

COUNCIL PROCEEDINGS OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT
JANUARY 14, 2003

The Regular Meeting of the City Council of the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, was called to order by Chairman James Green at 3:00 p.m., Tuesday, January 14, 2003, in the Government Chambers in Government Plaza (505 Travis Street).

Councilman Hogan led the Council in the Invocation.

On Roll Call, the following members were Present: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson (arrived at 3:15). 7. Absent: None. (Councilman Jackson was out today on business.)

Approve Minutes. Motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Lester to approve the Administrative Conference Summary Minutes of December 23, 2002 and the Regular Meeting Minutes of December 30, 2002. Motion approved by the following vote: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Green. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Jackson. 1.

Awards, Recognition of Distinguished Guests, and Communications of the Mayor Which Are Required By Law.

“Happy Birthday” was sung to the Mayor. Councilman Green: Also Mr. Mayor, we have a shirt from Pete Harris. We heard about you liked the apple pie and they got you some apple pie. They also sent you a shirt and autographed it on the back and they say whenever you wear this shirt to Pete Harris, you’ll always eat free.

Awards, Recognition of Distinguished Guests and Communications of the Council.

Councilman Green: I know we have some special guests, Councilman Hogan has asked the Evangel Football Team to come. Do you know if they are here yet?

Councilman Hogan: They were supposed to be here. Coach Dunn, are you in the audience?

Councilman Green: I don’t see him, so we will come back to that item, I am sure they will be here real soon. After the Mayor comes in, then we will go back to that particular item.

Councilman Lester: I would like to recognize a group of citizens from the MLK neighborhood that are here. I think they have a number of issues that they want to, they are going to be addressing. I just wanted to acknowledge them and thank them for coming to express their concerns of their neighborhood.

Councilman Walford: If we could, sneaking in the back door very stoutly back there, Representative Cedric Glover has joined us today.

Councilman Green: Welcome to our meeting Representative Glover and Cousin, you are mighty dressed up today.

Report on Convention Center and Hotel Project: Mr. Antee: As mentioned yesterday, Mr. Chairman, our report is basically a copy of the interim agreement that the Mayor signed that is being circulated to Whitaker Construction, Safeco, as well as Barton Malow. And those copies should have been made available through the Clerk’s Office.

Mr. Thompson: I don’t recall seeing the copies.

Mr. Antee: I know the copies were made yesterday afternoon and we’ll make sure you have them, if you don’t already.

Councilman Carmody: In that we are going to receive a copy of the interim agreement for our review, is there also some documentation as far as the hotel agreement in which you can provide to us as well, Mr. Antee?

Mr. Antee: We can, we can provide a copy of the Development Agreement. The Management Agreement is still being worked out, but we do have the Development Agreement which has been signed and executed and we will have copies of that available as well.

Just a brief report on the Hotel Project. As I mentioned, late last week the Mayor and myself were in New Orleans meeting with HRI. We ironed out the final terms of the Development Agreement and began working with the actual design team. They are in the process now of putting together a

contract for the design of the hotel and that is starting to progress. They have done the schematic design but now they will get into the real meat and potatoes of it so that the design will take place over the 10-months then the package will be put together and submitted to various contractors. Once a contractor is selected and a guaranteed maximum price, contract is signed, then that package will be taken to the bond market to sell the first tier of bonds.

Councilman Gibson: Ken, will there be an opportunity, I have to assume that Pres Kabacoff is still involved with HRI, is that correct?

Mr. Antee: Yes.

Councilman Gibson: Will there be an opportunity for this Council to visit with Mr. Kabacoff at some point in time as this unfolds?

Mr. Antee: He hadn't really been involved. We have primarily been dealing with the President and the Vice-President Eddie Bockner, but anybody at HRI that the Council wants to meet and visit with, I know they will be more than willing to come up and meet with whoever and discuss any issues.

Councilman Gibson: I would just like to, if you could, to convey that I think it would be important over the next few weeks that we have an opportunity to visit especially seeing that we had, in my mind, there are still some things are outstanding from in the past tied with the Lee Hardware / United Jeweler building that just so we can make sure that, all those are separate projects in nature and stand on their own merits, but there are some specific questions that I have on that particular item just to make sure that HRI is on the same page with trying to maintain local participation in keeping, in maximizing the investment in this project in the local economy to help generate tax revenue in the future to put back in the infrastructure.

Mr. Antee: We'll work to get that set up. In our meeting last Thursday, we did reiterate, well first of all, in the contract there is the Fair Share language which wasn't in place with the other two projects and this project will be bid, publicly bid with a construction manager not to exceed contract just like the Convention Center. So those issue will be handled that way, but we will also coordinate a schedule and time as to when they can come up and meet with everybody.

Councilman Gibson: Okay, I appreciate it.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Antee, I know at ne point we had talked about the possibility of trying to put out both the hotel and the convention center at the same time, the bid, to try and make sure we had the work going on simultaneously on the site; that appears not to be a possibility, at this point?

Mr. Antee: None. Actually that has never really been the goal to put them out at the same time, for two reasons. 1) The construction of the hotel will be a lot quicker than the construction of the convention center. 2) We want the hotel to be complete and open within approximately 6-months of the convention center. 3) If you put all that work out at once, then you may stress the construction industry locally and maybe eliminate some of the local businesses because too much work will hit the street all at one time.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Antee, a quick question. As I appreciate it, I appreciate you complying with our request to give us a contract regarding the Convention Center. Where do we stand on the preparation of the bid packages, as it relates to the construction?

Mr. Antee: Right now, the design team and the construction manager, Ashiek Nee, Barton Malow are working so that bid packages, the current schedule is to have them out by February 26th, but they, Slack-Alost has stated that they can have their work done by January 31st and then it would take two to three weeks of Barton Malow to put it in final form to put it out, so that is where we are on that.

Councilman Green: Mr. Mayor, we would like to welcome you to the meeting. We will move back up to Awards, Recognition of Distinguished Guests, and Communications of the Mayor Which Are Required By Law. Do you have any Awards, Recognition of Distinguished Guests?

Mayor Hightower: Nothing today.

Public Hearings: None.

Confirmations and/or Appointments: Motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Lester to confirm to the Shreveport Regional Sports Authority (re-appointment): Michael

McCarthy and Carl Pierson. Motion approved by the following vote: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

Councilman Green: Thank you Mr. Jackson for coming to the meeting. We had announced that you wouldn't be here today, but this is not your clone is it?

Councilman Jackson: I just came as a surprise. This is the Mayor's birthday present.

Motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Walford to confirm to the Civil Service Board: Dock Voorhies, Jr. Motion approved by the following vote: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

Adding Legislation to the Agenda. Motion by Councilman Hogan, seconded by Councilman Gibson to add the following to the agenda:

1. Appointment of James Pannell to the Caddo-Bossier Port Commission (no further action taken.).
2. Resolution No.6 of 2003: A Resolution to congratulate Evangel Christian Academy for winning the 2002 Class 5A Louisiana State Football Championship; to declare Wednesday January 15, 2003 as Evangel Christian Academy Eagles Day in the City of Shreveport, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
3. Resolution No. 7 of 2003: A resolution providing for periodic reports to the City Council concerning substandard structures and weeded lots and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
4. Resolution No. 8 of 2003: A resolution to formally name the tennis courts at A. B. Palmer Park, the "Julia M. Williams Tennis Center" and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

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

Public Comments: None.

CONSENT AGENDA LEGISLATION:

TO INTRODUCE RESOLUTIONS AND ORDINANCES ON CONSENT:

RESOLUTIONS: None.

ORDINANCES: None.

TO ADOPT RESOLUTIONS AND ORDINANCES ON CONSENT:

RESOLUTIONS:

Motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Lester for Adoption of the Resolutions on the Consent Agenda. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

RESOLUTION NO. 1 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING LARRY ROY GRAFF & JANET PARENT GRAFF, LOCATED AT 10041 NORRIS FERRY RD., TO CONNECT TO THE WATER SYSTEM OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

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

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened, that Larry Roy Graff & Janet Parent Graff, be authorized to connect the building located at 10041 Norris Ferry Rd., to the water system of the City of Shreveport.

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

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

RESOLUTION NO. 2 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION ACCEPTING DEDICATION FOR GRAND OAKS DRIVE, HIDDEN OAKS CIRCLE AND AUTUMN OAKS LANE IN THE HIDDEN TRACE STREET DEDICATION PLAT, 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 Grand Oaks Drive, Hidden Oaks Circle and Autumn Oaks Lane in the Hidden Trace Street Dedication Plat in Section 28 (T16N-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 Grand Oaks Drive, Hidden Oaks Circle and Autumn Oaks 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.

ORDINANCES: None.

REGULAR AGENDA LEGISLATION:

RESOLUTIONS ON SECOND READING AND FINAL PASSAGE:

The Deputy Clerk read resolution by title: Resolution No. 196 of 2002: A resolution rejecting bids received on IF #02-291, Amiss Water Treatment Plant Chemical Feed Building Improvements & Automation.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Gibson to postpone the resolution until the January 28, 2003 meeting. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

The Deputy Clerk read the resolution by title: Resolution No. 201 of 2002 by Councilman Jackson: A resolution authorizing the Mayor to execute a Cooperative Endeavor Agreement with the National Baptist Convention of America (NBCA) relative to holding the NBCA's 2003 Winter Board Meeting in Shreveport and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Walford for passage. The Deputy Clerk read the following amendment:

Delete the Original Resolution and Agreement and substitute the attached Amended Resolution and Agreement.

Motion by Councilman Jackson, seconded by Councilman Gibson for adoption of the amendment. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Jackson to adopt the resolution as amended.

Councilman Hogan: I am in favor of this, however I think one of the reason that I am in favor of it because of the potential economic impact. And of course I have a special place in my heart for this group, the National Baptist, I'm a member of the Southern Baptist as well, but one of the reasons I'm choosing is because of the economic impact.

And I think that it would be a good idea for us to, in the future, I don't know if we need a written rule but in examining future cases we need to have a rule that says that if the potential economic impact is a certain amount, if it is x-amount, whether it be a religious group or whether it be another group, then we want to give the same consideration and I'm open for ideas on this but I think that we need some type of guideline in the future; so, that's the comment and again, I'm in favor of it.

Councilman Carmody: In that at we or at least my tenure on the Shreveport City Council have looked to the Shreveport-Bossier Convention and Tourism Bureau to assist in bringing organizations to the City to book facilities that we have. This is a major

accomplishment in my opinion that they've come forward with some funds.

But I would also echo Councilman Hogan's comments in that it would be nice if this body could work toward a system by which someone could make application, but document the actually economic impact through an organization that we could look to and in the case, it would be nice if we could look to Stacy Brown and the Shreveport Bossier Convention and Tourism Bureau to do that work and then to hopefully help facilitate offsetting the cost to the citizens of the community.

Councilman Walford: Yesterday, I was sitting there with a calculator when they said what they projected their dollars to be brought in, what they would be in using 2.75% sales tax would be generated because of it. We more than offset what we are giving us and I think that that is important, Councilman Carmody and I had discussed that.

I think that he makes a very good point that we need the information. One other thing, I would commend Stacy Brown and her board for stepping forward, this is what I think we need to see and I'm pleased to have seen it and I hope that it is a continuing thing.

Councilman Jackson: Let me first say, thank you to the Councilmen for at least allowing us to at least have this opportunity to have this discussion. We started out a month or so ago with a conversation and obviously there was some concerns expressed by some of the Councilmen, by the Council in general and I think legitimate and valid concerns as well.

I don't know Councilman Hogan, what the answer is, but I do think we moved in the right direction as it relates to policy. I think rather than a written policy, that we have established a spirit and a policy to this, as a Council and that on case-by-case basis that we will look at and one of the criterion that we want to pay close attention to, obviously, the leading criteria will be economic impact.

So, I don't know if it will necessitate us putting anything in writing but I think that we will be consistent that we will be governing under the policy of being sure that those things, like economic impact and some times you never know there may be other, other criteria that come up as we do it on a case-by-case basis, so I would hate to be restricted totally by just looking at economic impact if there are some other criteria that may come up.

But I do, and I would encourage this Council to continue in this same spirit of moving forward and looking at things on a case-by-case basis and when cases like this come up as you said, it is not a religious issue it is an issue of economic impact. So, I think that we are going, we are moving in the right direction of doing just what you've said, doing it in practice more than having it printed, we are doing it in practice; so, I would commend this entire Council on having the diligence to take the time and look at this case as an individual case.

Councilman Carmody: Now, almost five years ago when I came onto the Council, there was a request from the Administration that the Council look at the fees waiver because of the cost to SPAR's annual budget. When the Council would waive the user fees, SPAR would actually absorb that cost. And the Council spent, I want to say somewhere close to half a year or maybe a little bit longer in evaluating the fees and actually reducing the fees for non-profit. And there is a standing rule of this body that we do not waive fees and as I appreciate it, the Clerk of Council says, we would suspend the

rules in order to do that.

And, I would agree with Mr. Jackson that it would be nice if we had some sort of a verbal agreement to do so, but I think that it would be more advantageous to have something in writing and then that way any user or potential user of the facility would know that this would be the process by which you would make that particular search for some relief.

So, again I think that it would be imperative that the Council have worked through that mechanism, supplied it to the public, and then that way there is no question from SPAR nor the other potential user of the facilities as to how they would go about looking for some relief.

Resolution as amended passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

RESOLUTION NO. 201 OF 2002

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO EXECUTE A COOPERATIVE ENDEAVOR AGREEMENT WITH THE NATIONAL BAPTIST CONVENTION OF AMERICA (NBCA) RELATIVE TO HOLDING THE NBCA'S 2003 WINTER BOARD MEETING IN SHREVEPORT, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BY: Councilman Jackson

WHEREAS, the National Baptist Convention of America proposes to hold its 2003 Winter Board meeting in Shreveport from Monday, February 24, 2003, through Friday, February 28, 2003 in consideration of the Shreveport - Bossier Convention and Tourist Bureau and the City providing the use of L. Calhoun Allen Exposition Hall ("Expo Hall") for the Conference at no cost; and

WHEREAS, during the 5 days of the NBCA Winter Board Meeting, over 2000 persons from all over the United States will attend and will occupy local hotels for 1,600 total room nights; and

WHEREAS, the 2000 persons in attendance will generate between \$21,000 and \$41,000 in sales and hotel-motel taxes for the City of Shreveport, and provide an economic impact of between \$242,000 and \$484,000 for the City; and

WHEREAS, NBCA Winter Board Meeting will provide an economic benefit to Shreveport and said activity constitutes a public purpose, and

WHEREAS, the Shreveport Convention and Tourist Bureau has agreed to pay \$2,300.00 of the fee for the use of Expo Hall for this event; and

WHEREAS, it is in the economic interest of the City of Shreveport to contract with NBCA to hold its Board Meeting in Shreveport and, after the \$2,300.00 has been paid, to provide the use of the L. Calhoun Allen Exposition Hall at no additional cost in consideration of the economic benefit the event will provide the City of Shreveport and the merchants and citizens of the City.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, regular, and legal session convened that the Mayor of the City of Shreveport is authorized to execute an agreement with the National Baptist Convention of America, substantially in

accordance with the draft agreement filed in the Office of the Clerk of Council on Dec 23, 2002.

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 ordinances or resolutions or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

RESOLUTION NO. 202 OF 2002

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO EXECUTE AN AMENDMENT TO THE COOPERATIVE ENDEAVOR AGREEMENT WITH STEEPLE ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION RELATIVE TO THE FIRST TEE YOUTH GOLF PROGRAM AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, Resolution Number 89 of 2002 authorized the Mayor to execute a Cooperative Endeavor Agreement with Steeple Economic Development Corporation relative to The First Tee Junior Golf Program; and

WHEREAS, City and Steeple now desire to amend the Agreement to provide for additional matters relative to The First Tee Junior Golf Program.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened that the Mayor is authorized to execute an amendment to the Cooperative Endeavor Agreement with Steeple Economic Development Corporation, substantially in accordance with the draft attached hereto and filed for public inspection with the original of this resolution in the Office of the Clerk of Council on December 30, 2002.

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 ordinances or resolutions or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Lester for passage.

Councilman Jackson: I know yesterday, we didn't have a chance to speak to anybody who had come perhaps to represent Steeple Economic Development Corporation. I am not opposed to the process, I just didn't know who they were, I was just interested in who this was. Does anybody know?

Councilman Carmody: Could I ask Gary Norman to come forward, please.

Mr. Norman: I don't know that I can give you all the names of everybody involved. Mr. Ike Sloan is the person that I have worked with on a regular basis out at Lakeside Golf Course who has been very instrumental in getting a lot of things done at that location with our Junior Golf Program, but he is the individual through that particular group that I'd be happy to get you all the information on that furnished.

Councilman Jackson: I just didn't see in the Cooperative Endeavor Agreement a list of, perhaps, who were the principles involved; of course, I see it is Steeple Economic

Development, but I just was wondering who were any of the principles involved with the Steeple Economic Development Corporation?

Mr. Norman: I can furnish that for you. This particular amendment, we already have an agreement that is in place with them. Just to kind of brief you on this particular amendment, the First Tee organization was interested in us, they are looking for long term commitments and we had a 5-year agreement with two 5-year extensions. They wanted a 10-year agreement with an additional 5-year extension is the reason that we bringing back for, just to amend that particular part of the agreement, but I will be happy to furnish you with that information.

Resolution passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

The Deputy Clerk read the resolution by title: Resolution No. 203 of 2002: A resolution authorizing the Mayor to execute an Intergovernmental Agreement with the Parish of Caddo Relative to the development and operation of a park and related facilities in the Martin Luther King Area and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

CONTINUED - RESOLUTION NO. 203 OF 2002

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Gibson to postpone the resolution until the January 28, 2003 meeting. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

RESOLUTION NO. 204 OF 2002

A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE CITY'S CONTRACT WITH MICHAEL WAINWRIGHT, ATTORNEY AT LAW, FOR LOBBYING SERVICES AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport has retained the services of Michael Wainwright, Attorney at Law, to represent the City's interests in connection with public policy matters in Baton Rouge, Louisiana, since 1999; and

WHEREAS, during Michael Wainwright's representation of the City, Shreveport's interests have been effectively represented; and

WHEREAS, Michael Wainwright desires to continue to represent the City in its efforts to receive favorable treatment from the State of Louisiana; and

WHEREAS, funding for the services of Michael Wainwright is contained in the 2003 General Fund budget; and

WHEREAS, Ordinance No. 161 of 2002, which adopted the 2003 General Fund budget, contains language requiring Council approval of the contract with Mr. Wainwright before any additional payments may be made .

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in legal session convened, that it hereby approves the contract (a copy of which was provided to the Clerk of Council with the original copy of this resolution on December 30, 2002) between the City of Shreveport and Michael H. Wainwright, Attorney at Law, wherein Michael

Wainwright is paid to represent the City's interests as its State legislative lobbyist.

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

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

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Lester for passage.

Councilman Carmody: Yesterday at our work session, I had asked you to modify your contract. Have you done so?

Mr. Wainwright: I have done so and gave Mr. Dark three original signed copies of it.

In particular, I did exactly what you and I discussed at the work session and that is provided for a presentation to the City Council, at least not less than 14 days prior to the commencement of any regular session and then a written report subsequent to the adjournment of that session within 30-days of the adjournment to the Council.

Councilman Carmody: Thank you Mr. Wainwright. Would you mind, Mr. Dark, let me take a look at that contract, before we vote on it? Thank you, Sir.

Councilman Lester: If you have another one, I would like to look at it too.

Councilman Carmody: I will go ahead and pass it down to each Council member.

Councilman Lester: While we are waiting Mr. Chairman, can I ask a question.

Councilman Green: We got a vote on the floor right now, just give me one minute. You need to ask him a question?

Councilman Lester: Yeah.

Councilman Green: Go ahead.

Councilman Lester: I just wanted to reiterate, I appreciate the conversation that you and I had and I just want to reiterate my concern about finding some ways to deal with some inner city development working with some of the legislation that you and I talked about.

I would appreciate it if you could give us some kind of update so that maybe we can be ahead of the curve as far as the Legislature is concerned so that maybe we can get something pre-filed to kind of deal with some of those issues.

Mr. Wainwright: And yes, you have my commitment to do that.

Councilman Gibson: Michael, I want to commend your group again. Sorting through all the paperwork that is fixing to hit down in Baton Rouge when average 4- or 5,000 bills per session. The Administration of this City is definitely way ahead of the curve by having somebody down there on a full-time basis to make sure that we are covering the bases and then also meeting some of the needs of certain of the City Councilmen on representing their district. So, I don't wish that upon anybody but I know that you've done a great job over the last four years and I am looking forward to you representing us the next four years.

Mr. Wainwright: I am looking forward to working with the Council.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Wainwright thank you very much for taking time to

do that for me and again, I will support the renewal of your contract with the city lobbyist.

Councilman Jackson: I saw State Legislature Representative Cedric Glover in the back. I thought maybe we ought to call him up and ask him if he thought what Mr. Wainwright was doing was worth the money?

Mr. Wainwright: Can I have a few minutes to visit with him first?

Councilman Carmody: Let me just please remind the Administration that the Council will need a signed copy of this agreement once the Mayor's signature is on it; I think we are prepared to vote.

Resolution passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

RESOLUTION NO. 205 OF 2002

A RESOLUTION APPROVING THE CITY'S CONTRACT WITH PATTON BOGGS LLP, ATTORNEYS AT LAW, FOR LOBBYING SERVICES AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport has retained the services of Patton Boggs, LLP, Attorneys at Law, to represent the City's interests in connection with public policy matters in Washington, D. C., since 2000; and

WHEREAS, during Patton Boggs' representation of the City, Shreveport has received at least \$8 million in new Federal grants, the receipt of which was greatly enhanced by Patton Boggs' efforts; and

WHEREAS, Patton Boggs continues to assist the City in its efforts to receive new Federal funds; and

WHEREAS, funding for the services of Patton Boggs is contained in the 2003 Riverfront Special Revenue Fund budget; and

WHEREAS, Ordinance No. 171 of 2002, which adopted the 2003 Riverfront Special Revenue Fund budget, contains language requiring Council approval of the Patton Boggs contract before any additional payments to Patton Boggs may be made.

CONTINUED - RESOLUTION O. 205 OF 2003

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in legal session convened, that it hereby approves the existing contract (a copy of which was provided to the Clerk of Council with the original copy of this resolution on December 30, 2002) between the City of Shreveport and Patton Boggs, LLP, Attorneys at Law, wherein Patton Boggs is paid to represent the City's interests as its Washington lobbyists.

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

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

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Hogan for

passage.

Councilman Gibson: From the Administration, obviously we have two major thoroughfares that are slated to come through this area over next few years. Could I ask periodically during the length of this contract that Patton Boggs give us an update of their perceptions on I-69 and I-49. I know we have the Transportation Committee of the Shreveport Chamber of Commerce eyeballing that issue along with their lobbyist with Bennett Johnston, but I would be interested to get their perception from Washington D. C. Especially, I guess I am going to specifically ask that seeing that this summer the next federal transportation bill is going to be considered and voted on which is going to be a key component of both of those projects having monies in there. It may be by March or April, they could give us their observations on where we are as a City and a region in doing our part to help drive that issue to make sure that we get the dollars necessary to support that project.

Mayor Hightower: Be glad to do that. I may make one comment on that, on I-49, they certainly been a voice for us along with our Congressman in Washington. On I-69, they are actually the lobbying firm that does I-69 for the I-69 Coalition; so, we don't specifically having them working on that as part of our contract with the City, however, we'll certainly keep you updated on that. . .

Councilman Gibson: I-69, you are exactly right, Mayor, I apology but on I-69 obviously that is one of the main focal points, but if we could get leading up to June, July, or August when that anticipated Transportation Bill is going to be considered and voted on, it would be nice to have their observations.

Mayor Hightower: Be glad to do it.

Councilman Jackson: Question of clarity to the Administration, I don't know what the structure of the contract was originally with the firm, however, there is an increase in the pay and I am certain that's the impetus for this vote because other than that, they were entered into a contract that didn't expire until March 2005. So, I am assuming that this vote is one that will ratify the increase that looks to be \$13,000 dollars or so, increase; is that correct?

