

COUNCIL PROCEEDINGS OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT, LOUISIANA
July 27, 2004

The Regular Meeting of the City Council of The City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, was called to order by Councilman Jackson at 3:02 p.m., Tuesday, July 27, 2004, in the Government Chambers in Government Plaza (505 Travis Street).

Invocation was given by Councilman Green.

On Roll Call, the following members were Present: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7.

Approve Minutes: Motion by Councilman Green.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Chairman, if I could, could I offer an amended motion to approve the minutes as amended to reflect several, lets call it anomalies that we had in them. And I believe everyone has a copy of them in front of them. There are actually 20 amendments to the minutes as written.

Mr. Thompson: I believe there are 20 changes with one amendment.

Councilman Walford: Semantics.

Mr. Thompson: And the amendment is to substitute the attached document. The document that is actually attached to this for the document that was published in the journal. And in these minutes, we will list these 20 changes.

Amendment to the July 13, 2004 City Council Minutes as published on July 19, 2004 in the Official Journal

Amend the July 13, 2004 minutes as follows:

Substitute the attached minutes for the July 13, 2004, minutes that were printed in the Official Journal on July 19, 2004.

Explanation of amendment:

1. On page 1, after the Roll Call vote delete "Absent:0"
2. On Page 1, under Approve Minutes change "6" to "7". and delete " Out of Chamber 1"
3. On page 1, on the vote on the motion to suspend the rules, delete "Absent:0"
4. On page 5 (Judge Matlock comments), change "vs" to "verses" each time it appears.
5. On page 9 (Councilman Lester's comments to Judge Matlock), change "(unclear)" to "Claville".
6. On page 13 (comments by "Mr. Thompson") change "on" to "one"
7. On page 20 (motion to extend the time for Ms. Bedford) change the vote as follows: "Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green. 6. Nays: None."
8. On Page 27 change "comment" to "commit" twice, and "commenting" to "committing".
9. On page 29 change "Mr. Pools" to Mr. "Pool".
10. On page 35 change the first "Unknown Name" to "Councilman Jackson"
11. Pages 35 and 36 - remove the motion to suspend the rules and to amend the agenda from page 36 and insert it on page 35.
12. On page 35 change the second "Unknown Name" to "Tom Dark"
13. On page 35 change third "Unknown Name" to "James Green"

14. Pages 37 and 39 - remove Resolution 150 from page 39 and insert it on page 37 and insert the amendments (including the correct amendment No. 2) and the votes (with names) after Resolution 150 as they occurred.
15. Pages 38 and 41 - Councilman Gibson's prepared remarks are printed twice, beginning on page 38 and again on page 41. The duplicate remarks are removed.
- 16 On pages 44 and beyond, "\$40thousand", "\$52million" and similar mistakes are changed to "\$40,000.00", "\$52,000,000.00", etc.
17. On page 47, show Councilman Carmody's statement (that his vote did not register on the electronic board and that his vote was a "No" vote) before the final vote is announced.
18. On page 47, on the vote on Ordinance No. 96 of 2004, the word "resolution" was changed to "ordinance", and footnote (1) was added as follows: "(1) Clerks Note: Councilman Gibson's vote was changed from yes to no at his request (later in the meeting after the vote was announced), and without objection from the Council."
19. On page 18, duplicate sentences are removed.
20. On page 49, the Note is removed.

NOTE: Page numbers refer to the WordPerfect version of the minutes before they were converted to Word and type set.

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

Motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Gibson to approve the Summary Minutes, July 12, 2004 and Council Meeting Minutes, July 13, 2004 as amended. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen 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.

Councilman Jackson: Distinguished Guest, Awards and Recognitions - I know that we have a few from the Council, but does any Councilman have any separate recognitions?

Councilman Green: Yes sir, I don't see her in the audience, but I'd ask Ms. Velma White to come. I don't know if she is here or not. But maybe she'll show up later on in the meeting Mr. Chairman. Thank you.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Hightower: Nothing Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Jackson: I want to at this time, I thought that we had someone from ShreveCorps.

Mr. Thompson: We do. Lee Jeter Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Jeter: Good Morning Mr. Jackson, Mayor, Council. Again, I'm here to, not necessarily toot our horn for our young people, but also to bring some of our young adults before the Council that have been doing a lot of community service over the summer and let them express to the Council some thanks of gratitude for their support and to share with you some of the service projects that they have been doing over the summer. As you all

are very, very aware, the City of Shreveport and many other agencies support Shreveport Green and support our youth program. And I personally would like to thank the Mayor's office and the Council for that continued support. We give young people the opportunity to make a difference, and to make that difference through service. And through service to their community, their neighborhood. And to get actively involved in this process that we call government. And they're learning from this Chamber, from this Council, from this Administration. But they're also in the field serving just like you're serving your particular districts. And they'd like to share some things with you and I'd like to give them that opportunity to do that. I'd also like to recognize the team leaders that I worked with, young adults during the summer. These are the people that's molding, motivating and directing them, to make sure that these young people that are a part of our program are growing up to be productive citizens. And not only productive citizens, but we like to think of ourselves as grooming our leadership for the next generation. Because we need young people to stand up to take charge to make a difference, to be actively involved in the government process. One of the young people that's leading our program this summer, I'd like for him to stand up is Josh Madden. Josh is a former Ameri Corps member and Josh recently returned from a tour of duty in Afghanistan and Kuwait so he's used to service, because he's been serving his country and I'd like for y'all to recognize him and give him a hand. I'm also going to introduce Ms. Laronda Walsh. Laronda is an educator with the Caddo Parish School Board System and she spends her time trying to mold young people. She do it all year round in the class room, but this summer, she's doing it to make a difference with the young people that serve in our Shreveport Program. And she's going to have a couple of words and then we're going to start with the young people. They'll introduce themselves and say a couple of words to the Council.

Ms. Walsh: Thank you Mr. Mayor, Mr. Jackson, Council. I'd like to say thank you for the continued support to mold these children. I feel it's an honor, a privilege and a blessing to be able to work with them all summer long. I've seen improvements in progress and growth in both the children and the community. Because of these efforts that you support. And I truly appreciate it. The children have come, not children, young adults - excuse me, have come together as a team. They've learned to work with a diverse group of people. They've learned initiative, self motivation, how to do practical skills as well as life skills. We have a lot of training in addition to the work that we do. I'm the team leader for the Paint Team, and we paint house for the elderly, for the disabled, for the low and fixed income. We've heard a lot of appreciation, believe it or not, occasionally we don't hear appreciation and that has led the kids to build tolerance and a compassion with different kinds of people. And I like I say, they learned team work this summer, if nothing else, they've learned team work. And I really like to thank you for the privilege to be able to work with them. Thank you.

Mr. Ramin: I'll be a senior at Southwood High this year and I became an Ameri Corps member in May. We've cleaned intersections, parks, playgrounds, painted houses and other projects. It may seem like it's only a job, but it's more than that. It's an opportunity to make a difference and to help others. I've learned a lot in this program and I'll carry it with me wherever I go. No one really has a problem with doing something for our community if it's convenient for them. But the hard work that all of us Corps member do is nowhere near convenient for us. So, it doesn't become something we do to make ourselves look good. But it's something that we do to make others feel good about their

living environment. The things we do are just more meaningful and admirable than anything else that we can do this summer. I've had a lot of memorable experiences this summer, amazing friends, the members, all the people that I work with are pretty cool people. All the hard work we've done has been really worth it. So, thank you very much for your support of this program. Thank you.

Councilman Jackson: Excuse me, let me just ask again. For the record, whenever you come, if you would, just everybody state your name and address for the record so we'll know who you are and we'll have you in our record as appropriate. Let me say that okay? Thank you.

Ms. Chavarris: *(2518 Brown Circle, Bossier City)* I'm currently enrolled in BPCC. We're here today to listen to you and to learn about our city. Our program comes to a close and we look back on the things that we have accomplished. We've help clean up Shreveport in many different ways by traveling through intersections and picking up trash from different parks, mowing the grass and weed eating around town. Also, we paint houses for the disabled and the elderly. And everything we do helps us in our quest to become better people who can make a difference in our community. Without your support, we'd be unable to do these things, so thank you for giving us the opportunity to speak to you today and thank you for your support.

Mr. Dupree: *(353 Albert Ave)* I am a student at Louisiana Tech University and I began working for Shreveport Green in late May, and I really, really enjoy doing it ever since. So, far we've painted houses and cut grass and worked around some of the City's parks, but to me, some of the most rewarding part of it was painting the houses, because we could actually see how happy it made the people and how grateful they we were actually young kids coming up doing this. So this kind of brings me to what I believe is the most important part of the Ameri Corps program and that is the service and the team work. I've never worked with a better group of people than I have in the past two weeks and I believe the reason for this is because we're working together to help people out to serve this city and I really hope this program is around for a long time. So thank you very much for your time and your support.

Mr. Smith: *(968 Stonewall-Frierson Road, Frierson, La)* I'm a 22 year old from Frierson, La and I'm a former student at LSUS. And I am currently working at Brown E. Moore's Headstart School as well as Shreveport Green. I want to start off by saying this working season is almost over and we've been working for six months now and during these past months and in my opinion, I think we did some pretty memorable tasks. Besides from mowing intersections and picking up litter, the usual, this year, we were also able to lend our assistance in helping to clean up around one of Shreveport's most historical sites, the Municipal Auditorium. I learned a lot about Shreveport's history during that experience. This year we were also able to help increase the tree population around Veteran's Park. I didn't know Veteran's Park was a place where people used to go to see concerts, so, I learned a little bit more about Shreveport. So, all in all Shreveport Green has been a learning experience. And, to sum it up, this whole summer has been a learning experience, so on behalf of Mr. Jeter, and me, and the whole gang, I want to thank you for your support.

Mr. Johnson: *1841 HollyHock Drive)* I'm a 2004 graduate of Southwood High School and I will be attending University of Louisiana at Lafayette in the fall. I joined Ameri Corps because I wanted to serve and beautify my community. In trying this goal, I have achieved

many honors. We have painted the houses of elderly, we have mold intersections for the City and beautified many parks and recreational facilities. When I joined the program in late December, I participated in my first project which was the Christmas recycling project. Doing this, we won an award down in Laffayette, La. We also recycled tons of telephone books (unclear) recycling project. We've also done several beautification projects for schools around Caddo Parish. We also participated in 'Hooked on Fishing' project and these are some of the many projects that Shreveport organizations have been involved with and I feel the organizations will only flourish into bigger and better things. So, thank you for your support.

Mr. Jeter: Mayor, Council, again, thank you for your support. We've painted over 12 houses over this summer and our young people have really learned a lot. They've really gelled as a team and the support of this government body of this city, makes it possible. We get students all over Shreveport/Bossier, Caddo Parish, all over that come to be a part of this program to make a difference and your support is greatly appreciated in that effort to help mold the leadership of our community for the future. Thank you very much.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you. And certainly I don't know that I speak for everybody, but I'm certain that this Council would say that not only do we appreciate what you've done, but it gives us a whole lot of hope into the future that people understand. At least, I'm of the opinion that service is the price you pay for the space you occupy and that all of us ought to leave this earth a little bit better than it was when we came. And if we don't, then we've really not given much to like. And so, thank you so much for investing this time at this age in your life and I hope that something has happened so that there'll be some kind of - - I think as many of you have articulated, some indelible marks left mentally, so that you recognize that the world needs people who are willing to serve other people and not just to be served. So, thank you so much Lee, Laronda, I say Donna who is here for Shreveport Green for what you do. We obviously. It's a privilege to do our part, but it's a benefit to have you do your part as well. So, thank you all so much. We also have some resolutions if you will that we'd like to present, but we'd like to ask- - - and I want to give - - yield some deference cause Councilman Lester a few months back came and he suggested that one of the things that we should do as a Council was to allow younger people to embrace civic activity. To embrace civic responsibility and to understand how their City Government operates and one of the ways of facilitating that was through an internship program over the summer. I certainly commend him for being forth-thinking and forward thinking and to at least bring this to the table. Obviously, there were different concerns about it with regards to resources and otherwise, but I think it has been money certainly well invested. And I want to certainly extend my accolades to Councilman Lester for in fact his ingenuity and again his aggressive nature of bringing forth this internship program. I don't know if Councilman Lester, do you have comments you'd like to make, or Councilman Carmody- -?

Councilman Carmody: Well, I'd like to suspend the rules to go ahead and add the resolution of support and also to receive the comments from our interns at this point if the Council would second.

Motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Walford, to suspend the rules to add the resolutions and to receive comments from City Council Interns. Motion approved by the following votes: Ayes: Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan,

Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

Councilman Jackson: What I'd like to do Councilman Lester, perhaps if you want to reserve your comments until they finish, I'll call them up so that you all as well can meet those young women and men who worked this summer and done a lot of good for this Council in my opinion. First, Ms. Jasmine Winston. And she happens to be representing District G and as Fred Sanford says "G stands for Great".

Ms. Winston: Hi, I am Jasmine Winston from District G. First of all, I'd like to thank all the Council members for allowing us to participate. I had a great time. And I don't want it to end. We did a lot of things. Thank you Councilman Lester for keeping us busy. I don't know what else to say. I really appreciate the opportunity, and I would do it again in a heartbeat. I loved working with the staff and I've made several new friends, so I hope you keep the program going.

Councilman Jackson: Next we have Ms. Corrigan Rachal.

Councilman Green: What district?

Councilman Jackson: Oh, I'm sorry. From District F.

Councilman Green: The Future! It stands for the future.

Ms. Rachal: Hello, I live at 4610 Alton Street. And I'm the Council Intern for Councilman Green which is District F. I attend Stephen F. Austin University where I will be a junior and a political science and sociology major. I will be leaving Thursday to go back to school for Cheerleading Camp. This has been an extraordinary experience for me. I have enjoyed working with the Councilmen of our City and the Shreveport City Council Staff. This was my first internship and not to say my last, hopefully, but this was the best thing to ever come my way this year. This has been a wonderful experience that I will take with me. Every since I could remember my goal in life was to become the female counterpart of Johnnie Cochran. And this experience has put me at the halfway mark. Thank you Councilman Green for the opportunity and thank you to the City Council Staff for the experience. Thank you.

Councilman Jackson: Next, we have Mr. Ben Koerner.

Mr. Koerner: (871 Glen Haven) My name is Ben Koerner, I reside at 871 Glen Haven, Shreveport, La. Those of you that know me, know that I don't like talking much in public, so I'll keep my comments short. Thank you Mr. Thompson. I just wanted to really thank the Council, thank the City, and thank Mr. Gibson for giving me the opportunity to get a lot of experience. It's been a great job, I mean, as I said earlier in the year, it's been a great experience, for the facts that we've gotten good experience, gotten a little bit of money, and it gave us something to do besides sleep til 4:00 in the evening. So, I mean, it's been a real positive experience and I had a great time working with everybody and y'all have a great group of people here working in the City for y'all. I haven't met anybody that is - - - it's just real positive people (unclear) y'all have going. So, thank y'all.

Councilman Jackson: Next we have Mr. Charles Ray Hilt, II from District E.

Councilman Hogan: Chairman, that E stands for Excellent. I just wanted everybody to know.

Mr. Hilt: (9318 Sandalwood Dr.) My name is Charles Hilt, 9318 Sandalwood Drive. I'm a current graduate of Caddo Magnet High and I will be attending University of New Orleans majoring in Electrical Engineering. I would like to thank the Council of

course, but I would personally like to thank Mr. Hogan for hiring me and giving me a chance and the opportunity to work this summer and get ready and have a little money in my pocket before I went to college. What I take from this experience is a better understanding and a better respect for the people on the Council and the people who work for the Council. Because without them, a lot of this isn't possible. And I have a greater respect for y'all because I see that y'all do care about the City of Shreveport and the work does go on. There's not really more for me to say other than thank you. And I hope that y'all keep the program alive and have it next year, and give me a call, because I want to work next year too!

Councilman Jackson: Next we have Ms. Megan Wooley and she's from Council District C.

Ms. Wooley: (965 Audubon Place) Hi, my name is Megan Wooley, and I live at 965 Audubon Place. I just graduated from Caddo Magnet High School and next year, I'll be attending Hendrix College in Conway, Arkansas. Since I plan to study Political Science and be involved in politics, this internship has been a really invaluable experience for me. It has given me insight into the inner workings of the City government as well as the behind the scenes efforts of the City Council. I'd really like to thank Councilman Carmody for this opportunity as well as Mr. Sharon Pilkinton for help and direction. And I will say what Chuck says, if you need me again next year Mr. Carmody, call me. Thank y'all.

Councilman Jackson: Next we have Mr. Jason Jackson from Council District A.

Councilman Lester: A is for Awesome Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Jackson: (2536 Corbitt) Good afternoon. My name is Jason Jackson and I live on 2536 Corbitt Street, Shreveport. I'm an intern for Councilman Lester. I am currently in the Delayed Entry Program in the United States Navy, and I'll be leaving next year on February 24th to go to boot camp. I have really enjoyed working with Ms. Sharon and Ms. Tonya and all the other Council members for this short period of time. This has been a priceless experience for me, to be able to work for the City and to learn more about how the City operates. I'm very interested in numbers, so, therefore Ms. Sharon has me working on the budget for 2005 and it's really easy and I'm planning on becoming an accountant. This knowledge that I've gained on accounting has given me a head start on my future career as a Navy Ship Accountant, and I'd like to thank Councilman Lester and the rest of the City Council for this opportunity. Thank you.

Councilman Jackson: And finally, Mr. Alex Smith, who is from Council District B.

Councilman Walford: Okay, B is for Best.

Mr. Smith: (4314, Rosary Lane) Good afternoon, my name is Alex Smith, 4314, Rosary Lane, Shreveport. First of all, I want to take this time, I know that the Council doesn't get much praise. A lot of criticism, but not much praise. So, I want to thank the Administration, the Council, Councilman Lester, of course for bringing this to everybody's attention, and all the other workers for the City Council for making this possible. A few months ago, I was pondering how I would spend my time after my first year of college, even though I am currently enrolled at The Academy for Performing Arts. I have long had a deep seeded desire to understand how things work in the political arena. A couple of weeks before returned home from New York, my mother called and informed me that the City Council had been given the final approval to hire seven interns, and I thought I should apply for one of the positions. This really was an

answer to all of my prayers. I couldn't have asked for anything more. For the past three or four years, I have been struggling with career decisions between both Performing Arts and Political Science. And I've made my mind up at that very moment, with God's help that I will have a dual career in both Political Science and Performing Arts, the Lord willing, I'm going to do both.

Mr. Antee: I think that's one in the same Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Smith: But in closing, being chosen as one of the seven interns has been, I can't even imagine, one of the most gratifying opportunities of my young life. And I hope this is good for you to hear that being here is my first step. You know a baby has to take a few steps before it can run. I plan on running, I don't plan on walking too much longer, so this is going to be my first step. And I want you to know that this experience solidifies my love for politics and my love for public service. And I emphasize the word 'public service'. For the people and I will make that my life's service, for not only the citizens of Shreveport in Louisiana, but the citizens of the United States of America. That is my dream and I'll stand by it. Thank you.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Smith, I don't know if you missed your plane to Boston, but that was pretty good! Thank you, Councilman Walford, you better hold tight to that seat. Let me just say thank you to all of those interns who just spoke and I'll ask now the Clerk if you would read the resolution that we want to present to them. Look's like a couple of them may have left out, but we want to present to them these resolutions so that they would have that for themselves.

The Deputy Clerk read Resolution No. 165 of 2004:

RESOLUTION NO. 165 OF 2004

A RESOLUTION TO RECOGNIZE CHARLES RAY HILT, JASON L. JACKSON, BENJAMIN B. KOERNER, CORRIGAN D. RACHAL, ALEX C. SMITH, JASMINE WINSTON, AND MEGAN K. WOOLEY FOR THEIR EXEMPLARY, DEDICATED AND COMPETENT SERVICE TO THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO

WHEREAS, the Shreveport City Council adopted Resolution No. 121 on May 25, 2004, to hire seven interns to work for the City Council beginning no earlier than June 1, 2004, and ending no later than August 31, 2004; and

WHEREAS, Charles Ray Hilt, Jason L. Jackson, Benjamin B. Koerner, Corrigan D. Rachal, Alex C. Smith, Jasmine Winston, and Megan K. Wooley were hired; and

WHEREAS, Charles Ray Hilt, Jason L. Jackson, Benjamin B. Koerner, Corrigan D. Rachal, Alex C. Smith, Jasmine Winston, and Megan K. Wooley proved to be smart, dedicated and extremely resourceful, and they started or completed several projects requested by council members or regular staff which will make it easier for the council to respond to the requests of constituents and for the city to meet certain Charter provisions.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session, convened that the City Council of the City of Shreveport recognizes and thanks Charles Ray Hilt, Jason L. Jackson, Benjamin B. Koerner, Corrigan D. Rachal, Alex C. Smith, Jasmine Winston, and Megan K. Wooley for for their exemplary, dedicated and competent service to the City of Shreveport as 2004 City Council Summer

Interns.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, that this resolution shall be executed in duplicate originals with originals presented to Charles Ray Hilt, Jason L. Jackson, Benjamin B. Koerner, Corrigan D. Rachal, Alex C. Smith, Jasmine Winston, and Megan K. Wooley and an original filed in perpetuity in the office of the Clerk of Council for the City of Shreveport.

Motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Green to adopt the resolution. Motion passes by the following votes: Ayes: Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

Councilman Jackson: What we'd like to do at this time is call those interns, if you will, up and I don't know, it's really difficult, but Mr. Lester, if you would, join us to make this presentation. You all will come up. Sharon?

Ms. Pilkinton: Yes.

Councilman Walford: I think he's asking for their mother to come down with them.

Councilman Jackson: And again, thank you so much and we certainly appreciate the work you've done and we certainly wish you the best as you go back to your individual endeavors and just keep up the good work. And the other recognition of guests. Mr. Lester?

Councilman Lester: I'd just like to echo what Councilman Jackson has said. These seven young people represent the best and I think the brightest that exist in our City. It does me well to see that we have such good, smart, strong, intelligent young people that can work together as a unit, both Black and White, male and female that can come together around a particular set of tasks and accomplishments. I think their success is not our success as a Council, it's a success for the City of Shreveport and it portends positive things for the future of our City. And I was just glad to be a part of that process. And again, I'd like to thank the Council for their support. Many times, we do things one person might have a particular idea, but at the end of the day, it takes four of us, at least four of us to make something happen and I would just say thank you to the Council for supporting this effort and I would hope that we would continue to do this in the future, because anytime you make an investment with our young people, it always pays positive dividends. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Lester: Thank you Councilman Lester as we continue on with our meeting, I think it's been a great start to the meeting to have young people both from ShreveCorps as well as these interns which both well for the future of the City of Shreveport. Very often, we have a lot of contention meetings with adults. But it's great to see such a great start to today's Council Meeting with these young people.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, we had correspondence from Judge Stephen Beasley. I don't know whether he's here, he had wanted to address the Council and I wanted to be sure that if he was in the audience, he would know that we did receive his correspondence, but apparently he's not here.

