

COUNCIL PROCEEDINGS OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT, LOUISIANA
JULY 8, 2003

The Regular Meeting of the City Council of the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, was called to order by Chairman Monty Walford at 3:00 p.m., Tuesday, July 8, 2003, in the Government Chambers in Government Plaza (505 Travis Street).

Councilman Jackson led the Invocation.

On Roll Call, the following members were Present: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Absent: None.

Approve Minutes. Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Jackson to approve the Administrative Conference Summary Minutes of June 23, 2003 and the Council Meeting Minutes of June 24, 2003. Motion approved by the following vote: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

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

Convention Center and Convention Center Hotel Project Report:

Chairman Walford: In reports, yesterday, we had the Convention Center and Convention Center Hotel Project Report and our Property Standards Report.

Public Hearings: None.

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

Confirmations and/or Appointments:

Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Gibson to confirm Jimmy Hewlett and Gene Hicks to the Electrical Board (reappointment). Motion approved by the following vote: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

Fire and Police Civil Service Board: Richard Lamb III: Councilman Walford: And Mr. Mayor, I understand you want to remove. . . Motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Green to withdraw the name of Richard Lamb III to the Police and Fire Civil Service Board. Motion approved by the following vote: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

Adding Legislation to the Agenda.

Motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Green to add the following to the agenda:

1. Resolution No. 109 of 2003 by Councilman Gibson: A resolution amending Section 1.11 of the City Council Rules of Procedure by adding Subsection (I) relative to Appearances Before the Council and related matters and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
2. Resolution No. 110 of 2003 by Councilman Gibson: A resolution to appoint a committee to explore the feasibility of establishing a metro law enforcement agency and otherwise providing with respect thereto

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

Public Comments (Agenda Items to Be Adopted):

Kevin W. Hammond (415 Texas, Suite 100): Gentlemen, I'm here today on behalf of Richard Carroll and his appeal from the Zoning Board of Appeals decision to deny his

application for home occupancy.

As you may be aware, this matter seeks to allow Mr. Carroll to make use of his residence as essentially an office for his business. And under the zoning requirements, there are 15 specific criteria that must be met and it was found at the ZBA level that he met 11 of those 15 and there were some recommendations that perhaps we try to come to some sort of stipulations as to the other four.

What I'm asking for today is this body to exercise its jurisdiction to either remand or postpone this decision to permit the parties involved to try to come to some resolutions between themselves. We feel strongly that with people being neighbors, everyone's interest is better served by them sitting down and hopefully come to some sort negotiated resolution to this. It's essentially a dispute over a parking spot, as I've found out since last talking to you Mr. Carmody and there are some other issues regarding advertisements in the telephone book and that sort of thing.

But, I've talked to Mr. Salvucci today (unclear) and I believe you'll find that he favors this proposition and also agrees that mediated resolution would be better than having a decision on this matter today.

And not to burden you with too much information on this deal, but I would like to point out that Mr. Carroll's been in this location for nine years. And as you are probably aware, the prescriptive period for non-conforming uses is something in the neighborhood of five years. And so, if the matter is forced to a decision, all that will happen is that we will end up filing suit and everyone will spend a lot of time and money fighting over whether he is allowed to do this.

So, I would ask you to exercise your discretion and let the parties try to come to some sort of resolution instead of litigation. Thank you for your time.

Councilman Hogan: How long of a postponement did you say you would need?

Mr. Hammond: Initially I was comfortable with something in the neighborhood of something of about 30 days. In my conversation with Mr. Salvucci, who you may recall is the President of the Homeowners Association for the properties involved, he actually is out of town during this time of the year and he told me that he would be more comfortable with something along the neighborhood of late September, early October which in my conversations with him, it really sounds like a good idea because it permits us to call a meeting of the Homeowners Association. I'll be present and answer any questions that we have, get all the parties together and try to come out with a resolution that makes everyone happy. So, rather than the 30-days that I initially thought might be acceptable, it sounds like it works better for the other side to postpone it until October or so.

Ken Kreft (157 Archer), President of the Homeowners Association, Broadmoor Neighborhood: This is on the item to be introduced today, not on final passage, correct, to consolidate the Caddo Parish Sheriff and the Shreveport City Police?

Councilman Walford: That has been added to the agenda so yes, sir you can go ahead.

Mr. Kreft: I'd like to speak generally in support of appointing the group to study the issue to possibly consolidate Caddo Parish, Steve Prator's office and the Shreveport City Police. I read a nice letter by former Captain Snell yesterday opposing this and certainly there is room for the thought on both sides.

I'm unaware of any City-County or City-Parish which has done this which is then gone back on it. I know that Baton Rouge, East Baton Rouge managed to do it within our status, did Lafayette and Lafayette Parish in our state and other examples----Nashville-Davidson County, Tennessee, Charlotte-Mecklinberg, North Carolina and dozens of others. It may be difficult. It may have some problems, such as civil service with the City and the Sheriff Deputies.

But you know gentlemen, about 235 years ago, there were 13 colonies under the article of confederation who got together for constitutional convention and that was very difficult and

they pulled it off. You know, we're pretty difficult. I'm not saying this is a good thing. I don't know that it'll save us a nickel. I think that it would. I think a former study showed savings of 8-12%, but that was years ago and things have changed. All I'm saying is let's not be afraid to study the issue and if it pans out fine, and if the study is a good one, impartially done and its not a good thing, we could stay together.

I like the way the City gets along with the Sheriff. Some of us wish the Sheriff and the Commission got along as well. I mean not always the case that two local governmental bodies see eye to eye on things so, lets at least give this the opportunity to have a serious study. I want to thank Mr. Gibson for coming forward with this idea.

John Salvucci (1401 Oden) concerns the case of Mr. Carroll wishing to have a business in his place of occupancy: We have, since the Zoning Board's time received four (4) more letters from people that are opposed to that and like to get that to the secretary. And that I have talked to—well through, as you know I was out of town in Boston since the middle part of May and I have all he e-mails I received from both Mr. Thompson, Mr. Carmody, Mr. Hammond and that which I'll turn also for your review of those items.

It seems that it was a big confusion as far as the timeframe. I was not in town when we had the final Zoning Board Commission hearing. I asked for the information on that, so that we could find out when they would be going or whether it would be appealed. I was informed it was being appealed June 24th. Subsequent to that, Mr. Carmody was being out of town., they delayed it 'till today. They said okay, they'll probably delay it pass that. I asked for a definitive firm date so I would know whether I had to fly in from Boston to be here.

I have a City Council Meeting on Thursday outside of Boston that I have to make also. No one was able to give me an answer to this. I didn't know whether I was supposed to be coming back, whether it was being delayed till today or whether it was being delayed until later on or not. I could not wait up until the last moment. I had to get airline tickets.

Okay, I flew in here Saturday night and as of the first part of the week, I starting getting communication from everybody that well. . .they thought it was being delayed. But there was nothing assured of this. But I had to find out from the Board, the homeowners is quite willing to delay this to September, however we'd like something firm and in writing from somebody that this is in fact what's going to happen. And thereby we can go ahead and set up for a Homeowners meeting a discussion between Ms. Banks and Mr. Carroll so they can kinda resolve their differences and see where we stand. If they are able to resolve it, fine. It dissolves any need to go further. If they can't, then we need to pursue with the motion that we have right now, denying any business activity.

This morning, I had a call from David Carroll, Richard's father and also from the attorney. And they said well, since I've come down here, they wanted to reimburse me for the flight cost to come down and that so that this would cover the fact of my being here and then do reschedule until September. If this is to be, that's fine. The Homeowners Association can live with that and that's all I have to say.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Salvucci, I want to make sure that I'm clear. You have in addition to this, I think its 27 letters in opposition?

Mr. Salvucci: Twenty-nine (29).

Councilman Carmody: In addition to the 29 letters that you have in opposition, you now have four more. In our file, I believe we have three in support. Is it the position now of the Homeowners Association that you would desire this matter reprimanded back to the MPC or Zoning Board of Appeals for consideration there again?

Mr. Salvucci: No, not necessarily going back to the Board of Appeals, its just a matter of delaying any action here until such time as we can have a meeting of the Homeowners Association and see if they can resolve this within themselves. I mean, they can change the

Homeowners covenants to allow certain actions to take place and then Mr. Carroll would not be in violation of the homeowners rules, then he could go ahead and seek justification through the Zoning Board if he needs it.

Councilman Carmody: At yesterday's work session Mr. Hammond, I believe had asked us to remand this back to the ZBA and that would again kinda start the process over at that level. Is that what the Association wants us to do?

Mr. Salvucci: That's fine, it wouldn't bother me one way or the other.

Joe Exidine (Anodark, Oklahoma): And on behalf of the Caddo Nation, I thank you for this opportunity to speak and on behalf of Chairperson Ruth Parker, I have been designated to say a few things concerning the changing of the name of Caddo Street to Huckaby Street.

As you know Shreveport was at one time the heart of the Caddo homelands. And our homelands stretched into Arkansas, into Oklahoma, into Texas and deeper into Louisiana. We were at one time very proud and prosperous. We traded with the River Tribes. We traded with the Dessert Tribes, the Comanche's and Apaches for instance the Southeastern United States Tribes and the Plains Tribes as well as the French and the Spanish and many Black and White and Hispanic traders.

And at one time the Caddo People that were settled here were very friendly and generous. We shared our wealth with tribes and the people in need. We ate at the Wichitas and the Delawares and the Alabama (unclear) and the French and the Spanish and the Americans. We were also known for aiding and harboring many slaves prior to our removal and our eventual placement into Southwestern Oklahoma.

Today, there are four thousand (4,000) of us from tens of thousands to four thousand (4,000) of us. From the vast land that we own now, we have 2500 acres. At one time, we were down to 1,900 in the 1970 census, so we are making a small comeback. But we are placed among 39 tribes, 7 in our immediate area: the Comanches, the Kiowas, the Apaches, the Wichitas, the Delawares, the Cheyennes and the Arapahos. And we have many battles. We are in battles with 29 counties in southeastern Oklahoma for water rights. We are in land disputes with other tribes throughout Arkansas and Louisiana and everyday for decades, our graves have been robbed and looted in all of our homelands. And everyday, we fight for keeping from losing a little bit of our culture.

But the changing of Caddo Street is not about, as much about the cultural preservation of the Caddo Nation, as it is about your own historical integrity. Was not Caddo Street one of the original sixteen streets that was named by Captain Shreve in the founding of this City? We the Caddo Nation, we are not interested in getting involved in the internal affairs of this City of Shreveport. I'm sure Mr. Huckaby was a fine man, but surely there is an Elm Street, or Maple Street or even a Main Street that would be honored to hold this name.

Councilmen of the City of Shreveport, your Honor and Citizens of Shreveport, please do not take another little piece of our heritage away by changing the name of Caddo Street. Thank you.

Councilman Carmody: I was just gonna ask, the Caddo Nation doesn't have a casino?

Mr. Exidine: We have a small casino on our complex with 52 machines. We're not one of the big casino tribes, no.

James Ken Howard (5424 Primitive Baptist Church Road): I noticed here that the Shreveport-Blanchard Road is gonna be changed only from the Roy Road to the Hearne Avenue. My information said it was gonna be completely changed.

I want to give a little history about changing road names. Once upon a time, Primitive Baptist Church Road was changed to Ranger Road. A young fellow lives on that road, didn't like to have to write that much each time he gave his address. So, he changed it or it took three people down to the office and got it. . . three people—got it changed Ranger Road. Well, 210

people went down and got it changed it back to Primitive Baptist Church Road. Well, my long driveway was renamed by the tall fellow down there at the office and they named it Shandra Drive, well, I didn't get in on that. And I didn't ask for it and I didn't need it. So, three years later, I had not been getting any tax notices on the piece of property on the west side, so I went down, checked to see what had happened. And the lady said well, you don't own that property and I said, what happened. I've been paying property taxes on it now for 18 years. And she said, but it was sold at Sheriff's sale. And I said well, what happened?

So, I did a little research. Found out that the Post Office didn't know where Shandra Drive was. So, the letters to inform me to pay my taxes were in the "dead letter file." So, I had to go through the process of re-buying and getting my property back in my name.

Changing the names of the streets can cause a few problems. I would like to not have the Shreveport-Blanchard Road since I've been driving on that for 33 years and a lots before that too. I didn't realize it was gonna be just from the Roy Road to the Hearne Avenue, but still, I would like to not change Shreveport-Blanchard Road to any other name as a matter of fact and I think that's all I wanted to say relative to the problem.

James Pannell (3835 Eileen Lane): I came to speak for the proposition for the name change and I would just like to say that about less than two months ago, you had a mountain that was named after, I think, President Coolidge and they changed the name of that mountain to Reagan. If you can change a mountain for a man, what do we do in the City of Shreveport to give adequate contribution to a man's legacy that I stand here and look at right now?

The change in the former city government. The only mayor that has been the mayor of this city since the change of former city government that did not come from this Council, and you can correct me if I'm wrong, was the first mayor. After that, all those people who served this city has come from this Council here. All of the people who are serving this Council now would not have had an opportunity to serve on this Council had that form of city government not been changed.

If the decision not to change the name, then how do you honor a man whose action gave you the opportunity to be where you are? And I think the fact that Mr. Lester is bringing this resolution forward may speak volumes to the situation because that should be something that if Mr. Hogan, Mr. Carmody, Mr. Gibson, any of y'all should be trying to think of ways to honor this man. It should not just be a Black issue. If you and your conscious feel that this is not the right thing to do, what did y'all decide was the right thing or the fitting thing to honor this man and have y'all come up with any kind of ideas?

I think that its not an issue at this point of convincing anyone to vote one way or the other. I think these people, that the Council is pretty, or mind is pretty well made up on the way they are voting, but I would just ask y'all to think of how or what ideas have y'all had to honor a man who has changed this City more than any other person, I think, that worked in this present form of government and probably in this City for a long period of time.

So, I think we need to if not do this, we need to figure out a way to honor this man. It has been too long already.

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Pannell, if you'd like to stay, you may. But to answer your question, one of the ways and one of the things I talked about, an idea that I had and I've conveyed this to Councilman Lester is that, we rename the Multi-Cultural Center after Mr. Huckaby; that's just an idea. I hope we can explore that and so, I just wanted to let you know that I have had some other thoughts about this.

Mr. Pannell: Well, I just wanted to make sure that at this point when we are talking about healing this community and you know at some point, we need to sit and discuss how we go about doing that and the fact that CNN was in here this morning, and you know the national spotlight is still on this city, they are looking at not necessarily the problem that we've had, but

how do we go about solving those problems and how do we work together. And I think that we can go a long ways toward doing that by coming up with something to do for a man that's done so much for this City.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Pannell, I appreciate your coming forward on this issue. I know personally, the esteem and regard that you held for the late Councilman Huckaby, and I appreciate you coming forward at this time.

I want to let you know as well as the citizens that are here and the citizens that are watching that today, I'm going to be moving to postpone this issue, voting on this issue.

I made certain commitments to certain folks within the confines of District A and some people that I told them I was gonna talk with them some more in regards to this particular issue.

I do believe that you are right. I think there should be a way for us to honor a man such as Hilry Huckaby that does service to him, but does not diminish the contributions of others. As Mr. Exidine clearly stated, nothing that we propose in this resolution was an attempt to denigrate anyone group in favor of another. Because certainly that's not my intention and I know that, that was not Councilman Huckaby's position and that's not something that he would want to do.

And so, I'm moving to, I'm gonna be moving to postpone this, because I think there are some ways that we can do, accomplish both of these goals. But, I do agree with you, that this is something that is long since coming and we do need to find a way to honor Councilman Huckaby and his legacy because certainly in a personal way, none of us would be sitting here before this Council in the seats that we are sitting in, but for his contributions. And on a personal level, I certainly wouldn't be sitting here in a seat that he . . . not only did he open the door, he kicked the door open and he put himself in harms' way in many an opportunity many a day, so that someone like me and other people like me, and when I say *people like me*, I'm not just talking about African-Americans, I'm talking about young lawyers in the City of Shreveport could have certain opportunities to do certain things.

So, I think there should be a way for us to do that. And I'm committed and working forward to find a way for us to do that and I would hope that my colleagues would join me in trying to find a way, like I said, to honor the legacy of Hilry Huckaby as well as not doing anything to denigrate anyone else's history and when I say that, I'm talking about not only the Caddo Indian Nation, but I'm also talking about the Ford Family as well.

Mr. Pannell: I think its important that you know that we will support you. This is something that we thought was a good idea, but you know, if it appears that its dis-respecting someone else, we need to find another way or we need to, at this point, try to figure out some kind of way that we can unify the City and hopefully this wouldn't be another dividing point to the City. So we'll support whatever your decision is, Mr. Lester.

Louis Wells, Sr. (406 Woodrow): I'm speaking in opposition to the request for a liquor on Hollywood Avenue that would add a dimension that we do not want in the community.

I am a property owner and I live within a block and a half of that business. We're delighted that he's decided to have a barbeque place, I think that's great. We welcome their business and I will be one of those who will go in and see if its worth trying.

But to have an additional place that is selling beer and et cetera is not a good idea. We have a lot of places in the area that's already selling liquor and et cetera that are grandfathered in, that we can't deal with. We can't touch them, because they're grandfathered in. But we don't want an exception to the B-2 zoning where we have an additional dimension. That, we just don't want to have.

We'd like to maintain the quality of life in that area and that's a 7-day a week, 24-hour a day challenge in order to do that.

So, the thrust of my comments are that I beseech the board to deny that request for an

exception to the B-2 zoning. We welcome him as a businessperson and any business that fits the B-2 zoning. We have no problem with that.

David Cox (2633 Lyles Lane): I'm here on behalf of the Southern Hills Homeowners who have signed a petition which y'all have a copy of and we're asking the City leaders to overturn a ruling by MPC dated June 4, 2003.

The property in question is at 905 Francis Drive and is occupied by Shreveport Christian Church. We are asking the City Council to overturn the MPC ruling for them not to be able to open up this school for the reasons that was in the letter dated to you July 8, 2003.

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Cox. The room is full of people, but for the record, would you just have your people stand up today, everyone that's here (approximately 25-30 people stood).

Mr. Cox: And for the record, we had over 500 signatures that was turned down.

Councilman Hogan: Thank you, I appreciate y'all coming today.

Dr. Artis Cash (900 Francis Drive): Earlier today, I was watching CNN and I noticed that the President was in Sinagoge. Being in Sinagoge, the President made a statement, that he made a statement for America and that statement was is that "slavery was the biggest crime in history."

So, what is that saying to me as an African-American? That's saying to me that most recently, just a few minutes ago, Mr. Hogan asked Mr. Cox to have all the people to stand that was with him. I'm the Pastor of the Church that is not trying to open up a nudist bar, that's not trying to open up a liquor store, but trying to educate children. And so, he asked all the people to stand, but unfortunately nobody in that group looked like me. I thought that was appalling.

Here we are, the aftermath of March 15th and we're still playing games. We're playing the race card too big. This should be the time where we come together. We want to bring this City together. We cannot bring this City together if we're gonna still play racial games. We don't want to play racial games, surely, people on the other side shouldn't play racial games.

And so, its important for us to watch what we're doing. As Mr. Pannell said. CNN was in here, the nation is watching Shreveport now. They're watching to see what direction we're going to go. And if we keep playing these little games of racism, we are forever dooming ourselves to be the ones that everybody look at and laugh at.

We call ourselves an All American City. But here the President of the United States of America gets up and says its wrong for slavery to have happened. So, that must mean anything that's the fruit of slavery, must be wrong. Racism is wrong and we need to deal with it. If we don't deal with it on this issue.

The nerve to want to come against a school, a church school is incredible to me. That much says that, you don't even want me to live in the neighborhood because you have now taken a definitive point against a church and I think that's sad.

And so be it building it up your political career or what, but to sit here and to act as if its alright to stand up, all these people, and all these people turn out to be White, and here I am, a lone Black man, come down here to say to you all, this is not our measure of rule. Our measure of rule is not to deal with personalities. Its to deal with the issues.

The Fire, the State Fire Marshals are being made aware of what is taking place in that building. Now, if it cost a ton of money, its nobody's business, but ours. And so, I guess, what I'm saying to you is lets look at the full picture this time, lets don't look at . . .you know the Cedar Grove riots was a horrible thing. We didn't learn nothing from that. Watts riot, Ben Harvard, Cincinnati, most recently Cleveland, Ohio—shouldn't we have learned anything from any of these actions? Evidently we did not. If we're going to allow this kind of stuff to keep going on. The attendant over there asked me while I was parking, he said why are all those people down there? And I say, well, I heard I had an issue on the ballot here and hopefully, somebody take a look at it and realize that I'm not this guy that people say or try to make me out to be. That I can

wear white suit like Brother Carmody and be a good guy just like everyone else; so, I'm trying to be a good guy. Lets do right now, lets do right and lets stop this racial games that we're playing, otherwise, we set ourselves up for continuation of what we don't want. Thank you very much, God bless you all and God bless America and thank you for this, President.

Councilman Lester: Thank you Mr. Chairman, I have a question. Not to Mr. Cash, but to Mr. Cox if I could.

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Chairman, I'm not sure if its in order, I have a question, I have a comment to Dr. Cash. How would you like . . . ?

Councilman Walford: Right now, Dr. Cash has got the floor, if there are questions for him, please ask them.

Dr. Cash: I'll yield, Sir.

Councilman Walford: No, as a matter of procedure, Mr. Cox had his time and there were no questions that I recall other that to have folks stand, so, right now are there any questions for Dr. Cash?

Councilman Hogan: I do have a question. I have a comment rather, I was waiting on Councilman Lester to see if he wanted to go first?

Councilman Lester: Well, actually Mr. Chairman, I want to ask a question. I didn't have any questions for Mr. Cox, but in listening to what Dr. Cash, I wanted to ask a couple of questions for some clarity from Mr. Cox and I think if Mr. Cox will be allowed to answer my question, it could shine some light on some issues and we could move forward. I don't think its out of the realm of possibility procedurally to ask both people that are for a particular issue or against a particular issue to answer a question and then we move forward. So, that's my complete position on that. If the Chair rules that we want to deal with this, then that's fine but I would just ask those questions. I think that could maybe shed some light on things.

Councilman Walford: I think its out of order, but if your fellow Councilmen would like to vote to suspend the rules, then certainly we'll back up and go back to Mr. Cox.

Councilman Lester: Well, I would move to suspend the rules. I don't think that a suspension of the rules is necessary, but if the Chair is saying that, then I would ask that we suspend the rules so that I could ask Mr. Cox a question (seconded by Councilman Green.)

Councilman Jackson: Point of Order, is it necessary to suspend the rules to ask a question, in this wise?

Councilman Lester: I would think not Councilman Jackson, but I guess the Chair is. . .

Councilman Jackson: I'm addressing it to the Chair.

Councilman Walford: The Chair thinks so. We're under Public Comments. Mr. Cox had his time, he was at the podium, no one asked any questions, that time is up. If you have questions for the other people, I would assume that during debate you could call those people forward but I don't think under Public Comments is the time to be calling people back up.

Councilman Jackson: So, am I correct in saying that the Chair would suggest that the correct time for asking questions to these other individuals that Councilman Lester suggested, would be at the time when it appears on the agenda?

Councilman Walford: When we are debating the issue. But at the moment we have a motion by Councilman Lester with a second by Councilman Green to suspend the rules to allow Mr. Cox to come back to the podium to be asked questions.

