees receive a raise and that cannot be over five percent. Mr. Thompson: That's correct. Councilman Spigener: If it's 2 ½ or 3, then that's what the Council would get also to be renewed in four years.

Councilman Burrell: Is that 2 ½ % annually or over the four-year period? Mr. Thompson: Each time the City employees get a cost-of-living raise, the Council members who are then serving could get a cost-of-living raise, but not more than 5%.

Councilman Burrell: Okay, now, say if the next Council comes on, then their salary would start at the cumulative rate of previous salary they enter plus the cost-of-living? Mr. Thompson: No, their salary is set. It's \$14,500, plus if the next year employees got a cost-of-living raise they could get a cost-of-living raise also up to 5%. If the employees got 2% then their cap would be no more than 2%. If they got 6%, Council members' cap would be 5% percent.

Having passed first reading on April 23, 2002 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Spigener seconded by Councilman Carmody adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Carmody, Spigener and Burrell. 3. Nays: Councilman Serio. 1. Absent: Councilman Huckaby, Stewart and Shyne. 3.

The adopted Ordinances, as amended, follow:

ORDINANCE NUMBER 42 OF 2002

AN ORDINANCE TO REPEAL CERTAIN SECTIONS OF CHAPTER 90 OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT CODE OF ORDINANCES; TO AMEND SECTION 90-273 OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT CODE OF ORDINANCES; AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, Chapter 90 of the City of Shreveport Code of Ordinances contains provisions relative to traffic laws in the City of Shreveport and the enforcement thereof; and

WHEREAS, Chapter 90, Article VII, Division 2 of the City of Shreveport Code of Ordinances contains specific provisions relative to the creation of a Parking Ordinance Hearing Board (the "Board") and assigns duties and functions thereto; and

WHEREAS, no members have been appointed to the Board since the adoption of the ordinance creating the same; and

WHEREAS, the duties and functions previously assigned to the Board can be performed by the City or a third party contracted by the City.

WHEREAS, City desires to amend certain provisions of Chapter 90 of the City of Shreveport Code of Ordinances.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT ORDAINED, by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened that Section 90-272, Section 90-273(5), Section 90-273(6) and Section 90-275 of the City of Shreveport Code of Ordinances are hereby repealed.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that Section 90-271 of the City of Shreveport Code of Ordinances is hereby amended to now read as follows:

Sec. 90-271. Method of notice.

Except as otherwise provided in Section 90-273(e), any notice permitted or required to be given under this article shall be considered given when mailed by first class mail to the operator, if known, or to the registered owner at the address appearing on the registry of the department of motor vehicles or any successor agency thereof, or to a lessee at the address provided by the lessor; provided, however, that the laws relating to citation and service of process shall be observed prior to legal enforcement of any civil judgment.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that Section 90-273(e) of the City of Shreveport Code of Ordinances is hereby CONTINUED - ORDINANCE NO. 42 OF 2002

amended to now read as follows:

Sec. 90-273. Impoundment or immobilization of motor vehicles.

5. Prior to removal, impoundment, detention or immobilization pursuant to subsection of this section, the owner of the motor vehicle shall be mailed a notice, at the address shown on the records of the office of motor vehicles of the state department of public safety, or the appropriate office of motor vehicle registration of any other state. Such notice shall be sent by certified U.S. mail, return receipt requested, and shall inform the owner that failure to pay all outstanding parking citations, late fees or other charges in full within ten (10) days of the owner's receipt of the notice shall result in the vehicle being removed, impounded, detained or immobilized by city or a third party contracted by city without further notice to the owner. The owner's failure to receive delivery of the notice required by subsection due to a change of address of which no notice was given to the office of motor vehicles of the state department of public safety, or the appropriate office of motor vehicle registration of any other state, or the owner's refusal to accept delivery of the notice when properly addressed to the owner at the address shown on the records of the office of motor vehicles of the state department of public safety, or the appropriate office of motor vehicle registration of any other state, shall be deemed to be receipt of such notice.