Reports:

- a. Convention Center and Convention Center Hotel

Councilman Jackson: Alright, thank you Mr. Thompson. Item 5, we also have Convention Center and Convention Center Hotel Project reports and Property Standards

Program. We received reports on both of these areas on yesterday. Gentlemen, do we have any other questions outside of what we- -

Councilman Carmody: Just wanted to ask, I did understand that there was a meeting at 1:00 today, the Committee to look at the feasibility for the hotel. Would one of the members be able to provide us with a report?

Councilman Walford: Mr. Chairman, I was gonna, if I may?

Councilman Jackson: Yes. At the end of the meeting, when you call for Committee Reports, I was gonna ask - either you or I - to run through what we did.

Councilman Gibson: Could I ask Sam Gilliam to come forward please? Afternoon Sam. I'm in receipt and I guess my colleagues have copies of the letter from you July 13th to Mr. Larry English regarding a Joe Price Enterprises?

Mr. Gilliam: Yes sir.

Councilman Gibson: Would you brief the Council on what we're doing here on what we're doing here on that particular situation?

Mr. Gilliam: Well, we have a situation where there is a (unclear) that has been recently certified as a Fair Share Participant. You understand that in the review process when this individual or this company applied was that they either were not employed by a certain firm, or they soon would not be. Our investigation subsequent to certifying them indicates some feedback from that particular individual, Mr. Price, I believe that is, that indeed is still an employee of that company. On the surface Mr. Gibson, that may not appear to be any problem, but in looking at this further, we find that indeed a colleague has indicated that they are a part of the Convention Center Project, that they are a sub-contractor under Yates of course. And this particular company would be a sub-sub to that particular firm. We are simply following up because our- - - the name of the Fair Share initiative as you've given it to us and the ordinance in the plan is that we would protect the integrity of that program. People who need to be in it, we want them in it, people that don't need to be in it, we don't want them in it. And those who happen to get in it, we're going to take every step to make sure that steps are taken to (unclear). So we are pursuing to make sure that indeed that there is not some kind of - - - I would say incestuous relationship between this sub and sub to Yates.

Councilman Gibson: How many of those circumstances do you have come across your desk?

Mr. Gilliam: This is the very first one that we've encountered.

Mr. Antee: On the Convention Center. It's not the first we've encountered.

Mr. Gilliam: Oh, overall, yes.

Councilman Gibson: Okay. Is Joe Price Enterprises a licensed contractor?

Mr. Gilliam: My understanding is that his license specifically relates to plumbing and things along that scope. I believe what we're looking at here is that, this firm is actually reporting to be somewhat of a wholesaler in terms of certain materials and supplies to RRAC I believe it is.

Councilman Gibson: So, there is no actual license contract involved?

Mr. Gilliam: The only license that we have seen, that's in our record would be in the plumbing works.

Councilman Gibson: No, I'm talking about in terms of the \$1.68 million that you list here. This is not in terms of construction work, it's more of a supplier role.

Mr. Gilliam: Well, we're trying to affirm that to be sure.

Councilman Gibson: I'm just listening to what you had to say. You said there was mainly supply work involved or did I mis-hear you on that?

Mr. Gilliam: No, it appears as though this is simply materials.

Councilman Gibson: Okay, so, if it's materials, my point being is a license is immaterial so to speak, but as there is no work performed.

Mr. Gilliam: That would be true. And that would not be our concern. Our concern is to make sure that indeed there is a - - - this company is doing what it reports to do and that is not some form of performing. And we have not drawn any conclusions yet Mr. Gibson on that, we're still investigating.

Councilman Gibson: And you're going to give us an update on that as it develops?

Mr. Gilliam: We will certainly follow it up and advise you accordingly.

Councilman Jackson: Any other questions gentlemen? If not, we are at Item 6, Public Hearings.

Mr. Antee: We did have some things on Convention Center Report.

Councilman Jackson: Oh I'm sorry, you did have some other- - - Okay. Mr. Antee.

Mr. Antee: I was going to touch on where we were with the feasibility study, but I take it from the conversation that y'all going to give that at some point based on the Committee's report. And I do have the information that we talked about on Price Waterhouse and a Hospitality Venture, Int., I'll give to Sharon today. I don't know if that's the same HVS or a division of it that's in the resolution, so they'll need to verify that. Also in terms of the resolution for a RFP, for anybody that wants to build a hotel, this is

b. Property Standards Report

Public Hearing: None

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

Confirmations and/or Appointments.

Greater Shreveport Human Relations Commission - Mr. Fred Moss

Motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Gibson to confirm the appointment of Mr. Fred Moss to the Greater Shreveport Human Relations Commission. Motion passes by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. Nays: None.

Adding Legislation to the Agenda.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, we have one.

1. An ordinance to amend ordinance number 85 of 2004 with regard to the Riverview Project, authorizing the Mayor to execute a right of entry agreement with the United States of America, through the U. S. Army Corps of Engineers relative to the project; and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

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

Public Comments (Agenda Items to be Adopted)

Councilman Jackson: We have several and it has been suggested to us particularly those who are gathered in the Chambers today that this Council affords each person three minutes to speak and I would certainly ask if you could as a matter of preparation, prepare your remarks for that time limit and as succinctly as you can in that three minute time period, if you would articulate whatever are your concerns, we certainly would appreciate you being governed according to the rules of the Council. Our first request comes from James Robinson.

Mr. Robinson: (131 Mayfair)_ Yes, thank you Mr. President, Members of the Council, Mr. Mayor, Mr. Antee, I want to say good afternoon to you. My purpose to come before you today is stand here on behalf of the 600 members of PACE Local 425, Shreveport City Worker's Union which I serve in the capacity of President. And I'm here to voice our support and concurrence with a Resolution 101 which Mr. Lester is offering for your consideration on today. Resolution 101 is a suggested change to the Personnel Rules and Regulations. There are some of us who are here present in the Chamber in support of this resolution, an amendment to the Personnel Board. There are many of us because of work schedules who could not be here and I would like to submit to the Clerk this petition from the Solid Waste Department which is about 100 strong and we have about 68-70 signatures from them in the support of this resolution. And with that I'd just like to say the resolution that Mr. Lester is offering as we all realize addresses one of the problems, the situation that was identified in the Personnel Board's final report. And also, as we've all had discussions over the past, we all (unclear) that the existing personnel rules and regulations have been in place since 1986 and are antiquated in many instances, we feel that the fact that this is a good first step in the process of amending the Personnel Rules and Regulations to be more appropriate in this day and time. With that, I'd like to thank each and everyone of you.

Mr. Tanner: (6141 Creswell) This is regarding Case No. S-19-04. And the packets have been filed in this issue. And I want to thank y'all first for allowing me to speak today. And the reason that I'm here is just like everybody else. I think my biggest investment that I have is my home. And this issue is regarding a subdivision of property across the street from my home. And one thing about it, I cannot afford to take risks. I cannot afford to take risks when my biggest investment, when I'm talking about my home and my family. Now, what happened when my wife and I bought the property that we own now, was we were (unclear) at one time and we were aware that after the flood, that the City had spent a lot of money and that they had improved the drainage in the area. They had improved the ditch that runs right next to my house and that has solved many of the drainage problems that existed in the flooding issues that were involved. Now, through this, the MPC meeting and to this point, I'm aware, or have become aware that my property and Ms. Pettit's property have flooded at least two times. Now, that was in the middle 80s and also in the early 90s before the improvements. Now, my contention is that if you allow the subdivision of the property, if you allow them to build on that property, that will affect the drainage. That will affect the drainage to the property surrounding it to mine, across the street where there are other properties adjacent to it and that will affect the flooding issues. The drainage work that was done solved the problem and now, by doing this you're going to change that up and possibly create problems for all the surrounding neighbors. Now another thing is, the neighborhood where I live in, everybody enjoys the neighborhood, we love the

neighborhood, we're glad to be in that neighborhood. That is something that any neighborhood in Shreveport, you should embrace that. Because that is exactly what we want. You want people to gather, you want to build on that neighborhood, improve it and make it better. Now 91 people have signed a petition and they believe that this subdivision also creates a risk to the neighborhood as a whole. Whether that be for drainage, whether that be for flooding issues, or just due to the character of the neighborhood. There are smaller homes near my house, there are larger homes near my house. But I have not talked to anyone who thinks that this is going to improve the neighborhood or that this is a good thing as far as the character of the neighborhood is involved. Now, they are going to build a house over there if they are able to subdivide this. And by doing that, I think at the MPC meeting, they stated that there was no way they would build a house or anyone would build a house where it's going to flood. Well, they have the opportunity to build their house up. Our homes are older, we've been there, we have to deal with the affects of that. And like I said, it's not a risk that I feel that I am able to take and I have to do what I can and this is then only forum to address that. And I thank you for your time.

Mr. Craig: (6025 Buncombe Road) I believe you have a copy of the letter I've written on the house with the (unclear) subdivision. I just wanted to make myself available for any questions you may have on my letter or on the drainage there.

Councilman Jackson: Well Mr. Craig, we will obviously it's on our agenda and the time for debate and discussion on that will be at the point where it is on the agenda and we'll note that you are present and if in fact anyone has questions, if you'll remain here at such time, we will be able to call you if necessary. Thank you so much.

Mr. Pettit: (6132 Creswell) We had two hearings before the Metropolitan Planning Commission which voted 6-1 to approve the subdivision. A little history, I think most of you I hope got the piece I mailed to you, the information. Brenda Kraak bought this lot 33 years ago with a house on it. That was 1971. She's raised her children, they're all grown and gone. In 1973, she bought the adjoining lot from a separate owner and has owned that, as undeveloped, since that time. This lot has 125 feet of frontage on Creswell by the way. The applicant receives a homestead exemption on Lot No. 2 and not Lot No. 1. No. 1 is the one that - - - these have been separate lots for the taxing authorities and the like, but they don't apparently qualify as separate lots for the purposes of development. And she would like to sell her big house with a lot of grass to cut and try to build a smaller house on the small lot with less maintenance, and that's the purpose for which she bought it. The lot in question is twice as large as the minimum requirement for the zoning. The Planning Commission cited - - - Mr. Kirkland cited - - - this is his language in the minutes which I hope you have of that Metropolitan Planning Commission, on April 7th. Mr. Kirkland again noted that none of the property is in the floodway. Only a small portion in the flood plane. This has been confirmed by the City Engineering Office. And nothing would prevent permits from being issued for construction or to build on this property. You also notice that the request meets all the requirements for zoning. And at the time, the property was purchased was done so in tracts. The applicant acquired the property as two or more parcels. Then the same was never put together, now being subdivided. This is the first subdivision. Those in opposition call it a re-subdivision. But I do not agree with that. Mr. John Bowman is here to speak, he's an engineer and surveyor. And in the minutes of that meeting, he reaffirmed his position from March 3, Public Hearing, that no part of the proposed property is in the floodway, but a small portion is in the flood plane. The floor

elevation will be placed on the plat. And they voted 6-1. So, I submit to you, this is almost a technicality. This has been two separate lots, bought separately, at different times, treated separately by the taxing authorities and the rest of the community as far as I know and that what she wants to do is comply with the requirements of the Planning Commission that this be treated as a (unclear) lot under all the conditions there and the engineers of the City have certified that this lot can be built upon and that the 100 year flood would only touch a small portion of it. You've got I think a plat that shows that and Mr. Bowman will confirm that, the engineer when he speaks. Any questions?

Dr. Reilly: (6120 Creswell) I'm opposed to the partitioning of this land and primarily of the construction on it for this reason. This is a map, if you can see it. I guess not, that shows the - - -

Councilman Jackson: Just one second Dr. Reilly if you will, let us get it up and so it won't encumber your time. While we do so. Robert if - - - alright.

Dr. Reilly: Basically, the map is a contour. It shows that there is drainage down there, this direction, down this direction, this direction and this direction. A total of 960 acres are drained at this particular point. Already even this spring time with the rain, the water was over this ditch and at the edge of this ditch and this was by no means a 100 year flood. When you look at the map, you also see that this area including the house where they are planning to build or wanted to build is low. So, the excess water flows down this way across the road and then back into the ditch further down. This was discussed with the engineering department and they basically said there really was no change. We have an engineer who was involved with the construction of this ditch that shows that this is continued risk for flooding. And we live here, right next to one of the ditches and the large ditch. Blocking any egress from the water without any additional (unclear) for any heavy rain is going to back us up and flood us and it's going to flood the people here and I believe it's going to cause a significant amount of problem in that area. Thank you.

Ms. Pettit: (6132 Creswell) I'm Brenda Kraak Pettit and I have lived at 6132 Creswell since February of 1971 when we purchased the property. Two years later, the next door property became available and knowing that I had four children that someday when they all grew up and moved on, I would like to sell my house with a little over an acre and then build another residence on the smaller lot. Cause I love the neighborhood, it's wonderful, we've lived there forever. And I want to show you all, this is the lot. It has 125 frontal feet which is a pretty good size lot. A lot of the other lots in the neighborhood are not quite this large. It's going to be very easy to build a house. We'd build it on piers, and I think that would take care of any sort of flooding problems. We, since the ditch was enlarged a few years ago, we have not had any trouble. I have every once in a while there is some water in the neighborhood, but it goes away. This neighborhood has a bunch of new houses, there is big huge house going up on Oak Hill, and I feel like the neighborhood is not going to go up or down with this new (unclear). You can see that it would improve the way that everything looks. But I just want you all to consider the fact that it's bought, these two lots never were separated, I paid taxes on two different pieces of property and has since 1973. And I would thank you for considering letting us just - - - let it go as it is. Two lots. Thank you so much.

Councilman Hogan: Ms. Pettit, would you come back for a moment? I also received a copy that you had. A much smaller copy, but the pink portion that's shaded in is your home right now?

Ms. Pettit: No, that is the lot, that's the side lot. Our lot, I have a picture of our lot

with the whole neighborhood, with all the houses. That is just a possibility of if a house were to be put there, how it could be. It would fit perfectly on that lot. That house has not been - - -

Councilman Hogan: So, that's what you're proposing then?

Ms. Pettit: That's what we're proposing.

Councilman Hogan: Okay, where is your home right now in relations to this?

Ms. Pettit: To the west of it.

Councilman Hogan: Over here? This part?

Ms. Pettit: Yeah. I would like to show you the neighborhood- - -

Councilman Hogan: That's okay. Maybe later on, when we have other discussion. But I mainly was interested to know on your current home right now, which you built in 1971?

Ms. Pettit: It was built in '51, we purchased it '71.

Councilman Hogan: You purchased it in 1971. Are you required to have flood insurance on your current home?

Ms. Pettit: Oh yes. I always have been required and still am required.

Councilman Hogan: Okay. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Mr. Barrett: *(1501 Corporate Drive)* I'm here today to speak in opposition to the zoning appeal of the Case C-31A-04. As I've said many times before and I'll try to keep this brief and thank you for the opportunity. It's a rezoning appeal for as you guys all well know industrial and multi-family residential. The reason for opposition is all existing business currently fit that zoning. We operate 50 vehicles, approximately 50 vehicles in our facility each day, numerous times, and 25 of them being 18 wheeled tractor trailer units, operating up and down the streets of that industrial park that this borders and there's only two access points in and out of there. One being Hearne Ave and the other being Nelson Drive (unclear) N. Market. And creates quite a safety issue for our employees and also for any residents that would be in there as the park itself has no sidewalks anywhere for these people to travel on and also for accessing in and out of their residential facility that they plan to build there. (Unclear) houses in this area would impede any future industrial development and reduce the value of existing industrial structures. We currently are leasing in that facility, we do not own it, but the majority of the people that are here today in opposition to this own their facilities and won't have the opportunity to move if the residential development encroaches in that industrial park, but on the other hand, (unclear) have that and have a payroll and an employee headcount of 61 people that we provide to the City of Shreveport. And our goal is not to move or leave Shreveport, but to stay there. I live in Shreveport and I want to continue to work in Shreveport and keep our business there. Twice during the last year, the Metropolitan Planning Commission has unanimously voted to refuse this appeal. Also, since our last meeting on the 13th, and I gave y'all a letter in your packet today, some things have come to light that I wrote you all about. And I delivered to Mr. Thompson earlier today and it was presented to you, company letters and information concerning the alleged letters of support for Cambridge Court Apartments, presented by Mr. Miller to the City Council on Tuesday, July 13th. And I have attached letters of retraction of support for this development from both Brookshires Grocery and Kroger Food Stores. At the meeting on Tuesday, July 13th, Mr. Miller also stated that he possessed the letter of support from Walgreens. So, I requested copies from the City Council Office of the letters he had submitted. There was not a letter from Walgreen in that

group. I'm also attaching the alleged letters of support from Mr. Miller. Please share this information prior to today's meeting. I also called the District Manager for Eckerd's Drugs for this area, Gary Gabby who operates out of an office in Longview, TX, who stated that they would not authorize an employees to write or sign letters of this type. He also gave me the name, address and telephone number of the owner of the strip mall that Eckerd leases from on N. Market location. This property is owned by Gary L. Smith, Republic Central Relay Inc., Houston, TX. I spoke to Mr. Smith, I faxed him the information concerning his proposed new development adjacent to his property. He said, he had never spoken to Mr. Miller or anyone else concerning this zoning change and he had not granted his permission for sidewalk to be constructed along side his property. He also stated his opposition to this zoning change for this type of development and the traffic and safety issues it presents for his current and future tenants. You should have also received a letter in the last week from Centerpoint Energy, the land owners of Hunter Business Park strongly oppose to this change. I would encourage you to use this information along with the many other pieces of information we've presented to you in order to make a positive decision for the future of economic and industrial development in Shreveport. Thank you for your time.

Mr. Roe: (*5705 Camelot Dr*) I've addressed the MPC on two occasions before. This is the second time to address the City Council. I appreciate the opportunity to visit with you about this matter. What I've come to the conclusion, I want to kind of consolidate what my thoughts have been in the past and narrow it down to three particular concerns. Primarily would be safety of all of the people involved in the subdivision as far as employees workers that work in the industrial park and any potential residents out there. The next concern I have was the actual impact it would have on future development of our industrial park. Another concern that I have is that it would stifle the future of any new industrial tenants coming in there. Along that line is the compatibility issue that I feel like would be a great concern of ours. We operate a 24 hours industrial business and we're in and out of there 24 hours a day with heavy trucks and trailers. All of our concerns can really be summed up in this. It's the safety compatibility and the impact on our future of the City. If it'd be alright, we'd have several other supporters from our neighborhood, would it be alright for them to stand at this time?

Councilman Jackson: Yes sir.

Mr. Roe: Thank you very much. Are there any questions? Thank you.

Councilman Carmody: One comment Mr. Chairman. Visibly absent of course is Mr. Craig Kennedy, but I did want to make a mention that he certainly got to be here in spirit with these folks that are in opposition. Thank you sir.

Mr. Goode: (*2140 N. Hearne Ave*) I'm here to talk on behalf of the Cambridge Square Apartments and especially for Mr. Miller. You know Mr. Miller much better than I do having dealt with him over the years. And I have know him as (unclear) acquaintance ever since I moved into this unit. In that time, I found him to be fair, generous, equitable, and a good neighbor. You've had to deal with him on a number of projects in which he's made promises to you negotiations, compromises and he's lived up to everyone of them, if not surpassed them. He's maintained a quality of his units. He's provide hope and heart to his residents. He's a good landlord, a good neighbor and he wants to do more by building the Cambridge Square apartments in a place that's easily accessible by one of the access roads and the people using those access roads would use a small portion of it. The road

that goes behind the apartments are very seldom used by any of his apartment units that have access from driveways within the units. I've often asked myself why Mr. Miller would do this, because he has his. Nobody is going to shut off his electricity, nobody is going to tie up his phone and I've wondered why he did it and last week, I had my answer, the last time he was here. Someone referred to the units that he built as a compound and some of the people who are here on behalf of this motion heard a negative derisive term applied to that phrasing. And Mr. Miller out in the lobby was upset because his people may have been so shabbily referred to and I wanted to applaud him for that. I think it was absolutely magnificent that at the start of this meeting, you were applauding and approving the young people who worked with Shreveport to rehabilitate areas in the community and I applaud you for your (unclear) and your support of that. Mr. Miller runs what they call a tight ship. There is no blight in his property. He has units that are five years old that have a quality and a look about them that is just as brand spanking new as the day they were built. He has trained managers and staff over there to make sure that the rules are kept, that the peace is kept and in the heart of the people is surging with hope because they have quality place to live surrounded by good neighbors. Last night, I left the lights on in my car and my neighbor came over and knocked on my door and said 'you left your lights on'. So, I put my pants on and went out and shut my lights. I would have wholeheartedly ask you to allow Mr. Miller to do more good for the businesses in this community, for the community, for Shreveport and for those hoping to live in a home (unclear) for that. Thank you.

Mr. Jones: *(907 Louisiana Ave)* And I want to thank first of God, for allowing me to be here and I want to thank House of Representatives to speak on behalf of the (unclear) apartments to allow us to come here to help build the Cambridge Court Limited. There's two things that I want to touch on. Firstly, I want to touch on is that the apartments that was up about a year ago has been successfully running by the people who has been managed those apartment. There have not been any crime in those apartments, there has not been any hanging over 10:00 in those apartments, I think they're doing a real good job. And people are trying to get in from all that are unable to get in because of the limited, or how many apartments that they built and they're full. And I'm grateful that they want to do another set of apartments which is going to be located on Nelson Street, 1800 Nelson Street, and I believe that would be another successful apartment complex that they are going to build. If the first one is successful, I believe that the second one will be also too. So, I'm asking that y'all give us an opportunity and a chance to prove to society that the second thing I wanted to touch base on was low income which is has been misunderstood for many- - - . Just because we're receiving low income, don't mean that we're low people, we just need help. And I think everyone deserve help and being given help in some type of way, I believe that. The people that are here with me, I want to ask them to stand. I want to thank them for taking their time out to come here on the busy day to represent the people who have been shown that we as society and productive members of Shreveport, Louisiana can be proven that this can be a successful future for the young ladies. Most of the ladies that's here, the young ladies children that they want to raise in that apartment complex is going to be fenced off. It's going to be run well by the people who are going to be managing those apartments. And I believe that it's going to be a good future for those children to be raised in an environment. It would be more helpful. And that's what we're here for to help turn society around. I mean, just because a lot of bad things have been happening in the past, doesn't mean that they have to continue to happen. And I believe

that by building these places, they want to give somebody an opportunity somewhere to say 'hey, I want to go over there, I want to move in those apartments, because seeing it, they're doing a real good job'. I don't see no children running the streets, I haven't heard anybody getting run over by any cars or trucks that they're talking about and definitely haven't heard any crime, being that CCC jail is right there, they ain't gotta go too far to walk 'em over there, so they like - - - hold up, now, let me be a little (unclear). But whatever it took, they're doing a well good job. I hope God put it on y'all hearts, cause y'all sitting in the seat of judgement to judge right for this, you know to the heart and take a good look at it. Thank y'all for allowing me to be here.