Councilman Gibson: Mr. Chair, in the spirit of . . .and again, I'm a supporter of Robert's Rules, but if a recommendation that Mr. Cox if he so chose to, fill out another slip to then come before this body, could then the questions be asked of him?

Councilman Walford: Mr. Gibson, that's a good one. Nobody has yet tried to speak twice.

Councilman Gibson: Again, I'm just asking the question just to be able to accommodate.

..

Councilman Walford: And I'm not trying to be difficult, I'm trying to put debate where it belongs.

Councilman Gibson: I understand that and again, I'm only asking for a point of clarification to the Chair. You've already ruled and I respect your rule.

Councilman Walford: To the best of my knowledge, there is nothing in our rules that prohibits one from speaking twice. Ms. Glass, do you want to help me on that?

Ms. Glass: Mr. Chairman, the rules do say that persons wishing to speak should provide notice in writing prior to the meeting. So, if you were to strictly follow that rule, they would not be able to provide it now.

Councilman Walford: So at this point, we have a motion to suspend the rules to essentially debate this issue at this time. I stand corrected. The motion is to allow Mr. Cox to come back up to be questioned by Councilman Lester.

Councilman Jackson: No, the motion is to suspend the rules.

Councilman Walford: The motion is to suspend the rules, however, a motion to suspend the rules as I appreciate it, you have to state the reason. And my understanding of your motion and the reason is to bring Mr. Cox back up to be asked questions.

Councilman Lester: Right.

Motion failed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Gibson, Hogan and Green.
4. Nays: Councilman Walford, Carmody and Jackson. 3.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Chairman, I'm literally at a lost and I say this because we have, whenever we have had people to come before this body on issues both pro and con, we have allowed a person that is in favor of an issue to speak, a person that's against an issue to speak.

..

Councilman Walford: Mr. Lester at this moment. . .

Councilman Lester: And if in fact. . .

Councilman Walford: Mr. Lester, you're out of order at the moment.

Councilman Lester: If in fact that person has a . . .

Councilman Walford: Mr. Lester unless this is a Point of Order, we don't have a motion on the floor, your motion was voted down.

Councilman Lester: Okay.

Councilman Walford: So, at this time, Dr. Cash, unless there were questions and I'm sorry you had to stand there through this.

Dr. Cash: No problem.

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Chairman, I still have a question. I have a couple of comments.

Councilman Walford: For Dr. Cash?

Councilman Hogan: Yes relating to this issue. First of all, Dr. Cash, I want to say thank you to you about your church and for what you've done with that building. I grew up in that neighborhood. I've lived there all my life and for the past some 15 years, that church building sat there. It was an eyesore, it looked pitiful. And, you and your people have gone through and fixed that church up. You've painted it, you put in flowers, you know I drive by there to come home. I come and go down that street everyday and I saw y'all myself out there working, putting in sweat equity on that building and you've done a fine job on that building, I want to say thank you for what you've done. You've even re-paved the parking lot. I'm sure that was an expensive item.

And you know, if this were about race, I would say that people would be in opposition of you having the church there but, its not about race, you know. No one, not one person I have spoken to and I've spoken to a lot of those 600 names is in opposition to you having the church

there. Its not about race, and its only about the school. We don't believe that it's a good location and we're gone leave it at that.

You said in your comments a moment ago, you said something about we don't want you in the neighborhood. You know, you live down the street from me, about a half mile down the street from me. I went by your home when I was campaigning and I met your wife and I have no problem with you living in my neighborhood. You're welcome to live in my neighborhood; that's fine. Again, not the issue and so, I just wanted to make those points clear to you.

Dr. Cash: Okay, may I respond sir?

Councilman Walford: Certainly.

Dr. Cash: Let me say this here. We've have since we've been there, two maybe three incidents that are very, very serious violations of human rights. 1. The first Wednesday night we had a service there, every car in the parking lot was . . . a flyer was put on there asking that we come up with a song, they're gonna give us \$1,000 cash to come up with a song that support slavery; that was the first Wednesday. From that, we had to hire an officer to be on the parking lot every time we hold services. 2. I'm sure you're aware of it, a young Caucasian lad, not 10 years, not probably older than my youngest son, came up and threw a rock through the window of the school because he heard his parents talking about the school. 3. Yesterday, I'm sitting in my office. Had I been sitting two feet back, there was an explosion in my office. Had I been sitting two feet back, I would have probably not be addressing you today.

Just all these little things. So, for you to say, yes you want me in your neighborhood, but you like the church and we brought the church property up, what make you think we're not going to bring that building up? And we have a school down the street as you well know, there are several schools in that area. The young boy that threw the rock, he didn't even attend the schools in the neighborhood. He lived across Kingston Road, down a ways but he walked up there because his parents were given a certificate. I had a White couple and you know them too, came to my office and they said "we want to know why you come here and you hate us?" And I said "who said, I hate you?" We ended up knowing some of the same people in New York City. They in return said "I don't know why they said that about you." But they tried to force us to sign a petition against you. So, when you tell me you have 600 names, I wonder did I meet all 600.

Now, I know for some reason, people don't believe I back the badge but I back that badge when its right and only when its right. So, I just wanted to bring to your attention. Now these flyers, we sent one to the FBI. Obviously we took them off the cars, because we thought they were something else. We sent one to the FBI, we sent one to Paul Carmouche and so, we have done our homework. The rock incident, I refused to prosecute the young man. I refused to prosecute him because I felt that, that was the fruit of the same thing President Bush talked about today, that's the fruit of that and that shouldn't go on now. This is 2003, Councilmen, and in 2003, you mean to say that someone can come to you and tell you that even though you and I have prayed together, you and I have personally prayed together and we prayed together, and we prayed for healing of this City (that's what you and I prayed for.) You led the prayer and I came back and reinforced the prayer and so we prayed. And you mean to tell me that we're gonna occupy heaven with this kind of stuff? Come on man, you know this is wrong. So, I just wanted you to know about those incidents. They did happen. The police got the rock incident and Swepco and whatever investigators they sent out had the other one.

So, you know, I'm not at all moved. I'm in my 50s now so, I'm a little too old to run. So, if somebody wants to mix it up, I'll mix it up and I'm just that way. So, whatever it takes, I'll be ready for it. So, if I want to do right by that community, that's why I didn't come in there and do nothing half way. I came in there and did an excellent job with building and continue to do stuff with that area.

And they haven't seen nothing yet. There is a song we sing in our choir that says, you haven't seen nothing yet, you just wait.

Councilman Lester: Dr. Cash, you made reference to some people in the community having objections to the school. Mr. Cox during his presentation didn't make any specific reference to any objections and had I been allowed to ask, because I think its only fair to give both sides a chance to make their case, I would have asked Mr. Cox could he get into some specifics of the objections that the community has because we could have very easily had about 20 people speak and I'm sure each one of those 20 people could have spoken for three minutes about their issues. I just thought it would have been fair since you've said that the community has apparently has some objections to some of the things that have happened at the church. I think it was only fair to give Mr. Cox an opportunity to state those objections. And I would hope that someone with the group would possibly fill out a form before we finish this so that you could state what those objections are because I think its important to put those objections on the record especially given the fact that we're going to be voting on those issues. I think that's important. Some people don't. I think its important to hear everything that everybody has to say—maybe that's just the lawyer in me.

Having said that, you indicated that some folks in the community had some objections to the church and then you made reference to a Fire Marshal. In as much as I don't live in that area, could you enlighten me to maybe what the colloquy has been. I'm not talking about the issue that you spoke of before as it relates to the rock. I'm talking about the issues as it relates to your application. What has been the dialogue between you and some of the citizens in terms of specific issues. I think you indicated something about Fire Marshal and some other issues. I'd like for somebody (hint, hint) to enlighten me on that if possible.

Dr. Cash: Okay, as of this day, I have not met with the community in a totality. I have met with individuals that have come by the church and talked with me. As you know, I have a very tight schedule. I have driven out of my parking lot and people were standing there and I offered to speak to them, but they never spoke back. I've received that kind of treatment.

And last meeting that we were with at the MPC, it was given that, that was one of the things that was brought up. And so, I don't think there is dialogue with the immediate people in the area. I have met with Mr. Lorrick who is one of the leading individuals over in that region. I've met with Councilman Hogan. I met with Charles Kirkland. He came out with a group of his staff people and so, we met out at the site. We talked about different things, what was going on. And the individual that we had the contract with for the building, he informed me that he has been approached and he said that they wanted to know personal records about me at the MPC Board. I think Mr. Jackson was fortunate to be in one of the meetings. It was all about my personal life as opposed to anything else. I never sought a political office and will never seek one (and anybody can quote me on it.) I have the best office in the world and that's pastoring God's people.

So, I don't need someone sitting up and trying to run, because its one thing I know and I thought it was so interesting, Mr. Cox was the spokesperson, but seeing he has political aspirations and so, I thought that was interesting. But Mr. Cox has made it plain that he's gonna do whatever he can to win and I think that's good for him. I think that's an excellent thing. But several of the people I recognize while I'm sitting here, that I drive out of one of the ladies lot is right in front of my place.

And Mr. Hogan, let me just say this to you also. One thing that's offensive to us as African-Americans when you refer to us as *you people*; that's so offensive.

Councilman Hogan: Excuse me. I did not say *you people*.

Dr. Cash: Okay, I'm glad we record this, because you did. And that's so offensive to us, because I have Whites that attend my church, I want you to know that. Whites do attend my

church. And so what happens is that one of the individuals said, in the MPC meeting, “those children, they make so much noise.” All children make noise. Be they Black, Brown, Yellow, Red, whatever, they make noise. Children gonna make noise. So, to tell me, those children, is it to point out only Black children make noise. No, its not that. So I was offended by it, the last time I was at the MPC and I said it to them that I thought that we were much bigger than this. To attach children. First, you tried to say these children were juvenile delinquents. Then they tried to say that, they were at-risk children. None of those children are such. We had one in the seven years that we been there, not at that location, but in seven years we’ve been in existence but our track record speaks for itself. Every educator in Caddo Parish School District talks about our children setting marks. But all of a sudden now, we go off into this unforbidden territory with our words and slurs and I think its just time out for that kind of stuff.

Councilman Gibson: I have limited information on this particular issue. And they relied on the Councilman in this district for a lot of the information.

The only thing I am a little bit unclear just a couple of questions regarding the school itself. Is this a public or private school?

Dr. Cash: It’s a church run school.

Councilman Gibson: So, it’s a private school?

Dr. Cash: It’s a private school.

Councilman Gibson: Funded through parents?

Dr. Cash: Funded through the parents and the church now. The church eats the lion’s share of it.

Councilman Gibson: How many students are we talking about?

Dr. Cash: Total of 25 at maximum. Right now we’re at 17 students.

Councilman Gibson: Do you anticipate additional funding from other sources, anytime soon?

Dr. Cash: Well, here’s the dilemma with that. One of the things if we accept money from the State, then the State’s curriculum comes in and we cannot teach about Jesus. And we have an hour whereby do Bible study in the morning time. Each child is in a program that teach them Bible. In fact, Mr. Hogan came out once when they were teaching Bible at the Noon hour for a group of the children as well. So, that’s one of the restrictions that the State has. You cannot speak or call the name of Jesus in a classroom. In fact, I don’t think you can call the name of God in a classroom.

Councilman Walford: But trust me, when test time comes, they may be quiet, but those names are used.

Josie Harris (6209 Nottaway Drive): I’m here to speak about the changing of the names in the memory of Hilry Huckaby. Course I do not live in that district, but my husband and I own property in that district and Greenwood Acres has a location in that district. So, I do have a concern of what goes on in that district.

As you know, Mr. Huckaby was a long time leader in this City. He served on this City Council. Mr. Huckaby was the lead attorney during the time when changed form of government took place. Of course, with this change, you guys, you men had the opportunity to serve each district.

Mr. Huckaby did a great job. He was concerned about his constituents. Mr. Huckaby was available and he had the ears of his constituents. Mr. Huckaby was not interested in padding his pockets. Mr. Huckaby was interested in the betterment of his people in his district.

Madeline Bowie (4105 Santa Monica Court): Well, I stand once again in front of the Council just as a reminder. I was encouraged to do so as well to just bring it back up to the table that the . . .this is in reference to BAC-57-03 for those that don’t know.

We the neighborhood of Western Hills is in opposition of this variance and exception.

We stated the reasons yesterday and we stated that we did have a petition and we polled the neighborhood and contacted as many people as we could. We only could of (unclear) homes in the area. And so 86% of the people that we contacted were opposed to this special variance and exception. And so, I'll just stand for it once more time, to represent the neighborhood in which I live in. This is the wrong precedent that we want to set. And I just want to make sure that Council is aware and hope that you vote along with the Zoning Board of Appeals to deny the application. Once again, thank you.

CONSENT AGENDA LEGISLATION:

TO INTRODUCE RESOLUTIONS AND ORDINANCES ON CONSENT:

RESOLUTIONS: None.

ORDINANCES: None.

CONSENT AGENDA LEGISLATION.

RESOLUTIONS:

Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Gibson for adoption of Resolution 103 of 2003. Motion approved by the following vote: Councilman Lester, Walford, Gibson, Green and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Out of Chamber: Councilman Carmody and Hogan. 2.

RESOLUTION NO. 103 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION ACCEPTING DEDICATION FOR BAGLEY ROAD IN THE KINGS POINT SUBDIVISION PHASE 6, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, legal, and regular session convened, that the dedication for Bagley Road in the Kings Pointe Subdivision Phase 6 in Section 34 (T17N-R13W), Caddo Parish, Louisiana, and as shown on the plats attached hereto and made a part hereof, be and the same is hereby accepted as dedicated to the public for public use in the City of Shreveport.

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

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

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

ORDINANCES:

Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Gibson for adoption of Ordinance No. 78 and 79 of 2003. Motion approved by the following vote: Councilman Lester, Walford, Gibson, Green and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Out of Chamber: Councilman Carmody and Hogan. 2.

ORDINANCE NO. 78 OF 2003

N ORDINANCE CLOSING AND ABANDONING THE 60' FOOT-WIDE TULSA STREET ADJACENT TO LOTS 15-41 AND 1001 IN ROSENWALD SUBDIVISION UNIT NO. 2 LOCATED IN THE NE 1/4 OF SECTION 20 (T18N-R14W), CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

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

WHEREAS, Water and Sewerage Engineering has reviewed this request and has no objections to the 60' foot wide right-a-way being closed and abandoned.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened, that the portion of the 60' foot wide right-a-way acquired by the City of Shreveport and recorded in Book 4000, Page 85, dated March 24, 2003 of the Records and as shown and as indicated on the plat attached hereto and made a part hereof, is hereby closed and abandoned.

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

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

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

ORDINANCE NO. 79 OF 2003

AN ORDINANCE CLOSING AND ABANDONING THE EDWARDS STREET RIGHT-OF-WAY RUNNING FROM CADDO STREET NORTH TO END OF DEDICATION, AND CLOSING AND ABANDONING A PORTION OF MARSHALL STREET ADJACENT TO BLOCK 36, AND CLOSING AND ABANDONING THE 20 FOOT-WIDE ALLEYWAYS LOCATED IN BLOCKS 36, 37, AND 54 OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT SUBDIVISION IN THE SE/4 OF SECTION 25 (T18N-R14W), CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened, that the 66 foot-wide Edwards Street right-of-way running from Caddo Street

north to end of dedication, and the northeasterly 26 feet of Marshall Street adjacent to Block 36 of City of Shreveport Subdivision, and the 20 foot-wide alleyways located in Blocks 36, 37, and 54 of the City of Shreveport Subdivision in the SE/4 of Section 25 (T18N-R14W), Caddo Parish, Louisiana, and as shown and as indicated on the plat attached hereto and made a part hereof, are all hereby closed and abandoned.

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

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

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

Councilman Lester: Mr. Chairman, looking at the comments that we had for public comment, there was this issue and apparently, its questions or concerns regarding the Convention Center or the Convention Center Hotel Report. And that is an agenda item. I don't know if that just means that its something that we have to take up now or we should have taken up now?

Councilman Walford: No, it can't be adopted, so it will be done in public comments.

Councilman Lester: Thank you for that ruling Mr. Chairman.

REGULAR AGENDA LEGISLATION:

The Deputy Clerk read the resolution by title: Resolution No. 53 of 2003: A resolution authorizing purchase of Snap II properties from the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Green to postpone until the July 22, 2003 meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Councilman Lester, Walford, Gibson, Green and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Out of Chamber: Councilman Carmody and Hogan. 2.

RESOLUTION NO. 91 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION ACCEPTING THE BID OF THE TIMES AND SELECTING THE TIMES THE OFFICIAL JOURNAL FOR THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT FOR THE PERIOD COMMENCING JULY 1, 2003 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2004 AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO

WHEREAS, the City Council of the City of Shreveport, advertised for the publishing of all minutes, ordinances, resolutions, budgets, official notices, advertisements, and other official proceedings of the City of Shreveport for the period July 1, 2003 through June 30, 2004 in accordance with law; and

WHEREAS, The Times has submitted the following bid:

All printing of required legals in the Classified Section - \$0.27 per agate line (6 point);
 All printing of required legals in the Retail Section - \$6.58 per column inch;
 All other (non-required) ads in the Classified Section - \$1.66 per agate line;
 All other (non-required) ads in the Retail Section - \$37.33 per column inch;
 Affidavits: \$15.00 each;

and

WHEREAS, the City is required by its Charter and state law to select an official journal;
 and

WHEREAS, the bid of The Times is responsive and therefore it is recommended that The Times be awarded the bid as described above.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, regular and legal session convened that the bid of The Times is accepted and The Times be and is hereby designated the official journal of the City of Shreveport for the period July 1, 2003 and ending June 30, 2004 and the Mayor of the City is hereby authorized to execute an agreement with The Times under the terms and conditions contained in said bid.

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 Green for passage.

Councilman Gibson: For the Administration, the quote that we had compared to I don't know when was the last time, is this a year-by-year contract? How did this compare to last year's quote in terms of percentage up or down?

Ms. Lee: I think it was generally the same. It was a one cent difference in the per line rate and maybe a few dollars in the retail advertising.

Councilman Gibson: So, not a big variance.

Councilman Jackson: Was that one cent up or down?

Ms. Lee: Up.

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

RESOLUTION NO. 92 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE WAIVER OF BUILDING PERMIT FEES AND AUTHORIZING THE DONATION OF BUILDING MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES TO 12 QUALIFIED LOW INCOME HOMEOWNERS IN THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, World Changers Ministries, an organization sponsored by the North American Mission Board of the Southern Baptist Church, will paint and/or repair 12 homes within the City of Shreveport between July 21 and July 25, 2003; and

WHEREAS, all persons assisted by World Changers will be low to moderate income homeowners residing in the Mooretown, Allendale, Cedar Grove, Ingleside and/or the

Queensborough area of the city; and

WHEREAS, all work will be performed by volunteers and will enhance the quality of life for the citizens of Shreveport and directly improve the housing conditions for 12 families in the City of Shreveport thus providing a public benefit; and

WHEREAS, World Changers has sponsored at least five (5) previous repair projects within the City of Shreveport; and

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport through its Department of Community Development desires to participate with World Changers by donating materials and/or supplies to the 12 homeowners that will be used by World Changers to repair and/or paint these properties and by waiving the building permit fees required by the City of Shreveport Comprehensive Building Code for the repairs; and

WHEREAS, the donation of the materials and/or supplies and the waiver of the building permit fees is a permissible exception to Article 7 § 14 of the Louisiana State Constitution of 1974.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, legal, and regular session convened, that building permit fees to paint and/or repair 12 homes by World Changers Ministries between July 21 and July 25, 2003 are hereby waived.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City of Shreveport is hereby authorized to donate materials and/or supplies to 12 property owners selected to participate in the World Changers project.

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

RESOLUTION NO. 93 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO EXECUTE CERTAIN AGREEMENTS WITH THE LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND DEVELOPMENT, CONCERNING LOCAL MATCHING FUNDS FOR FEDERAL INTELLIGENT TRANSPORTATION SYSTEM GRANTS, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development, will provide for the installation of ITS Immediate Term Phase I Program within the City of Shreveport; and

WHEREAS, prior to installation of said ITS Project, the City of Shreveport must execute certain agreements with the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development, that the City will commit to matching funds for installation; and

WHEREAS, in order to initiate the letting of the said project, the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development, requires an expression from the City Council of its intention to authorize the Mayor to execute these agreements with certain matching fund requirements.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, legal and regular session convened that Keith Hightower, be and he is hereby authorized

to execute on behalf of the City of Shreveport these agreements with the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development, in a form to be approved by the City Attorney, whereby the City of Shreveport will commit to the federally required 20% matching funds totaling Two Hundred Thousand Dollars (\$200,000.00) pursuant to the requirements of the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development.

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

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

RESOLUTION NO. 94 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION TO ESTABLISH THE NEIGHBORHOOD INVESTMENT PROGRAM (NIP), AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

By: COUNCILMAN LESTER

WHEREAS, that the City of Shreveport encourage economic development in every neighborhood of the City; and

WHEREAS, it is desirable and necessary that "Neighborhood Investment Program" (NIP) be designed and implemented to encourage economic development in the City's neglected neighborhoods by strengthening existing neighborhood organizations and businesses and by attracting new retail businesses to serve those neighborhoods; and

WHEREAS, NIP will promote and market neighborhood organizations and business districts and improve the appearance and economic health of neighborhood business districts; and

WHEREAS, NIP will foster partnerships between City government, civic and professional organizations, residents, and business owners and managers to facilitate commercial growth in neighborhoods.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened, NIP shall be administered by the Office of the Community Development for the City of Shreveport.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Council reserves the right to amend Appendix A by future resolutions.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that NIP as describe in Appendix A may be amended by the City Council of the City of Shreveport.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that if any provision or item of this resolution or the

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

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

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

Councilman Jackson: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I was just concerned about . . . I know we talked about this Neighborhood Investment Program before in that we had parameters. I think Councilman Lester in his draft and that which is being presented had parameters that extended from \$500 to \$10,000. I guess my question was in passing and adopting if you will this particular resolution, does everything that's in it constitute a final draft?

Councilman Walford: I'm gonna . . . I had essentially the same question because it referred to an Appendix, I think is the way it was written Ms. Glass? Can you help me there?

Mr. Thompson: I believe that the appendix was a part of the resolution and this would be the program, however the program can be amended by the Council at any time.

Councilman Walford: And I believe that was in the resolution, if I'm not mistaken.

Mr. Thompson: I think so.

Councilman Walford: Answer both of our questions since its your legislation. Do we understand correctly that the parameters that are attached, per the wording in your resolution that it can be, those can be changed, amended by the Council?

Councilman Lester: I certainly believe, thank you Mr. Chairman and Councilman Jackson for those questions. I think as with anything that we move forward on can be amended at some time. This is the program as I envisioned it and as I have work in consultation with our staff and some other folks with Community Development. This is how I see this program.

Certainly, if there are some additions or revisions that any Councilman would suggest. Then I think once adopted just as with any program, it can be refined. I don't think that this necessarily is the end all to be all, I would ask that you support this and move forward on the Neighborhood Investment Program.

If there are some specific issues that Councilmen would have in regards to that, I would be amenable to hear those. But this is a program that can be tweaked (for lack of a better term) by any Councilman once we've gotten started so, if there are any questions, I don't. . .its not written in such a way that its set in stone, that it cannot be either amended or revised, but I would ask that we support it in its present form. I hope, I don't know if that answers your question, if there are any other questions, I'd be. . .