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.

Roy A. Burrell, Vice-Chairman

Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council

ORDINANCE NO. 45 OF 2002

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2002 BUDGET FOR THE ENVIRONMENTAL GRANTS SPECIAL REVENUE FUND AND

OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, Article 7 of the Charter of the City of Shreveport provides for the amendment of any previously-adopted budget; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds it necessary to amend the 2002 budget for the Environmental Grants Special Revenue Fund, to appropriate two newly-received grants.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in legal session convened, that Section 1 of Ordinance No. 163 of 2001, the 2002 budget for the Environmental Grants Special Revenue Fund, be amended to read as follows:

Appropriations: The following funds are hereby appropriated for the grants in the column titled "2002 Budget." For those grants listed herein, total spending for all years shall not exceed the amount appropriated herein, unless such amount is increased by subsequent action of the City Council. For active grants which are not listed herein, but which have been previously appropriated in a budget ordinance for the Environmental Grants Special Revenue Fund, the prior appropriation shall remain in effect. The Director of Finance is authorized to expend same in accordance with law, to the extent that funds are available.

| Grant: | 2002 CHANGE | 2002 BUDGET |
|--|----------------|----------------|
| Brownfields Assessment Grant | 0 | \$ 32,700 |
| Brownfields Supplemental Assessment Grant | 0 | \$ 150,000 |
| Brownfields Greenspace Grant | 0 | \$ 50,000 |
| Brownfields Revolving Loan Fund | 0 | \$ 1,000,000 |
| Brownfields Job Training Grant | 0 | \$ 200,000 |
| Brownfields Economic Development Initiative | 0 | \$ 1,000,000 |
| Brownfields Economic Development Initiative (2001) | 429,100 | \$ 429,100 |
| Brownfields Economic Development Initiative (2002) | 300,000 | \$ 300,000 |
| In Section1 (Appropriations), appropriate \$15,000 for Ozone Flex Grant. | | |
| GRAND TOTAL - 2002 CHANGE | | \$ 729,100 |
| GRAND TOTAL - 2002 BUDGET | | \$ 3,161,800 |

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 CONTINUED - ORDINANCE NO. 45 OF 2002

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.

Roy A. Burrell, Vice-Chairman

Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council

ORDINANCE NO. 46 OF 2002

AN ORDINANCE LEVYING VARIOUS TAXES TOTALING TWENTY AND SEVENTY-SIXTH ONE HUNDREDTHS (20 AND 76/100THS) MILLS PER DOLLAR ON ALL PROPERTY SUBJECT TO AD VALOREM TAXATION WITHIN THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT FOR THE YEAR 2002 IN THE AMOUNTS AND FOR THE PURPOSES DESCRIBED HEREIN, AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