Mayor Hightower: Actually their contract had, stipulates. . .

Councilman Jackson: . . . steps throughout the contract.

Mayor Hightower: Yeah, throughout the term of the contract. The reason it is actually on your agenda is because the Council asked for it to be on there although you are correct, we are in a multi-year contract with Patton Boggs..

Councilman Jackson: Does this increase that I'm seeing now, does this constitute the final step or are there increases to come in the future?

Mayor Hightower: I'm sure there is increases to come in the future, yes. I don't recall what specifically what they are, but like I say, those steps are built in.

Councilman Jackson: But there is a contract somewhere that describes that to us?

Mayor Hightower: Right.

Councilman Jackson: Is it possible to get a copy of that?

Mayor Hightower: Yes, absolutely.

Councilman Lester: One of the questions that I had as it relates to Patton Boggs, I look at the attachments that where there that described a number of very worthwhile projects and initiatives that I am sure are going to help the City in the number of the

projects that we have. One of the concerns that I have and I expressed that with Mr. Wainwright is trying to find some ways to redevelop our inner city and our inner core neighborhoods and I didn't see anything in any of the 18 attachments that dealt with that. And what my question was, is can we direct Patton Boggs, I know that they are up there lobbying on a number of different issues, can we direct them to try to find some monies available to kind of help some of the projects that we've been talking about as it relates to inner city development?

I know for a fact, for instance that the Administration has engaged the services of a firm that is going to be doing some things in the MLK area and in a number of inner city areas as far as trying to find some businesses and do franchising and things of that nature, but what I wanted to ask is, do we have contemplated a scenario where we get Patton Boggs to kind of help us in that effort?

Mayor Hightower: Oh, absolutely. I mean anything that you have that you think that there may be some Washington work to be done on it, if you would get that to me, we'll certainly pick up the phone and call the firm and see. They have experts in every field that you can imagine. Some of the directives we have pointed them toward, others, they come to us and said here is the available appropriations that are coming up and have been able to get us in the loop on some things that we would have never otherwise known about. So the contract, although it may seem like it is an increase or a lot of money every month, they have been well worth the investment and actually if I thought we could go hire another firm and double our investment, we'd do it again and we'd triple it and we would quadruple it and we employ every firm up there if we thought that there was that much money available. So, it has been well worth it, but if it is something in particular, holler at me and let's pick up the phone and call them.

Councilman Lester: Didn't see whether or not it applies, but my other question was whether or not our contract for lobbying services, do we know if that falls under the (inaudible) of the Fair Share?

Mayor Hightower: It does. However, the lobby firm is the firm and they have, like I mentioned a minute ago, they have got experts in just about every single field up there. They can and have actually sent to us their employee list: there's African-Americans, there is Hispanics, there is Asian, there is—so, you know within the firm, they are fairly diverse but they don't contract out any of their services, they actually work the Hill themselves.

Councilman Carmody: I'm trying to phrase my question because I'm not sure that the Administration can answer it. I'm looking at the Appropriations Request via Senator John Beaux regarding funding for Revitalization of the Oakland Cemetery. And in it of course, we are talking about the needed funds to rebuild the walls around the cemetery there next to Municipal Auditorium. But in looking at the application, Item 15 says: What other organizations might be expected to oppose this request? And it list the: Shreveport Chamber of Commerce, Downtown Development Authority Shreveport Green, Northwest Louisiana Council of Governments, Oakland Cemetery Preservation Society, Shreveport-Bossier Convention and Tourism Bureau, Foundation for Arts, Music and Entertainment, Inc., Historic Preservation of Shreveport, Inc. Why would these organizations be opposed? Mayor Hightower: That's obviously a typo of some sort.

Councilman Carmody: Could I ask that we would go ahead and make sure before

we send this to John Beaux that we indicate that these persons are not opposed but more than likely are in favor of funding?

Mayor Hightower: Correct.

Councilman Jackson: One final question just to piggyback on what, I think, Councilman Lester had said to the Administration, just as a note. As we consider particularly the funds that this City receives that specifically are administered by the Department of Community Development, i. e., the HUD funds specifically Community Development Block Grant funds and others like that, that really go a long way in helping the under-served community and our inner city as it relates to infrastructure and updating and repairing infrastructure, so on and so forth that it has become obviously to me and to my knowledge, just recently that obviously, we lost money as it relates to Community Development Block Grant dollars and it was obviously because of a net loss in population.

I think one of the things I would ask of a firm like Patton Boggs to do would be to begin to find resources that will compensate because while there is a net loss it is not like the needs are diminished by the net loss and that the needs are still, to some degree, are even amplified with that loss in population. So, I would think that one of the things that we would be searching for is ways to fortify the way we re-build our inner cities as Councilman Lester said. So I would think very specifically and I would assume they could identify resources that would help to compensate for what is an obvious loss in Community Development Block grants. Obviously when we don't have the money in Community Development Block grant money, there are a lot of proposals and a lot of desires that go unfulfilled or unmet, so one of the things that I would suggest that the Administration would describe to this firm to look for, is resources, additional resources that would fortify our ability to be able to do what the mission of Community Development Block grant has been traditionally.

Resolution passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

RESOLUTION NO. 3 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION ORDERING AND CALLING A SPECIAL ELECTION TO BE HELD IN THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT, STATE OF LOUISIANA, TO AUTHORIZE THE LEVY OF SPECIAL TAXES THEREIN, MAKING APPLICATION TO THE STATE BOND COMMISSION IN CONNECTION THEREWITH AND PROVIDING FOR OTHER MATTERS IN CONNECTION THEREWITH.

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana (the "Governing Authority"), acting as the governing authority of the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana (the "City"), that:

SECTION 1. Election Call. Subject to the approval of the State Bond Commission, and under the authority conferred by Article VI, Sections 27, 30 and 32 of the Constitution of the State of Louisiana of 1974, the applicable provisions of Chapter 5 and Chapter 6-A of Title 18 of the Louisiana Revised Statutes of 1950, as amended, and other constitutional and statutory authority, a special election is hereby called and ordered to be held in the City on **SATURDAY, APRIL 5, 2003**, between the hours of six o'clock (6:00) a.m., and eight o'clock (8:00) p.m., in

accordance with the provisions of La. R.S. 18:541, and at the said election there shall be submitted to all registered voters qualified and entitled to vote at the said election under the Constitution and laws of this State and the Constitution of the United States, the following propositions, to-wit:

CITY OF SHREVEPORT TAX CONTINUATION PROPOSITION NO. 1

SUMMARY: 5 YEAR 1.31 MILL PROPERTY TAX CONTINUATION FOR IMPROVING, REPAIRING AND MAINTAINING STREETS.

Shall the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana (the "City"), continue to levy a 1.31 mill tax on all the property subject to taxation within said City for a period of five (5) years, beginning with the year 2003 and ending with the year 2007, being a continuation of the tax approved by the voters on July 19, 1997, for the purpose of improving, repairing and maintaining the streets of the City, title to which shall be in the public?

CITY OF SHREVEPORT TAX CONTINUATION PROPOSITION NO. 2

SUMMARY: 5 YEAR .98 MILL PROPERTY TAX CONTINUATION FOR OPERATING AND SUPPLYING RECREATIONAL FACILITIES AND APPURTENANCES AND MAINTAINING THE SAME.

Shall the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana (the "City"), continue to levy a .98 mill tax on all the property subject to taxation within said City for a period of five (5) years, beginning with the year 2003 and ending with the year 2007, being a continuation of the tax approved by the voters on July 19, 1997, for the purpose of operating and supplying recreational facilities and appurtenances and maintaining the same, title to which shall be in the public?

CITY OF SHREVEPORT TAX CONTINUATION PROPOSITION NO. 3

SUMMARY: 5 YEAR 1.31 MILL PROPERTY TAX CONTINUATION FOR CONTINUING SALARY AND WAGE SCHEDULE OF CITY EMPLOYEES.

Shall the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana (the "City"), continue to levy a 1.31 mill tax on all the property subject to taxation within said City for a period of five (5) years, beginning with the year 2003 and ending with the year 2007, being a continuation of the tax approved by the voters on July 19, 1997, for the purpose of continuing salary and wage schedule of City employees and for no other purpose?

CITY OF SHREVEPORT TAX CONTINUATION PROPOSITION NO. 4

SUMMARY: 5 YEAR 1.31 MILL PROPERTY TAX CONTINUATION FOR INCREASING POLICE AND FIRE PERSONNEL AND ALLOWANCE FOR UNIFORMS AND EQUIPMENT FOR SAID DEPARTMENTS.

CONTINUED - RESOLUTION NO. 3 OF 2003

Shall the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana (the "City"), continue to levy a 1.31 mill tax on all the property subject to taxation within said City for a period of five (5) years, beginning with the year 2003 and ending with the year 2007, being a continuation of the tax approved by the voters on July 19, 1997, for the purpose of increasing Police and Fire personnel and allowance for uniforms and equipment for said Departments and for no other purpose?

CITY OF SHREVEPORT TAX CONTINUATION PROPOSITION NO. 5

SUMMARY: 5 YEAR 1.99 MILL PROPERTY TAX CONTINUATION FOR PROVIDING FUNDS FOR CITY'S PORTION OF PENSIONS, EMPLOYEE LIFE INSURANCE AND HOSPITAL PLAN FOR CITY EMPLOYEES.

Shall the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana (the "City"), continue to levy a 1.99 mill tax on all the property subject to taxation within said City for a period of five (5) years, beginning with the year 2003 and ending with the year 2007, being a continuation of the tax approved by the voters on July 19, 1997, for the purpose of providing funds for City's portion of pensions, employee life insurance and hospital plan for City employees?

SECTION 2. Publication of Notice of Election. A Notice of Special Election shall be published in "The Times," a daily newspaper of general circulation within the City, published in Shreveport, Louisiana, and being the official journal of the Governing Authority, once a week for four consecutive weeks, with the first publication to be made not less than forty-five (45) days nor more than ninety (90) days prior to the date fixed for election, which Notice shall be substantially in the form attached hereto as "Exhibit A" and incorporated herein by reference the same as if it were set forth herein in full.

SECTION 3. Canvass. This Governing Authority, acting as the governing authority of the City, shall meet at its regular meeting place, the City Hall, 1234 Texas Street, Shreveport, Louisiana, on **TUESDAY, APRIL 8, 2003, at THREE O'CLOCK (3:00) P.M.**, and shall then and there in open and public session proceed to examine and canvass the returns and declare the results of the said special Election.

SECTION 4. Polling Places. The polling places set forth in the aforesaid Notice of Special Election are hereby designated as the polling places at which to hold the said election, and the Commissioners-in-Charge and Commissioners, respectively, will be the same persons as those designated in accordance with law.

SECTION 5. Election Commissioners; Voting Machines. The officers designated to serve as Commissioners-in-Charge and Commissioners pursuant to Section 4 hereof, or such substitutes therefor as may be selected and designated in accordance with La. R.S. 18:1287, shall hold the said special election as herein provided, and shall make due returns of said election for the meeting of the Governing Authority to be held on Tuesday, APRIL 8, 2003, as provided in Section 3 hereof. All registered voters in the City are entitled to vote at said special election and voting machines shall be used thereat.

SECTION 6. Authorization of Officers. The Clerk of Council is hereby empowered, authorized and directed to arrange for and to furnish to said election officers in ample time for the holding of said election, the necessary equipment, forms and other paraphernalia essential to the proper holding of said election and the Clerk of Council is further authorized, empowered and directed to take any and all further action required by State and/or Federal law to arrange for the election, including but not limited to, appropriate submission to the Federal Department of Justice under Section 5 of the Federal Voting Rights Act of 1965, as amended.

SECTION 7. Furnishing Election Call to Election Officials. Certified copies of this resolution shall be forwarded to the Secretary of State, the Commissioner of Elections, the Clerks of Court and *Ex-Officio* Parish Custodian of Voting Machines in and for the Parishes of Caddo and Bossier, State of Louisiana, and the Registrars of Voters in and for said Parishes, as notification of

the special election herein called in order that each may prepare for said election and perform their respective functions as required by law.

SECTION 8. Application to State Bond Commission. Application is made to the State Bond Commission for consent and authority to hold the aforesaid special election as herein provided, and in the event said election carries for further consent and authority to levy and collect the special taxes provided for therein, and a certified copy of this resolution shall be forwarded to the State Bond Commission on behalf of this Governing Authority, together with a letter requesting the prompt consideration and approval of this application.

SECTION 9. Resolution No. 206 of 2002 is hereby repealed.

EXHIBIT "A"

NOTICE OF SPECIAL ELECTION

Pursuant to the provisions of a resolution adopted by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana (the "Governing Authority"), acting as the governing authority of the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana (the "City"), on January 14, 2003, NOTICE IS HEREBY GIVEN that a special election will be held within the City on **SATURDAY, APRIL 5, 2003**, and that at the said election there will be submitted to all registered voters in the City qualified and entitled to vote at the said election under the Constitution and Laws of the State of Louisiana and the Constitution of the United States, the following propositions, to-wit:

CITY OF SHREVEPORT TAX CONTINUATION PROPOSITION NO. 1

SUMMARY: 5 YEAR 1.31 MILL PROPERTY TAX CONTINUATION FOR IMPROVING, REPAIRING AND MAINTAINING STREETS.

Shall the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana (the "City"), continue to levy a 1.31 mill tax on all the property subject to taxation within said City for a period of five (5) years, beginning with the year 2003 and ending with the year 2007, being a continuation of the tax approved by the voters on July 19, 1997, for the purpose of improving, repairing and maintaining the streets of the City, title to which shall be in the public?

CONTINUED - RESOLUTION NO. 3 OF 2003

CITY OF SHREVEPORT TAX CONTINUATION PROPOSITION NO. 2

SUMMARY: 5 YEAR .98 MILL PROPERTY TAX CONTINUATION FOR OPERATING AND SUPPLYING RECREATIONAL FACILITIES AND APPURTENANCES AND MAINTAINING THE SAME.

Shall the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana (the "City"), continue to levy a .98 mill tax on all the property subject to taxation within said City for a period of five (5) years, beginning with the year 2003 and ending with the year 2007, being a continuation of the tax approved by the voters on July 19, 1997, for the purpose of operating and supplying recreational facilities and appurtenances and maintaining the same, title to which shall be in the public?

CITY OF SHREVEPORT TAX CONTINUATION PROPOSITION NO. 3

SUMMARY: 5 YEAR 1.31 MILL PROPERTY TAX CONTINUATION FOR CONTINUING SALARY AND WAGE SCHEDULE OF CITY EMPLOYEES.

Shall the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana (the "City"), continue to levy a 1.31 mill tax on all

- 011A Arthur Circle Elementary School, 261 Arthur Avenue, Shreveport, La. 71105.
 - 011B Arthur Circle Elementary School, 261 Arthur Avenue, Shreveport, La. 71105.
 - 012 Broadmoor Middle Lab School, 441 Atlantic Avenue, Shreveport, La. 71105.
 - 013A Broadmoor Middle Lab School, 441 Atlantic Avenue, Shreveport, La. 71105.
 - 013B Broadmoor Middle Lab School, 441 Atlantic Avenue, Shreveport, La. 71105.
 - 014 Knights of Columbus Hall, 220 East Stephenson Street, Shreveport, La. 71104.
 - 015 Byrd High School Learning Center, 700 Kings Highway, Shreveport, La. 71104.
 - 016 Haynes Avenue Baptist Church, 610 Haynes Avenue, Shreveport, La. 71105.
 - 017 Byrd High School Learning Center, 700 Kings Highway, Shreveport, La. 71104.
 - 020 Byrd High School Learning Center, 700 Kings Highway, Shreveport, La. 71104.
- CONTINUED - RESOLUTION NO. 3 OF 2003

- 021 Pierremont Mall, 4801 Line Avenue, Shreveport, La. 71106.
- 022A Pierremont Mall, 4801 Line Avenue, Shreveport, La. 71106.
- 022B Pierremont Mall, 4801 Line Avenue, Shreveport, La. 71106.
- 023 Pierremont Mall, 4801 Line Avenue, Shreveport, La. 71106.
- 024 South Highland Elementary School, 831 Erie Street, Shreveport, La. 71106.
- 025A Werner Park Elementary School, 2715 Corbitt Street, (Hearne Avenue entrance), Shreveport, La. 71108.
- 025B Werner Park Elementary School, 2715 Corbitt Street, (Hearne Avenue entrance), Shreveport, La. 71108.
- 026 Betty Virginia Park Recreation Building, 4010 Line Avenue, Shreveport, La. 71106.
- 027 Mall Saint Vincent, 1133 St. Vincent Avenue, Shreveport, La. 71104.
- 029 Booker T. Washington High School, 2104 Milam Street, Shreveport, La. 71103.
- 030A Atkins Branch Shreve Memorial Library, 2709 Hassett Avenue, Shreveport, La. 71109.
- 030B Atkins Branch Shreve Memorial Library, 2709 Hassett Avenue, Shreveport, La. 71109.
- 031 Galilee Baptist Church, 1500 Pierre Avenue, Shreveport, La. 71103.
- 032 Mall Saint Vincent, 1133 St. Vincent Avenue, Shreveport, La. 71104.
- 034A Caddo Heights Elementary School, 1702 Corbitt Street, Shreveport, La. 71108.
- 034B Caddo Heights Elementary School, 1702 Corbitt Street, Shreveport, La. 71108.
- 035 Linwood Middle School, 401 West 70th Street, Shreveport, La. 71106.
- 036A Sunset Acres Elementary School, 6514 West Canal Blvd., Shreveport, La. 71108.
- 036B Sunset Acres Elementary School, 6514 West Canal Blvd., Shreveport, La. 71108.
- 037 Queensborough Elementary School, 2701 Catherine Street, Shreveport, La. 71109.
- 038 Hollywood Middle School, 6310 Clift Avenue, Shreveport, La. 71106.
- 039 Our Lady of the Blessed Sacrament Catholic Church, 2932 Murphy Street, Shreveport, La. 71103.
- 040 Ingersoll Elementary School, 401 North Holzman Street, Shreveport, La. 71101.
- 041 Bilberry Park Recreation Center, 1905 Alabama Street, Shreveport, La. 71109.
- 044 Shreveport Job Corps Center, 2800 W. College Street, Shreveport, La. 71109.
- 045A (IN PART) Lakeshore Elementary School, 1807 San Jacinto Avenue, Shreveport, La. 71109.
- 045B (IN PART) Lakeshore Elementary School, 1807 San Jacinto Avenue, Shreveport, La. 71109.
- 046 Fair Park High School, 3222 Greenwood Road, Shreveport, La. 71109.
- 047 (IN PART) Ford Park Baptist Church, 5755 Yarbrough Road, Shreveport, La. 71119.

- 048 Haynes Avenue Baptist Church, 610 Haynes Avenue, Shreveport 71105.
 - 049A Youree Drive Middle School, 6008 Youree Drive, Shreveport, La. 71105.
 - 049B Youree Drive Middle School, 6008 Youree Drive, Shreveport, La. 71105.
 - 050 Caddo Middle Magnet School, 7635 Cornelious Lane, Shreveport, La. 71106.
 - 051A 81st Street ECE Center, 8108 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La. 71106.
 - 051B 81st Street ECE Center, 8108 Fairfield Avenue, Shreveport, La. 71106.
 - 052 Woodlawn High School, 7340 Wyngate Blvd., Shreveport, La. 71106.
 - 053 Sunset Acres Elementary School, 6514 W. Canal Boulevard, Shreveport, La. 71108..
 - 054 Judson Street Elementary School, 3809 Judson Street, Shreveport, La. 71109.
 - 055 (IN PART) Hillsdale Elementary School, 3860 Hutchinson Street, Shreveport, La. 71109.
 - 056A (IN PART) University Elementary School, 9900 Smitherman Drive, Shreveport, La.
 - 056B (IN PART) University Elementary School, 9900 Smitherman Drive, Shreveport, La.
 - 057 Pine Grove Elementary School, 1700 Caldwell Street, Shreveport, La. 71107.
 - 058 Caddo Heights Elementary School, 1702 Corbitt Street, Shreveport, La. 71108.
 - 059 Linwood Middle School, 401 West 70th Street, Shreveport, La. 71106.
 - 060 Morning Star Baptist Church, 5340 Jewella Avenue, Shreveport, La. 71109.
 - 061 Mooretown ECE Center, 3913 Powell Street, Shreveport, La. 71109.
 - 062 (IN PART) Summerfield Elementary School, 3131 Ardis Taylor Drive, Shreveport, La. 71118.
 - 063 (IN PART) Summerfield Elementary School, 3131 Ardis Taylor Drive, Shreveport, La. 71118.
 - 064 Stoner Hill Lab School, 2127 C.E. Galloway Blvd., Shreveport, La. 71104.
 - 067 West Shreveport Elementary School, 2100 Weinstock Street, Shreveport, La. 71103.
 - 068 Shreve Memorial Library, 8303 Line Avenue, Shreveport, La. 71106.
 - 069 (IN PART) Westwood Elementary School, 7325 Jewella Avenue, Shreveport, La. 71108.
 - 070 Westwood Elementary School, 7325 Jewella Avenue, Shreveport, La. 71108.
 - 071 J. S. Clark Middle School, 351 Hearne Avenue, Shreveport, La.
 - 072 (IN PART) Baptist Student Center at LSU-S, Building 43, One University Place, Shreveport, La. 71115.
 - 073A (IN PART) David Raines Center, 2325 David Raines Road, Shreveport, La. 71107.
 - 073B (IN PART) David Raines Center, 2325 David Raines Road, Shreveport, La. 71107.
 - 075 (IN PART) Shreve Memorial Library, 8303 Line Avenue, Shreveport, La. 71106.
 - 076A University Elementary School, 9900 Smitherman Drive, Shreveport, La. 71115.
 - 076B University Elementary School, 9900 Smitherman Drive, Shreveport, La. 71115.
- CONTINUED - RESOLUTION NO. 3 OF 2003

- 077A (IN PART) Holy Trinity Lutheran Church, 8895 Youree Drive, Shreveport, La. 71115.
- 077B (IN PART) Holy Trinity Lutheran Church, 8895 Youree Drive, Shreveport, La. 71115.
- 078 (IN PART) Calvary Baptist Church, 9333 Linwood Avenue, Shreveport, La. 71106.
- 079 (IN PART) Calvary Baptist Church, 9333 Linwood Avenue, Shreveport, La. 71106.
- 080 Mooretown ECE Center, 3913 Powell Street, Shreveport, La. 71109.
- 081 (IN PART) Newton Smith Elementary School, 3000 Martin Luther King Jr. Drive, Shreveport, La. 71107.
- 082 North Highlands Elementary School, 885 Poleman Road, Shreveport, La. 71107.
- 083A (IN PART) Ford Park Baptist Church, 5755 Yarbrough Road, Shreveport, La. 71119.
- 083B (IN PART) Ford Park Baptist Church, 5755 Yarbrough Road, Shreveport, La. 71119.