Councilman Walford: I'm back to Mr. Jackson. We were trying to get an answer to your question so, go ahead.

Councilman Jackson: And I guess I was looking for whether or not this was. . .this served as definitively as the beginning. This is where we were with some degree of finality (for lack of a better term) or . . .and I think you answered it by whether or not, I think it states in the. . . there are two phrases in the resolution that they are both together in there and I think they're kinda repetitive, but they both say basically the same

thing that the Council has the right, obviously by resolution to change this.

I guess my concern is I don't know if this is while it represents a start, I don't know if it represents the best start. And that's my concern that you know while I'm in favor of again, at the risk of sounding redundant even from yesterday, I'm in favor of the spirit of what the Neighborhood Investment Program is all about. So, I think the language which describes this Neighborhood Investment Program and the Task Force and all those other things that are described in here are in my opinion, a well thought out and well intended program.

I'm back to exactly what I said two weeks ago. I think that \$126,000 divided by seven districts if you will, at a rate of \$18,000 to me is not impact at all. I think that the kind of a program that you've described and laid out deserves far more than what I think is an amount of money that is laughable. \$18,000 in any district will not go far even leverage. Certainly a district right now, any neighborhood that doesn't have \$18,000 right now would like to have that \$18thousand. The question is how in fact, how much would we be able to, from a universal perspective, really be able to change the City and I urge as I did the last time, that we look and we develop a way to find more money to do it if we're going to do it, because I think this while, it serves only as a model, I said last time, that I think we probably make more impact by throwing a rock in the Grand Canyon than \$18,000 and some of the problems that we have.

And, I would suggest that while I support the spirit of the initiative, that I think its woefully underfunded and it won't take us 3-months to find out, once you get started, that its woefully underfunded. And certainly it may be in one of those scenarios where this is all the money we have and if that's what we're working on and if perhaps you or someone else is prepared today to say, this is all the money that we have, then maybe we can change our tune. But I want to be sure that we've investigated every source of funding and leveraged it against what's out there in the community right now, through foundations and otherwise to be sure that we've done. It didn't make any illusions toward leveraging the money with foundations and other things, nor did it say that preference would be given to organizations who could leverage the money with private dollars and foundations and neighborhood association dollars and those kinds of things. I think to me, that would go further and that would certainly make it more palatable to suggest that \$18,000 is the beginning number if in fact the multiplier effect of that is 4 or 5 times that much.

Councilman Green: Mr. Chairman, my request was I call for the question.

Councilman Walford: Okay, at this point we have a call for the question or for Robert's previous question by Councilman Green which would essentially end debate. We have to vote on that motion which is not debatable. Motion denied by the following vote: Nays: Councilman Walford, Gibson, Hogan and Jackson. 4. Ayes: Councilman Lester, Carmody and Green. 3.

Councilman Lester: I would at this time as the sponsor of this legislation, I would reserve my comments toward the end and I would defer to Councilman Gibson if he has any questions at this time.

Councilman Gibson: Councilman Lester, I very much am in support of what you have in front, I have a couple of questions though. In passing this legislation, is this going to establish the baseline or an organization that basically, I'm going to describe from a business standpoint, a shell company? A show organization that has zero funds at this point and time or if we pass this, there is gonna be an immediate \$126,000?

Councilman Lester: What we're doing is establishing a program and to answer your question, you're absolutely correct. This is a resolution to establish it and we're

saying as I appreciate it, what we would like the funding to be. But as I appreciate it and I might defer to the Clerk. Do we, I think we would probably need a budgetary amendment to actually fund the organization. What I've set forth is a framework of what I thought a figure that we had available. Certainly as we go through the budgetary process, and I can kill two birds with one stone here, I don't think that \$18,000 per district is enough. I would certainly to see us expand this program and look to find other sources. I just believe that this is a beginning point. Certainly there are organizations within the confines of District A that I know of for instance, Allendale that does not as old and as large as Allendale is, have a neighborhood association.

So, what this program will do is provide an opportunity for folks to get themselves together, to do some capacity building in terms of putting together 501 (c) 3 status and things of that nature and it will also allow them to have some resources available to do some brick and mortar type of improvement projects in their individual neighborhood.

Certainly, \$18,000 isn't a lot of money when you break it out, but then when you look at certain areas, then I think Councilman Jackson was absolutely correct. When you look areas like Allendale and when you look at areas like the Martin Luther King/Cooper Road area that has never really received any funding for any type of neighborhood association, this would go a long way to do it.

But to answer your question directly, this is just setting forth the framework of the organization and how we believe that the money should be divided and certainly if the Council is amenable to this, then certainly during budget time, we could make the necessary revisions and additions, so that we could strengthen and/or change anything that's set forth in the program in terms of the funding amount. But I would just point to the Council Members that I think the framework is a solid framework in terms of project, in terms of how the money can be spent, in terms of the organization and the structuring of what have you if the eligible applicants, and so I would think that this is something that we can do to kind of invest in our neighborhoods, in our neighborhood organizations, because these are the people where the rubber meets the road.

Councilman Gibson: Still, I'd like to have some. . .I asked the question, I didn't want to defer . . .

Councilman Walford: You directed it to the Chair, the Chair had Mr. Lester answering your question.

Councilman Gibson: Okay, I appreciate it. The other comment that I have in looking at the Task Force being the Director of Community Development or designee. The CCAN Coordinator for the Offices of the City Council, the Economic Development Coordinator of the office of Mayor or designee and Executive Director of the MPC or designee. There is. . .is there an opportunity to have a City Council representative on this group?

Just for consideration and I guess to go back to my original comment, each year, we're charged judicially with looking at the budget and being caretakers of the taxpayer's money and there may be some years if this passes, that obviously there's gonna be maybe more room in the budget maybe not or we're gonna have to make some hard decisions on some programs that have merit and some programs that do not have merit in order to fund this thing. And I guess, the reason why I want to make sure I was clear in my mind that this was establishing what I for lack of a better word a "shell" organization is that obviously coming into this Fall and have made no secret about it. I think that we're gonna be challenged seriously to look at where we are revenue wise and things of that nature and I have no problem in looking at everything to try to do more for

what we need in our particular neighborhoods. So, I think you answered the questions I have other than I would hope there was room seeing that we do have responsibility on this Council to approve what the Administration puts before us as a budget, that there be a representative from that City Council on this particular task force.

Councilman Lester: As I appreciate it, the way that the program is tailored, any outlay of any funds that comes to this program will ultimately have to pass through this body.

So, whereas you might not have the actual representation on the task force, all of those requests have to come before this body before any funds are actually disbursed. So we will as a Council have an opportunity to express our will in terms of both in the front end, in terms of how much we fund the program itself and on the back end actually where the rubber meets the road in the programs.

Councilman Gibson: The last question I have is. . .is it the intentions of the author of this legislation, I guess, where exactly would this money come from? I know that there was discussion in previous Council two weeks ago, if I'm not mistaken that we would start with the \$125,000 and correct me if I'm wrong out of what now is going to be no longer a Greater Shreveport Human Relations Commission, then obviously they are funded through the end of the year, as I understand it. And that money, as I understand it, comes out of the Riverfront Development Fund. So, is it your intent as the author of this legislation that you begin with monies coming out of that Riverfront Development Fund as the initial funding source or are you looking at that versus other areas within the General Fund based on working with the Administration and the City Council?

Councilman Lester: To answer that question, I'm looking at the initial figure that we put with this resolution as that figure that was previously dedicated to the Human Relations Commission from Riverfront Development. But certainly in working with members of this body and certainly members of Administration, if we are in a mindset to put greater funding behind this program, certainly we would only be limited to our creativity in 1. finding funding sources and 2. probably most importantly, the actual amount of money that we have available. So, I don't think that anything that is down here limits us in terms of how much a) that we can fund the program or b) where we can find those funds, but at the time it was created, that was my intention.

Councilman Walford: I will get to you Mr. Jackson, but let me get my first debate in and I'll get your's second one.

I like what you've done and I will support it, but what I would appreciate is the opportunity to, instead of adopting your Appendix or whatever you're calling this second sheet (the attachment) there is some changes that I would like to talk to you about and unfortunately you and I both had the same work situation the last week and we just couldn't get together on it. There are a couple of things that I would like to see changed and rather than having to come back and make changes in it, I would ask you if you would consider a two week postponement on it, you and I will talk in the interim. I'll write you a note with what I didn't like about it and what I would like to see and I sense that from Mr. Jackson's comments, that he might have some of the same intention. As I would ask you if you would consider amending your motion to postpone for two weeks and I will support, but I'm gonna suggest several changes that I think will make it better?

Councilman Jackson: I wanted to ask Mr. Lester maybe he can talk a little bit more about it. First, let me just comment that Mr. Gibson had suggested that maybe a Councilman be a part of it as well, and I think he made his point.

However, I would respectfully disagree. Cause one of the things that I see and I would ask Mr. Lester about it, he did suggest to Councilman Gibson to address his

concern that each of these allotments or each of these disbursements would have to have final approval of this Council or pass before this Council.

I hope that what we 1. would not create is a situation where people who apply and request \$500 for an organization would have to all, all these people would come before the Council for a \$500 request. I don't know if there is some kind of a number that stands as a particular number that, above those numbers that has to happen. But I would hope that, that would not be the case first of all. 2. I would not want to get into a situation to where we have taken this \$125,000 or whatever the number may be and be accused of turning it into monies that we as Councilmen, not arbitrarily, but specifically used for political patronage. Also, I say that because I think we need to again fund it in such a way that we make a statement in how we do it. That being the case, we don't have an endless amount of money, we don't have a money tree somewhere, where we can just get this money. Obviously, it. . .we're in a situation where our city and not that there are other issues necessarily that are more important, but we are strapped for money at every juncture. Which says to me then, we have to think about, do we accomplish the mission of this neighborhood investment program. We know what the end is and I think we all agree with the end, but is this the best way to accomplish that?

I would suggest to you that it almost borders and maybe the Mayor or the Administration or Community Development could answer the question. But it almost borders on replication in my opinion of the Community Development Block Grant Program. I think one of the things that we can do as a city, because there. . .we're talking about \$100s of thousands or maybe millions of dollars in Community Development Block Grant maybe if our focus, we re-focus or we tweak the focus that we have on Community Development Block Grant dollars, they serve to do by and large everything that this Neighborhood Investment Program requests. And so I guess my suggestion is if we have dollars there, that we can re-focus rather than trying to find new dollars or in increase a burden on taxpayer or killing one program to have another program, I think starts a dangerous precedent where each year, we'll go down the list and find those programs that are funded this year that we don't like in order to fund a new program that we create or that we do like and I think it sets a dangerous precedent.

And, Councilman Gibson brought up the fact that at our last meeting we talked about the fact that the beneficiary of the death of the Greater Shreveport Human Relations Commission which I might add again, I think was a terrible mistake, happened to be the Neighborhood Investment Program. Well, nobody is going to be against a neighborhood investment program. I mean it's crazy to suggest that anybody would be against that. The question is, does this represent our best fiscal effort? Does this represent our best governing efforts? Does this best represent our legislative efforts to put together not only a program that in spirit is a good program, but that fiscally will make the impact that the nomenclature gives it? And so, I'm concerned that \$125,000 will not do particularly when you start talking about dividing it up into seven. Well, District F may have more need than District E. Why does District E have to get \$18,000 if they've got \$50,000 worth of needs and District E has \$10,000.

So, I think we're being relatively arbitrary though its being fair in doing that in the sense that we divided it by seven. But I just think that its going to be true impact that we've got to think about other ways. And for me, I would suggest that we look at how we re-focus our dollars from the Community Development Block Grant side of it. Just about everything and I'm sure even the Mayor or somebody could answer. If you go down these lists of at least 14 things, that applicant organizations should be certain to identify, its about what and what for the CDBG application. When you go through what

in fact the purpose is and the eligible activities or projects. I'm in favor of doing what we can't cover with Community Development Block Grant dollars and then coordinating the Neighborhood Investment Program with the Development Block Grant Program to make sure that there are some gaps there, that, that \$18,000 would do more to try to fill those gaps rather than reorganize a program that ends up being, if we're not careful, utilized for political patronage and I just don't want us to run that course.

Mayor Hightower: Councilman, back when Councilman Lester came and approached me about this idea, I too maybe had some reservations about it, but the more we talked about it, and the more we looked at what we as a governing body's focus should be over the next four years and have agreed to and that's neighborhood re-investment, I think it makes sound sense.

This program at \$125,000, you know I agree with Councilman Jackson, that we can't go out and build a neighborhood center or we can't do anything massive, but what we have to do, given the budget constraints that we have as leverage every dollar that we possibly can. And, in this case, also leverage manpower, people in getting neighbors involved in their neighborhoods. Some neighborhoods have great organizations now. Some neighborhoods have zero organizations now and need some professional help to get 'em going. Maybe need stationary money, who knows? Something so that they can go out in some cases and solicit additional financial support from businesses in the area to create a flower bed or a sign or a welcome home or whatever they need to do so. At \$125,000, I don't think anybody should be misled that we're gonna go out and build projects with this.

What we hope to build is some human capacity, some involvement from the neighborhood in a leveraging type manner so that those things can be folded in with CDBG and some CDBG money and get projects that need to happen, to happen with neighborhood input and financial support from now only neighbors, but perhaps neighborhood businesses and grant writing opportunities as well. So, \$125,000 is more to encourage neighborhood involvement than to solve neighborhood problems from the government standpoint. We know that we'll never be able to budget enough money to do that.

But, I'm certainly supportive of what Councilman Lester is trying to do, you know that provided that Council sees fit to provide that in the 2004 budget on January 1st. So in the meantime, I think it would be prudent to set up the shell to encourage organizations to start to form that have not formed in the past to be in line to start to applying for help. And that's exactly what this is. Its help, its not hand-outs, its not 100% funding. We expect when decisions are made to hand out dollars, that we're gonna get something in return for that—either manpower, financial matching or project delivery.

Councilman Lester: I appreciate the support of the Administration. I would appreciate the support of the Council.

Certainly, the impetus of this program was to redirect to a neighborhood type of scenario some of the funds that we have generated in our Riverfront Development Fund. As I'm sure, we are all aware the Riverfront Development Fund is a fund by which many of our civic appropriations are drawn from. There are organizations within the City that get a tremendous amount of support from that fund. There are organizations in areas in the City that get absolutely no support from that.

What this program will do is to use a finite pool of money to start to maybe from an embryonic stage or embryonic standpoint bring some structured organization to that process. Certainly, you know, we're not trying to create a slush fund for Councilmen. I

think if you want to do a slush fund, we're in the wrong place. We need to be in Baton Rouge as opposed to the City of Shreveport. They've pretty much gotten that under control. But in our particular situation here, we're trying to bring a program that has work and to be honest with you, I would love to say, that I could take complete and total intellectual authorship for this program, but in fact, I cannot.

This is a program that has been an amalgamation of several that have been used in Denver and Washington, D.C. and have been very, very successful. And through some of the travels that I've been able to do, talking with some representatives of different councils, programs like this have been started and they have provided their neighborhood organizations a tremendous amount of support.

We're not looking to solve everyone's problems because certainly, the government can't do that but if you have a scenario where you have a group of hard working citizens in a neighborhood that would like to have some funds to do some small things and maybe can help them to go larger heights, then certainly, I think the funds from this program will be well spent.

I would use as an example some resources that were spent in the Highland area before they became as organized as they were, they were able to get a certain amount of support from the City to do some planning and some things of that nature. To put together some 501C3s in terms of a neighborhood organization or restoration society or rent control organization. And from that, they were able to, once they organized themselves, go out and solicit other sums of money from other places.

So, I envision this program as a start up type scenario to help organizations to get up and move forward and certainly if there are greater needs in other areas, then certainly they would have an opportunity address them, but certainly the last thing that I would be any part of is creating a slush fund as nice as that would sound, under our current fiscal situation, it just doesn't seem practical. But the idea of being able to be Santa Claus in the City of Shreveport is a great one, but that's not what we're doing.

And certainly, I think that the comment that you made in terms of our Community Development Block Grant money is absolute dead on target. There are some things that can be done with that, but we have this money in the Riverfront Development Fund. We have been spending it in certain places and not spending it in other places. So, my idea was to create a scenario where all organizations and districts can have an opportunity to get some support. It's not a perfect program. It's a beginning, not an end. And, I think as we started and as we worked through it, we will find that I believe that the program will be successful as it has been in other places and in fact might lead us to do an even better job of identifying some of the needs that are out there in our neighborhood and I would just ask that we would support this effort.

Councilman Green: Mr. Chair, mine is not a debate, mine is to call for the question (seconded by Councilman Lester and approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, and Green. 5. Nays: Councilman Hogan and Jackson. 2.)

Resolution passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Gibson, and Green. 4. Nays: Councilman Carmody and Hogan. 2. Did not cast a vote: Councilman Jackson. 1.

RESOLUTION NO 102 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO EXECUTE A COOPERATIVE ENDEAVOR WITH THE SHREVEPORT OPERA GUILD RELATIVE TO THE PRODUCTION OF THE 29TH ANNUAL LES BOUTIQUES DE NOEL AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT

THERETO.

By: Councilman Walford

WHEREAS, during the 5 days of Les Boutiques de Noel, over 100 merchants from Louisiana, Texas, Arkansas, Arizona, Mississippi, Virginia, California , Tennessee and Oklahoma will bring more than 10,000 shoppers to Expo Hall on the Shreveport Riverfront who will spend more than \$275,000.00, and

WHEREAS, the Les Boutiques de Noel sales will generate more than \$7,562.00 in direct sales taxes to the City of Shreveport, and the out of town merchants and shoppers will generate additional sales taxes hotel/motel taxes and River boat revenues for the City, and

WHEREAS, the Shreveport opera Guild, a 501 (c) (3) organization, will provide the net proceeds of the event to the Shreveport Opera to produce operas and to produce education and music workshops for the citizens of Shreveport, and

WHEREAS, Les Boutiques de Noel provides an economic benefit to the citizens of Shreveport, and the operas and workshops sponsored by Shreveport Opera provide a cultural benefit to citizens of Shreveport and surrounding areas, and said activities and benefits constitute a public purpose, and

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport desires to participate with the Shreveport Opera Guild in the production of the 2003 Les Boutiques de Noel by providing the use of Expo Hall for this event from Wednesday, November 19, 2003 through Sunday, November 23, 2003.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, regular, and legal session convened that the Mayor of the City of Shreveport is authorized to execute an agreement with the Shreveport Opera Guild, in a form approved by the City Attorney, in which the City provides the use of the Expo Hall (the rental fee only) for the 2003 Les Boutiques de Noel, and in which the Shreveport Opera Guild agrees:

1. To provide the economic and cultural benefits described herein to the City, and
2. To provide the insurance and to pay for the other customary services and charges associated with the use of the facility.

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

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

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

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Walford, this is your deal isn't it? It's got your name here.

Councilman Walford: Its my district.

Councilman Jackson: Oh, I thought it was your name. I thought you were sponsoring, I'm sorry.

Councilman Walford: Did that come out of the Administration?

Mayor Hightower: Mr. Chairman, I'm not real sure if it did or not. I know every year the Boutique and the Opera Guild solicit a Council Member to introduce this legislation. I'm not real sure if it came (unclear).

Councilman Walford: I might have introduced this.

Mayor Hightower: You could ask. . .

Councilman Walford: I do recall having a conversation with Mr. Burton about it. I was of the impression that it was coming from the Administration, but I'll be happy to claim credit.

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

RESOLUTION NUMBER 104 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION DECLARING THE CITY'S INTEREST IN A CERTAIN ADJUDICATED PROPERTY AS SURPLUS AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, there are numerous parcels of property which have been adjudicated to the City of Shreveport and Caddo Parish for non-payment of ad valorem taxes; and

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport has entered into an intergovernmental agreement with Caddo Parish under which Caddo Parish will undertake to sell or donate said properties as authorized in R.S. 33:4720.11 or R.S. 33:4720.25; and

WHEREAS, pursuant to Section 26-294 of the Code of Ordinances, the city's interests in said properties can be sold after the City Council declares them to be surplus; and

WHEREAS, the purchasing agent has inquired of all city departments regarding the property described herein and has not received any indication that it is needed for city purposes.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport

in due, regular and legal session convened that the following described properties are hereby

declared surplus:

Lot 10, Johnston Subdivision

Geographic Number 171410-075-0010

Municipal Address: 3539 Sumner Street
Council District "G"

Lot 13, Johnston Subdivision

Geographic Number 171410-075-0013

Municipal Address: 3521 Sumner Street
Council District "G"

Lot 25, Maplewood Heights Subdivision

Geographic Number 171416-042-
0025

Municipal Address: 3832 Flora Avenue
Council District "F"

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that if any provision or item of this resolution or the application thereof be 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 Green, seconded by Councilman Lester passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

RESOLUTION NO. 105 OF 2003

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

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

WHEREAS, the City Council desires to retain responsibility for the disposition of all surplus supplies, materials, equipment, and vehicles having an acquisition value of \$10,000 or more; and

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

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

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

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

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

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Walford

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

The Deputy Clerk read the resolution by title by Councilman Hogan: Resolution No. 106 of 2003: A Resolution amending Section 1 of the City Council Rules of Procedure by adding Subsection 1.14 relative to carrying of Signs and related matters and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

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

Councilman Jackson: I wanted to and I suggested to Mr. Hogan on yesterday and I'll say it again today and perhaps he can speak to it as well, I'm really, and I think all of us should be much slower than we are to begin to change the law of or the rules if you will, of how we do what we do, particularly with relation to singular matters rather than having a universal approach to how we do and considering the spirit of how we do what we do.

Having discussed this with Councilman Hogan, one of the things that he and I talked about was the fact that I had a problem with the absolute nature and the nature of carrying signs and what the definition of carrying signs was. And what his description to me was that no one who was here, period. And then I started asking questions about what constituted a sign. Does in fact a sign have to be a placard that has to be a certain size. If I write something on the back of a sheet of paper, is that considered a sign or is that considered a back of a sheet of paper. What in fact constitutes signs is one of the things that we talked about. I mention this now, because I think this is the point where we express unreadiness on these particular matters, that was the first thing.

The second thing was that I suggested to him even on yesterday that I think I agree with him and that materially, no one individual, either here or there ought to have the ability to materially disrupt a meeting and the continuity of a meeting. I don't know how far that goes into whose got the right to do what. But I do know that Councilman Hogan's rights end where mine begin. And that while we enjoy collective rights, that there's an infringement, that I don't have the ability to do.

My concern was that if we suggest to anyone that he or she cannot carry a sign, are we doing this because this is something that we thought about some time ago, or is it in reaction to something that's happened at the Council, or do we anticipate having to continue to add to that what kind of a sign? How far? You know there are several issues that I think that were not addressed in this particular legislation.

I recognize that there are many Councilmen from yesterday and based on our conversation on yesterday who seem to be overly prepared to do that. I just would suggest to us that we are careful about how we handle the rights of individuals who come. I think anybody who comes up to that podium to speak has a right to not have signs behind them if he or she chooses not to have them. If he or she is materially disturbed by that, they have the right to not have those signs behind them. I think that's a matter that can be handled by the Chair in any situation.