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

An ad valorem tax of Twelve and Thirteenth One Hundredths (12 and 13/100ths) mills per dollar of assessed valuation be and the same is hereby levied on all property subject to ad valorem taxation within the City of Shreveport, for the year 2002; for the purpose of general operating expenses of the General Fund.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that an ad valorem tax of Ninety-eight One Hundredths (98/100ths) mills per dollar of assessed valuation be and the same is hereby levied on all property subject to ad valorem taxation within the City of Shreveport, for the year 2002; for the purpose of operating and supplying recreational facilities and appurtenances and maintaining the same, title to which shall be in the public, in accordance with the results of a special election held July 19, 1997.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that an ad valorem tax of One and Seventy-three One Hundredths (1 and 73/100ths) mills per dollar of assessed valuation be and the same is hereby levied on all property subject to ad valorem taxation within the City of Shreveport, for the year 2002; for the purpose of providing revenues sufficient to enable the City of Shreveport to provide a three-platoon system in the Police Department, now in effect in the City of Shreveport in accordance with Act 323 of the Legislature of Louisiana for the year 1936.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that an ad valorem tax of One and Thirty-one One Hundredths (1 and 31/100ths) mills per dollar of assessed valuation be and the same is hereby levied on all property subject to ad valorem taxation within the City of Shreveport, for the year 2002; for the purpose of improving, repairing, and maintaining the streets of the City of Shreveport, title to which shall be in the public, in accordance with the results of a special election held July 19, 1997.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that an ad valorem tax of One and Thirty-one One Hundredths (1 and 31/100ths) mills per dollar of assessed valuation be and the same is hereby levied on all property subject to ad valorem taxation within the City of Shreveport, for the year 2002; for the purpose of continuing the salary and wage schedule of City employees, in accordance with the results of a special election held July 19, 1997.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that an ad valorem tax of One and Thirty-one One Hundredths (1 and 31/100ths) mills per dollar of assessed valuation be and the same is hereby levied on all property subject to ad valorem taxation within the City of Shreveport, for the year 2002; for the purpose of police and fire personnel and allowance for uniforms and equipment for said departments in accordance with the results of a special election held July 19, 1997.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that an ad valorem tax of One and Ninety-nine One Hundredths (1 and 99/100ths) mills per dollar of assessed valuation be and the same is hereby levied on all property subject to ad

valorem taxation with the City of Shreveport, for the year 2002; for the purpose of providing funds for the City's portion of pensions, employee life insurance and hospitalization plan for City employees in accordance with the results of a special election held July 19, 1997.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that this ordinance shall be full authority to the Tax Assessor of Caddo Parish and the Tax Assessor of Bossier Parish to extend said taxes on the assessment rolls of the City of Shreveport for the year 2002.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the Director of Finance, Ex Officio Tax Collector of the City of Shreveport, be and she is hereby empowered, authorized, and directed to cause said taxes, as herein above set forth, to be spread upon the tax roll of the City of Shreveport for the year 2002, to collect said ad valorem taxes for and on behalf of said City, according to law, and to place the same to the credit of the funds described herein above as authorized by law. The taxes herein levied shall become a permanent lien and privilege on all property subject to taxation as herein set forth, and the collection thereof shall be enforceable in the manner provided by law.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the Clerk of Council shall provide a certified copy of this ordinance to the Tax Assessor of Caddo Parish and the Tax Assessor of Bossier Parish immediately after its final passage by the City Council and approval by the Mayor.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that if any provision or item of this ordinance and the application thereof is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions, items or applications and to this end the provisions of this ordinance are hereby declared servable.

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

Roy A. Burrell, Vice-Chairman

Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council

ORDINANCE NO. 47 OF 2002

AN ORDINANCE LEVYING A TAX OF THIRTY AND FIFTY-FOUR ONE HUNDREDTHS (30 AND 54/100THS) MILLS PER DOLLAR ON ALL PROPERTY SUBJECT TO AD VALOREM TAXATION WITHIN THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT FOR THE YEAR 2002 FOR THE PURPOSE OF PAYING PRINCIPAL AND INTEREST ON THE OUTSTANDING GENERAL OBLIGATION BONDS OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT, AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

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

An ad valorem tax of Thirty and Fifty-four One Hundredths (30 and 54/100ths) mills per dollar of assessed valuation be and the same is hereby levied on all property subject to ad valorem taxation within the City of Shreveport, for the year 2002, for the purpose of paying the principal and interest on the outstanding general obligation bonds of the City of Shreveport, and creating a reasonable reserve for the payment of such principal and interest as the same respectively become due and payable, and this shall be full authority to the Tax Assessor of Caddo Parish and the Tax Assessor of Bossier Parish to extend said tax on the assessment rolls of the City of Shreveport for the year 2002.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the Director of Finance, Ex Officio Tax Collector of the City of Shreveport, be and she is hereby empowered, authorized, and directed to cause said taxes, as herein above set forth, to be spread upon the tax roll of the City of Shreveport for the year 2002, to collect said ad valorem taxes for and on behalf of said City, according to law, and to place the same to the credit of the funds described herein above as authorized by law. The taxes herein levied shall become a permanent lien and privilege on all property subject to taxation as herein set forth, and the collection thereof shall be enforceable in the manner provided by law.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the Clerk of Council shall provide a certified copy of this ordinance to the Tax Assessor of Caddo Parish and the Tax Assessor of Bossier Parish immediately after its final passage by the City Council and approval by the Mayor.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that if any provision or item of this ordinance and the application thereof is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other 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.