- 084 (IN PART) Western Hills Baptist Church, 4153 Pines Road, Shreveport, La. 71119.
- 085A (IN PART) Huntington High School, 6801 Raspberry Lane, Shreveport, La. 71129.
- 085B (IN PART) Huntington High School, 6801 Raspberry Lane, Shreveport, La. 71129.
- 086 Oak Park Elementary School, 4941 McDaniel Drive, Shreveport, La. 71109.
- 087 (IN PART) Huntington High School, 6801 Raspberry Lane, Shreveport, La. 71129.
- 088A (IN PART) Calvary United Pentecostal Church, 6811 Woolworth Road, Shreveport, La. 71129.
- 088B (IN PART) Calvary United Pentecostal Church, 6811 Woolworth Road, Shreveport, La. 71129.
- 089 (IN PART) Summerfield Elementary School, 3131 Ardis Taylor Drive, Shreveport, La. 71118.
- 090A Summer Grove School, 2955 Bert Kouns Industrial Loop, Shreveport, La. 71118.
- 090B Summer Grove School, 2955 Bert Kouns Industrial Loop, Shreveport, La. 71118.
- 091A Ridgewood Middle School, 2001 Ridgewood Drive, Shreveport, La. 71118.
- 091B Ridgewood Middle School, 2001 Ridgewood Drive, Shreveport, La. 71118.
- 092 Forest Hill Elementary School, 2005 Francais Drive, Shreveport, La. 71118.
- 093 (IN PART) Southern Hills Elementary School, 9075 Kingston Road, Shreveport, La. 71118.
- 094A Summerfield Estates, 9133 Baird Road, Shreveport, La. 71118.
- 094B Summerfield Estates, 9133 Baird Road, Shreveport, La. 71118.
- 095A (IN PART) South Caddo Branch Shreve Memorial Library, 9701 Baird Road, Shreveport, La. 71118.
- 095B (IN PART) South Caddo Branch Shreve Memorial Library, 9701 Baird Road, Shreveport, La. 71118.
- 097A (IN PART) Ellerbe Road United Methodist Church, 10130 Ellerbe Church Road, Shreveport, La. 71106.
- 097B (IN PART) Ellerbe Road United Methodist Church, 10130 Ellerbe Church Road, Shreveport, La. 71106.
- 098 Mall Saint Vincent, 1133 St. Vincent Avenue, Shreveport, La. 71104.
- 099 Stoner Hill Elementary Lab School, 2127 C.E. Galloway Blvd. Shreveport, La. 71104.
- 122A (IN PART) The Police/Fire Academy, 6440 Greenwood Road, Shreveport, La. 71119.
- 122B (IN PART) The Police/Fire Academy, 6440 Greenwood Road, Shreveport, La. 71119.
- 123A (IN PART) Grawood Christian School, 10420 Grawood School Road, Keithville, La. 71047.
- 123B (IN PART) Grawood Christian School, 10420 Grawood School Road, Keithville, La. 71047.
- 125 (IN PART) Keithville Elementary/Middle School, 12201 Mansfield Rd., Keithville, La. 71047.
- 126 (IN PART) Caddo Fire District #6, 10377 Linwood Avenue, Shreveport, La. 71106.
- 128A (IN PART) Grace Community United Methodist Church, 9400 Ellerbe Road, Shreveport, La. 71106.
- 128B (IN PART) Grace Community United Methodist Church, 9400 Ellerbe Road, Shreveport, La. 71106.
- 129 (IN PART) Shreve Island Elementary School, 836 Sewanee Place, Shreveport, La. 71105.

- 133 (IN PART) Calvary Pentecostal Church, 6811 Woolworth Road, Shreveport, La. 71129.
- 135 (IN PART) Lakeview Baptist Church, 4520 Tacoma Blvd., Shreveport, La. 71107.
- 137A (IN PART) Northwood High School, 5939 Old Mooringsport Road, Shreveport, LA. 71107
- 137B (IN PART) Northwood High School, 5939 Old Mooringsport Road, Shreveport, LA. 71107

BOSSIER PARISH POLLING PLACES

- 02-06 (IN PART) Bossier Elementary School, 322 Colquitt Ave. Bossier City, La. 71111
- 02-23 Waller Elementary School, 1130 Patricia, Bossier City, La. 71112
- 04-08B (IN PART) Curtis Elementary School, 5600 Barksdale Blvd. 71112

The polling places set forth above be and the same are hereby designated as the polling places at which to hold the said election, and the Commissioners-in-Charge and Commissioners, respectively, shall be those persons designated according to law.

The said special election will be held in accordance with the applicable provisions of Chapter 5 and Chapter 6-A of Title 18 of the Louisiana Revised Statutes of 1950, as amended, and other constitutional and statutory authority, and the officers appointed to hold the said election, as provided in this Notice of Special Election, or such substitutes therefor as may be selected and designated in accordance with La. R.S. 18:1287, will make due returns thereof to said Governing Authority, and NOTICE IS HEREBY FURTHER GIVEN that this Governing Authority will meet at its regular meeting place, the Government Plaza, 505 Travis , Shreveport, Louisiana, on **TUESDAY, APRIL 8, 2003, at THREE O'CLOCK (3:00) P.M.**, and shall then and there in open and public session proceed to examine and canvass the returns and declare the results of the said special election. All registered voters of the City are entitled to vote at said special election and voting machines will be used thereat. Precincts listed above with the notation “(IN PART)” are those in which not all registered voters are residents of the City of Shreveport, and those who are not residents of the CONTINUED - RESOLUTION NO. 3 OF 2003

City of Shreveport will not be entitled to vote on this proposition.

THUS DONE AND SIGNED at Shreveport, Louisiana, on this, the ___day of _____, 200_. _____/s/Keith Hightower , Mayor

ATTEST: _____

/s/ Arthur G. Thompson

Clerk of Council

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

Councilman Carmody: Just for the benefit of those in the Chambers as well the public might be watching on television, these are actually , this will be an election for the renewal of taxes. This would not be a new tax on top, it would actually be a renewal of existing

millages.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Antee, can you tell me, I know we've talked about it before but please if you can, just tell me again if obviously we have to put this on to order a special election to renew those taxes. If we were to levy anything that would be new, what would be different about the process?

Mr. Antee: To levy a new tax, then it would, that's exactly what the proposition would be and what it would say would be for a new tax and it would state what the millage was and what it was for. Whether it be for special bonds or a dedicated fund or whatever, but these are existing millages.

Councilman Jackson: So it would have to be separate resolution to call for an increase or to levy an additional millage above what we already have now, what we are calling for now?

Mr. Antee: Yeah, that is correct. You would have to go through the same process for a new one as you do a renewal.

Resolution passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

RESOLUTION NO. 7 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION PROVIDING FOR PERIODIC REPORTS TO THE CITY COUNCIL CONCERNING SUBSTANDARD STRUCTURES AND WEEDED LOTS AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO

BY: Councilman Lester and Walford

WHEREAS, when the City's Property Standards Code was enacted on May 25, 1993, it contained the following finding of fact:

There exists in the city, structures used for human habitation and nonresidential purposes that are substandard in structure and maintenance. Many of these structures, because of their condition, are havens for criminal activity and contribute to neighborhood decay. In the absence of corrective measures, the neighborhoods where these structures are located will experience a deterioration of social values, a curtailment of investment and tax revenue, an increase in criminal activity and an impairment of economic values. The city, acting through the city council as its governing body, has adopted, by way of ordinance at its regular meeting convened, this chapter which is authorized by R.S. 33:4752 and 33:4754; and

WHEREAS, the Codes Enforcement Bureau's mission is to administer the City's Property Standards Code and specifically "to prevent and eliminate the deterioration of neighborhoods as a result of dilapidated housing, unsightly premises and overgrown properties"; and

WHEREAS, since May 25, 1993, the Codes Enforcement Bureau has spent millions of dollars "to prevent and eliminate the deterioration of neighborhoods as a result of dilapidated housing, unsightly premises and overgrown properties", including \$2,183,000 in 2001 and \$2,200,00 in 2002; and \$2,334,500 is budgeted for this purpose in 2003; and

WHEREAS, although more than \$2,000,000 is expended each year on private property to secure and demolish structures, to mow lots and to remove inoperable vehicles; budget documents show actual revenues (reimbursements) in 2001 as follows: Lot mowing fees - (\$22,688); Demolition Fees-\$18,631, and Securing Structures- \$4,124; and

WHEREAS, although millions of dollars have been spent on dilapidated housing, unsightly premises and overgrown properties since 1993, the neighborhoods where most of these properties

are located continue to experience a deterioration of social values, a curtailment of investment and tax revenue, an increase in criminal activity and an impairment of economic values; and

WHEREAS, as of December 12, 2002 there were 755 sub-standard structures and thousands of neglected lots in the Codes Enforcement System; and

WHEREAS, citizens complain that some sub-standard and dilapidated houses remain in the Codes Enforcement System for years without being demolished or repaired and the many properties are unsightly and/or overgrown year after year; and

WHEREAS, it is necessary that the City of Shreveport make every effort to timely remove substandard structures from our neighborhoods; return the maintenance of weeded lots to the private sector and recover the amounts expended to remove the structures and to maintain the lots when possible: and

WHEREAS, because the Shreveport City Council is the Governing Authority of the City of Shreveport and the members of the Shreveport City Council are the elected officials closest to the citizens of Shreveport, it is therefore necessary and desirable that the City Council receive regular detailed status reports concerning the substandard structure program and the weeded lot program, and the reimbursement of funds expended in these efforts.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened that the Chief Administrative Officer, the Director of the Department of Community and/or the Bureau Chief of Codes Enforcement, or another designee of the Mayor, is authorized and directed to provide the City Council with detailed reports, in the form approved by the Property Standards Task, at each City Council meeting, beginning at the second City Council Meeting in January 2003.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Clerk of Council is directed to place on the City Council's agenda for each City Council meeting the following: "Status Report: Property Standards Program", and the item is to remain on the agenda until the item is removed from the agenda by the Council.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that if any provision or item of this ordinance or the application thereof is held CONTINUED - RESOLUTION NO. 7 OF 2003

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.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Walford for passage.

Councilman Lester: I was going to say it is a co-authored resolution by myself and Councilman Walford and we would ask that our Council colleagues support us on this and I move the adoption.

Councilman Carmody: Could I ask for Mr. Ferdinand if he is in the Chamber or Mr. Bowie is here. I guess what my question is would be, I like the idea of where we are going with this, but I'm concerned about whether or not it is going to create additional workload on Code Enforcement to get us these reports in a timely manner.

Councilman Green: He just walked out, but what we will do. . . .

Councilman Walford: If I may address his question. Councilman Lester and I have discussed this with Mr. Thompson and since we do currently have a Code Enforcement Task Force, we intend to address the format of the report at the next task force meeting but I think

what we are after right now is to have them available to report to us and again we will work during the task force to come up with a format, hopefully not to ask them any additional work, but bringing us information on various concerns within our districts.

Councilman Carmody: Well, this basically, the resolution in the WHEREAS' basically cites the information I'd asked of Mr. Ferdinand at a previous Council meeting, in that if the City expends funds in order to maintain properties and yet we are not invoicing the property owners of record and placing liens against them, then it is obvious that we are spending money and giving persons a buy, so to speak, without requiring them to be responsible for the cost for us to maintain and so I like the idea of that.

Again, I was hoping that we would have the benefit of personnel to at least come forward and give us their thoughts on it, but I applaud ya'll on what you are trying to do. Again, I'm waiting for the same reports that you have reiterated these numbers here, so.

Councilman Walford: And you are on the Task Force, I believe Mr. Carmody is on the task force with us, so we will come up, I hope with a very acceptable format for the report that will be made to the Council.

Councilman Jackson: I don't know and maybe they have another reason for doing it this way, but it just seems to me that perhaps this committee that already exists could get together and establish the format and bring that, before we would even act on the resolution.

There is nothing about the format that would preclude them from getting together prior to that time and then voting on the resolution, I would think, I am just saying that this is what my thought is. Because I would feel more comfortable knowing that we have come up with a format that would be acceptable and you won't have to come back and ask for approval of the format or present the format and perhaps have debate about, the format. If we could do all of it at the same time which the resolution would be inclusive of what the format is because right now to just pass the resolution, free of a , format then brings us to a scenario where we'll have to come back and we may not all agree because I don't want any person to come in here and give us a laborious report on grass cutting all across the City for two hours, when we could get it in a written form.

So, my suggestion would be to have a format and allow this resolution to reflect what the reporting format will be and then lets vote on that all at the same time,

Councilman Lester: I think that is a very, very valid point Councilman Jackson. The impetus and the reason why we are asking for this reporting, from where we sit certainly in District A and it has been a concern, I think of a number of us on the Council certainly it is something that Councilman Walford and I have discussed at nauseam.

What we are seeking here is not such much concerning with the form, but the information itself. One of the concerns that I have had and one of the concerns that Councilman Walford has had and I think Councilman Carmody has even alluded to is from time-to-time we as Councilmen have made a number of different requests to the Department and we have not been given information for one reason or another.

What we wanted to do is by moving forward with this resolution to elevate the idea of what is going on with Code Enforcement to the same level that we elevated the discourse as it relates to the Convention Center. This is something that affects our citizens in a very systematic way and so what we are trying to do is set up scenario where we can have a dialogue with someone from the Code Enforcement and Community Development Department on a permeating basis.

Certainly we are not looking for a scenario where we looking for cumbersome reports but by putting it on the agenda and this resolution will put it on the agenda such that we won't have to be in a scenario where each and every meeting we have to remember to make sure we ask that it placed on the agenda so that we can have the dialogue as it relates to the

issues that are going on and that is what we are seeking to do.

And I think in the body of the resolution, there is, it is directs and I am quoting I think from the Now, Therefore language, if you look at it, . . . by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due and regular session. Where it says: . . .the Director of the Department of Community and/or the Bureau Chief of Codes Enforcement, or another designee of the Mayor, is authorized and directed to provide the City Council with detailed reports, in the form approved by the Property Standards Task, at each City Council meeting, beginning at the second City Council Meeting in January 2003.

Now, we are going to have a Property Standards Task Force meeting between now and the next meeting. So that by the time this resolution becomes into affect, which is the second meeting of this month, they will have the form in which we were asking it for. So, it won't be a scenario where we will in fact have to come back before this body and say, this is a form. We are going to deal with that in the context of the Property Standards Task Force so that they will know exactly what we are asking for at that particular time.

Councilman Green: Mr. Ferdinand, would you come forward, please.

Councilman Jackson: I guess my question would be, something that we would have to figure out because I may just have had the wrong concept of what we are going to hear. Because if it were just a report on a regular basis and the Convention Center obviously was a contract and we knew specifically what in the contract we were expected and we wanted an update on that particular contract. Here, it is an on-going process and I don't want to cross the line of micro-management and that was my fear and concern as we got started going down and that is why I say I may in fact be thinking about it in the wrong way. So, I think if we delineate it and maybe I just have not understood what specifically we were looking for as it relates or are we trying to establish a different property standard and want to know what the progress is in establishing that or do we want to know how we are spending money on grass cutting and will he come in and say: we cut 17 lots, we charged for 14, 3 we couldn't find the person to. Because, if that is the case, while I support this resolution, I would certainly prefer to read that than to have one of the people named here come up at each meeting and give us a list of properties cut, you know, yada-yada. That is my concern, that is the only thing, that is my caution about moving on the resolution without knowing what the form is, first.

I'd feel a lot more comfortable knowing that it is not going to be tenuous, it is not going to be a laborious task where we have and again, I am not suggesting that it is not important. Obviously we all know that it is of paramount importance. I just don't want to cross the line of making whoever it is, Mr. Ferdinand or anybody else think, that what we are doing is micro-management. If we are having any problems getting information, the Administration needs to understand that and get that corrected. If we don't feel satisfied with that, then from that point, I think we can move on. But I just want to be sure we don't enter into a gray area of micro-management which means I think we have to delineate for them what we want and then in what form. Then I'm comfortable about saying, I support the resolution, as written, it is just the concern about how we are going to get the report and how much time will it take with him stating it versus us reading it, that's my major concern.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Ferdinand, we are considering a resolution providing for the periodic reports to the city council concerning substandard structures and weeded lots and otherwise providing with respect thereto. And this proposed legislation would require a report in the second meeting of the City Council on basically the lots mowed, demolition, and the securing of structure and in particular to answer Councilman Jackson, I take it that what we are trying to monitor is how this money is expended and then also how and to what extend the City is recouping those funds and I applaud that.

My concern would be, is this going to create an additional burden on Code Enforcement to document and get this information to us, once a month?

Mr. Ferdinand: I think a couple of weeks ago we provided the entire Council with a listing of lots that we had mowed by district. It is those districts we are working to make sure we have it by the new districts as well as lots sprayed, okay; so, we are doing that now so it is just a matter of us giving it to you on a monthly basis, we do keep track of it.

I think one of the concerns was, Mr. Lester you had asked something about a little more detail relative to identifying adjudicated property, those that are vacant, those that has structures on it, those that are occupied et cetera, et cetera. Now, that is another issue, that's a voluminous task.

We don't have all the mechanization and systems talking to themselves relative to what's adjudicated, that we get that report from Finance and is that in a mechanized system like our Permits Plus that we use. We talked about that at the task force meeting and trying to marry some of that. But as far as what lots we cut, what districts, what houses we demolished, we can get that.

Councilman Carmody: And Mr. Ferdinand what we are requiring, goes towards the question that I asked you earlier this year. It is stated in this resolution: WHEREAS, although more than \$2,000,000 is expended each year on private property to secure and demolish structures, to mow lots and to remove inoperable vehicles; budget documents show actual revenues (reimbursements) in 2001 as follows: Lot mowing fees - (\$22,688); Demolition Fees-\$18,631, and Securing Structures- \$4,124; and.

There is a large difference between the amount of money that we expended versus what we went after and tried to seek some compensation for having to go in and do that work on private property or adjudicated property for that matter. And that is my concern right there.

Mr. Ferdinand: I think we've kicked this issue around in terms of collecting, how we are going to go about doing that.

One of the problems I think I read in the draft of Internal Audit Report recently, a lot the work we do and this is their report it is just a draft, the number may change is right at 70% adjudicated property. So, are we going to try to and we may need to address that, all that may come out of the task force, but we got 70% adjudicated property when we cutting and demos and things like that which is absent owners or folks who just walk away from it, what our odds are of collecting on those 70%. We have to make a decision, this Council and Administration will have to make a decision. Are we going to go after that 70% when it look like they are walking away.

Councilman Carmody: And I understand your comment Mr. Ferdinand . I think my frustration is, in prior meetings discussing Code Enforcement is there are adjudicated properties that are occupied or somebody is renting those properties and if we are going out and expending municipal funds to maintain those funds and someone who is not paying the taxes is getting the benefit of rental income, there is something wrong.

Mr. Ferdinand: We have some issues right along about now with taxpayer, property people occupying, the whole issue or redemption. I think you may not have seen it but it is a letter from Ms. Julie Glass who addressed something about the synchronization of tax sales persons buying something then redeem, and just so happen because of the timing and things not in sync, the person who should have gotten a notice didn't get the notice so that is something that has got to be worked out too; so it is a lot of (inaudible) out there.

Councilman Carmody: Well, it does seem to me that if you would have filed a lien on a piece of property even if it was adjudicated, that whoever is going to redeem the taxes is then got to redeem that lien in order to get a clear title.

Mr. Ferdinand: This is true.

Councilman Carmody: And I would think that would be our policy by which we would operate so that we would indeed receive money from those persons who are going to redeem their adjudicated property. Without the benefit of that lien, they in essence got a free ride and some free work from the City of Shreveport citizens and their tax money to maintain their property.

Mr. Ferdinand: Then it is going to be some policy issues that this Council. You know, a lot of times we get calls from Council members and the Administration do too, you know calls from Council members, that due to the urgency of the matter we need to get this done right away in terms of cutting this grass because of for whatever reason. And we have got a decision to make, do we take the order and cut or wait to the requisite time. If you don't wait the requisite time, you can't put a lien so most of the time in the past if the other Council, we saluted and went on and cut the grass.

Councilman Carmody: And let me make a comment in that I am the only last man standing from the previous Council. Never, did I contact Code Enforcement and ask ya'll to bypass what the policy is in order to get a situation remedied. Now, if someone took what my call as to be that urgent to do so, they were mistaken because again I would never want this community to be spending money without the ability to recoup that money because I said, I want it done.

Mr. Ferdinand: I shouldn't have said the entire Council.

Councilman Carmody: But for the benefit of the gentlemen that are sitting up here now, I would hope that they would understand there is a process by which we get the problem addressed but the Bureau is responsible for following that course so that legally we have the ability to try and recoup that money and you could say, well Mr. Carmody, 70% of what we do is on property that we will never get the money back on, do you want us to go ahead and do it? I would tell you if 70% is the workload that you are doing work on without ever having the possibility of recouping the money, yeah, why not implement that policy, follow it, and lets see how much money we got back instead of \$22,000, \$18,000 and \$4,000 at the end of the year; let's just check.

Mr. Ferdinand: That's fine, I mean, I was just only stating. I stand correct in saying the entire Council. So, it was more or less an understanding from some Councilmen.

Councilman Carmody: Well lets hope that we've reached an understanding here today, that is not going to be something that we are going to do.

Mr. Ferdinand: Okay.

Councilman Carmody: And I understand because I've people chew on my ear about the fact that this has been out there all summer growing like this and nobody has touched it and I want it done today and if this is the first I've heard of it, I can go ahead and notify but the process takes normally about 60 days. So, again, I know that is frustrating to people, but if they want to wait until the grass is 3 feet high to start calling, there is a time period in which that property owner has got to be notified of the violation, given an opportunity to correct it, if he does not correct it, then we are going to take that action and we are going to file a lien against that property for our work; correct?

Mr. Ferdinand: Correct.

Councilman Carmody: Lets make sure we are correct from now on.

Councilman Green: Mr. Ferdinand, if some of the citizens in District F call me and I call your office, Mr. Bowie about getting some grass cut, cut my grass and we will talk about the money later.

Councilman Lester: I believe that knowledge is power and in this particular scenario we have spent millions and millions of dollars and there is an issue as to we saying that we

are cutting property on adjudicated property but we don't know. The way that we are going to find out is this resolution. We are just asking for information.

If we get that information then we can make an intelligent choice on what we need to do to correct the system. I think we all agree that something is wrong. We are not blaming Mr. Ferdinand because this problem exist before Mr. Ferdinand was here and before this Administration was there. If we find out that, asking for this report, I have found out that in fact in Code Enforcement they don't have, as I appreciate it, the computers set up necessary to generate some of this information. Well, if that is the case, then we need to, from our standpoint, if our citizens tell us that this is an issue, then we need to support Code Enforcement and give them the technology to get us the information. If we have the information then we can then put together a system and a process so that we can address the issue of recouping the money if necessary, deciding which lots need to be cut and which don't.

So what I am asking this Council to do is, it is not a perfect scenario but I am asking the Council to support this resolution as a first step of us trying to come up with some solutions to a problem that we hear about every day. My calls at my office, if I don't get a call from someone in District A about a lot that they have something is wrong. And while I have you up here, Mr. Ferdinand and I would ask that you pass this on to Mr. Bowie, Mrs. Erma Thomas (1844 Jordan Street). She has a problem with abandoned housing right behind her on Garret Street. She says the rats have gotten to the size of cats and she has got a drug problem and the house is about fallen down and it is contingent upon her, in her house. I can show you, you send those information to me on a daily basis.

So, what I am asking the Council to do is support this resolution, come to the Property Standards meeting that we are going to have next week, iron out a form, and lets move forward so that we can get some information, so that we can hopefully, if we have a scenario where it is just not cost effective, Councilman Carmody, if we are not following our procedures, lets maybe increase the fees and get more aggressive about the liens. But we can't get that from our standpoint unless we have the information and this resolution is just asking for information.

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Ferdinand, I am not trying to create any humor out of this situation, but I am in the rental property business and I just thought a moment ago these people who are occupying the homes now that have been adjudicated, have you thought about approaching them and just identifying yourself and suggesting to them, they just pay the rent to the City and thereby they can own the house. Is that a possibility?

Mr. Ferdinand: I would like to defer to our legal mind along about now, because there are certain things we can and can not do if it is occupied, et cetera, et cetera.

Ms. Glass: It may become more information than you want right now in this meeting, but the direct answer to that one question is, there is a procedure where with the adjudicated property that the City can go in and get a court order to take possession of it. Now, years ago we decided that we didn't want possession of 5,000 pieces of property and the policy decision was made at that time not to go in and take possession. Instead the City is now pursuing the process where you sell it to a 3rd party so you get it in the hands of a 3rd party who will take care of it. That is an option, but the City had decided that, that is not something that we wanted to do.

Councilman Hogan: That 3rd party could not be possible the tenant there that is paying the rent?

Mrs. Glass: The tenant could make application. . . .

Councilman Carmody: I am in support of passing this resolution based upon what Mr. Ferdinand has said and other Council members.

I would certainly consider that we might very well want to amend the resolution after passage at something point to ask them to document what fees were waived and by which Council person or the Administration so that we have benefit of that as well.

Mr. Ferdinand: Well, we will attempt, that will be a little difficult, but we will attempt. Because if I can recall the history and some of the other persons, (inaudible) and the history of the grass cutting crew in Codes was addressed things quick because of the Councilman call et cetera, et cetera.

