

COUNCIL PROCEEDINGS OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT
FEBRUARY 25, 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, February 25, 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 (3:15), Green, Hogan, and Jackson. 7. Absent: None.

Approve Minutes. Motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Hogan to approve the Administrative Conference Summary Minutes of February 10, 2003 and the Regular Meeting Minutes of February 11, 2003. Motion approved by the following vote: Councilmen Lester, Carmody, Hogan, and Green. 4. Nays: None. Out of Chamber: Councilman Jackson. 1. Did not cast a vote: Councilman Walford. 1. Absent: Councilman Gibson. 1.

Awards, Recognition of Distinguished Guests, and Communications of the Mayor Which Are Required By Law. Mayor Hightower: We do have a special guest today. She is the best looking girl in the United States of America (don't make a liar out of me now.) Mr. Antee: Other than his daughters, Mr. Chairman. I just want to keep him out of trouble there.

Mayor Hightower: Thank you, Ken. Brittney Rogers is with us today. She is Miss Louisiana USA. Next month she will be traveling to San Antonio to compete in the Miss USA Pageant that we hosted here, for several years and we certainly want to wish her well. She is certainly an accomplished young lady and I would like to read this resolution that you guys are going to vote on in a few minutes (see action under Resolutions on Second Reading and Final Passage).

Report on Convention Center and Hotel Project: Mr. Antee: I have the proposed Management Contract that we are close to finalizing, I think it is the final redline version that I'll pass out after the meeting so that ya'll take and that is what we've worked on since the last Council meeting.

The Convention Center is moving forward. We've got the dates for the bids that's proposed from Barton Malow. I've got a note going back to them because I want to shorten the bid time from the 45 days back down to 30 days because I think that will give everybody plenty of time to bid on it; so that is the only thing left on that.

They are still working on the front end documents which is the big rules of how the project will proceed and so there is still scheduled for mid-March bid to be advertised as it was scheduled before. So other than those couple of things, there hasn't been a lot of work from our part on it. All the work is being done by Barton Malow and the design team to get the bid packages ready to go.

Councilman Lester: My question is partially to Mr. Antee and to I think, Mr. Gilliam is here. My question is, o we have a showing as it relates to the Fair Share Agreement of where exactly the construction management contract is in terms of fair share. I guess my question is, is that contract a fair share applicable contract?

Mayor Hightower: The answer to that is, absolutely.

Mr. Antee: And the contract that we will be operating under will have the Fair Share language in there. There is no contract other than the original Whitaker contract, right now.

Councilman Lester: My next question is and maybe Mr. Gilliam can help us with this. Has there been a showing of whether or not the proposed, I guess, Barton Malow which is going to be assigned as I appreciate it, the Whitaker Construction interest, has there been a showing that they have Fair Share participation in their submission? In other words, as I appreciate the Fair Share program, the way it works, the Fair Share Administrator's Office has the review of the contracts to determine whether or not there is a showing that there has been good faith in a city contract in terms of the Fair Share Agreement and in fact, that individual or that office, has the power under the statute to hold up a contract if there was not a showing of Fair Share good faith and compliance with the Fair Share Program. So, my question is, where do we stand on that process as it relates to the Construction Management?

Mr. Antee: And that gets back, there is no contract with Barton Malow, at this time. At the proper time when there is a contract, they will have to satisfy and meet all of the requirements of the Fair Share Ordinance. There has been discussions and correspondence, back and forth, we've inquired to them how they plan on meeting that and we hope to have a meeting with them in the near future to discuss that in further detail, but right now all Bart Malow is doing, is they are being paid to get the project to bid and they are being paid to work with Slack Alost to get the bid packages finalized so that they can be advertised. Once there is a settlement, an agreement reached with Safeco, Whitaker, the plan at this time is that Barton Malow would then enter into a new contract or be assigned the initial contract however the legal technicalities of that need to be worked out and at that point in time, they will have to meet the Fair Share Ordinance.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Gilliam, where does your office stand as it relates to looking at the Construction Management Contract of the Convention Center in terms of Fair Share?

Mr. Gilliam: As Mr. Antee has stated Mr. Lester, it will have to fall within the same purview as any other contract. The goal of course is 25% as set forth by the ordinance and by the plan.

We have been dialogue and in meetings with Bart Malow and in fact, quite honestly, I commended Mr. George Whalen who has been the point person on the ground here, for the last month I guess. It appears as though Barton Marlow has some experience in doing inclusiveness kind of work. I think the last big project they did, I believe the Superdome in Detroit. They've done this before and it appears as though, Mr. Lester that they are extremely sensitive to maintaining their reputation of inclusiveness. And our last meeting we had with this, this past Thursday at 8 p.m. and we have a meeting—they have worked with us. We have a meeting set up on March 18 at 4 o'clock in the afternoon that is going to be held in Municipal Auditorium and they have set forth, what I think is a rather comprehensive program dealing with just Fair Share issues and it includes everything from the introduction of the representatives from Barton Malow to the specifics of the bid packages, to getting into a full-fledged discussion of what our plan involves and what it is going to be required of primes and I would be willing to share that draft with you.

Councilman Lester: And I would appreciate if you would give that Mr. Thompson and he would share that with the respect of the Council.

What steps are we taking, from your office under the direction of the Administration, to insure that there will be some type of orderly program in terms of Fair Share

participation not only in the construction management portion but in all phases of the Convention Center Project?

Mr. Gilliam: As you would imagine, the vast amount of energies right now are geared toward that latter aspect and that is trying to make sure that we provide the opportunity for Fair Share clients and minority contractors to participate to the fullest extent possible. As we look at it right now, we know that there are some things and I need to share these and be quite candid with you, if I might solicit that from you. There are going to be some things we know that are going to mitigate to some extent the involvement of my clients or my clientele as I like to refer to them. Of course, that is just an inevitable thing of bonding and this particular clientele you would imagine that is nothing unique to my clientele. The bonding industry right now is just in some degree of turmoil but that is going to be one of the situations we know that they're going to come up against. Of course, the others, I've got the Executive Director of the Minority Contractors Association sitting back there with me, they have also voiced concern that in the, to some extent, our standard clausuring requires of course that the bonding producer will have a AM Best rating of A-, there has been some concern from them as to whether or clientele will even be palatably to be served by the particular rating.

There is also some things that came up in our meeting with Barton Malow this past Thursday. We had two representatives there from the State Contractors Licensing Board and it was revealed at that time too that everybody (every prime and every Sub) on this project will also have to be licensed. I've spoken with representatives of the Minority Contractors Association, they don't think that that's a real problem. I think it is yet to be seen just what kind of situation that is going to be.

The third thing I would put on the table Mr. Lester and to the rest of the Council members here is the fact that, we are looking at our clients who think will have a real chance to participate in this project and we realize now that there is something that we call the Big 10. There are about 10 Fair Share contractors, minority business enterprises, that we feel have a track record to possibly have the potential to really participate with bonding rating and all of that. We are saying to a lot of our smaller clientele, don't try to hit a home run on the Convention Center Project and miss out on all of these day-to-day smaller projects that are going on that we see kind of getting passed over because they just aren't presenting themselves for.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Mayor I have a question. I know that you and I have had discussions regarding this. My question is, are we prepared to hold fast to the language Fair Share Ordinance in terms of the Construction Management Agreement even if it means that we might have to potentially not enter into a relationship with Barton Malow if they indicated they can not perform under the Fair Share contract given the percentages of the construction management fees?

Mayor Hightower: My commitment all along in this project has been to the Fair Share Ordinance. Barton Malow is fully aware of the Fair Share Ordinance and in my discussions as late as last week they've been made, again, fully aware of the Fair Share Ordinance and not as an extra cost. The scope of work from their perspective won't change a dime and we don't think the numbers should either. So, we have a Fair Share Ordinance, this is part of it that we can control to some extent although we are in a little bit of a precarious situation with the bonding and all of that that's gone on but even in the bidding of the actual work itself, you know, we are committed to Fair Share. I mean, the reason that we are busting the project up into 45 bid packets is, to give

locals and minorities the opportunity to bid on this work and hopefully obtain a huge portion of it whereas if we were to bid this job out in one lump sum we wouldn't only have the Barton Malows, we would have the biggest boys in the business in town taking all the work to their subs in Detroit or St. Louis or wherever it may be so, we have been committed all along. Our commitment has never changed, it won't change. We have an ordinance on the books that helps us back our commitment and I know the support of this City Council, as well, so. It is a Shreveport project that we want to be for as many Shreveporters as we can make it for.

Councilman Gibson: Thanks Sam. It is always a pleasure to visit with you and work with your Department. You do a great job in handling a lot of information.

You had stated earlier about one of the concerns for minority small business in town about bonding being an issue. It is a fact, you and I have talked about it that the bond market, the insurance market, we haven't seen this insurance market like this since probably 1982-'83 whereas there is a nationwide trend of defaulting going on, on projects that caused the insurance market to react in a way similar to what the S & Ls did to the banks back in the '80s, but I guess my comment being that the bonding issue is not anything that has to do with any kind of discrimination. It is a whether you have the cash or whether you don't have the cash and the local insurance companies and state insurance companies and regional insurance companies are doing everything they can from what I heard on February 4th when the Fair Share Department of the City of Shreveport along the National Association of Minorities Contractors, Associated General Contractors and the Women In Construction hosted a bonding seminar specifically geared toward small business in this town to try to help bring more resources to the table. But I just felt, would you agree that the fact bonding is not a discriminatory practice?

Mr. Gilliam: Absolutely. We are all kind of in the same boat, if you will. Larger contractors, our LDEs are having the same situation. The market is just rough out there and it is rough on everybody.

Councilman Gibson: And I'd also like to, you are aware of other projects that are going on and one of the things that I've always been impressed with your department is you are always pushing information to the Certified MBEs and WBEs that are within your department that are certified to look at other projects both in the public-private sector.

One project that you and I have talked about a little bit that is right now in the process of letting projects go, that is the Louisiana Downs expansion with Harrah's. And I will just like to state for the record, that Kwame Building Group is part of that project over there and is right utilizing the talents that they have through the process that they worked with Whitaker and the reason why they are a consultant to Louisiana Downs and Harrah's right now is because Kwame Building Group is promoting themselves as getting information on our local minorities to promote on Louisiana Downs. So, I would suggest to my Council members out there, that we may not have some minorities bidding the Convention Center project because of the projects that are going on right now with Louisiana Downs which is to the tune of up to \$250 million dollars. There is only so much capacity, there is only so much insurance that you could provide, so I would just like to lay the groundwork that the fact is, that there is work going on in conjunction with that project and others that the end of the day, I'm hoping that we'll have every local minority bidding our projects. In fact, you've heard me say, on a routine basis.

It is incumbent on the National Association of Minority Contractors and the Associated General Contractors and Women In Construction to do everything within our power to work within the Fair Share Department to get these minorities and women-owned businesses to bid every single project package that comes out on this Convention Center, because if you don't bid it, then shame on you. But the fact is, that is a business choice that each business owner has to make in this community but again, I would like to commend you and Karen Barnes for the assistance on February 4th with that bonding seminar because I think we had close to 70 companies in attendance there and I think it provided a wealth of additional information, not just for the Convention Center project but for future projects to look at. I do appreciate your leadership on that.

Councilman Jackson: To Mayor Hightower, we talked about a few things that I've discovered over the course of the weekend, I guess, mostly Sunday through the paper and through our conversation here today 'cause I appreciate, as you all have said that your commitment has not changed as it relates to the Fair Share. We talked about 45 packages, breaking it down to 45 packages. This is the case that at some point it was more packages than 45 and 45 is now fewer packages than you had intended initially to bid?