I think when we go to codifying these things in rules and in law and those kinds of things, then we just put ourselves perhaps in a situation for people to challenge us, to suggest that we are trying to censor content and all those kinds of things. So, I just would hope that we would be apprehensive about how we move forward in changing those things. Some people have been offended and made those statements that they've been offended. You know when you start talking about objectionable and offensive things, it's a real relative situation. I don't know that we have the power to suggest what is in fact represents offensive versus not. And then I don't know if the best move in the world is to just do the extreme which is rather than just trying to deal with what somebody said is offensive was not doing, lets just get rid of all of it. You know it was the same scenario and I think again, we set alarming precedence when we look to rather than improve systems, we look to just destroy 'em or throw 'em away.

Two weeks from today, two weeks ago, I said the same thing, I said why don't we improve the Greater Shreveport Human Relations Commission rather than just throwing it away. Today, I suggest to us that we talk about signs and I said to Councilman Hogan, I'm in support of the ends, I just don't support the means by which we arrive at those ends.

And so, can we find a way to fix our process and to tweak our process other than racing to the extreme and throwing the baby out, proverbially, if you will with the bath water; that's my major concern.

Councilman Lester: I too express some concern with this particular issue. I've had an opportunity to speak with Councilman Hogan and again, I will say, I agree with where he's trying to go.

I think its important for us to maintain a certain level of civility both amongst ourselves and the public. I think those are some of the things that they expect and they should expect from us. I also believe that we should have the expectation that if people disagree with our positions, that they should be able to come into this body and express their disagreement. The question becomes how and in what manner do they express their disagreement and I don't believe that we should be in a position of trying to judge content because I think what you do and what this scenario is setting ourselves up to do is determining what is objectionable and what is not.

I would think that also, that when the public wants to come and express themselves, they should be able to express themselves, because that's what we're here for. We are the representatives of the people and we're supposed to hear what the people have to say. Now, having said that, the question thus becomes, if someone is in the process of expressing their particular viewpoint on a particular issue, does someone else that has either an opposing view or a supporting view, have the right to take away from that person speaking at the podium? Well, the answer to that clearly is, no.

So, the question then becomes how do we get to that point? I don't believe that this gets us there. I think this goes too far and I expressed that to Councilman Hogan when we spoke yesterday as well as today. I told him that I would be in support of this effort if in fact we made a change and an amendment to it that said "a citizen that had a poster, a placard, or whatever could come in and display it, but they could not display it to the detriment of the person behind the podium." Because I think that's what the real

deal. I think that podium just like I believe this podium is a very special place and if a citizen decides to take up of their time and come to this meeting to speak on an issue that's important to them, I think we should hear it. I think its important that we listen to them. That's why I have been an advocate of allowing people to speak on issues regardless of whether their issue was on the agenda to be voted on or if its something that is just a burning issue that they have, I think that they should be able to come and speak.

So, having said that, I would just ask Councilman Hogan to maybe take that into consideration and advisement and maybe offer an amendment to his particular legislation to allow citizens to come in with their poster and placard or what have you, so long as the display of their particular poster, sign or whatever does not interfere with the person at the podium making their statement. Because I think at the end of the day, that's what we're really talking about when we were offering this particular scenario. It's not that we don't want to hear protests. Because that's part of the deal.

We sit, you talk, we listen, we vote. If you don't have the courage or you don't have it within yourself maybe to speak, then if you want to bring a sign and express yourself, you should have the right to do that. But certainly, you should not have that sign to the point where you take away from the person at the podium.

So, what I would just ask Councilman Hogan to do is to consider an amendment to his resolution on subsection A and B that would allow a person to come to the meeting with their board, but would prevent them from displaying that board or whatever behind the podium in such a way it takes away from the podium. And if he were to do that, I certainly would be in support of what he's trying to do. Because I think its important not only that we listen to the citizens, but I think its important to view what they have to say without any type of material disruption or interruption.

Councilman Hogan: You know in relation to some of the comments that have been made so far, this idea did come out, I'm not going to apologize this, this idea did come from recent Council meetings where we experienced severe interruptions because certain people were displaying signs, trying to position signs in the back of the person speaking, get 'em on the camera, you know.

As some people recall, three weeks ago or three meetings ago, Mr. Chairman, you had tried to re-direct that and make a ruling on that and I voted against you on that. And the reason I did, as I stated at the end of that meeting, is because we didn't have anything in place that would prevent this type of behavior. And so, as I observed in the subsequent meetings, things begin to die down just a little bit.

And I too share your opinion Mr. Jackson, about less rules. I am for less government. I am for smaller government, but by the same token, the people expect us to run this meeting in an orderly fashion. We're always concerned about the rights of the people in this meeting, but it is our right, it is our responsibility to run these meetings in an orderly fashion.

And so, the purpose of this resolution is not to take away someone's right to speak. As it says in the resolution, that people will be allowed to speak at their time, they fill out the form and they come and speak and if they don't even want to speak, if they want to stand up and hold their sign for their whole 3 minutes, they're welcomed to do that.

Someone said something about somebody putting something on their t-shirt. We can't control what you wear on your clothes, unless its and obscenity. We're going to speak up about that. But as I was helping to understand the process here and doing the wording on the resolution, I had some assistance from our attorney, Julie Glass. And she had found in East Baton Rouge Parish, the School Board had crafted a similar resolution, they were having some of the same type of problems and had put in place in their house rules a restriction on signs, and it was challenged and it was challenged unsuccessfully. And so, we know that this language will hold up in court should we be challenged, if someone filed suit on us against this. And Ms. Glass, I'd like for you to take a moment and explain that case to us if you don't mind.

Ms. Glass: Mr. Chairman, okay. The case was a Louisiana Supreme Court case, I see Mr. Lester with his pen in hand, so I'll give you the name.

Councilman Lester: Cite. Yeah, I was gonna ask you what the citation was.

Ms. Glass: It was Godwin versus E. Baton Rouge Parish School Board 408 Southern Second 12-14. The gist of the case was the court held. . . well, first let me say that the rule in Baton Rouge was a little bit more strict even than is being proposed here. It was a complete prohibition of signs in the meeting room or the building at all. But the Court held that based on the test for First Amendment Rights, there's three parts to it. 1. The first was that the rule has to be justified without reference to the content of the sign and held that, that was met because all signs were prohibited regardless of what they said. That would be similar in Mr. Hogan's resolution because the rule would apply to all signs regardless of the content of the sign. 2. The second part of the test is that it has to serve a significant governmental interest. And the court held that, that was met because there was a significant governmental interest in order and decorum in a public meeting. 3. And the third part of the test was that it has to leave open ample alternative channels for communication. And the court held that, that was met because the person, the people were allowed, I think in that case it was 5minutes to speak and they did not allow the sign during the time to speak, but that the ability to speak was an ample alternative means of communication.

Councilman Hogan: One other thing. As I said a moment ago, we began to notice that the sign activity was going downhill somewhat and so I thought, I was waiting to see what would happen on this and had chosen not to pursue this resolution to the house rules until last meeting when we had two other individuals that had displayed signs of a different nature with a different message. And, also we just about had an altercation right here before our very eyes as someone turned around and referred to someone holding a sign behind them. And so, that's what prompted me to draw up this resolution. So, I'm gonna ask for your support on it.

Councilman Gibson: I call for the question Mr. Chair (seconded by Councilman Hogan. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Walford, Carmody, Hogan, Gibson, and Green. 5. Nays: Councilman Lester and Jackson. 2.)

Councilman Lester: Mr. Chairman, I have a question.

Chairman Walford: Debate has ended.

Councilman Lester: I'm not debating the issue, I'm making a request. I'm asking if I could get someone to actually print this case out for me, because I'm sitting here. .

I'm trying to read it. If I could get some. . . Do you have it Ms. Glass.

Chairman Walford: I think Ms. Glass has got it. Okay at this time we have a motion by Mr. Hogan and a second by Councilman Green to adopt.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to offer a substitute motion.

Councilman Walford: Not now, I don't believe. Ms. Glass? We've had a call for the question on this motion that ends debate, can a substitute motion be offered at this time?

Councilman Jackson: Yes!

Ms. Glass: I believe so, yes.

Councilman Jackson: Why wouldn't it be?

Councilman Walford: Because we've had the call for the question.

Councilman Jackson: On that motion.

Councilman Lester: And he's offering a substitute motion.

Councilman Walford: Okay, your substitute motion.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to offer a substitute motion to postpone until such time that we've had an opportunity to read some of this. . .the basis of Mr. Hogan's writing of this. . .was based on this Supreme Court case and I certainly would be interested in Godwin versus East Baton Rouge Parish School Board and some of the things that happened there. And being able to read some of the information that Councilman Lester. . .

Motion by Councilman Jackson, seconded by Councilman Lester to postpone the resolution.

Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Carmody, Green and Jackson.

4. Nays: Councilman Walford, Gibson, and Hogan. 3.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Chairman, I would simply say to Councilman Hogan, I would just like the opportunity to peruse the case, because once I did it. . .because I do agree with the need to have some rules and regulations and I fully am for having people speaking without being interrupted.

I would just like the opportunity to peruse the case myself and then maybe distribute the information to all the Council Members so that we could have a fuller discussion of that; that's all. But I will, I am in support of where you're trying to go. I will state that publicly.

RESOLUTION NO. 109 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION AMENDING SECTION 1.11 OF THE CITY COUNCIL RULES OF PROCEDURE BY ADDING SUBSECTION (i) RELATIVE TO APPEARANCES BEFORE THE COUNCIL AND RELATED MATTERS AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

By: Councilman Gibson

WHEREAS, the Shreveport City Council welcomes and encourages comments from citizens concerning Shreveport City government; and

WHEREAS, those comments should be received in an orderly and dignified setting; and
 WHEREAS, it is in the public interest, and the public demands, that meetings of the
 Shreveport City Council be conducted in an orderly and dignified manner; and

WHEREAS, the Shreveport City Council has adopted rules to insure that citizen's
 comments are received in an orderly and dignified setting and that council meetings are
 conducted in a orderly and dignified manner; and

WHEREAS, it is therefore necessary for citizens to know the rules that have been
 adopted concerning public comments before speaking to the Shreveport City Council.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport
 in due, legal and regular session convened that Section 1.11(i) of the Rules of Procedure of the
 City Council is hereby added to read as follows:

1.11. Appearances before the council.

(i) Guidelines which contain the city council rules for citizens to address the
 Shreveport City Council shall be available and displayed in prominent locations
 in or near the council chamber.

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

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

Ms. Lee: The one that was added earlier in the meeting sponsored by
 Councilman Gibson that asked that the guidelines containing the rules of procedure are
 displayed or given to the person desiring to speak.

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

Councilman Jackson: Can we read the description of the resolution.

Mr. Thompson: Yes, it would amend 1.11 of the rules, Appearances before the
 Council. And it would add an I) Guidelines which contain the City Council rules for
 citizens to address the Shreveport City Council shall be available and displayed in
 prominent locations in or near the Council Chamber.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, I'm assuming that Mr. Gibson, he may have
 some clarification like. . .that made me thought about where or how we would do that,
 that was my question.

Councilman Gibson: Councilman Jackson, the spirit is to 1) through discussions
 with Mr. Thompson, I thought he had a good recommendation. That 1) they be
 obviously displayed out in the foyer, but also prior to that we also display up on the
 screen so, we have the opportunity to have that. Also an opportunity to where and this
 came through Council Staff and I want to applaud their recommendation on this that this

be . . . the rules be attached to the sign-in sheets to where they are required to tear on a perforated edge, the sign off to give to the Chair and the Vice-Chair, but they have the rules right there in their hands. So, once they sign, if I put Mike Gibson and subject matter and I tear it off, by tearing it off, you've acknowledged that you have those rules in your hand.

Councilman Lester: That's a lawyer trick.

Councilman Gibson: Well, we're learning from the best Mr. Lester. So, that is in . . . what the spirit of this particular resolution would be.

Mr. Thompson: I'm not sure that we've figured out how to put it in a perforated form, but at least it would be attached to it, stapled or some other way until we can get that.

Councilman Gibson: Well, the creativity that you have, I'm sure, y'all will figure out a way.

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

RESOLUTION NO. 110 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION TO APPOINT A COMMITTEE TO EXPLORE THE FEASIBILITY OF ESTABLISHING A METRO LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCY AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO

By Councilman Gibson

WHEREAS, Shreveport has reduced its general fund operating budget this year by \$5,709,700, because of a decline in (anticipated) revenues; and

WHEREAS, Shreveport cannot continue to provide it's current level of services without raising taxes unless it finds creative ways to reduce the cost of services; and

WHEREAS, The Sheriff of Caddo Parish has recently reduced his operating budget by \$3,000,000 because of a decline in revenues, and

WHEREAS, The Police Department has recently reduced his operating budget by \$1,250,000 because of a decline in revenues, and

WHEREAS, it appears that combining the personnel of the Shreveport Police Department and the personnel of the Caddo Parish Sheriff (a Metro Law Enforcement Agency) will result in significant savings for the citizens of Shreveport and Caddo Parish; and

WHEREAS, because Shreveport's police chief has resigned and the sheriff is a very capable law enforcement officer who is a former police chief for the City of Shreveport this is an ideal time to explore the possibility of forming a Metro Law Enforcement Agency; and

WHEREAS, it is therefore timely, prudent and necessary for a committee to be formed to explore the idea of establishing a Metro Law Enforcement Agency; to determine the advantages and the disadvantages of the Agency; to determine the legal barriers and other barriers to establishing the Agency and the ways to overcome those barriers, and to report it's findings to the Shreveport City Council and the citizens of Shreveport and Caddo Parish as soon as possible.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened that the Metro Law Enforcement Agency Committee is established.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the purpose of the Committee is to explore the feasibility of establishing a Metro Law Enforcement Agency using the resources and personnel of the Shreveport Police Department and the Caddo Parish Sheriff.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the specific, but non-exclusive, objectives of the Committee shall be:

1. To determine duplications (administration, services, etc.) if the police department and the sheriffs office are combined.
2. To determine anticipated savings if the police department and the sheriffs office are combined.
3. To determine legal barriers to combining the police department and the sheriffs office.
4. To suggest ways to change the existing legal barriers to combining the police department and the sheriffs office.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Metro Law Enforcement Agency Committee shall consist of persons who occupy one of the positions and/or are to be a citizen, described as follows:

1. The Sheriff
2. A Council Member
3. The Mayor of Shreveport or the CAO
4. The interim Police Chief of the City of Shreveport
5. A State Legislator
6. A State Senator
7. A Member of Shreveport's Fire and Police Civil Service Board
8. A Member of the 911 Board or the Administrator of the Board
9. Citizens from Shreveport and Caddo Parish
10. Business persons from Shreveport and Caddo Parish
11. The Caddo Parish District Attorney
12. Representatives from other towns and communities in Caddo Parish

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Chairman of the Metro Law Enforcement Agency Committee, and initial members of the Committee shall be appointed by the Chairman of the Shreveport City Council and the remaining members shall be appointed by the Metro Law Enforcement Agency Committee.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Metro Law Enforcement Agency Committee shall provide periodic reports to the City Council and the Committee's existence shall terminate on December 31, 2003, unless that date is changed by the Shreveport City Council.

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

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

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

Councilman Jackson: Councilman Gibson, yesterday, we talked about it and I suggested to you I would not have any real serious problems with the idea itself that I wouldn't have any serious problems supporting your resolution if in fact we added an amendment to that resolution and that amendment was that, in fact we were going to do this feasibility study, that we would also simultaneously stop work on the current city jail so that we would not waste money if in fact this group came back and suggested that we did a metro form of government and if everybody passed off on it, then it would be tantamount to wasting money right now, going through with that process when we could add to what the Parish has, build another part and then if in fact, it was one form of policing if you will or law enforcement, then certainly it would be a whole lot less expensive to operate in that way.

I don't know what it would cost in comparison to build, but certainly without question, it would be a whole lot more efficient to operate if it were in that one location, so, I didn't know if we in fact. . . I don't have the document, so I don't know if its in its amended state or what the current state of the resolution is.

Councilman Gibson: Mr. Chair, I will but, I do appreciate Councilman Jackson's recommendation. 2. As I stated yesterday, I do believe that our capacity as a Parish and City is not going to shrink, it is going to grow. In fact, in talking with law enforcement officials, they were under the, they were agreeing even as the current city jail moves forward and we do have signed contracts where work has already commenced, that they envision if we are successful with passage of this task force which obviously begin the process of looking at concept, that they is still going to be a need and I'll use some of their descriptions of even a north-south campus of jails for incarceration of people that are convicted that those things all come into play, that it would not be a waste of money. That in fact is is going to be a need that is not only current, but also is going to be a need that is going to be in the future because of the capacity, the correctional center is already dealing with a number of needs and this only would give that--if in fact we were to pass this as a metro law enforcement agency---give them options and capacity to address the needs for incarcerating prisons.

Councilman Jackson: Well, again, on yesterday I suggested to Councilman Gibson that I would in fact support him contingency on that and I thought we were in agreement on yesterday but I would suggest to us then that, I hate to sit around planning on those kind of needs and the anticipation of crime continuing to increase and us having the jail and lock, if you will, up more people and that crime is going to continue to go up rather than down.

I hope that something about our quality-of-life and our economic development would help to work to make sure that it goes down rather than continues to spiral upward. And I am sorry that whoever is anticipating that, is anticipating it the way that they are.

But I would suggest to you then Mr. Gibson that there are a lot of things and I guess maybe this feasibility study will tell us that people have had concerns about them, about metro policing and those kind of things which include the fact that we are not

limited now because there are a lot of things that we could do together that even I mentioned on yesterday from sharing information to integrating information and integrating intelligence, infrastructures. There is no reason why we could not engage in cooperative endeavor agreements with the Sheriff's Department, contractual agreements, and have a contractual relationships even as we do with some things we do even now.

I think it would be good if this committee would focus on some things that we could do such as creating standards and training policies that could be parish-wide standards and parish-wide training policies so that all of the men and women who serve even in these rural towns who very much will be an after thought in this metro police.

In my opinion we have to think about the fact that we talk about police being familiar with the area that they serve and so on and so forth, I just think that we, there is a lot of different options. I recognize that even as we go through this process, a lot of people have gotten excited as if we can make this consolidation happen with this feasibility committee, that doesn't happen like that. As Mr. Gibson, I know well knows, the State Legislature have got to get involved, that perhaps will need to be a Constitutional change, we've got civil service issues that we have got to deal with, there is a lot of things. And while on the face it sounds nice and to a lot of people when you start talking about the fiscal restraints and all those things, that sounds nice but there are a lot of inherent issues that we got to begin to deal with.

I don't have any problem with a committee going forward. I am concerned about the cost of going forward and the cost of being able to do a feasibility study. Obviously you are not going to get a bunch of volunteers together and everybody that is volunteering that we have produced for us something that we will consider the foundation for changing the way we do law enforcement in this area. Obviously you are going to have to have a great level of expertise involved at all junctures and so my concern too then and I guess my question is, is there a cost associated with this and if there is, I haven't seen anything said about it, but what in fact is the cost?

Councilman Gibson: Until we have, and if you look at what we proposed a lot of which are very similar to any other committee that we put together, there is no cost associated with it at this point and time.

If that is something that the Councilman would like as we move forward, I would appreciate that. But at this point and time, I do not have what the cost associated with although the parties that have been discussed this issue with, believe that there is a cost savings and there is a window of opportunity for us to move forward on looking at the feasibility of such an agency.

Councilman Lester: I have some serious concerns about this entire idea of a metro police department because I don't believe that our excitement that surrounds a metro police department is so much about the idea of metro policing as it is about metro government.

And, I've heard on yesterday, Councilman Gibson said that his effort is simply just to deal with the issue of metro policing and I know Councilman Gibson to be a man of his word and I respect that. I just have some concerns that others that have expressed such excitement about the idea, typically have been those that 1. have been in favor of metro government. 2. At no time have I heard anyone that is a proponent of the idea of a metro police department, incouch the idea of metro policing in terms of improving the quality-of-policing. And my concern is if that sounds eerily similar to scenario that we dealt with in another body, that being the Caddo Parish School Board in terms of saying we want to consolidate and close schools and this whole nine yards, but

no one actually said this is a quality, we are going to improve the quality of our product. I think with what we have going on right now in the City in terms of what our issues are with our Shreveport Police Department, before we decide to do anything in terms of a metro police department, I think we need to deal with the problems and the issues of the Shreveport Police Department first, and after we have done that process then if we decide that we want to deal with a metro police issue or even study that, I think we should do that but I at this particular time, I don't think with the issues that are presently on the table in the City of Shreveport with our Police Department, this is the time for us to deal with this.

I think what we need to be doing is, supporting the issue of a Citizens Review Panel to deal with our Police Department that is in the four corners of the City of Shreveport, first.

After we have done that and figure out how to improve the quality of policing of the Shreveport Police Department, then maybe I would be a position to entertain the idea of regionalizing or metro police, but at this particular time, it just doesn't make sense to me for us to even undertake the idea of metro police department when what we have going on with SPD and the issues that are there.

And the question that I hear is and I'm sure this is not a quote from Councilman Gibson, but the individual that expressed so much pessimism in terms of--we are going to need more jails, you. I think what we need to do is worry about our economic situation. I think if we try to develop our neighborhoods and our inner cities and deal with some of the issues that we have in education of our young people, then we will need less jobs. I think there is a direct correlation between people working, people having opportunity and people committing crime. Of course, you are always going to have people that don't want to do right, and that is why you have the jails, but as your economy picks up, fewer people are robbing other people because they are too busy working and getting things of their own.

So, I just would say I don't think this is the time for us as a Council to be advocating the issues of metro government or metro policing until and unless and until we have dealt with the issues of the Shreveport Police Department.

One of the things that Councilman Gibson came up with, and I think it is excellent, is the committee that is suppose to be dealing with some issues in terms of SPD and I don't know if that committee has ever met or moved forward, but I would suggest to my Council colleague that we table this issue and deal with the issue that we have with our Police Department within the confines of the City of Shreveport, first. And then deal with the issues of a metro police department because for us to do otherwise, is to ignore a problem that is obviously there and I am not talking about a race problem, I am not talking about that at all. I'm talking about an issue of excessive use of force. Mr. Pannell and a number of other people both black and white have come before this body over the last couple of months and have given us issue after issue after issue in terms of issues and concerns that they had with SPD. And rather than for us to deal with them, we were talking about going to a metro police department, I don't think that is the direction, that we just need to be going.

So, I would just implore my colleague and Mr. Gibson as well as the rest of the members of this board, lets deal with SPD first then after we have dealt with that issue, maybe then it would be time for us to look at a metro police department. I don't think this is the time for us to deal with this issue at this particular time and I would ask that we table this issue until that such time.

Councilman Gibson: Two weeks ago, we got into a debate and this Council has

been challenged from its beginning when we were installed by a prominent judge in this community and we were elected by our constituents, that challenge was budget.

November and December we saw cuts in all departments; that wasn't good enough. In April and May of this year we saw another 4.5% cut in services. I have heard from all of my constituents up here talking about the citizens, the taxpayers. The taxpayers are our bosses. The taxpayers expect minimum services, minimum services being police, fire, streets, water and sewer. Anything over and beyond that, is a luxury especially under economic conditions that we are faced with in this City and that we are faced with in this country, right now. Even despite having low interest rates, we are dealing with real challenges.

Why did we cut in November and December or approve a budget that was submitted by the Administration based on cuts requested from the departments heads and then another budget proposal by the Administration to this Council in May, is because of revenue stream being diminished and as a result we are having to cut expenses related to that overhead.