I think that it was intended at that time, even with creation of the grass cutting crew is to expedite things because of the calls but we will do anything just about going forward but historical data will be a little difficult, but we will try.

Councilman Walford: Add, 1340 Lawhon, right under the one Mr. Lester gave you.

Mr. Ferdinand: 1340 Lawhon?

Councilman Walford: Right.

Mr. Ferdinand: Substandard structure?

Councilman Walford: Vehicles and other abandoned things, in the yard.

Mr. Ferdinand: We'll take care of it, take care of both of them.

Councilman Green: Again, Mr. Ferdinand, you can write this note down. If the constituents in District F call me and I call you, cut my grass. I lost my job once and I don't plan to lose it again.

Mr. Ferdinand: Yes, sir.

Mayor Hightower: I would like to make one comment if I could and all of you have been around long enough now to know that what you are talking about today, is one of the toughest problems we have to deal with. No question about it. It has been for every Administration since Administration started.

One thing that we did different over the past four years is we tried to get organized in that we put together a Property Management Division. Now we at least know what we have adjudicated to us. Our intention when we go out and mow a piece of property that has not been adjudicated, there should be a lien filed on it. A piece of property that has been adjudicated to us however, Calvin you probably know better than maybe most, bit its expensive. I mean, we got to go pay somebody to do that. You don't just mail something down to the courthouse and a lien gets filed. You got to do the research and do the notice and the whole bit.

On adjudicated property we haven't been filing liens every two months when we cut the grass because you got to pay again and pay again. And reality is that adjudicated properties mount more lien costs than the properties ever worth.

And what we are trying to do with SURC is to take properties that have been adjudicated to the City and expropriate them essentially to the City so that we can get clear titles and turn those pieces of property back into develop-able property or property that somebody next door may be able to use so that we can get them back on the tax roll. Because reality is, that's the only what we are going to get our money when we've got people that have abandoned the piece of property, hadn't cut it in three or four or five or fifteen years, it is boarded up, the house is torn down, most of them never even know and certainly don't care. And there is not a day that goes by that we don't get calls from somebody somewhere in California or wherever that say: I want to donate my property to the City. They don't want anymore notices. They are never going to pay them so anytime we do accept property it is just good money after bad to go file liens on those. What we eventually again, what we have to do is expropriate and get them into the CDCs and hopefully turn them back into commerce but we will never get the CDCs of the world to pay us \$10,000 for a vacant piece of property that is worth \$1,500; so we have got to be practical

about it.

And I know you can make the numbers look terrible when you talk about what do we expend versus what we get back. The only real possibility we have to recoup any money is on property that is valuable to somebody. And most cases that properties have been adjudicated or has been mismanaged, it is not very valuable to them. They don't live in them or they are not receiving income. There are some out there, like you mentioned, that you know it is a little bit tougher to do something with, but again our strategy has changed on why we don't file a lien every single time we cut grass. We own 7,000 piece of adjudicated property. If we cut them all, four times a year, you are talking about paying 28,000 times for liens. At some point, like you say we have got to stop the bleeding and try to get those properties expropriated and back into commerce and that is what we have been working to do, really, I guess Larry about a year now, is that maybe a year and a half that we started doing that and Mr. Thompson is real involved in that effort with SURC as well. So, we just have to—its a huge problem, like I say and it is not going to go away, a bite at a time not a huge chunk at a time so we are working on it.

Mr. Ferdinand: I think the call, my guy is saying, it is normally two sheets to file a lien, it is \$23 dollars.

Councilman Walford: There are exceptions to what you are saying, some of the adjudicated property about to be sold in the square mile area that is being done on the intergovernmental agreement, there is a brick four-plex that is occupied, obviously somebody is getting rent. There is a house on Merrick Street that any of us in this room would buy. Now, I don't know how much we are expending on those, but there is no doubt in my mind that the owner is going to reclaim that as the sale starts. And we've had expenses to the City, I hope we are filing—there is going to have to be some judgement, I guess is what I am saying. Some of the pieces are valuable enough that I would think we would want to put the liens on them because we will recover the money. Sooner or later the people are going to try to reclaim their property when it is about to be sold by the City and Parish not at Tax Sale but during the sale that they are doing now, so that is something that we are going to have to look at and there is going to have to be a judgment call and somebody who goes and looks at it, your inspector is going to know whether it is valuable or not.

Resolution passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

RESOLUTION NO. 8 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION TO FORMALLY NAME THE TENNIS COURTS AT A. B. PALMER PARK, THE JULIA M. WILLIAMS TENNIS CENTER" AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO

BY: Councilman Gibson

WHEREAS, the tennis courts located at A. B. Palmer Park have never been officially named; and

WHEREAS, the provisions of Section 78-451 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport do not apply to "to the initial naming of public property of the City of Shreveport"; and,

WHEREAS, Julia M. Williams was a resident of the Cedar Grove Community before she moved to Los Angeles, and her son Richard Williams was born in Cedar Grove; and,

WHEREAS, Richard Williams, formally a neighborhood tennis coach in Compton, California has coached and guided the careers of his daughters, Venus and Serena, to the very top of

professional tennis, and to world celebrity status; and

WHEREAS, residents of the Cedar Grove Neighborhood have requested that the Tennis Courts at A. B. Palmer Park be named in honor of Julia M. Williams, the mother of Richard Williams and the grandmother of Venus and Serena Williams; and

WHEREAS, the naming of these tennis courts in honor of Julia M. Williams will be a constant reminder to both children and adults in the Cedar Grove Community and in Shreveport that dreams can be reached by setting lofty goals, staying focused and working hard.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened that the tennis courts located at A. B. Palmer Park be named the "Julia M. Williams Tennis Center".

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

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

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

Councilman Gibson: This weekend we have an opportunity to have one of our native citizens come back to Shreveport, in Richard Williams. Richard is the father of Serena and Venus Williams, who obviously has set the world on fire in terms of tennis and their success story is definitely impressive. He is coming back in town to visit. He grew up Cedar Grove and he is also going to be the Grand Marshal of the Martin Luther King Parade on Monday.

But State Representative Ernest Baylor along with several other citizens have been working on a, and I don't want the audience or the people on Cablevision to let this out, but Mr. Williams has got a surprise party coming Sunday, which I would like to personally invite each and every one of you to attend at 5 o'clock at A. B. Palmer, but what we would like to do is honor his mother who is also a Cedar Grove resident who passed away some years ago in naming the Tennis Courts after Richard Williams' mom.

And I think there are plans long term to try to work with Mr. Williams, there is obviously a tremendous coach in tennis but also a tremendous businessman to bring him back into Shreveport in the years to come and hopefully entice his daughters to come into Shreveport and maybe we could, as a city just as we do with the City sponsoring golf tournaments for our amateur players, maybe have Mr. Williams and his daughters work with our youth in Cedar Grove and some of the other neighborhoods with some youth tennis clinics.

So, I would ask for your support on this. I think it is a great gesture on the group that approached me with this opportunity. And I think it also recognizes someone like Richard Williams who again has touched a lot of peoples' lives in Shreveport over the years and it is an honor to be able to present this before this Council.

Resolution passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS:

1. Resolution No. 4 of 2003: A resolution authorizing the Mayor to execute a Historic Preservation Easement with a qualified historic preservation organization and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
2. Resolution No. 5 of 2003: Resolution authorizing the filing of a Section 9 (5307) Application with the Department of Transportation, United States of America, for a grant under the Urban Mass Transportation Act of 1964, as Amended.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Gibson for Introduction of the Resolutions to lay over until the January 28, 2003 meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

INTRODUCTION OF ORDINANCES:

1. Ordinance No. 2 of 2003: An ordinance amending the 2003 Capital Improvements Budget and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
2. Ordinance No. 3 of 2003: An ordinance to repeal an existing speed limit ordinance for the Clyde Fant Memorial Parkway Ordinance No. 145 of 2002 and amending and reenacting a portion of Section 90-198 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport pertaining to the maximum limits on Clyde Fant Memorial Parkway, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
3. Ordinance No. 4 of 2003: An Ordinance Amending Chapter 2 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport Relative to Legal Descriptions of City Council Districts and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
4. Ordinance No. 5 of 2003: An ordinance amending Chapter 42 and Chapter 86 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport relative to Occupational License Taxes and License Fees for Peddlers and Itinerant Vendors and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
5. Ordinance No. 6 of 2003: An ordinance to amend Section 26-109 of the Code of Ordinances to authorize a Non-refundable \$200.00 Administrative Fee for Services rendered in connection with requests for expropriation to the Shreveport Redevelopment Agency and to otherwise providing with respect thereto.
6. Ordinance No. 7 of 2003: An ordinance amending Chapter 42 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport relative to Professional Bondsmen and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
7. Ordinance No. 8 of 2003: An ordinance amending Chapter 86 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport Relative to Occupational License Taxes and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
8. Ordinance No. 9 of 2003: An ordinance amending Section 004.1 of the Shreveport Comprehensive Building Code relative to Permit Requirements and otherwise providing

with respect thereto.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Gibson for Introduction of the Ordinances to lay over until the January 28, 2003 meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

9. Ordinance No. 10 of 2003: An ordinance authorizing a Right of Use of approximately 20' x 175' of City-owned property in Cross Lake to Waterfront Grill on the Lake, L. L. C. and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Walford for Introduction of the Ordinance to lay over until the February 11, 2003 meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

Councilman Gibson: I would like to visit with the Administration on No. 9 to get some additional information. I guess we have, it is dealing with Permits and possible taxes owed by companies implying for that. Could I get, not this week but next week, could I get with the Administration to get details on the historical perspective on this in terms of what, is this a re-occurring thing which obviously we are looking at this then it probably is but I would like to get a little bit more information in that, if I could.

Mr. Antee: Sure

Councilman Lester: Can I also ask the Administration to give me some information relative to Item No. 10 regarding the previous arrangement that the City had.

Mr. Antee: Is that the pier at, what used to be, Moree's. Briefly, the Waterfront Grill that is current operating in Monroe on Bayou Desiere is opening a Waterfront Grill on Cross Lake in the old La'Moree's. Two of the managers that have run it for several years in Monroe, they are from Shreveport, and they will be moving back and actually operating this business here. What that before you there, is to be able to use the pier that is currently existing that goes out into Cross lake and I think the Zoning Issue actually comes up tomorrow.

Councilman Lester: Okay.

Mr. Antee: If you ever get to go to Monroe, just go by there and eat, they got great food.

Councilman Lester: My question is and I guess maybe get into it at a later date, I just need some information and some questions answered as to it relates to how we came up with the fee that is contemplated and if there were any previous arrangements with the prior owner.

Mr. Antee: We can get you a full report.

Councilman Walford: Item No. 3. In the way of a quick explanation to the rest of the Council. I had a request from Sci-port. Apparently, the speed limit northbound until you are actually a beam of Sci-port and across their first set of crosswalks is still, 45 miles an hour. So, it drops to 35 there, drops again at Civic Theater and then 25 to protect our gamblers but they would like to protect the children with a 25 mile an hour speed limit from Lake Street north and so that is the reason for the Introduction of this ordinance. I wanted to pass that to my fellow Council members.

10. Ordinance No. 11 of 2003: An ordinance repealing and replacing Chapter 72 of the Code of

Ordinances of the City of Shreveport; providing for the licensing and regulation of Sexually Oriented Businesses and Employees, and otherwise providing with respect thereto. (Action taken under Reports from Officers, Boards and Committees.)

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Hogan, seconded by Councilman Carmody for Introduction of the Ordinance to lay over until the January 28, 2003 meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

ORDINANCES ON SECOND READING AND FINAL PASSAGE:

1. Ordinance No. 200 of 2002: An ordinance to enlarge the limits and boundaries of the City of Shreveport – A tract of land located along the West 70th Street and along Dinkins Drive in Section 29 (T17N-R15W), Caddo Parish, Louisiana, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on November 26, 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 Gibson to postpone the ordinance until the January 28, 2003 meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Out of Chamber: Councilman Lester. 1.

2. Ordinance No. 201 of 2002: An ordinance to enlarge the limits and boundaries of the City of Shreveport – A tract of land located in the S/2 of Section 21 and in the N/2 of Section 28 (T16N-R13W), Caddo Parish, Louisiana, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on November 26, 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 Gibson to postpone the ordinance until the January 28, 2003 meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Out of Chamber: Councilman Lester. 1.

3. Ordinance No. 202 of 2002: An ordinance to enlarge the limits and boundaries of the City of Shreveport – A tract of land located along the Norris Ferry and Southern Loop Roads in the SE/4 of Section 20 (T16N-R13W), Caddo Parish, Louisiana, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on November 26, 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 Gibson to postpone the ordinance until the January 28, 2003 meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Out of Chamber: Councilman Lester. 1.

4. Ordinance No. 203 of 2002: An ordinance to enlarge the limits and boundaries of the City of Shreveport – A tract of land located at 5895 Bert Kouns Industrial Loop in the SE/4 of the SW/4 of Section 1 (T16N-R15W), Caddo Parish, Louisiana, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on November 26, 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 Gibson to postpone the ordinance until the January 28, 2003 meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Out of Chamber: Councilman Lester. 1.

5. Ordinance No. 204 of 2002: An ordinance to enlarge the limits and boundaries of the City of Shreveport – A tract of land located at 3001 and 3003 Meriwether Road in the N/2 of the SW/4 of Section 33 (T17N-R14W), Caddo Parish, Louisiana, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on November 26, 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 Gibson, seconded by Councilman Green to postpone the ordinance until the January 28, 2003 meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

7. Ordinance No. 206 of 2002: An ordinance amending Chapter 102 of the Code of Ordinances relative to Vehicles For Hire and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on December 30, 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 Gibson adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

8. Ordinance No. 207 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 Hawkins 850 feet east of Jones-Mabry Road, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from R-1H, Urban, One-Family Residence District to R-1H-E, Urban, One-Family Residence / Extended Use District, limited to "a commercial tire and repair shop" only, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on December 30, 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 Lester, seconded by Councilman Carmody adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

9. Ordinance No. 208 of 2002: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the northeasterly side of North Market, 250 feet north of McKinley Avenue, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from B-3, Community Business District to I-2, Heavy Industrial District and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on December 30, 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 Walford, seconded by Councilman Lester adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

10. Ordinance No. 209 of 2002: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances,

the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the east side of Youree Drive 200 feet north of Archer Avenue, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from SPI-3 (B-1, Commercial Corridor Overlay (Buffer Business) District to SPI-3-E (B-1), Commercial Corridor Overlay / Extended Use (Buffer Business) District, limited to an interior design business with light retail sales and a clothing boutique” only and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on December 30, 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 Walford adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

11. Ordinance No. 210 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 Industrial Loop, 1000 feet east of Mansfield Road, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from B-1, Buffer Business District to B-1-E, Buffer Business / Extended Use District, limited to a dry cleaners only and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on December 30, 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 Hogan, seconded by Councilman Gibson adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

12. Ordinance No. 211 of 2002: An ordinance authorizing the lease of city-owned property to Shreveport Baseball Club, L. L. C. and otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on December 30, 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 Jackson to postpone the ordinance until the January 28, 2003 meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Out of Chamber: Councilman Lester. 1.

13. Ordinance No. 1 of 2003: An ordinance declaring a Public Emergency in connection with the purchase of the air compressor for filling self contained breathing apparatus (SCBA) bottles and ratifying the expenditure of approximately \$28,676.00 and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on January 14, 2003 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 Jackson adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Out of Chamber: Councilman Lester. 1.

The Adopted Ordinances, As Amended, follow:

ORDINANCE NO. 206 OF 2002

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 102 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES RELATIVE TO VEHICLES FOR HIRE AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the Cities of Shreveport and Bossier City have enacted legislation concerning vehicles for hire; and

WHEREAS, this legislation governs the manner in which casino transportation services may be licensed and operated; and

WHEREAS, it has been requested that these requirements be modified.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in legal session convened, that Chapter 102 of the Code of Ordinances be amended and re-enacted as follows:

In Section 102-1 (Definitions), replace the definition of “casino transportation services” with the following:

Casino transportation services means the transportation of passengers for hire from one or more casinos to one or more other casinos, or from one or more hotels to one or more casinos in a motor vehicle in a motor vehicle carrying not less than 13 passengers nor more than 20 passengers.

In Section 102-85 (Operating requirements - Other vehicles for hire), replace section 102-85 (a) with the following:

- (a) No vehicle for hire which is operated as a casino transportation service shall be operated as a taxicab. Vehicles operated by a casino transportation service shall transport passengers for hire only from casinos to other casinos or between hotels and casinos along a fixed route of travel.

In Section 102-263 (Permitted uses), delete the existing language and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

102-263 Permitted Uses.

Use of a vehicle licensed under this article as a taxicab is not permitted. Casino transportation services vehicles shall transport passengers for hire only from one or more casinos to one or more other casinos or between hotels and casinos along a fixed route of travel.

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

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

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that this ordinance shall become effective on February 1, 2003.

James Green, Chairman

Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council

ORDINANCE NO. 207 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 HAWKINS 850 FEET EAST OF JONES-MABRY ROAD, SHREVEPORT, CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA, FROM R-1H, URBAN, ONE-FAMILY RESIDENCE DISTRICT, TO R-1H-E, URBAN, ONE-FAMILY RESIDENCE / EXTENDED USE DISTRICT, LIMITED TO "A COMMERCIAL TIRE AND REPAIR SHOP" 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 the W. 50 ft. of N.150 ft. of Lot 312, Jones -Mabry Subdivision, Unit #3, property located on the south side of Hawkins, 850 feet east of Jones-Mabry Road, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, be and the same is hereby changed from R-1H, Urban, One-Family Residence District, to R-1H-E, Urban, One-Family Residence / Extended Use District, limited to "a commercial tire and repair shop" only.

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

1. Development of the property shall be in substantial accord with the site plan submitted with any significant changes or additions requiring further review and approval by the Planning Commission.
2. Approval is granted for period of one year from public hearing date. Failure to comply with stipulations will cause the application to become null and void.

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.

James Green, Chairman

Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council

ORDINANCE NO.208 OF 2002

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 106 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES, THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT ZONING ORDINANCE, BY REZONING PROPERTY LOCATED ON THE NORTHEASTERLY SIDE OF NORTH MARKET, 250 FEET NORTH OF MCKINLEY AVENUE, SHREVEPORT, CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA, FROM B-3, COMMUNITY BUSINESS DISTRICT, TO I-2, HEAVY INDUSTRIAL 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 2, 3, & 4 North

Market Industrial Sites Unit No. 2, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, located on the Northeasterly side of North Market 250 feet north of McKinley Avenue, be and the same is hereby changed from B-3, Community Business District to I-2, Heavy Industrial District.

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. Approval shall be for the portion of property shown on the site plan submitted.

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.

James Green, Chairman

Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council

ORDINANCE NO. 209 OF 2002

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 106 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES, THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT ZONING ORDINANCE, BY REZONING PROPERTY LOCATED ON THE EAST SIDE OF YOUREE DRIVE 200 FEET NORTH OF ARCHER AVENUE, SHREVEPORT, CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA, FROM SPI-3(B-1) COMMERCIAL CORRIDOR OVERLAY (BUFFER BUSINESS) DISTRICT TO SPI-3-E(B-1), COMMERCIAL CORRIDOR OVERLAY/EXTENDED USE (BUFFER BUSINESS) DISTRICT, LIMITED TO "AN INTERIOR DESIGN BUSINESS WITH LIGHT RETAIL SALES AND A CLOTHING BOUTIQUE", 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 the N. 50 feet of S. 241.1 feet of Lot E, Resubdivision of Plot 18, Broadmoor Sub. Unit #1, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, be the same and is hereby changed from SPI-3(B-1) Commercial Corridor Overlay (Buffer Business) District to SPI-3-E(B-1), Commercial Corridor Overlay/Extended Use (Buffer Business) District, limited to "an interior design business with light retail sales and a clothing boutique", 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 CONTINUED - ORDINANCE NO. 209 OF 2002

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.

James Green, Chairman

Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council

ORDINANCE NO. 210 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 INDUSTRIAL LOOP, 1000 FEET EAST OF MANSFIELD ROAD, SHREVEPORT, CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA, FROM B-1, BUFFER BUSINESS DISTRICT TO B-1-E, BUFFER BUSINESS/EXTENDED USE DISTRICT, LIMITED TO "A DRY CLEANERS" 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 11 less the south 500 feet thereof of Summer Grove Village Subdivision, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, located on the south side of Industrial Loop 1000 ft. east of Mansfield Road, 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 dry cleaners" only.

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

1. Development of the property shall be in substantial accord with a revised site plan showing landscaping to ordinance standards to be submitted to and approved by the Zoning Administrator, with any significant changes or additions requiring further review and approval by the by the Planning Commission.
2. Waiver of solid wood screening fence requirement is granted on the east, west, and south property lines until such time as the adjacent property is developed residentially.

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.

James Green, Chairman

Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council

ORDINANCE NO. 1 OF 2003

AN ORDINANCE DECLARING A PUBLIC EMERGENCY IN CONNECTION WITH THE PURCHASE OF THE AIR COMPRESSOR FOR FILLING SELF CONTAINED BREATHING APPARATUS (SCBA) BOTTLES AND RATIFYING THE EXPENDITURE OF APPROXIMATELY \$28,676.00 AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the air compressor for filling self contained breathing apparatus bottles (hereinafter SCBA's) is out of service and is over 10 years old; and

WHEREAS, over \$3,000 was spent on the compressor in 2002 and will need to be upgraded in 2003 due to standards and the new SCBAs, and

WHEREAS, the equipment is used by firefighters for any type of hazardous situations such as fires,

haz-mat, gas leaks, etc.; and

WHEREAS, it is essential to purchase the air compressor as soon as possible without going to bid.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened, that the emergency action of the Fire Department to purchase the air compressor is hereby authorized and ratified and that the expenditure of approximately \$28,676.00 for this purpose is hereby authorized.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that monies for this emergency repair shall come from the operating budget of the Fire Department.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that a public emergency is hereby declared and notice of such public emergency shall, within ten days thereof, be published in the official journal of the City of Shreveport proposing or declaring such public emergency in accordance with Section 38:2212(D) of the Louisiana Revised Statutes.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that if any provision or item of this ordinance or 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 application, 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.

James Green, Chairman

Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

1. Alcohol Retail Permit: Mr. Alton Ross (2911 Milam Street - New Nat Café)(G/Jackson) (January 13, 2003: Appeal removed from the table and the decision of the Police Department was upheld (to deny the license application for 2002. Applicant applied for a 2003 permit which was approved by the Police Department.)
2. Alcohol Retail Permit: Ms. Deborah Hawkins (Employer: 2901 Milam St. - Take-A-Bag Grocery) (G/Jackson) (Council to schedule a hearing date.)

NEW BUSINESS:

Mr. Thompson I believe that there are one or more persons who want to speak on an item that can be voted on under New Business. And with the Rules upon us by the Legislature, I think that you might want to suspend the rules and ask those persons to come forward now.

Motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Gibson to Suspend the Rules. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson.

6. Nays: None. Out of Chamber: Councilman Lester. 1.

Councilman Carmody: Just to make sure, these persons will be allowed to speak and given 3 minute?

Councilman Green: Yes, sir.

Commissioner Rose Wilson McCullough, Representative of District 2, Caddo Parish Commission: I am here today regarding Item No. 5 in reference to the King Gardens community. What I would like to do is just kind of bring you up to date as to what part I've played in the opposition in supporting these citizens of King Gardens. I met with them prior to December 9 along with the Metropolitan Planning Commission, Mr. Allen, I believe is Mr. Kirkland's assistant and several of the citizens expressed their concerns about the development that is forthcoming, I'm understand. And they expressed some concerns about their property values, the property of their homes decreasing and some concerns about the crime in the area. And they have some documents and reports that I'm sure that they will be able to present to you, after I'm finished.

But in meeting with those citizens, I did express to them the importance of them getting with the City Councilman, Councilman Lester to express their concerns in regards to this particular development. I also did pledge my support of opposition because I too am a homeowner and I do empathize with their concerns at this time.

We also agree to launch a petition which each one of you should have and that petition consist of at least 200 signatures. Included among those signatures are signatures of members of the MLK Association as well as other citizens and surrounding areas within the MLK area. So, what I would like to do is just ask you for your support in opposition to this development on behalf of these residents that are residing within the King Gardens community.