Mayor Hightower: We never really had a number and that was part of what the Whitaker and Kwame Group were working on, you know that was really, their assignment in construction management was to bust the packages into more than one. We never gave them a number, obviously they are in the business and we are not.

When Barton Malow came on, they took over that job, that task and have come with now with 45 packages. Some things you just obviously can't bust up—electrical work, is one of them because we don't want finger pointing at the end of the job saying, Mr. Jackson did that job; no, Mr. Antee did that job. So, and I think that is something that Barton Malow has probably brought to the table that may have us in better shape, but again, keep in mind, 45 packages versus one package that is the entire reason that we have gone to construction management versus the GC (general contractor) one lump sum price-type of deal because we know that again, that not only do minorities have a better chance of participating in this project as a result of that, 45 times better chance but so do locals, as well. And, we know that on a project of this size that we just didn't have many, if any, local general contractors stepping forth doing the whole thing by themselves.

Councilman Jackson: Are you satisfied, I guess, I say "you", I guess the Administration or whomever has been working on this, satisfied that 45 packages is as much as we can do?

Mayor Hightower: Yeah, I think so. Again, I am not in the business, Councilman Gibson and I think some of the General Contractors have taken a look at some of those as well. I am really not qualified to tell you we could go to 46 or 47 or 57, all I can tell you is that we think that we've got a reputable, big, go to contractor on board that knows what is feasibility and what isn't feasible and again 45 packages is a lot of different packages to bid.. And we'll never know, I don't guess without bidding it out to the general contractor way as well, if it is a cheaper way to go or not but we do know that it is a more inclusive way to go or at least potentially. But as Sam said and Mike indicated a while ago, you can't win it if you don't bid it. And we have got to encourage our local, both majority and minority, to get in on the action because that is

our whole intent in doing this. If we want to send the whole project out of town we should have gone to general contractor route and you know, mailed it out to the plan rooms in San Francisco and New York City. It has never been our intent. It is not our intent at this point, so unless Barton Malow comes back and says, we can add a package here and we can add a package there and I don't see that happening, I think 45 is the number we are going to go with and yeah, I'm satisfied with that. I wish it could have been 95, but. . . .

Councilman Jackson: With 45 packages, then it is safe to assume that probably if we had gone the General Contractor route, it may have been less expensive, but 45 will provide at least for us, greater opportunities. I think as you said, 45 times more opportunities for any particular contractor or whatever area they may be in, may be 2 or 3 times more likely that they would have gotten it and I think that that is the right spirit that if it cost more that it is worth doing it for the purpose of inclusion.

Which brings me to the next point which we had talked about a few weeks ago which was being sure that we preserve the spirit of the original contract as it was being assigned and we had talked some time back about value engineering and the process of value engineering. And, in that process of value engineering, one of the areas, one of concern was that of the construction management fee. And at some point again in reading over the weekend, there were numbers thrown around, anywhere from 5 to 3.5% and then there was also alluded to some conversation in reference to costing more. I think maybe either Councilman Lester or Councilman Gibson commented that in fact, perhaps we ought not to do it if it cost more but I think that it would be in keeping with the spirit of what we done to, break the packages down from 1 possible bid package to 45. I just hope that we retain the consistency all the way across the board because I think to advocate that spirit at this point, will be inconsistent with what we've done already so I just want to encourage this Administration to stay the course and to stay consistent across-the-board which would include all phases of this project. So, that was just, not a question, but just my comments to that part and maybe you can speak to that, construction management fee if you would like to, but you don't have to. I just wanted to be on record as asking for us to stay consistent across the board.

Mayor Hightower: I think Councilman Lester asked a similar question a minute ago and I thought I was pretty clear when I answered it. We've never wavered on our position. Fair Share is the ordinance and it pertains to everything we do. Barton Malow will come with some participation. Now, whether it is the same amount, not proportionately, I would hope it is, but they are the ones that are running the project and they are the ones that are going to have to decide what they are going to divvy up and partner up with somebody to do. Now, we want it to be a good faith effort. Now, whether it will be the same effort that was put forth by Whitaker, we'll wait and see but. . . .

Councilman Jackson: Well I guess my concern is, they may in fact be running the project, but we paying for it and if we are paying for it, we ought to be satisfied as well. And it is going to be hard-I don't know about anybody else, but it will be hard for me to consider myself satisfied if anything that is a reduction is not a proportional reduction.

I think I said it a month ago that that I am in favor of value engineering and I understand the need to have to reduce and the way we have to value engineer for the purpose of cost. I just think the fair thing and I hate to have to use the same nomenclature of fair in everything, but I think the right thing to do is that, if there is going

to be some reduction and if everybody's going to maintain the same roles, then that the reductions ought to be proportional and no one particular part of any partnership or entity should bear more brunt or the other whether they be the majority partner or the minority party. I think a percentage is a percentage regardless of what the gross number is. I think that if we stay consistent with that, while they may in fact have the management responsibilities, we are paying for it and we ought to be satirized and I would hope that what it takes to satisfy us is that everything is done fairly and the right thing, again, it is just my opinion, that it ought to be done in a proportional sense.

Mayor Hightower: Well at one point in this project, we did control the entire project, it was our project, all of our money. Now, we have a partner, unfortunately. When we had Whitaker in the driver's seat, maybe we had the perfect world until they went bankrupt and now we have a new partner, Safeco. So, they have a huge say so in whether we move this project forward, whether we got to court and delay the project for months, years, who knows; so, that is the reason we are at the table with Safeco. It is not that I don't think that we got a good position with the bond, I think that we are in great position with the bond, but they are also in a position that they can battle us as long as they want to pay attorneys, I guess. We want to be cognizant of that so that we get the project moving as quick as we can. We want to break ground this summer, hopefully the number come (inaudible) over the next couple of months and we can move the project forward.

But again, our commitment all along has been the Fair Share. At the end of the day when we cut the ribbon on that thing, our goal is 25%. I want to get 25% in every single category and 100% in the few to make up for the few that we are going to get zero in, but at the end of the day we got to hope and do everything we can to push for that 25% goal.

Again, Barton Malow understands that if we move forward with them, they have got to have a minority partner; so, I suspect that over the next couple of weeks in our meetings with them, they will come maybe to better grips with that and we are going to push as hard as we can, again, to get to the 25% and have as much local participation as we possible can. I am not dictating to them who they have to use, but we are telling them that we have an ordinance and we expect them to adhere to it.

Councilman Jackson: I think as long as they understand our community values and we don't compromise our community values for economic expedience, that we understand, that we hold fast to those values, then I think to them, we will all be satirized.

Mayor Hightower: And I think you are right, but there may be a difference between the values and the dollars. Again, we are not asking to do any more work than they've agreed to do, we are just asking to divvy some of it up so that is where we are at this point. They came to town and offered the 3.5%, I didn't throw it out to them. They obviously wanted out business so we think we have some pretty solid ground to work with them all. I still think they want the business and I think we'll see them work out an agreement with somebody over the next several weeks.

Mr. Antee: Just to follow up, we can't lose sight of the fact that it can be 100%, but 100% of zero, is still zero. We've worked a year to try and get it to this point and we've been working with Safeco and you can't lose sight of the fact of how important Safeco is in this project because they could draw the line in the sand and three years from now, four years from now when the court case is finally over, then the next Council and the

next Administration can then decide what all do they want to cut out because the money we did win won't build the building that it could have built today. And, we've got to keep that in mind and not lose sight of the fact that Safeco, its our position, has got to make up the difference. It is their position they are not writing a check for anything. And, we've been working a year to get it to this point and the Fair Share portion of it has always been out there. They've always known, it has been a part of the contract and it will continue to be a part of the contract, but Safeco can just come in and say we are talking over the whole project or there is no project. If they want to really dig down so we've got to balance that as well so that there is a project for everybody to participate in.

Councilman Gibson: I just want to be clear here because I've heard we are going to pay more money to do whatever. The Fair Share Program is there. I think the Mayor has been very consistent in terms, I've sat in meetings and heard him, consistently talk about to anybody who is doing business with the City of Shreveport of working with the Fair Share Ordinance. But lets be clear to the audience, lets be clear to the people on the cable telecast of this City Council, this project is publicly bid. Us, as Council, have a judicial responsibility to take the process as we know it under the public bid law, to take the lowest responsible bidder out of these 40 (some odd packages) no matter if, ands or buts about.

And that we, as City Council and the Administration, are responsible. We have a judicial responsibility based from three years ago when the \$85 million dollars were sold or promoted to the citizens who passed that, to not only make sure that good faith effort was made on the Fair Share Program but we spend that money judicially responsible and that we are not ratchet-ing up the cost of this project. We are not breaking this project up to spend more money. We are breaking it up first and foremost to be able to enhance the ability for a local construction firms, both minority and non-minority, to get the project but by no mean are we, did the construction industry work with this Administration to come up with a construction manager and charge that construction manager and the design professional to come up with packages to then expect that we are going to spend money in order to fulfill something on a piece of paper.

And I don't want anybody to walk away from this room today thinking that this project is going to cost more money because of something on a piece of paper. It still has to comply with the public bid law of the State of Louisiana and the Mayor, Ken Antee, and no one sitting up here can circumvent that public bid law without severe consequences. So, lets be clear on that. There has been some statements made that may give you the impression that that's not the case, but at the end of the day, I agree with Mayor Hightower, the fact is, Safeco is going to be the first stumbling block to get by and hopefully at the end of the day, sooner versus later when we see these packages hit the street, we are going to see the local participation both from the minority and the non-minority companies in this community to be able to keep the money here circulate four or five times over and create economic wealth for those business owners. But, at the end of the day, it is the individual business owners that makes those choices but we are confined to that public bid law to spend that money as judicial responsible in order to fulfill our obligation with the public in order so we can have future public bond opportunities to sell bonds in this community. But, I think that it is important to be able to put that on record and understand that we are all up here

making sure that we do the right thing for our local minority companies and non-minority companies that are located here.

Councilman Lester: I would just offer these comments. I appreciate the fact that this Mayor and this Administration came forward with the Fair Share Program. I think prior to this Administration, the amount of contracts that were going to African-American minority firms was a single digit scenario and I think that is an abomination and that's an insult.

I just want to go on record as saying this, I have an expectation and I think many people in the African-American community, both business and otherwise, have an expectation that this project will be done by the letter of the law as it relates to public bid law but also as it relates to the Fair Share Program. At a certain point, the Fair Share Program should be more than just a piece of paper. The Fair Share Program must be a policy and this Administration has made the Fair Share Program something that is a center point of what's it is trying to do and I applaud that and I congratulate this Mayor and this Administration.

I would just want to go on record as others have today in saying that, for the sake of expedience, for the sake of any other excuse, I will not stand idly by nor do I think that any member of the African-American political or business community will stand idly by, and see this project go forward without strict adherence to the Fair Share Program in terms of construction management, in terms of all of the packages that are being built. If from the City's standpoint we have to do something with Mr. Gilliam's help and Mr. Gibson with the AGC and other national minority contractors, I see Mr. Henson in the audience, if we have to do something from the City's standpoint to assist those folks that don't have the bonding capacity come up with a program that can assist them, I think it is in our community's best interest. You are talking about public money and you have to follow the rules and the law but at the same time when you are talking about public money, you are also talking about, there is a public trust that goes along, there is certain expectations that the community has and I think those expectations are that the Fair Share Program will not be used as a cost and say, well we can't afford to use the Fair Share Program. I would take the position that at this particular time in our City's history we can not afford not to use the Fair Share Program in this scenario.