Mr. Miller: (6745 N. Club) I'm here as the property owner and developer to speak on behalf of Cambridge Court Apartments. And it will be brief. There are seven other apartment complexes in three blocks of this site. Some of 'em been there for 20 years without opposition. We built five on N. Hearne without any opposition to zoning, so if there's seven, what wrong with the 8th one? It makes you wonder why anybody would be opposed. They've been successful, they've helped the community and (unclear) what's wrong with this site? This site is ideal for the working poor. It's in walking distance of shopping drug stores, public transportation is half a block away, so it's ideal for the working poor, a lot of 'em who don't have automobiles. You know in North of town, Councilman Lester, we're experiencing a renaissance of sort and growth. You're to be commended for that. And I feel like I've been a part of that and we've been a part of that with out development and we want to continue that. We got a lot of letters of support no matter what you hear today, we have a lot of businesses who support us out there as well as the 200 people on the waiting list. They sure support us. We have a letter of support from the Housing Authority that's in your file stating the tremendous need and I believe it's called sorely needed housing in Shreveport with 14,000 units short of affordable housing. And we pledge to be good neighbors. We've always been good neighbors wherever we went. We run a good show, we take care of our business, we pay our taxes and we just think we're all around good citizens. And we do not house criminals. We house good class, working class, poor people who follow the rules, who want the same thing as you and I want. They want an education for the children, they want a decent, safe, and affordable place to live. They want to be a part of society, they want to grow. And the first thing in any family's life, to be able to grow their children is decent, safe, affordable housing and that's what we do for a living. And that's what we're trying to do here. This site's been there for 35 years. Nobody wanted it except us. And we're wanting it. We have it ready to go, and I appreciate the opportunity to talk to y'all. You've given me this opportunity. Remember, I've been here for a long time, and I don't think y'all have ever had any problem with my operation. So, we'd like to build these people some houses. Thank you very much. You have any questions?

Mr. Williams: (2755 Circle Dr.) To the Mayor and Councilmen, I'd like to echo the phrases of the young people before me. Respect and praises that we try to give our Councilmen. We try to give our elected officials. January 2003, the Council voted against. I'm here in opposition for the Rosenwald Subdivision that's going in on David Rains and Roundgrove. You voted against this same project last year, but it was in University Villages. This same 15 year lease to own. They didn't want it in their back yard. It's not that we don't want it in our back door, we just don't think predatory lending is the way to go about putting these houses up. If you're going to put house up there, put houses up there

to seal. Put senior citizens, put retirees. That's what we have in University Park now. I've been in my home for 34 years. As you've stated in some of your comments, the blood, sweat and tears went into building my yard up, keeping my house up, adding on, remodeling, bringing my children up to be respectful young citizens and to give back to the community. I have some pictures here. Since my time is short my concern today, Rosenwald Subdivision, if they're not doing a good housekeeping now, what are they going to do when they build the homes.

Councilman Jackson: Just one minute Mr. Williams, we'll get the pictures up. Robert?

Mr. Williams: We all know that David Rains Recreational Center is falling apart from the inside out. Now, it's falling apart from the outside in. They say they had to build a line from Phase II to Phase I, so they're going across the park doing it. This is not good housekeeping. This tractor here is picking up gravel, taking it from Phase II to Phase I. Not only are they dropping in on our track where we're trying to walk in the morning, where someone might trip, stumble or fall or twist an ankle, where the City is not reliable for it. We know Mr. Turrentine is not going to be reliable for it. They're continuing to tear up the park track. It took three Councilmen, like I stated before, begging and pleading, please come up there and fix our park. It got fixed. They're tearing it up quicker than it got fixed. They've got this hole in this fence, they're tearing up the fence, now, they're tearing up the curbing right here, where they're coming across with the dozers. This picture here, this is your dozer, coming tearing up your curbing, tearing up your street. They already done tore up Roundgrove, so now instead of just tearing up Roundgrove and David Rains, they're tearing up our own City park, the only place we have to walk and exercise in the morning. This is another area of the track that's tore up. He said, they're going to fix it back. This been tore up for two months, when are they going to fix it back. It don't take but five feet of asphalt ten feet long, it shouldn't take three months to put that back together. He said, they got to test the pipe. How long is it going to take to test the pipe? How long do we have to stop walking to find an alternate route to come up to use a public park that you supported and built for us. And with that I know my three minutes are up and I won't echo any more (unclear) because we have others to speak. And at this time, everybody that's in opposition to that, can I please get you to stand? With that Councilmen and Mayor, I thank you.

Ms. Cheevis: (2020 N. Hearne) I'm here on behalf of Tredor Property. I've been living there three years now, I know a lot of people that get tired of me telling my story, but I have to tell y'all. Before I moved there I was homeless, me and my kids. We didn't have nowhere to go. I had gotten in contact with Dr. Pendleton and Dr. Pendleton, said "well, I will help you find somewhere to move", because I had been looking everywhere from Peach Street, Allen Ave, Prince Village, Grimmatt Drive, Northwood, Kings Manor, I'm talking about everywhere for me and my kids, you know somewhere to live. And I was facing a custody battle over my kids, because I had nowhere to go. And you know, the father was trying to take 'em from me because I was the one that was homeless, didn't have nowhere to go, so, at that time, I had spoke with Dr. Pendleton about the issue and Dr. Pendleton said "Well, I tell you what Ms. Cheevis. I'm going to try to find you somewhere to move." He had called the people at Trador. I had never considered moving there a day in my life, because I had heard that they do credit checks, they do background checks, that they are very strict about the people that move there. So, I had never even, I

mean, I just passed by and looked the other way, because I knew that I could never move there. So, one day, I had got a call, I was living with another friend girl, which I had lived with all my friends, me and my kids. And I had three kids and was pregnant. Ms. Darlene from Trador had called me and I had explained to her my situation. She said that Dr. Pendleton had gave her a call and you know they had told her that I didn't have anywhere to live. She asked me "well, would you be interested in a one bedroom apartment?", like that. I'm like yeah, of course, you know me in my situation, I'm taking a one room apartment, like I told them today. So, I'm just here to let y'all know that there are people out there that do need housing, like myself. I have came in contact with so many people that is looking for houses and I refer them to come over there because you know, there are people out there that can help you, like Mr. Miller and the people that work with Trador like they helped me. And what else I had to say, I'm not real good speaking in front of people, but I just say that because I feel like that people need houses. And I guess that's why they asked me to speak today, because I was one of them that was homeless and I needed a house and thanks to them, I do have a house now, somewhere to call my own. And the shelters are full of people, because I've stayed in all of them. The shelters are full of people who need apartments and places to live along with their kids. So, if y'all go for this, I think that it would be good. So, thank you.

Mr. Turrentine: (3104 Breard St., Monroe, LA) Thank you for allowing me the opportunity. We've been over this several times. I think that the meat of the matter here is that the property that I'm buying is zoned properly for what we're doing. We have asked for no variances from the City. It's R-1-D, Residential Zoning. We meet every requirement. This land and the owner of this land has owned it for over 50 years. Nobody has beat his door down to come and develop this thing. We've come in with a program in place to develop single family homes there and just ask that we get our legal right which is to develop the property in which it was intended to be developed. As far as you guys have never disapproved a subdivision, I think one of the folks mentioned that y'all disapproved a subdivision last year, that's inaccurate. You did in fact issue a resolution of support or maybe that's what they were talking about, I don't know. You know as far as the track, I gotta tell ya and for these people, I really apologize for any convenience that our construction may be causing them. We are required to take, by the City, to take our sewer through the park. We've (unclear) a lot of that, there were some areas that where the track was damaged and will be repaired. When I went out there today to look at it, I'm going to try to expedite process and minimize this inconvenience for these folks. You know on the way here, I'm from Monroe, the highway is under construction. I-20 is under construction, and it's awfully inconvenient when I leave here about 5 and the traffic is backed up all the way, you know it takes us about 20 minutes to get through a two mile area. But you know, it's just one of those inconveniences that we have to go through when there is construction going on. And I saw the photographs that the gentleman showed and I'm going to look into that immediately to see what we can do to minimize that. But you know progress goes on, and we think we have a good program and Mr. Miller don't get mad at me for some of the supporters here, we may have some housing for them too. So, anyway thank you very much.

Councilman Carmody: I know that this is our second time around to hear the same sides of this, but one thing that I seemed to pick up on by the neighbors was their concern about - -they used the term "predatory lending practice". The idea that you would do the

development with an opportunity for someone to lease a single family residence for a 15 year period with an option that at the end of that term to purchase it. Is this a program that was established by the Louisiana Housing Authority?

Mr. Turrentine: Yes, I'll be honest with you, I'm not sure what predatory lending is, I think I first heard of it here from Ms. McCulloch. What is that, could you explain that to me?

Councilman Carmody: I can explain what my understanding of that would be. It would be in essence taking advantage of people, who because of (unclear) will pay an absorbent fee, or use an interest rate to be provided a service. I'm not making a comment on that I'm just trying to establish. This is a program you are utilizing that was set up by the Louisiana Housing Authority. Is that correct?

Mr. Turrentine: It was in a Housing Financing Agency, that's correct.

Councilman Carmody: Okay.

Mr. Turrentine: I don't think this falls within the predatory lending.

Councilman Carmody: Okay, and again I didn't mean to jump off on that. I'm just trying to find out though, are there other programs that are available to the developers that have a shorter term than a 15-year period?

Mr. Turrentine: I'm not sure.

Councilman Carmody: Okay.

Mr. Turrentine: I do know that this property has been there for 50 years undeveloped, and we have a program.

Councilman Carmody: Okay, thank you, sir.

Mr. Turrentine: Thank you.

Mr. Rogers (*820 Jordan Street Ste. 400*): And Mr. Chairman, Mr. Mayor, and Council Members, I'm here to speak in favor of Mr. Travis Miller proposed multi-family housing development Cambridge Court. I serve Mr. Miller as his insurance agent, and I personally inspect all of his properties throughout Louisiana and Texas. Mr. Miller constructs quality properties to house the working, poor and single parents; as well as the handicapped. His properties are built to last, they are pleasing to the eye and they offer opportunities that are often unavailable to those who need the most. Mr. Miller's investment in revitalizing transition areas is often a catalyst for further redevelopment in many areas that are forgotten. And his onsite managers are trained professionals and the environment at Mr. Miller's properties is warm, clean, and inviting. At a time when communities rigorously pursue economic development opportunities, from all points of the compass, I'm actually encouraged that we have a local business owner who is seeking to invest in our community. Where there are people, new businesses will follow, and I'm sympathetic to business concerns, and traffic concerns, every time I drive down Line Avenue, that four-lane road on a very narrow track through many houses, I think about things like that. But this is a good location, and I believe that when Mr. Miller further develops this that there will be other economic development that follows. I heard you support Mr. Miller's proposal, it's needed, it will benefit the community at large, and it will serve many who will need affordable housing. Thank you.

Carolyn Tanner (*6141 Creswell*): I'm also here to speak in opposition to the recent division in Case # S-19-04. Mr. Love, is on a board and had to attend a board meeting, that's why he left. He left his comments with me, and I would like to read those into the record if possible. Mr. Love lives at 6203 Creswell, which is just a few houses down from Ms. Pettit's property, and he was going to speak today on behalf of the 90 plus people who

signed the petition in opposition to this re-subdivision efforts. We do have a few of those people in the audience today and I would ask that they stand if they are still here? We had a few of them that had to have left also. Some of the opponents like himself, opposed the re-subdivision primarily because of concerns about the increased risk of flooding that would occur if the house is built on this lot. While Ms. Pettit might be sensitive to these concerns because she has experienced flooding on the property, she may not be the one to build on the property. A majority of the other people signing the petition also opposed the re-subdivision on the grounds that it might not be compatible with the character of the neighborhood. It's hard for him to understand how the voices of over 90 plus people who signed this petition to be overruled by the voice of one individual. These people are clearly saying that they don't want this approved in their neighborhood and they would hope that their voices would not be ignored. Only one person is better off if the re-subdivision is approved, at least 90 other people hope that this would not be approved. If the re-subdivision is not approved, then Ms. Pettit is in the same position she's in now, her position improves or stays the same, in no case does it worsen. On behalf of more than 90 people that oppose the re-subdivision, he would ask that you overturn the decision of the MPC and not allow the decision to stand. That is also our position as well. Thank you.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you, Ms. Tanner if you would fill out one of the speakers form.

Ms. Tanner: Thank you.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Arthur Lee Houston.

Mr. Houston: Good Afternoon.

Councilman Jackson: Just one second please.

Mr. Houston: Okay.

Councilman Jackson: Let me ask a question to – I have two forms for you, Mr. Houston, and it seems as if that your comments may not be on anything that's on the agenda.

Mr. Houston: No.

Councilman Jackson: Okay, let me ask you, at this time we only receive public comments on items that are on the agenda.

Mr. Houston: Okay.

Councilman Jackson: And we have a section in our agenda later for comments that have nothing to do with those things on the agenda. So if you will be patient, we'll get to that.

Mr. Houston: Yes sir.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you.

Mr. Houston: Thank you.

Mr. Bowman: (3833 Southern Avenue): I'm the land surveyor that prepared the plat, for Brenda Pettit. If I could get the overhead on the copy of the plat, I think you have a copy of it in your packet, that's a little more clearly. I prepared this plat for Brenda, based on two legal descriptions that she provided, the parcel that had been in existence on the tax role for over 30 years. Lot I is a portion of lot 172 and 173 in the old Southern Heights subdivision, and Parcel II was a portion where her house is, which became lot two, the portion of lot 172, 173, and 200, of the same Southern Heights subdivision. We prepared the plat so that she could subdivide the property and comply with the city ordinance to sell property and build across property lines, I think that's ordinance 82-27. And I had serval

meetings through the course of the several meetings with the MPC, to deal with Mr. Strong and the City about the flood zone question. I think on your packet the plats are drawn in pink shows the elevation of one of your flood zones, based on the theme of flood maps, now that's the April – I think 6th of 2000, flood map. That's after the improvements of '90 when the City came through there and approved the (unclear) ditch, or the Pierremont ditch. This one is a map prepared by the City Engineer's office, overlaying flood plan maps with the two tracks, lot one and two. Basically she's trying to subdivide her property based on existing particles that she brought separately. Now as far as the size in relation to adjoining tracks, there are several partials all around that are equivalents, are smaller than these two lots, it's not going to depreciate the area as far as the way the partials are divided. The two tracks directly across the street on Creswell, are almost equal square footage, two lots right across the street. And that's all I have right now, if you have any question, I'll be here for this afternoon (unclear). Any question today?

Councilman Jackson: Any question gentleman?

Mr. Thaxton (*8518 W. Wildernes Way*): I'm here on behalf of the partnership, which is actually the land owner of the project on which Cambridge Court is to be built, it's the matter before you on a zoning matter. I genuinely appreciate the opportunity and privilege to be able to speak, and I promise you I won't abuse the time limit by any means. There are five facts I'd like to bring to your attention. I've remained silent on behalf of the property owner, but the last time we met there were some things brought up that I think need to be pointed out. The first fact is that this particular tract of land is not in the Hunter Industrial Center. I have a plat from the clerk of court, (unclear) this land is clearly to the north, the representation that this land is in the Industrial Park is simply not correct. Secondly, although there are statements that were made the last time, and to some extent referred to this time, about crime in the area. There simply are no statistics that crime has increased as a result of these developments and the citizens who live in them, if there were I assure you, you would have first statistics. The third is for a letter of support, I received a copy of it, it was apparently delivered to you dated July 27th, 2004, about the question of rather or not there was or was not support, you have the letters, you have both sets of letters. I certainly trust you to make the judgement call on those, and whether a corporation flexes its muscles to try to undo something that's done is something for you to certainly verify and weigh the credit ability of. The true test here is not a single individual, not a single true individual, has come forward in opposition to this particular development. There are corporations, there are landowners, but not the individual people who are affected by this, I suggest to you, it's the true age old problem, perhaps someone should just approved for it, and when we crew up of the haves and the have nots, I don't report to represent either side, I am here on behalf of a client, and I represent that client and I intend to do the best I can for that client. It's entrusted to you to represent the people, of the City of Shreveport, and we trusted you to make the right decision, and well of course abide by, and thank you, very much for your time, and your attention.

CONSENT AGENDA LEGISLATION

TO INTRODUCE RESOLUTIONS AND ORDINANCES:

RESOLUTIONS: None.

ORDINANCES: None.

TO ADOPT RESOLUTIONS AND ORDINANCES:

RESOLUTIONS:

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

RESOLUTION NO. 161 OF 2004

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE INSTITUTION OF EXPROPRIATION PROCEEDINGS AGAINST CERTAIN DESCRIBED PROPERTY WITHIN THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT IN CONNECTION WITH THE TURN LANE @ FAIRFIELD AND PIERREMONT PROJECT, PROJECT NO. 01C022, PARCEL NO: R-11, AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport has developed the **Turn Lane @ Fairfield and Pierremont** Project, Project No. **01C022**; and

WHEREAS, the property rights described in the legal description, and more fully shown on the plat map marked as Exhibit "A" attached hereto, is situated in said development; and

WHEREAS, all attempts to amicably acquire fee title to the property comprising Parcel No: R-8 have failed; and

WHEREAS, public necessity dictates that these property rights be owned by and subject to the use by the City of Shreveport.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened, that the expropriation of this property is necessary for the public interest; therefore, the City Attorney be and he is hereby authorized to institute expropriation proceedings against the owners of record, as they might appear at the time of filing suit, of the property described in Exhibit "A" attached hereto as Parcel No: R-11, to be acquired in fee title.

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.

ORDINANCES: None

REGULAR AGENDA LEGISLATION:

RESOLUTIONS:

The Clerk read the Resolution by title:

Councilman Lester: Yes, Mr. Chairman. I would like to postpone action on items 139, 140, 141 subject to the conversation that we had at work session on yesterday.

1. Resolution No. 139 of 2004. A resolution authorizing the Mayor to execute an agreement with W. G. Yates & Sons Construction Company relative to Fair Share requirements and penalties and otherwise to provide with respect thereto.

2. Resolution No. 140 of 2004. A resolution authorizing the Mayor to execute an agreement with SMG relative to Fair Share requirements and penalties, and otherwise to provide with respect thereto.
3. Resolution No. 141 of 2004. A resolution urging and requesting the Convention Center Hotel Authority to execute an agreement with HRI relative to Fair Share requirements and penalties and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Carmody on the postponing of 139, 140, 141. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

RESOLUTION OF 155 2004

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO ACCEPT A DONATION FROM U.S. SMOKELESS TOBACCO COMPANY AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO

WHEREAS, the U.S. Smokeless Tobacco Company has offered to donate a John Deere Gator Trail Utility Vehicle to the Shreveport Fire Department for use as a Search and Rescue Vehicle; and,

WHEREAS, the vehicle is valued at seven thousand nine hundred and ninety six dollars (\$7,996.00); and,

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

THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due regular and legal session convened, that the Mayor be and is hereby authorized to accept the donation of property referenced herein and execute any necessary documents to complete the donation, effective July 27, 2004, substantially the same as the document filed in the Office of the Clerk of Council on July 13, 2004.

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

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

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

5. Resolution No. 156 of 2004: A resolutin authorizing the Mayor to execute a professional services agreement between Commerce Street Ventures, LLC and the City of Shreveport and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Councilman Walford: I would ask for a postponement on this.

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

RESOLUTION NO. 157 OF 2004

A RESOLUTION RATIFYING THE WAIVER OF BUILDING PERMIT FEES AND THE DONATION OF BUILDING MATERIALS AND SUPPLIES TO 12 QUALIFIED LOW INCOME HOMEOWNERS IN THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE 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 19 and July 23, 2004; and

WHEREAS, all persons assisted by World Changers will be low to moderate income homeowners residing in the Mooretown, Allendale, Caddo Heights, Hollywood, Martin Luther King, Sunset Acres, Werner Park and/or Queensborough areas 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 the waiver of building permit

fees to paint and/or repair 12 homes by World Changers Ministries between July 19 and July 23, 2004 is hereby ratified.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City of Shreveport is hereby authorized to donate materials and/or supplies to the 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 on 157 to adopt. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: recognize Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

RESOLUTION NO. 158 OF 2004

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

WHEREAS, the Purchasing Agent, after consultation with various department heads, has determined that certain supplies, materials, equipment, and vehicles as shown in Exhibits A & B (attached) hereto are surplus, obsolete, or unusable for present and future City needs; and

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

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, equipment, and vehicles described in Exhibits A & B 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, equipment, and vehicles described in Exhibits A & B 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, equipment and vehicles described in Exhibits A & B 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 Lester for adoption.

Councilman Jackson: Excuse me, gentleman, before I recognize any action on 158. It was an oversight on my part, as Chair, seeming that there was another request to speak, from a lady who was here. So we –

Councilman Walford: Mr. Chairman, if you need a motion – I would make a motion that we continue to vote on this item, and then suspend the rules to take the public comment.

Councilman Jackson: Let me, we want take a vote. I don't recognize the motion on that. We can vote on this right here, I don't think we will need a motion to go on and vote on this.

Councilman Walford: Right, we have a motion on the floor, and then I will give you a motion to suspend the rules, if you like.

Councilman Jackson: Right, let me recognize the motion, then I had a motion from – I don't know who made the motion.

Councilman Walford: I don't either.

Councilman Green: From me.

Councilman Lester: Right, and I seconded the motion.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Lester to adopt.

Councilman Jackson: The point I was making, is that I hadn't recognize the motion yet. Any question?

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

Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Walford to suspend the rules to allow the one speaker who was omitted to speak. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: recognize Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

Councilman Jackson: Please accept my apology for that oversight.

Julia Joffrion (6031 Dillingham Ave.) And I'm speaking about the zoning appeal, as (inaudible) subdivision and property in Pierremont. It isn't exactly a subdivision, it's a piece of property which originally was brought without that lot in that neighborhood meaning years and (inaudible) couple of years. I've been in the neighborhood for many years, and I am very familiar with the property of Brenda Kraak Pettit. I strongly support the favorable vote of the MPC, to recognize these existing petition, this would be to build a house on the undeveloped lot, which has been her hope and plan forever. The petition, signed by many people in the neighborhood (and not by myself), affect people or do not affect people because they live on widely divergent streets, I'm not sure everyone in the 90 people signed the petition, knew which piece of property it was and who owned it. Brenda has always been remarkable, I have known Brenda's blossoms and keeping it beautiful – yard and a beautiful piece of property, aside from that and perhaps they knew or did not know whose property it was and perhaps may or may not have made a difference in signing the petition. I, myself fell that since the property was brought originally without the lot and the lot was a separate piece of property at that time, it would be fair to consider it the (inaudible). Thank you.