So, two weeks ago it dawned on me that we are sitting there in our discussions on cuts on budgets that one of those cuts was the police training facility in terms of the cadet class. We are already short some officers, in my opinion we are going to be short more officers. I've also at the same time heard numerous complaints, obviously discussions about the Police Chief. Now, the Chief is no longer here, he has resigned and now we are in an interim position.

As I stated two weeks ago, I think there is an opportunity. Yes, there was study done in 1990, that was 13 years ago. It can be used as a baseline beginning for what is on the table in terms of a metro law enforcement. The key component in that study was law enforcement subcommittee. It stated that there was duplication exists in both the Shreveport Police Department and the Sheriff's Department of which that includes K-9 units, emergency rescue, hazardous materials, special tactics teams, patrol, administration, training, equipment purchases, maintenance, computer software and hardware, prison facilities, criminal and civil processes, just to name a few.

Knowing the status of our revenue stream and in my opinion, I'm still convinced and this body has heard me say it for the last 6-months, I think we are going to continue to face those challenges and with an opportunity in an interim police chief and a proven commodity in Sheriff Prator---and I want to make it clear, Sheriff Prator had nothing to do with this proposal in any form or fashion. I have talked with Sheriff Prator. He endorses the concept but in no way did he have anything to do with its bringing before this body.

I believe going back to my earlier statements that the taxpayer deserves the best service as possible, both in the rural area and in the metro area. This task force would be charged with looking at the feasibility, not approving a metro police agency, not looking at a metro form of government, that's only muddying the water. There is a commonality, there is an opportunity. At best or at worse, however, you want to look at it, if this is approved, I believe that the dialogue created through the different agencies, citizens in the rural and metro areas, legal and legislative minds that are going to be part of this task force, that the dialogue created from that, at best could develop what Councilman Lester referred to as cooperative endeavors. But unfortunately, those cooperative endeavors, don't seem to occur too much because of what happened in 1990 on the study, there were turf battles.

The objections I've heard in the last two weeks, which by the way, there is a poll out there that shows over 80% of our bosses, the citizens of Shreveport, like the concept of a task force looking at this particular concept as a feasibility.

On top of that, each of us have a letter from the Shreveport Chamber of Commerce who, I will say, doesn't stand up and endorse too many concepts, but they do endorse this.

There are several other business groups that are endorsing the concept to say, look at the feasibility. The people who have said they are opposed, I hear status quo and I hear turf battles of which I don't think, from what I've heard from my constituents, that is not what we are up here for. We are up here to look at how we stretch taxpayer dollars, the best of our ability and in my opinion, this particular resolution is to address that situation.

In the very beginning, I asked the staff to look into a couple of items: 1. the budget that was just cut 4.5% cut \$5,7 million dollars out of the City of Shreveport budget, of which \$1.2 came from the City of Shreveport Police Department that doesn't include what happened in November and December. In the Sheriff's Department, over the last two years, they've cut \$3 million dollars, that trend is going to occur, that is going to affect services or someone is going to have to stand up, a political leader and ask for a tax increase, it is not going to be me because you are not as tax payers going to be willing to pay for a tax increase in any form or fashion, but what you want to see is stream line efficiencies in services, the best of our ability based on the revenue that we bring in. Hopefully, the economy will turn. I am not betting on it any time soon. But, I'm hopefully with the Administration and their economic development team, the Shreveport Chambers, the African-American Chamber and others, that we are going to turn that tide but I am not going to bet on it at this point and time and I think that in anticipation of that, knowing all these things are coming into play that we have an opportunity to look into the feasibility of such a concept of which then that recommendation will come back before this body.

Councilman Hogan: I have no comment other than that I am in favor of the idea and I'm in favor of forming the committee to explore this situation.

Councilman Carmody. Hear, hear.

Councilman Walford: I say the same thing, I think it is prudent to explore it.

Councilman Lester offered a substitute motion to postpone the resolution, seconded by Councilman Green.

Councilman Walford: We already have a motion on the floor.

Councilman Lester: A substitute motion to postpone.

Councilman Hogan: To postpone, until when—to next meeting?

Councilman Lester: At a minimum until the next meeting, but I think we should postpone it until such time that we have dealt with our issues with SPD. I mean, it just doesn't make sense for us to explore the idea of regionalizing our Police Department when we already have issues that we have not acknowledged with our Police Department. We need to deal with first things first. Deal with what we are having with our SPD. Let the new chief, whoever he or she is going to be kind of come in and make some changes to that Department. Money is an issue, it is always going to be an issue. Money was not, a worse issue in than in the '80s when we had forecloses going left and right and no one talked about dealing with a metro our police department at that time, that was a '90s issue. We need to deal with the quality of policing within the City of Shreveport, first.

[Councilman Walford: Reverend Brown, I know that Mr. Lester's comments are exciting you, but I am going to ask you if you would, to please hold your applause.

Unidentified person: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Reverend Brown: It is against the law to applaud?)

Mr. Chairman, I would simply say that I would just believe that we need to deal with first things, first. We have an issue that we—[Councilman Walford: Reverend Brown, that's my last warning, Sir. If you disturb the Chambers again, I will have you removed. Reverend Brown: I can not applaud? Councilman Walford: I am asking you to please quit disturbing the speakers, one more time and I will ask that you be removed.]

Reverend Brown: You been wanting to do that. Why don't you do it now. Councilman Walford: Don't try me. Lets just have an orderly meeting. If you want to participate, you are going to have your opportunity to speak. Allow the Councilman to speak. You are out of order.]

We need to deal with our issue in terms of improving the quality of policing first without or citizens, that should be our first goal. Our second goal to be dealing with our financial issues. I think the issues that we have with the Police Department, are not just financial, they are cultural and we need to deal with those and for us to move forward, on an issue in terms of metro policing when we said that we—in fact this board voted to support the idea of a Citizens Review panel and even though it did not pass in Baton Rouge, we have not done anything in terms of this body to put together. We have not done anything as this body to put together any type of committee to deal with that issue.

I am just asking that we postpone this issue, in terms of metro policing until such time that we have dealt with our issues with SPD. I don't think that, that is asking a lot. If the issue of metro policing is still there, if there is some support for that then we'll do it. I mean, Councilman Gibson has said that you are talking about duplication, but at the same time we are not talking about stopping any construction on the jail. So, I just think that we need to deal with first things, first.

Councilman Green: I would just like to say, I support what Councilman Lester is saying. I do support the idea, I talked to Councilman Gibson about the metro. But, I just think at this point and time that our Interim Chief and his entire staff, the whole entire Shreveport Police Department, should be given an opportunity to work toward what we are all looking forward to and I just think that if we would, the wise and prudent thing would be to give them that opportunity. I am sure the Chief would like that opportunity I am sure that he would think in terms of there are some things and I've talked to him and he is excited about his job. And I just think to put that burden on him, as to whether or not his ideas, what he would like to do to go forth, I don't think that we ought to basically abandon the ideas that he has. I think that we should just postpone this and give them an opportunity and once that all the dust is settled, then we could always come back, but I just think that that is one thing that we should do at this point and time.

Substitute motion to postpone denied by the following vote: Nays: Councilman Walford, Carmody, Gibson and Hogan. 4. Ayes: Councilman Lester, Green and Jackson. 3.

Motion by Councilman Lester to table the resolution, seconded by Councilman Green. Motion denied by the following vote: Nays: Councilman Walford, Carmody, Gibson and Hogan. 4. Ayes: Councilman Lester, Green and Jackson. 3.

Councilman Walford: We are back to the original—Councilman Jackson: I don't have a copy of the—Councilman Gibson: We have a motion and second on the floor.

Councilman Walford: I thought we got a substitute motion. It was defeated. So we are still on Councilman Gibson's motion (seconded by Councilman Carmody.)

Councilman Jackson: Councilman Gibson, do you have a list of those people or can you read off a list of those people who you have suggested would serve on said committee?

Councilman Walford: We all had one left at our. . .

Councilman Jackson: I am asking through you, does he have that?

Councilman Gibson: It is listed in the resolution that you have before you and it says, *it is not limited to*—that was given to you yesterday.

Councilman Jackson: You don't have it with you?

Councilman Gibson: No, I sure don't.

Councilman Green: Since we are at this point of voting on this particular committee, would it be out of order—we have our interim Chief present today as to get a comment as to how he would basically feel about this, would that be out of order?

Ms. Glass; It is my understanding, that the Chairman will rule and if there are any questions.

Councilman Gibson: I have no objections on other motions or other resolutions when we call up department heads. If you would like to call the Chief up, certainly.

Councilman Green: Welcome, Chief and welcome to the meeting. As we've talked, out at the camp that you all sponsored with the young folk, not long ago.

In hearing about the metro policing and all, what would be your basic comments if you had any to make and I hate to put you on the spot, but I don't have any other choice.

Interim Police Chief Campbell: First, let me make it clear, that would not be my decision. It would be the decision of this Council, the Mayor, the Caddo Parish Commission, and the Sheriff along with the citizens of Caddo Parish and the city of Shreveport.

There are several things that need to be taken into consideration. I see no problems with looking into it. I think that the issues, there will be several issues that will have to be dealt with. The Sheriff's Department is a at-will employer. The Shreveport Police Department as covered by civil service, which obviously we would have to go to the Legislature to make some changes there.

But I just kind of, just on short notice, pulled some things off the Internet in regards to some and generally speaking, one that was, that kind of caught my eye and one of the big things and I think we talked about here today is the cost savings. This was from Metro Augusta newspaper, December 28, 1997. It says: Two years after the City-County merged to save money, budget has risen \$22.3 million dollars.

There is also some differences in the services that are provided by the Sheriff and the municipal police departments. We are primarily a law enforcement agency, he is primarily a keeper of the jails. Not to say that something couldn't be worked out, but I think some careful consideration should be looked at if we decide to go there.

But again, it is not my choice. It is the choice of the Council, the Mayor, the Caddo Commission, the Sheriff and the citizens of Caddo Parish.

Councilman Green: Chief, again, you said, after 2 years?

Interim Police Chief Campbell: Yes, sir and I'm sorry I don't have copies. There are several articles, just got on the internet and did a brief search.

Councilman Green: You said, how much the budget went up?

Interim Police Chief Campbell: \$22.3 million is what they quote in the paper.

Councilman Green: Thank you very much. Here, again, I didn't know that you had that information, but I really appreciate that, that has helped me out a whole lot.

Councilman Carmody: Very quickly, let me take this opportunity in that this, is the first time that we have laid eyes on one another, since your appointment, congratulations.

Interim Police Chief Campbell: Thank you, Councilman Carmody.

Councilman Jackson: Chief, what year was that?

Interim Police Chief Campbell: That was in 1997, let me make sure and there is several other articles and that is one of the big and I think there are some initial savings in doing that, but I think that if you read some of these articles and I can provide them to you and I'm sure there is more research that can be done, but just on short notice, just went through and picked up a few things but the article is dated December, 1997.

Councilman Jackson: Is just wanted to state for the record that and I guess Councilman Gibson can affirm and maybe I'm wrong. We were near the apex of economic ode at that time, not in the dodgems of the economy that we are in right now.

So, I suggest that while, we talk about it being economic sensitive and fiscally driven, that we ought to observe those things. It doesn't mean that is going to happen Shreveport at all, I'm not suggesting that. But I am saying when we begin to throw up examples, that we can't be in denial about other examples that exist as well. I appreciate those examples that the Councilman from District D has presented, but by the same token, there are other examples as what the Chief is presenting now that also says to me that there are some drawbacks, you know, some plus' and minus'. I just don't want us to be in a position you know like crazy investor or people who really think they get excited because they spend \$20 worth to buy lottery tickets and they win \$10 dollars and they get excited because won.

I don't want us to be in that situation, jumping up and down because we spent \$20 million dollars and say, we saved \$10. I want us to be realistic about it and that is my concern that we are not getting, it is not like shooting fish in a barrel. It is not as easy to project and so that is what my concern has been. Again, it is not about not having a committee, it is just being concerned about metro form of government and hopefully, I am not mad about Councilman Gibson proposing it and I hope that he is not mad about me having some questions about it, and so I appreciate your input Chief and the input of other Councilmen.

I would just suggest to us as well, Mr. Gibson, I asked last time but I didn't— wasn't it on the list they had a Council person as a part of that list? I don't have the list. I think a Council person.

Mr. Chairman, I think you will have the authority to appoint that person. I would just like you, if we pass this I certainly would be interested in being the Councilman who serve on that committee.

Councilman Gibson: I'll certainly consider that.

Councilman Gibson: Chief, welcome aboard. I hadn't had a chance to visit with you. Appreciate you bringing that information together. In fact, instead of this body reviewing it and I do appreciate you doing that, the whole purpose of the task force is to take all information and let me just state for the record, if we are to pass this. It would be my intent at least from my management style in the private sector, I don't like to leave any stone unturned and to have a wall full of 'why it won't work' and examples of 'where it has worked well' and 'where it hasn't worked well' because I think for every example you bring, I can bring another one. But, in fact if you noticed in the resolution, the Shreveport Police Department is a major component of that task force. We are not trying to omit anybody in this process and I hope that in the spirit of that, we are going to take every angle on this particular item to make sure that no one whether it be at will, whether it be civil service, the tenure, the positions, the legislative action that needs to take place, the input from the citizens, the input from the business community, the whole nine yards is going to be looked at.

And again, I am just kind of a little surprise that from comments made today that we are talking concept and to go from concept t reality, there is a lot of hurdles that have

to go on. Now, these aren't really directly specifically at you, but it is there is an opportunity here and I hope that if we are passing it, I am going to rely on your expertise and your personels' expertise to bring a lot of information to the table for review.

And to go back and to respond on another issue from one of my fellow colleagues, the issue that and you've got a big challenge before you, I think you knew that when you stepped up because of some things created before you took the position, that you will be working those issues parallel to hopefully this task force working something in conjunction.

I think this City is more than capable of walking and chewing gum at the same time, and that is the way I look at it. Is, we've got an opportunity and that opportunity is a window that is there because of a variety of factors that are before us and I'm looking forward, hopefully to having that task force move forward to look at the concept and look at the different parameters and the issues that are put before from your department, from Sheriff Prator's Department, the citizens, and the parish and the metropolitan area that both law enforcement agencies service and see what comes out of it.

And whatever comes out of it, still has to come right back to this body and to be debated and massaged from a legislative standpoint and then that is where I would expect some of these comments to be coming from but not until we see all of the ins and outs of this particular aspect. But I do appreciate that information because I have seen some positives and some not so positives in my research throughout the country on metropolitan law enforcement.

Councilman Lester: I appreciate you Chief. I look forward to working with you in whatever capacity that you are serving whether it be on an Interim or on a permanent basis. I really appreciate you coming forward in this difficult time and I would just ask that you do what you have always done as I appreciate it as being fair and being a man that looks at all issues, without an jaundiced eye but an eye toward improving the quality of our police product. I think that is the most important thing that we can deal with as a City at this time.

I understand the idea about saving money and who am I to say we shouldn't save money because I think that is important but I think that at this particular time in our City's history I think the thing that is most important to our citizens, as well as their pocketbook is to know that they are getting a quality product and I appreciate.

Councilman Green: Basically Chief, I really appreciate you having that information with you today and it just shows the type person you are and the type Chief you'll be.

But saying that we went forth with this study, with you being in law enforcement, about how long would you think it would take a committee to come back with sound information that would help us to go forward?

Interim Police Chief Campbell: Well, that is not really my area of expertise but I think that and to answer Councilman Gibson, again I would reiterate to you that it is not my choice where we go with the metro concept. I think that there are some issues that need to be worked out. It may be a workable system and there are going to be positives and negatives on both sides.

I would think thought not necessarily the committee length, but I think to change some of the issues regarding civil service and state law, that you may get into at least a couple of years before it could come to fruition. And I would tell you this, that I am certainly open minded to anything because I would rather be a part of the solution than a part of the problem.

Councilman Lester: I have some questions from Councilman Gibson. Have we heard from any of these other municipalities in terms of Vivian, or Greenwood or Oil City

or any of those areas relative to where they are? I mean from the idea of metro policing because basically when you are talking about metro policing, what we are doing from the City of Shreveport is, we are talking about taking over another Police Department in terms of geography and in terms of additional liability. So, I mean is this a scenario where we heard someone from the City of Greenwood or the City of Vivian or any of those unincorporated villages or whatever that says that we really need you guys to come in and take over our Police Department?

Councilman Walford: Mr. Gibson if you don't mind, if you will just respond directly to the question, please.

Councilman Gibson: First of all, I don't think we are taking over anything. I think again the task force is looking at the concept to discuss this or say that I've discussed it directly it with outlying towns and mayors and things of that nature.

If you will refer to the committee make-up, the rural committees are going to have major role in input and discussions on whether they are in favor or not in favor.

Again, Councilman Lester, I will suggest it is very difficult and again, I say this without hesitation, this is my hometown. I moved back here 7½ years ago. The fear of unknown is always something that is difficult for all of us to deal with. Embracing status quo, has been the easy way for Shreveport and change is very difficult.

I don't know if this is going to change anything, but I do know the dialogue, the productive dialogue, that will be produced through this task force to look at all angles. And it may only produce one thing, for example bulk fuel purchases. It might come out that both agencies decide to join together and purchase that under one cooperative endeavor agreement. Obviously bulk gives you better pricing. If that is the only thing that comes out of it who wins? Our bosses the taxpayers. But I don't know what else can be discovered through this.

And again, there is going to be a laundry list of pros and cons and in my expectation would be that that wall would be full of 'why it won't work' and I think one of the challenge the task force would have before us is, utilize the talent of law enforcement, political, legal, legislative mind to find out how those 'why not's' can turn into 'whys' and then present it findings back to this Council.

And to go back to Councilman Greens' statement, I'm hoping that this task force could be in a position within three months to bring a primarily report back and maybe year end have a final report, because again, you have a window of opportunity. And again, it is a 'what if'. Lets play a 'what if' and see what happens, because we find some opportunities for cooperative agreements. I'll go back and as an example, Mayor Hightower and his Administration played a what if game when they took off. The what if game was lets move City Hall downtown. Oh, by the way, the Sheriff's Department decided they wanted to look at it, and the Parish Commission wanted to look at it. I have to believe Mayor Hightower, since that has occurred because this is a joint facility, being used by two or three different agencies that there is sufficiency in that. But that what if produced something that I think from what I've heard from my constituents, were very much appreciative because we are stretching their taxpayer dollar. And I would suggest to you that we have similar concepts available to us in this process as we move forward.

But it is the fear of unknown. Hey, I don't know what is going to come out of it but I'm willing and I hope that you are willing to join with me in moving forward and demonstrate to our bosses (the taxpayers) that we are willing to think out of the box and look at ways that we can stretch our taxpayer dollars knowing that we are strapped for revenue in terms of the stream that comes into this City and the recent history that is

before us, in terms of shortfall with revenue.

Councilman Lester: Do you envision, because from what I've heard the impetus for this moving forward on the metro police scenario is an economic issue. What about the quality of our policing? And the reason I ask that question and the reason why I asked you to consider tabling this issue is, the financial issues are going to always going to be there, but right now, not only do I think the citizens of Shreveport can walk and chew gum, I think we can walk, chew gum, sing, dance, write and do whatever, but our bosses are also telling us, certainly the bosses that put me here are telling me we need to deal with some of the issues inherent on our Police Department. And you talk about a window of opportunity. Th window of opportunity for us is not to deal with a metro concept, we are in a scenario for one reason or another, we have a new leader in the Shreveport Police Department. What we should be doing is focusing our energy on supporting the interim Chief and whoever that person is going to be, whoever he or she is whether this person is from Shreveport, from Bossier, from Timbuktu, from Johannesburg, from Naple or whoever, this person comes in and restores the trust of all citizens in the SPD and puts us in a scenario where we don't have issues that we have had before in terms of use of force, in terms of training and whatever.

I just think that it sends a bad message to both your boss and my boss that we don't even deal with that issue and we are starting to talk about money because I can assure you if we don't deal with our issues in terms of the training of our Police Department, whether it is a metro police department whether it is a police department for the whole state, if we don't deal with those issues in a quick and substantive manner we are going to have more lawsuits because we are going to incur greater liability simple because you are going to have the same people, doing the same thing over a greater area over more people. And simple mathematics tells you that you are going to increase your problems in terms of liability.

So, without even dealing with the issue of metro policing and I understand that is an issue of your's and maybe at another date I could support it, but right now I just think it sends a bad message for us to try to talk about the metro police department when we don't and we have not addressed or fundamental issues as they relate to the Shreveport Police Department and it is not a black-white issue. It ain't about black and white.

We have a issue with our Police Department and whether you talk about the Hudspeth thing, whether you talk about citizens and young folks that are having problems with police issues over at Clyde Fant Parkway, whether you are talking about different parts of town, we are having issues with our Police Department and we have got to deal with that. We can't stick our head in the sand or go off and play the red herring and deal with a metro police or anything else.

All I'm saying is, I think if we are going to deal with our bosses' issue, our bosses number one issue is the quality of policing within the confines of the city of Shreveport. No disrespect to anything outside of those confines, but we should deal within the confines of the city of Shreveport first, and then once we have dealt with that issue then maybe we can start talking about regionalizing and sharing what we have, but right now we haven't crossed that bridge yet.

Councilman Gibson: Your question was about quality?

Councilman Lester: Yes.

Councilman Gibson: The quality can be addressed through cooperative discussions in the fact that there is best practices in both departments. And I expect, I would hope that some of those discussions coming out of that process also because they are some things, and again, you heard me say 2-weeks ago sheriff is a known

quantity in this community.

Now, Sheriff Prator may not have interest if we were to get the final result of this thing, okay. But the fact is there is an opportunity for those discussions for best practices within both law enforcement agencies, which then obviously, the end result of those best practices, produce a better quality product and that would be part of the discussion. It is not pure economics. There is a variety of share ideas, resources, and a variety of other things that come out of this process.

I would also suggest to you that we did as a body and just because this Council if it approves this concept of the task force to look at the concept of this situation, we do have a Safety Committee. We did approve that that Safety Committee work in conjunction with the Police Department and the Administration to look at our policies and procedures and do things. I don't know where that is, I don't know who the Chairman of that Safety Committee is at this point and time, but I would suggest to you that when I saw walk and chew gum at the same time, I believe we can and that Safety Committee should be looking at those issues and I think everybody on this body would be willing to step up if called upon to help with that Safety Committee working in conjunction without our Interim Chief and our Mayor and our Administration, to address those issues. But all these things, Councilman Lester can be worked parallel and will not detract away from anything, but to move forward and to look at these items from a concept and feasibility standpoint.

Councilman Lester: My question again, when you talk about best practices, the best practice argument assumes and pre-disposing that the practices of both SPD and the practices of the Caddo Parish Sheriff's Department are feasible. But, obviously they are not because those are the problems that we are having.

All I'm saying is this issue with metro police department, isn't ripe at this time (to use a legal term of art). What we need to be dealing with is the practices of the Shreveport Police Department and the issues with the Shreveport Police Department to give a better quality product to our citizens.

After we have done that and have expended the energy necessary and given the proper look at that issue, then if the citizens tell us lets look at the metro police department then I think we can do that but right now for us to take away from our time to do and address or even discuss metro policing to me sends a negative message that the issues that we have with our Police Department don't rise to the level of us saving money, and I would hate for us to be dollar rich and value poor.