So, I would just say to this Administration, please continue on the vein that you are, please hold fast to the Fair Share Program. I will say to Mr. Gilliam if we have a scenario where a contractor, whether they be local or be out of town that has the responsibility of making a good faith showing to the Fair Share Program and they have not done that, my expectation and I can speak for anybody else but my expectation is that your office will use the Fair Share Program and the powers that you have been given to hold up that contract until there is a bona fide showing that they have comported with all of the terms of the Fair Share Program because I know that under the statutes that you do have that power.

I'm like Mr. Antee. I understand that Safeco has a dog in this fight, so does the City on a number of different levels. I would just say that, our expectation is not only for this project to be done but this project to be done in the right manner. And think doing this project in such a way that shows inclusion on all facets from the top to the bottom is something that is going to be heralded that is going to show our community not only from the public standpoint but it is going to send a message to the private sector that this is something that ought to be done. And I think any deviation from that, any retreat

from that, is a move in the wrong direction and my expectation is that we will not do that.

So, I will just commend the Administration to continue on the vein that you are doing and let's do this and do it right to honor not only the people that bleed and die so that we could have a Fair Share Program but again, I am in a unique position that I sit in the chair of an individual and that being the late Hilry Huckaby III that made economic justice a center piece of his representation of our district, so I would ask us to continue in that vein.

Report on Property Standards Program. Councilman Lester; We are going to defer that. We will have a report at the next Council meeting. You will be getting some information from Mr. Burton as it relates to the information that we have ascertained thus far, and we are going to meet again so that we can bring some recommendations to the body. So, you will be getting phone calls from Mr. Burton to set up a meeting so that we can share those, what we've gone with so far.

Public Hearings: The Chairman declared the public hearings open. There was no Presentation from the Administration. The Chairman called for persons to speak in favor of the proposed annexations. No one came forward to be heard. There was a call for persons to speak in opposition to the proposed annexations and no one came forward to be heard and the hearings were closed.

1. Tag No. 02-02: Enlarge the limits and boundaries - Tract of land located along West 70th St. and along Dinkins Dr. (G/Jackson)
2. Tag No. 02-03: Enlarge the limits and boundaries - Tract of land located in the S/2 of Sec. 21 and in the N/2 of Sec. 28 (T16N-R13W). (D/Gibson)
3. Tag No. 02-04: Enlarge the limits and boundaries - Tract of land located along Norris Ferry Rd. and Southern Loop Roads. (D/Gibson)
4. Tag No. 02-05: Enlarge the limits and boundaries - Tract of land located 5895 Bert Kouns Industrial Loop. (E/Hogan)
5. Tag No. 02-06: Enlarge the limits and boundaries - Tract of land located at 3001 and 3003 Meriwether Road. (E/Hogan)

Confirmations and/or Appointments: Motion by Councilman Lester to confirm the following: Spencer Griggs to the SPAR Council; Ted Roberts to the Airport Authority; Travis Miller to the Downtown Development Authority; Dean Brady to the SPAR Council (at-large), seconded by Councilman Lester and approved by the following vote: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. None.

Councilman Walford: I see Mr. Roberts who we just confirmed to the Airport Authority sitting out there. If I may, I would like to tell Mr. Roberts being close to the Airports, how much I appreciate all that you've done in your past term and I look forward to knowing you are there for me to call during your next term, but we appreciate what you do.

Adding Legislation to the Agenda. Motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Carmody to add the following to the agenda:

1. Resolution No. 23 of 2003 by Councilman Lester: A resolution in support of restoring local community authority concerning protection from secondhand tobacco smoke and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
2. Ordinance No. 24 of 2003 by Councilman Lester: An ordinance amending Chapter 72 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
3. Ordinance No. 25 of 2003: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning the south 150 feet of the north 350 feet of Lot 1, Dean Terrace Subdivision, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana from R-1D, Urban, One-Family Residence District to B-1, Buffer Business District and by rezoning the north 350 feet of Lot 2, Dean Terrace Subdivision, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana from R-1D, Urban, One-Family Residence District and B-2, Neighborhood Business District to B-3, Community Business District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

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

Public Comments: James Brown (4616 Broadway) with Rosa Lee's Carriage Ride, Inc.: What I am up here for today is that I have been going through Community Development as far as trying to obtain a loan for my business.

I have a horse and carriage business that I've been trying to get off the ground for at least about two years now. There have been, most of my money been spent off into the carriage and also the horses and maintaining the horse and carriage.

Right now I ran up into a brick wall because of I need a co-signer to do my loan, make sure my loan goes thorough but that is something, I do not have and pretty much I want to—Councilman Carmody: For a point of information, I believe that we are at a Public Comments for items to be adopted, today?

Councilman Green: Yeah, we are, but I'll tell you what, since you are up, I'd like to make a motion to Suspend the Rules, seconded by Councilman Carmody (motion unanimously approved.)

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Brown, I want to apologize to you but normally at this point on the agenda, under Public Comments they are items that the Council will consider and vote on today, so we've actually taken you out of order.

Mr. Brown: Well, was I suppose to go after all of this is over with?

Councilman Carmody: Yes sir, but what we've done is, the Chairman has made a motion and we've agreed to allow you to finish your statement.

Mr. Brown: Well, basically I thought my business was based on tourism in Shreveport and we are the only parish here without a horse and carriage. There are a couple came before me that did not succeed, people had the money to do the horse and carriage business but they did not know how much extensive work that goes into it as far as promoting it and the work that goes into the day-to-day operations. And I think that it is really an eyesore that I can't get my stuff off the ground. The Shreveport Tourist Bureau, Althetica, different agencies is willing to help

and work with my on my project and drum up business for me. Just like the Mardi Gras situation, that was almost \$4,000 I missed on that, Valentine's Day, \$4- or \$5,000 missed on that. Not talking about the previous events that is getting ready to come up and I think that the carriage that I have to offer and the one that I was getting ready to purchase which was 24-passenger troller which New Orleans, Memphis, and other places have which I have think would be a plus for what we are getting ready to do downtown in the Red River District. And my stuff is just sitting up collecting dust because I done ran into this big brick wall. And I can't just—if I need a co-signer I could have went to the bank with a co-signer. I wouldn't have to come to the other people. They been trying to help me out pretty much and everything, but I have a 9-passenger carriage that is ready to go to work and I need some help, bottom line. I just need some help from somebody that is going to say, okay James, we will—I know that there is going to be stipulations tied onto what I spend or whatever, I just want to see my business thrive to help bring tourism. We been spending thousands of dollars to bring people to Shreveport, but they got to have something to do once they get there. And I have a 9-passenger carriage that, you know, show them around town, show them through the district and what we have. I just want a helping hand. I've got two folders of this stuff here. I done complied with pretty much everything, but everybody is saying that I need a co-signer to get this going and I spent \$15,000 already been invested already or more.

CONSENT AGENDA LEGISLATION:

TO INTRODUCE RESOLUTIONS AND ORDINANCES ON CONSENT:

Motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Gibson for Introduction of Ordinance No. 23 of 2003 on the Consent Agenda to lay over until the March 11, 2003 meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

RESOLUTIONS: None.

ORDINANCES:

1. Ordinance No. 23 of 2003: An ordinance closing and abandoning a 14 foot- wide alleyway in Block 4 of Tuxedo Park Subdivision located in Section 1 (T17N-R14W), Caddo Parish, Louisiana, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

TO ADOPT RESOLUTIONS AND ORDINANCES ON CONSENT:

RESOLUTIONS: None.

ORDINANCES: None.

REGULAR AGENDA LEGISLATION:

RESOLUTIONS ON SECOND READING AND FINAL PASSAGE:

RESOLUTION NUMBER 20 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING AN INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT AND/OR COOPERATIVE ENDEAVOR AGREEMENT WITH THE JOHNNY GRAY JONES REGIONAL YOUTH SHELTER AND THE PARISH OF CADDO AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the Johnny Gray Jones Regional Shelter ("Shelter") located at 4815 Shed Road, Bossier City, Bossier Parish, Louisiana, agrees to accept children in need of care from the City of Shreveport and the Parish of Caddo; and

WHEREAS, the Parish of Caddo ("Parish") has agreed to provide financial support funding of the Shelter in the amount of \$20,000.00 in 2002 and in the amount of \$25,000.00 for the years 2003-2005; and

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport ("City") has agreed to share equally with the Parish in providing funding for the Shelter for the years 2002- 2005; and

WHEREAS, the City's financial support of the Shelter serves a public purpose.

NOW, THEREFORE NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, regular and legal session convened that the Mayor is authorized to execute an Intergovernmental Agreement and/or Cooperative Endeavor Agreement with the Johnny Gray Jones Regional Youth Shelter and the Parish of Caddo, substantially and in accordance with the draft thereof which was filed for public inspection in the Office of the Clerk of Council on January 28, 2003.

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 resolution or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Carmody passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

RESOLUTION NO. 21 OF 2003

AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE EMPLOYMENT OF SPECIAL LEGAL COUNSEL TO REPRESENT THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, it is the desire of the City of Shreveport to retain the services of outside legal counsel to represent the City of Shreveport in litigation matters in connection with the City's contributions to the State Firefighters' Retirement System; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 8.03 of the City Charter, the City Attorney recommends that the

firm of Kean, Miller, Hawthorne, D'Armond, McCowan & Jarman, LLP, Attorneys at Law, be retained for the purpose of said representation; and

WHEREAS, this firm has been employed by the Louisiana Municipal Association to coordinate legal efforts on behalf of the governmental entities affected by the unreasonable increases in employer contributions proposed by the board which governs the State Firefighters' Retirement System.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in legal session convened, that the Mayor be and he is hereby authorized to execute, for and on behalf of the City, such documents as may be necessary and required to participate, along with other Louisiana governmental bodies, in the costs of legal expenses accrued by the firm of Kean, Miller, Hawthorne, D'Armond, McCowan and Jarman, Attorneys at Law, in matters related to the City's contributions to the State Firefighters' Retirement System.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED 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 affect 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 resolutions or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Walford passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

RESOLUTION NO. 22 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION COMMENDING AND CONGRATULATING BRITTNEY ROGERS ON HER SELECTION AS MISS LOUISIANA USA AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, Shreveport resident Brittney Rogers was crowned Miss Louisiana USA on October 12, 2002; and

WHEREAS, Brittney Rogers has previously been honored as an All-American Cheerleader while she was attending Evangel Christian Academy in Shreveport; and

WHEREAS, she is currently a junior pre-medicine and nutrition major at Louisiana State University and has received numerous scholarships and awards, in recognition of her outstanding achievements in the classroom; and

WHEREAS, she plans to attend medical school and make a career as a pediatrician after graduation; and

WHEREAS, Brittney Rogers will be representing the State of Louisiana and the people of Shreveport when she competes in the Miss USA Pageant in San Antonio in March 2003; and WHEREAS, the Mayor and City Council of the City of Shreveport want her to know that we are proud of her and support her in this prestigious endeavor.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in legal session convened, that it hereby commends and congratulates Brittney Rogers on her selection as Miss Louisiana USA, expresses its best wishes for her success in the 2003 Miss USA pageant and thanks her for being a positive role model for our citizens and an ambassador for our City.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that in recognition of the accomplishments of Brittney Rogers,

the Mayor and City Council do hereby proclaim Tuesday, February 25, 2003, to be
“**BRITTNEY ROGERS DAY**” within the City of Shreveport and encourage all Shreveport
residents to join them in wishing her well in the Miss USA Pageant.