RESOLUTION NO 159 2004

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO EXECUTE A COOPERATIVE ENDEAVOR AGREEMENT WITH THE CENTRAL TRADES AND LABOR COUNCIL OF SHREVEPORT AND VICINITY, AFL-CIO RELATIVE TO HOLDING THE UNION-INDUSTRIES, TRADES & SERVICE SHOW IN SHREVEPORT, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the Central Trades and Labor Council of Shreveport and Vicinity, AFL-CIO proposes to hold it's Union-Industries, Trades & Service Show ("Show") in Shreveport on Labor Day, Monday, September 6, 2004 from 10:00 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. in consideration of the City providing the use of L. Calhoun Allen Exposition Hall for the Conference at no cost; and

WHEREAS, approximately 15,000 persons will attend the show including 700 out-of-town overnight visitors staying for two to three nights; and

WHEREAS, according to the Bureau the 6,000 persons in attendance will generate approximately \$28,250 in sales and hotel-motel taxes for the City of Shreveport, and provide an economic impact of approximately \$258,909 for the City; and

WHEREAS, the Shreveport-Bossier Convention and Tourist Bureau is providing in-kind assistance of \$1,500 and has agreed to pay \$500.00 of the fee for the use of Expo Hall for this event; and

WHEREAS, the Show will provide an economic benefit to Shreveport and said activity constitutes a public purpose, and

WHEREAS, it is in the economic interest of the City of Shreveport to contract with Central Trades and Labor Council of Shreveport and Vicinity, AFL-CIO to hold it's Show in Shreveport and, to provide the use of the L. Calhoun Allen Exposition Hall at no cost in consideration of the economic benefit the event will provide the City of Shreveport and the merchants and citizens of the City.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, regular, and legal session convened that the Mayor of the City of

Shreveport is authorized to execute an agreement with the Central Trades and Labor Council of Shreveport and Vicinity, AFL-CIO, substantially in accordance with the draft agreement filed in the Office of the Clerk of Council on July 13, 2004.

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 Walford, seconded by Councilman Lester to adopt. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Green, and Jackson. 6. Nays: Councilman Hogan. 1.

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Chair.

Councilman Jackson: Yes sir.

Councilman Hogan: Pardon me, I hit the no vote and meant to hit the yes vote on that. Could you maybe record it for the record please?

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Clerk, would you make sure that for the record, that Councils voted seven for and none against on resolution 159.

(Requested change of vote on resolution 159)

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

Councilman Hogan: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

RESOLUTION NO. 160 OF 2004

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, 2004 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2005 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, 2004 through June 30, 2005 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 (7 point);

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

All other (non-required) ads in the Classified Section - \$1.66 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, 2004 and ending June 30, 2005 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 Carmody, seconded by Councilman Walford to adopt. Motion passed by the following votes: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

10. Resolution No. 162 of 2004. A resolution stating the City of Shreveport's endorsement of Certained Corp., Roofing Products group to participate in the benefits of the Louisiana Quality Jobs Program and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

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

11. Resolution No. 163 of 2004. A resolution directing the Chief Administrative Officer and the Director of Finance to issue a request for proposals to build and operate a full service hotel or a limited service hotel adjacent to the new Convention Center; to widely advertise and circulate the request for proposals, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

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

Councilman Jackson: I have a question, and I think this is Councilman – it doesn't have a name, but I assume this was Councilman Gibson. Is that correct?

Councilman Gibson: That's correct.

Councilman Jackson: Early in the meeting, Councilman Gibson alluded to the fact the last time that this was I think the term was widely published to the hotel community or those who are in hotel development community was 2000. Is that correct?

Councilman Gibson: That's correct, Mr. Chair. And I did not use those words, but –

Councilman Jackson: I'm sorry.

Councilman Gibson: If given the opportunity, I would like to expand on it.

Councilman Jackson: Well I think you understand what I'm saying. I'm certainly not trying to put words in your mouth, accept my apology. I guess my question to you then is we talked about the last time they went out 2000. Have we seen a list, and was that list exhausted? And maybe the administration can answer this question, Councilman Gibson. Have we seen a listing and was the list that you all used, I don't know who you sent it out to, but Mr. Gibson alluded to a community, well I'm sorry, a hotel industry on those who develop – and I guess would be the appropriate group of folks, who would get a RFP for those who develop hotels or who just develop in general, or anybody who would have an interest? Who did you mail to or did you mail?

Mayor Hightower: Yeah, we submitted a list to over 25 companies that either had expressed an interest or we thought maybe be interested back in 2000. Since that time we've talked to a number of others that have come forward after hearing of the discussion, or hearing of the RFP. And I think, Mr. Antee explained this several months ago, in the Convention Center Hotel Report, that we had no takers for the full service hotel, nobody that would put up their money and build the hotel. We had two developers step forward, HRI being one, another out of Dallas that was connected with the Wyndham chain. We ultimately selected HRI, in the Hilton chain out of New Orleans versus Garfield, and the Wyndham chain out of Dallas, and since then entered into a contract with the HRI and the Hilton Corporation developer hotel. As Mr. Antee said a few minutes ago, our doors still wide open. If there is somebody who wants to come to us, as a matter a fact last week, I met with a man that wanted to put forth a proposal. I'm not real sure that he ultimately will but he did inquire, we did meet, we did tell him what we had on the way; that we wanted a full service hotel, we wanted a minimum of 300 rooms, we gave him all the incentives given from 2000 to him. Whether he'll propose or not, you know, I don't know but I don't suspect that he will, so our door is open. And if there is somebody that wants to come and take this headache of building a 300 room or 500 room hotel to help support our Convention Center, off of our hands where we can get about more business of the City, you know, during the remainder of my term, believe me, I welcome that. I mean that's the last thing that we want to do is another big construction project, if we can get the private sector to do. So if there is anyone that's talked to anyone that wants to build a full service, minimum 300 room convention style hotel, please have them contact me, my office, a member of the trust, you know, we will certainly entertain that. We want to get the hotel built, we know it's a necessity, I think the majority of this community knows that it's a necessity, but the same time, I've got a real problem with us going out looking for a limited service hotel of substandard quality when it comes to convention (inaudible) recruitment. I don't think we do ourselves any good by that, as a matter fact, we may do ourselves some harm by that.

Councilman Jackson: Well, let me tell you a couple of reasons that I asked. We got a motion and a seconded on it, but as we talked about it on yesterday, my concern is that this particular 163 says; full service hotel or limited service. And I think we either know

what we need or we don't, because a limited service hotel could in fact (if in fact I'm interrupted corrected), would be just that a limited service hotel, which would imply the Holiday Inn Express, and all those kinds of folk who are in limited services. And I thought that at least before we move forward with accepting RFP's and wasting paper that we need to know what we are asking for. And if we are going to ask for a limited service hotel I think it takes us way out of the boundaries of any conversation that we've been ever having. And we may get 30 of those and it may look like a success on the front, and say well we getting RFP's from everywhere, but it's really just we'll be smoking mirrors. Because I don't know about the council but I can only speak for myself, and when I speak I don't purport to speak for everybody on the council, I'm speaking for myself. I'm certainly not a supporter of a limited service hotel, because we don't have a limited service Convention Center, if we did then we need a limited service hotel. We got a full service Convention Center, and we can't go out marketing, you know, a Toyota with a Mercedes grill.

Mayor Hightower: And that's true.

Councilman Jackson: We have to be able to say that we are going to go full service. If we are going to go full service we have to go full service, and that's one of my chief concerns. Secondly, throughout this whole conversation many of us have heard people talking, even some of my colleagues here have said that there are no takers out there because everything has changed since 9-11. Well if in fact this went out in 2000, and in 2000 there were no takers, 2000 if I'm not mistaken was before 9-11. If there were no takers before 9-11 and if the climate has changed since 9-11, I mean – what I would just look for is some intellectual, rational as to why in the last six months, people something has changed in the marketplace that would bring people to the table now, more than they were six months ago. Because six months ago we were convinced that we had to do it, and I think all of us would prefer not to do it, but we were convinced that we had to do it as a City, because there were no takers. And I guess, you know, my third question, to the Administration, wherever else it may be. If we have a contract in place right now with HRI and SMG, or whoever the case may be, HRI I believe it is, how does this RFP process change in relationship with them?

Mayor Hightower: Mr. Chairman, I think it almost goes back to the conversation that we had yesterday, Mr. Lester brought forward; asking the City to go back and talk to the contractors and tell them to change the contract after it had been awarded to them, you know, I think it's awful tough to do. In this situation, you know, we have a contract; are they're cancellation clauses in it, there are, they're expensive, so I am not going to say that it can't be done. And, you know, again, if someone wants to come forward, as you stated after 9-11, when all the opponents tell us that the market's changed, and the numbers are down, and there's no way this thing will work, how they've changed over night too now? Apparently, we may have a glut of people out there wanting to bid, you know, it's amazing to me. But again, if someone is out there that wants to come forward, you know, we don't have to go waste 30 days or 60 days, they can call me in the morning. We will sit with them, I don't think we are going to have a lot of competition here. We'll sit with them and hopefully work out a deal, access it against any cancellation penalty, and you know, given 52 million or 40 million of our money, versus someone coming in and build it. We will come up with the money to pay a cancellation fee, that want get in the way, although I think in fairness the Council should know that it is there. But again, we would welcome any opportunity, any developer that can come in and certainly prove to us, and to the Council,

that they have the wear with all the come in, and put their money down, and build us a 300-room full service hotel. Whether it be 50 million or 150 million is no substance to me at that point, what we want is the final product. And we know that since 911 and before 911, we had no takers, on that particular product. If we want to build a limited service hotel, you know, we could have done that started that probably been under construction with that a long time ago, with mostly someone else money. But I don't think anybody in the community, as you said, see us building a limited service Convention Center to go with a limited service hotel, we're just the opposite of that. In fact, even the Hotel Motel Association, in a letter that they wrote to me, as late as a couple a weeks ago, acknowledge that we need a full service hotel to connect to our Convention Center.

Councilman Jackson: Well, my point was just interested in voicing my concerns, because we are at a point of voting about a limited service hotel, cannot and I certainly will not support asking for a RFP on a limited service hotel. If that's not what we really want, you know, again I see it as, and again I direct this to Councilman Gibson, because he has submitted this that to me, it's turning out to a waste of time, if it's not something that we are going to do. And to me, it appears to be a scenario where we could go and do it. But it would be exercise of utility, if in fact it is not this council, and I believe that if this council votes on this and suggest that we will send out RFP for a limited service hotel, that we brought into being open to a limited service hotel. So I think that, you know, this vote to me, clarifies the position of the members of this council with regard to what we expect and what we want as a hotel for this Convention Center. Because if we do not really want a limited service hotel then why waste the paper, and waste the time of sending out RFP's for something that we don't really want. It would be in fact, to me again, I use the term smoking mirrors earlier; but I say that to simply suggest that if we don't want it why would we send out RFP's for something that we don't want. And, aside from that I'm not against the whole RFP process, if Councilman Gibson thinks that's the most prudent way to do it, I don't have any argument with that. My argument is with the idea A., I don't want to waste time, because if in fact this was done before 9-11 and there were no takers, then it would prudent to just assume since we also gauge the water since then that their will not be takers after 9-11. Given that, if we still feel like we want to go forward, I can still be flexible on that, but not to put out a RFP for something that we don't want. Councilman Gibson.

Councilman Gibson: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Historically, this Council defers to the person who offers the bill to have first say, I guess that went out the window here.

Councilman Jackson: Well, let me say this.

Councilman Gibson: Excuse me, I've got the floor, Mr. Chair.

Councilman Jackson: Well, let me say this.

Councilman Gibson: I've got the floor, Mr. Chair, so I will give it back to you when I'm finished in ten minutes. First of all, for the Administration, did you put out a formal RFP in 2000, was there a formal RFP sent out by the City of Shreveport, yes or no?

Mayor Hightower: The RFP that we sent out, was sent out by the Economic Development department.

Councilman Gibson: A formal RFP, like what we send out for professional services on other services that we deal with the City of Shreveport.

Mayor Hightower: I'm going to tell you, just like you told Mr. Jackson, if you'll let me finish, then I will be glad to. What we did, is we had the Economic Development Director send out RFP's on city letterhead, to 25 different prospects, companies, including; Hilton,

Sheraton, Starwood – I think they're in your packet.

Councilman Gibson: Yes, I got it.

Mayor Hightower: We received, as I stated in my earlier comments, no positive response from any of those that we sent to. We also again, verbally talked to at least two local hotel here, to ask about their interest as well, and received no response from those either. We did not send out through the Purchasing department a formal request, had we received interest from any of the 25, or at least more than one of the 25 that we sent our letters of request to, then we would have called them in and done the whole formal request (I don't want to call it dog and pony show), but essentially, we would have taken proposals and tried to pick the best one. But again, we went out and tested the water with a letter from the City of Shreveport, and received again, zero response with the exception of the two that I submitted to you earlier; HRI and Garfield out of Dallas. Furthermore, the trust could actually go out, and just select someone, we didn't choose to do that via vote of the trust or at least a consideration by the trust to send out to see what we could do as far as solicitation goes. So to answer your question, did we go through a formal, through the Purchasing department. We did not.

Councilman Gibson: Okay.

Mayor Hightower: But I think we did do a due diligence, by sending out 25 –

Councilman Gibson: I haven't questioned that Mr. Mayor. The letter that you sent on April 10th, 2000 it reads; the City of Shreveport is currently in the process of planning a \$85 million state of the art Convention Center project. Is that what we are talking in terms of solicitation due diligence, the letter that the Council has? This was addressed to American Executive management, Rick Haggerman, Overland Park Canvas. Let's say it is, other projects include; \$25 million Entertainment District, \$6.5 million River Walk project, and a \$240 million Casino Hotel, now is the time for your company to consider Shreveport. In a RFP process, you would have said we are looking specifically for this particular project to happen, the key words I see in here says; is currently in the process of planning. If I was a hotelier, I would probably say yeah, I would give some inquiry, but I'm not going to go that far until I know exactly what's going on. Which you say here later on that we are pleased to announce the opportunity to develop a 300 room headquarter hotel, in association with the City's new Convention Center. The Center is now in design and the sell of bonds if approved, we go on to say that we expect to start that project in 2000, with completion in 2003. My administration, already has identified operators, which we believe have credentials in marker recognition necessary for the project, before negotiation with the developers began, we wish to meet with you and other operators, and developers from across the country to gain market informed understanding of the deal points. This letter was signed by you, not by (inaudible), but by you and I'm suggesting for this RFP process, that is not a delay tactic, actually it would actually complement what we are trying to do in the fact that whether – and the key words in the legislation, gentleman, is full service or a limited service, if we get proposal from full service or limited service, I've heard this administration say, if they go to the Barn Market, and the presentation that they make isn't good enough, I've even heard this Mayor tell me that by God if we got to put Motel 6 out there, we'll do it. Well, I think that we need to be in a position to look at all options because at this point and time, the way I see it is we are being asked to guarantee a \$52 million project without any idea of how we are going to pay for it, if we default, or if sell this hotel. And I got news for the audience, we don't have \$52 million to pay back and I got news for

you too, services will be cut if that project goes south and that's why we are having some serious discussions up here. It is not to say that this administration, and I have applauded this administration time and time again for their due diligences, but when they come before this body and ask for our vote, to guarantee \$52 million, and that's what's been on the table up to this point, now we may have two more proposals coming from them in the near future. I think that this is not a delayed tactic, Councilman Jackson.

Councilman Jackson: I didn't say it was a delay.

Councilman Gibson: I'm saying that I don't think it is that's not what my intent was. It is to say, we got a few so called independent feasibility study, that is in the process of taking place right now, while that's going on, since April of 2000, a lot of time has pasted that there could be some interested parties. That if we put an official RFP out, through the normal channels that go out throughout this country, we might be in fact amazed that we might have a response. And if that was the case, it would be sure be a lot less than \$52 million guarantee, and they also according the financial people that I have talked to say, that with an independent feasibility study, and a RFP going out there; let's say Radisson comes to the table and say, you know what, we'll throw \$30 million on the table, but here's what our expectation of the City of Shreveport is. That's far less than a \$52 million guarantee, and that is what we are talking about here, because again, I will remind this body in 2002, a similar proposal was put on the table with the Entertainment District, with great intention, with great intention for \$5 million of which that money could have been used for redevelopment of the inner city neighborhoods. And we lost that money, we will never get it back, and this is ten times that amount which is going to hurt this City in the long run. And again, you are talking to somebody that pro-construction that represents the construction community, but not at the risk of the future of this community. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Councilman Jackson: Councilman Green.

Councilman Green: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Two weeks ago we voted for a feasibility study, my question is, did we get the study back yet?

Councilman Walford: We had our first meeting today.

Councilman Green: And I guess, my brain is slow, if in fact we voted to get a feasibility study as to whether or not we need a hotel, and that study is not back, nor have we selected a company consultant to do the study. If we vote on this and the feasibility study, once we pay them the money, because they already got – they put our address on some paper with whatever they want to say, what if the study comes back that we don't need one? We got this that says, directing the Chief Administrative Officer and Director of Finance to issue a request for proposal to build an operating full service hotel or a limited service hotel adjacent to the new Convention Center, to widely advertise and circulate the request for the proposals, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. We are directing them to say send this out and tell them that we are ready, but what if this study comes back and say, we don't need it, one, we are about to spend \$40 thousand plus to say, can you tell us if we need? Today, we are saying you send this out and tell them that we are ready to build it. Now unless we are already know how to study is coming back, and we haven't got nobody yet because once that study comes back, then I plan to offer a resolution to get somebody to study the study that's been studied. But unless we already know how it's going, how do we direct that Administrative Officer and the Director of Finance to say we ready to get either one of these, I don't think – Mike I listened to you, I'm not asking for your

comment after I finish with my ten minutes, then you can have another ten minutes. But I don't understand how do we do this two weeks later and we just had the first meeting for the study today. And if somebody can help me to understand that I would be ready, now here again my question is ...Did we get the study back? The answer is, no. How do we know how it's going to come back, now who can tell me that, that you already know that it is going to come back that we need the hotel, and if we know that today, why didn't we know that two weeks ago? Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you. Let me just say since I raised the initial question, that my concerns have not been addressed. Councilman Gibson, let me apologize if what you thought was me interrupting you, but the fact that sometimes I believe we get confused that the fact we are on TV doesn't make this a show. Which means we don't have starring roles, and so nobody has to be the star, we are supposed to work together, my effort in asking the question was in an effort to work together. Councilman Green, in my opinion has just said something that I think to be very important. And I think the only thing that I can do it is use my own intuition, and to use my own rational to suggest that since this wasn't on the agenda two weeks ago, that as you referred to the so-called feasibility study, which was as I appreciate it as well, an idea that reached this agenda by your initiation, didn't turn out the way I think exactly you wanted it to. And too, as I see it every two weeks there's something different, that acts as a counter strategy, because it would seem that Councilman Green makes sense, that if we have said that we are going to go a feasibility study and as you intimated the purpose for doing so was to find out whether or not we need pull back off this thing or keep going because we are moving forward with the \$52 million and so on and so forth, then we come back with this. My question was not about that, my question was about something that was never addressed. Do we in fact know what we want, I don't care if the administration said that they put a session and session hotel down there, that's not my point? The point is not what the Mayor wants, the point is what we want, what we as individuals want. That don't have to be the same thing, my question and my concern was I spoke. (Already speaking) that I as an individual Councilman, do not support the idea of a limited service hotel down at the Riverfront. I know it's within my purview to be able to say that, and I don't purport to speak for everybody else. What I am suggesting is that this that's in front of us says, as if I can quote you, full service or a limited service hotel, and we'll take what we can get to me, is not the right posture, we need to know what we want if we are going to send out an RFP. We ought too quite playing and we ought to quite wasting paper, we either know what we want or we don't know what we want.

If we don't know what want don't send out an RFP, if we do let's do it, and it just seems that there ought to be some logic, some connective logic between a feasibility study, a RFP this whole nine. And it just seems like every two weeks, there's a different change and I'm saying this only to respond to what you are say Councilman Green, I don't know the logic of it. But since it's before us, all I want to say is, the things that are on this screen, this that is before me, to me, puts us in a position of saying, we don't really know. It may be a full service, it may be a limited, we are putting this out there, are we putting it out there so that we can the information when the feasibility study come back, and then we will be ready to roll at that time, I doubt it. I doubt very seriously we are gonna be in (inaudible) to do anything like that, by that time it'll be a pole, you know, it'll be a vote, a referendum, there'll be something different each time this comes up. And I never said it was a stalled tactic, and Councilman Gibson referred to me as this is not a stall in tactic. I never said it's a stall

in tactic, but when I think about TIF legislation this, that – if it looks like a duck and it quacks, sometimes we have to say it is a duck. And I'm suggesting to you that if it is not a stalling tactic, it's illogical in the form that we keep receiving it every two weeks. I'm not giving my comment for your consumption and to decide rather you like it or not, that's just my commentary and I hope that we still possess the right to be giving them – I listen to one every week, I thought maybe I'd give one this week.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Walford.

Councilman Green: Mr. Chair, can I get the answer to my question?

Councilman Jackson: Nobody can answer your question Councilman Green. Councilman Gibson is probably wouldn't mind and we will get back to him and he will be able to explain it. Councilman Walford.

Councilman Walford: I share two thoughts with you Mr. Chairman. One, I think going out and asking for limited service is a mistake. If we don't get a taker on full service, then maybe we need to regroup, but I certainly think we are making a mistake to throw out a either or, and I would have no problem supporting this if the limited service was stricken from it. Second thing, I believe that the so called, I believe it is, feasibility study would be – assuming it comes back and saying what I think it's going to say is that we need a hotel, that it would be a very positive part of what goes out with our RFP's. So my point is this, if there were a substitute motion or an amendment to strike the limited service, I would be glad to support this.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Chair.

Councilman Jackson: Councilman Lester.