Councilman Hogan: I haven't said anything else other than I was in favor of the idea. I would just like to remind everybody that we are not here to debate the feasibility of this. All we are doing is, I want to read this resolution: *A resolution to adopt a committee to explore the feasibility of establishing a metro law enforcement agency and otherwise providing with respect thereto.* And we are taking 60 minutes to talk about what should take 60-seconds. All we are doing is just exploring the feasibility, forming the committee and I call for the question, right now (seconded by Councilman Gibson and approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Walford, Carmody, Gibson and Hogan. 4. Nays: Councilman Lester, Green and Jackson. 3.)

Resolution passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Walford, Carmody, Gibson and Hogan. 4. Nays: Councilman Lester, Green and Jackson. 3.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS:

1. Resolution No. 107 of 2003: A resolution authorizing the execution of a contract with BFI Waste Systems of Louisiana, L.L.C ., and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
2. Resolution No. 108 of 2003: A resolution authorizing the Mayor of the City of Shreveport to execute and deliver a Master Swap Agreement with JP Morgan Chase Bank with respect to the aggregate principal amount of \$30,000,000 Louisiana Local Government Environmental Facilities and Community Development Authority Revenue Bonds (City of Shreveport/Independence Stadium Project) Series 2000 and Series 2002A and provide for other matters in connection therewith.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Green to Introduce the Resolutions to lay over until the July 22, 2003 meeting. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Green. 6. Nays: None. Out of Chamber: Councilman Jackson. 1.

INTRODUCTION OF ORDINANCES:

1. Ordinance No. 82 of 2003: An ordinance amending the 2003 Capital Improvements Budget and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
2. Ordinance No. 83 of 2003: An ordinance amending the 2003 Budget for the Water and Sewerage Enterprise Fund and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
3. Ordinance No. 84 of 2003: An ordinance to amend Chapter 90 of the Code of Ordinances Relative to Traffic and Vehicles and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
4. Ordinance No. 85 of 2003: An ordinance to amend and re-enact Section 2-1 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport to require certain officers and employees to reside and be domiciled in the City of Shreveport and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
5. Ordinance No. 86 of 2003: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the North side of South Lakeshore Drive 500 feet west of Municipal Pier Road, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana. from R-1D, Urban, One-family Residence District, to R-1h(PUD) Urban, One-family Residence (Planned Unit Development) District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
6. Ordinance No. 87 of 2003: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the southeast corner of South Lakeshore Drive and Willow Ridge Boulevard, Shreveport,

- Caddo Parish, Louisiana. from B-3, Community Business District to R-3, Urban, Multiple-family Residence District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto
7. Ordinance No. 88 of 2003: An ordinance Amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property Located on the East side of Southern Avenue 200 Feet south of Ockley Drive, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana. from B-2, Neighborhood Business District to B-2-E, Neighborhood Business/extended Use District, Limited to “Taxidermy/wildlife Artist as Applied For” Only, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto
 8. Ordinance No. 89 of 2003: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the South side of West 70th Street 1700 Feet east of Raspberry Lane, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from, R-1D, Urban, One-family Residence District, to B-1, Buffer Business District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto
 9. Ordinance No. 90 of 2003: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the southwest corner of Essex Street & Hearne Avenue, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana. from B-1, Buffer Business District to B-3, Community Business District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto
 10. Ordinance No. 91 of 2003: An ordinance authorizing the Purchasing Agent to dispose of surplus real property Lot 14, Yarbrough Subdivision and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
 11. Ordinance No. 92 of 2003: An ordinance authorizing the Purchasing Agent to dispose of surplus real property Lot 15, Yarbrough Subdivision and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
 12. Ordinance No. 93 of 2003: An ordinance authorizing the Purchasing Agent to dispose of surplus real property Lot 26, West Shreveport Subdivision and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
 13. Ordinance No. 94 of 2003: An ordinance authorizing the Purchasing Agent to dispose of surplus real property Block 5 of Solo Hood Partition and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
 14. Ordinance No. 95 of 2003: An ordinance authorizing the Purchasing Agent to dispose of surplus real property Lot D of Carrie Hood Allen Partition and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
 15. Ordinance No. 96 of 2003: An ordinance authorizing the Purchasing Agent to dispose of surplus real property Lot 9, Morningside Subdivision and otherwise providing with

respect thereto.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Carmody Green to Introduce the Ordinances to lay over until the July 22, 2003 meeting. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Green. 6. Nays: None. Out of Chamber: Councilman Jackson. 1.

16. Ordinance No. 97 of 2003: An ordinance declaring 740 Stephenson Street to be surplus property; authorizing the donation of same to Volunteers of America of North Louisiana; and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Carmody Green to Introduce the resolutions to lay over until the August 12, 2003 meeting. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Green. 6. Nays: None. Out of Chamber: Councilman Jackson. 1.

ORDINANCES ON SECOND READING AND FINAL PASSAGE:

1. Ordinance No. 40 of 2003 by Councilman Lester: An ordinance changing the names of the Shreveport Blanchard Road from the Roy Road to North Hearne Avenue, and of Ford Street from North Hearne Avenue to Pete Harris Drive, and of Caddo Street from Pete Harris Drive to the Clyde Fant Parkway to Hilry Huckaby III Avenue, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on April 8, 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 Lester, seconded by Councilman Green to postpone the ordinance until the July 22, 2003 meeting. Motion denied by the following vote: Nays: Councilman Walford, Carmody, Gibson, and Hogan. 4. Ayes: Councilman Lester and Green. 2. Out of Chamber: Councilman Jackson. 1.

Councilman Lester: I am going to ask that we table this issue and I am going to tell you why. I have an amendment—Councilman Walford: If we could, make your motion, so that we can discuss.

Motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Green to table the ordinance.

Councilman Lester: I have spoken with several property owners and I will be offering an amendment to this ordinance to make it strictly a District A issue.

In the process over the last weekend, I've spoken to a number of property owners in the area that will be affected and I made a commitment to them that I would not move forward on this issue until we have had an opportunity to dialogue.

Primarily some folks that I was suppose to have a meeting with on yesterday, with KCS and a number of other businesses that expressed a desire to sit down and talk with

me about this issue so in as much as this issue will be a District A issue. I would ask that my colleagues would honor that and vote with me to table this issue so that I can honor the commitment that I made to those people that will be affected and then move forward at that time.

Motion to table the ordinance denied by the following vote: Nays: Councilman Walford, Carmody, Gibson, and Hogan. 4. Ayes: Councilman Lester, Green and Jackson. 3.

Motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Gibson for adoption.

Councilman Carmody: It is the custom of this body that we make a affirmative motion but I will ask for a 'no' vote of the Council and I've spoken to the merits of this particular ordinance, I believe it was a month ago and my feelings have not changed.

Councilman Jackson: I just would urge us to consider this. I know Councilman Carmody has done this obviously to bring it up, to vote down.

I am certainly disappointed that that happens because the person who represents that particular district in which this is confined, has suggested to us and asked us to consider giving him an opportunity to do something different with it. I just want to encourage us as we continue to engineer a bad spirit, that we will be considerate of those things, particularly those things that cross. I am not asking us, because we have this, in my opinion, we have this incessant desire to have this anemic parochial attitude anyway.

But what I would suggest to us is that somehow or another we would try and be respectful, at least by suggesting that something that happens in another Councilman's district is something that we at least give him deference to be able to work to a degree that we can all allow, it would be palatable, to all of us.

I would just suggest that and I would suggest to the rest of my colleagues who are prepared to vote in this same ploy or in this same situation that, you don't want—I would be foolish to suggest that what goes around, come around. Because doing bad for bad, doesn't help anybody. But what I would suggest is that the deference that you accord to others, ought to be the deference that you expect to receive in return.

So, I am simply saying as we engender a spirit of cooperation which has been absent that we at least begin to particularly in areas of, every area that is on here, obviously we debate and we argue about a lot of things that have just a generic application to the entire city but when it comes to matters of individual districts, I think it is an ultimate sign of disrespect and a lack of deference for that particular elected official in that district to suggest that what you are going to do is to bring it up to defeat it because you are tired of it laying on the table, you are tired of having to deal with it, and so the best thing is to send a signal that you are now going to try to do this.

I would suggest that if you are going to send a signal, that you do, what we ought to do is continue to work even though we got rough spots. I don't disagree with how some people treat me, perhaps, but I am going to continue, I'm committed to the work. The work of continuing to move forward to try to make the City better, notwithstanding individual confrontations we might have on the Council, we are bigger than that. We ought to be bigger than that and we ought to be better than that. You win some, you lose some, but even when you lose and even when you win—you see a loser, when he wins, is

still a loser. A winner, even if he loses can still retain the attitude of a winner.

What I am suggesting to us is, don't put each other in situations to where we begin to cat fight or cross districts lines and do those kind of things. Lets accord and lets give to each other, the deference that we expect in return.

I certainly would not, when Councilman Carmody was out of town, he asked us to table something. He said, he wasn't going to be here. It was his desire that we not deal with. We could have pulled it off the table and killed it. He came back, it would have been dead, that would have been engineered out of a bad spirit. What I am suggesting to us, lets not operate.

I can't tell you not to do it. I just ask out of respect and deference to each other, that we try as often as possible to not do this. I don't care who calls you, how many phone calls you get from anybody with any kind of political pressure or even if it is your own personal convictions. I would suggest that those convictions are not to be put on the back burner but in deference to the other Council members and to our colleagues, lets at least take that into consideration before we move to do things that could be seen as things that are being done out of a bad spirit.

Councilman Green: In observing what's happening today, Councilman asked that it be postponed, he asked that it be tabled. And I think that if in fact we fail to do that for him, respect that, then it reminds me of a book by Travis Smalley that talks about, I guess I would basically preface it by saying: *Being on the Council while being Black*.

But, I would like to caution you all up here and I've said this before, and of course we have about 3 ½ years to work on it and I would also like to caution the citizens of this town that in the next 3 ½ years I want you to watch the Council now. In the next 3 ½ years, the numbers up here are going to change. And after the numbers change and folk are going to want you to be kind and nice and wonderful and all of that kind stuff. And, it is easy to make decisions when you are outnumbered. Certainly I would like to say this that, we've always been outnumbered but we have always had a God who has been able to see about us.

And this is taken us down, in fact this is worse than getting, shot down when you fail to respect one Councilman but you can respect another because you have the numbers to do that. And if we do this today, by disrespecting this Councilman, who has said, don't do any more work on it, I just want it postponed, I just want it tabled. And, you can't find it in the goodness of your heart to just postpone it or to table it, that there is something so urgent that you promised people that we are going to get rid of it and we are not going to have it because, Mr. Ford and Mr. Caddo and Mr. Whoever, they will be very offended, and we are just not going to do that. We are not going to offend them and we just going to get it off so we won't be worried. I think that sends a bad message.

And, I am just here to say, that 3 ½ years is not too long for me to wait. I may not be here, I may not be up here but in 3 ½ years the numbers are going to change and the whole situation may change even over in the Chair over to my far right, it may change. And, I know that there is a spirit that is going through the town: they are taking over, and I hate to be calling 'they.' But they are taking over and don't do this and don't do that, it is a bad spirit, and just about a name of a street.

So, I just ask that before we make this next vote as to bringing this to the table.

Why it got to come to the table today, I don't understand? But before we do this instead of talking about getting a committee to get the Police Department straight, I think we may have to get a committee to get us up here straight because we have to be mindful of what we do.

So, I am going to be in hopes that we won't send a message that we won't even respect another Councilman's district, another Councilman's request and in the same spirit that Councilman Jackson said, when Councilman Carmody was out a few weeks ago, he says, don't deal with my stuff. We respected that, nobody even thought about doing it. This Councilman is present to say, look will you all just table my stuff, will you just postpone it and we won't give him that right.

And in a few days, 3 ½ years is not long, it is going to be here before you know it. We are going to be asking for some support for whatever area and Councilman Jackson said that he possible wouldn't be taking notes, and I won't either but somebody is going to be taking notes and somebody's record is going to make a whole lot of reflection.

And, I just ask that if in fact and I don't have a problem saying it, if we have the love of Jesus in our heart, we need to do unto others as we would have them to do unto us.

And Mr. Chairman, with that, I am just in hopes that Councilman Carmody that you would withdraw your motion and just let this ride, just for the spirit of making our City better and that is just where I am.

Councilman Lester: Ordinance No. 40 has probably been with the exception of the Hudspeth incident probably one of the most controversial things that has been, as being certainly, that I've advanced.

I knew when I started out that there as going to be opposition and I respect that and I never had a problem doing things in a difficult scenario.

I've listened because this is my district for the most part with the exception of the part that deals with Councilman Walford's district in terms of the Caddo and the downtown area. I've listened to a number of citizens on th is issue, almost on a daily basis. I've listened to opposition and if the Council will take note, on my own, I have put together an amendment that if adopted that would have removed the portions that death with Ford Street and the portions that death with Caddo Street. That is an amendment that I offered myself that is on the agenda today and when the gentleman from the Caddo Nation came up, I told him that I believe that there is a way to name a street along those same lines that would have honored and will honor the late Councilman Huckaby that would not do any disrespect to any one of the Ford family or anyone of the Caddo Indians. I offered that amendment. It is on the book, it is there for your consideration.

I talked to Councilman Gibson over the weekend and he indicated to me that one of the largest land owners, that being KCS has an issue and hadn't, to his mind, their representative was not aware of this particular piece of legislation. Well, I called the individual and we talked about it and I said well, lets do this. We have a meeting Tuesday. Why don't you and I get together, Monday and we'll talk about it and he said, fine, lets get together.

Well, for one reason for another we missed each other on Tuesday. I left the

officer earlier to come to our Administrative Council meeting and based upon that and some other conversations that I've had with some other land owners that owe the area that would be affected directly, I said at the Administrative Council meeting on yesterday, that in fact I was going to be moving to postpone this issue until I've had had an opportunity to make a conversation with some of those large landowners.

You know I've offered the amendment that is there. Like I said that is on the machine that removes the odious parts of the statute, the part that has got everybody riled up, as I appreciate it in terms of the Caddo and Ford Streets. I told Councilman Walford that I was going to offer that amendment and in fact, I told the Councilman long before yesterday because it is on the written agenda. It is not something that, in fact, that we would present with on yesterday that had to be typed up, it was in your packet.

All I am asking for is an opportunity to speak with those folks and if I can in fact talk with them and change their mind in terms of where we are going with this statute, then if we don't meet the requirements of the statute then you can vote your convictions and what have you. But I am just, I continue to be surprised on the Council with out consistency with our inconsistency.

And like I was saying my whole point in this whole exercise is, I believe that with my amendment, this will be strictly a District A issue and if I can not get this support from the folks in District A in terms of the statute then hey, it won't pass. You've not loss anything. But for you to or other Council members to disrespect, that is the only way I can take it, a Council member that is asking for a delay in order to have other conversations with other of his constituents especially given the fact that he had a conversation with another Council member that said, maybe you should talk to this guy and a Council member says, okay well I will go and talk to this guy. And, for you to deny that opportunity, I think it sends a negative message.

If that is what the body of this Council is, I will be disappointed but I will move forward because I am still in favor of moving forward on this particular issue and if it means that I have to take some avenues, then I will take those other avenues, I assure you. But for us to get into this scenario where we are going tit for tap, I just think that it is a negative situation because time is too short. I mean, there are going to be issues where we as Council members are going to ask for a deference from our colleagues and if we get to the point in 6-months or about 8-months that we have established or extinguished (for a lack of a better term) the foundation of goodwill that we have for each other, well I would say, it is going to be a bumpy ride for the other 3-years and I think that that sends a negative connotation to the citizens.

It is all about process, gentlemen. We have rules. We have regulations. We have Robert's Rules or whatever you, but at the end of the day if we don't have a fundamental respect for each other and a fundamental respect for the positions that we hold as it relates to issues of our district, then I think that we are setting a negative scenario.

If that is the will of the Council then I would be disappointed and we will move forward, but I again I would ask and I would do it in the form of a motion that, we table this issue until such time that I could have the conversations that I've committed to have with folks in my district, and I would make that in the form of another motion to table (seconded by Councilman Green). Well, I guess I would say a substitute motion to table

because there is a motion; so, it would be a substitute motion.

Councilman Carmody: I guess at this point, we do have to consult Roberts Rule. If this motion has already been made and considered, can you go back and make a substitute motion to reconsider the same thing?

Councilman Jackson: Point of Order.

Councilman Gibson: Point of Order. I would like a ruling on the fact, is there an opportunity for reconsideration and is that reconsideration does that come from the majority on the previous motion.

Councilman Walford: You are going to have to give us a minute on going back whether it is going to be a reconsideration because it was the same motion. But I was discussing a motion with Mr. Lester, if ya'll will bear with you for one second.

Councilman Green: We'll bear with you.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Green: Time out.

Councilman Jackson: I don't think a reconsideration would be in order because Mr. Lester would not be able to make a motion for reconsideration because he wasn't from the prevailing side, so it couldn't be a reconsideration.

Councilman Walford: So, it is not a reconsideration. Councilman Jackson: But I would at this point, call for the question.

Councilman Green: Well the Chair has, he and Mr. Lester had a sidebar and they have something new to bring.

Councilman Jackson: I am sure he can bring it up separate, it is the next thing on there.

Councilman Walford: Okay, we have a call for the question.

Councilman Lester: On the amendment or on the ordinance itself.

Councilman Walford: I think on your substitute motion.

Councilman Jackson: I think the motion that is on the floor is the original one by Councilman Carmody.

Councilman Walford: Councilman Lester made a substitute motion, I believe, Councilman Green seconded.

Councilman Green: Yes, sir.

Councilman Jackson: I thought that failed.

Councilman Green: No.

Councilman Walford: It didn't get voted on yet.

Councilman Gibson: I have hear a second. I had one other comment if I could. Mr. Thompson, could I ask just for the viewing audience, could you read the statistical data because in the conversation that I had with Councilman Lester there were two things: 1. obviously we had a major employer who has communicated back to me--- Councilman Jackson: Point of order. I called for the question.

Councilman Walford: But we didn't get a Second.

Councilman Jackson: Well what was happening, we just talked about whether or not, which one it was on and that kind of thing, but the Chair started that conversation. There was never an opportunity for a second, Mr. Chairman, because we started talking about.

Councilman Walford: We clarified that the motion that you were calling for the question on, was indeed his substitute motion, that was the motion that was on the floor at the moment. He had made the motion, Councilman Green had seconded it, but we didn't get a second to, your call for the question.

Councilman Gibson: Could I ask for the Council Clerk to read the statistical information that came from the surveys.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Thompson, do you have that information, the statistical data?

Councilman Gibson: To read into the record.

Mr. Thompson: Do you want it total for Ford Street, Caddo Street and Shreveport Blanchard Highway?

Councilman Gibson: Yes.

Mr. Thompson: We calculated the information, that we received in two different ways. 1. Was on the persons who owe the abutting linear footage, so we will read that first: 1. 23% of the persons who owe the footage which abuts these streets, supports the name change. 13% supports the name change—(let me go back): 23% Supports the name change, 37% Opposes the name change and we Did Not Receive Any Responses from 39.77%. 2. If we look at it according to the number of property the person who responded and just each one who owed a piece of property: of the people who Support it, it is 10.77%, those who Opposed it, it is 25.59% and No Responses from 63.64%.

Councilman Gibson: So from that information right now as we have as a quantitative piece of information, it appears that the persons or businesses or whatever that is affected by this are saying that they do not want this name change, is that correct?

Mr. Thompson: A majority of the people who owe the property that abuts these streets of the ones who responded, do not want the name change.

Councilman Gibson: And that was the other part of the conversation I had with Councilman Lester was dealing with what the will of the people wanted and obviously we went through 90 days of process and expenditures.

You also have , just for the record, for the public so we understand that this Council was committed to following through over a 90-day period we spent: Associated Cost - \$18,765.00. Is that correct, Mr. Thompson?

Mr. Thompson: That was calculated by the Department of Operational Services, who did most of the work, yes.

Councilman Gibson: But there was quite a bit of expenditures, both human resource and dollars, into this process of which now we have this issue before us so it is not as if we are completely ignoring process and all the other things we have done our due diligence in seeking input from citizens that are affected by this particular name change on these corridors, correct?

Mr. Thompson: Let me back up. The human resources cost to day is about \$5,325. Now the signages that you see at the bottom, those will not be done unless the ordinance is adopted and this does not include postage and it does not include paper and other costs.

Councilman Gibson: We did expend money to make sure that we fulfilled our obligation to get the feedback from the citizens of the City of Shreveport affected by this

particular ordinance that we have before us, is that correct?

Mr. Thompson: That is correct.

Councilman Gibson: And again reemphasizing that all three corridors are affected, responded in the negative.

Councilman Lester: I would offer a substitute motion to adopt Amendment 1 to Ordinance No. 40 (seconded by Councilman Walford).

Councilman Jackson: Point of order. Didn't he have a motion already on the table that needed to be rescinded before we offered that new motion?

Councilman Walford: Well, it is a substitute for the substitute is where we are right now.

The Council considered the following amendment:

Amendment No. 1 to Ordinance No. 40 of 2003 Relative to Changing the Name of the Shreveport Blanchard Road to Hilry Huckaby III Avenue

By: Councilman Lester

Amend the ordinance as follows:

Delete the title and substitute the following title:

AN ORDINANCE CHANGING THE NAME OF THE SHREVEPORT BLANCHARD ROAD FROM THE ROY ROAD TO NORTH HEARNE AVENUE TO HILRY HUCKABY III AVENUE, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO

Delete the eighth and ninth Whereas paragraphs and substitute the following:

WHEREAS, the Shreveport Blanchard Highway as described herein was located within the boundaries of District A when Hilry Huckaby III represented District A.

WHEREAS, in accordance with Section 78-452 of the Code of Ordinances the following historical information is provided about the existing name of the street to be renamed:

Shreveport Blanchard Highway is State Highway 173 that connects Shreveport and Blanchard, Louisiana.

Delete the NOW THEREFORE BE IT ORDAINED paragraph and substitute the following:

NOW THEREFORE BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, legal, and regular session convened, that the Shreveport Blanchard Road from the Roy Road to the North Hearne Avenue, in the NW/4 OF Section 35 (T18N-R14W), Caddo Parish, Louisiana, be and the same is hereby renamed and changed to Hilry Huckaby III Avenue, as shown and

indicated on the plat attached hereto and made a part hereof.

Delete the first BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED paragraph.

Explanation of amendment: Revises the ordinance to change only the name of the Shreveport Blanchard Highway.

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

Councilman Hogan: I would like to clarify something and make sure I know before we are voting. Is this a final vote which would be in re-naming the street?

Councilman Walford: No.

Councilman Hogan: What the amendment says.

Councilman Walford: Could I call on Mr. Thompson to explain what we will be doing here.

Councilman Lester: I can explain very simply. I made an indication to some of you, I think most of my colleagues that I talked to that I would in fact be offering a motion to amend Ordinance 40 dealing with the Ford Street and the Caddo Street, to take that off of the table for consideration.

I told you I was going to do it before. . . it was not something that was done on Monday. It was something that it is in your book and in the computer; so, I am going to do that and I would ask that you support that.

And I would also ask that you would support tabling Ordinance 40 after we have adopted the amendment so that in fact I can have the conversation with those large land owners. Because in point of fact, if 2 individuals maybe 3 change their vote then the tally that Councilman Gibson has given that is part of the record, will flip flop on the other side, so we are only talking about 3 people. And I have had a conversation with one and we were suppose to meet on yesterday and we didn't get an opportunity to do so.