At this time I would like to maybe if it is in order to allow some of the residents to come before you and speak.

Councilman Lester: I'd like thank Commissioner McCullough for spearheading that effort in working with the residents in the community. I apologize (I had to run to the little boys room) but I really appreciate her work in this effort.

Ms. Erma D. Rogers (1920 Michoud Street): I am speaking on behalf of myself, my husband, and several of my neighbors and adjoining members of the community. We live in University Oaks Village and it is approximately 2 street, approximately 17 to 18 homes in our area. The proposal to erect the King Gardens Apartment complex, which is primarily the intent from the beginning was going to be an apartment complex, to our understanding.

We received notices back about four days prior to the meeting of the September Metropolitan Planning Commission meeting stating that this item was going to come up for a discussion. That weekend was the weekend of Labor Day, so we had two days of non-business where we could not contact anyone. We did go ahead and try to get information. We have had persons to come and meet with us on the meetings, as were stated by Ms. McCullough.

And the biggest problem is, this site is built directly behind my home. My home is 4,000 square feet or a little over, 3,200 heating and what they are proposing to build and I can quote for you from the meeting that was held by the MLK Association back in December and the representative who came from the King Gardens Association which is under the Calhoun, I think is the name, Reimer Calhoun is the name of the backers and engineers of this project, Mr. Bob Tallent. And what they proposed were 28 2-bedroom units, 760 square feet, approximately and 1 bedroom—the total is 40 units but you had 28 which were going to be 2-bedroom, the rest were 1-bedroom units consisting of 600 square feet of property, in house.

This does not compare to my home nor to several homes of my neighbors. The minimum codes when we moved into this neighborhood was going to be at least 13- / 1,400 square feet. Most of my neighbors have expanded their homes, almost all of the homes are nearly about 2,000 square feet at this time, heated.

I don't see how a structure 600 or 750 square feet can compare to our neighborhood and how it can bring up the property value. The only thing that I can see is that it is going to de-value it.

There is also a problem of drainage at the corner of Michoud and Redstone Streets. We have flooding. We have had consisting flooding in that area over the past several years. We have lived in this neighborhood 17-years. We built our home, my home, ourselves, my husband and myself, I mean, sub-contracted. I mean, we did the hammering, the nailing, and much of the interior; okay.

So, I see a lot of my blood, sweat and tears, and my money going down the drain based upon the property taxes that I have paid over the years and the value of my home, today when you build a structure that is about one-fourth the size of what I live in today, that is my basic problem.

It is not a problem with trying to provide homes for the elderly. We feel that there is sufficient number of apartments available but there is also a sufficient amount of land in the MLK area where this development could be erected. We just don't understand why it has to be located in my backyard, more or less.

I know that others have said this is going to be 600 feet, but when you build, if you look at the site, if you look at the plot and the land and the erection, the presentation of the apartment complex, it is going to come backwards more yards than 600.

And I am sure that Council should be in receipt of a letter that we sent on December 12th, which explains a lot of this that I am going over. It was sent to all of you care of Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council. I should hope that you all would have it. It shows a list of the names of all of our members in this community that we are against it. There is another set of names and petition against this project, which was

sent to the Commissioner, the Parish Commissioner who is here, Mrs. Rose McCullough, and that is approximately 200 other names.

I think that as the major property owners in this vicinity I feel that we have the right to say what should and should not be in our neighborhood more or less, in my back yard.

We want more homes of the same structure, size, and value of what we live in today so that we can strengthen our community, so that we can bring in younger and newer families into our community, keep our schools solvent and more secure, and thereby increasing the value of the property in the City of Shreveport.

Also on the date stated, when Mr. Tallent spoke with the MLK Neighborhood Association, I think that was December 9th at that regularly scheduled meeting, he said this rental property is designed to be rented. They are suppose to be single dwelling units which will be homes. They are designed for rental (I quote directly from what he said, I wrote it down verbatim) after 15 years. These will be available for purchase by the elderly. They can not get in unless they are 62 years of age. Add your 15 to your 62 and tell me what you think the life span is left of an elderly person owning that property?

I feel that this company will come in, they will take the money and run as several other property owners have done in our community. This has been the habit over and over. They rape the land, they take the money, and we are left barren to re-build. If we have to do it, let us build what we want for ourselves.

Mr. John D. Washington, Major, United States Air Force Retired and I'm also retired from another career as a Personnel Administrator (3217 Redstone, Shreveport, 71107): I've lived at that address for the last 29 years, as a taxpayer and homeowner.

I would like to thank you for allowing us the opportunity to appear before you and to just share some thoughts about the proposed project in our neighborhood.

Our first knowledge of this project was in August and to be perfectly frank with you, I'm getting a little bit tired of it. Ms. Rogers has already addressed the issue of the short notice that we received in August for a September 4th hearing before MPC (Metropolitan Planning Commission) and we really didn't have a lot of time to prepare. I have been to the Planning Commission on at least. . . and let me state unequivocally, that I'm opposed to it but my reasons are more economic in nature than social.

I can appreciate the interest in trying to provide housing. I do think that there are other options available, for example, the project in Queensborough where you have the Model Blocks Project for example. I think, but people are encouraged to own homes as opposed to renting, is a route that you might want to consider.

But since this issue has been pending since August and my neighbors and I have had to come back and forth to all kinds of meetings. Of course, I am retired. I am not on the payroll and it is expensive for me to come back and forth and pay the parking fees and of course, spend my time doing this but I do think that it is important that we present our views to you.

Now, Mr. Councilman, I want to thank you too, Mr. Lester for at least trying to bring some balance to this issue because things like this can become emotional and I am trying to be as objective about it as I possible can, but this is strictly a business matter with me.

The bedrock of our society is, one of the bedrocks is, home ownership and I really would hope that we would encourage home ownership as opposed to rental property.

I can look and stand in my back yard and look at apartment complex that was built after I moved into the neighborhood. About 12 years ago, another project which consist of rental property is located about 200 yards from where I live, which has an extremely high crime rate. And so we are squeezed in right now by rental property and to add more rental property, I am not sure would be in the best interest of the City as well as homeowners.

But, I don't know what the protocol is here, but there are a number of neighbors that we have present and with your permission, Mr. Chairman, is it permissible to have these persons to stand, those who are in opposition to this project?

Councilman Green: Yes, sir. Would you all stand, please (approximately 15 to 20 people stood in opposition).

Mr. Washington: This is a cross section of persons some of whom are retired, some of whom are still active, in terms of employment. We do have several disabled neighbors and we've had some serious problems with regards to vandalism in our area.

Motion by Councilman Lester to grant Mr. Washington additional time, seconded by Councilman Carmody.

Councilman Carmody: I would ask before we vote in a sense of fairness in that we've asked those persons to stand that were in opposition, if there is anyone here in support that we all have the same consideration of, if they would please stand.

Councilman Green: We are going to have those to come after Representative Glover.

Mr. Washington: I just want to thank Commissioner McCullough and Councilman Lester for trying to bring some balance because I believe that we should not be placed in a win lose situation, but we should all be winners and I'm glad to see that Mr. Lester is bringing some leadership to that arena.

Councilman Hogan: Upon my request, Mr. Lester had taken time yesterday to spend with me. I had asked him to show me this property and where the proposed development would be. And I would just like to go on record as saying, I'm in total support of this, that is of overturning the MPC decision in your favor, Mr. Washington.

And I'll tell you why, because of the location. Mr. Lester as I said, spent time with me and showed me exactly where it is going to be and it is, as Mrs. Rogers mentioned, it is a low lying area. It wouldn't make much sense to me to develop this if I were going to develop some apartments there, besides the fact, it has not city utilities there.

Mr. Lester had taken time, as Mrs. Rogers you mentioned, there is other land areas that this could be placed in. There is a need there. As Mr. Lester also agreed, that there is a need for senior housing and he took time to show me another piece of property about 1.5 mile down Martin Luther King Drive, is that right.

Councilman Lester: That is correct.

Councilman Hogan: That is obvious that the grade is not, it is up high and it is not a flood zone and the City utilities are already there, and so I think that would be a great recommendation if the developer were going to talk to you or whatever about that. And, I would just like to encourage the other Council members to vote in favor of this, which would be to overturn the MPC ruling.

Councilman Gibson: I concur. I think anytime that we as Council, I think we have an obligation to protect the integrity of the existing neighborhoods. From time-to-time we are all faced with developments and development is good in a city, a metropolitan city, a progressive city of which Shreveport aspire to be. But there are some other options it appears in this area which obviously is an asset for this developer and I would encourage that developer to do so. But at the same time as I was saying before, with a development is 3- or 4,000 square feet or 1,200 square feet to come in almost half of what the existing neighborhood is, is not what I think those of you in the audience were anticipating when you bought your homes and invested in your neighborhood and in this City.

As a Councilman out in southeast Shreveport, I will be consist in looking and supporting these type endeavors that prevent the infringement in, on the integrity of what the existing neighborhood is and again encourage not by just saying "no", but encourage this developer to go back to the drawing board and look at those options of which I am sure my colleague, Councilman Lester will work in conjunction with to present to the MPC and hopefully we won't have to be coming back to re-address.

Councilman Green: Councilman Hogan, did I understand you say Mr. Lester carried you up there to this particular place?

Councilman Hogan: That is correct.

Councilman Green: Mr. Lester, is there any reason why you didn't take me? You don't have to answer now.

Councilman Walford: He probably bought supper and everything.

Councilman Green: I was just wondering.

Representative Cedric Bradford Glover, State Representative of District 4: I am honored at the opportunity to appear here before you today.

Before I go any further, I want to make an expression of thanks to the Mayor for something that was referenced earlier, I believe by one of you and that is the contract for the Community Market Place Development Institute. A group of individuals who are specialists in developing retail activity in hard-pressed communities, has been approved and moved forward with, and so I want to thank him for working with me to bring that into reality and to encourage each and everyone of you all to make a point to find out exactly who the folks from CMDI are and to see how they may be of help to you in efforts to grow and revitalize your individual districts in the City of Shreveport as a whole.

Now, to why I am here today and I guess I have seldom found myself facing such a stacked deck.

But, I have been there before, I am sure I'll be there again and so I will forge ahead without hesitation.

One of the single best pieces of advice I got upon becoming elected to this body, as a member of the Shreveport City Council, I got from a gentleman who was an out-going member of this body. His name was Bill Bush, represented District D, I believe for 8 years, Art. And his advice to me was, Cedric when it comes to zoning matters before you make up your mind and take a firm, absolute position, make sure you hear both sides, make sure you hear both sides.

I didn't understand just how significant and profound that statement was until I actually sat where you gentlemen sit right now. I wished I'd had a chance to make that statement to each of you before some of the comments that I just heard, especially those that came from Mr. Gibson and Mr. Hogan. I hope it would have been something that my Council member, Mr. Lester would have given some consideration to as well. Because, the sad thing here today, gentlemen is that, this particular project, this particular effort, this particular initiative suffers from probably one of the best efforts at mis- and dis-information I've seen, this side of the CIA.

There has been so many things said about this particular effort, this particular initiative that are not true, that are exaggerated, that are completely without any basis in fact, that it boggles my mind.

So, the thing that I am here to ask you all to do today is that before you take a position to do aware with a initiative that would afford relief to hundreds, if not thousands of senior citizens within the Martin Luther King Drive area and north Shreveport and Shreveport in general, who find themselves on a cold wintery day, living in substandard housing, before you make a decision to kill that project, I'd ask that you at least allow some time to hear both sides. I think that's only fair.

The dis-information effort and the mis-information effort on this particular initiative has been so successful that, members of the Martin Luther King Neighborhood Association, a group that has been in existence since 1935, one of the oldest if not the oldest neighborhood association in Shreveport, Louisiana didn't fully understand the parameters, the impact, the benefit or any of the positives of this particular project develop.

In fact, so many of the members had been mis-led and in some cases lied to, that the membership of that particular organization on last night, where I was in attendance along with Councilman Lester, along with Commissioner Rose McCullough, the membership of that organization, last night, after having an opportunity to hear both sides passed a motion requesting their Council member, Council member Lester to postpone this particular effort until a community meeting could be convened that would afford the opportunity to allow both sides of this issue to be put out and to be detailed.

Why is that important? Well, the reason why it is important is, is the 12 now 13 years that I've been an elected official, there has been no challenge any greater than trying to address the issue of the retention and the redevelopment of our inner city neighborhoods. One of the facets of dealing with that is that, we have so many of our seniors who found themselves in homes that they sacrificed and bought, but because of income and physical condition have gotten to the point where they can no longer afford them or maintain them. And so they either continue to live in them in substandard conditions or they ultimately end up moving out into other areas of our City but ultimately they end up leaving the MLK neighborhood and they leave north Shreveport.

In my capacity as State Representative in that particular community and as a charge I accepted from the MLK Neighborhood Association and my constituents in general, I began to attempt to put in place a infrastructure that will begin to bring forth these types of efforts and these types of initiative. We have one here before you today.

If this Council were to pass and allow this zoning designation, it would be ready to move forward with additional significant input from this community.

Now, there have been people who have tried to describe this as if it is going to be another urban slum, another project that is going to have kids running around back and forth, going to have drug dealing going on and so on and what have you, that is not true.

This is a development that is intended to address the housing needs of low income senior citizens and to do so in an exclusive manner, and to do so in a supportive manner.

Each and every one of you should have a packet of information. You were copied on a letter that I sent to Councilman Lester. I attempted to try and provide some light on this particular matter. I asked that you all give me and those who would be in support of this project, an opportunity to be able to allow the community to have a full and fair hearing.

The people who are here today in opposition, they may have some legitimate points. We need to continue to dialogue. But I am also here to tell you that, in their efforts to try and defeat this proposal, they have presented skewed and slanted information to the community. And once the community has had an opportunity and has an opportunity to get correct and specific information, they decided on a different course of action that was manifested last night by the motion that they made asking our Council member to come before you all today and to request that this particular matter, be postponed.

As the advocate for it or one of the advocates for it, I even offered to give a specific time frame to that postponement and that is, this represents the first meeting in the month of January for the Shreveport City Council. I committed to Councilman Lester that this issue could be resolved in terms of public input, criticism, support, whatever the case may be, by the second meeting in February. That represents, members of the Shreveport City Council, a span of six weeks.

In my perception right now, that is a demand that appeared to be too much for my Council member. If you all agree with him today and vote this measure down, you will kill a project that is funded, that has funds to cover the infrastructure that is needed and necessary, and Mr. Hogan I know you had many talents, I didn't know you were an engineer—but I can assure you that your concerns can be adequately addressed and answered, and whatever ideas that you may have, would be given due consideration.

I am here to let you all also know that this particular development is at a minimum 2 football fields away from the residents on Michoud Street, 200 yards. In addition, its also separated by a natural gas easement, that in my perception is some, 50+ yards wide. There are woods in between and there is fencing that is called for, for this particular project.

In addition to the 40-units of housing, also funded in this mechanism as you will see details in the package before you is, funding for a community center on site that would provide supportive services for the senior citizens within the development and for the MLK neighborhood, in general.

Now, I take what I do very seriously just as you all do. I respect what you all do and hope that you would respect what I do. Included within that packet of information that you have, is a letter of support from the Martin Luther King Neighborhood Association, at that time known as the Martin Luther King Civic Club dated from when I began this initiative. It was a letter of support that I needed to include it in the package that I sent off to begin to pull together the resources to make this happen, asking that I move forward with this particular initiative.

Councilman Hogan: Pardon me, Mr. Glover. You've exceeded your nine minutes, and I would like to ask, do you need more time?

Representative Glover: I will take a minute to wrap up or would accept a motion from you for an additional 3 minutes. [Councilman Hogan moved to give 2 extra minutes, seconded by Councilman Walford (unanimously approved).]

Thank you Mr. Hogan. You see information in that packet that details not only the need and the desire for this particular initiative. You have a site plan that shows you how the development itself would plotted and laid out. You see the community center itself. You see the individual homes. You see the floor plans for each individual unit. And no, they are not 2,000 square feet. For an individual who is in their later years of life, does not need a 2,000 square foot home. They need the same type of housing that is provided at many of the assisted living facilities that populate Mr. Gibson's district and Mr. Hogan's district and so many of your other districts, that are not within my district.

Now, why Mr. Lester would want to come here before you today and kill this project without offering the opportunity for the neighborhood to be able to engage in a true, substantive debate and dialogue? I do not know. I hope you all would not allow him to succeed.

Councilman Gibson: Cedric, you referenced—but first of all let me be clear in my statements. I am very clear on the fact that I am supportive of neighborhoods, period and anything that comes in encroaching or reducing the integrity or diminishing the integrity of what that original neighborhood was put into place, I think as Council, whether it be in my district or out of my district is to work with my colleagues to protect that integrity. That, I am clear on and ran my campaign on that particular item because that is a big issue in District D.

My question to you Cedric, you have a letter enclosed in here: July 7, 1998 from the Martin Luther King Civic club, is that correct?

Representative Glover: Correct.

Councilman Gibson: In looking at the plans on this project, the best I can ascertain on this, these

plans were done in March 2002?

Representative Glover: Okay.

Councilman Gibson: The question I have is, the letter states that this group was supportive in working for this project (I lost my place here) but taking out of context, that they were anxious, we are anxious to further detail and support and illustrate how our organization will actively interact with this housing development if it is granted and I have to assume that when the letter was written in '98, that that statement was, when we see the details. And now the details are there and what did—did I hear you correct in saying that as of last night that this group has re-affirmed now that they know what the details in these specs and drawings?

Representative Glover: I don't want to speak for them except how they spoke on last night and that is, many members similar to you and other members before this Council, had a misconception exactly what it is that this project was and what it sought to do. Once they had an opportunity last night to hear from everybody practically whose in this room today, including myself, Councilman Lester, Commissioner McCullough, Mr. John Washington, and other folks who are in opposition, the membership on last night by an overwhelming vote requesting that this particular issue be postponed on the City Council agenda until the second meeting in February, to afford the community and the neighborhood association in its capacity as an organization seeking to offer leadership and direction to the community, to be able to participate in the dialogue that would put all of the information out before the community so that people would have the benefit, Councilman Gibson, of both sides, which you obviously did not before you made the comments that you did.

Councilman Gibson: My comments are still standing Cedric in fact that we, me personally, are going to do and support neighborhoods and the integrity of that neighborhood and that I didn't say, support up or down the specifics of this particular deal. My comments were geared specifically to anything that would disrupt the integrity of that neighborhood.

Representative Glover: And I would offer to you that, there are other voices within the neighborhood.

...

Councilman Gibson: I agree with you on that statement but I did not come out and say, support / not support. The fact is support anything that detracts away from the integrity of the neighborhood. I look at the facts presented on one side and when you are going from 1,500 or 1,400 square feet down to 7- or 800 square feet, then you've got an element in my mind based on my experience that you are infringing upon the integrity of the neighborhood, on that fact alone.

Now, you have other pieces of information that could present that, but I want to be clear with you that I agree that there are two sides to every coin. But on principle, integrity is most important because again, anybody—everybody in this room in on point. This City is dependent on strong neighborhoods. No ifs, ands, or buts about it. I think everybody on this Council ran a campaign and I am not speaking for my colleagues, but it is imperative, based on the feedback that I received from my constituents that, I got clear direction on, on where they stand. In talking with my colleagues I think they heard some of the similar things that it is imperative that we continue to support and work to the best of our ability to support the existing neighborhoods as we know it.

Councilman Jackson: A few questions. First of all much of the decision, much of the, let me say, the due diligence that I think has to go into these decisions must as I think you said, revolve around what is good for people, first. And I understand consistency in neighborhoods and those kind of things, but I also believe that everybody deserves to have an opportunity to own a home. Unfortunately, all of us didn't have that experience until adult hood. Those projects that people often condemn are the ones, I grew up in and so I recognize one of the paramount opportunities in life, is to be able to have that opportunity to own a home. I don't think that from a perspective of home ownership that this is clearly a case of home ownership.

I guess my question, as I listen today to ascertain what was the other side of the story. I might add, I don't know who the King Gardens people are. I just assuming you represent an interest in the development of the community in general, but the King Gardens Subdivision or whoever is doing the development, I've not heard anything from them to, let their voice be heard.

And so, I don't have any problem with moving forward on the side I've heard because everybody knew what the scenario was and what we were faced with even it was between, yesterday and today. I don't even know who the King Gardens people are and I called, the MPC will give you your record back a month and a half ago, I talked to, I want to say maybe the name was Julia something at the MPC and Charles

Kirkland called me back, because I requested information a month ago before I knew, you would even be supportive of this project because there were some people who didn't support it, who called me. And one of the first things I did, I think in due diligence is fine out who in the world are these King Gardens people and I wanted to know who the company was doing the developing. I couldn't get any information about that from the MPC.

Representative Glover: King Gardens is an initiative started by my Legislative Office. It has brought together a local non-profit community support programs along with developer, Calhoun Builders. Together, we have successful put forth an initiative that is funded though a combination of tax credits through the Louisiana Housing Finance Agency and through federal home dollars to put forth this initiative.

The intention is not to provide home buying opportunities, although that is available. The intention here is to have a pool of available supportive housing for senior citizens in similar fashion to what you would find in any assisted living center throughout this city. These units, as you will find, architecturally and in size, are consistent with what research has shown is appropriate for senior citizens.

So the motivation here is not to provide a transition of ownership, it is to insure that people who grow old within the Martin Luther King neighborhood and Shreveport who want to continue to be a part of that neighborhood when they need to move to the later phases of their life, have an option which keeps them within the neighborhood. Right now, there is no option that allows them to remain a part of the neighborhood.

Councilman Jackson: And that was a part of what I was trying to ascertain, some time back. Could never get the answer to, but also after having listened to the people who live there, obviously you know, that you have to respect the voices of the people who are, in my opinion, are at least more physically affected by having a current presence in that area now.

As I appreciate it, there were concerns relative to crime that nobody has addressed sufficiently. Obviously the people in opposition did, what they were suppose to do, in trying to paint a case that showed and very vividly, the number of calls, the number of criminal incidents in that area. Also, there was an issue of environment, an environmental issue that rose to the conversation when we talked, that came up in the conversation when I spoke with them. All of those things said to me that there was at least some issue.

And if we are going to be, I think that if we are going to be developing houses for seniors, that safety ought to be paramount. While we start talking about where they live and the fact that they need housing, affordable and quality are good buzz words as it relates to housing, but to me, safe is also something that is important as it relates to the environment and anything that is environmentally questionable, I think we have got to think twice about being able to do it.

I haven't heard anybody in this whole discussion who was against housing for seniors. Nobody. I heard people say that the route, and as you referred to other senior assisted living communities. And as you may well know, in other assisted living communities, there is an emphasis placed on aesthetics. There is an emphasis placed on community, often there are multiple family units or individual units, if you will, that more than one person stays in. They are very nice. It seems to me if I am not mistaken and again, I apologize if I've gotten mis-information, but from the looking at the dimensions and from listening to—let me ask you this, is this correct—about 750 square feet or so? Is that correct?

Representative Glover: Yes.

Councilman Jackson: From listening to. . .

Mr. Glover: (already speaking): No, it would be the third to the last page.

Councilman Jackson: Am I looking at the right thing, this is the outside and then the floor plan is the page right before that, is that correct?

Representative Glover: You should have one at the bottom like this with 2-bedroom unit at the bottom.

Councilman Jackson: Yeah, two bedroom, 760 sq ft. It just seems to me in looking at this page, that shows you kinda what it looks like, that while we compare it to assisted living places, its obvious we've gone the cheap route on this one right here.

Representative Glover: That's not true Mr. Jackson.

Councilman Jackson: I'm saying . . .

Representative Glover: If you would afford this process the time, your point could be dis-proven. But now, if you want to rush ahead, then you can go ahead and end this particular potential opportunity right here today. If you're not afraid of the truth, then lets allow what was requested last night to actually take place. An additional process, any additional six weeks and allow myself and anyone else who is either in support or

opposition the opportunity to be able to engage in a dialogue that lays out the facts and we deal in 'what is' not . . .

Councilman Jackson: Representative Glover, let me ask you two questions. Is it correct that its 760 sq ft?

Representative Glover: Yes.