Councilman Lester: Thank you. A lot of times we get vilified up here by the media, they assume that if we ask a certain question, or say something that appears to support one person versus another, that we have come under the throws of one particular school versus another. But one thing that I can say from my experience from being up here that we have seven individuals, very strong will with each have our own school of thought and were are not susceptible to the influence of – many times each other, less alone the administration. So let me say that first, I wanted (inaudible) to hear that. Having said that, we need to think this hole process through in a straight line, as it relates to the hotel, if your concern (and as I think it is for each of the seven of us), is before we commit ourselves to \$52 million, do we want to be absolutely sure number one, that this is something that is going to work? Number two it's something that – first of all, something that we need, number two, it is something that is going to work, and number three it should be done the way that it has been proposed. The Administration came to us with a proposal that says that we want, we believe that we should do a Convention Center Hotel and this is the price tag, and this is how we want to pay for it. We had some experts that the Administration brought before us and laid their case. We listened to that and having not made a decision on that; because gentlemen, we still haven't made a decision on the varsity of the City Administration's original proposal to A., do a hotel, B., this is the way we want to pay for it. Councilman Gibson came up with the idea, and I give him credit, and I think we all supported the idea that yes, as a council we need to get an independent third party to look at whether or not A., we need a hotel, B., it should be financed the way that the Administration has said. For some reason we weren't given credit for being independent thinkers, I don't know, I guess Lue does what Lue does. But we decided that yes, that's

something that we wanted to do, and I think that was absolutely prudent. This issue that Councilman Gibson has at this particular time, is not right, this is not the time to decide rather or not you need a RFP, if you followed this thing through in a straight line we have to find out from our independent third party whether or not one, we need a hotel, two, rather the financing source that the Administration has proposed to us is legitimate, and if not it should be done this way. After we have done that then the next question should be if the, you know, survey comes back saying yes you need it, and no you should not pay for it this way or you should pay for it that way, then at that point we should act in terms of putting a RFP on the street. But for us to do that right now, obfuscate the whole need of doing the study, I mean how can you say I know what the study is going to be so I'm going to send a RFP based on a study that I asked you to do, but I haven't gotten a result yet, I mean it presupposes, you know, what the results is going to be and if you know what the result is going to be then why suggest doing an independent third party study in the first place, it just doesn't make sense, it does not flow logically. Second of all, I think that in all fairness to what we have been discussing we have been involved in an apples to apples situation, at least in my mind we have, as it relates to the type of hotel that we want. All the discussions that we have had with the Administration to this point have been for a full service hotel, at no point has the Administration given us a proposal about a limited service hotel. We have said, and the administrations have said, if that doesn't work then there's a possibility, but we still have not dealt with this particular issue right now. I understand where Councilman Gibson is and I agree, we need to be very circumspect before we spend that \$52 million, are we guarantee the \$52 million? And I agree with him that we have made some decisions that have come back to hunt us in the past, but where we are right now today, I think this Council is on the proper track, an independent track to check every I dot, you know, dot every "I" cross every "T" in terms in what the City Administration has proposed to us, this is just – it's too early and it sends the wrong message, clearly because it's not a fair apples to apples situations in terms of what has been on the table. And I would suggest to my colleague that, you know, lets pull this, lets find out what the study says and then once the study – we got some hard numbers then we can – if we wanted to do an RFP let's discuss that at that time. But I don't think we are at that point right now. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Jackson: Just a second, Councilman Carmody, Councilman Hogan any comments? Councilman Gibson.

Councilman Gibson: Thank you, Mr. Chair. In terms of the hard burn with the concerns on the limited side of things, again I have heard the Administration talk about the timing issue. I'm very sensitive to the time also that is why I was interested in putting that in there because again, if you are going to ask for a Request for a Proposal on the street, let's see what's out there. The differences Councilman Green and Councilman Jackson, on a RFP versus feasibility study is I have it in my mind, with the feasibility study when I voted for the feasibility study was to look at the numbers that the expert put together under the Administration's direction, to see whether or not those numbers or feasible to have \$52 million guaranteed to do a hotel, because again if we have an independent group come out there and look at those numbers and give us the worst case and the best case scenario then we as seven City Councilman would represent the very diverse group of citizens in this town could look each one of our constituents in the eye and say we did our due diligence, that's first and far most. Feasibility study for our publically funded hotel, okay, the RFP is

totally different, in the fact that RFP is soliciting the private sector. The private sector with their own money, no involvement, at least at front if they say yes in fact we're looking for \$15 or \$20 million from the City, but we don't know that, because we have never put a Formal Request for a Proposal out there, which is going down a separate track, Councilman Lester in terms of we're asking the private sector to do something versus a proposal, that the Administration put in front of us, that said, we don't have any takers and we've got to go out and finance this thing with guarantees of the citizen's tax payers money. The reason for that, sense of urgency, numbers two it is a private sector the other ones a public sector, a scenario, completely different all together. And at the same time if you get proposals in and again, I am very much receptive to taking if that is a major concern I would ask for a two-week delay, rework the legislation to take the limited hotel out of there to be consistent, but I felt that at the time that we had an opportunity to see what the private sector was all about, that we could ask for full service and limited service to see exactly what we're dealing with, because again, if the proposal that the feasibility study looks at comes back and says, ready to go and we've heard the Administration say, at least Mr. Antee has said, if we go before the Barn Market and they turn thumbs down we got to go back to the drawing board then the clock sets over and we have to start all over again. And again, there was no malicious intent, it was to say if you are going to ask for it lets ask – it's done all the time. You know if we do it with professional service out there and even the construction, we are specking a material A, but you can substitute something else out there. And again, I heard your comments loud and clear, let's not confuse the issue so as a result Mr. Chair, I'd ask for a two-week delay.

Councilman Green: I wasn't through.

Councilman Gibson: A substitute motion.

Councilman Jackson: I have a motion but no seconded.

Councilman Gibson: Oh, I'll be glad to seconded it.

Councilman Green: I was next in line, to speak before your motion.

Councilman Jackson: He offered a motion, we have a motion on the floor –

Councilman Walford: I'll second with him – but he can discuss.

Councilman Jackson: Councilman Walford to delay for two weeks, Councilman Green.

Substitute motion by Councilmen Gibson, seconded by Councilmen Walford to postpone.

Councilman Green: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Councilman Lester we didn't all vote for the feasibility study, I didn't. Even if we delay this two weeks, unless we have the study in hand, the feasibility study that we are going to pay a minimum of, I think of \$40 thousand, that's still not a guarantee as to whether we need one or not. One is how do we, unless we are trying to send a feasibility study folk, whoever we get, a message to say come back with a study that say we need it, then I think we are throwing some tax payers money away, and I don't think that is fair to the tax payers. We have the opportunity to vote up here on the legislation, but I think it's unfair to tax payers to pay for a study and then send a subliminal message that we are sending out RFP's saying that we are ready, I think that's wrong, I don't think that's right. I think that if in fact we were going to do this we should have done it first, if we are going to do a study then I just think the study by an

independent person is not going to be independent because they watching TV just like anybody else, so they already know what to do, and all they got to do it put our name and address on it and send it to us, put it on some pretty nice paper probably the best paper they got and send it to us – get it over at Office Depot on a special, and send it back. But I think we are doing it wrong, but if we are assuming that the study is going to come back stating that we need a hotel then we shouldn't be wasting the tax payer's money on this feasibility study, that's completely wrong. And as I said about the feasibility study, I will vote no on it and I did, if this is delayed for 30 days however it comes back I will still vote on 163, because this is absolutely wrong rather it's in a form of full service, a limited service, until we get the feasibility service study back we don't know if we will need any of the service. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you, you know I think at some point and we can prepare to vote, but at some point we've got to decide what direction we are going. Because in essence what we have before us and I thank Councilman Gibson for clearing it up, in essence what we have is a public sector scenario moving forward spending money for that, and then we have a private sector scenario that we are putting in place, which suggest that we still don't know where we're going, the private sector route or the public sector route. I think if we're not going to do the public sector route and that's the big sticking point, if we think it's in our own conscience, wrong for our constituents the fact that we can't find anybody to do it, don't make it any less wrong, if it's wrong and we feel convicted that it's wrong it's wrong. Now I think we could've placed all that on hold, which means we would not be doing a feasibility study, we could just go out with the RFP and find out who would be interested and do strictly a private sector when we come back from the private sector then if we found nobody then we say, okay we must move forward. But I think doing both of these things at the same time suggest again we're confused and don't know exactly where we as a council want to go, excuse me, and what direction we as a council want to go and my hope is that in two weeks we would have thought through this scenario to find out which way we want to go, because it's just like having full service or limited service it's confused, we don't know which one we want to do. In this case we don't even know how we want to develop a hotel, so I just think it is incumbent upon us to make some decision about what we are supporting, what we are for and move forward on it because I know that if, you know, that I've always been a citizen before I was a Councilman and if the citizen's are like me as a citizen I'm getting tired of listening to this same stuff week in and week out, and there's always a new sticking point, there's always a new problem. I think we ought to fish or cut bait, make our decision and not let this think linger on and with a lot of twist and turns so it's just me I may over simplifying it but I just think we ought to do that.

Mayor Hightower: Mr. Chair.

Councilman Jackson: Mayor Hightower.

Mayor Hightower: Could I comment before we vote?

Councilman Jackson: Yes sir, by the way you are not voting.

Mayor Hightower: Well exactly.

Councilman Carmody: He's out of the state.

Mayor Hightower: Thank goodness.

Councilman Jackson: Go ahead, Mr. Mayor.

Mayor Hightower: What I would like to – I guess reiterate is we've been out in the

marketplace, we've been out there for several years know trying to put this hotel bill together, and we have not been able to find a person in the private sector that wants to pony up their money and do it. We are not afraid of that we welcome that, I want to reemphasize that I would rather see the council if we want to go out for RFP at some point – I think the real decision here Councilman Jackson, you hit it on the head, either you can support the hotel with a City backstop or you can't. And I think that's what it's going to come down to two weeks from now or 22 weeks from now, either you can or you can't. If this Council wants to go back out to the private sector let us reissue letters to every hotelier that we can put together and you can put together, we're happy to do that to request for proposals for interest in building us a full service hotel, we'd love to be out of the business, absolutely love to. What I would rather do is be instructed today to do that versus another two-week delay to push the hotel back while, you know, we try to find something else that we need to go and do. Bottom line is I think everybody at the table, everybody in the City understands we've got to have a hotel to make the Convention Center perform to it's highest standard. And there's no need for us to continue to delay for another two weeks, if the council wants us to do a RFP we'll put the letters together, welcome addresses from each and every one of you and put our own list together and we'll get those out before the end of the week.

Motion denied by the following votes: Nays: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Green, and Jackson. 4. Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Gibson, and Hogan. 3.

Motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Carmody to adopt. Motion denied by the following vote: Nays: Councilman Lester, Walford, Hogan, Green, Jackson. 5. Ayes: Councilmen Carmody and Gibson. 2. Out of the Chamber

12. Resolution No. 164 of 2004: A resolution ratifying the amendment of an intermodal transit facility cooperative endeavor agreement between the City of Shreveport and the Louisiana State University Health Sciences Center, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
13. Resolution No. 151 of 2004. A resolution approving a restoration tax abatement application for 411 Ashley Ridge Blvd., (Formerly TicketMaster) Ashley Ridge Partners, Ltd. (Public Hearing is required) (Not to be adopted prior to August 10)

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, 164 shows on your agenda as something you can adopt today but I believe because it was just introduced and it is ratifying an amendment to an agreement it needs to lay over. So I would ask for a postponement.

Councilman Carmody: One sixty-four and 151.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Lester on postponing 164 and 151. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS:

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Lester to introduce Resolution No. 163A to lay over until the August 10, 2004 meeting. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

1. Resolution No. 163A of 2004: Authorizing a cooperative endeavor agreement with the Caddo Parish School Board relative to the mutual use of facilities, buildings and equipment and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

INTRODUCTION OF ORDINANCES (not to be adopted prior to Aug 10):

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Carmody seconded by Councilman Walford on introduction of ordinances to lay over until the August 10, 2004 meeting. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

1. Ordinance No. 107 of 2004: An ordinance declaring the City's interest in certain adjudicated properties as surplus and otherwise providing with respect thereto. (A/B/D/F, Lester, Walford, Gibson, and Green)
2. Ordinance No. 108 of 2004: An ordinance closing and abandoning the 50' foot-wide Blueberry Lane Adjacent to Lots 27 and 28 in the Southwood Terrace Subdivision located in the SE 1/4 of Section 4 (T16N-R13W), Caddo Parish, Louisiana and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (D/Gibson)
3. Ordinance No. 109 of 2004: An ordinance closing and abandoning the 50' foot-wide Ardyce Lane in the Southern Hills Park Subdivision Unit No. 1 located in the NW 1/4 Section 3 (T16N-R14W), Caddo Parish Louisiana and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
4. Ordinance No. 110 of 2004: An ordinance closing and abandoning the 15' foot-wide Alleyway in Mooretown G.D. Subdivision located in the NE 1/4 of Section 16 (T17N-R14W), Caddo Parish, Louisiana and to otherwise provide with respect thereto. (F/Green)
5. Ordinance No. 111 of 200:ZONING: C-29-02: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on southeast corner of Centenary and Olive Street, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from B-2, neighborhood Business District, to B-2-E, Neighborhood Business extended use district, limited to Auto Repair only, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

6. Ordinance No. 112 of 2004: ZONING C-42-04. An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the northeast corner of north Market and Ravendale Street, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from B-1, Buffer Business District to B-2, neighborhood Business District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
7. Ordinance No. 113 of 2004: ZONING: C-44-04. An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on north side of Egan Street 100 feet west of Nutt Street, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from B-2, Neighborhood Business District, to B-2-E Neighborhood Business Extended Use District limited to a Multi-purpose Center only and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
8. Ordinance No. 114 of 2004: ZONING: C-45-04. An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the west side of Youree Drive 300 feet south of Archer, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, From SPI-3 (B-1) Commercial Corridor Overlay (Buffer Business) District, limited to "One Nail Technician and the Retail Sales of Clothing Accessories & Gifts" only, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
9. Ordinance No. 115 of 2004: ZONING: C-48-04. An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on north side of Summer Grove Drive 500 feet east of Mansfield Road, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from R-1D, Urban, One-Family Residence District to B-2, Neighborhood Business District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
10. Ordinance No. 116 of 2004: ZONING: C-49-04. An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the northwest corner of Valley View and Wyngate, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, From I-1, Light Industry District, to R-2, Suburban, Multi-Family Residence District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
11. Ordinance No. 117 of 2004: ZONING: C-50-04. An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on west side of Broadway, 100 feet south of Murvon Street, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, From B-1, Buffer Business District, to B-1-E, Buffer Business extended use District, limited to Antique Shop only and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

12. Ordinance No. 118 of 2004: ZONING: C-28-04. 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 Wallace Lake Road 700 feet south of Dalton Street, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from R-1, Urban, One family Residence District, to B-1, Buffer Business District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Mr. Thompson: We also added an ordinance to amend ordinance no. 85 of 2004, so that would need to be included.

13. Ordinance No. 119 of 2004. An ordinance to amend ordinance Number 85 of 2004 with regard to the riverview project; Authorizing the Mayor to execute a Right-of-Entry agreement with the United States of America, through the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers relative to the project; and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Councilman Carmody: My motion is inclusive of that.

Councilman Walford: As is my seconded.

ORDINANCES ON SECOND READING AND FINAL PASSAGE

1. Ordinance No. 78 of 2004: Amending certain provisions of Article VIII of Chapter 2 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport relative to the Fair Share Program for Equal Business Opportunity.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Chairman. I'd offer to withdraw number 78.

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

Mr. Thompson: And I believe there's one amendment.

Councilman Carmody: No sir, I think that we are off the agenda. You have missed a couple of –

Councilman Jackson: 94 is down.

Councilman Carmody: Yeah, we should be at 101, sir.

Councilman Lester: Right, 101.

Councilman Jackson: 78, then 101.

Councilman Carmody: He just went through 78.

Councilman Jackson: Right.

Councilman Carmody: We should be at 101.

Councilman Jackson: Yeah, 101.

4. Ordinance No. 101 of 2004: Amending Chapter 66 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport relative to Personnel and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Chairman, I have an amendment to 101 that I am having passed out to the Council. I'd like to move adoption of the amendment, if I can get a second I will explain it.

Motion by Councilman Lester seconded by Councilman Gibson to adopt the amendment.

Councilman Lester: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Item 101, is an ordinance that will allow City Personnel to have employee representation of their own choosing. That's one of the findings that came out of one of our most recent study from the employee committee, the personnel committee. I have offered an amendment no. one that strikes the bottom portion of paragraph B. There was some discussion that we had about that at work session, and I have struck that provision that would have made a gray area in terms of whether not someone that's representing gets paid and on the clock. I've asked that portion be deleted, and this will allow the employee to have designees of their own, it can be an employee, or any other thing, except that person will have to take off to represent that particular worker. Now I know that there's some conversation has been had about employee representation and from my understanding this was the biggest sticking plant in terms of what the council has. I think that if we are going to move forward with allowing the City Worker's to have their representation I think we need to do this. Second of all, I would also think and would ask the Administration in spirit of compromise that if in fact we are going to strike this provision, that the designees of the employees, the four, five people that they designate to be the representative for workers in these particular issues, there are a hearing process that has to take place that we would schedule those hearing around the off days of those individuals that are designated by the union. Because I think it's only fair if we are going to tell them that you can have your representation but your representation can't be on the city clock, then if they are not going to be on the city clock then the least that we should do is have the hearing at the time where the people who are going to represent them are off. And I think that would be a good and fair compromise and I would ask that the council support this amendment and support this ordinance at the same time. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you, Councilman Lester. Mr. Gibson.

Councilman Gibson: Thank you, Mr. Chair. This is for the Administration, has legal council reviewed this?

Mayor Hightower: I don't know that legal council reviewed it but with Councilman Lester's amendment we are find with it.

Councilman Gibson: But no legal council has reviewed it on our part?

Ms. Glass: Mr. Chairman, I drafted it for Mr. Lester.

Councilman Gibson: So we do have legal council reviewed that. The answer to my question is yes.

Ms. Glass: Legal form, yes.

Councilman Gibson: And it complies from, you authored it and you've looked at it and you feel find with it, from the City perspective. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Chair.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Walford.

Councilman Walford: So, if I understand this correctly, and I guess I'll address this to Mr. Lester and the Administration, both. If an employee selects another employee, we're

going to set the schedule around the employee that he or she picks to represent them and all those others involved that are City Employees on the Board will have to adjust their schedules according to that one person who is designated to represent them.

Councilman Lester: That would be, if I may respond.

Councilman Walford: I'm directing it to you, if that is all-right Mr. Chair, I'd like an answer.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Lester.

Councilman Lester: Sure, that answer to that is yes, and I'll tell you why. In most instances when you have employee representation, most cities consider employee grievances city issues, and there is not a situation where they have to come off the city clock to deal with that issue. Me personally, I didn't think it was a tremendous overbearance to allow the City Employee's to have their own representative, deal with their issues while they are here on the City time. There was some hesitancy that was expressed by the Administration, so I said if that is the issue, then if the union designates four or five individuals and trains those people at the policies and procedures and these are the four for a lack of a better term, lawyers, that the employee's had then I think it would be not a great imposition to schedule those hearings around the time any one of the three or four people can come to deal with that, if the issue is are we paying somebody to do what's considered union work, and I don't think its union work, I think its City work, but if that's the concern I think that gets us around, and I don't think it's going to hold the City hostage. Because if the union designates four or five people and as I have talked with the representation of the leadership of the union that is what they are in the process of doing, as a matter a fact they have sent a number of people for training for just such situations then we can get that done, and it wouldn't be an imposition to the City.

Mr. Antee: Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Antee.

Mr. Antee: Most – well all of the grievances at some point have the opportunity to reach my level, they may be resolved at the department head level, but for any of them that get to my level, I'll commit to do it at times, whether it be during a lunch hour, whether it be if they get off at four or four thirty, if they get off at five to work around those schedules. I don't see it as being an imposition as long as it's not being used by the employee, because we have had circumstances where an employee in every hearing comes in and wants two or three delays, but if they got four or five people that are designated and we know what their schedule is, we'll work around that schedule to do just what you want and we don't think that's an imposition at all.

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

Having passed first reading on July 13, 2004 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Motion by Councilman Lester seconded by Councilman Jackson for adoption. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 6. Nays: Councilman Walford. 1.

5. Ordinance No. 102 of 2004: Repealing Ordinance No. 28 of 2004 which created a two-way stop at the intersection of Manor Place and Midvale Street

and to create and establish the intersection of Manor Place and Midvale Street as a four-way stop intersection and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Councilman Hogan: Yes sir, Mr. Chair, I would recommend approval of this.

Councilman Jackson: Just a second Mr. Hogan.

Motion by Councilman Hogan seconded by Councilman Carmody to adopt.

Councilman Hogan: I have been in contact with the neighbors in this area and this is the desire of the overwhelming majority of the neighborhood. In fact there's a petition on file that's been submitted, if anyone's interested I will be happy to show them. It is in the record I will be happy for them to view, but I would appreciate the approval of this, from the Council members. Thank you.

Having passed first reading on July 13, 2004 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Hogan, seconded by Councilman Carmody to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None

6. Ordinances No. 103 of 2004: Amending the 2004 General Fund Budget. (City Courts)

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

7. Ordinances No. 104 of 2004: Amending Section 62-78 of the Code of Ordinances relative to the Department of Public Assembly and Recreation Fee Schedule and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

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

8. Ordinances No. 105 of 2004: To approve Act 529 relative to the Policemen's Pension and relief fund as enumerated in R.S. 11:3724(8) relative to the remarriage of widows of deceased Policemen after the age of 55 with no loss in pension benefits and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

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

9. Ordinances No. 106 of 2004: Amending the 2004 Budget for the General

Fund Budget. (VA Parking Revenue)

Motion by Councilman Green seconded by Councilman Hogan for adoption.

Councilman Jackson: Question, Councilman Carmody. Okay

Councilman Walford: I have a question.

Councilman Jackson: Councilman Walford.

Councilman Walford: If I can direct this to the Administration, do we even have a lease with them yet?

Mayor Hightower: Yes.

Councilman Walford: We do.

Mayor Hightower: Yes.

Councilman Walford: Okay, thank you.

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

4. Ordinances No. 94 of 2004: Authorizing the lease of parking spaces at the Stoner Marina parking lot to Overton Brooks VAMC and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.(not to be adopted prior to July 27):

Motion by Councilman Green seconded by Councilman Gibson to adopt.

Councilman Green: I'm sorry, Mr. Chairman this is July 27th, right? Oh, I'm sorry, I was thinking something else. Yes I resend that, motion to adopt.

Mr. Thompson: This authorizing the lease I believe, with the parking spaces in Stoner Marina.

Councilman Green: Right.

Mr. Thompson: There's one amendment.

Councilman Jackson: Let me – okay, the amendment.

Mr. Thompson: It deletes the original pages one through five of the lease agreement and substitutes the attached pages one through five of the agreement. The explanation is, it amends paragraph one of the lease agreement to provide that the lease will become effective upon execution of this agreement, by all parties and will expire twelve midnight, January the 31st 2007, which is the initial term. It amends paragraph eight of the agreement to provide that seat shall be responsible for repair or damage to the surface kept of the lease premises, at its expense. It amends paragraph thirteen of the lease agreement to provide that the lessee itself insured for purposes of general liability insurance. It amends paragraph sixteen of the lease agreement to provide that claim or dispute arising from this lease agreement, will be instituted in the courts of and governed by the laws of the United States.