I would hate for us to just kill this having not given an opportunity to have a complete resolution of the issue. I don't think that we are losing anything, the money has already been spent. If the Council is in a hurry to deal with it, then lets say that but I would just ask that we support the amendment and then support a motion to table and give me an opportunity to speak with those 3 large landowners.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Hogan, does that answer your question? Basically you are only voting on the amendment which in essence removes Caddo and Ford from consideration. Then, Ordinance 40 will be as shown in the amendment: *An ordinance changing the name of the Shreveport-Blanchard Road.*

Councilman Hogan: Just to table that?

Councilman Walford: Well, we will address tabling later. Right now, we are just voting on the amendment which in essence takes Caddo and Ford out of the equation, and I would urge a 'yes' vote on that.

Amendment adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 5 Nays: Councilman Carmody and Gibson. 2.

Motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Jackson to table the ordinance as amended. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Green and Jackson. 4. Nays: Councilman Carmody, Gibson and Hogan. 3.

Councilman Walford: Let me apologize to everyone, sometimes procedure can

get a little bit ahead of us and it is a bit hard to communicate and I think that we are all better served when we do communicate up here and some times it is not easy, so I apologize for the dis-order that we presented to you over the last few minutes.

Councilman Green: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to commend you for taking charge.

Councilman Walford: Thank you, I think.

2. Ordinance No. 80 of 2003: An ordinance amending the 2003 Riverfront Development Special Revenue Fund Budget, appropriating the funds therein, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on June 24, 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 Lester to table the ordinance. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: Councilman Gibson. 1.

3. Ordinance No. 81 of 2003: An ordinance amending Chapter 94 of the Code of Ordinances relative to Water and Sewer Reorganization of Services and Fees, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on June 24, 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 Green seconded by Councilman Hogan adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

The adopted ordinance follows:

ORDINANCE NO. 81 OF 2003

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 94 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES
RELATIVE TO WATER AND SEWER REORGANIZATION OF SERVICES AND FEES,
AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the Mayor has proposed that procedures for some services provided by water and sewerage be modified and fees paid by customers of the Office of Water and Sewerage of the Department be increased; and

WHEREAS, these modifications and increases are necessary to reflect current work flows, cost of operation and provide adequate funding for utility operations.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, legal and regular session convened that of Article's I, II, III, and V of Chapter 94 of the Shreveport Code of Ordinances is hereby amended pursuant to Section 4.20 of the City Charter and shall read as follows:

Chapter 94
UTILITIES

ARTICLE I. IN GENERAL

Sec. 94-1. Definitions.

The following words, terms and phrases, when used in this chapter, shall have the meanings ascribed to them in this section, except where the context clearly indicates a different meaning:

Department means the department of Operational Services, Office of Water and Sewerage of the city.

Director means the director of Operational Services of the city.

ARTICLE III. WATER SERVICE***DIVISION 1. GENERALLY****Sec. 94-61. Definitions.**

Replace construction and roving meter definition with *Bulk water consumption* means metered water obtained from a transit line to a portable container at a designated location.

Sec. 94-64. Fire line service; fire service storage tanks.

(a) No connection for a sprinkler or fire service shall be permitted unless application therefore has been made to and granted by the department and approved by the chief building official of the city. In no instance shall any connection be made with any sprinkler or fire service without the written consent of the department. Should it be found that any unauthorized connection has been made, or that any water has been used from a sprinkler or fire service for any other purpose than extinguishing a fire, or that a waste of water is permitted from such connection through leaks in the pipes or fixtures, the water service shall be discontinued until a meter of the kind and size prescribed by the director of Operational Services shall have been installed at the expense of the customer.

DIVISION 2. METERS**Sec. 94-81. Bulk Water Consumption**

(a) All water furnished by the department to its customers shall be measured at an approved location, and no person shall use unmetered water except as provided in subsection (b) of this section.

(b) The director of operational services may authorize unmetered and/or metered water use for temporary special purposes, and enter into agreements for the assessment of charges therefor.

Sec. 94-82. New meter sets.

The director of Operational Services shall have the authority to establish rules, regulations and specifications regarding new meter sets or meter vaults. All meters shall be purchased from the department. Installation of new meters and construction of meter vaults shall be at the expense of the contractor or customer, and approval by department personnel shall be required before service begins.

ARTICLE V. BILLING AND COLLECTIONS

Sec. 94-163. Deposit.

2. (1) Deposits when required shall be in the following amounts: *Effective July 1, 2003:*

Water Meter Size (inches)	Amount of Deposit
5/8	\$ 40.00
3/4	60.00
1	100.00
1 ½	170.00
2	250.00
3	1100.00
4	1500.00
6	2500.00
8	6850.00
10	8500.00

(c) These deposit amounts may be increased by the director of operational services-in accordance with the rules and regulations issued pursuant to section 94-168.

(d) For sewerage only metered accounts or special unmetered accounts, the amount of the account deposit will be determined by the director of operational services, with \$50.00 being the minimum deposit required.

(f) The chief administrative officer, after consultation with the director of operational services, may waive account deposits for the following entities:

1. The city;
2. The state;
3. The parish;
4. The parish school board; and
5. The United States government.

(g) Each account deposit posted pursuant to this section, shall be returned to the customer after 12 consecutive months in which the customer's service has not been disconnected for late or nonpayment of charges pursuant to section 94-167. The amount shall be paid to the customer by check.

Sec. 94-164. Water charges.

Effective July 1, 2003:

Add the following language under each table in Section 94-164 (1) b through (1) f: *Monthly water customer charges for bulk water purchase shall be the same as for regular commercial quantity rate plus an administrative fee of \$10 per month.*

Sec. 94-165. Sewerage charges.*Effective July 1, 2003:*

2. The flat rate charges shall be as follows:

QUANTITY CHARGE

INSIDE CITY

Customer Charge	User Charge	Capital Charge	Total
\$2.70	\$9.97	\$6.60	\$19.27

QUANTITY CHARGE

OUTSIDE CITY

Customer Charge	User Charge	Capital Charge	Total
\$5.45	\$19.93	\$13.20	\$38.58

Sec. 94-166. Fees.*Effective July 1, 2003:*

- (a) The following fees shall be charged for services provided:
- (1) Leak inspection requested by customer, if no leak found \$30.00
 - (2) Reread request by customer, if no reading error found \$12.00
 - (3) Removal of stolen meter or straight connection \$500.00
 - (4) Plugging service at the meter box \$500.00
 - (5) Termination of service at the meter box \$500.00
 - (6) Bench test of meter upon request by customer, if meter found to be functioning properly:
 - 5/8-inch and 3/4-inch meter \$35.00
 - 1-inch meter \$60.00
 - 1 1/2-inch meter \$100.00
 - 2-inch meter \$140.00
 - (7) Connection for new service \$15.00
 - (8) Restoration of disconnected service at the meter \$25.00
 - (9) Restoration of service after removal of meter \$50.00
 - (10) Handling charge for each check or automated clearing house (electronic) bank draft which is unpayable due to insufficient funds or for any other reason \$25.00
 - (11) Pumping of meter vaults for industrial and commercial customers \$100.00
 - (12) Private fire hydrant, per private fire connection (annual charge) \$240.00
 - (13) Public fire hydrant (annual charge) \$100.00
 - (14) An account maintenance fee shall be applied to accounts with unrefundable credit balances maintained for over six months. The fee shall be in the amount of the credit, not to exceed \$50.00.
 - (15) Effective January 1, 1994, a late fee of five percent of the original bill shall be charged to an account for payment received after the delinquency date.
 - (16) Broken curb stop \$75.00
 - (17) The charge for a damaged meter shall be the same as the deposit for that meter size as provided in section 94-163(b).
 - (18) The charge for termination of service at the main shall be the cost of termination, as determined by the director of operational services.

Sec. 94-167. Discontinuance of services; adjustments.

(c) The director of finance and/or the director of operational services through his designees, shall have the authority to make billing adjustments, including the back-billing of charges due, when verifiable errors are discovered, in accordance with rules and regulations established pursuant to section 94-168.

Sec. 94-168. Additional rules and regulations.

(a) The director of operational services shall establish written rules and regulations for the implementation of this article, which shall include but not necessarily be limited to the following:

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that when not consistent with the provisions of this Charter, any reference in any ordinance, resolution, law, rule, obligation, contract, grant or document vesting any power in, assigning any function to, or imposing any duty upon any office, officer, person or body abolished by this ordinance, shall be deemed to refer to the office, officer, person or body under the Charter or Code that most closely corresponds to that designated in the ordinance, resolution, law, rule, obligations, contract, grant or document.

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

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

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

1. 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.)

Mr. Thompson: We discussed yesterday the possibility of taking this up at the next meeting. Do you want—is that the intent of the Council and do you want me to notify the parties? This would be as to the motions that were filed, to decide those motions and then set the regular hearing at a later date?

Councilman Jackson: No.

Councilman Lester: I would defer to Councilman Jackson because it is in his district.

Councilman Walford: Councilman Jackson do you have a?

Councilman Jackson: Want to leave it on the table.

Councilman Walford: You want to leave it on the table, okay.

2. Resolution No. 85 of 2003: Urging and authorizing the Mayor to execute an agreement with R. M. McCarthy and Associates to conduct a review of the Shreveport Police Department Shooting Incident of March 15, 2003 and to provide other services all

substantially in accordance with the Proposal dated May 21, 2003. (C/Carmody) (*Tabled on June 10*)

3. Resolution No. 88 of 2003: Amending Sections 1.8 and 1.11 of the Rules of Procedure of the City Council (Public Comments). (A/Lester) (*Tabled on June 24*)

NEW BUSINESS:

1. ABO Card appeal: Demarcus Bedford. [El Chico's (D/Gibson) - Postponed until July 7]
2. ABO Card appeal: George Spruell. (A/Lester)
3. ABO Card appeal: Benjamin C. Hagar. [The Oyster Bar (C/Carmody - Residence: B/Walford)]
4. BAC-37-03, *Frank Jackson*, 1616 Hollywood: Special Exception Use in a B-2 District - Restaurant with on-premise consumption of low alcoholic content beverages. (B/Walford) (Postponed on June 24)

Motion by Councilman Jackson to uphold the ZBA, seconded by Councilman Gibson.

Councilman Lester: The ZBA, was the ZBA in a position to deny?

Councilman Walford: If I may, the ZBA was unanimous in their denial on this one. And I will add for the record that Councilman Green and I, since this is right across the street from his district, we've had a quite a bit of citizen input. A 'yes' vote would uphold the Zoning Board of Appeals.

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

5. BAC-38-03, *Sharron Lacy*, 218 Texas Street: Special Exception Use in a B-4 District - lounge. (B/Walford) (Postponed on June 24)

Motion by Councilman Green to postpone the application until the July 22, 2003 meeting, seconded by Councilman Lester.

Councilman Walford: I would prefer not to postpone this one. I've had a tremendous amount of citizen input on this one and a number of conversations and I would prefer to address it today. However, the motion is to postpone, so a 'yes' vote postpones.

Motion to postpone denied by the following vote: Nays: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, and Hogan. 5. Ayes: Councilman Green and Jackson. 2.

Motion by Councilman Walford to uphold the ZBA, seconded by Councilman Carmody.

Councilman Lester: I know that on one of the other (inaudible) someone was

suppose to be speaking on one side of this. Have we not heard from them? The Lacy's or whoever the person that is asking for this request?

Councilman Walford: I've had a number of conversation with Ms. Lacy, well not a number but I've had conversations with ms. Lacy and her intent is a restaurant and what she applied for with the Zoning Board of Appeals, was a lounge. She has the right and I might have to call Captain Shoemake or somebody from the—Councilman Lester: We don't have to go through all of that. I am just asking did she I know, see at the last meeting she came and wanted to speak and did not because we passed the matter. So, I just wanted to make sure that the citizen had that, this is their issue, had an opportunity to speak. But if you've spoken to her and you are satisfied in as much this is in our district, I would support that.

Councilman Walford: I would urge the Council to uphold the Zoning Board of Appeals on this.

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

6. BAC-39-03, *D. Richard Carroll, Jr.*, 1401 Oden #2: Special Exception Use in a R-3 District - Expanded Home Occupation (home office with one employee). (C/Carmody) (Postponed on June 24)

Councilman Carmody: Having met with both parties and having heard from the attorney for Mr. Carroll as well as the President of the Homeowners Association, they have asked that I would make a motion to postpone this matter until our meeting in October (if the Clerk of the Council can verify it, I believe that is on October 14? Mr. Thompson: We'll just say the first meeting in October. Councilman Carmody: Thank you Sir for that guidance).

Councilman Lester: What time is our official time?

Ms. Lee: What time is it?

Mr. Thompson? Twenty-five minutes until 7.

Councilman Green: In Mooretown, it is 20 minutes til 7.

Councilman Lester: Twenty minutes to 7. Because I was just wondering, it didn't seem to take very long for us to ask to table an issue by another Councilman, I was just wondering.

Motion by Councilman Carmody to postpone the application until the first meeting in October, 2003, seconded by Councilman Gibson. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

7. C-13-03, *Shreveport Christian Church*, 905 Francais Dr., MPC approval in a B-1 District, school. (E/Hogan)

Councilman Hogan: I would ask for the support of the Council in overturning the decision of the MPC on this issue. I was merely asking the support of the Council to overturn the decision. I didn't present that in the form of a motion.

Councilman Walford: And I think Mr. Carmody must have. . so you will withdraw your second.

Councilman Carmody: I will withdraw my second.

Motion by Councilman Jackson to uphold the MPC approval for the B-1 District, school (motion died for lack of a second.)

Councilman Green: Do it again.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Thompson, could I ask what the effect is if we don't get a motion on this.

Councilman Hogan: Pardon me Mr. Chairman, I think Mr. Jackson was little bit confused. Could you let him clarify what he is saying.

Motion by Councilman Jackson to uphold the MPC approval for the B-1 District, school seconded by Councilman Green.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Cox was here. I wanted to ask questions of the people—Councilman Lester: I know I wanted to.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Cox, earlier we made reference to as I said to Councilman Hogan, as I said earlier, that it is my habit and basically the stance of this Council, particularly with matters of zoning to take that advice and follow the lead of the person in that district. So I just wanted to ask you just a couple of questions that you might clarify because I think everybody want to feel good about how they vote and why they do that.

Earlier, we talked about enumerating some issues as to, why. I know that people stood up, but nobody ever said anything about, why. I had the opportunity to be here at the MPC meeting for another issue when that same thing was on the agenda that day, I believe but I apologize because I don't remember, that wasn't the case I was here on so I don't remember all of. . .

Mr. Cox: Ya'll got more on your plate than you can shake a stick at, I can tell you that.

Councilman Jackson: So I wanted to find out what it was that was the principle objection to, because I am assuming that you all are not in opposition to a church or a church having a school?

Mr. Cox: So you basically, want me to go forward and run, okay. If you look at Southern Hills as a whole, and you look at schools within Southern Hills, you have both public and private schools. Now, if you go to these schools and lets just pick them out: Southern Hills, Forest Hills, Ridgewood, Southwood and then you go to private schools such as Calvary and a few other ones that are in that are area, that I just really can't remember right now, but they all have something in common which this school that is proposed does not: 1. and which on July 8, ya'll got a letter of my doing this from the MPC. We state that safety is a concern of ours and not only for the children who attend this school, but for the neighborhood itself because if you have ever been down Francais Drive between the hours of 7:30 and 9:00 and then from 2:30 til 5:00. I was there yesterday, and it is like Indianapolis 500. There is not a proper way that building is made as it sits right now, to house this school, safety wise. There is no fence for a playground. There is not enough room for a proper playground.

Next, the lot next to it has tanks still in the ground from a gas station that was there years ago. And I got to be honest with you, I don't even remember the gas station but I've told by more than one person, tanks are still in the ground. They were doing sample test, EPA was last year, somebody said, last year; so, to have kids romping and running on the playground, that would be a concern.

The building code, let me show you this. Some of ya'll may not have seen the building and I'll just flip it around in front. [Referring to pictures.] This is your building that is in question. You see these windows, they are not as wide as your screen. If fire breaks out, you or I could not get out of that window. They are not made for exiting. This building along is not good for a school, safety alone. Now, I have never been in the building so I couldn't tell you how it is set up.

As far as the other schools that I have brought into question, you've got a buffer zone at schools. You look at Forest Hills, Ridgewood, Southwood, Summer Field, Calvary, all these schools have what we call a 'buffer zone.' The buffer zone here, 47 inches.

Now, noise. There is going to be noise but in this subdivision of homes, you have retired people, that is an issue for them. If it is a business, 8 to 5, which it had been for years, an insurance company, cars come and go, but it was a business, it was not a school. You can control business better than you can control a school. Ask a teacher, ask a principal how hard it is at a normal private school, at a normal Caddo School

So, safety, the building code itself. To get this building up to Code, I would say it would be tough. My wife used to work for a company that they dealt with the Fire Marshal a lot and they were tough, they were really tough and it was more or less a in-home living for kids. To take a building like this and get it into Code, I don't think can be done.

So, safety, the availability of the driveway, the lot next door, the playground, the noise level. And I'll give my hat off to Mr. Cash. They have done a remarkable job with the church. We have never had a problem with the church. Like I told the MPC, we are glad the church is open. But we are not happy, and we are not—I couldn't go to sleep at night knowing I did not do my best knowing that something could happen to a child because this building was open to a school. Now school starts August 16 for most kids. He can not have this building ready by August 16, no way. It is too much red tape. But the red tape needs to stop here simple because these issues I outlined on July 8 that you all should have got a copy of. Next question.

Councilman Jackson: Let me ask you, because I am assuming that as you have come to the podium twice, that you serve as a spokesman for at least the people who are represented here today, is that correct?

Mr. Cox: Yes.

Councilman Jackson: There are a few things. I am assuming that, have any of the Councilman who are here been over there other than Councilman Hogan. Councilman Carmody, ya'll went to go check out the school?

Councilman Green: I didn't go check out the school, but I been over there.

Councilman Jackson: Councilman Gibson, you did and Councilman Carmody, you did?

Councilman Carmody: Correct.

Councilman Jackson: The tanks that are in the ground that you spoke of, I'm assuming that the real concern is about contamination?

Mr. Cox: Correct, well they were out there taking test so that tells me somebody is worried whether it be the owner itself, who I believe is in New York or something, so just the idea of the tanks are there, is something.

Councilman Jackson: And I don't know whether they were using pyrometers or whatever the case may have been, but I am assuming that they were concerned a. what it could do to the water supply and b. what it could do to the air that I might add, will not only affect the school children but would affect residents and any businesses in the area, as well.

Mr. Cox: You are correct.

Councilman Jackson: Second, I don't know if it is any more safe for business or residents or it is for the people who live in the townhouses may need to investigate that themselves as well because you may have a bigger situation on your hand than a school.

I would also say that, I would hope as we've all done from time to time, I am not in the practice of questioning anybody's motive I am just look at what you say and present to me as it relates to the public schools. I am assuming you all had someone who either who is a fire marshal or somebody who went through already or someone who is to some degree, an expert in school design or those kind of things to check that out as a process of being in opposition, is that correct?

Mr. Cox: Process of elimination. Basically we were told through Mr. Cash that he is suppose to submit a plan to the Fire Marshal. Whether he has or not, as of this date we do not know.

Councilman Jackson: So when you all were told that, was his submission of that contingent on your approval or would it not have meet your approval not withstanding what kind of plan he would have submitted?

Mr. Cox: To be honest with you, the MPC put us at sort of like a table, that wouldn't have mattered to them. To us, we feel it is—I would like to know what the Fire Marshal said or what the Fire Marshal has to say. But, realistically the building itself, I have been told by more than one person that it is just not made structurally for a school, safety-wise.

Councilman Jackson: But do you know or anybody who is accompanied you, do you all or do they know to what degree the building is out of Code?

Mr. Cox: To my knowledge there is not a study on that. We were never given

that information.

Councilman Jackson: So is the building out of Code?

Mr. Cox: For a school, yes sir.

Councilman Jackson: To what degree is the building out of Code?

Mr. Cox: There again, I was not given that paperwork.

Councilman Jackson: Well, I guess somebody told you that the building was out of Code?

Mr. Cox: Well the comment was made at the MPC that he would have to go to the Fire Marshal. The Fire Marshall would have to give him a Certificate saying that it was up to Code because changes was going to have to be made.

Councilman Jackson: Alright because what I read, I thought what it was talking about was a Certificate of Occupancy.

Mr. Cox: Well, he never got that either.

Councilman Jackson: It talked about a development of the property shall be in substantial accord with a revised site plan that dealt with the playground and circular pattern. And then, being in compliance with the local building codes was a contingency in issuance of the Certificate of Occupancy. And then the third thing that the MPC suggested is that the total enrollment of the school could not exceed 25 students or somewhere in that regards. I am assuming that is what you all knew as well?

Mr. Cox: That is the only thing we knew. As far as the Fire Marshall itself, that paperwork we have not been funneled. Whether it is our right to have it or not, I don't know.

Councilman Jackson: I am sure that is probably why you haven't gotten it. But I would suggest then too, what I heard today now as I'm hearing it and I think maybe what Councilman Hogan was eluding to and what my concern was again was that, we didn't get individuals who were attempting, who didn't run schools, who were attempting to try to give advise on how schools ought to be run. And in matters of opinion that is one thing and we can listen to that, but when it comes to matters of fact, that is a different thing and this Council, I'm assuming continues to make decisions on matters of fact and not necessarily matters of opinion. What Dr. Cash has said, may in fact be matters of opinion versus matters of fact. Our job is to try to sift through that.

And because we don't have the kind of time that it would take to do all those kind of things, we put in place a Metropolitan Planning Commission. We entrust to that Metropolitan Planning Commission, that they would do that legwork to suggest to us as a

Council give advise to us as a Council in acting in that advisory capacity and then we as a Council would weigh in based on what they say.

I'm assuming that they had some favorable thoughts about all, they were not totally negative about this because on 4-2-03 on April 2, I don't think anybody who may have been in the opposing group was even there to make any commentary on it.

I see on 5-7 a few people did, yet they continued to vote to defer to give this group an opportunity to do what it is they needed to do. And, so I guess that was my concern that this process seemingly has gone through all of these stages not without any opposition because there is very seldom going to be anything that happens without opposition. So, my suggestion is not that you don't have a right to oppose it, you have absolutely a right to oppose it. We talked a little about signs, we talked about this room and those kind of things and I suggested then and even what I'll reiterate now, is that my rights end where yours begin and as it relates to infringement, I think the case has to be made that this school in some way shape or form infringes on the rights of somebody.

I have a friend who lives in the townhouses, Ms. Thomas she is here today who talked to me before about this, and I suggested that it makes sense and I think she had a point about smoke and all those other kinds of things. So my question is were we just against it or have we listened to a definite plan to try to address the concerns the people who are in the community have. Because as you said, in closing, as you said that, two of the statements that you made that really had me concerned in a positive way is that the people who were concerned were concerned about children (Mr. Cox: Correct). That make a difference. I am suggesting to you that the people who are concerned, if they are authentically concerned about children, that the parameter and the line doesn't stop at Southern Hills.

Mr. Cox: This is true.

Councilman Jackson: Because if you will visit many of the schools, I hate to say it in Caddo Parish, every day, you've got students who going to school that open and they are going to open in August as well who have dilapidated conditions, who have no air condition and other issues, and so while I don't condemn you for being in opposition, what I would suggest is that to escape the idea of being hypocrites that you move beyond the boundaries of that particular district and let that same spirit go to these other places where they have problems because we need people who will show up and people who will be active who will help out to make sure that every child in Caddo Parish goes to a decent school, public and private.