Councilman Jackson: Do you know what the average size is as it relates to assisted living in these developments for seniors, notwithstanding income or anything like that, what the average size is?

Representative Glover: Most of them are anywhere from 600 (depends on whether or not they are efficiency), none of these are efficiency units. You have efficiency units within some of the finest assisted living facilities in this City. None of these efficiencies. These are all designed to have the appearance, the look, the feel of being someone's home. So, you have efficiencies that are as small as 500 sq ft. You have larger units that go sometimes into the thousand to eleven hundred sq ft range. If you go to the Waterfords or any other places that you would look throughout this city that offer similar types of housing for individuals whose income are obviously not the targeted population for this particular community, you would find the same types of dimension, the same types of architectural design. That is done in that particular manner because when you are a senior and you are afflicted with old age and all that goes with that, arthritis and what have you, the idea of walking 50 feet to go from your kitchen to your living area to your bedroom is nothing that you are desirous of doing. What you want is an opportunity to have a compact living space, but something that is quality and something that is safe and something that is affordable.

And all of the issues that you have raised from environmental to safety and what have you, I offer to you (inaudible). Any environmental concerns that would be faced by this particular development would also be applicable to the folks who currently live on Michoud.

In terms of safety, there will be on sight residential management and safety and security. And during the working hours, an actual staff there operating out of the Community Center seeking to provide and engage in the types of activities that will improve the quality of life for these individuals as well as anybody else who would be interested throughout the MLK or the North Shreveport community.

Councilman Jackson: So, based on what you're saying, is this development an integrated development, meaning integrated as it relates to income or is this a low income senior development?

Representative Glover: This is for people who can't afford to go to the Waterford.

Councilman Jackson: Well, that's a large group of people, but there is a big piece in the middle that would be middle income.

Representative Glover: This is for low-income as it would be described in the classic use of that term, this would be for low income senior citizens.

Councilman Jackson: And I guess my concern is that if it's obvious that its low income, and if as you've said, any environmental issues that would affect them would affect the people on Michoud and I'm assuming you said that because of the proximity and the closeness, then the fact that it's 200 yards away, you can still appreciate their problem with it, because that proximity which affords them the equal safety is the same proximity which caused them a problem with inconsistency in the building of the two different kinds of development all in one area.

Representative Glover: Then, lets call the folks from Kansas City Southern, lets get the people from Department of Environmental Quality, EPA, whomever else may be a part of the dialogue and lets see whether or not there is an actual. . .

Councilman Jackson: Well, let me ask you this. If we are going to do that, does that then intonate that we haven't done that already?

Representative Glover: If you pose to do what now?

Councilman Jackson: If you're saying, what your plea is today, is to lets postpone this and if we have environmental questions, lets call Kansas City Southern, the EPA, DEQ or whomever to see if there are some problems, that intonates to me that, there hadn't been due diligence done already to say . . .

Representative Glover: Due diligence has been done. This project would not be ready to be funded if due diligence had not been done. Louisiana Housing and Finance Agency would not be in a position to allow this project to move forward if there were those types of concerns.

Councilman Jackson: Well, I must have mis. . .

Representative Glover: What was necessary to be able to pass muster in these particular situations is a whole volume of information that you end up having to compile from all different types of sources concerning

the environment, the land itself and the surrounding neighborhood, the needs and those types of things. That information in order to put this project in this particular posture has been done, Councilman.

Councilman Jackson: Well, I must have misinterpreted you. I thought you said 'lets call Kansas City Southern'.

Representative Glover: But now in the interest of being able to get all of these issues addressed, I'm willing to call anybody into the room that needs to be called into the room as well as all of the senior citizens and all of the other residents of the Martin Luther King Drive area, anybody else along Michoud, anybody else in Pine Hill Estates, the folks from Easy Living and anywhere else within the MLK neighborhood that would have an interest in trying to see that this project had the opportunity to get a fair hearing and that's all I'm asking.

Councilman Jackson: Well, let me ask my final question.

Representative Glover: There was a request earlier to postpone a measure that involved the park on MLK Drive. Council Member Lester stated last night that, that request was because he did not get, have everything necessary to make a decision and it's not a big problem to make a postponement. Unless there is a fear of the truth manifesting itself in this process, what are we afraid of?

Councilman Jackson: Well, I don't know that, that's the case because that would imply that we're all in cahoots and I'd have to take the contrary on that stance.

But I guess my concern again is that I just don't . . . when you've looked at the land, is that the only spot of land that you all could find on Martin Luther King?

Representative Glover: This particular effort represents hopefully what will be the first of many. Hopefully, what will be the first of not only involves providing additional alternatives for senior citizens but also providing opportunities for young families to come back and re-populate that community. We moved forward with one of the initiatives to bring in new families. There are some other homebuilding initiatives that are coming. Those are all things that are necessary, in my opinion, to insure that people continue to live in neighborhoods like MLK, like Allendale, like Mooretown, like Queensborough. If we do not create scenarios that allow our seniors to be able transition into good safe supportive affordable housing and at the same time create a mechanism that draws and encourages an infusion of young families, then at some point somebody is going to have to turn off the light when the last person leaves Allendale.

Councilman Jackson: Let me ask you again. If you're talking about multiple developments and obviously, having a synergy, I don't know if you've identified another contiguous piece of land where you would move to a second phase to develop for younger families or what have you, but I'm assuming that just means in the Martin Luther King area in general.

Representative Glover: No, it means throughout the entirety of House District 4 and any place else that I can manage to work with.

Councilman Jackson: Right, but I'm talking about in proximity to this particular development. And the reason I'm asking that is because I want to know if there is an inflexibility on the part of the King Gardens Apartments Partnership to be able to say, we've heard from these people, maybe there is an area where this many people will not come and where these people will not have a problem. Maybe there is a place somewhere else in all of that land that's in North Shreveport, in House District 4 that there are other places that would a) satisfy what you need. Which is to (I would assume) not an infatuation with that piece of land, but the fact that you could find some, build and develop homes for seniors regardless of where it is. And then secondly, that you would at least be flexible enough so that the people who are homeowners in that particular area would know that housing development is important, but also you respect and appreciate their concerns about where they currently live.

I haven't heard any of them say they are against housing or quality affordable housing for seniors, I just heard them say, I don't want it in my backyard. And so, that being the case, I wonder if the flexibility exist that will allow you or the King Gardens Apartment Partnership people rather than to go down in defeat in attempting to stay in that spot to go and to find another place that would still provide the same level of quality, the same level of service to seniors, and more importantly the same amount of stock that these seniors could continue to look to have affordable housing in the same area—I don't know how far away, but in the same area and then everybody could be happy because you wouldn't have this large group of people who are dissatisfied with that development idea.

Representative Glover: In answer to that question, I would go back to the statement that was made by Councilmember Gibson where he asked about the date of the letter of support that came from the Martin King

Neighborhood Association, the fact that it was dated July of 1998 and the fact that the Association and since that time has even had a name change. It's no longer the Civic Club, its now the Neighborhood Association. These types of efforts and initiatives take a very, very long time. You end up being turned down, you end up being put in a reserve pool, you end up being wiped off the slate. It now finally has been successful in its efforts to be funded. To take the action that's being proposed by Councilmember Lester today would kill this proposal and it would not be on the table and it would go away and it would have to start all over again, and I probably would not be or anybody else not be here before you for another four or five years actually dealing with the realistic possibility of being able to go out and put a shovel into the ground and turn it over. So to kill the proposal today and to suggest we go out and find an alternative location, simply kills the project.

Councilman Jackson: Right, well here's my dilemma and my also my final comment.

Representative Glover: Can I say this before you say anything else? And also let nobody misunderstand. There is no one in this Council or on this Council or in this room, that's any more concerned about the needs and desires and the wants of homeowners. For most of you all, my term as an elected official, exceeds yours and so I have represented this community and communities throughout this City since 1990. I don't think I would have been allowed to stay here as long as I have if I had a reckless disregard for the concerns of the homeowners within my particular district. So, I do not do this recklessly and with careless disregard for their issues and their interest. And I'm looking forward to engaging them as I have many of them already in a substantive dialogue, in a fair dialogue. But the intent is, is to simply demonize this project and spread mis- and dis-information and convince you all to sentence the residents (the seniors) of MLK and North Shreveport and anybody else in this area who would want to come and live in this facility, should have to deal with another winter of substandard housing and another summer of substandard housing; I don't think its fair gentlemen.

Councilman Jackson: I understand Representative Glover. But also note, that, how long would it take to build this project?

Representative Glover: I think it's projected to be six to nine months.

Councilman Jackson: Started when? When would it be able to get started?

Representative Glover: I believe that with you all's approval, when we would come back a year from today, we will have completed the project and individuals will be living there and programming would be going on. But one thing that will take place, one of the things that will take place upon and you will see that within the letter that I've sent to you, once this particular process is either dealt with and if we are allowed to move forward, then one of the things that still has to happen is several things and that is the architects, the individuals who have drawn this preliminary work have to sit down with these folks, with senior citizens from within the community and any other interested party and receive their feedback and input and direction with regard to other issues with this development: do you want to have security system, do you want to have an intercom system, do you have this portion that's already called to be brick, do you want a high percentage of brick, do you want that brick to run horizontal? What would it costs to make 100% of it brick? All of those things are on the table and its that way, because I would not come forward with a project to offer to you all, to my community, that I could not stand on and be proud of. The people in Martin Luther King Neighborhood Association would not have support me in my efforts to do so if they thought I would do anything different than that.

Councilman Jackson: Do you know how many people in MLK area signed the petition that was in opposition to what you're. . . ?

Representative Glover: I haven't seen the petition. As I understand it from what I've heard here today and heard previously is about 200 names. I know, I think in the last two Sundays, there was a petition circulating throughout the churches. I have heard personally from many people, in fact many who are members of the Neighborhood Association last night who said I signed it. Now based upon the discussion that took place last night, I'm asking that my name comes off it. And I wish that somebody would offer an alternative for another petition to be circulated that would allow us to be able to have an opportunity to be able to counteract it.

Councilman Jackson: Right. Well, as you know, that is not my district per se, but its my friends who live not only in that area that's in dispute, but in other places on the MLK and while we certainly think about the seniors and not just seniors, but there are going to be a lot of kids who go to bed and not have a roof that's adequate and not have windows and everything else that's adequate and so, while I believe that we ought to do that for our seniors and it ought to be something that we do, I just wonder if we've taken all of the right

steps and done the proper due diligence. Obviously, we didn't consider everything or we wouldn't have a neighborhood of people here in our opposition to it. My concern is that it may in fact be three years or five years before somebody can come back with a better plan. But my problem is that we would vote today to accept this. I wonder how many years it will be before the people behind you would ever be satisfied.

Representative Glover: I'm not asking you today to vote to accept it. I'm just asking you today to vote not to kill it, that's my request. I'm not here today asking based upon an opposition that has been presented by these folks who I represent the same as Mr. Lester. I'm not here today asking for you to endorse this particular project. What I am asking you to do here today is afford me and the people within this community who find merit in this project, the opportunity to present as I said to you in the beginning the other side.

One thing that I want to add that I think Council member Jackson should be of particular interest to you, one of the particular advantages offered by this location for this development is that not only is it well situated, its also within walking distance to the Willis Knighton Medical Clinic at the corner of Shreveport-Blanchard Highway and MLK Drive and for those seniors that hopefully will seek to engage educational opportunities is within walking distance to your employer, Southern University Shreveport, and so, there are numerous reasons as to why this represents. . . .

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Glover of course you certainly know that Southern University Shreveport wouldn't want to put itself in a position to be liable to have seniors walking across that busy street that we'd bring our classes over there.

Representative Glover: Well, we would welcome you having your class to walk over there, but I do want you to know that the City of Shreveport and the State of Louisiana has the ability to be able to regulate traffic across every other major thoroughfare in Northwest Louisiana and throughout the rest of the State of Louisiana and other cities have managed to traverse much busier traffic arteries than Shreveport-Blanchard highway, so, if not, then we'll compromise and we'll have one week of class at your place and bring 'em in bus over to mine.

Councilman Gibson: Representative Glover, you've presented the information, whose the architect of record on this project?

Representative Glover: I believe its at the bottom. Its Gaudet and . . . I can't remember the other name.

Councilman Gibson: I saw the Gaude. Where are they based out of?

Representative Glover: I have always spoken to 'em here in Shreveport, so I'm not sure.

Councilman Gibson: Okay, I'm not familiar that they have a firm here in Shreveport. Is this going to be publicly bid?

Representative Glover: Is it going to be publicly bid? I tend to hope not. You know why? Because there are several outstanding construction companies that are owned by individuals who grew up in the MLK area. And if I had my druthers, I'd like to be able to see those individuals have the opportunity to be able to come in and construct these particular developments.

Councilman Gibson: I don't dispute that. I just was asking for clarity. Is this , this has got some public money in it or . . . ?

Representative Glover: It involves tax credits and it involves home dollars; so, there may be some implications in terms of public bid and there may be some implications in terms of I'm not. . . at this point, that's a question, I could not give you a complete and accurate answer to. But I do stick to my hope, and that is I hope its something that can end up being directed . . .

Councilman Gibson: We're all consistent with that, keeping dollars here in the local economy.

Chairman Green: One point I'd like to make is this. Of course, we've spent a lot of time on this particular issue and so I wish again today that somebody would call or e-mail Lou Burnett so that he won't call me heavy hammered again. This is my request as Chair, the pledges that I've made to the folk that live in the district, my pledge will remain the same. The pledge that I've made to Councilman Lester, my pledge will remain the same. Six weeks, two weeks will not change the pledge that I have already made.

But my request would be as to 1) respect for the representative. If I were in your place, I would ask that, that you respect the position as to giving him an opportunity to fulfill his request as to postponing. If it was a matter of life and death, then I could understand it. My vote will remain the same. But I just believe in being fair and it wouldn't be breaking the rules, it wouldn't breaking the law to give two weeks.

And again, I'd like to say to those that I've pledged as to how I would vote, my reason that I pledged the way that I would vote is, because I only had one side of the story; that's my fault. You'll still have my same vote, you will still have my same pledge. But I just think in being fair that, two weeks would not kill us and we should basically just honor that request as a precedent has already been set with the Council on many occasions, I've asked to asking for postponement. And with that, I will relieve you and the Councilman from that district will have comment but I will not put you under the gun again to ask any more questions. I would just ask that, that request from the Chair would be honored that two weeks would come and then we would have an opportunity to let everybody talk and I think that's what America is all about. The freedom to speak.

My vote will remain the same. My pledge will remain the same. Wouldn't want anybody to call me to tell me that we should have voted on today. This is just our right as Americans; so, thank you for coming, you are relieved now.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Chairman, I just want to respond and ask a couple of questions of Representative Glover if I might. Representative Glover, it is my understanding, you made reference to this letter of July 1998. At the time that you, that letter was written, isn't it a fact that you did not have this particular site, that was not presented to the MLK Association?

Representative Glover: There were three sites that were in consideration at that time.

Councilman Lester: And as I appreciate it reading the letter, this letter does not reference anyone of those particular sites; is that correct?

Representative Glover: No, to my recollection, it does not.

Councilman Lester: Isn't it also a fact Representative Glover that, this issue has been hotly discussed in the MLK Neighborhood since about October of last year when it originally went before the Metropolitan Planning Commission?

Representative Glover: My perception of the level of opposition to this issue became apparent at December Meeting of the Martin Luther King Neighborhood Association. Mr. Washington, Ms. Rogers and others were in attendance.

Councilman Lester: Well, lets go back to December meeting. Isn't it a fact that at that December meeting, there were some representatives from and folks that were associated with this particular development that spoke?

Representative Glover: Mr. Bob Tallent was in attendance at that meeting. Mr. Bob Tallent is a staff member of Community Support Programs. He is the individual from that non-profit exempt social service agency that has the responsibility for the development of housing for these types of population.

Councilman Lester: And that was, as I appreciate it the MLK Association meets the 1st Monday of the month?

Representative Glover: Second Monday of the month.

Councilman Lester: So, that was the second Monday in December?

Representative Glover: Correct.

Councilman Lester: And this matter had actually been before the MPC in September and in the December meeting it was again discussed by the residents in the MLK neighborhood.

Representative Glover: I'm sorry, I don't understand.

Councilman Lester: In the December meeting it was discussed?

Representative Glover: Yes.

Councilman Lester: Okay, so for us to say, that there has not been time to discuss this, that would be inaccurate wouldn't it?

Representative Glover: No, it would not, because the information that was shared at the December meeting was information that was not direct and accurate and truly reflective of the intentions of this project. I think the information that was shared last night is information that is more reflective of the actual truth of this project.

Councilman Lester: Well, let me ask you this. Isn't it a fact that at that December meeting cause I do remember being there, that the gentleman that was associated with this project and there was an opportunity for him to ask questions and he was questioned by several members of the organization, isn't that a fact?

Representative Glover: He was there at my request. Yes.

Councilman Lester: And that was some colloque between the residents of the MLK Association and in fact that gentleman?

Representative Glover: I'm assuming that *collogue* is one of those legal terms that lawyers use, but if you mean questions asked back and forth, then yes.

Councilman Lester: Well, I know you have a reasonably well vocabulary and your powers of persuasion as well as your powers of . . .

Representative Glover: (inaudible) so all of my constituents can understand.

Councilman Lester: I wouldn't insult the intelligence of the folks in the MLK Association to say they couldn't understand a word of *collogue*. Nevertheless, now, you say that voting and I'm concerned that your characterization of me voting to kill this project, that disturbs me somewhat. Isn't it a fact that if this Council votes to overturn the MPC's decision, all that means is that you or anyone else associated with this project would just be forestalled with the coming back for another six months?

Representative Glover: This particular project won a competitive process for these tax credits and for these home dollars. There are other developments that were offered by other entities in other parts of this State and in some instances other parts of this country that would like to receive the funding opportunity that this project has received. If this project is not able to move forward, in a time frame that is within what we're talking about here right now, we will lose these dollars. If we follow what you suggested last night, and that is, if its voted down, somebody could come back and bring it back up for reconsideration. If that were to happen, the project would be dead.

Councilman Lester: But you would not be forestalled from picking another location?

Representative Glover: I'm sorry?

Councilman Lester: You or anyone else would not be forestalled from picking another location?

Representative Glover: This project would be dead. The process would have to start over. Another whole package would have to be re-developed and then re-submitted and re-competed for. This is a very competitive process when you're talking about HUD 202 Program, HUD 811, Tax Credits and what have you. Your family has obvious experience in this particular area so you probably have some knowledge of what I'm talking about.

Councilman Lester: Right. Well, lets leave my family out of it for now.

Representative Glover: Well, I'm referencing the fact that you have knowledge of the real estate area. You have knowledge of how these types of projects operate and develop. You have knowledge of how these types of projects operate and what their target audience is.

Councilman Lester: Right and for the record, I do have knowledge that at the point that this process began, certainly you did not have this property into play. I think the grant of the government was awarded on the merits of the project itself, not the location, the actual physical location of the drawings.

Representative Glover: It was awarded based upon the totality of what was submitted. What you see before you today in terms of the site plan, in terms of the drawing, in terms of the floor plan are all a part of the. . . .

Councilman Lester: This site plan in this information that we have here is dated 2001 and the letter of support was in 1998.

Representative Glover: Because you've had previous developments and previous offerings that have been turned down.

Councilman Lester: Right and this is all part of a continuum, the point that I'm trying to make, as I appreciate is that, this project has merit. And let me please be clear, I'm not a killer despite any comment to the contrary. I believe in the fact that a senior citizens assisted living home should be in the MLK area. And I think if you ask most of the people that are in the Association, most of the people in the neighborhood agree that, there should be this type of development.

As I appreciate it, the comments is, they just don't want it where you have proposed. And for us to say, well, if we vote now, to vote to kill it' I think that's a specious argument. I think in fact if we vote to do this, what we're doing, we're telling the people that live on Michoud, we're telling the people in that neighborhood is, you know what, we don't care about you. We don't care about our feelings are, we don't care about the investment that you made in the neighborhood, we don't think about the 30 years of equity that most of you have in your homes as well as well as the blood, sweat and tears, that they put and made a decision that this is where they were going to build their property. Now, if that's what you want to say Representative Glover, then that's your choice, but as far as I'm concerned, I'm going down with the residents of that neighborhood and I'm going to ask this Council to move forward and at this time, I'm going to move that we vote to overturn the MPC decision and will make that in the form of a motion at this time.

Chairman Green: We're not there yet. We just suspended the rules to give everybody an opportunity to talk.

Councilman Gibson: One question to follow up. What is the total value of this development?

Representative Glover: Somewhere in the \$2+ million dollar range. I'd have to call back on staff to be able to give you the specifics of that.

Councilman Gibson: Is that what's been approved for funding?

Representative Glover: To my understanding, yes.

Councilman Gibson: That being a yes?

Representative Glover: That to my understanding that \$2+million dollar figure. But I would prefer to go and actually get that specific number rather than give you an absolute in that regard.

Councilman Gibson: And just one caveat to that, I appreciate because that \$2million, if we are successful and I know Representative Glover, you have been very persuasive since I have returned back to this State in a lot of things, but that's a potentially an \$8million economic impact to the community. But I will piggyback off Councilman Lester's comments and go back to what I said earlier about protecting the integrity of the neighborhood, that if we infringe or tear down the integrity of the neighborhood of the residents that bought their residents there and frustrate them to the point that they feel and obviously their perceptions are based on their perceptions, and they move out of the community, they take their tax base with them. So that's just so you understand my philosophy and again, neighborhoods are critical to this community. And based on the merits of each individual project, based on the perceptions of the neighborhood residents, that if they perceive that a project is coming in that's going to detract away--- whether it be property value, or that they just don't feel like that's why they moved into a particular neighborhood, they're going to be seeking somewhere else to go which then works against that economic impact of which this project would bring into account. With that said, again, again there's two sides to every coin, but I just want you to understand where I'm coming from in the neighborhood issue but I appreciate the information on the \$2million value.

Representative Glover: Mr. Gibson, the folks who are here today are wonderful representatives of the Martin Luther King Neighborhood. There are other voices within that neighborhood. You've not had a chance yet to hear those voices. Some of those voices were present last night. They heard what was offered by Mr. Lester. They saw the information presented to them. In light of that, they came up with a different decision. The Martin Luther King Neighborhood Association last night and if I'm not speaking the truth Mr. Lester, I would ask that you correct me. But the MLK Neighborhood Association last night, requested by vote of that organization that this matter be postponed by this City Council. They asked that you as their Council Representative make that motion for that postponement. They did not ask for this project to be approved. They did ask for the opportunity before it goes away for this opportunity to be presented in full and complete detail, not just to a few members of the community, but all of those who may be interested. And if you all are not willing to afford the seniors who would benefit from this particular project, that opportunity. Mr. Lester, you are killers.

Councilman Hogan: I need to ask Mr. Glover a couple of questions. I first of all, you have to excuse me, I had to step to the back for a moment a while ago and I came out when you were speaking and you referred to me as an engineer. I've been called a lot of things before, but I've never been called an engineer, but I'm not sure what you meant, but anyway. . .

Representative Glover: Could I explain?

Councilman Hogan: Yes sir.

Representative Glover: Well, you offered comments about the proposed property not being suitable for this type of development and my point to you is that before this project could get to a point of being funded, all of those types of engineering and design issues are a part of the due diligence. You don't have a project ready to receive funding without knowing that you are not intending to build in a flood zone. And I assumed that for you to be able to offer the type of expert input that you did, that, that meant that you must have been an engineer.

Councilman Hogan: Well, Mr. Glover, I don't like to brag on myself, I've been in the rental business for 18 years and I've owned four successful apartment complexes on my own with no partnerships. And so I feel like I do have some degree of ability to speak to that issue okay, but that's neither here nor there.

Representative Glover: But what I prefer to do is to allow us to answer the questions that you have,

lets get an actual answer to that and not one that comes from me because I'm not an engineer. And if you're not, lets get one from somebody who is actually is. But if you're going to kill a project based upon information that at this point is unknown, then that's not fair Mr. Hogan.

Councilman Hogan: Okay, I hear what you're saying, I appreciate that. Again, you are here to represent the people of the MLK Association, is that right?