AMENDMENT

Delete the original pages 1-5 of the Lease Agreement and substitute with the attached pages 1-5 of the Lease Agreement.

Motion by Councilman Walford seconded by Councilman Carmody on the amendment.

Councilman Gibson: Mr. Chair.

Councilman Jackson: Question, Councilman Gibson.

Councilman Gibson: For the administration. Number one, normal release past that you've brought before us, have been anywhere from ten to twenty years, is there a reason why we choose January 31, 2007?

Mayor Hightower: That was at the suggestion of the VA.

Councilman Gibson: Also, second question I have. I see that you got some language in here to protect us if they damage the property out there, but what provision and maybe Mr. Strong might be able to inject in this conversation. If damage is caused to that parking lot, ends up creating a problem seeing that's a contaminated soil underneath there, if that exposes us to EPA or DEQ fines, what protection do we have in leasing this lot? Is the City on the hook for this, or do we have a provision in there to cover us?

Mayor Hightower: You want to answer that Mike.

Mr. Strong: (inaudible)

Mr. Antee: That's a SPAR issue too. To answer the question as far as the EPA, if something were to happen right now the City would be solely responsible. If the lessee, and their insurance states in there that they're self insured and responsible for their damage, at least we do have the VA to go after as well, rather than being out there all by our self in that.

Councilman Gibson: Okay, the fact being is, if for some reason they put – let's say an overloaded vehicle on that is over the low limits of that parking lot, they crack the foundation or crack the asphalt that was put there, because there is not a foundation on the thing, water gets down there aroused the clay ceiling that we have on that, contaminants the soil and exposure happens and somebody says, I'm calling EPA, then we can enjoin them VA in this process?

Mr. Antee: You can't enjoin them, I mean we can include them as a third party defendant as being the person responsible in the event that we are.

Councilman Gibson: So we are protected in the circumstance then?

Mr. Antee: There's nothing that guarantees the City from anything, but what it does do is allow us to have somebody else to look towards. Because right now anybody can go out there and park on it, and if that happens the City solely responsible, at least with this we can look at the VA, if in fact it was their vehicle or people during their lease, as a co-defendant.

Councilman Gibson: Thank you, Administration. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

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

3. Ordinances No. 98 of 2004: Authorizing the Lease of City-Owned property to North Shreveport Development Corporation, Inc. (Postponed on July 13)

Mr. Antee: Mr. Chairman, we would ask that be postponed, this is the one that talked about yesterday, where there is a potential buyer.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Lester seconded by Councilman Gibson

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

11. Ordinance No. 99 of 2004: ZONING: C-35-04, 5600 Buncombe Road, *Vintage Realty Company*, Beard Properties, L.L. C., west side of Buncombe Road, 1,400 feet from north of West 70th Street from B-3 and I-1 to R-3, Apartment complex or other permitted uses within this zoning classification. (F/Green) (Postponed July 13, 3004)

Having passed first reading on June 22, 2004 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 Gibson to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None

12. Ordinance No. 100 of 2004: ZONING: C-31A-04, 1800 Nelson Street, Cambridge Court Limited Partnership, north side of Nelson at its intersection with Corporate Dr, from I-2 to R-2. (A/Lester)(Postponed July 13, 2004)

Councilman Lester: I would like to have some discussion on this, Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Jackson: Councilman Lester.

Councilman Lester: Thank you. We've discussed this issue a lot. We heard some caleche about this being involved in a Hunter Business Park, and clearly it is not. I think that the discussions that were entered into by some of the folks are – they just don't make any sense Mr. Chairman, and I would just ask that we move forward because you know, I just don't understand how you can say you are against development in this particular instance where you are to put people that need housing in an area and the people that need the housing are going to there and they are going to trade with the people that live up and down the whole entire North Market Corridor and it's already been happening. I mean, we are developing that corner even as we speak and this is just furtherance of this. This is not going to prevent any industrial development and point of fact this is this particular piece of property has lied dominant for over thirty years. Thanks to the contrary, I just don't understand Mr. Chairman, so I would ask that we move forward on this issue and support this and that would be my comment. Thank your Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Chairman, can we ask the Clerk for clarification on – this is on the agenda twice. What are we voting for this time?

Mr. Thompson: The zoning 100 will determine the appeal. If you vote for or against. If the zoning ordinance is adopted or if it is defeated that will determine the appeal.

Councilman Lester: Question Mr. Chair.

Councilman Walford: If you are going for clarification, go ahead. I will yield –

Councilman Lester: Yeah, that is why I was going to asked. If your vote or your desire is to overturn the MPC to grant the zoning, would the proper vote be a “no” vote on this or would it be a “yes” vote on item 100?

Mr. Thompson: The motion is to adopt.

Councilman Lester: Okay, and the motion is to adopt the zoning or to adopt the MPC decision?

Mr. Thompson: We are on 100 and 100 is an ordinance and the motion is to adopt the ordinance which would then rezone the property. So if you want to rezone the property your would vote, "yes". If you do not want to rezone the property you will vote "no" and the outcome of that will determine the appeal.

Councilman Lester: Okay, okay. Alright. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Ms. Glass: Mr. Chairman, I might further clarify that (inaudible) that MPC denied the zoning. So in voting in favor of – if you adopt the ordinance to vote in favor of it with MPC denied it, it would take a two-thirds vote of the council.

Councilman Lester: And if you the two-thirds on 100 does that mean that –

Mr. Thompson: There is nothing to vote on.

Councilman Lester: – On number 2?

Mr. Thompson: That is correct.

Councilman Lester: If number 100 does not pass then –

Mr. Thompson: There is nothing to vote on, on number 2.

Councilman Lester: Okay.

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Chairman. I just have a couple of quick comments before we vote. I can honestly say that I have done my homework on this issue. I have met with the property owners, I have met with the business owners, and I have met with Mr. Miller personally to view all the drawings and his ideas and it has been a very difficult decision on my part. Obviously, these people need a place to live. There is existing housing out there.

It doesn't appear to be causing a problem. There doesn't appear to be any increase in crime in that vicinity, that neighborhood ever far over to Grimmet Drive, has crime in that area. I don't think you will ever escape that or for that matter escape it anywhere in this city. However, again, I've been out to the property, I have viewed the property and I have met with both sides and I would just like to say it has been a very difficult decision. So, I feel comfortable with where I am and will be voting a no vote. Thank you.

Councilman Lester: Question, Mr. Chairman. If the council desire, I would offer a substitute motion at this time to remand Item 100 back to MPC

Motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Walford to remand Ordinance No. 100 of 2004 to Metropolitan Planning Commission.

Councilman Green: I'd like to say this and here again, I'm in hopes that whenever an issue comes up in District F, that we remain consistent. Because sometimes up here, we're not. On certain issues we say, we're going to go with what that Councilman in that district recommends. And then other times, we say 'well, I can't do that'. And I think it's very unfair. I think we need to be consistent. I don't think we ought to be hypocritical, and I don't think we ought to be hypocrites. If in fact, when it comes to your district, that you want me to support you in your district, and when it comes to my district and I've supported you, then I think it's very hypocritical that we find and we search out reasons. I think we ought to be fair and just state why we do what we do, so that our hypocriticalness won't just overshadow us and make us look like we don't really know what we're doing. And that's what I'd just like to throw that out parenthetically. But I'm in hopes that if in fact, you have

something in your district and I vote consistently with you because you like it. If you like it, I love it. But when it comes to my district, I'm in hopes that in the very near future, when something comes to District F, it'll be coming up in a minute, I'm going to be recommending that we vote yes. I'm gonna ask that when we get to 89, that you would support the Councilman from District F. And when it comes to something in your district, I'll support you. And I just think that we should be consistent. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you Councilman Green. Any other comments? There is a substitute motion on the floor for remanding to the Metropolitan Planning commission.

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Chair, I'd like to get some clarification on Councilman Lester's recommendation. And if we remand this to the Metropolitan Planning Commission, what will happen there? Their decision will stand?

Councilman Jackson: They'll have another hearing and the process is still the same.

Councilman Hogan: Okay. It will not come back to us for a vote after they've heard it the second time?

Councilman Jackson: No, what I'm saying is no guarantee that it won't - - and if it's - - you can assume that if it's the exact same decision, that yes indeed it will come. Because it still will have to follow what is due process. So, it doesn't mean in any way now take it as a responsibility that we never see it again. So, there's no guarantee.

Councilman Hogan: Thank you.

Having passed first reading on June 22, 2004 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Green to adopt. Motion passes by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Green, and Jackson. 4. Nays: Councilmen Carmody, Gibson, and Hogan. 3.

10. Ordinance No. 89 of 2004: ZONING: C-30-04, 7020 Union Avenue, *Rinchuso's Plumbing and Heating, Inc.*, Leon J. Rinchuso Sr. & Rose Borman Rinchuso, west side of Union Avenue, 200'south of West 70th Street from R-1D to B-3. (F/Green) (Postponed July 13, 3004)

Councilman Hogan: I just have a couple of comments. I'm not sure if the comments previously were directed towards me.

Councilman Green: No sir, they were not.

Councilman Hogan: I didn't- - - okay. I didn't ask you, that was not in the form of a question Councilman Green.

Councilman Green: Oh, I didn't know.

Councilman Hogan: And just like you cut the guy off the other day, I'd appreciate it if you'd let me talk and not be jumping out like that at me.

Councilman Green: Okay. You okay? You cool? You alright?

Councilman Hogan: Yeah, I'm fine. I'd just like to say that normally, I probably say the least of any councilman up here, and we take a lot of criticism because of that, and some people say we talk too much. And some people say we don't talk enough. But I'm going to refer back to those comments just a few minutes ago, and that is typical since we've been on this Council, that normally we try to follow the Councilman's recommendation from that district. But Councilman Green, twice I asked you for support on something in my district and twice you voted against me. I'd just like clarify that for the

record.

Councilman Jackson: Just one second Mr. Hogan. Let me apologize first because perhaps what I should have done is to cut Councilman Green off when he began to talk about that same thing, when we were actually voting on a different kind of issue. And the discussion went away from what it was we were voting on.

Councilman Hogan: Okay.

Councilman Jackson: So, I apologize for cutting you off and because of that, I'm going to let you finish your commentary, but moving forward gentlemen, I'm going to ask you that any comments that comes after there's been a motion and a second will be relevant to what we are voting on.

Councilman Hogan: Okay, okay. Thank you Mr. Chair and that's fine. I have no problem with that. I would like to say again, that I believe there's exceptions to every rule. You know there is no hard and fast rule up here. We normally try to respect the wishes of the other Councilman's district and that's the case most of the time. Even in the upcoming issue, Councilman Green had not asked for my support on it, but I've reviewed that and I'm going to be in favor of that and Councilman Green, there's no hard feelings. I'm going to vote in favor of your zoning that you're asking for support on in just a minute. I just wanted to know. But I do want to clarify that over what had happened in the past and you know, to say that I've never done anything hypocritical would not be true. But, that issue sticks in my mind over the zoning in my district where it was a big deal to me. And I asked for your support and you said no in 2002 and then when it came up again in 2003, you said no again. And so, I'd just like to clarify that for the record. It's no hard feelings again, and so, I just wanted to set the record on that. I appreciate it. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Green, we'll entertain commentary on Ordinance 89.

Councilman Hogan: And I have to go to the bathroom Mr. Chair. Thank you.

Councilman Green: After that comment, you should.

Councilman Jackson: Are you finished Councilman Green?

Councilman Green: Yes.

Councilman Hogan: Are you okay, Councilman Green?

Councilman Green: And Mr. Chair, just for the record, the reason that I - -

Councilman Jackson: Hold on, hold on Councilman Green.

Councilman Green: Let me finish?

Councilman Jackson: I didn't recognize you.

Having passed first reading on June 22, 2004 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 Gibson to adopt. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Green, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Out of the Chamber: Councilman Hogan. 1.

Councilman Green: Thank you. Just for the general public, so that you all would know what he was referring to. Is that when Dr. Artis Cash wanted a school at his church, I would never, ever vote against a church. Just so that you all would know. All he wanted was a school for some children to go to church in a Christian school. I would never even dream about it. I mean, Councilman Hogan should have been embarrassed to even ask me to have - - - as bad as this country is, and you would vote against a church having

school. So, that's why.

Councilman Gibson: Mr. Chair, I'm going to call for point of order.

Councilman Green: There's no point of order.

Councilman Gibson: Yes, we're digressing.

Councilman Green: Well, you need to know. And you know cause you voted with them.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Clerk, item 10 Unfinished Business I believe is where our next- - Mr. Thompson: That's correct Mr. Chairman. The first thing we have is listed on your agenda is a Zoning Appeal, but it's a Subdivision Appeal. It's case no. S-19-04

The adopted ordinances and amendments follow:

ORDINANCE NO. 94 OF 2004

AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE LEASE OF PARKING SPACES AT THE STONER MARINA PARKING LOT TO OVERTON BROOKS VAMC AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, Overton Brooks Veterans Administration Medical Center ("VA") has requested the lease of 100 parking spaces at the Stoner Marina parking lot for employee parking; and

WHEREAS, the parking spaces are not needed for public purposes; and

WHEREAS, the lease provides for an initial term of three (3) years with an option to renew for three (3) additional terms of one (1) year each; and

WHEREAS, lease payments shall be \$1,000.00 per month; and

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport desires to enter into this lease with VA relative to use of the parking spaces.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT ORDAINED, by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, legal and regular session convened, that the City of Shreveport is authorized to lease 100 parking spaces at the Stoner Marina parking lot to Overton Brooks Veterans Administration Medical Center.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the Mayor of the City of Shreveport is hereby authorized to execute all documents relative to the lease of the parking spaces substantially in accordance with the draft hereof filed for public inspection with the original of this ordinance in the Office of the Clerk of Council on June 22, 2004.

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

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

ORDINANCE NO. 101 OF 2004

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING CHAPTER 66 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE

CITY OF SHREVEPORT RELATIVE TO PERSONNEL AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened that Section 66-1 of the Code of Ordinances is hereby amended to read as follows:

Sec. 66-1. City Personnel System; Employee Representation.

(a) In any disciplinary action taken against a member of the classified service as defined in Section 14.07 of the City Charter and in any grievance procedure filed by or against a member of the classified service, the employee may be represented by legal counsel or by any other person designated by the employee. Said representation shall be at the cost of the employee.

(b) If an employee designates an employee who is a member of the classified service to represent him in a matter as provided in paragraph (a), the designated employee shall be permitted to attend any meeting the employee is required to attend regarding the matter, and if the meeting is during the representative employee's regular work day, the time spent attending the meeting shall be included in the record of his hours worked.

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

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

Amendment 1 to Ordinance 101 of 2004, An Ordinance amending the Chapter 66 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport Relative to Personnel.

Amend the Ordinance as follows:

In Sec. 66.1(b). City Personnel System; Employee Representation.

Delete the following clause:

“And if the meeting is during the representative employee's regular work day, the time spent attending the meeting shall be included in the record of his hours worked.”

Explanation of Amendment:

This amendment deletes the requirement that the time spent attending the meeting shall be included in the hours worked.

ORDINANCE NO 102 OF 2004

AN ORDINANCE TO REPEAL ORDINANCE NO. 28 OF 2004 WHICH CREATED A TWO-WAY STOP AT THE INTERSECTION OF MANOR PLACE AND MIDVALE STREET, AND TO CREATE AND ESTABLISH THE INTERSECTION OF MANOR PLACE AND MIDVALE STREET AS A FOUR-WAY STOP INTERSECTION, 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 of Ordinance No. 28 of 2004 which created a two-

way stop at the intersection of Manor Place and Midvale Street is hereby repealed, and to create and establish the intersection of Manor Place and Midvale Street as a four-way stop intersection requiring that all traffic and vehicles approaching this intersection shall come to a full stop before entering the intersection.

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

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

ORDINANCE NO. 103 OF 2004

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2004 GENERAL FUND BUDGET AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the City Charter provides for the amendment of any previously adopted budget; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds it necessary to amend the 2004 General Fund budget, to adjust appropriations among expenditure categories and for other purposes.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in legal session convened, that Ordinance No. 158 of 2003, the 2004 General Fund budget, is hereby amended as follows:

In Section 2 (Appropriations):

In City Courts, decrease Personal Services by \$67,600. Increase Materials and Supplies by \$18,000 and Contractual Services by \$49,600.

Adjust all totals and subtotals accordingly.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the remainder of Ordinance No. 158 of 2003 shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

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

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

ORDINANCE NO. 104 OF 2004

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND SECTION 62-78 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES RELATIVE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC ASSEMBLY AND RECREATION FEE SCHEDULE 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 Section 62-78 of the City of Shreveport Code of Ordinances relative to fees for the following activities, rental and uses is hereby amended to now read as follows:

Sec. 62-78. Fee schedule.

A fee schedule for activities, rentals and uses in the department of public assembly and recreation is hereby established as follows:

Description	New Fee

Softball Tournaments—Cargill Park Rental	
Deposit	\$50.00
Tournaments Charge	\$25.00 per field per day
Additional Field Crews	Actual cost based on employee's overtime rate
Ball Field Rentals—	
Field Use- No lights	
SPAR League	No Charge
All Others	\$5.00 per hour
Field Use - Lights Required	
SPAR League	No Charge
All Others	\$10.00 per hour

All deposits will be credited to the total cost of the tournament. All deposits are non-refundable, unless the scheduled event is canceled at least thirty (30) days prior to the event. The base cost will cover initial field preparation prior to the start of each day. Additional Field Crews may be provided when scheduled in advance.

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

ORDINANCE NO. 105 OF 2004

AN ORDINANCE TO APPROVE ACT 529 RELATIVE TO THE POLICEMEN'S PENSION AND RELIEF FUND AS ENUMERATED IN R.S.11:3724(8) RELATIVE TO THE REMARRIAGE OF POLICE WIDOWS AFTER THE AGE OF 55 WITH NO LOSS IN PENSION BENEFITS 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 Act 529 relative to R.S.11:3724(8) be approved.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that Act 529 amending R.S.11:3724(8) be approved as follows:

R.S. 11:3724(8) Remarriage of Widows

If any member of the police department, while in the service of said police department or while eligible for or receiving benefits under the provisions of this Subpart, dies from any cause and leaves a surviving widow, the board shall direct the payment monthly from the fund to such widow, during the remainder of her life, or until remarriage, unless such remarriage occurs after

age fifty-five, in an amount equal to fifty percent of a beginning policeman's pay and to each surviving minor child under the age of eighteen years a sum equal to seventeen and one-half percent of a beginning policeman's pay. However, the total monthly payment to be made at any time to a member's surviving widow and dependent children shall not exceed eighty-five percent of a beginning policeman's pay. Payments to such child or children shall continue after the remarriage of the widow but shall cease as to each child upon remarriage. In order to receive herein provided for, a widow must have been married to such member before his removal from active service and must have been living with him at the time of death. Upon application therefor to the board of trustees, the benefits of a widow whose benefits have now been terminated or hereafter terminated because of remarriage shall be restored to the level at the time such benefits previously terminated upon a showing that the subsequent marriage has terminated, provided if her subsequent marriage has been terminated, provided if her subsequent marriage was to a member of the fund she shall have the option of choosing restoration to her original benefit or the benefits to which she would be entitled because of the death of her second husband, but not both. If an applicant whose benefits have been restored, as here provided, again remarries, her benefits shall terminate.

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

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

ORDINANCE NO. 106 OF 2004

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2004 GENERAL FUND BUDGET AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the City Charter provides for the amendment of any previously adopted budget; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds it necessary to amend the 2004 budget for the General Fund to appropriate funds and for other purposes.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in legal session convened, that Ordinance No.158 of 2003, the 2004 General Fund budget, is hereby amended as follows:

In Section 1 (Estimated Receipts):

Increase External Service Charges by \$6,000.

In Section 2 (Appropriations):

Operational Services

Increase Improvements and Equipment by \$6,000

Adjust subtotals and totals accordingly.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the remainder of Ordinance No. 158 of 2003 shall

remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

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

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

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

1. ZONING APPEAL - Case No. S-19-04, *Brenda Lilley Kraak Pettit*, Northwest corner of Creswell Avenue & Montrose Drive, R-1D. (Postponed until July 27, 2004). (C/Carmody)

Councilman Carmody: I want to make sure that I'm doing this appropriately. Does it require a motion in order to bring it up, the matter to discuss it, or can I call for Mr. Kirkland to come up and bring me some information before I make my motion?

Ms. Glass: Make the motion.

Councilman Carmody: That's what I would think.

Motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Gibson to uphold the decision of the MPC to approve the subdivision.

Councilman Carmody: Thank you Mr. Chairman. If I could ask Mr. Kirkland to come forward. There are a number of points that I'd like to make so that Council is aware. Mr. Kirkland, I had asked you earlier today, if you could bring for the Council members, and I think that you're actually going to have to readjust the lamp, because the gentleman came forward. Well, he came forward - - - yes sir, there you go, straight up. I think that's what it's got to do. No, he pulled it - - -there you go. Just like that. Mr. Koerner, I don't know that we can let you go, you seem to run all the (unclear).

Mr. Kirkland: Well, it's there, but it's not coming on. Robert, can you hear us?

Councilman Carmody: There it goes. Thank you sir. Gentlemen, I know that all of us received correspondence regarding the various cases that come up before appeal. Just to give you an idea, so you can kinda see that this is just this one particular case. And in looking at the information and why I wanted Mr. Kirkland to bring this forward is because the approval for the subdivision was appealed two-fold as I appreciate it. The adjacent neighbors were concerned, I think first and foremost and rightly so, about the impact of development of a house in that area, because of the incidents of flooding which had occurred in the past in Pierremont. However, as a result of the deluge which occurred, and if I'm not mistaken, I thought it was in '91, the City of Shreveport spent a substantial amount of money for improving the capacity as well as the drainage of that area, to the point of, if I'm not mistaken the Federal Emergency Management Administration came back in and actually redesignated the area of this lot adjacent to Pierremont ditch, as now being out of the floodway, although in the flood plane. A little section of it. So - - -

Mr. Kirkland: Councilman, if I may, I'm not sure that, and this is the subject property we're talking about, and this is the drainage way, I'm not sure that it was ever in the "floodway".

Councilman Carmody: Okay.

Mr. Kirkland: That is a very specific term, it means the path of the water. The flood plane means where waters will flood occasionally. But you're correct. But I don't know that it was ever in the floodway.

Councilman Carmody: Thank you sir for that clarification.

Mr. Kirkland: But it may have been in the flood plane.

Councilman Carmody: But of course, the concern is that any adjacent neighbor would have would be that if a piece of property that seems to be prone to flooding is developed, then wouldn't that create a problem for me if I'm on the downhill side of that site? I mean, that's the nature of - - Mr. Kirkland: It could be upstream or downstream, either one.