Roy A. Burrell, Vice-Chairman

Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council

ORDINANCE NO. 48 OF 2002

AN ORDINANCE LEVYING A TAX OF SEVEN AND NINETY-NINE ONE HUNDREDTHS (7 AND 99/100THS) MILLS PER DOLLAR ON ALL PROPERTY SUBJECT TO AD VALOREM TAXATION WITHIN THE BOUNDS OF THE DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT AS DEFINED BY ACT 554 OF 1978, AS AMENDED, FOR THE PURPOSES AS SET FORTH HEREIN, AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

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

An ad valorem tax of Seven and Ninety-nine One Hundredths (7 and 99/100ths) mills per dollar of assessed valuation be and the same is hereby levied on all property subject to ad valorem taxation within the bounds of the Downtown Development District, as defined by Act 554 of 1978, as amended, for the year 2002, and to be expended by the Downtown Development Authority for administration, operational expenses, capital improvements, project expenses or the retirement of bonds or other evidences of indebtedness, all in accordance with the results of a special election held November 20, 1999 and this shall be full authority to the Tax Assessor of Caddo Parish to extend said tax on the assessment rolls of the City of Shreveport for the year 2002.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the Director of Finance, Ex Officio Tax Collector of the City of Shreveport, be and she is hereby empowered, authorized, and directed to cause said taxes, as herein above set forth, to be spread upon the tax roll of the City of Shreveport for the year 2002, to collect said ad valorem taxes for and on behalf of said City, according to law, and to place the same to the credit of the funds described herein above as provided for and authorized by the special election held on November 20, 1999. The taxes herein levied shall become a permanent lien and privilege on all property subject to taxation as herein set forth, and the collection thereof shall be enforceable in the manner provided by law.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the Clerk of Council shall provide a certified copy of this ordinance to the Tax Assessor of Caddo Parish and the Tax Assessor of Bossier Parish immediately after its final passage by the City Council and approval by the Mayor.

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

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

Roy A. Burrell, Vice-Chairman

Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council

ORDINANCE NO. 50 OF 2002

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 MILAM 100 FEET WEST OF ARKANSAS, SHREVEPORT, CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA, FROM B-1, BUFFER BUSINESS DISTRICT, TO B-1-E, BUFFER BUSINESS/EXTENDED USE DISTRICT, LIMITED TO "A RESTAURANT" ONLY AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO

SECTION I: BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, in due, legal and regular session convened, that the zoning classification of Lot 28, Block 5, Washington Subdivision, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, property located on the south side of Milam 100 feet west of Arkansas, be

and the same is hereby changed from B-1, Buffer Business District, to B-1-E, Buffer Business/Extended Use District, limited to "a restaurant" only.

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

1. Development of the property shall be in substantial accord with the site plan submitted with any significant changes or additions requiring further review and approval by the Planning Commission.

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

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

Roy A. Burrell, Vice-Chairman

Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council

ORDINANCE NO. 53 OF 2002

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 GLADSTONE BOULEVARD, 220 FEET WEST OF THORNHILL AVENUE, SHREVEPORT, CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA, FROM R-2-E, SUBURBAN, MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENCE EXTENDED USE DISTRICT TO R-2, SUBURBAN, MULTI-FAMILY RESIDENCE DISTRICT, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO

SECTION I: BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, in due, legal and regular session convened, that the zoning classification of Lots 1, 2, 3 Colonial Hills Subdivision, Unit No.2, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, property located on the south side of Gladstone Boulevard, 220 feet west of Thornhill Avenue, be and the same is hereby changed from R-2-E, Suburban, Multi-Family Residence/Extended Use District, to R-2, Suburban, Multi-Family Residence District.