/s/Keith Hightower, Mayor/s/James Green, Council Chairman
/s/Calvin B. Lester, District “A”/s/Monty Walford, District “B”
/s/Thomas Carmody, District “C” /s/Mike Gibson, District “D”
/s/Jeff Hogan, District “E”/s/Theron Jackson, District “G”

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Jackson
passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Hogan, Green and
Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Gibson. 1.

Councilman Green: Councilman Hogan has a Vince Lombardi trophy that he is going to later
present to Evangel Academy. They are not here, but this is their Vince Lombardi trophy from
the City Council so we are going to take it out there and hand deliver it to them.

Mr. Antee: I would just wanted to comment that, I don’t know Brittney what was it about five
years we were down in Lafayette for the Miss Teen USA Pageant and she came in Second
Runner-Up and I think Shreveport is going to be well represented in San Antonio and good luck
to you.

RESOLUTION NO. 23 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION IN SUPPORT OF RESTORING LOCAL COMMUNITY AUTHORITY CONCERNING PROTECTION FROM SECONDHAND TOBACCO SMOKE AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BY: Councilman Calvin Lester

WHEREAS, no other US state has a higher rate of cancer deaths than Louisiana; and
WHEREAS, tobacco kills 6,500 Louisiana residents every year; and
WHEREAS, tobacco costs the Louisiana economy over \$2.8 billion annually in health care costs
and lost productivity; and

WHEREAS, 2002 Louisiana Health Report Card recommends that in order to decrease the
prevalence of cancer and heart disease in Louisiana our state must prevent initiation of tobacco
and provide cessation of tobacco use; and

WHEREAS, smoking is the number one preventable cause of death killing 404,000 Americans
every year; and

WHEREAS, the use of tobacco products is the leading cause of preventable death in the United
States, killing more people than AIDS, alcohol, cocaine, heroine, suicide and car accidents
combined; and

WHEREAS, the third leading preventable cause of death in the United States is secondhand
smoke killing 53,000 Americans each year; and

WHEREAS, like asbestos and radioactive radon gas, secondhand smoke is classified by the
Environmental Protection Agency as a Class A carcinogen containing 200 known poisons and 43
known carcinogens; and

WHEREAS, secondhand smoke exposure has been documented to cause increased respiratory

infections, asthma, lung cancer and heart disease in adult non-smokers, and triggers bronchitis, pneumonia & asthma in our children; and

WHEREAS, Louisiana law regulating smoking in offices and public places prevents local communities from enacting legislation appropriate for the specific needs within their jurisdiction; and

WHEREAS, local communities in Arkansas, Mississippi, Texas and most states are not prevented from enacting comprehensive protections against secondhand smoke; and

WHEREAS, the National Association of County and City Health Officials calls for the inclusion of language in all state legislation that preserves local communities authority to enact more comprehensive protections from secondhand smoke; and

WHEREAS, local standards to protect against secondhand smoke exposure in public places and workplaces have been implemented successfully in over 1,500 municipalities across the nation such as Dallas, Boston, San Francisco, Los Angeles, and New York;

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Shreveport City Council hereby calls for the repeal of preemptive legislation, specifically, Sections 40:1300.26 and 40:1300.46 with regard to workplaces and public places; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Legislature for the State of Louisiana is hereby urged to repeal La. R.S. 40:1300.26 and 40:1300.46, so that local government and communities in Louisiana will once again have the right to address the health and safety of their citizens by enacting such laws and ordinances that they deem appropriate regarding tobacco products.

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

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

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Carmody passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS: None.

INTRODUCTION OF ORDINANCES:

1. Ordinance No. 24 of 2003 by Councilman Lester: An ordinance amending Chapter 72 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
2. Ordinance No. 25 of 2003: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning the south 150 feet of the north 350 feet of Lot 1, Dean Terrace Subdivision, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana from R-1D, Urban, One-Family Residence District to B-1, Buffer Business District and by rezoning the north 350 feet of Lot 2, Dean Terrace Subdivision,

Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana from R-1D, Urban, One-Family Residence District and B-2, Neighborhood Business District to B-3, Community Business District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

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

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 Jackson, seconded by Councilman Gibson for adoption.

Councilman Lester: Let me say this for the record, I intend to support all of these annexation.

My question to Mr. LaFitte or someone from the City Attorney's Office would go into the process of how do we deal with the Justice Department's investigation of all of the annexations and will that process be, can we be apprized of the progress of that investigation, that will be my request.

Councilman Green: I think they've already gone to the Justice Department, right Mr. Thompson?

Mr. Thompson: I don't think so. I think the process is once it is adopted by the Council then they are sent to Justice Department.

Councilman Green: Then they go to the Justice Department and if the Justice Department have any problem with them, then they will in turn call Councilman in that particular district and that is basically the process, they called me on several before.

Councilman Lester: I would make a request of the City Attorney's office and Mr. LaFitte to be kept posted as it relates to the annexations.

Councilman Green: The Justice Department, Mr. Lester, will call you directly.

Mr. Antee: We'll make sure that you get any response from it whether it is in your district or any other district.

Councilman Lester: I would appreciate that.

Ordinance adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

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

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

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

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

6. Ordinance No. 19 of 2003: An ordinance amending the 2003 budget for the Community Development Special Revenue Fund and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on February 11, 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 Jackson seconded by Councilman Gibson for passage.

Councilman Lester: I made a request on yesterday to get some additional information from Community Development Department. I see, I think Mr. Ferdinand is in the Chamber. I was going to inquire as to whether or not they were able to comply with that request?

Mr. Ferdinand: Mr. Lester, it is my understanding you wanted me to be here to discuss that. We don't have a written report but if you want to ask the question, I'll address that.

Councilman Lester: My questions were to get some specifics as it relates to some of the projects that will be included as it relates to, I think, on one of the matters it regarding the CHDOs, I made the request, as to what specific projects those additional funds were going to be moving toward.

Mr. Ferdinand: On this amendment, all that it is dealing with is prior year funding that we are having to re-appropriate. There was \$475,000 of CHDO (which is Community Housing Development Organization) that did not get contracted out so we had to reappropriate that and make it available for those organizations to apply for that money in this year.

Councilman Lester: So, the \$475,000 under the CHDO appropriations, have there been applications made for those funds?

Mr. Ferdinand: Not yet, but they will be coming in.

Councilman Lester: As it relates to the 232 on the Home Program, have any of those funds, have there been any plans made for the disbursement of any of those funds? Mr. Ferdinand: The 232?

Councilman Lester: Yes, appropriate the Homes Program at \$232,800?

Mr. Ferdinand: I guess I'm missing that. Don is that in the budget, the \$23,000. You said: \$232?

Councilman Lester: Well that is what our Amendment has, \$232,800 - Appropriate Homes Program at \$232,800.

Mr. Ferdinand: We have \$23,200, is that slip of a digit there, but either way it is being re-appropriated for next year and will be in the Housing. . . .

Councilman Lester: Big slip.

Mr. Ferdinand: Yeah, it will be appropriated for Housing. We show "\$23,000."

Councilman Jackson: So that "\$232.800" is not correct?

Mr. Ferdinand: Where is that at?

Mr. Dark: In the ordinance, Larry.

Councilman Lester: It is in the ordinance.

Mr. Dark: That is what you have.

Mr. Ferdinand: Well it is being appropriate for Housing activities (I have a bad number here) but it is going into Housing, let me just say that.

Councilman Lester: And how much is going into Housing?

Mr. Ferdinand: The whole amount. Let me be clear. When we say, there are several housing initiatives. It could be Rehabilitation, it could be Down Payment Closing Costs initiative, so when I say Housing activities, it could be any one of those initiatives, as an example, I'm sorry.

Mr. Thompson: I guess the question is, how much is being appropriated for the Home Program? What is the correct amount?

Mr. Ferdinand: Don, do you have the correct? Okay, \$232,000.

Councilman Lester: So it is \$232,000 not \$23,000?

Mr. Ferdinand: Yeah, my notes are wrong, I'm sorry (I slipped a digit.)

Councilman Lester: And that could be, I guess what I am asking for is, I understand that they can go to any one of several programs, I guess what I was wondering is, could we get a break down of.

Mr. Ferdinand: We will get that. Let me just—the Home Funding, let me be clear. CDBG is more versatile. You can handle it in infrastructure, you can use it for housing, but any home funding, it has to be housing related. It could be rehab, it could be Paint Your Heart Out, it could

be World Changers. It has to do with dealing with home or somebody house. So, we give the amount to the Housing Bureau and have them break it out where they think it is best needed. We kind of lump it together here to give them some flexibility.

Councilman Lester: To your knowledge, has that Department given you a breakdown of where those funds are going to go?

Mr. Ferdinand: Not all of it, we are working that now. We are looking at, we are re-structuring some of our programs like the Happi Program which is the down payment closing cost assistance and we are trying to break all of that out, so we are in the process of doing that because we are having to restructure the Happi Program to concentrate more the model Block neighborhoods.

Councilman Lester: And as it relates to LHFA Substandard Housing Assistance at \$210,000.

Can we get some information as to where specifically those funds are being targeted?

Mr. Ferdinand: We can do that. We were fortunate enough to compete and get some money for Louisiana Housing Finance Agency. We had chosen the houses and sent them down to LHFA before the end of the year. They have a consultant they have retained that reports to them to look at the Housing and the applicants that we have chosen. They did not get it done by the end of the year, so we have to re-appropriate it and LHFA is in the process their consultant to look at the applicant as well as the house to make sure that they comply with the guidelines, that's what happen on that one.

Councilman Lester: Under \$64,000 we are talking increasing Housing Program, I guess—let me say this, would it be proper at this time to move to postpone this matter until the next.

Councilman Green: You have to make a substitute motion.

Motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Carmody to postpone the ordinance until the March 11, 2003 meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

Councilman Green: Mr. Ferdinand, would you be kind enough to get the information on the break out and get it to each Council member.

Mr. Ferdinand: I'll get that from the Housing Bureau.

Councilman Lester: And if you could get the breakdown on each one of those items and as much specifics as possible to Mr. Thompson, he can get it to us.

Mr. Ferdinand: Relative to the Housing activities, exactly where the Housing Activities is going?

Councilman Lester: Relative to each one of those areas. In other words, you have increase housing program, there is a dollar amount. We want, what I am asking for in my request is to get information as to where those dollars are going in each one of those specific programs, as much as possible. If that is in an area where the dollars are going to be appropriate but there is a competitive situation and it hasn't been determined then indicate that as well.

Mr. Ferdinand: Yeah, that is the case with the 495.

Councilman Hogan: Would I be out of line if I asked Mr. Ferdinand about what Mr. Brown spoke of a few minutes ago, I just had a question for him related to that.

Councilman Green: Mr. Hogan you can ask him anything you want.

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Ferdinand, were you present a few minutes ago when Mr. James Brown spoke up.

Mr. Ferdinand: Right.

Councilman Hogan: As I understand, those type of applications come through your Department,

is that correct?

Mr. Ferdinand: Yes, we have a Small Business Loan Department.

Councilman Hogan: I'll just be interested to know if you could give us some insight or some guidance on that, if there is anything that we can do to help this gentleman?

Mr. Ferdinand: I will check with my loan coordinator. But the first requirement to even apply for small business development is to have a rejection letter from the financial institution. We recognize that this is the kind of clientele we are going to be dealing with, okay. But, even with that, there are certain stipulations, the guidelines that these applicants still have to meet so I'll get back and ask but just quoting him, he said there was something that held him up that had to deal with a co-signer so apparently they need additional financial strength on his application but I'll verify that. But we are acutely aware that the clientele that we get, the first thing is to get rejected by a financial institution, that doesn't stop us but there is still some additional things that we need even after that, but I'll get word back with that.

Councilman Hogan: If you could follow up on that, I would appreciate it.