Representative Glover: I am here as State Representative for District 4. One of the charges that I have accepted in my capacity as an elected official is to address any and all development issues facing my community. One of the issues that appeared before me as a member of this Council and now as a member of the Legislature, is that there are literally thousands of senior citizens throughout this City, but a large portion of them concentrated within my district who live in substandard and inadequate housing. There are people that when they lie on their backs, they see the stars; when they roll over on their bellies, they see the ground below. The gas that they use to heat their homes in most instances escapes out the eaves and the overhangs and cracks in the doors before it has an opportunity to do much heating. Many of them have no heat whatsoever. There are individuals right now that I could take you to whose homes are heated by wooden stoves. In recognition of that Mr. Hogan, I have endeavored to bring together entities that would make it possible to develop these types of developments within any of the communities within my legislative district and any other community that might be interested in addressing their problem for their senior citizens in a similar fashion.

Councilman Hogan: Well, Mr. Glover, the issue is not you're trying to convince me of the need for this. I appreciate what you're saying and your concern. I'm already convinced of the need.

Representative Glover: Then what's your hurry to kill this project?

Councilman Hogan: Well, I'm in no hurry to do anything.

Representative Glover: Then would you afford me the request that was made by the Martin Luther King Neighborhood Association?

Councilman Hogan: I don't have a problem with postponing the vote, but I have a couple of more questions for you.

Representative Glover: Certainly.

Councilman Hogan: You mentioned that in the meeting last night, your people could not come today to speak on this?

Representative Glover: I'm sorry?

Councilman Hogan: Why are the people you spoke of at the meeting last night not here today to speak?

Representative Glover: Because I did not seek to organize, see that's part of what's happened at this point. There has been and I applaud the people who live on Michoud Street have organized because they have concerns. And that's the way democracy works. And they have presented those concerns and they are being heard and they need to be heard even more. But now in addition to being heard, they also engaged in an effort to convince the rest of the community and the rest of the neighborhood that what was proposed was a bad idea, so they went and they put together a petition and what have you. Many times when somebody when ends up signing up a petition at church which is where most of these petitions were signed, in fact, the folks at the Neighborhood Association disavowed after the meeting last night, the status of the petition based upon the motion that was made by the Neighborhood Association itself.

So, what has not happened is that I nor anyone else who may be in support of this project, we've not gone out and asked for people to sign a petition in support. I have not gone out and rustled up the little old ladies and the elderly gentlemen who right now live in substantially substandard housing all throughout my district and the City of Shreveport. How do I know that they live in those conditions? Because not only do I live amongst them, but also in my capacity as a State Representative, I have sponsored initiatives within my legislative district to repair the homes of senior citizens. To go out and try and assist people who have problems with the quality of their housing to make it better. We've gone and we've replaced foot steps and front porches only to find out that once you step inside the front door, that anybody over 150 lbs, your foot goes right through the floor or to find out that the ceiling is falling in within the kitchen or to go in an repair the plumbing within the bathroom only to discover that the rest of the plumbing from the house out to the City's main line is completely rusted away and has to be condemned. We've replaced heating fixtures only to find out that the gas lines have to be condemned.

So, I've seen firsthand the needs of people. I've seen people who want and need an air conditioner

and has gone out and purchased that air conditioner for \$150 to come back and find out that in order to run the air conditioner, we need an additional \$800 to do electrical work so that the air conditioner can run. So rather than engage in just trying to help those people who are trying to stay in their homes, we began to go about trying to figure out ways to develop new housing. Because we need to do multiple things all at the same time.

We need to continue to help those folks who want to stay in their homes and have minor to moderate repairs and make those. We need to find a way to bring young families into the community. And at the same time, when a person gets to a point to where they have to move out of their homes because they can't afford it or because its' falling down, they should not have to leave their community, their support network, the place where their church is and where their friends are.

Councilman Hogan: You are preaching to the choir though. I am agreeing with you on everything you're saying, okay.

Representative Glover: Then give us the six weeks to be able to allow all of this particular process to be able to go forward. I suggested the second meeting in the month of February and I don't know what the exact date of that is. I'm not asking for approval here. I wouldn't ask you guys based upon what you're hearing from these citizens today to approve this project. But I'm not afraid of engaging in an open honest dialogue with these people and anybody else about the merits of this project.

And anybody who wants to ask you all to vote to kill it today, obviously is. Because there's nothing magical that you're going to accomplish. If you don't kill this today, you're not creating a window of opportunity for it to go out and happen anyway. If you don't act right now, then its going to be rampant and uncontrolled and it'll happen despite the action of the City Council, that's not the case.

Councilman Hogan: Okay, my question is would two weeks be enough. You said six weeks just a second ago.

Representative Glover: And I'm asking for that for at least six weeks for an opportunity to be able to hold at least one public meeting, possibly two to three. Because there would be probably an opportunity at the first meeting where there would be some questions that would be asked that would require some answers that may need to come out later on. And so rather than try and squeeze it all in between having been a member of Council, I know how quickly you go from one second Tuesday to a fourth Tuesday, back to a second Tuesday again. And obviously in looking to try and get meeting dates within the community, at some point, you can use Tuesday nights and Monday nights possibly if they don't conflict with Council meetings cause I would want to have the opportunity for Council Member Lester and each and everyone of you all to be there.

So, to kill this project today only does one thing. It kills it. To postpone this project today, does not give it license to proceed, it does not give it any kind of advantage, it does not give the Council a diminished position, it only affords the people of the Martin Luther King Neighborhood Association the very folks whose name appears on the top of your petition, many of who feel themselves to be duked right now, the opportunity to be able to have a full and complete airing of this issue.

Councilman Hogan: Who owns the land right now Mr. Glover?

Representative Glover: I don't know who the current owner is.

Councilman Hogan: One final comment I'm going to make and I'll be finished. About two months ago, there were some articles in the paper and one of the biggest apartment owners here in this part of the country is Reimer Calhoun of whom you spoke of. And I don't know Mr. Calhoun, I haven't met him, I can't say that I know him. However, as the paper stated, four of the men that worked for him who had formed separate companies have now pleaded guilty to fraud by inflating the cost of the apartments that were being built. And Mr. Calhoun allegedly has skimmed the money off the top and they accused him of having the money in gold coins being held in an account here in Shreveport; so, it may not even matter whether we kill the issue or not.

Representative: Can I answer that question?

Councilman Hogan: I am not finished, just a second. And so, they have not indicted Mr. Calhoun from my sources, people I know who know him, they expect that to be coming any time soon. I assume you were aware of that?

Representative Glover: By all means.

Councilman Hogan: So, it appears from the surface that this might even be a non-issue here.

Representative Glover: You know why its not a non-issue? Because Mr. Calhoun's role in this

particular relationship is expendable. And if he becomes nonviable then, he will be excised and replaced.

Councilman Hogan: Okay.

Councilman Green: At this particular time, I will have one more comment which will come from Mr. Monty Walford and then we will move to the next item. Thank you Mr. Glover.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Glover, before you sit down, I'm going to echo the comments that the Chair made. I've pledged my support to Mr. Lester. At this point, I perhaps didn't have all the information I'd like to. I'm going to encourage Mr. Lester to go with at least a two week postponement as a courtesy to you. Whether things would happen that would change his mind to release us from that pledge or not, I don't know, but I would encourage him to give you the extra time.

Councilman Green: Thank you Mr. Glover for coming. Have a great day.

Representative Glover: Thank you Mr. Walford. I would hope that the sentiment that has been expressed by members of the Council might have some impact and that the folks within the community maybe offered an opportunity to air this issue.

Councilman Green: Madam Clerk, where are we?

Ms. Lee: We are entertaining speakers on the project, if you have anymore slips.

Councilman Green: Yes. We're going to move from those and we are going to move to the next item.

Councilman Lester: I have a question.

Councilman Green: We are going to move to the. . . .

Councilman Lester: Are there any more speaker?

Councilman Green: Mr. Lester, we are going to move to the next item.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Chairman, I don't think that we. . .

Councilman Green: We are going to move to the next item.

Councilman Lester: I understand that Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Green: We are going to move to the next item.

Councilman Lester: I understand Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Green: We will come to those at Public Comments.

Councilman Lester: That is where we are at this particular time.

Councilman Green: We are nto at Public Comment, sir.

Councilman Lester: As I appreciate it Sir, we had suspended the Rules for the purpose of allowing those people. . . .

Councilman Green: We will come to those sir at Public Comments, we are not there yet.

Councilman Lester: As I appreciate it.

Councilman Green: Mr. Lester, can you please honor the Chair.

Councilman Lester: Can you answer the question.

Councilman Green: I know what you are doing.

Councilman Lester: No, no, no, no.

Councilman Green: And all of that is wonderful, but would you honor the Chair?

Councilman Lester: The question I am asking, Mr. Chairman, whether or not we had any slips that are still available.

Councilman Green: Mr. Lester, listen at this. Listen at this again.

Councilman Lester: I am listening to you.

Councilman Green: When we come to Public Comments, everybody with a slip will speak not at this time, can you read your lips.

Councilman Jackson: Point of order.

Councilman Green: We will move to the next item, Madame Clerk.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, point of order.

Councilman Green: Madame Clerk, Where are we?

Ms. Lee: We suspended the rules to entertain the Public Comment on that particular. . .

Chairman Green: So, at this particular time, we have done that. So now, we're going to move to the next item.

Councilman Lester: Hold on. Mr. Chairman if we have suspended the rules,

Chairman Green: And the rules are un-suspended by the Chair sir.

Councilman Lester: I don't think you can un-suspend the rules Mr. Chairman.

Chairman Green: I just did.

Councilman Lester: I think there has to be a motion.

Chairman Green: Mr. Lester, I just did.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Thompson, let me. . .I'm trying to get a ruling here. Can the Chairman itself go back into the regular session without having a motion to go back into regular session? As I appreciate the parliamentary . . .

Chairman Green: We did not go out of regular session sir.

Councilman Lester: As I appreciate it, we suspended the rules for the purpose of having this discussion. Is that correct Mr. Thompson?

Mr. Thompson: That's correct. If there is a point of order and there is a disagreement with the ruling of the Chair, one can call for a vote of the entire council.

Councilman Lester: And a vote of the entire council as to what?

Mr. Thompson: As to for instance in this case, whether or not the rules are still suspended and persons who wish to speak on this matter can speak.

Councilman Lester: Well, okay, I will call for that vote..

Chairman Green: And at this time Mr. Thompson, would you also state the rule. What is the rule as to how many times each speaker can speak on a particular (each Council Member) can speak on a particular item?

Mr. Thompson: It's two times.

Chairman Green: Two times. How many have we exceeded that?

Mr. Thompson: I think that most of the members have exceeded that.

Chairman Green: How many times about?

Mr. Thompson: I did not keep count.

Mr. Carmody: I believe Mr. Chairman, I have not taken an opportunity to speak, but I did have a question for you.

Chairman Green: Okay.

Mr. Carmody: In that we suspended the rules to receive public input on this particular matter, is the Chair holding any other requests to speak on this particular matter?

Chairman Green: Yes the Chair is and the Chair said to my fellow Council Member that we will take up the rest of those once we come to Public Comment.

Councilman Carmody: But may I point out that when we get to Public Comment, we will have already passed this vote.

Councilman Jackson: Absolutely.

Councilman Carmody: The matter will have already been considered by this body. So, its imperative that we allow the persons to speak so that we can receive that information prior to our decision unless we postpone.

Councilman Green:: Mr. Lester has called for Point of Order. At this time, everybody in favor of moving on to the next item we .ask for you. . . is that the way we do it Mr. Thompson?

Mr. Thompson: That is a good motion if you'd like to.

Councilman Green:: The motion is if we would like to move to the next item on the agenda, and then we will pick up the rest of the comments at the Public Comments vote yes, those not, vote no.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, I think as I was speaking earlier, I think Councilman Carmody voiced my point. My point of order. The reason for my calling a Point of Order was just because of what was said. That unless we are determining or attempt to determine before we vote, which direction the vote will go, if in fact, it should happen that it does not get postponed, then we will have then denied persons the right to have spoken at this time. Thus, subverting their opportunity to speak on the issue at hand and that's why I want us to move with caution as it relates to our civic responsibility to have heard from all of the citizens who took their time and I might add very patiently to wait, as we've had this discussion and give them an opportunity to speak. They may not speak as long as Representative Glover spoke or be questioned quite as much, but I do think the significance of what they have to say is equaled in gravity; so, I would caution us to give them the opportunity to speak.

Councilman Carmody: Very quickly, based upon the information that we've received that we still do have some communication to receive before this vote is considered, my vote is gonna be no, in that under the same concerns as Councilman Jackson, is that we have to allow the persons that are requesting an opportunity to give us their input before we take this matter up and vote. Its imperative.

Councilman Green:: Mr. Carmody, apparently, you didn't understand my statement. My statement is we will go to the next item. We have about 1,2,3,4,5, 6 items before we get to this item again. Okay? This item is at the bottom. So, all I need to do is go to the next item to get these items out of the way, then however long everybody wants to speak, they will have that opportunity.

Councilman Carmody: No they won't sir, because we'll have to go back through, if I understand correctly, we'll have to suspend the rules again.

Councilman Green: Fine, no problem. I don't have a problem with suspending the rule. I just want to take care of this business at hand just in case there are some other folk that are interested in these other items that we can relieve them and then we can come back to this item, stay as long as we can. And I don't think that, that's unreasonable. Now what's unreasonable is not giving the Chair the opportunity. If I have this opportunity I will vote in your support, if I don't have this opportunity then I will vote against your support because of the kind courtesy. I just think in America, this Council, I don't think that we ought to go forth with a mean spirit. My vote is just like already cast, but I think it has been the history of the Council if anybody ask for a postponement that's not beyond reason and Councilman Carmody, you've been here before, we've given them that opportunity. Is that true or false?

Councilman Carmody: Sir, I would say that I have seen it where it worked and where it did not.

Councilman Green: But we've given the opportunity.

Councilman Carmody: Because personally I have asked for postponement and then not received a second, and then the matter was considered, the issue decided. So, I would have to say in my experience. . .

Councilman Green: But basically.

Councilman Carmody: Basically.

Councilman Green: Thank you. That's all I'm asking.

Councilman Walford: I am now totally confused. My first question is for Mr Thompson if I may. We didn't take the Public Comments under 7C on the agenda items to be adopted. I thought that's where we were, that we suspended the rules and gone to that. Was I mistaken?

Mr. Thompson: That's correct. We did not take them there, there were persons who wanted to speak. There is a State Law that says that if citizens want to speak, we have to give them the opportunity to speak at each meeting of the Council.

Councilman Green: But it didn't say exactly what time, did it?

Mr. Thompson: No.

Councilman Walford: Tell me where we are. What is your motion, what are we?

Councilman Green: *My motion is to move to take care of the rest of the items until we come to item 6 which is S-69-02, King Gardens Apartment then whoever wishes to speak, then they will have that opportunity*

Councilman Walford: One more point of discussion, as long as Mr. Carmody's concern is addressed.

Councilman Green: Addressed. They will speak before the opportunity to vote, then we have no problem.

Councilman Walford: Well, all I needed was clarification.

Councilman Green: Just in case, there are some other items, I don't think that we ought to punish the rest of the people that have come here as well to stay beyond reason.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, I just want to caution the Chair, that this is setting a precedent

Councilman Green: We do it all the time.

Councilman Jackson: To expect to come by and have, you know, quick, you know, 'get mine up first' and don't have to sit through whatever else. So I appreciate your courtesy, I just caution you for the precedent that we set.

Councilman Green: Thank you and this is what makes America, America, And once you all become Chair and you sit in the Chair, then you will understand. Thank you.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Chairman, I just want to make this comment for what its worth. It's certainly not my intent or anything like that to disrespect the Chair or this Council. However. . .

Councilman Green: Your apology is accepted.

Councilman Lester: My concern is that we have begun this process. We have had these individuals, we are engaged in a matter that deals with their particular issue and they have been down here for this time. It would just seem that we should go ahead and finish this issue and give these folks who may have taken away from their jobs or whatever, an opportunity to be heard and once they have said what they want to say, if they need to leave, go back to their homes, go back to their families, we will have dealt with that issue and then we

can move on. As I appreciate it we suspended the rules for the purpose for allowing. Because as I appreciate it, most of the people in the Chamber, citizens, are citizens that came before this body that wanted to speak on this particular issue.

And so, what I'm just asking the Chair to do would be not for my benefit, certainly not for mine, but for the benefit of most of the individuals who are citizens in this Chamber, allow them the opportunity to give vent to their comment and then if they want to leave, then allow them to leave. I'm not here to get into a running battle with the Chair, because I too have been presidents of organizations and I understand the power of the gavel.

Councilman Green: Just for your concern, there is only one other speaker to speak. She has already spoken, that is Ms. Rogers

Councilman Lester: Well, then you know what? Mr. Chairman, you were right and if you remember, if we would go back and play the tape and I'm going back on my other career now, the first question that I asked before we got to this point was, are there any more speakers?

Councilman Green: And I said yes.

Councilman Lester: And if you would have told me, one, then maybe we could have saved . .

Councilman Green: You didn't ask me that sir.

Councilman Lester: Well you kept hitting the gavel and kept trying to shut me up.

Councilman Green: So, we only have one that's already spoken and that is Ms. Rogers. She sent another slip to speak. So would you like for her to speak again? If there are any new information.

Councilman Lester: If you are so inclined to allow that Mr. Chairman, I would appreciate it.

Councilman Green: Okay, she will speak right before we take up the matter as to voting on your issue. Thank you.

Councilman Lester: But we have a vote right now.

Councilman Jackson: We have a vote right now?

Councilman Green: Vote right now.

Councilman Hogan: Could someone clarify the vote for me please.

Mr. Thompson: I think the Chair's motion, the way he framed it was, the motion is to move to the next item. So, if you're in favor of moving to the next item at this point, I believe that correct is it Mr. Chair?

Councilman Green: Yes. Then the speakers will speak right before we entertain the item regarding King Garden.

Mr. Thompson: So, if you're in favor of that motion, you'll vote yes. If you're opposed to that motion vote no. Motion denied by the following vote: Nays: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan and Jackson. 6. Ayes: Councilman Green. 1.

Councilman Green: Okay, So Ms. Rogers will you come forward?

Ms. Rogers: Thank you to the Chair. I will try not to be leger the point. I simply wish to give some information. Questions from I think City Councilman Hogan concerning a letter from July of 1998. I do not believe this site was chosen at that time and we were not as property owners notified from the letter that was given to Representative Cedric Glover concerning the building of this property and we were notified from State Representative Glover that this was being built in this proximity to our homes.

There is also another set of statistics that I did read in front of the MPC and I don't think you are privilege to this information in the package that you received from the members in my committee. They are the Housing availability in the MLK area. These statistics are based on facts that were received by myself and my husband. We called all of these apartment complexes and asked how many dwellings do they have available? I will read the list for you, just for your information purposes and I think Mr. Jackson. Kings Manor Apartments - 64 units. University Oaks Apartments - 124 units. Prince Village Apartments - 60 units. Peach Street Apartments - 112 units. Audrey Lane Project - 36 units and I might add that those are single dwelling units I think of a similar type that is to be built in the Kings Garden Manor. Devenger Village - 110 units. Yorkshire and Windsor Village - 129 units. Total available is 744 units inclusive of duplexes, apartments and single dwelling homes. If you need a copy of this, I did fax a copy to my Councilman Lester. He can forward it to you or I can give you a copy.

Also on the comments concerning fraud, the fraudulent charges. I'm not sure, I think this was brought up by Councilman Hogan. Is that correct? I do have a copy of the paper which list Reimer Calhoun Associates.

Councilman Hogan: Okay.

Ms. Rogers: And it does list the same kinds of things that you were saying. We had a concern about this. I brought this up last night at the MLK Neighborhood Association Meeting. There were approximately 25-30 members at the MLK Neighborhood Association in attendance last night, okay not inclusive of the children. But, I did bring up this information that we were also concerned about the kinds of people that would be dealing with in order to build this property behind my home. So, if you need the facts on this, I do have a copy. I don't have dated paper, I believe it's December 12th, I left it in the car, I can get that to you. Also if you need any other statistics or information, I'd be happy to get that to you. If you want me to leave this, I can leave it.

Councilman Hogan: Ms. Rogers, if I may, if you could give a copy of that to Councilman Lester and he'll forward that to all of us.

Ms. Rogers: Okay, I certainly shall. I've heard the arguments from Representative Glover, I will stop at this time, I still say that we are opposed to this, there are other availability sites in the area. If he wants them to walk to the clinic, there is a clinic at David Raines Street, plenty of property next to the Kings Manor Apartment there. They can build the site right there.

Councilman Gibson: Mr. Chairman, could I ask one question of you real quick. The list of signatures, are these signators, are they residents that border or are adjacent to this proposed property.

Ms. Rogers: There are. There is one list, I think his name is Calvin, I'm not sure of his last name. I solicited that list from the apartments that are directly in front of my house. I can only tell you about the list that I worked. I worked that list because those people live in apartments already, they do want some homes. They do want to look forward to a home.

Councilman Gibson: Let me clarify my question. The list of signatures here.

Ms. Rogers: Okay, let me see which list you're talking about. There is a list that we sent to the Commissioners. If you're speaking of the list in your packet, this list to the MPC?

Councilman Gibson: Yes, the one of December 31st. We the undersigned present the petition in strong opposition to this development. . . These signatures, do they represent residents in and around this development?

Ms. Rogers: Yes, they are in the MLK area. We did not go outside. They are. The ones for the apartments are directly in proximity to my street.

Representative Glover: Not all of them.

Ms. Rogers: No, not all of the but the ones that I worked. The list that I got, it is directly, I mean 50 feet away from my house.

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Chairman, I have quick comment. Is Mr. Jambor from the MPC, no need to come forward. I just have a question for you. The owners of the property should be listed on the application is that right?

Mr. Jambor: Yes.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, it would be better if he would. . . did you hear the answer? If you would repeat the answer please.

Councilman Hogan: Okay, he said yes. And if you could call me one day this week, I would just be interested to know who the owners of the property are.

Mr. English: (5600 Lakeshore) First of all, Happy New Year. This is my first time down here speaking in front of the new Council. I just want to know what it is about my personality when I walk in the door, folks start fighting.

I'm here to speak in opposition against the King Gardens Apartment. As a matter of fact, I was representing the residents who live directly behind that project in front of the Metropolitan Planning Commission. I was in a trial and I wanted to get here earlier and to state and as I know, its probably already been stated, for too long the MLK and other neighborhoods have become dumping grounds for these kinds projects. These are governmental projects that are designed to get some long term income coming for developers. These are 600-750 sq ft houses that are designed for an elderly program. The program is a lease-option program for an elderly individual. So that individuals 60 years old, 65 years old and if they go through this program, by the time they are ready to buy, they are 80 years old and that causes some problems.

And what happens in all to often in these kinds of projects, that invariably in a lot of low income neighborhoods, grandparents end up taking care of their kids and in these kinds of high density projects, they are breeders for crime, because a lot of these children fortunately or unfortunately, are not being watched, and so when you have that kind of density together, it cause those issues.

The neighborhood by which these houses are approximately right behind is one of the few stable middle class neighborhoods that's in the MLK area and like anybody else, I think that they have a right to make sure that there are no projects that put next to them on their property value.

But I think what this issue raises is a bigger raises is a bigger issue that this Council needs to address and that my City Councilman Calvin Lester raised on the budget hearing is, is that there needs to be some master planning done in these neighborhoods and in these districts. And if we spent its time for this City Council and this Mayor to bite the bullet, set aside the money and master plan these neighborhoods, so that a developer rightfully so, he knows going in exactly what can be developed in a particular area and what can't be developed in a particular area.

I think this Council needs to send a clear message that no more projects like these, 600 sq ft, low income, not really well planned, not people friendly, not neighborhood friendly, not community friendly, they have no place in Martin Luther King neighborhood or any other neighborhood.

I was in front of this Council 6 months ago representing a developer trying to get a project done on the Ellerbe Road. He was trying to build \$250,000 houses next to houses that cost a million dollars. How you want to bet that the Council voted on my client. You voted, not you, but the ones previously voted to kill the project. Give the residents of MLK and those who are living in stable middle class communities the same respect that you give the residents on Ellerbe Road. Thank you.