Mr. Cox: And on that note, just a quick answer, children do need our support, they need our help and that is why I supported the school Superintendent that we have now, that is why I was on the Search Committee to find a qualified teacher/administrator, somebody who has been through the ranks. And I when I see somebody like that that gets hired, that gives me strength to go on with my child in Caddo Parish. So, when I see a school like this that is moving into a office building that is not ready for school children, now matter at academic education they are doing, it is just not right.

Councilman Jackson: I might add that, I would agree and I wish that I had a 40,000 square foot building to give them to educate children because that becomes important. But I think the history of our country and the history of education will suggest to you in many back of a room, and many of a shanty and many of a brush harper, people began educating children because that is what mattered most not that and in those days, many times, education opportunities didn't exist and certainly didn't exist to the degree that it does now. So, while I would understand the concern for children, by the same token, I have a concern for education in whatever form it comes in that children have the opportunity to receive a quality education. Nobody really talked about the quality of education that these students were receiving because if they were in a bad school getting a good education then I would suggest what we ought to be doing is trying to find them a good building. Nobody has spoken to that and as a citizen first and as a Councilman, long after that, that is my concern. Is that I am concerned about children a well, but I am not concerned to the degree that I am not willing to suggest that the quality of the education has a lot more to do with how far that child will go than the quality of the environment in which they have the education. Both are important, but I will tell you that the quality of education outweighs the environment, to me.

Mr. Cox: As long as it is safe.

Councilman Lester: The questions that I wanted to ask have to deal with some of your objections and your organization's objections to this particular building and I wanted to ask those questions previously because I just believe that one side says something and raise an allegation, the other side should be able to give a response to that.

Having said that. Looking at the MPC decisions voting 6-0 to recommend the approval, I noticed and Councilman Jackson touched on it that there were a number of restrictions or I guess (for a lack of a better term) dilatory requirements that were placed on the school before they were given a Certificate of Occupancy, they had to comply

with certain things. Assuming for the sake of argument that these suspensive conditions (for lack of a better term) are complied with by the school, in your opinion does that still create a scenario that is objectionable to your group and the homeowners around the area?

Mr. Cox: To answer your question, I would have to look and see what the Fire Marshal said what the requirements were to see if I even agree with that, first before I can make a decision like that.

Councilman Lester: The MPC and I'm reading now it said that, you had to develop the property substantial accord with a revise site plan and Councilman Jackson read these things off---playground area and what have you---assuming all of these things are done and lets say for the sake of argument that the Fire Marshall says you have to do a., b., c., and that is done. Does this still create a scenario that you are not going to be or the homeowners would still would be in a position not to support the school at this location?

Mr. Cox: We would not support the school at this location because of the building and where it is sitting. If it was sitting further out on the corner, who knows. But you have to take into consideration from where you are sitting or I'm standing, you've got homeowners. You pick out a private school, a public school or a college that is sit up like that. And at what point do we take the homeowners who have lived there for years and when I say years, we are not talking 2 or 3 and then you put something besides a business that is there from 8 to 5 that had been there and been a part of the community and they knew their schedule, they knew the homeowners schedule that they could, they are meshed. But it was a grown up business. You are talking about 22/25 kids in a building in my opinion and in the opinion of the homeowners is not suitable for a school. So, you are asking them to basically put them in an area that does not co-exist with the neighborhood. And whether it be Dr. Cash, whether it be Calvary, whether it be anybody we would still be saying that, this is building is not ready for a school.

Councilman Lester: I just need to ask a few more questions and I can get to the issue because again, I think generally speaking, my policy and you've heard us talk about this ad infinitum is I like to support the Councilman of that particular district. Because, unlike some of my colleagues, I don't believe that I can know everything that happens in District A and everything in District B and everything in District E and everything in District C. I think my responsibility is to District A.

Now, I think that we have somebody that we are paying to do that job. I think

this, the man over there, I think he is doing a pretty good job if I do say so myself and he has a whole staff to support him, but you take that in the spirit that it is offered. So, in order for me to make an intelligent decision to support a particular Councilman or what have you, I just like to get information. I don't think that is asking a lot.

Mr. Cox: No.

Councilman Lester: Now, the other question I wanted to ask was about the building. I think you indicated that earlier that the building was empty for a period of time. How long was the building empty?

Mr. Cox: Does anybody know how long the insurance company—15 months.

Councilman Hogan: I was going to say about 16 months.

Councilman Lester: And so was there any conversation about the contamination with the tanks, is that something that has come up?

Mr. Cox: Well the tanks has been there from my knowledge forever. But the EPA just showed up from what the homeowners is telling me just out of the blue, and they walked over there and asked what is going on? Well, we are doing a ground test; so, you know.

Councilman Lester: The other question that I had, you made reference to a buffer zone between the school. Are you talking about the space between the physical actual location of the building itself or the building, the parking lot, the curledge or what are we talking about?

Mr. Cox: Can I walk up there, and show you?

Councilman Lester: Sure, sure.

Mr. Cox: I didn't want to do out of (inaudible).

Councilman Lester: I'm not that Councilman.

Councilman Hogan: Be careful with that sign.

Mr. Cox: Mr. Cox: [Referring to picture] You see is the side. Here, in here, is a homeowner's fence, near his driveway, culvert. So they are sitting outside.

Councilman Lester: I'm sorry, I didn't want to deny anybody the opportunity to see it. My final question is this. Do you and/or the homeowners that you represent envision any scenario by which a school could operate in that location that would be satisfactory to you?

Mr. Cox: Properly, no, Sir. Safely, no sir. You know, a school is a school and like he was saying earlier, some people learn in closets, some people have learned on their kitchen table but when you talk about 25 to 20 kids in a building not made, not

usually done, the structure itself, the outside itself, you are talking about a lot of change (inaudible). I don't think that it can be done not with this structure. I've had people look at these windows. They would have to rip out every window to make them Code. So, my problem is, it is back to the kids. Don't let me leave here today knowing I didn't do my best for kids whether it be mine or somebody else's because sooner or later they are our future.

Councilman Green: I have some other questions, but you were talking about the kids. How many schools do you go to a week seeing about if the kids are safe?

Mr. Cox: I am in two PTAs.

Councilman Green: No, no. How many schools do you go when school is in session a week to make sure that the kids are safe, actually go the schools?

Mr. Cox: Two.

Councilman Green: Which ones?

Mr. Cox: Ridgewood. Well it was Ridgewood and then Forest Hills.

Councilman Green: So you go there on a weekly basis?

Mr. Cox: Yes, sir.

Councilman Green: Do you have any type of documents that those schools are safe?

Mr. Cox: No.

Councilman Green: If there was fire, could they get out the windows?

Mr. Cox: Yes.

Councilman Green: Which windows?

Mr. Cox: The windows in the classrooms.

Councilman Green: So you've actually checked those windows?

Mr. Cox: Well I've been at Forest Hills when they had done fire alarm test.

Councilman Green: And they went out of the windows?

Mr. Cox: Well, no. They have a certain procedure to go out. But, if needed windows, can be opened and even an adult can get out of those windows.

Councilman Green: Out of those windows. So, tell me, about the size of the school, of course you probably wouldn't know this, but my church in the old days they had a school there. In fact it was a one room school and they taught all grades there and those folks turned out wonderful, so it is not the size of the school. But you talked about the windows, right. You talked about the noise and you talked about safety and you talked about Codes and you talked about the building itself, the buffer zone, right?

Mr. Cox: Right.

Councilman Green: But then you also said that they took this church and it is unbelievable. You've commended them completely on it right?

Mr. Cox: I think everybody has.

Councilman Green: So since this same group is talking about they have done this with the Church because they was given an opportunity, they have done that with the Church, they was given that opportunity so then they moved to the School. Do you think that they would have less priority as to bringing the school up to Class A as they have done the church? Would you say that they have a proven track record just from what they did to the church that these are some folks who are willing to take it to another level. Would you say that these are the type people you are talking about?

Mr. Cox: Well to be honest with you, I am not sure because I've never really sat down and—I've talked to Dr. Cash.

Councilman Green: What I'm saying Mr. Cox is just from looking at what they've done with the Church, would you say that these are some working people?

Mr. Cox: Yeah, they worked. They worked to do the Church.

Councilman Green: Now, you've commended them on one hand.

Mr. Cox: They worked really nice to make the Church, really nice.

Councilman Green: So I am asking you now, do you think that it would be a different group?

Mr. Cox: It is a different type of building that they would be working on.

Councilman Green: So you are saying that they would be capable of doing that type of work to the school?

Mr. Cox: Let me say this without making anybody. Hold on a minute.

Councilman Green: Mr. Cox, Mr. Cox.

Councilman Green: I've listened to you the whole time and I'm just asking some questions. If you would just answer my question and then if you want to do a wrap up statement.

Mr. Cox: Okay, you ask it and I'll answer it.

Councilman Green: These folks that you have commended that they have done a super job with this church. It was a church that was vacant for 16-months. And they've come in and they made this a Class A church and you said that everybody in the neighborhood is just pleased that they've done that. Is that true?

Mr. Cox: Correct.

Councilman Green: My question is, do you think that these same folks would have the ability to do this to the other building, whether it is a school or whether it is a store or whether it is whatever. Do you think that their mentality has changed?

Mr. Cox: Mentality, no.

Councilman Green: So therefore, if in fact given the same opportunity and here again, what happens in life is that some times when there is a crisis then what we see is danger and then when we see danger, we see opportunity. So therefore, there is a crisis because this Church want to have a school So we are looking at the danger and the safety of these 25 kids so therefore, danger, crisis, opportunity unless they have the opportunity then who knows what could happen. But on the other hands, if in fact we fail to give them an opportunity, we will never know. But one thing you have to admit, Mr. Cox is that with what they have had to work with and the time span that they have worked, they have done a great job, true or false?

Mr. Cox: True on the church.

Councilman Green: That is all where we are, on the church. So therefore the church is good. Is there anything that they could do, say if they weren't going to have but one child in there, in that school. Say that they had—say, I'll tell you what if this was a school that these children didn't make noise. What if it was a school with just say, five (5) students in that big building. Would you then have a different opinion?

Mr. Cox: No.

Councilman Green: So, basically it is not really the safety.

Mr. Cox: Oh, yes it is.

Councilman Green: Whose safety?

Mr. Cox: The children'. You are going about it—

Councilman Green: Wait a minute, Mr. Cox. Let me tell you where I am going about it.

Mr. Cox: Okay, go ahead.

Councilman Green: I am going about the MPC says if you do a., b., c. d., then you are okay. So are you saying that that the MPC don't know how to do their job?

Mr. Cox: No, sir. What I am telling you is the MPC did was told them it was a land issue.

Councilman Green: Mr. Cox, Mr. Cox. There was something in this project that the MPC didn't have a problem with. True or false?

Mr. Cox: It is true but you don't want to hear what it was.

Councilman Green: But now on the other hand Mr. Cox, if you did not say the Church had done a great job and they do not have a track record then I could understand the fear. But, in your own words, you said when we looked at what they have done, they've done a great job. And you say the same mentality and the same folk so that they could possible still do a job, if in fact given an opportunity. Thank you Mr. Cox.

Mr. Cox: Now, can I say something

Councilman Green: No, Sir. I don't need a response. No.

Councilman Gibson: I need a Point of Order. Where are we at right now?

Councilman Walford: We are at No. 7 under. . .

Councilman Gibson: I understand the issue, but do we have a motion on the table or anything.

Councilman Carmody: Yes, we do.

Councilman Walford: We got a motion by Councilman Jackson with a second by Councilman Green to uphold the MPC and we are now at debate on that.

Councilman Gibson: Could I hear from, normally we have a comment from the Councilman from that particular district because I've had limited conversation with him on this and little if any conversation with many from outside other than some residents have called me. But, could I ask Councilman Hogan since this is in his district where we are in terms in where he stands on this situation?

Councilman Hogan: Something first of all I'd like to say to clear the record in my earlier conversation, when I was in the process of complimenting what a good job they had done on the church. I should have said, I'm sorry Dr. Cash. I want to apologize to you if you mis-interpreted what I said, that I checked and I did say, in building up the church and rehabbing the church and doing the work, that 'you and your people' have done a fine job. I was paying you a compliment and I mean that. I probably should have said 'you and your congregation' have done a fine job; so, if that offended you, I want to openly apologize to you on the record.

Next of all, to address what Councilman Gibson just said, this is not about bringing the building up to code. If they went through all the hoops if they brought it up to Fire Code, if they caught their Certificate of Occupancy and cut out the driveway where they could have a driveway and all the safety issues, the fire issues where concerned that is irrelevant. But it is the location, it is the location that matters. It is right up next to the driveway, is 47 inches away from the property line, actually that fence extends over onto the Association of the Townhouses. And it is the location, basically

that we have a problem with.

And I stand firm, that I am going to ask the Council –of course we have a motion now to uphold the ruling, but I would still would ask the other Council members to overturn the ruling of the MPC.

Councilman Gibson: Point of order, Mr. Chairman. Is that a substitute motion?

Councilman Walford: It would be.

Councilman Hogan: I would make that in the form of a substitute motion.

Substitute motion by Councilman Hogan to overturn the MPC, seconded by Councilman Carmody.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Chairman, do you know what time it is?

Councilman Walford: I have 7:15.

Councilman Walford: What was your point of order? Was it about the motion?

Councilman Gibson: Yeah, so we've addressed that. Now, I have a request from Councilman Green.

Councilman Green: Did we need a substitute motion either to vote 'yeah' or 'nay' on this.

Councilman Walford: My thought would have been that we could have had a 'no' vote would have had the same effect as the substitute motion.

Councilman Gibson: But you have a substitute motion and a second now?

Councilman Walford: We have a substitute motion and a second.

Councilman Gibson: Are we having any discussion, Mr. Chair.

Councilman Walford: Debate is open, Mr. Gibson.

Councilman Gibson: Again I would ask for some guidance and some direction again from the Councilman out in southwest Shreveport in terms of where he is on this issue?

Councilman Hogan: I am in favor of overturning the ruling of the Metropolitan Planning Commission, that is where I stand on it.

Councilman Green: What is the direction on the substitute?

Councilman Walford: A 'yes' vote overturns the decision of the Metropolitan Planning Commission.

Councilman Lester: What time is it?

Councilman Walford: I have got 17, almost 18 minutes after 7:00 now.

Councilman Lester: So we are supporting Council members' district twice within

30 minutes of not doing so. I was just curious. And for the record, I am going to be consistent in my consistency. I will support Councilman Hogan's message because I don't think that I as a Councilman from District A can substitute my ideas for a Council member of District E because it is all I can do to represent the people in District A, just for the record.

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

Ms. Tunnell: Mr. Chairman, you have something from me.

Councilman Walford: You are out of order. We will call for Public Comments.

8. BAC-53-03, *Wyvornia Decarol Nunley*, 4103 Santa Monica Circle, Special Exception Use in an R-1D District, expanded home occupation (bridal consultant). (G/Jackson)

[Councilman Carmody: I am going to offer a motion to suspend the rules to allow this young lady to speak before this Council (seconded by Councilman Gibson.) You are going to have to allow me. You are going to have to allow me, too. Councilman Carmody: I am taking all comers.

Dr. Cash: You are going to have to allow me. You guys are playing this racist thing to far.

Councilman Walford: Dr. Cash, you are out of order. You are all out of order.

Dr. Cash: And you are going to burn in hell.]

Motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Gibson to suspend the Rules to receive information from *Wyvornia Nunley* to address the Council.

Councilman Walford: I would like to make a comment before we vote in the way of an explanation. Ms. Nunley is speaking on an agenda item that was to be adopted today and was not aware that she had to get this in. It would unfair for her to speak after the item is voted on. (Motion unanimously approved).

Councilman Carmody: Was Dr. Cash aware that it was going to be Ms. Nunley that was going to speak?

Councilman Gibson: I have no idea.

Councilman Carmody: I think that maybe that was in light of. . .

Ms. Lee: You kind of pointed to her and he assumed you were . . .

Ms. Nunley (4103 Santa Monica Court): My purpose today is for a home occupation operation to be conducted in ½ of an existing storage that we had built on my property. My business is a home based business for weddings, bridal consulting.

I want to thank you for giving me this opportunity to speak. I feel that I have been mis-communicated by me or either by my neighbors information that was involved in my matter that was voted upon about two weeks ago from the MPC. First of all I wanted to expand my business as stated in the request that was located in the back of our home. We built an existing storage building and it measured by 32 x 32. Half of it, I would like to use as my office and storage for my wedding supplies. Actually, since the building served as a two-fold purpose for my home storage and my office, I basically the same amount of useable space that is in my home, will be in this building. And I am not requesting for rezoning of that area for commercial business as it was understood by several of our neighborhoods, and I think the misunderstanding started with a petition that is stating that, the area would be re-zoned for commercial business that would allow anyone to come in with a mechanic shop, beauty shop, barber shop and that is not what I was asking for basically I just ant to move my business out of my bedroom into this existing building.

Next, the volume of my business at this point, it is not such that I believe that it would be detrimental to the privacy of the community. The majority of what I do is conducted on the computer or by fax. They are drop shipment whenever my customer wishes to order and the fact that it negates the fear or extra traffic either from personal vehicle or delivery service, and that is not true.

And since starting my business about 3-years ago, I have never handled more than 12 weddings a year mainly because I am a registered nurse, full-time, 12 hour shift. And, my primary goal is for my family and myself and my job and the career of a wedding consultant falls somewhere between that. And if at this point that this situation should change, the business becomes such that it would be my primary income, I would be the first to acknowledge the necessity to move this operation out of the neighborhood into an environment that will, to a retail setting. However the chances of this happening will be slight since the bridal business is seasonal and consist of a very narrow window, spring and summer.

Our Mayor has encouraged small business and minority business to be established in the City and I'm proud to be part of that revenue-generating community. I also do not

take this opportunity lightly. I am on the Board of the Minority Business Council and associated with the Women' Business Council for the City of Shreveport and I am an active member of the City Chamber of Commerce. My husband is a resident of our Neighborhood Association for Western Hills Estates and has held this position for at least 10 years.

I would hope that the neighbors and friends we have made during our 19 years at this address, would trust that we do not or consider doing anything that would compromise their privacy or the value of their proxy as well as our. With this in mind I would respectfully request that you reverse the decision rendered in this case and allow me to conduct my home base business as requested. I would not be opposed to a time trial period being set to see that everything is acceptable to all parties.

And I also understand that there was an issue brought up that I do tuxedos, which I do. I order wedding dress, I order bridesmaid dresses, I order shoes. I also rent out tuxedos. They come out of Houston, my tuxedos. All the other items are catalog order. The bride or the groom comes to me and they are dropped shipped to wherever their dress may be. There has been concern a year ago I did have a high load of tuxedos ordered because I was doing a promo at a school for their prom, that was about 25 kids. At that time I did not realize that it was going to be generating such an ordeal for the neighbors and at that time, I was the only neighbor on the street. Since then a year and half, I've gotten four neighbors. Two of my neighbors do have home based business. Granted they do not have a detached building that they would like to operate out of. I am requesting just to use that area as my storage and office.

Councilman Jackson: Ms. Nunley much of what I've heard in reference to this and I've heard a lot in reference to this case, I guess probably as much or more than anything else that I've dealt with particularly specifically within our district.

One of the things that came up was this idea that and I think you spoke to this idea that in fact there was going to be increase in the amount of traffic, that in fact you have a dressing/fitting kind of room, that there are things that are on display which would give the connotation that folks are going to come inside and look around and then chose stuff to buy and/or try on things, the whole 9 yards. What I want to know from you and I think what we need the benefit of knowing is, is any of that true?

Ms. Nunley: Okay first of all, I do have a display. A bridal book, toasting glasses, knife to cut the cake and souvenir gifts that the groomsmen may order—that totals about \$300 of display item. I do not have a fitting room in my home. My customer has used

my office. I will step out, if they need to try on a tuxedo. If I have to reorder a tuxedo, I would like to make sure my customer is getting their product so I have them to try it on before they leave, just to sort of satisfy them and myself because I chose to please them. Now as far as fitting room in there, my office measured 12 x 32, half of that is the office, the other half is a bathroom (half bath/bath and sink.)

Now, that building I stated earlier, it has two purposes: 1. half of it is a storage for our personal use that we are trying to move out of our garage into that [and] 2. the other half I thought, well maybe I can use it for an office, move out of my home so that is the reason, maybe my neighbors had misunderstood that.

Now, as far as gowns, bridal wear those girls order those dresses from me from the internet or from a bridal book. They are shipped to them to try on, they have 5 days to try those dresses on. If there is any problem, then they in turn get in touch with me and we ship it back to the company if there is a problem.

Councilman Gibson: Quick question for Councilman Jackson, it is in his district and I would like--Councilman Walford: Lets wait until we are debating it.

Councilman Gibson: I thought we were debating it.

Councilman Walford: No, when we go back to regular session, we'll debate.

Ms. Nunley: May I say something please, a lot of my neighbors was concerned that the area was going to be rezoned for commercial that was going to allow if I was granted permission to have my business there, that it would allow other people to come in and that it was a zoning for commercial business. Can you clear that up please, do you know, because that is a big issue. I've spoken to several people last week.

Councilman Walford: When we debate it, we can call someone from the MPC staff up to discuss it.

Ms. Nunley: I hope so.

Motion by Councilman Green to return to regular session, seconded by Councilman Gibson and unanimously approved.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Clark or Mr. Jambor or both.

Councilman Walford: What I would like to do that before we do that is get a motion on the floor since we are coming to, I was going to ask Madame Clerk to bring us to BAC-53-03.

Councilman Jackson: Well the question is going to decide what the motion is going to be. I was intending to do it before we went back into, reconvened so that is why I wanted to.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Clark, I know the answer to the question but I'll let Mr. Jackson state the question.

Councilman Jackson: Well she stated, just go into the question. Mr. Clark did you understand her question?

Mr. Clark: Yes, I did. Basically an expanded home occupation is just as it implies, it is just an expansion of an existing use of a home for a home based business. It does not rezone the property. The property still remains residential. The restrictions are still in place unless you grant additional waivers to what would normally be in place. The hours of operation are still in place, the 7 a.m. to 7 p.m., the criteria that Mr. Walford had asked and I hope that you got concerning home occupations are still in place. Basically you are just waiving one of those criterias and that is to allow a home based business to operate in a detached structure.

Councilman Walford: Can I ask you to briefly summarize what the ZBA looks for, as I appreciate it, a home based business is suppose to be invisible.

Mr. Clark: They basically want it to maintain the residential character of the neighborhood they want it to be virtually be invisible. They want there to be a limitation of traffic, foot traffic or vehicular traffic. They want it basically to remain non-commercial in appearance. They generally don't like persons coming to the actually home based businesses. Basically they look at home based businesses as the home business where there is an office and basically with a computer and a desk and persons doing most of the performance of the business from their home without the persons coming in to utilize those services.

Motion by Councilman Jackson to postpone the application until the July 22, 2003 meeting, seconded by Councilman Green. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES. None.

CLERK'S REPORT: None.

THE COMMITTEE RISES AND REPORTS (reconvenes Regular Council Meeting).

ADJOURNMENT. There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting adjourned at approximately 8:00 p.m.

/s/Monty Walford, Chairman

/s/Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council