Councilman Lester: One last thing, Mr. Ferdinand while I have you up here. I want to and I'm going to give you this list. These are some structures that I would appreciate it if you could get someone from Code Enforcement to take a look at. Most of these structures are dilapidated and at one point have burned, some have been burned for quite a period of time and nothing has happened with them. The address that I have is, and I am reading this because I have gotten a number of complaints from my constituents: 1710 Looney, 1907 Looney, 1918 Looney, 1938 Looney, 1908 Ashton, 1800 Ashton, 1530 Arlington, 1803 Gary, 1900 Gary, 1944 Laurel (and there are three houses side by side, each one of them has fallen in and I think it is right in front of the nursing home over there), 1907 Dove and 1932 Wynstock and all of these are in Allendale. I'll give this list to Mr. Thompson and ask Mr. Thompson to get you a copy and I'd appreciate it if you could get someone to take a look at those.

Councilman Walford: I don't have a street address, the first house on Caddo west of Common. You may not have to do a demolition. It looks like we can stand there and watch it fall in, but it is working at it and I can't understand why it is still there, in that condition.

Mr. Ferdinand: I'll have the inspector look at it.

Councilman Jackson: I hope it doesn't seem like, I'm piling on but I had a call from my Parish Commissioner about a 1 ½ ago and I'd asked Mr. Bowie to check on a couple of properties in Queensborough, they are commercial property: 1) the Phillip 66 on Jewella right across from the Chevron Station and then 2) on the corner (I just lost the name of the street) but there is also a car wash that is no longer open about two blocks south of that near a liquor store that is right down there.

Mr. Ferdinand: I think diagonally across from Uncle Buck's Bar-B-Que.

Councilman Jackson: Exactly, that place right there. We wanted to, I told her that I was going to cc her on the response that I received and after talking with her again today, I've not received a response. So, I'd like to be able to get back with her because constituents have called her as well in reference to it, so just as soon as you can. Mr. Bowie, I'd given him the addresses, I don't have them with me now but I'd given them to him a month or so ago, so I was just trying to find out. I know it is probably a laborious task to try to find people who are responsible and those kinds of things. I just wanted to be sure that it stays on the front burner.

Councilman Green: I really appreciate you getting those woods cleaned up behind Winnfield Funeral Home and I know that by the time the rain stop, that you all will finish the job but I'd just like to commend you all on getting District F straightened out.

7. Ordinance No. 20 of 2003: An ordinance amending the 2003 Capital Improvements Budget and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on February 11, 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 Lester for passage. The Deputy Clerk read the following amendment:

Amendment No. 1:

AMEND THE ORDINANCE AS FOLLOWS:

In Program D (Drainage Improvements):

Increase the appropriation for **Landfill Drainage Rehabilitation (00-D001)** by \$45,000.
Funding source is 1996 GOB, Prop. 10 (Drainage).

In Program E (Water Improvements):

Re-establish **City-Wide Water Improvements (00-E002)** at its prior amount of \$930,000.
Funding source is Water and Sewer Revenues.

Increase the appropriation for **2000 Water Distribution System Improvements - Zone 3 (00-E003)** by \$250,000. Funding source is Water and Sewer Revenues.

Decrease the appropriation for **Downtown Airport Perimeter Road and W & S Utilities (01-E002)** by \$300,000. Funding source is Water and Sewer Revenues.

In Program F (Sewer Improvements):

Increase the appropriation for **SSO Abatement Program (98-F004)** by \$250,000. Funding sources are \$189,500 from Water and Sewer Revenues and \$60,500 from 1992-A Utility Revenue Bonds.

Decrease the appropriation for **Cedar Grove Force Main Rehabilitation (99-F003)** by \$55,000. Funding source is Water and Sewer Revenues.

Decrease the appropriation for **Mansfield Road Sewer Improvements (99-F004)** by \$60,500.
Funding source is 1992-A Utility Revenue Bonds.

Increase the appropriation for **Zone 4 - 2000 Project No. 1: SSO Control Program (01-F002)** by \$300,000. Funding source is Water and Sewer Revenues.

Decrease the appropriation for **Stoner Lift Station Improvements (01-F004)** by \$804,500.
Funding source is Water and Sewer Revenues.

Increase the appropriation for **900 Charlotte Utility Mains (02-F007)** by \$120,000. Funding source is Water and Sewer Revenues.

In Program H (Airports Improvements):

Increase the appropriation for **Construct Wash Racks - Downtown Airport (02-H005)** by \$25,000. Funding sources are State Grant \$15,000 and Shreveport Airport Authority \$10,000.

In Program I (Fire Improvements):

Increase the appropriation for **Relocation of Fire Station #13 (01-I001)** by \$900,000. Funding sources are \$165,500 from 2001-A GOB and \$734,500 from 1999 GOB, Prop. 1 (Public Safety).

Motion by Councilman Gibson to postpone the ordinance until the March 11, 2003 meeting, seconded by Councilman Walford.

Councilman Walford: That was the same thing I was going to ask without putting a great deal on the record. My thought is that we have a new Infrastructure Study Committee and I certainly think before we transfer this much money that is capital improvement money from a bond issue, that we should look at it further; so I would ask that we postpone on this and allow Mr. Gibson's Committee to take a look.

Councilman Green: Is this the money for the cement?

Councilman Jackson: No.

Councilman Green: No, I mean is this the concrete money?

Councilman Jackson: No, that is not what this is.

Councilman Walford: Am I on the wrong one?

Mr. Antee: This is concrete panel replacement.

Councilman Green: This is the concrete panel replacement.

Councilman Jackson: No. 20?

Mr. Dark: Yes, sir.

Councilman Walford: Not that I'm looking at here.

Councilman Jackson: According to the ordinance that I read, it talks about an explanation of the amendment: and it doesn't speak to unless I mis-read somewhere it:

1) Provides funding to allow construction of the relocated Fire Station #13. This will allow Station #13 to be completed at about the same time as the new Central Fire Station. The existing Station #13 on North Market will then be closed.

2) Allows construction to be completed on a project to improve drainage at the Woolworth Landfill.

3) Re-arranges funding for two water and six sewer capital projects, to allow construction to begin on the 900 Charlotte Street utility main project, a project on East Ridge Drive and on several smaller sewer projects. This also re-opens a project (City-Wide Water Improvements) which was inadvertently closed in 2002.

- 4) Provides \$25,000 in additional funds needed to construct wash racks at Downtown Airport..

Mr. Dark: I think the question that I may have is, are you asking to not act on the base ordinance at all, because the base ordinance not the amendment but the base ordinance is where the money for streets is. There are two amendments that we prepared based on needs that came up after that ordinance was introduced

Mr. Antee: And we can handle those in separate ordinances if we so chose rather than as amendments.

Councilman Carmody: I would ask my fellow Council members to let us act on amendment Ordinance 20 without the amendment and allow the Administration time to go ahead and prepare that.

The Concrete Replacement Program as we are all aware, this was money that we had solicited the Administration and the Mayor looked for to help address some deferred concrete work in all of our districts and I would think that the sooner we can get this done and get these streets fixed, the better it will be for the whole city.

Councilman Green: Mr. Thompson, what is the process to move on this?

Mr. Thompson: I wasn't in here but I thought Mr. Walford's request was to postpone the base ordinance.

Councilman Green: To postpone the amendments.

Councilman Gibson: I want to back up real quick. I was looking at the Amendment, that is the one I'm interested in postponing at this point and time and so I withdraw my original motion (Councilman Walford withdrew his second).

Councilman Walford: I would like to offer a substitute motion to postpone.

Mr. Thompson: If you are opposed to the amendment and if you are for the base ordinance, you would ask the Council to vote against the amendment.

Mr. Antee: I am not sure who offered the two amendments (Mr. Dark: We did). We can withdraw, I think procedurally, we can withdraw both amendments so that you can take action on the original ordinance and then what we can do is meet with any Councilman that has an issue and bring those two amendments back as either one or any number of additional ordinances.

Motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Lester for adoption of the ordinance.

Councilman Walford: I am going to oppose this ordinance. I believe it is wrong, I believe it is a breach of the public trust for us to take money from a bond issue that was voted for capital improvements and use it for what clearly is, street maintenance.

You can try to justify concrete repairs as capital expenditures, but the truth is, they are not capital projects. And I think that at some point in the future, this Council is going to go to the voters and ask them to approve the bond issue and I think as a matter of credibility, we would want them to know that the money is going to be spent in the way they approved it.

The comment I made a minute ago about Mr. Gibson's Committee. We have an Infrastructure Oversight Committee that hasn't even had time to look at these issues and I would certainly think that they should but I believe any spending we do right now, ought to be approached with a great deal of caution. We are in the first quarter of a year with a great deal of uncertainty as we listened to Councilman Hogan's prayer discussing war. I think we conceivable in an war could

see an economic downturn that could have a serious impact on our sales tax revenues and I just think that this spending right now is, not prudent or justified and I would urge us to take a cautious approach. Again, I think that we owe the people better than taking capital money and using it for normal maintenance, so I will be voting against it.

Councilman Green: In my district, my streets are so bad until I wished I had one of the buggies that Mr. Brown was talking about. So, in my district this cement replacement panel, is a capital project so I'll be voting for it. I just need the streets in my district fixed. I appreciate the Administration for finding the money. I appreciate the insight from Councilman Carmody and at this point, I have no choice but to vote for it. I just got some streets that need fixing and this is my best opportunity.

Councilman Jackson: I would urge all of this to consider this and vote. Obviously we had a chance at our last Council meeting to do something different. We chose not to do that. As a part of that, it was as simple as a vote and that money would not have been moved from this fund. At that particular time, we entrusted the Administration with finding the money and we suggested to them, those of us who were defeated, our trust was also in the Administration. They came back, we said thank you, at the last meeting for them coming back and finding this money. I think that we were all aware of where the money was coming from at that time.

I see this as a project, obviously necessary, the source of funds is always the issue. I thought, myself, I thought we had that issue taken care of at our last meeting. It didn't happen that way. We asked the Administration. We talk about credibility, we asked the Administration to go back, some of us who voted for it, our source of funding was rejected. We asked the Administration to go back and we took them at their word. They came and they delivered and I think it would be creditable for us to show our appreciation and more importantly our concern about getting these streets done in our communities by voting "yes" for this particular ordinance. And I think at that point and time, notwithstanding war, I believe our country can win the war, I think we have to continue to do what we need to do on these domestic soils and that includes representing our people, making sure that the people in our communities have streets that are safe and safe not only meaning "no crime" but safe meaning that the vehicles don't get torn up on some of these raggedy streets.

And so it is incumbent upon us to think about our investment in this community today. For too long, it has gone without and I think that it is just one of the things that we need to do I mean whether we fix streets all over the community or we just worry about I-49 / Murphy Street, to me that seems to be the question and I would suggest that if we could spread the money out and more communities can be benefitted by it, that's the right thing to do; so, I would urge our support for this vote.

Councilman Lester: I would also speak in favor of this particular amendment. I think quite honestly as with Councilman Jackson, I was in the minority in terms of finding a source of revenue to take care of this issue without having to deal with the rearrangement of funds. The fact of the matter is we tasked the Administration with a job of coming back and finding a way to meet the unmet need, not just in District A, not just in District G, but across the entirety of our City as it relates to our concrete and streets.