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

- (1) Site development plan shall be submitted to and approved by the Planning Commission prior to the issuance of any permits.

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

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

Roy A. Burrell, Vice-Chairman

Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council

ORDINANCE NO. 54 OF 2002

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 OLIVE STREET 120 FEET EAST OF BUCKNER STREET, SHREVEPORT, CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA, FROM B-1, BUFFER BUSINESS DISTRICT, TO B-2, NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS DISTRICT, WITH MPC AND PBG APPROVAL, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO

SECTION I: BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, in due, legal and regular session convened, that the zoning classification of the East/2 of Lot 29, Lots 30 and 31, the West 10 feet of Lot 32, Fairmont Subdivision, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, property located on the south side of Olive Street, 120 feet east of Buckner Street, be and the same is hereby changed from B-1, Buffer Business District, to B-2, Neighborhood Business District, with MPC and PBG approval.

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

Tract 1 (B-2)

1. Development of the property shall be in substantial accord with a revised site plan showing parking to ordinance standards, open-style fencing with landscaping shown on both sides, to be submitted to and approved by the Planning Commission at the April 24, 2002 meeting, with any significant changes or additions requiring further review and approval by the Planning Commission.
2. All existing lots (Tract 1 and Tract 2) to be replatted into 1 lot.

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.

Roy A. Burrell, Vice-Chairman

Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council

ORDINANCE NO. 55 OF 2002

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 106 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES, THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT ZONING ORDINANCE, BY REZONING PROPERTY LOCATED ON THE WEST SIDE OF YOUREE DRIVE 150 FEET SOUTH OF ALBERT AVENUE, SHREVEPORT, CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA, FROM SPI-3 (B-2) COMMERCIAL CORRIDOR OVERLAY (NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS DISTRICT) TO SPI-3-E (B-2), COMMERCIAL CORRIDOR OVERLAY/EXTENDED USE (NEIGHBORHOOD BUSINESS) DISTRICT, "LIMITED TO AUTO GLASS SALES AND INSTALLATION" ONLY, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO

SECTION I: BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, in due, legal and regular session convened, that the zoning classification of property located on the west side of Youree Drive 150 feet south of Albert Avenue, legally described below, be and the same is hereby changed from SPI-3 (B-2) Commercial Corridor Overlay (Neighborhood Business) District to SPI-3-E (B-2) Commercial Corridor Overlay/Extended Use (Neighborhood Business) District, "limited to auto glass sales and installation" only.

The North 100 feet of the following described tract of land: that portion of Plot 131, Broadmoor Subdivision, Unit #1, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, lying north of a line beginning at the SE corner of said Plot 131 and extending west to the west line of said Plot, less tract off the north end fronting 130 feet on Youree Drive and 130 feet on Albert Avenue.

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

1. Development of the property shall be in accord with the site plan submitted, with any additions or expansions requiring further review and approval by the Planning Commission.

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

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

Roy A. Burrell, Vice-Chairman

Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council

ORDINANCE NO. 56 OF 2002

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 106 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES, THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT ZONING ORDINANCE, BY REZONING PROPERTY LOCATED ON THE NORTH AND SOUTH SIDE OF MCCAREY STREET, 2000 FEET WEST OF LINWOOD, 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

SECTION I: BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, in due, legal and regular session convened, that the zoning classification of Lots 168 and 181 Suburban Acres Subdivision, 3rd Filing, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, property located on the north and south side of McCarey Street, 2000 feet west of Linwood, be and the same is hereby changed from R-1D, Urban, One-Family Residence District to I-1, Light Industry District.