Councilman Carmody: Correct. And as I appreciate it, the Metropolitan Planning Commission as well as the City Engineers went through this and major exercise of investigation to make sure that indeed the property could be developed. The point in this is and this is really the kind of question I really wanted to ask you was when you purchase a piece of property adjacent to a piece of property that you already own, does it automatically create an assemblage, and I use that term which is a real estate term that I'm familiar with, that in essence all of a sudden, now any property that you acquire is contiguous and it's all one piece? I ask that as a question, because - - -

Mr. Kirkland: No, it simply means you have acquired additional property. That's the only correct answer to your question.

Councilman Carmody: Okay, and so, my point being this. This particular piece of property is actually two pieces of property under the same ownership acquired at different times, tax assessed differently. The piece of property with the residence on it is assessed with as I understand it, a homestead exemption. The other piece of property is separately assessed and does not come under the homestead exemption.

Mr. Kirkland: That would be and of course, the owner would know and I think they've represented how that is. The assessor would actually make that call. In this case, I think they've considered it two separate parcels, I'll call it.

Councilman Carmody: The second issue was that of any person that would develop that property as being sensitive to the character of the neighborhood, and of course, Pierremont is a wonderful neighborhood, there's plenty of character, there's no doubt about it. But as I appreciate it, the City of Shreveport really has no architectural controls on the development of property. You'd have to hope that whoever acquired a piece of property and then develops it, does so with something that you would at least think is tasteful. Okay? And in the same way, I can tell you that I've seen people paint houses in colors that if I had to walk out my front door and look at them, I don't know if I wouldn't just go stir crazy. But again, it's their right and it's their taste, not mine. It's their property, not mine. And in this instance, I would say that, that is really not under the purview of this Council to regulate or to control how the aesthetics of this area is. All that being said, some properties in this area have already been subdivided in order to sell off lots for residential development in close proximity to this site, if I'm not mistaken.

Mr. Kirkland: The Crowe family is an example Mr. Carmody. When Gretchen and David Crowe who happen to be relatives of mine, when they owned this property, they sold off, sold this land and subdivided that for individual home sites. Other lots in the Dillingham area over the years have been subdivided. Most, I don't recall any real opposition. There was a little bit of concern here on the Crowe development, I'll call it development,

subdivided lots, but nothing prevented it from happening.

Councilman Carmody: So, and my final thought on it is this. I certainly think that we're not setting a precedence here and I don't think the Metropolitan Planning Commission in their discernment to go ahead and approve the re-subdivision I do not think is the appropriate term for what has occurred here, the subdivision plat- - -

Mr. Kirkland: The subdivision of land of pieces of lots that have been prior approved.

Councilman Carmody: Correct. So, to those persons that appealed the decision, I do want them to know that this is something that I took very seriously in trying to digest what your concerns were, but to also weigh them on the scales of what is fair and right. Now, my last question to you. That piece of property and I assume it's lot 1 that is closest to Pierremont ditch.

Mr. Kirkland: Yes.

Councilman Carmody: Let us say that there is a structure built on that piece of property and that structure indeed causes a problem with drainage, and again, now I'm speculating. Is the City culpable or is it the developer and homeowner?

Mr. Kirkland: I'd almost rather duck that one and let the Mayor answer it, but it sure makes it - - -

Councilman Carmody: Because we're going to issue the permit based upon the fact that - - -

Mr. Kirkland: Let me say this. Anything we do, we all as elected and appointed officials responsible as we all know to try to make good decisions. Any time the engineers and our experts we look to tell us that this is not in a floodway or a flood plane, only a small portion on that northern edge, and I'm talking about a part that really is of no consequence is in a flood plane.

Councilman Carmody: I mean is that a side yard set back area where they could not build a structure in it? I mean you know.

Mr. Kirkland: Well, you could, but in a flood plane all you can do is meet a certain elevation requirement for the finished floor of the foundation. We have been responsible in an approval if in fact we have determined as our engineers have in the City that this is not in a floodway, it's not on the flood plane, the only issue then is the rules of frontage and the other minimum square footage of the lot and it meets all those requirements. So, everyone's been prudent in their review and their assessment and if anything, this lot request has been subjected to an extensive exhaustive amount of research and activity by both sides. But the bottom line is the experts and the Planning Commission in their judgement agree that it's not a problem and it should be approved.

Councilman Carmody: Very good sir. Based upon that information as well as the information that I've looked at, I'm going to go ahead again and ask the Council's support in again supporting the Metropolitan Planning Commission's decision to allow for the subdivision and the plan (unclear)

Motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Hogan to call for the question. Motion approved by the following votes: Ayes: Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

2. ZONING APPEAL: C-31A-04, 1800 Nelson Street, *Cambridge Court Limited Partnership*, north side of Nelson at its intersection with Corporate Dr, from I-

2 to R-2. (A/Lester)(Postponed on July 13, 2004)

Mr. Thompson: The Zoning Appeal C-31A-04 has been decided by the remand.

3. SUBDIVISION APPEAL - S-49-04, *Rosenwald Partnership, ALPIC, et al, Smith & Raley, Inc.*, Extension of Markham Street south of Round Grove Lane & east of David Rains Road, R-1, One Family Residence District. (F/Green) (Postponed on July 13, 2004)

Councilman Lester: You have a question?

Councilman Walford: I have a comment.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, we think we know what the motion is, but could the author state it?

Councilman Lester: My motion is to overturn the decision of the MPC and to approve the subdivision.

Motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Green to overturn the decision of the MPC and to approve the subdivision.

Councilman Lester: I just want to make a couple of brief comments and I'll be finished. We've heard a lot of talk about this particular issue. We've heard a number of objections. One of the objections was that it's incompatible. That's not the case, because we're talking about 15-1700 square foot brick houses, which makes the character of the neighborhood. We've been told that the density is not there. That's not the case. It's just as dense as what's already there. People are talking about predatory lending. That has nothing to do with this particular issue. I think what it comes down to is we don't want them living next to us, because those are bad people. The people that will probably live in this particular area are people that live in the MLK community. People are going to be coming from an easy livin or other parts of the community to live there. We talk about growing MLK. A lot of people talk about I'm in support of growing the community, but what have you done to revitalize it, you haven't done anything. We talk about what are going to do to prevent our schools from closing. Green Oaks closing down, but we want more retirees. You've got to bring something in that's going to appeal to young families, people with children, that's how you're going to keep Green Oaks open and that's how you're going to keep Pine Grove open, and that's how you're going to keep Newton Smith open. We talk about economic development and the fact that in this particular area, we don't have certain things, we don't have certain things because we have not done any significant building in this area. There has not been a subdivision built in the MLK community in 25 or 30 years. At the end of the day, some people decide that they want to be as a slothful servant, they want to take the talent and hide it. Therein, when the master comes back, I didn't do anything with your talent, because I was afraid that you might be upset. Some of us are in the mindset of growing the talent, using it, multiplying it for the overall development of the area. And that's what I'm all about. I'd ask that the Council would support me in overturning the MPC's decision and moving forward for the subdivision of Rosenwald. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Walford: Since we're talking inconsistencies up here, and occasionally

Councilman Lester will zing me for being inconsistent, I said way back that I normally would support Zoning whether it be the MPC or the ZBA. Mr. Kirkland knows that, he's nodding his head out there. But I think we have to look at each issue. And sometimes I gotta say, I think the MPC makes a mistake, and in this case, I'm very disappointed in what I read in the minutes and I want to say to my fellow Council members and those of you out there, I took the time to get the minutes, to read the minutes, to become very familiar with this. And this is one of those times, where I was very disappointed in what I saw of the MPC and I'm going to go with Councilman Lester and vote to overturn this zoning and I know that's inconsistent with what I said in 2002, but it's the right thing to do.

Councilman Gibson: Mr. Strong, could you come forward please? It's been a very enlightening City Council Meeting. Mr. Strong, there were some pictures presented on this property about some of the damage and some other things going on. In terms of if at the end of this project, those matters are not resolved, what happens? In terms of the City. The City has an obligation to make sure that certain provisions take place before they sign off before they give the final approval? Could you elaborate on that?

Mr. Strong: Well, one thing I hadn't received any kind of phone calls on it. I have it on my notes for the inspector to get with me on exactly what has taken place. But we do have an inspector on the job as far as the line they put in there and part of the end of the job is to make sure it is put back like it - - -

Councilman Gibson: So, the question I'm asking is with the photographs- - -1) there's been no communication on this, but the photographs and some of the issues that were presented before this body today aren't resolved, what action or what will happen to the developer at the end when they're getting ready to finalize punch lists and get ready to allow people to take possession. Will the City sign off on that?

Mr. Strong: No sir, we will not and we will not sign off on the sewer line itself either.

Councilman Gibson: So, it is up sole to the developer to fulfill whatever, just like on any other construction project, if the contractor goes out there and runs a tracko down the middle of Ellerbe Road and tears it up, and we can prove that, I mean, they're going to have to get that resolved? Right?

Mr. Strong: That is correct.

Councilman Gibson: Okay, thank you Mr. Chair, thank you Mr. Strong.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Turrentine. We have some books. I'm not in possession of it. We had it two weeks ago. There were at least two different books. I wanted to go back and look at those books, because one of the chief things that has been argued particularly by the opposition is that it's inconsistent with what's happening there and I think what this council has got to make a decision on is, is this an MPC situation where we have to be able to talk about whether or not it is in fact consistent and I think when they talk about it, I'm not sure, I don't know if integration in that neighborhood, the housing integration if you will, among renters and buyers is what we mean by inconsistency. I think the inconsistency is the type of structure that is built. Is that correct? Mr. Kirkland, maybe you could come. Mr. Turrentine, what I want to do is to be able to look at these pictures, because everybody doesn't have a book and I'd like for everybody to see what in fact you've given to us. And let me just say that the thing that I'm concerned about is that we don't want to go in and put up Tee Pees where people have houses. And we don't want to put in wooden structures where folks have brick structures and so on and so forth, because our legal responsibility is to gauge whether or not this is consistent with what's happening in

the neighborhood. And that's what I need to see.

Mr. Turrentine: And I don't intend to be argumentative, but I clearly think that we are consistent, if not superior in a lot of ways in what we're building, but I disagree that, that is your legal obligation to make sure that this is consistent. Again, this is a zoning case, it is a subdivision approval. But I'm not a lawyer either, so- -I defer to the City on that. But basically these are the photographs that were taken several weeks ago. You could see the titles: Existing homes located on David Rains nearest intersection of Roundgrove. That is the home that is there now, and I'll show you if I may, these are the homes that we're building and here's another home. Maybe we should look at these first. This is what we're building. This is a development in Monroe that is identical to what we're doing. So this is what we're doing here (unclear) and here's what's nearest, this is the house right next door.

This is the home nearest (unclear) subdivision on Rosenwald, the very next house down, the next house, the next house, and then this is kind of throughout, these are some typical homes throughout the subdivision, taken at random- -oh no, these are clearly- -oh yes, these are in University Park Subdivision. This is University Park, this is University Park, these are typical throughout University Park. This is more of the same. But if I could- -

Councilman Jackson: Okay, let me ask- -okay, go ahead I'm sorry.

Mr. Turrentine: Kinda go through these real quick. These are some, now these are new homes that are currently being built in University Park. I think that certainly we're very comfortable, I believe they're superior to these. Again, some more recently built homes in University Park. So, these are fairly new that I'm showing you now. So, again, and I think it's pretty obvious that I believe that we're very consistent with what you saw.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you Mr. Turrentine. I'd like to ask I think Mr. Williams spoke, but I know, I think that Ms. Wilson, cause Mr. Wilson is also here as well and I want to ask either Mr. Williams or Commissioner Rose McCulloch, I'm sorry if either one of them would come. I want to ask questions. What I'd like to have is to make sure that they have in their hands is the same packet you just gave me? Is there another copy, does somebody have another copy that I could - - I know the pictures may not be clear on this screen here as they are in the book. Mr. Turrentine, do y'all have another copy of these books, so that I can - - - yeah, you can give it - - -for the podium sake, you can get it back. Mr. Williams, if you would? Is Commissioner McCulloch still here? I want y'all to be able to look at this - - - yes sir. Okay, oh, they've got one. What I'd like to do is look at this small book, because we were looking at it on the screen and this is in deference to Councilman Lester, I have listened to what Councilman Lester had said, but I've also listened to what the people from the community have said and what I was trying to clarify in this whole scenario is what the real sticking point was. On some days, it seemed like the sticking point was who was actually doing it and how the process went about it. Then the flip side became then whether or not they were building a quality product. And you know, I may not have been right when I said our obligation, but the thing that I'm concerned about is if, cause if the dirt is already cleared and all those things out there, is if they have built or are going to build something that in fact, it does not damage the physical structure or (and I'm making this word up) beautify what's already there. It shouldn't make it worse, it ought to make it better if not keep it right where it is, so I want you to look at this book and in the first few pages, of what he just showed me and I didn't have one, but I did look at it myself, are these- - -cause let me tell you what I know already. I know Commissioner McCulloch lives on Kemp Lane. I know that there is, I apologize, I can't think of the street right off, east-

west you know, just different streets, that these are not all the houses in - - -

Mr. Williams: Councilman, the first house that he showed you.

Councilman Jackson: Hold on Mr. Williams. These are the houses, these are not all the houses. But I don't think that they were presenting all the houses in University Park, because everybody can't afford all the houses in University Park. And nobody is suggesting that all the houses in University Park ought to cost the same amount. I'm not at least okay? So, my question then becomes whether or not these houses that are in these pictures are houses that are in University Park?

Mr. Williams: No sir. The first house here is not in University Park. This house is on David Rains Road.

Councilman Jackson: Okay. Keep going, the rest of the houses.

Mr. Williams: The second house is on David Rains Road, not in University Park.

Councilman Jackson: Okay, the next house.

Mr. Williams: The third house is in University Park on Roundgrove Lane.

Councilman Jackson: The fourth house?

Mr. Williams: So is the fourth house, the third house and the fourth house. Where he stopped to (unclear) is that fifth house, that sixth house and a seventh house.

Councilman Jackson: What about it? What did you say? He did what?

Mr. Williams: Like I say, he went in and picked a smaller houses that wasn't well kept instead of going in and taking pictures of - - - if you go past this fifth house, every yard here is manicured and well kept.

Councilman Jackson: That's what I'm saying. This is the one that I'm looking at. If we go past this page to the next page. Let's say, this house you're talking right here, with the fence and looks like a wreath on the door, at the top. You see the one I'm talking about? That's in University Park right?

Mr. Williams: Uh hmm.

Councilman Jackson: The one below that is in University Park too right?

Mr. Williams: Yes.

Councilman Jackson: Now, let me ask you, if you go on to the next page, the one at the top, that is in University Park?

Ms. McCulloch: Yes sir.

Councilman Jackson: Flip the page, that is in University Park?

Mr. Williams: Yes.

Councilman Jackson: Okay, and if you flip again, the one at the top, is that in University Park?

Mr. Williams: Yes.

Councilman Jackson: Then on the next page, both of those two. Are they both in University Park?

Mr. Williams: I don't know about the bottom one.

Councilman Jackson: Okay, but the one at the top is?

Ms. McCulloch: Yes.

Councilman Jackson: And Commissioner McCulloch, I'm not sure if y'all can answer this, do we have any idea what the average square footage of these houses that we just went through and agreed that were in University Park are?

Mr. Williams: Most of the houses started off when I bought in there was anywhere from 14, 1500 square foot.

Councilman Jackson: 14, 1500 square foot. Alright now, I want y'all to look at the other book. I don't know - -I think after Tab 1. Now, he didn't put these, well he did put some of these up on the screen. That house right there, would you consider that consistent or not consistent.

Mr. Williams: The houses wasn't the problem. It's the financing of the houses.

Councilman Jackson: No, no. I'm saying, it won't be a financing structure until 16 years down the road. So, it's technically a rental property.

Mr. Williams: It's not consistent with the lot that they have on Roundgrove right now that they are clearing.

Councilman Jackson: Tell me again? You're saying that they can't put this house?

Mr. Williams: Not this one.

Councilman Jackson: On that lot is what you're saying?

Mr. Williams: No, no.

Ms. McCulloch: The lots are much smaller.

Councilman Jackson: Well, let me ask you one question. I guess Mr .Turrentine, what is the size of that first house? This house right here.

Mr Turrentine: Well, I'm not sure if that's a 3 or 4 bedroom, but they range from 13-1500 square feet.

Councilman Jackson: So, 1500 is the max. And Mr. Williams, you were saying that 1400 or 1500 is about the average size of what's there right now?

Mr. Williams: And the smaller one.

Councilman Jackson: And are we suggesting that this house won't fit unless it's close to the next house, or it just won't fit at all?

Mr. Williams: This picture here is showing a larger front yard.

Ms. McCulloch: And a larger back yard.

Mr. Williams: If you would look at one of the pictures, this is the lot that they are building, it's no way that you can put this house here on this lot here.

Councilman Jackson: Do we have a picture of the lots anywhere sir?

Mr. Turrentine: Could I say this, that that's totally inaccurate. The picture of the house as you see are on 60 foot lots. They're on 60 foot lots they're 60 feet wide. The lots that we're developing on Roundgrove range from 60-64 feet wide. They're identical, I mean, they're the same size lots and if I could add that these lots also fit within the sizes for this particular zone. Which I believe is the same zoning in University Park. So, yes, it'll fit. It's gonna fit. This house will fit on these lots.

Councilman Jackson: Alright, hold on one minute. Mr. Kirkland. You have any idea about the size of the lots that was presented to the MPC?

Mr. Kirkland: What Mr. Turrentine just represented to you on these lots on Roundgrove? They were originally much smaller lots. The zoning base is R-1-H which allowed a much smaller lot. Also a 20 foot set back, a number of things that related to that zoning class. They resized voluntarily to a larger lot as he just said to you which brought them into complete comparable circumstances with the existing subdivision. If anything a little larger than some of the other lots of record.

Councilman Jackson: So, in other words, what you're saying to me and what we're hearing and Mr. Williams you tell me, you and Commissioner McCulloch, because I want us to be clear. Because of a lot of what's happening has been just people just kinda upset. And I want to be sure that we have with the benefit, not just emotion, but intellect, that we

make a good decision with regard to this. Do you accept the fact that they are suggesting that the lots are 60-64 feet?

Mr. Williams: Yes, I suggest that. We're not here- - we're here on Units III and IV. This is Phase I and II that's already supposed to be a done deal that's finished. The phase that Metropolitan Planning Commission turned down is Phase III and IV. That's the issue that's here before you today. From 52 more houses that's in the same area that's congested.

Councilman Jackson: Let me ask you this, the houses in III and IV, that you're talking about Phase III and IV, what size lots Mr. Turrentine are they going to be on?

Mr. Turrentine: They're the same size.

Councilman Jackson: Now, Mr. Williams are you suggesting that they are not - - - ah, Mr. Kirkland?

Mr. Kirkland: I just want to say for the record, the zoning class on the phases before you is in fact R-1-D. It is a different zoning class. The lots meet all the requirements as they were presented to the MPC. So, all the requirements have an R-1-D zoning class for a subdivision were met. But there were other factors which (unclear)

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Williams, you agree with, you understand what Mr. Kirkland has just said.

Mr. Williams: Yes.

Councilman Jackson: Now, the sticking point was, was it with density?

Ms. McCulloch: Yes sir.

Councilman Jackson: Was that the question at the Metropolitan Planning Commission Mr. Kirkland?

Mr. Kirkland: A lot of things were said and that's why the record on this case is a rather thick record. Those for and those against. But, the main issue, I think the Planning Commission related to was the type of rental program for 15 years in every single home and this development was to be that type and then they all would go on the market at the end of the 15th year and that was what I believe the Planning Commission related most to was that effect on this established residential neighborhood. Even though legally, that was not a basis.

Councilman Jackson: Right, let me ask this question based on what you said. Your question, your concern, Ms. McCulloch, those who are in opposition. I'm just asking you to speak for those who are in opposition, because all of them can't speak right now. But the key and the sticking point there was that you don't like Louisiana Housing Finance Agency's Tax Credit Program?

Ms. McCulloch: That's correct.

Councilman Jackson: But the kind of house, if it were for ownership- -

Mr. Williams: It'd be fine.

Councilman Jackson: That exact same kind of house would be fine?

Ms. McCulloch: Right.

Councilman Jackson: Now, let me ask this. Are there renters currently in University Park?

Mr. Williams: Yes.

Councilman Jackson: You have any idea what the percentage is?

Ms. McCulloch: We have 90% homeowners in University Park.

Councilman Jackson: So, you're saying that it's 10% renters in University Park.

Mr. Williams: Most of the homes in University Park are 30 years old. Like I had three neighbors to die. Their children have moved and moved out of state, so they've put the houses up for sale or up for rent to do a finance deal.

Councilman Jackson: One last time. And I know we spoke earlier on predatory lending, technically while you can draw some parallels, they have to be lending money for that to be the case. This is not lending of money until year 16 when somebody has to go out and get a private mortgage. So, I understand the concern of that and I have the same concern. We've got a lot of big issues in our community, but let me digress. The chief problem with renters in University Park as related to you by your folks who opposed was what?

Mr. Williams: 1) Renters don't tend to take care of their property as homeownership.

Councilman Jackson: Let me ask you this.

Mr. Williams: Prime example. I can take you to the houses that's rent versus the houses owned and show you the example.

Councilman Jackson: So, and I understand that and I have a particular bias with that in that regard. And I'm proud to own a house. But I got a particular bias because I haven't always- -we haven't always been in a position a house. You know myself. And I know that there are people who do take care of their houses that they rent and one of the things that I said to someone who talked to me, that it's unfair. And I'm not talking to you all, but it's unfair to say that everybody who rents will not take care of their property, because you also assume that everybody who buys takes care of theirs. While the propensity may be greater, that does not always happen. Cause a whole lot of folks foreclose much less take care of property. So, I guess the issue before this Council become one of whether or not we support a philosophy of being able to rent. I hate the idea that Louisiana Finance Agencies Program is like that. I was at an MPC meeting two years ago I believe and they were talking about doing something out at some other part of town, by Southern Trace. And there was a guy who talked about doing some different things and in the same builder wanted to do some things, that wanted to do that. And the people in that community were against that and I understood that. And I felt some compassion though for the fellow who was developing, because there are some people who are going to have to rent and who can't afford. And the question becomes (unclear) we do. And guess what everybody said? That ain't my problem. But on this City Council, I don't think we have the luxury of being able to say that. Cause no, it's not in my back yard and it's not in anybody's back yard who is up here, but we still have a responsibility for folks out there who have nothing. And it's got to be somewhere. And the question becomes where. And when we're faced with the issue that nobody is developing and a lot of people have unfairly said that this is the same thing that Councilman Glover was talking about, I mean that Representative Glover was talking about, it's a little different in a lot of ways. 1) he was talking about senior citizens and if you had come to me on senior citizens and tell me about a 15 year program to rent and then they can own, that would have been ignorant. You know, that would have just been all out, that wouldn't even made sense for a "senior citizen" to take 15 years before different. So, I know today is Art's birthday, he's 75. But my point though really is, that it's really not apples to apples and in this case, my concern is for people who are going to have to have somewhere to stay. That's the only question I was concerned about is when you pass down. And I know Commissioner knows what I mean. You drive down MLK and you see next to Lake Bethlehem what somebody did up there. 1) a renter would probably tear it up,

because it looks like it's just a nuisance waiting to be torn up. It doesn't look like anything. My question has always been, we dealt with Mr. Miller and other folks. I'm not against rental housing. But it needs to be quality. It needs to be quality not because of who lives there, but it needs to be quality because of our city. It needs to be quality because of folks have to drive through there. The folks who are not renting. And that was my chief concern.