The Administration did what we asked them to do. What they did was, I believe in my reading directly on the four corners of the law and the spirit of the law, they took monies that were appropriated that have not been spent and can apply them in such a way that it does not benefit one particular district--'cause Lord knows, I could spend all \$2 million dollars in MLK easily---but spreads this money throughout the entirety of our district and meets the unmet need. I think

it does, it is a way for us to communicate and cooperate and I think that we need to, whenever we can cooperate with the Administration and we ask the Administration to do something and they do it, I think we need to support them. I think the people, Mr. Strong's office and the Department of Operational Services have done an excellent job in going back and saying what is most critical in our particular districts and what is unfunded if those needs can be met. And I think we can do something that is going to provide relief not just in one particular district but in all districts and I think that that is something that our citizens in our individual districts can be proud of. So, I would ask that we move in favor of this particular amendment and move forward and give our citizens some relief without having to tap other sources of revenue because certainly if there was a concern then, I think myself and two other Councilmen had remedy that would have precluded us from rearranging money but that was something that we as a Council decided not to do.

So, I think having said that, I think we need to move forward on this and I would ask for support from the rest of the Council on this issue.

Councilman Gibson: Clarity on one point, Mr. Antee, are we officially removing the amendment to this particular item, is that correct?

Mr. Antee: There are two amendments. The first amendment has a whole list of items, I'm assuming that's the one you have some issue with?

Councilman Gibson: Yes.

Mr. Antee: The second amendment merely deals with some matching funds for the McNeil Street Pump Station that they are trying to make a museum and we remove both if that is what the Council would like. If it is just Amendment No. 1 and there is not a problem with Amendment No. 2, the McNeil matching money we would ask that you adopt Amendment No. 2, we'll remove Amendment No. 1 and then move forward on the main one or if you want to wait and talk about McNeil, we'll remove both of them.

Councilman Gibson: We are going to move toward a vote in just a second., I just want to make sure that we are not going to be voting on any of these amendments, at this point and time?

Mr. Antee: That correct as it stands right now, that is correct. Just to make it clear, the only issue to be voted is the concrete panels, \$2 million, every else is removed.

Councilman Gibson: I just want to be clear I my mind, what I'm voting on.

Mr. Strong, if this money is approved, do you have idea—the approximately \$2 million dollars is this going to be put out for bid or is this going to be done with in-house personnel.

Mr. Strong: This will be out for bid with contractors. It was looking at, the plan was, looking at it as seven different contracts.

Councilman Gibson: The reason why I asked you that question is, I know and I'm very—whether we are talking about the state of the economy or what may be happening abroad we are talking about \$2 million dollars, but really we are talking anywhere from \$8 to \$10 million dollars in terms of economic impact for this community because those projects will be put out for bid, of which those will be used with local companies which in the marketplace as we know it right now, could definitely use the work. 2) I believe historically on a lot of this work and we just go through in an exercise of discussing economic inclusiveness, when we are talking about concrete work there is a lot of work hat is provided for the African-American community so there is opportunities there in this \$2 million dollars worth of work.

But, times change with different things, I am very cognizant of Councilman Walford's statement and very aware of the fact that the trust that we as a city, in terms of citizens, put when this Administration and this Council move forward to be put bond elections out on the street for

approval are based on the fact that good faith effort is going to be used that when they approve those bonds, that they re going to be spent for what they are intended but at the same time, as time moves on, some of those projects were well intended at the time that they were passed, priorities have changed. And whether that is the case in this particular situation, I'm not here to judge but I do know the economic impact that this \$2 million dollars will have for construction firms out there, specifically minority firms and other firms that do this particular work, will be definitely appreciated. And, at the same time I think too, because of the timing that this is being put out that you may find some very competitive bidding going on because of a little bit of lull in the construction marketplace at this point in time.

Councilman Green: Also Mr. Gibson along with the economic impact it will help me in my district because high as gas, once I get these streets fixed where I don't have enough gas, I can just roll smooth. I just urge passage on this and here again, we've had the motion and the second. Mr. Thompson: Just to be sure, Amendments 1 and 2, for the record, have been withdrawn. The motion is to adopt Ordinance No. 20 without amendments.

Ordinance adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: Councilman Walford. 1.

Councilmen Lester: Would it be proper at this time to move that the amendments that had been proposed by the Administration, before being placed on the agenda be submitted to Mr. Gibson and the Capital Improvement Committee prior to being placed on our agenda for their consideration, would that be proper?

Councilmen Green: Well that would only be one of them. One of them is for the Pump Station that they are trying to do (what with the Pump Station)?

Mr. Antee: It is a grant with \$150,000 and the City would match that \$150,000 for a total of \$300,000 to go towards furthering that museum project.

Councilmen Green: One is for the museum.

Councilmen Lester: Not the one with the museum, but the one that deals with the drainage improvements, the water improvements and sewer improvements. Would that be a proper motion at this time?

Councilmen Green: I don't think we need a motion, can we just pass it?.

Mr. Thompson: The Administration(the Mayor) can place items on the agenda or he can submit items to be placed on the agenda. I think he has that right. Whether or not the Council actually puts them on the agenda, would be up to the Council. I think that if you communicate to the Mayor that you would not be inclined to actually put the item on the agenda until it has gone to that committee, I think that communicates to him what you want to do and I don't think the motion would be necessary.

Mr. Antee: We will work with the committee on the items on that prior to bringing it back.

Councilman Lester: Okay.

8. Ordinance No. 21 of 2003: An ordinance amending the 2003 Downtown Development District Budget, appropriating the funds authorized therein, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on February 11, 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 Green for adoption.

Councilman Jackson: In this, Mr. Antee, we decrease Streetscape contract and DDA Administration and Programming by, well we decrease the DDA Administration and Program by \$444,700 and we increase Parking Services and a few other things in this budget. While we were here, I wanted to ask, on yesterday I'd asked about handicapped parking spaces in downtown on Texas Street and Mr. Taft is here and I understood you all had some communication about it and I just wanted to find out where we were in that regard?

Mr. Antee: He responded today and I saw on the e-mail I think just a short while ago, the response to that. I was planning on forwarding that to your e-mail address or he is here if you want to address it now.

Councilman Jackson: No. I just wanted to know. I saw we were doing some things with parking services and increase Parking Services contract and those kind of things and while we were in that area, I just wanted to find out if we had come close. I don't know the information that you have and those things that he submitted perhaps to you, if that brings us any closer to what my request was.

Mr. Antee: I'll provide you the information that we can move forward from there.

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

9. Ordinance No. 22 of 2003: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning the south side of Montrose Drive 250 feet east of Line Avenue, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from R-1D, Urban, One-Family Residence District, to B-1-E, Buffer Business/Extended Use District, limited to "parking and storage as applied for" only, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on February 11, 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 Walford adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

The Adopted Ordinances follow:

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.

TAG NO. 02-02

WHEREAS, Section 172 of Title 33 of the Louisiana Revised Statues of 1950 provides for annexation by petition; and
WHEREAS, petitions were signed by more than the required percentage in property value of

the area described below has been filed with the City Council to annex and bring within the corporate limits of the City of Shreveport, Louisiana, the following described property, to-wit:

Begin at a point on the west line of Lot 16 of Leopard Subdivision located 638.80 feet north of the southwest corner of the Leopard Subdivision as per Book 150, Page 271, of the Map Records of Caddo Parish in the SW/4 of Section 29(T17N-R15W), Caddo Parish, Louisiana, and being a point on the present City limits line as established by Annexation Ordinance No. 176 of 2001; run thence, from said point of beginning, west a distance of 603.80 feet and north a distance of 2924.20 feet, more or less, along the existing City limits line of Annexation Ordinance No. 176 of 2001 to the intersection with the south right-of-way line of the West 70th Street (La. Hwy. 511) as it existed in 1982 and to a point on the existing City limits line of Annexation Ordinance No. 276 of 1982; run thence east along the south line of the West 70th Street as it existed in 1982 and along the City limits line of Annexation Ordinance No. 276 of 1982 a distance of 1861.20 feet, more or less, to the intersection with the east line of the said Leopard Subdivision and to a point on the east right-of-way line of the 282 foot-wide Dinkins Drive as per LA DOTD fee, Parcel No. 1-1, in Book 1737, Page 462, of the Records; run thence south 01° 18' 07" west along the east line of the Leopard Subdivision and along the east right-of-way line of Dinkins Drive as per Parcel No. 1-1 in Book 1737, Page 462, a distance of 1379.50 feet, more or less, to the intersection with the northeasterly right-of-way line of the 175 foot-wide Missouri Pacific Railroad; run thence north 64° 33' 10" west along the northeasterly right-of-way line of the 175 foot-wide and 185 foot-wide railroad a distance of 900.35 feet, more or less, to the east line of Lot 2 of the Leopard Subdivision; run thence south 01° 24' 37" west along the east line of Lot 2 a distance of 27.37 feet to the southeast corner thereof of Lot 2; run thence north 64° 33' 10" west along the southerly line of Lots 2 and 1 and an extension thereof of the Leopard Subdivision and along the northeasterly line of the 160 foot-wide and 130 foot-wide Missouri Pacific Railroad to an intersection with a north extension of the west line of Lot 20 of Leopard Subdivision; run thence south 01° 24' 37" west along the said extension of the west line of Lot 20 across the original 100 foot-wide railroad right-of-way to the northwest corner of Lot 20 of Leopard Subdivision; continue thence south 01° 24' 37" west along the west line of the Leopard Subdivision a distance of 1992.40 feet, more or less, to the intersection with the point on the west line of Lot 16 located 638.80 feet north of the southwest corner of the Leopard Subdivision, the point of beginning, and containing 70 acres, more or less.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened, that the limits and boundaries of the City of Shreveport are hereby changed to include within the limits and boundaries of said City the above-described property.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the annexed area contained herein be and is hereby assigned to Council District "G".

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the Clerk of Council be and is hereby authorized to file, within ten(10) days of the final passage of this ordinance, with the Clerk of the District Court

for Caddo Parish a description of the entire boundary of the municipality as changed by this ordinance.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the Clerk of Council be and is hereby authorized to record a certified copy of this ordinance in the official records of the District Court for Caddo Parish, Louisiana.

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

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

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.