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

CONTINUED - ORDINANCE NO. 56 OF 2002

1. Development of the property shall be in substantial accord with the site plan submitted with any significant changes or additions requiring further review and approval by the Planning Commission.

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

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

Roy A. Burrell, Vice-Chairman

Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council

ORDINANCE NO. 58 OF 2002

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 106 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES, THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT ZONING ORDINANCE, BY REZONING PROPERTY LOCATED WITHIN THE GREENWOOD VILLA TOWNHOMES UNIT #1, SHREVEPORT, CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA, FROM R-3 (PUD), URBAN, MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENCE DISTRICT (PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT) TO R-3-E (PUD), URBAN, MULTIPLE-FAMILY/EXTENDED USE DISTRICT (PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT), LIMITED TO "A DAY CARE CENTER FOR THE RESIDENTS OF THE GREENWOOD VILLA TOWNHOME DEVELOPMENT" ONLY, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO

SECTION I: BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, in due, legal and regular session convened, that the zoning classification of property located within the Greenwood Villa Townhomes Unit #, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, legally described below, be and the same is hereby changed from R-3 (PUD), Urban, Multiple-Family Residence District (Planned Unit Development) to R-3-E (PUD), Urban, Multiple-Family/Extended Use District (Planned Unit Development) limited to "a day care center for the residents of the Greenwood Villa Townhome development" only.

Beginning at the NW corner of Lot 1000 of Greenwood Villa Townhomes, Unit No.1; thence N0°00'28"E a distance of 90.13 feet to the TRUE P-O-B of this 0.138 acre tract; thence S89°59'32"W a distance of 79.50 feet to a point; thence N0°05'00"E a distance of 75.43 feet to a point in the North line of a 4.285 acre tract; thence N89°59'32"E, with said North line, a distance of 79.38 feet to a point; thence S0°00'28"W a distance of 75.43 feet to the P-O-B and containing 0.138 acres (5,992 sq. ft.) or land, M/L

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

1. Development of the property shall be in substantial accord with the site plan submitted, with any significant changes or additions requiring further review and approval by the Planning Commission.
2. Approval is subject to all applicable local and state requirements being met.
3. The number of children is limited to the number allowed by the State Daycare Regulations.

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.

Roy A. Burrell, Vice-Chairman

Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council

ORDINANCE NO. 59 OF 2002

AN ORDINANCE REVISING CHAPTER 10 OF THE CITY CODE OF ORDINANCES AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO

WHEREAS, the City Charter provides for the revision of current ordinances; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds it necessary to revise Chapter 10 of the City Code of Ordinances to allow alcohol retail dealers the opportunity to be open on Sundays to host nationally sponsored sporting tournaments..

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in legal session convened, that Ordinance No. ____ of 2002, revising Chapter 10 of the City Code of Ordinances, is hereby amended and the following sections added as follows:

Sec. 10-185 Same-Sunday Only Special Sporting Event Permit

(a) It shall be lawful for any retail dealer of alcoholic beverages otherwise licensed to allow consumption on the premises to open and sell, serve, dispense, or otherwise dispose of any alcoholic beverages between the hours of 12:00 noon and 12:00 midnight on Sundays for the purpose of conducting CONTINUED - ORDINANCE NO. 59 OF 2002

a bona fide special event, as defined in this section, and on the terms and conditions contained in this section. The provisions of this section, with the exception of section 10-185(b)(1) shall not apply to a retail dealer who is otherwise permitted to be open pursuant to section 10-172.

(b) A special sporting event is described as an event held by the retail dealer which is limited to a nationally sponsored sporting event, such as pool or dart tournaments, or event of kinds, where the registered participants, their families and other spectators are permitted to attend.