And I think a lot of my questions have been answered because what I'm concerned about is whether or not this will make University Park look like a terrible looking neighborhood. When I saw the pictures of those houses, I thought either they might be lying and we'd ask these question. Because we just had a book. And you know people don't have to do what they say. But if in fact, these people are going to do this, it seems to me, you know somebody- - - nobody ever presents an alternate plan for where the renters are going to stay. You know we know what we want and I agree. I understand. It's not in my backyard.

But we have to be concerned - - - to me, it's a neighborhood issue number 1, but I think it's a people issue, even larger than that. And nobody has presented to us. And I think you got pro and con and I think even the people whose for it have done a poor job of talking about people. They've just going back and forth with you all. Fighting about where it is and that kind of stuff, rather than focus on what it's about and I think it's about people. And that's my concern. And I know Commissioner McCulloch, you had a comment.

Ms. McCulloch: Yeah, I wanted to say something. Again, its not development that we're fighting for. Because this is something that we've been asking for. I know for the first term that I've served so far and as I've said before, we've also come before Community Development requesting development during my first term. But it was explained to the Metropolitan Planning commission by Mr. Turrentine that this is a piloted program. Now we have some similar programs that have been constructed in less than 25 years. For instance, that's - - -is it Pine Hill Estates, I believe. Those houses were spank brand new. They were pretty when they were built. But I would invite each one of you City Councilmen to ride through that particular community and look at the yards and look at the houses. And as I said before, you know we all get excited over something that's new. Our biggest concern here is the fact you're bringing in this influx of rental property which you know, based on some programs that have already been brought in the community, they look like the slums now. So, for that reason, we say forget the renter and if the government is going to offer a package to our people to our brothers and sisters, you know, offer them a better financial package than renting 15 years and then you know with the option to buy. And my question has been to the Metropolitan Planning Commission and this City Council as well, you know if you're going to allow the people to come in under the Louisiana Tax credit, you know, it's been said that they would spend over \$180,000 receiving rent. They're going to have assistance in paying this rent. But then they're going to be left with a balance and my question and nobody has answered that question, once they've paid 15 years rent and if they will and most of 'em don't. You know it's an in and out situation. Who? Will the government let them have the \$25,000 balance to pay it off in order to have ownership, because this is what you're selling to the people. Look, you can own your own home. So, that's the concerns that I have.

Councilman Jackson: Listen you and I - - -

Ms. McCulloch: It's not all about being pretty, it really ain't all about being compatible. It's the financial package. It's as far as I'm concerned, you're preying on poor people and at the same time, you're not giving them anything.

Councilman Jackson: Let me - -

Ms. McCulloch: You want to pretend that you're helping them, when really the mothers and fathers and the children will never own anything.

Councilman Jackson: Let me say this to you. What happens is and again divorced of the emotion connected with it. Let me say this, there are people who live generations in public housing, projects, family after family. The same family, the daughter, the son, the next generation, then next generation. I think Louisiana Housing Financing Program to me is not the best program. But the problem is that it's the only program we have where a person will be able to enter in rent. At the year 16, I can tell you this as well about Louisiana Housing Financing Program as I appreciate it. That person has the opportunity to buy. At the point that, that person, they have no balance at year 16. At year 16, at year 16, they have a decision to make whether to go out and finance the house and purchase it after they've been living there 16 years. And to me, it just looks like a bad- -it's not for a young person who just graduated from college and they got a brand new job, it's not the deal for them. The issue is that it is the deal for a unique group of people who fall into the situation that they are more and more increasingly homeless today. Because they're in a group that's there is nothing provided for them. Do I think it's a bad- -that 15 years is bad? Yeah. But is it all we have. And my issue that is in fact right now, all we have. The State may have to entertain changing the project. To tell people that you're going to put them in home ownership and they're not even a good renter is to continue to do foreclosing which then continues to destroy their credit, which continues to destroy their ability to move into anything else and they really have some serious issues. I think we agree on those kinds of things. The issue though becomes in this case, there are people who live an entire lifetime in a rental property. They won't have a balance at year 16, they have a choice to do the financing at that point. Most mortgages anyway are 30 year mortgages. My thought is and my concern and question would be what then is the market value of that house at year 16 so that they know what they're going out to get a mortgage on. If it's a mortgage on as you say, \$25,000, then you can do that in 15 years. And that would be a total of 30 years that person would have stayed there. Which is going to take me and you and everybody else who owns their house to pay their house off anyway. That's the positive side of it. Will everyone of them be like that? No. Just like I don't believe every person who rents is going to tear their stuff up. There are some people who live in public housing who have immaculate houses, but one of the chief concerns and I think and I've said this to Councilman Lester. If University Park has a neighborhood association? Neighborhoods go bad because neighborhoods allow them to. And people who will not let their neighborhood go bad, don't have bad neighborhoods, because they won't stand for it. There's a lot of things to mitigate those circumstances. My question would be, if in fact that is there, will the University Park Neighborhood Association embrace the folks who live there and be able to provide for them the mentorship the training and those kinds of things that puts them in a better situation, because your neighborhood has that at stake. And it seems to me that if it's going to happen, I think the next thing to do is to be able to take lemons and make lemonade, if you will with this situation. But it just seems to me, that I haven't been put in the position to understand what's going to happen to the people who will still be left without a place to rent or just to live.

Ms. McCulloch: Another concern to me and I would truly embrace the people that would come into the community. There is no doubt about it. But you know as I as I said

before that when we heard about this, this past April, the 200 families that's actually going to be affected by this, one of the questions were, you know that the first 56 houses, there is nothing that you can do about it. And legally, if you took it to the courts, Phase I and II wouldn't come through. But we're told that there is nothing that can be done about it. The one thing that we're asking the Council today is to stop III and IV, because we have been informed by very reliable resources that were recommended by our City Councilman Lester, that when you bring in 800 to 1,000 people on a population at one time, that's not even fair to the community. You're talking about bringing in, from what we were explained, you're talking about bringing 80 to 100 houses that might bring in anywhere from 800 to 1,000 people in population on a set population at one time. And it was definitely explained to me. And somebody here might say, well, no, that's not the case. Well then we won't know. But it was explained to me by the site manager. We're going to build 80 to 100 houses here and not one person will go into one dwelling until the last one is built. So, my concern is, it seems as though the City has a set population in place somewhere to bring in this population. This 800 to 1,000 people at one time. And I feel that, that's so unfair to that community.

Councilman Jackson: Well, and I'm assuming that the 80 to 100 houses. I think if you went out and found out and asked the question, what's the need. You know where is the need. That obviously 80 to 100 houses won't put a major dent into the need, because people say - - -

Ms. McCulloch: Well the need is just not in the MLK area, that's our concern also.

Councilman Jackson: No, I agree, I agree. But I think the need is- - - I don't know what the numbers are, I heard somebody say 1400, 14,000, I understand that.

Ms. McCulloch: (unclear)

Councilman Jackson: And again, Councilman Lester may not agree with me, you know his process of bringing it forward may not have been one that I would have done. It may not have been the way that I would have done it, but what I'm not prepared to do is penalize the people for whatever (unclear)

Councilman Gibson: Mr. Chairman, do we need to extend the time on this?

Councilman Jackson: You got somebody that's got the time? Go ahead.

Ms. McCulloch: So Mr. Chairman, since we're not able to, since we're being told that we can't stop I and II and we're told by our City Councilman in front of hundreds of other residents that there would not be another addition, another phase to the 5th and 6th, and yet a week later, we get a letter that you know, we need you to come down to approve the 52 that we are here today saying you know, uphold the MPC, not to bring in the additional 52, come on with the 5th and 6th, but we're don't need the 52. And that's why we're here today. Thank you all. I appreciate all of y'all. We have - - -

Councilman Walford: We lost our lights.

Councilman Jackson: Oh, the lights went off. Bea?

Ms. Pierce: Oh, I'm sorry.

Motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Hogan to call for the question. Motion approved by the following votes: Ayes: Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Out of the chamber: Councilman Green. 1.

Councilman Walford: Please state the motion if you would.

Councilman Lester: The motion is to overturn the MPC.

Councilman Gibson: Can I get a clarification on how you- - -if you vote yes, that is to

overturn?

Mr. Thompson: The motion is to overturn the decision of the MPC and to approve the subdivision.

Councilman Gibson: So, a yes would be approving?

Mr. Thompson: That's correct.

Councilman Gibson: A no vote would be not approving?

Mr. Thompson: Correct.

Councilman Gibson: Thank you.

Motion approved by the following votes: Ayes: Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Out of the chamber: Councilman Green. 1.

NEW BUSINESS:

1. SUBDIVISION APPEAL - S-52-04: WOODLANDS SUBDIVISION, *Mark W. Prevot*, Alliance, Inc., Applicant East end of Chinquapin Drive, R-1D, One Family Residence District. (D/Gibson)

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Clerk, so we're at New Business. We have a subdivision appeal?

Mr. Thompson: I believe that can be decided today, but I believe Mr. Gibson has a motion.

Motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Carmody to postpone for two weeks approved by the following vote: Ayes: Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Out of the chamber: Councilman Green. 1.

2. ABO Appeal: Ms. Brenda Pope (Postponed July 12, 2004, at the request of the appellant)

Councilman Jackson: Item 2 was decided.

Mr. Thompson: Was decided yesterday.

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES.

Councilman Gibson: I have a report on Infrastructure. August 10th, this City Council Meeting, I've asked Mike Strong to give his last, I guess first half of the year report on infrastructure and then I will be getting to you Mr. Chair, two additional dates. Right now, tentatively, we are looking at September 13th and September 27th to have additional Infrastructure updates in working sessions with Mike Strong and Infrastructure or Department of Operational Services. The 13th and 27th Work Session.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Gibson, I heard you say August 10th, I'm not sure what that was, was that August 10th?

Councilman Gibson: Yes sir. Regular session meeting.

Councilman Gibson: What I'd like to ask and we're not a point of voting anything at this point, but I'd certainly not only as a member of the committee, but just as a Councilman, know that the report that Mr. Strong gives will be a report that we need to hear

and I would just ask that as we were able to devote time and questions to that in fact that we would look to do that on the 9th versus the 10th.

Councilman Gibson: I can appreciate that Mr. Chair, but with some of the comments and concerns that are going on, I think that the public definitely needs to be able to see the presentation.

Councilman Jackson: Sir.

Councilman Gibson: And I'm the Chairman, and I've made the call for August the 10th and that's my recommendation. I won't be available on August (unclear)

Councilman Jackson: Okay. Mr. Clerk, I may be sending you a letter to re-appoint on that committee and we'll deal with that in the way we need to.

Mr. Thompson: Could we ask a question Mr. Chairman? Will the committee report be after the meeting, immediately after the meeting.

Councilman Gibson: It will be in conjunction during the Committee Reports.

Councilman Jackson: What Mr. Gibson is asking is that it will be item 12 and that Mr. Strong will give his report at item 12. And all I'm asking Mr. Gibson again is in deference to everybody including those folks who are watching is that we don't, if we're at 7:00 getting to item 12, I just think in deference to the rest of the Councilman and to those folks who are watching, that one of the things we always forget is that we do open - - we notice every meeting. And we act as if our Monday meetings are done somehow under the cloud of secrecy and that people can't come. Again, I don't seek to judge motive and I apologize if that's what it comes across as. I'm simply saying that as an effort to facilitate one of the complaints we've heard over and over again, was about how loquacious we can become in regards to issues. And I'm thinking that if we have a report of that magnitude and that significance, as I asked this Council with the Convention Center Hotel, that ended up taking us four hours into the meeting with no deference to the people who come to our meetings and in my opinion, in holding a meeting that resembles decorum with regard to time, that we ought to be flexible enough to do just that. Every time we convene, whether it's an Administrative Hearing or the Council Meeting, we convene to take care of the people's business. I would ask that particularly when meetings are going to be lengthy, we can't circumvent the fact that those things that have to be voted on have to be done in Tuesday's meetings. But there are some things that are for the consumption of the public and the Council, that I think lead us to making decisions down the road and will need a vote, that will- - it's my opinion, I wanted you to know where this came from and why it is that I'm in opposition to doing it via television or on Tuesday and so that everybody can see. But I just think that at some point, you know we won't be able to cram everything that we do into a Tuesday meeting and we meet twice, that we ought to do what we can to also make sure that our meetings again, continue to represent some degree of decorum with regards to length and time.

Councilman Carmody: I would think that Councilman Green would probably agree with you on the fact that we ought to keep you know the time constraints, so that it doesn't interfere with our personal schedules, but I would make this observation. That this particular committee report Mr. Chairman, and Council Members is one that is really of such importance to the public that I would really hope that the confines of this Chamber (unclear) and that the only appropriate way to allow the public the opportunity to participate in at least the hearing of the information is to have it televised. I would not be opposed at the work session if the other members would be in agreement to try to see if we could

postpone those things that are going to be lengthy so that we could place the priority of the time on this particular issue. Because it has that much weight. That much significance, especially when you think about the fact that we're headed into the budget hearings in October. And this right here is got to be the Number 1 priority. And again, I appreciate the fact that I would love to think that we could start our Council Meetings at a reasonable time and get out at a reasonable hour, but reasonable was never part of what I understood this service was to be. And that includes getting telephone calls as we all know at the most inappropriate times.

Councilman Walford: I'll vouch for that.

Councilman Carmody: And yet, the nature of it is, if we ask to serve, then we've got to be here and give it the time to do it properly. So, invite the public, especially when it is that important for them to make sure that they're paying attention to what we're doing, cause it is going to affect them directly in the pocketbook. Everyone of us. So, again, that's my suggestion. Because if we could look at the agenda on the 10th of August and see if there is something that maybe that is not going to be that significant, and again, I'm not trying to displace those persons who have business that will hit the agenda on the 10th, but maybe we could actually try to clear the agenda with as much that we can postpone and deal with at the next meeting and focus our attention on this information.

Councilman Jackson: Well Councilman Carmody, let me say, that again, I don't disagree, and again, I appreciate you saying, because I think that expresses at least some reason to say 'lets postpone some other things, and not just because- - you know some folks won't be able to be here on Monday. So, that's in essence, we did it on that day, it wouldn't be convenient for them. So again, I think every time, we get together on Monday, though many of us take those days off, on Monday, we still are doing the people's business on Monday and we handle that very casually. And I think we don't ever talk much about that, but we do and that's an important meeting. I don't want to dismiss the significance meeting, just like I don't want to dismiss the significance of the report that we're talking about now. But what I am saying to us is that certainly whenever it comes to service and whenever it comes to public service, that we need to get whatever time is necessary, but that doesn't mean having a servant's heart and logic have to be conflicting values. You know we can do both. We can have some in my opinion, some logic to how we do things and they're not mutually exclusive, if you will. And that was my only concern and I hope that I certainly wasn't trying to give the impression, cause I've been at every meeting until we were finished. So, I'm not trying to give the impression that I got something else to do. But the truth of the matter is, if we're talking about timing, most of the people in our community work. And most of the people in our community who work don't get off until 5. So, to put it at the top of the agenda and to give it the significance that is necessary, you know certainly, that doesn't mean that some people are not watching. Some people are. But I think that if we ever make an attempt to reach the majority of our folks, it needs to be after 5:00. And I'm just suggesting that. There is a lot that has to be given thought. And we just can't, in my opinion, we won't ever be able to please everybody, notwithstanding ourselves on this Council. So, that's not my issue. I hope that you all receive it in the spirit that it was given. Had nothing to do with the level of significance. Just simply in trying to keep a time decorum. Because sometimes it matters, sometimes it doesn't. And basically sometimes it's based on what our schedules are.

Councilman Gibson: Mr. Chair, that's why I was asking for that Item 12 and working

with Mike Strong, I think Mike Strong is going to be very prudent in giving his report and he has also assured me that those reports will be handed out ahead of time. This is the only, if you looked at the dates that I gave, that's the only date that is during a regular session, the other dates for Infrastructure are during work sessions. But because of what Councilman Carmody has stated, we've said this two weeks ago, we said this four weeks ago, and I think we said it eight weeks ago, the information that was forthcoming out of DOS and because of some other information the Administration has been putting in front of us in terms of critical infrastructure needs and whether it be future or current needs, that the Infrastructure Committee felt that it was imperative that we go and put this before the public to get the maximum exposure. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Walford, you have a report from the so called Feasibility Study Committee?

Councilman Walford: Mr. Chairman, if I may, I'm going to be brief.

Councilman Jackson: For the record, let me just say it's not really called "so called" (unclear) just a - - -

Councilman Walford: No, absolutely not and I think I can say with a great degree of confidence that the Committee took the task very seriously. I'm going to run through what we did, but I will ask the Council Staff, once I decipher it for 'em to please put it in written form and we'll get it to each Council Member. But basically what we're asking for is the consultant that we pick to meet with the City with SMG, with the Shreveport/Bossier Tourist and Convention Bureau to obtain the input that's necessary as far as demand on their part. We want them to look at the economic and demographics of Shreveport. The economic climate right now and also estimate the future growth potential as it might relate to lodging demand beyond just the hotel. I mean, just the new hotel. What's going to happen to lodging demand in Shreveport. We'd like for them to interview key representatives in the area in commerce and industry. And certainly we want them to develop a summary of competitive lodging facilities available. Granted there is an older study. There have been new hotels, motels. We'd like to know their opinion of current overall market demand before we have the Convention Center opened and then we'd like for them to evaluate what we're showing as a proposed size for a hotel. I know we tossed that back and forth today. 300 rooms, 500 rooms, when they meet SMG, they're going to hear what Convention size we're looking for and we're asking them to evaluate what we're talking about in terms of a 300 room hotel with restaurant and so on. And then we're asking them to give us an estimate of the average annual occupancies and what kind of room rates we can achieve. We want the average. We want the best case and we want the worst case. We're going to ask for five year cash flows and the availability of funds for debt service and one of the key things is we're putting a 60 day window asking that it be completed in that time frame. Although it was made light of, I assure you we took the task seriously. I certainly will not tell you that this is all that we will get from the consultants. They're professionals. I'm sure they'll make recommendations on what else they'll give us. But our goal is to see that we get really meaningful information that this Council can use to make an informed decision and that the public can view as well. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Carmody: I might have to direct this to the Administration, because again, I'm not really familiar with how you bring a project of this scope to the financial market, but should this feasibility study in essence provide that final step that the Administration needs in order to put the information in front of those who are going to be

able to evaluate to the solicitation to the market. If I remember correctly, the original study was more or less a market study. Which kinda sounded like what we were asking from this consultant whoever "this" might end up being. But my question is what will be required of the Administration if we get to that point to take this to the market that you do not have yet?

Mr. Antee: Well, the process and let me touch on something that's been mentioned several times, that there has not been a study by an independent third party. Everybody I guess assuming PKF has a vested interest. PKF is not different than HVS, Hospitality Ventures or Price Waterhouse. They've got zero interest in whether a hotel ever gets built or not. They came in and were asked to do a market study, do projections based on operating expenses, financing with the assumptions given by the finance people and render an opinion as to the feasibility of that project. Once they are through with that and they've done that twice. They did it back in 2000 and they updated it and did it again January 9th was the date of it, this year. Once they're paid for that, they're out of it, they're gone and they're on to the next project. So, they're completely independent and have no vested interest whatsoever. Price Waterhouse, they're currently doing a study now. Which is brand new as though they've done nothing before. And its an A-Z, soup to nuts, what's required by the bond market. When we take entire package which is the bids, or not necessarily the bids, but the construction budget, the construction estimates from a constructing estimating firm that are solid. The entire package. Part of it would be the feasibility study by PKF. With a second study being done and the disclosure process that's required anytime you're selling bonds, it will have to be disclosed that there was another study by either HVS or Price Waterhouse. And that will be disclosed in the disclosure statement so that the people buying the bonds will have both of them there. Lot said, but I hope that answered your question.

Councilman Carmody: It does. I guess I'll wait until Miscellaneous Matters to ask my next question and I'll defer back to the Chairman so that we can continue through the agenda.

Councilman Gibson: Okay, in terms of other Boards, or Officers, Boards or Committee Reports, do we have any?

Councilman Walford: Mr. Chairman, if I may since Mr. Lester is not here. We have Property Standards. Sharon, help me. Thursday, at 3:30- - is that correct? Okay, Thursday at 3:30, Property Standards for anybody who is interested.

CLERK'S REPORT:

Letters of Appeal:

1. APPEAL: C-51-04, Property located on the west side of Linwood between Woodrow and Champ Clark Street.

Mr. Thompson: We have letter of appeal concerning C-51-04. And I also wanted to mention. We'd had a question about this. This post legislative, post session legislative report for 2004 was delivered to our offices. I don't know if copies were given to each Council Member. And I don't know if each Council Members want this office to make copies for everybody.

Councilman Jackson: Yes sir, please.

Councilman Gibson: We received a summary report from our legislative lobbyists?

Mr. Thompson: This is all I've gotten. And I really haven't read it, so it might be a summary in - -

Councilman Carmody: Could the Administration ask Mr. Wainwright to come back and kinda give us a summary overview of what occurred during the last session please?

Mr. Antee: We'll be glad to do that and either at the next meeting, or if that's going to be a long one, the next meeting. Y'all just tell us when. And as far as that - - -

Councilman Jackson: The next meeting (unclear) service, he can come to the next meeting, so we - -

Mr. Antee: We would even bring him on a Monday, if that would be more - - -

Councilman Jackson: No, no. That's important. We need to hear him Tuesday.

Mr. Antee: But as far as the legislative report that Mr. Thompson held up, there is an executive summary in the front and then I think attached to it, which makes up a lot of it, I believe are the bills. So, that may help in terms of copies for everybody.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Thompson, if you would get a copy, I'd certainly like to have a copy. I think I owe it to my constituents to read the whole thing.

Mr. Thompson: Yes sir, I'll be sure and get this to you.

Councilman Jackson: Service.

Councilman Carmody: Service with a smile.

There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

//s//Theron Jackson, Councilman Chairman

//s//Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council