Councilman Walford: Mr. English, did you see the clock?

Mr. English: Its been a long day.

Councilman Gibson: Just for the record Mr. Chair, they didn't start that clock until about five minutes ago.

Councilman Green: Thank you. At this time, we have Representative Cedric Glover would like to speak.

Representative. Glover: I guess you guys have changed the rules since I was down here. I used to think that you only got a chance to speak once, but since Ms. Rogers had a chance to come back and share with you guys some erroneous information, and since my good friend Larry English showed up, I feel the need to have to come back and respond.

I guess Larry may be my on only ray of hope since he's arrived. I am kinda like Bobby Knight when he was worried at Indiana about playing Dale Brown at LSU until he looked down and saw was coaching. So, I kinda feel that way when Larry walks in.

A little bit of misinformation has been shared. And that is tax credits for this particular project and the type of project that this represents are completely endangered and can be lost if the management and the residents of the complex do not comply by the stipulations of the original agreement and that is that this is elderly housing.

Any individual who would live in this housing that would seek to bring a grandchild or any other child that does not fit within the target population or an adult for that matter that does not fall within the targeted population endangers the entirety of this project and could result in the tax credits being lost and the project itself being shut down.

This is a development for senior citizens and senior citizens alone. It has a mechanism in place that would allow for potential purchase at some point in the future, but it is my hope just as Galilee Gardens and Canaan Towers and the Waterford and all of the other wonderful developments right now that provide positive alternatives for our senior citizens continue to provide that same opportunity for senior after senior after those individuals come, spend their time and either transition on to the other side or into more intensive care situations like nursing homes, this is exactly what this situation is intended to address. So any effort to try and paint it a color or describe it otherwise is just simply inaccurate.

And I go back to what I said to you guys earlier. I'm not asking today, maybe at some point, I will come back based upon hopefully what would have been a good opportunity for a dialogue, a good creative dialogue by this community to take place, I would maybe come back and ask for your support at that time. But today, the only thing I'm asking for you all to do is afford the very neighborhood association and all of the affected members thereof who allowed their name to be put on top of a petition request that they as it turns out based upon what transpired last night did not fully understand. They in turn requested and voted as an association to ask their Council Member to afford them the opportunity in conjunction with their elected leadership to allow the community to engage in a dialogue. Gentlemen, what are we afraid of? And the failure to allow that for something that represents something that of so much benefit for the people that it is in

design and intended to benefit and affect leads me to wonder whether or not there is another agenda at work.

There is nothing magical about having Mr. Lester vote this project down today. There is nothing magical about voting this project down today. An additional six weeks does not in anyway disadvantage the residents of Michoud Street or the City of Shreveport or any of you. Any other effort or any other motivation leads me to wonder exactly what's at work. Tried to get that answer from Mr. Lester. Hadn't been forthcoming. I hope that one of you all may be able to get it.

Chairman Green: Thank you. At this time Mr. Walford asked that he would step out for a minute, but to give him the opportunity to come back, we'd like to recognize Representative Lydia Jackson, thank you for coming today. Mr. Thompson, would you give me some direction, I'd like to move to Item [5] with the S-69-02, Kings Garden Apartments up to the top of the New Business. What's the procedure on that? Would we have to suspend the rules again?

Mr. Thompson: It would be a motion to suspend the rules for the purpose of moving this item up for immediate vote and I think you can do that in one motion.

Motion by Councilman Carmody to move this item up for consideration by the Council, seconded by Councilman Lester. Motion unanimously approved.

Motion by Councilman Walford to postpone the application for two weeks, seconded by Councilman Hogan. Motion denied by the following vote: Nays: Councilman Lester, Carmody, Gibson, and Jackson. 4. Ayes: Councilman Walford, Hogan and Green. 3.

Motion by Councilman Lester, to overturn the decision of the Metropolitan Planning Commission and to deny the application, seconded by Councilman Carmody.

Councilman Hogan: If you chose to abstain or Mr. Thompson, what would be the procedure, there?

Mr. Thompson: The rules do not allow Council members to abstain unless there is a legal reason for you to do so.

Councilman Hogan: Well my question was, I was in favor of the two week delay to give Mr. Glover and his people a chance, so we will carry on with the vote then.

Motion to overturn approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

Councilman Green: We will move to the next item and in so doing, we would like to thank you all for coming and certainly, it has been a very interesting day. At this time, I would like to turn the gavel over to the Vice-Chair, I have some business to take care of and he will proceed.

Councilman Lester: I would just like to take this opportunity to thank the members of this Council for their support on this measure. I'd like to thank all those that came to speak in favor and against. I think we sent a message, that we're going to stand with neighborhoods and stability and I think that's something that's very important. So again, I just say thank you for your support and I'd like to thank the Chairman, in his absence for his working through this issue, that's a difficult one, just say thank you and I appreciate it.

1. Beer License: Walter Strickland (Business: Pinkey Liquor Store - D/Gibson [January 13, 2003: No definitive action taken by Council]
2. ABO Card appeal: Beau Carroll. (Employer: Tony Roma's): [January 13, 2003: No definitive action taken by Council]
3. ABO Card appeal: Christine Pickens. (Employer: El Chico's on Bert Kouns) [January 13, 2003: No definitive action taken by Council]
4. BAC-95-02: Gumbeaux's of S'port, LLC, 760 S'port-Barksdale Hwy., Special Exception Use and Variance in hours of operation in B-3 District; Restaurant w/on-premise consumption of high alcoholic content beverages operating til 2 a.m. (C/Carmody)

Vice-Chairman Walford: Mr. Thompson, that presents me with a bit of dilemma here. We didn't take the public comments on that earlier. Do we need to suspend the rules to take those comments now?

Mr. Thompson: I would suggest that you suspend the rules.

Motion to suspend the rules by Councilman Carmody, seconded Councilman Lester and unanimously approved.

Mr. Doyle Seal: (720 Camilla Drive) I'm a homeowner, I've lived there for 44 years. And this matter at hand, first of all, I want to say, I do applaud anyone who would risk his capital to start up a new venture, new employment it helps communities.

I'm just very concerned in this instance about the noise level of this type establishment. To me, Jazz Bands, dance floors or hard liquor usually ends up in a lot of noise. We had a bad experience as you all know with the previous tenant there. So, I just want my opinion to go on record that if this noise level does increase, if this is approved, then we're going to voice our opinion again as citizens and I just wanted to go on record.

Mr. Don Daigle (30 Country Lane, Haughton, La): I'm here in response to the appeal that was made on a project that I have brought to the Metropolitan Planning Commission.

And if I may go through the chronological order of events as they occurred. Arthur Frierson of Vintage Realty and I visited with Tom Carmody at the end of October to inform him what I was going to do on the Shreveport-Barksdale Highway as far as the restaurant was concerned. We exchanged ideas, got a game plan together and so on, so forth. On November 26th, I was invited to meet with the Broadmoor Neighborhood Association. I did. I told the people what I was going to do. I answered their questions, answered any fears that they had because of what happened at this location two years ago by some other people. That organization endorsed my project unanimously.

Several days later on December 1st, I met with the Shreve Island Neighborhood Association. The same process-- explained to 'em what was going to happen, answered their questions, addressed fears that they had, so on, so forth. Again, relating back to what had happened at this property a year and a half / two years ago by other people. That organization endorsed my project unanimously and I have the letters to verify that.

I went to the Zoning Board of the MPC on December 11th explained what I was going to do, communicated everything, answered questions. The Zoning Board approved my project unanimously. After that, 16 people homeowners, appealed that decision.

From December 11th until right now, 11 of the 16 people who appealed the Zoning Board asked me to meet with them in the spirit of communication. Last Friday at 10:00 am, I met with 11 of those homeowners in one of their homes, two houses away from the Shreveport-Barksdale Hwy. We met for an hour and a half, the same process: told them what I was going to do, addressed all of their fears and so on and so forth.

Now, I find it interesting that not one of those 11 people that I met with who appealed the MPC decision, not one is here now. And that's because they decided after hearing what was going to happen to drop their appeal and in fact verbally gave me their endorsement. So, to surmise this process, from the end of October to this point not one person who has been willing to listen to what I've had to say, not one person is in this room and with that I arrest my case.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Daigle, you had called me on Monday and had reiterated that you had met with 16 people that had appealed and that they had verbally given you the commitment that they were wanting to withdraw the appeal after having gotten more information. And when we talked, I said well, the best thing really is for those persons to communicate back to the Clerk that they are withdrawing their appeal of the decision so that we would have that on record as opposed to just a verbal communication. And I want to ask Mr. Thompson have you received communication from any of those persons?

Mr. Thompson: I received one telephone call from a lady and I think I informed her that normally we get those kinds of withdrawals in writing.

Councilman Carmody: Right. Don as you spoke, I recognized Ms. Cash in the audience and I know that when we first met, that I had kinda gone through basically the communication that I

received over the frustration with the previous business that operated at that location and specifically had asked you to talk to Ms. Cash and that her home is in the closest proximity to the building. And I'm hoping that she has submitted a request to speak so that she will have an opportunity.

Ms. Cash: Yes I did and its Collins.

Councilman Carmody: I apologize to you Lucille, I was thinking about a realtor that I know.

Councilman Walford: No, he was thinking about money when he said cash.

Councilman Carmody: Ms. Collin, accept my apologies, I'm sorry ma'am. But Don, I like Mr. Seal applaud you on your desire to put your sweat, equity and money into this location to do something that I think would be of benefit to my district. But in the same way, I'll go back over the same ground I gave you in October that my position is such that I ask my neighbors and constituents to allow me to serve them again for four years. Because I take this job seriously and I respect the fact that when they've got problems, I've ask them to let me assist in resolving the problems. Right now, we don't have a problem. I think a perception is in essence a problem and what your concept is, I don't think is going to be a problem for this district and my hope and desire would be is that it would be a tremendous asset, somewhere my wife and I and my family would want to go and enjoy a nice meal.

But because of the perception that's on this property, the noise factor, first and foremost, I know had to have been addressed when you came before the ZBA. Because that really was what the number of complaints had come out of. Not only the business establishment, but the clientele that frequented that location apparently were very loud.

I heard about it as I mentioned to you when we first met every weekend. I don't think that, that's your desire to create a nuisance in that neighborhood. I don't think that you'd be wanting to risk your funds, nor your time and energy to do that to have a problem. But it makes me uncomfortable that I had not gotten back the written withdrawal by those persons (the 11 persons) that have said that they don't have a problem with your concept. And not that I would say that your communication to me is in anyway a fabrication of the truth, I believe that, that's right. But you will recall that I had mentioned to you that the proper way would be for them to, in writing, acknowledge that.

Now, in my business, time is gonna be money and the last thing I'd want to do is to hold you up. But if I ask this body to postpone the approval of your locations for two weeks to get these persons to put on the record that they withdrawn their appeal, it would make me more comfortable in saying that I fully support it because you've sold it to these folks and they've said 'no, we don't have a problem with it.'

Now I can't tell you that you're going to get 16 letters by persons who signed that letter of appeal saying that they are all gong-yo for Gumbeaux's. But in that I think its important that they go on the record to say that they don't have a problem with it. You obviously have taken the time to listen to their concerns. They've also given you the opportunity to explain your concept and they've gotten comfortable with it, that's what you communicated to me. But I need them to communicate that publicly back.

Mr. Dagle: I have absolutely no problem at all calling Ms. Law and having her draw up a letter. Could all 16 sign?

Councilman Carmody: That would be wonderful and that way, it would be one letter for everybody's signature to say that they agree to withdraw.

Mr. Daigle: If I had known that I needed that, I'd have already had it right here today but you know, we just met Friday. I assumed that with her phone call to Mr. Thompson, in which he acknowledged that she did call, that, that would suffice, apparently it didn't so, if this means that I've got to wait another few more weeks, then I do what I have to do.

Councilman Carmody: I know and its not a comfortable thing for me to do, but I think it's the proper way for us to. . .

Mr. Daigle: I could probably have that letter tomorrow. I'll call Ms. Law and have her draw up a letter. The actual letter of appeal, as a matter of fact was a form letter, that she had a group of people sign as opposed to 11 different letters.

Mr. Carmody: Right, we've got that in our package.

Mr. Daigle: But I'll be glad to have that done.

Councilman Carmody: And again, I don't mean to inconvenience you, but I think that it's the proper thing to do.

Mr. Daigle: Do you want that letter brought back to you?

Councilman Carmody: What will happen, you will give it to Mr. Thompson, he will disseminate that to all Council Members.

Mr. Archier Frierson (10985 Harts Allen Road): I'm a real estate agent at Vintage Realty Company. We represent the owner of the property, Mr. Paul Gusick of Louisville, Texas. As Mr. Daigle had stated, we've been working on this project for a good while and my only purpose in being here today is to support him in his efforts and to communicate to you all that the owner of the property is excited about the prospects of having Mr. Daigle and his concept of Gumbeaux's Restaurant as a tenant in his property at 760 Shreveport-Barksdale Highway.

Mr. Gusick quite frankly has not fared well with some of the tenants that he's had there. He is eager to have a stable tenant much like those at Hong Kong City. He and we all feel that there is a revitalization going on, on Shreveport-Barksdale Highway. Witnessed by the fact that Super One foods is coming in, Hong Kong City, the leases that have been signed recently at Shreve City, perhaps even the prospect of a City agency moving on that corridor. We think that Gumbeaux's is going to fill a niche in the marketplace. Its going to add to the economic revitalization of that area and we think its going to be a good neighbor and that might be the most important quality that Mr. Daigle brings to the table.

The requirements of the process that you have to go through are a laborious for us and frustrating quite frankly. But if that's what it takes and Mr. Daigle is willing to do that, certainly, we at Vintage Realty are willing to help and I can tell you that Mr. Gusick, the owner of the property in Louisville will certainly be willing to cooperate and whatever you all would like for us to do. . .

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Daigle, some ten years ago, I recall a restaurant on Centenary, it was on Kings Highway excuse me, right across from Centenary College. It was Gumbeaux's and it was the exact same spelling as this that you're proposing. Is there any connection with that?

Mr. Daigle: There is no connection between the two at all. None.

Councilman Hogan: I was wondering if you were the owner of that restaurant and you were gonna try to reopen it under the same. . .

Mr. Daigle: I recall what you're talking about. I didn't know that they spelled it the same way. If that matters, but no, there is no connection at all.

Mr. Frierson: I noticed on the display up here, it says 'w/on-premise consumption of high alcoholic content beverages operating til 2 a.m.'. What was approved by the ZBA and I hope this is reflected in y'all's packet.

Councilman Carmody: It is. 12 midnight.

Mr. Frierson: A change which Mr. Daigle is comfortable with.

Councilman Carmody: You know, I've stood in your place so many times and Mr. Daigle, I've stood there next to my client trying to make sure that we got the thumbs up to take care of business so that I could earn my salary. And I think that you guys have done an excellent job of taking everything that I asked y'all to do. . .for two weeks, let you have the opportunity to communicate back to Mrs. Law to get the signatures so that we can make sure that the course is easy and made straight for ya'll to get to what you want done.

And Don if nothing else, I guarantee you anytime you turn the music on inside of that building, you are going to be riding that volume control because you are going to be thinking, Oh

my Lord, I do not want a telephone call. And I don't blame you because you want your property to be successful. You are not going to put your money and your energy in it to have the thing fail and I don't want to see that happen either. So, if you can bear with us and we can go that route, I think that would be the appropriate course.

Mr. Don Daigle: (Inaudible).

Mrs. Lucy Collins (3025 West Cavette): I just wanted to really say that Mr. Daigle has made a big effort to keep us informed and made us a lot of promises. A few of these promises I'd like to review. 1) No loud music or noise. 2) No parking lot parties. 3) The parking lot be cleared immediately. 4) And of course, I been eyeing that "2 a.m." and I knew it was suppose to be 12; so ya'll have confirmed that. 5) And I know that there is to be dancing and if there is a type of dancing that was suppose to go with the era of this restaurant, that won't be a problem either, but I sure hope that there won't be any of this modern dancing—break-dancing, well for a better word, vulgar like I see on t.v. 5) I know he is to bring in some entertainment, but maybe he won't do that and we thank you Mr. Carmody.

Vice-Chairman Walford: Mr. Carmody, do you have a motion.

Councilman Carmody: I would ask this body to follow me in my motion to defer the decision on this for two weeks.

Vice-Chairman Walford: Excuse me. We had suspended the Rules here to get our Public Comments. Do we need to go back to our Regular Agenda?

Mr. Thompson: That would be the proper way to do it.

Motion by Councilman Carmody to go back to the regular agenda, seconded by Councilman Lester. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

Motion by Councilman Carmody to postpone the application until the January 28, 2003 meeting, by Councilman Gibson. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Out of Chamber: Councilman Lester. 1. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

5. S-69-02: King Gardens Apartments Partnership, N side of MLK Dr., 600 feet W of Michoud St., King Gardens Subdivision. (A/Lester) *See Council as first item of New Business.

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES:

Report of the Sexually Oriented Business Committee: Councilman Walford: Ya'll will recall that on our first meeting, the Chair threw me into the briar batch as the Chair of the Sexually Oriented Business Committee. So each of you, in your package should have a report from this Committee. I am going to run through it and paraphrase and not read the whole report, since each of you have it. I will tell you that the Committee consisted of myself as Chairman, Councilman Lester and Councilman Hogan.

We were guided by two overriding facts concerning sexually oriented businesses and that is: 1) that activity is speech protected by the First Amendment therefore, we wanted an ordinance that would stand a constitutional challenge and protect the rights of those people. However we wanted one that would regulate those businesses. 2) We wanted an ordinance that was reasonable and that the Police could enforce. If it weren't reasonable, it could be challenged in court and probably thrown out.

We met two different times. The first time was December 19th. We met at the old City Hall in the Police Chief's conference room. We invited or had the police invite a number of the operators of these type businesses. We got their input. We met again on January 9th where we—I would have to say, worked very hard to come up with an ordinance to present to this body.

I really have to thank the other members of the committee, Councilman Gibson and Reverend Green both were good about coming to the committee meetings and giving us their input. Captain Shoemake, now Corporal Collins, and we had Assistant Chief Charlie Owens who was very helpful. The Police Chief was there, Tom Arceneaux put a great deal into this ordinance. Mr. Carmody, I thank you for the items that you passed on for my reading pleasure. They did help, I will assure you that. I want to thank the citizens that gave us input, those who came to the meeting. I think we came up, in fact I know that we came up with a very good ordinance to present to this Council and since I am the Chair making this report, I am not quite sure how to handle it Mr. Thompson. And by the way, thank you for all of your efforts as well. I would like to suspend the rules to introduce the ordinance at this time.

Mr. Thompson: The Chair can do that.

Motion by Councilman Walford to suspend the Rules to introduce the Ordinance, seconded by Councilman Carmody. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

Councilman Walford: At this time, all of you should have an ordinance repealing and replacing Chapter 72 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport—basically providing us with an SOB Ordinance, regulating the adult entertainment businesses which would be considered, Mr. Thompson, on the 28th?

Mr. Thompson: That is correct. It can be adopted or at least considered at the next meeting.

Councilman Walford: For the media that I see out there, I hope she will make it clear to everyone that this is an ordinance to regulate the businesses, this is not a new zoning ordinance to allow any new businesses, we are not addressing that at all.

Motion by Councilman Hogan, seconded by Councilman Carmody for Introduction of the Ordinance to lay over until the January 28, 2003 meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Green. 1.

Councilman Gibson: I would like to take a second just to commend Councilman for your efforts and leadership on that. I know that, that was not one of the first things that you thought you were going to be chairing.

Councilman Walford: You are most correct.

Councilman Gibson: I made a point to be there because obviously, I wanted to understand the dynamics and also hear my fellow Councilmen' input and also obviously hearing from the Police Department, our professionals which do an outstanding job for this City, and also be able to voice some of the concerns that I had, specifically on enforcement. And obviously dealing with what we just came out of, three weeks earlier in a budget review, knowing that our department heads had gone, sharpening their pencils based on the Administration's due diligence in putting together a budget for our review knowing that we are limited in resources and needed, after today's discussion, obviously wanting to focus our resources on things specifically like the neighborhoods.

So, again, I want to commend you for those efforts in leading us to the point that we are at and hopefully over the next meetings that we will be able to be in a position to put the first ordinance on the books so our Police Department can move forward in doing their job in regulating an industry which is obviously controversial, at best but at the same time I'm looking forward to being able to see their efforts in enforcement. And as I stated before I'm looking forward to having current monitoring by the Police Department in order to keep us properly informed to look at, if any revisions, in the near future. Thank you again, for your leadership.

Councilman Walford: I appreciate you being their and your input. It was, the last meeting was rather long and Mr. Hogan and Mr. Lester can tell you, we had really good discussions. We didn't always agree on each particular point, but I think it was a very good exercise in working together and coming up with what I think is a very good product for us.

Mr. Thompson: Is it your desire to insert your enter report into the record?

Councilman Walford: Yes, please with the minutes for the two meetings, please.

Councilman Gibson: I'd also like to add to my comments. I think it is important to point out and thank those industry representatives who were very candid in giving their feedback to the committee. And I think that, that helped all of us better understand the business that they are in and I think that we got a better understanding of what the Police Department has to go through in their day-to-day operation but, I think that you orchestrated a all encompassing, three dimensional view of this particular ordinance that's presented at this point in time.

Councilman Walford: Thank you very much, I'm glad its done. Now, if we can pass it

Councilman Hogan: For the Council members who are not aware of this and anyone else who is interested to know, if you read this report, you will see that I had voted "no" in favor of these ordinances. The reason I did that is because I had not had a chance yet to make two important amendments which were in the original draft: 1) limiting the hours of operation and 2) the six foot buffer zone. And so at that time we voted, it was on the whole package, and so that is why I voted "no". I am in favor of the other 98% of the draft, I just wanted to make that clear.

Councilman Walford: And you did, you made that very clear to us that you supported the package we had, you wanted a little bit more and I certainly respect that.

Councilman Lester: I want to echo the sentiments that have been expressed thus far by Councilman Gibson. I can recall when we sat here before we were sworn in and I can remember with great, less than great excitement, to have seen the process that went forth previously by Councilman Carmody.

We were hoping that the prior Council would have dealt with the issue. In fact, there were many fingers crossed on the side that the previous Council, would have dealt with this issue. And having been through the process, I can understand what Councilman Carmody went through as well as some of the issues that were created and discussed among the Councilmen.

I want to publicly acknowledge and congratulate Councilman Walford because as Chairman of this Committee he took the ugly, ugly duckling that nobody wanted and he worked out a process and I think the success of us coming back with this statute is directly related to his view from the beginning that we should have members not only, those people that would be affected by the actual ordinance itself but individuals from the Police Department as well as individuals from the Council. And I think by beginning with the end in mind, that kind of almost assure that we were going to have a product that everyone can live with at a minimum.

I will echo some of the comments that Councilman Hogan. There are some things in the statute that I don't particularly like. There are some things in the statute that I would like to be placed in the statute and I am going to offer some amendments.

I think if any citizen would have been privy to those meetings, I think that they would have proud at the level of comment, the level of discourse, and the sincere desire of all parties to come back with a statute that can be enforced, maybe not a statute that everybody likes, but it has been my, I guess, experience not so much in this, but in other matters of business and negotiations that if everyone has something that they like and dislike about a particular issue, that means that you come up with a compromise that is really pretty reasonable that everybody can live with and so I just wanted to take this time to thank you for your leadership and hopefully we can have a good debate. I am sure that we will. I'll make sure that I wear something comfortable and we can hopefully pass this ordinance.

Councilman Jackson: I just I like to say that, I wanted to find out if anybody was here from Deja Vu?

Councilman Walford: Mr. Whitesides was here earlier, but we must have waited him out.

Councilman Jackson: Just let the record reflect that the Chairman, when he left told me to ask, if we had any footage of how everything was going so far at the club?

Councilman Lester: Maybe he left to go on a fact-finding mission (I doubt that though).

CLERK'S REPORT: None.

THE COMMITTEE RISES AND REPORTS (reconvenes Regular Council Meeting).

ADJOURNMENT. There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting adjourned at approximately 7:30 p.m.

Jams Green, Chairman

Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council