TAG NO. 02-03

WHEREAS, Section 172 of Title 33 of the Louisiana Revised Statues of 1950 provides for annexation by petition; and

WHEREAS, a petition was signed by more than the required percentage in property value of the area described below has been filed with the City Council to annex and bring within the corporate limits of the City of Shreveport, Louisiana, the following described property, to-wit: Begin at the northwest corner of Lot 230, and being a point on the south line of Lot 229, of the Long Lake Estates, Unit No. 12, Subdivision as per Book 3000, Page 80, of the Map Records of Caddo Parish in the SE/4 of Section 21 (T16N-R13W), Caddo Parish, Louisiana, and also being a point on the present City limits line of Annexation Ordinance No. 147 of 1999; run thence, from said point of beginning, south 44° 15' 32" west along the said south line of Lot 229 of the Long Lake Estates, Unit No. 12, and along the City limits line of Annexation Ordinance No. 147 of 1999 a distance of 60.00 feet to the southwest corner of Lot 229; continue thence running south 44° 15' 32" west a distance of 58.11 feet to an intersection with the easterly 167.0 foot contour line of Long Lake; run thence south 31° 35' 35" east a distance of 168.55 feet and south 46° 09' 04" east a distance of 16.56 feet along the easterly contour line of Long Lake to the intersection with the northwesterly right-of-way line of the 100 foot-wide Long Lake Drive as dedicated on the plat of Long Lake Estates, Unit No. 14, in Book 3500, Pages 257 thru 261, and in Book 3527, Page 14, of the Records; run thence south 44° 15' 32" west along the said northwesterly line of the 100 foot-wide Long Lake Drive a distance of 250.22 feet across the lake to a point on the westerly 167.0 foot contour line of Long Lake and to a point on the boundary line of a 28.0639 acre tract of land described in Book 3482, Page 356, of the Records; run thence in a counter clockwise direction around a portion of the 28.0639 acre tract in the S/2 of Section 21 and in the N/2 of Section 28 (T16N-R13W), Caddo Parish, Louisiana the following 26 directions to an intersection with the southeasterly right-of-way line of the 100 foot-wide Long Lake Drive as dedicated on said plat of Long Lake Estates, Unit No. 14, Subdivision: North 44° 15' 44" west a distance of 48.87 feet and north 05° 12' 34" west a distance of 87.36

feet (these 2 calls are along the westerly 167.0 foot contour line of Long Lake); run thence south $78^{\circ} 53' 26''$ west a distance of 318.21 feet to the point of curve of a curve to the left or south having a radius of 2878.57 feet, and a central angle of $00^{\circ} 37' 31.41''$, and a chord bearing of south $06^{\circ} 02' 40''$ east for 31.42 feet; run thence in a southeast direction along the arc of said curve a distance of 31.42 feet; run thence south $89^{\circ} 48' 44''$ west a distance of 301.62 feet; run thence south $00^{\circ} 08' 06''$ west a distance of 530.00 feet; run thence south $63^{\circ} 41' 04''$ west a distance of 528.04 feet to a point on the northeasterly right-of-way line of the 100 foot-wide K.C.S. Railroad in the NW/4 of Section 28 (T16N-R13W); run thence south $26^{\circ} 23' 20''$ east along the northeasterly line of the K.C.S. Railroad a distance of 685.27 feet; run thence north $63^{\circ} 41' 04''$ east a distance of 745.50 feet to the westerly 167.0 foot contour line of Long Lake in the NE/4 of Section 28; continue thence running along the boundary line of the 28.0639 acre tract and along the westerly 167.0 foot contour line of Long Lake across the NE/4 of Section 28 and across the SE/4 of Section 21 the following 17 calls: North $64^{\circ} 55' 56''$ east a distance of 64.30 feet; south $87^{\circ} 19' 54''$ east a distance of 109.32 feet; north $67^{\circ} 27' 21''$ east a distance of 155.91 feet; north $70^{\circ} 56' 16''$ east a distance of 148.58 feet; north $63^{\circ} 35' 27''$ east a distance of 137.81 feet; north $19^{\circ} 45' 26''$ east a distance of 60.53 feet; north $35^{\circ} 05' 18''$ west a distance of 118.51 feet; north $52^{\circ} 00' 34''$ west a distance of 84.17 feet; north $51^{\circ} 16' 24''$ west a distance of 138.44 feet; north $30^{\circ} 22' 54''$ west a distance of 86.55 feet; north $04^{\circ} 30' 39''$ west a distance of 95.39 feet; north $82^{\circ} 20' 55''$ east a distance of 24.56 feet; north $25^{\circ} 25' 04''$ east a distance of 33.19 feet; north $01^{\circ} 50' 06''$ east a distance of 44.36 feet; north $18^{\circ} 15' 19''$ west a distance of 87.10 feet; north $43^{\circ} 05' 44''$ west a distance of 101.92 feet; and north $25^{\circ} 31' 36''$ west a distance of 59.69 feet to the said intersection with the southeasterly right-of-way line of the 100 foot-wide Long Lake Drive as dedicated on the plat of the Long Lake Estates, Unit No. 14, Subdivision in the SE/4 of Section 21 (T16N-R13W), Caddo Parish, Louisiana (Note: The said previous 26 directions being in a counter clockwise direction around a portion of the 28.0639 acre tract described in Book 3482, Page 356, and abutting a portion of the K.C.S. Railroad right-of-way, and abutting two portions of the westerly 167.0 foot contour line of Long Lake); run thence north $44^{\circ} 15' 32''$ east along the southeasterly right-of-way line of the 100 foot-wide dedicated Long Lake Drive a distance of 262.35 feet across the lake to a point on the easterly 167.0 foot contour line of Long Lake; run thence south $39^{\circ} 33' 29''$ east along the easterly 167.0 foot contour line of Long Lake a distance of 181.04 feet to the intersection with the northwest corner of Lot 201 of Long Lake Estates, Unit No. 10, Subdivision, as per Book 2300, Page 100, of the Records, and being a point on the present City limits line of Annexation Ordinance No. 205 of 1995; run thence north $44^{\circ} 15' 32''$ east along the northerly line of Lots 201 and 202, and along a portion of the northerly line of Lot 203 of the Long Lake Estates, Unit No. 10, and along the existing City limits line of Annexation Ordinance No. 205 of 1995 a distance of 265.99 feet to the southwest corner of Lot 231 of said Long Lake Estates, Unit No. 12, and to a point on the present City limits line of said Annexation Ordinance No. 147 of 1999; run thence along the existing City limits line of Annexation Ordinance No. 147 of 1999 the following 3 directions to the northwest corner of Lot 230 of the Long Lake Estates, Unit No. 12, Subdivision: North $45^{\circ} 44' 28''$ west a distance of 200.00 feet; south $44^{\circ} 15' 32''$ west a distance of 90.00 feet; and north $45^{\circ} 44' 28''$ west a distance of 260.00 feet to the intersection with the said northwest corner of Lot 230 of the Long Lake Estates, Unit No. 12, Subdivision, the point of beginning, and containing 30.6896 acres, more or less.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened, that the limits and boundaries of the City of Shreveport are hereby changed to include within the limits and boundaries of said City the above-described property.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the annexed area contained herein be and is hereby assigned to Council District "D".

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the Clerk of Council be and is hereby authorized to record, within ten(10) days of the final passage of this ordinance, with the Clerk of the District Court for Caddo Parish a description of the entire boundary of the municipality as changed by this ordinance.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the Clerk of Council be and is hereby authorized to record a certified copy of this ordinance in the official records of the District Court for Caddo Parish, Louisiana.

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

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

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.

TAG NO. 02-04

WHEREAS, Section 172 of Title 33 of the Louisiana Revised Statues of 1950 provides for annexation by petition; and

WHEREAS, petitions were signed by more than the required percentage in property value of the area described below has been filed with the City Council to annex and bring within the corporate limits of the City of Shreveport, Louisiana, the following described property, to-wit:

Begin at the point of intersection of the west right-of-way line of the 80 foot-wide Norris Ferry Road with the north line of the S/2 of the SE/4 of Section 20 (T16N-R13W), Caddo Parish, Louisiana, and being a point on the present City limits line as established by Annexation Ordinance No. 75 of 1994; run thence, from said point of beginning, north 88° 57' 13" west along the north line of the S/2 of the SE/4 of Section 20 a distance of 2598.88 feet to the north-south centerline of Section 20; run thence south 01° 03' 46" west along the north-south centerline of Section 20 a distance of 748.66 feet to and across the 145 foot-wide Southern Loop Road to a point on the southwesterly right-of-way line thereof; run thence in a southeasterly and easterly direction along the southwesterly and southerly right-of-way line of the 145, 135, and 120 foot-wide Southern Loop Road (Parish fee per

Book 2966, Page 331, and originally called the East-West Road and renamed per Book 3306, Page 596, and now owned by the City of Shreveport per Book 3521, Page 124) across the SE/4 of Section 20 to the intersection with the west right-of-way line of the 80 foot-wide Norris Ferry Road and to a point on the City limits line of said Annexation Ordinance No. 75 of 1994; run thence north 01° 05' 49" east along the west right-of-way line of the Norris Ferry Road and along the existing City limits line a distance of 1309.16 feet to the said intersection of the west line of the Norris Ferry Road with the north line of the S/2 of the SE/4 of Section 20(T16N-R13W), Caddo Parish, Louisiana, the point of beginning, and containing 67.236 acres, more or less.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened, that the limits and boundaries of the City of Shreveport are hereby changed to include within the limits and boundaries of said City the above-described property.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the annexed area contained herein be and is hereby assigned to Council District "D".

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the Clerk of Council be and is hereby authorized to record, within ten(10) days of the final passage of this ordinance, with the Clerk of the District Court for Caddo Parish a description of the entire boundary of the municipality as changed by this ordinance.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the Clerk of Council be and is hereby authorized to record a certified copy of this ordinance in the official records of the District Court for Caddo Parish, Louisiana.

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

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

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.

TAG NO. 02-05

WHEREAS, Section 172 of Title 33 of the Louisiana Revised Statutes of 1950 provides for annexation by petition; and
WHEREAS, a petition was signed by more than the required percentage in property value of the area described below has been filed with the City Council to annex and bring within the corporate limits of the City of Shreveport, Louisiana, the following described property, to-wit:

Begin at the point of intersection of the south right-of-way line of the Bert Kouns Industrial Loop Expressway (La. Hwy. 526) as per LA DOTD fee in Book 1484, Page 394, of the Records of Caddo Parish, Louisiana with the west line of the SE/4 of the SW/4 of Section 1 (T16N-R15W), Caddo Parish, Louisiana, and being a point on the present City limits line as established by Annexation Ordinance No. 195 of 1994; run thence, from said point of beginning, south 00° 02' 46" east along west line of the SE/4 of the SW/4 of Section 1 a distance of 1051.77 feet to the southwest corner thereof of the SE/4 of the SW/4 of said Section 1; run thence south 89° 41' 54" east along the south line of the section a distance of 318.03 feet, more or less, to the southeast corner of the 7.70 acre tract owned by the Word of God Ministries, Inc. as described and acquired in Book 3374, Page 694, of the Records; run thence north 00° 11' 30" west along the east line of the Word of God Ministries property a distance of 1071.84 feet to the intersection with the said south line of the Bert Kouns Industrial Loop right-of-way and to the existing City limits line of Annexation Ordinance No. 195 of 1994; run thence south 89° 01' west a distance of 63.29 feet and south 86° 14' 34" west a distance of 252.05 feet along the south line of the Bert Kouns Industrial Loop and along the existing City limits line to the intersection with the said west line of the SE/4 of the SW/4 of Section 1 (T16N-R15W), Caddo Parish, Louisiana, the point of beginning, and containing 7.719 acres, more or less.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened, that the limits and boundaries of the City of Shreveport are hereby changed to include within the limits and boundaries of said City the above-described property.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the annexed area contained herein be and is hereby assigned to Council District "E".

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the Clerk of Council be and is hereby authorized to record, within ten(10) days of the final passage of this ordinance, with the Clerk of the District Court for Caddo Parish a description of the entire boundary of the municipality as changed by this ordinance.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the Clerk of Council be and is hereby authorized to record a certified copy of this ordinance in the official records of the District Court for Caddo Parish, Louisiana.