(c) Any retail dealer desiring to open on Sunday between the hours of 12:00 noon and 12:00 midnight and sell, serve, dispense or otherwise dispose of any alcoholic beverages during that time for the purpose of conducting a bona fide special sporting event shall first apply to the chief of police for an alcoholic beverage permit to sell, serve, dispense or otherwise dispose of any alcoholic beverages at a special event party on Sunday. Any application for such a permit shall be legibly printed or typed on an application approved by the chief of police. The applicant will provide all information requested on the application. All applications for such permits shall be submitted to the chief of police no later than ten working days prior to the proposed time and date for such a special event. Any permit issued pursuant to this section shall be subject to revocation and suspension for any grounds that a dealer's basic liquor permit may be revoked or suspended. Violations that occur during the permitted dates and times of the special sporting event can subject the retail dealer's basic

permit to revocation and suspension.

(d) A retail dealer will be allowed to have no more than a combined total of ten (10) special permits in one (1) calendar year which include both bona fide Sunday Only Special Sporting Event permits and bona fide Sunday Private Party permits. Of those ten permitted, no more than seven Sunday Only Special Sporting Event permits will be allowed.

(e) If the chief of police denies an application, the provisions of sections 10-45 and 10-133 will be followed on all denials and appeals.

(f) Any permit issued pursuant to this section shall be for one bona fide special event only. The fee for such permit shall be \$200.00. All fees will be paid in cash to the city prior to the issuance of the permit.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that if any provision or item of this ordinance or the application thereof is held invalid, such invalidity shall not affect other provisions, items or applications; and, to this end, the provisions of this ordinance are hereby declared to be severable.

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

Roy A. Burrell, Vice-Chairman

Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council

ORDINANCE NO. 60 OF 2002

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING AND REENACTING SECTION 2-28 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT TO PROVIDE FOR AN INCREASE IN THE SALARY AND OTHER COMPENSATION TO BE PAID TO THE MAYOR, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BY: COUNCILMAN SPIGENER

WHEREAS, Section 5.05 of the Charter of the City of Shreveport, 1978, provides that the Council may by ordinance change the salary of the mayor subject to the following provisions:

- (a) The change shall be adopted at a regular meeting of the council;
- (b) No change shall be effective during the term of office of the current mayor at the time of the change;
- (c) No change shall be made during the last six (6) months of a term of office of the mayor; and

WHEREAS, the compensation of the mayor of the City of Shreveport is provided for in Section 2-28 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport, last amended by Ordinance No. 84 of 1990; and

WHEREAS, the Louisiana State University in Shreveport's Center for Business and Economic Research conducted a survey of Mayor and City Council Compensation Plans and presented the results of the survey with recommendations in a report dated March 2002; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, legal and regular session convened, that Section 2-28 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport be and the same is hereby amended and reenacted to read as follows, to wit:

Sec. 2-28. Compensation of mayor.

- (a) The mayor shall receive an annual salary of \$95,000.00, payable in equal monthly installments on his own warrant. In addition, such salary shall be increased by the same percentage as any percentage cost of living increase granted to classified employees for the years 2003, 2004, 2005 and 2006. Each annual percentage increase shall be based on the previous year's total salary.

CONTINUED - ORDINANCE NO. 60 OF 2002

Provided, that the annual percentage increase in the mayor's salary shall not exceed five percent, even if a greater percentage increase is granted to classified employees. Provided

further, that if no annual cost of living increase is granted to classified employees, there shall be no increase in the mayor's salary. Such salary shall otherwise remain in effect unless and until changed by the city council in accordance with section 5.05 of the Charter.

- (b) The mayor shall receive an annual car allowance of \$5,400.00, payable in equal monthly installments on his own warrant; provided, however, that in lieu thereof the city may furnish to the mayor a suitable automobile.
- (c) The mayor is authorized to participate in the city's health and life insurance package in the same manner as other unclassified employees of the city. It is estimated that this benefit will be valued at approximately \$5,000.00 in 2003.
- (d) The mayor is authorized to participate in the city employees' retirement system or the city's deferred compensation program in the same manner as other unclassified city employees. Alternatively, the mayor may participate in any other retirement or insurance plan with the city paying the actual cost thereof or whatever the city would have contributed had the mayor elected to participate in the city's deferred compensation program.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the estimated value of this compensation package in the year 2003 is \$113,600.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that this ordinance shall become effective on November 28, 2002.

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.

Roy A. Burrell, Vice-Chairman

Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council

ORDINANCE NO. 61 OF 2002

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING AND REENACTING SECTION 2-29 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT TO PROVIDE FOR AN INCREASE IN THE SALARIES OF MEMBERS OF THE CITY COUNCIL, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BY: COUNCILMAN SPIGENER

WHEREAS, Section 4.08 of the Charter of the City of Shreveport, 1978, provides that each member of the City Council shall receive a certain base salary; and

WHEREAS, Section 4.09 of the City Charter provides that the Council may by ordinance make changes in the salaries of its members, subject to the following provisions and limitations:

- (a) The change shall be adopted at a regular meeting of the council;
- (b) No increase of salary shall be effective during the term of office during which it is adopted;
- (c) No change in the salaries of council members shall be made during the last six (6) months of the terms of office of council members; and
- (d) Any change in the salary of council members shall apply uniformly to all members, provided that this provision shall not prevent the payment of additional compensation to the chairman of the council; and

WHEREAS, the compensation of the council members of the City of Shreveport as provided for in Section 2-29 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport was last amended by Ordinance No. 85 of 1990; and

WHEREAS, the Louisiana State University in Shreveport's Center for Business and Economic Research conducted a survey of Mayor and City Council Compensation Plans and presented the results of the survey with recommendations in a report dated March 2002; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, legal and regular session convened, that Section 2-29 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport be and the same is hereby amended and reenacted to read as follows, to wit:

Sec. 2-29. Compensation of councilmembers.

- (a) Each member of the city council shall receive a base annual salary of \$14,500.00, payable in equal monthly installments. In addition, such salary shall be increased by the same percentage as any percentage cost of living increase granted to classified employees for the years 2003, 2004, 2005 and 2006. Each annual percentage increase shall be based on the previous year's total salary. Provided, CONTINUED - ORDINANCE NO. 61 OF 2002

that the annual percentage increase in the council's salary shall not exceed five percent, even if a greater percentage increase is granted to classified employees. Provided further, that if no annual cost of living increase is granted to classified employees, there shall be no increase in the council's salary.

Such salary shall otherwise remain in effect unless and until changed by the city council in accordance with section 4.09 of the Charter.

- (b) The chairman of the council shall receive the additional sum of \$2,400.00 per year, payable in equal monthly installments.
- (c) Salaries payable under the provisions of this section shall be payable on the warrant of the respective councilmember.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that this ordinance shall become effective on November 28, 2002.

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.

Roy A. Burrell, Vice-Chairman

Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

1. Discussion and/or Action Relative to the Public Safety Committee. (F/Shyne) (Tabled on Oct. 23)
2. Resolution No. 12 of 2002: Authorizing the Mayor to accept the donation of certain immovable property from Charlton Christopher Holmes. (1033 Shreveport-Barksdale Hwy.) (Tabled on March 26)
3. Appeal: Denial of Class A License to operate non-emergency ambulance - North Webster Medical Services/MED-ONE Ambulance. (*Special Meeting scheduled for May 22*)
4. Alcohol Retail Permit: Ms. Deborah Hawkins [Employer: 2901 Milam St. [Take-A-Bag Grocery] (G/Burrell) (*Special Meeting scheduled for May 30*)

NEW BUSINESS: None.

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES. None.

CLERK'S REPORT: None.

THE COMMITTEE RISES AND REPORT. None.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting adjourned at approximately 8:15 p.m.

Roy A. Burrell, Vice-Chairman

Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council