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

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

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

TAG NO. 02-06

WHEREAS, Section 172 of Title 33 of the Louisiana Revised Statutes of 1950 provides for annexation by petition; and

WHEREAS, a petition was signed by more than the required percentage in property value of the area described below has been filed with the City Council to annex and bring within the corporate limits of the City of Shreveport, Louisiana, the following described property, to-wit:

Begin at the point of intersection of the northwest corner of Lot 9 of the Ed Jacobs Subdivision as per plat in Book 300, Page 592, of the Map Records of Caddo Parish, Louisiana with the south right-of-way line of the 50 foot-wide Meriwether Road as dedicated in Book 131, Page 47, of the Records in the N/2 of the SW/4 of Section 33 (T17N-R14W), Caddo Parish, Louisiana, and being a point on the present City limits line as established by Annexation Ordinance No. 162 of 1971; run thence, from said point of beginning, south along the west line of Lot 9 of the Ed Jacobs Subdivision a distance of 925.16 feet, more or less, to the north right-of-way line of the Inner Loop Expressway (La. Hwy. 3132) and to a point on the present City limits line as established by Annexation Ordinance No. 101 of 1985; run thence east along the north line of the Inner Loop Expressway and along the present City limits line across lots 9,10, and 11 of the Ed Jacobs Subdivision a distance of 495.45 feet to the east line thereof of Lot 11; run thence north along the east line of Lot 11 a distance of 125.40 feet to a point located 800.00 feet south of the northeast corner of Lot 11; run thence west, 800.00 feet south of and parallel with the north line of the Ed Jacobs subdivision, across Lots 11 and 10 a distance of 330.00 feet to the east line of Lot 9; run thence north along the east line of Lot 9 a distance of 800.00 feet to the northeast corner thereof and to the intersection with the said south line of the Meriwether Road and to the City limits line of Annexation Ordinance No. 162 of 1971; run thence west along the north line of Lot 9 and along the south line of the road and along the City limits line a distance of 165.00 feet to the northwest corner of Lot 9, the point of beginning, and containing 4.455 acres, more or less.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened, that the limits and boundaries of the City of Shreveport are hereby changed to include within the limits and boundaries of said City the above-described property.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the annexed area contained herein be and is hereby assigned to Council District "E".

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the Clerk of Council be and is hereby authorized to record, within ten(10) days of the final passage of this ordinance, with the Clerk of the District Court for Caddo Parish a description of the entire boundary of the municipality as changed by this ordinance.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the Clerk of Council be and is hereby authorized to record a certified copy of this ordinance in the official records of the District Court for Caddo Parish, Louisiana.

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

to this end the provisions of this ordinance are hereby declared severable.
BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that all ordinances or resolutions or parts thereof in conflict
herewith are hereby repealed.

ORDINANCE NO. 20 OF 2003
AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2003 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS BUDGET AND
OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the City Charter provides for the amendment of any previously-adopted budget; and
WHEREAS, the City Council finds it necessary to amend the 2003 Capital Improvements
Budget to provide additional project funding, to create new projects and for other purposes.
NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in legal
session convened, that Ordinance No. 162 of 2002, the 2003 Capital Improvements Budget, be
further amended and re-enacted as follows:

In Program C (Street Improvements):

Decrease the appropriation for **Westport Road Improvements (96-C017)** by \$107,400.
Funding source is 1999 GOB, Prop.4 (Streets).

Decrease the appropriation for **Fern Avenue Extension (70th to Pierremont) (98-C003)** by
\$100,000. Funding source is 1999 GOB, Prop. 4 (Streets).

Decrease the appropriation for **I-49/Murphy Street/Texas Avenue Corridor Improvements
(98-C007)** by \$1,400,000. Funding source is 1999 GOB, Prop. 4 (Streets).

Increase the appropriation for **Concrete Street Panel Replacement Project (01C009)** by
\$2,000,000. Funding sources are 1978 GOB (Streets) \$5,700, 1980 GOB (Streets) \$40,000,
1989 GOB (Streets) \$18,700, 1990 GOB (Streets) \$4,400, 1993 GOB (Streets) \$30,700, 1993-B
GOB (Streets) \$202,400, 1996 GOB, Prop. 4 (Streets) \$90,700 and 1999 GOB, Prop. 4 (Streets)
\$1,607,400.

Adjust totals and subtotals accordingly.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the remainder of Ordinance 162 of 2002, as amended, shall
remain in full force and effect.

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

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

ORDINANCE NO. 21 OF 2003
AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2003 DOWNTOWN DEVELOPMENT DISTRICT
BUDGET, APPROPRIATING THE FUNDS AUTHORIZED THEREIN, AND OTHERWISE

PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Shreveport has previously adopted the 2003 budget for the Downtown Development District; and

WHEREAS, the Downtown Development Authority has recommended that the 2003 budget be amended, to modify estimated revenues and expenditures.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in legal session convened, that Ordinance No. 180 of 2002, the 2003 Downtown Development Authority budget is hereby amended as follows:

Under Funds Available for Appropriation:

- Decrease Prior-Year Reserves by \$101,500.
- Decrease Streetscape Contract by \$100.
- Increase Streetscape Miscellaneous Income by \$20,000.
- Increase Parking Services Contract by \$25,000.

Under Appropriations for 2003

- Decrease DDA Administration and Programming by \$ 444,700.
- Increase Parking Services by \$40,000.
- Appropriate \$348,100 to Capital Purchases and Reserves.

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 affect without the invalid provisions, items or applications; and, to this end, the provisions of this ordinance are hereby declared severable.

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

ORDINANCE NO. 22 OF 2003

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 106 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES, THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT ZONING ORDINANCE, BY REZONING THE SOUTH SIDE OF MONTROSE DRIVE 250 FEET EAST OF LINE AVENUE, SHREVEPORT, CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA. FROM R-1D, URBAN, ONE-FAMILY RESIDENCE DISTRICT, TO B-1-E, BUFFER BUSINESS/EXTENDED USE DISTRICT, LIMITED TO "PARKING AND STORAGE AS APPLIED FOR" 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 13 & North 100 feet of Lot 14 and abandoned 20 feet alley lying & adjacent to Lot 13, Montrose Park Subd., Shreveport, Caddo Parish, located on the south side of Montrose Drive 250 feet east of Line Avenue, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, legally described below, be and the same is hereby changed from R-1D, Urban, One-Family Residence District, to B-1-E, Buffer

Business/Extended Use District, limited to “parking and storage as applied for” 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 a revised site plan drawn to scale showing landscaping to ordinance standards and parking with proper dimensional standards and turnaround space to be submitted to and approved by the Planning Director, with any significant changes or additions requiring further review and approval by the Planning Commission.

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

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

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

1. Alcohol Permit Renewal: Michael Smith for The American Legion (1725 Jamison St.) (Deferred on Feb. 10)
2. Alcohol Retail Permit: Ms. Deborah Hawkins [Employer: 2901 Milam St. (Take-A-Bag Grocery)] (G/Jackson) (Special Meeting scheduled on Tuesday, April 29, 2003 at 3:00 p.m.)
3. Resolution 203 of 2002: Authorizing the execution of an Intergovernmental Agreement with the Parish of Caddo relative to the development and operation of a park and related facilities in the MLK area. (A/Lester) (Tabled on Feb. 11)

NEW BUSINESS:

1. Motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Jackson that all appeals from cases numbered BAC -8-03, BAC-9-03 and BAC-10-03, relating to Deja Vu., II - Shreveport, LLC and 202 Commerce Street be consolidated for the hearing and heard immediately after agenda item 7.C. at the March 11, 2003 regular meeting; and that:
 1. The MPC Staff shall be allowed 10 minutes to explain the actions they took that led to the consolidated appeal;
 2. Each appellant (that is, all persons listed on an appeal, members and employees of any corporation listed on an appeal and their attorney) shall receive a maximum of 30 minutes to present their case on the consolidated appeal, and

3. Deja Vu, II - Shreveport, LLC shall receive a maximum of 30 minutes to present its case and respond to all matters contained in the consolidated appeal.

Councilman Hogan: Not long after we started our meeting, I had been trying to get in touch with Mr. Milkovich. I was able to hear from Mr. Thompson who said Scott Sinclair was okay with the 30 minute limit and Mr. Kirkland but are you okay with the 10 minutes, does that give you enough time.

In speaking with Mr. Milkovich, I wanted to make sure that we were fair to him and he has four people listed as co-plaintiffs on his suit. And, I'd like to remind everyone too that his is a legal suit, this is a legal suit, this is a case that is coming before us, it is just not a grievance from someone in the public. And so I asked Mr. Milkovich how much time would he need and he said, 45 minutes to an hour. In all fairness unless we can—I would make a motion during the time that they are speaking that he could have extra time, I'm going to have to vote against it. Mr. Thompson, I may defer to you for guidance on that.

Mr. Thompson: If you are not satisfied with the motion then the correct vote for you to make would be “no.”

But, I'd like to set the record straight on one thing. When I talked to Mr. Scott Sinclair, he did not say 30 minutes was okay. He said, I asked him what was a reasonable time? He responded, but he didn't give me a definite answer, but he said, if you give us a reasonable time, then I will make sure that my presentation fits within that time and if I need to put anything else in the record, I'll do it in writing. So, he did not specifically say 30 minutes was okay or was not okay, but he said if you give me a reasonable time, then I'll make my presentation fit within that reasonable time. If I have anything else to say then I'll put it in writing and give it to the Council members and then make it a part of the record.

Councilman Hogan: So, Mr. Thompson, if everyone is okay, all the other people here listed are okay with that and Mr. Milkovich wants an extra 15 minutes, could I still vote in favor of this and make a motion to give him the extra time although it may not receive a second though, is that right?

Mr. Thompson: You can do that but I think it is inconsistent if you are going to vote for this with the idea that you are not going to force him or expect him to abide by this particular motion, that's inconsistent.

Councilman Jackson: By the form of this motion, did I understand I think Councilman Walford was reading and he suggested that there were additional plaintiffs and I don't know if Mr. Milkovich is a plaintiff or is he representing four plaintiffs?

Mr. Thompson: He represents several people and the intent of the motion is that all of the people that he represents, they would have a total of 30 minutes to make their presentation to the Council.

Councilman Jackson: So what happens if there is someone else who is not named in this motion?

Mr. Thompson: The state law requires you to provide an opportunity for people to speak at a Council meeting and if a person is not represented by one of these attorneys, is not an plaintiff or is not an appellant, in this particular case, I think they would have the 3 minutes that you ordinarily give people to speak on any subject on which they want to speak.

Councilman Walford: That was the reason that we suggested moving it to 7.C. so the public would have their 3 minute comments under Public Comments and then this appeal would be heard for the very reason that you are bringing up, Mr. Jackson.

Councilman Lester: Is it my understanding that Mr. Milkovich represents about four plaintiffs and that Mr. Milkovich will be given 30 minutes to present his case on behalf of all four of his clients as opposed to 30, 30, 30, 30?

Mr. Thompson: That's is correct.

Councilman Lester: Thirty minutes for the entirety of his case for all four clients?

Mr. Thompson: Yes.

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

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, if you direct I will send this to all of the persons involved who filed an appeal or that I know that have an interest so that they will know head of time what the rules are for this particular hearing.

Councilman Green: That'll be fine.

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS, BOARDS AND COMMITTEES: None.

CLERK'S REPORT: Letters of Appeal :

- 1.C-3-03, KEN CANATELLA INVESTMENTS, LLC & E. C. REALTY, INC., generally located on the southwest corner of Walker Road & Bert Kouns Ind. Lp. (South and west of Thrifty Liquor), from *R-1D & B-2 to B-3* and *R-1D to B-1*, auto sales and B-1 development with access to Walker Road. (E/Hogan) (Note: Appealing denial of B-3 zoning)
- 2.BAC-8-03, Appeal by Muy Alto Corporation and Chuck A. Pourciau, regarding the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy for 202 Commerce Street, Shreveport, Louisiana.
3. BAC-9-03, Administrative Appeal of the Certificate of Occupancy for Deja Vu in a B-4 District.
4. BAC-10-03, Appeal by Muy Alto Corporation and Chuck A. Pourciau, regarding the Certificate to Lift Stay signed by Alan R. Clarke on January 6, 2003.
5. Mr. Thompson: I believe that Lynette talked to some of you about a Property Standards Task Force meeting tomorrow at Noon and I believe the Chairman of that Task Force has informed me that, that's been cancelled. (Councilman Lester: That's correct.) and I wanted to make sure that all of the Council members understood that it will be re-set and we will notify you at a later date.

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 4:55 p.m.

/s/James Green, Chairman

/s/Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council

