

CC 3827
10 19 04

Council Proceedings of the City of Shreveport, Louisiana
October 12, 2004

The regular meeting of the City Council of the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana was called to order by Chairman Theron Jackson at 3:02p.m., Tuesday, October 12, 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 (Arrived at 3:08 p.m.), Walford, Carmody, Gibson (Arrived at 3:06 p.m.), Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Absent: None. **Approve Minutes: Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Hogan to approve the Administrative Conference Summary Minutes of September 27, 2004 and the Council Meeting Meetings of September 28, 2004. 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.

Reports:

- a. Convention Center and Convention Center Hotel
- b. Property Standards Report

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Mayor?

Mayor Hightower: Nothing Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Jackson: I understand that we do in fact have distinguished guests or awards or recognition for at least one of the Councilman. Councilman Green?

Councilman Green: Yes, thank you Mr. Chairman. I have a special guest I've invited to come today, Mr. Sam Giordano, and he has some folk also with him. Come on up Sam and he always comes about this time every year. Sam, the mic is yours. I'd like to say welcome to the Council Meeting and thank you for taking out the time to come.

Mr. Sam Giordano: Thank you Rev. Green. Thank you Council for letting me address you. We are one week away from the State Fair and that's what I'm here today to tell you about. The State Fair opens on October 22nd, which is a week from this Friday, and go 17 days through November 7th. Last year we had around 350,000 people attend the Fair during that time, and we're hoping for even more this year. I ask for your prayers for good weather. We're like plumbers, we're very dependent on the weather and we hope that some of this rain is out of here. Our Board, which I'm happy to tell you has voted to have two days of the Fair (both Wednesdays) as free days. So, there is no citizen that can't come to the Fair, because you can get in absolutely free on

Wednesdays till 5:00 (p.m.). We also have some special days this year. The first Friday, school is out. They have a teachers meeting. So, we're going to open at 12:00 noon for the children. So, we'll open all day on that first Friday. The schools are out again on election day, on Tuesday the 2nd. So, we're going to open at 12:00 noon that day. So that the children who are not in school can come to the Fair. I want to invite everybody to the Fair. It's Fair time. Chris, would you give out some of these.

Councilman Green: I'd like to say welcome to the meeting Chris.

Mr. Sam Giordano: Chris is my son, Chris Giordano, and as our Assistant Manager. Now, the last weekend of the Fair, for the first time, we're having what we call an open rodeo. We've had the professional rodeo before, we've had the LRCA Rodeo. This year it's open, which means we'll have both professional cowboys, amateur cowboys, Louisiana Association, Texas Association- - - in other words, it's open to anyone. I guess one of you could come and join and ride the bulls if you'd like. You don't have to qualify. But we think for our (unclear) here in the City, it'd work out real good having an open rodeo.

Councilman Green: Sam, let me ask you a question.

Mr. Sam Giordano: Yes sir.

Councilman Green: These rodeo tickets- - - if you have enough, just for our guest that's in the audience today, would you give everybody? You got enough?

Mr. Sam Giordano: Rev. Green, that's an excellent idea. And I thought you would ask something like that, so we brought Rodeo Tickets for all the good citizens that are civic minded enough to come to this meeting. Chris, let's pass out some hats. I don't have hats for everybody in the audience. But I know everybody on the Council is a good guy, but they tell me Black Hats are in this year. So, I've got everyone a black hat, cause I expect to see you at the rodeo. Chris, can you hand everybody a hat please. The sizes vary, if you get the wrong size, we could easily exchange it or go to Topps. That's where we got our hats from and Topps will exchange your hats for you.

Councilman Jackson: I don't know about the rest of y'all, but I want to see the Mayor and Councilman Green put those hats on.

Mayor Hightower: I'm going to give my to Councilman Gibson, because I think he needs it more.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Giordano, what year is this for the Louisiana State Fair in Shreveport?

Mr. Sam Giordano: This is actually our 98th Fair. The Fair started in '06. We'll celebrate our 100th year in 2006. If you do the counting, it's actually one year off, but the celebration will be in 2006. The only year we didn't have a Fair was during an epidemic back in what year Chris? The epidemic that we didn't have a Fair?

Chris Giordano: 1918 due to the influenza.

Mr. Giordano: I'm glad I've got Chris to back me up. Make sure you get everyone a hat. Are there any questions that we might answer that you could ask?

Councilman Walford: I do have a question. I tried my hat on, it fits nicely, thank you but, I didn't see Councilman Green try his on. Wouldn't you think that it would be a

nice gesture to try it on?

Councilman Green: Actually, I'm going to wait until I get in the rain.

Mr. Giordano: Well, as long as he wears it the night of the rodeo. That's all we really care about. We'll make sure he does that.

Councilman Walford: Do you have a nice gentle bull that he could ride?

Mr. Giordano: We'll probably have something that he could ride, yes.

Councilman Walford: He's not even paying attention to me.

Mr. Giordano: I will tell you a little about our rodeo. The Pros decided this year to go to the larger building at CenturyTel, and that's the reason we went to an open rodeo. But I'm very proud to tell you that as of last Friday, this was completely clear. We have covered all our expenses. So, the rodeo is going to be very successful. Every ticket we sell from here on, part of the profit goes back into the Fair. As you know, we have a long term agreement with the City of Shreveport. It's been many, many years and we could not put on the State Fair without the help of this City. It's helped us in many ways. They're helping us right now and I want to thank the Council and the Mayor for that help that we get each year. We think it's very important to the City. The Fair, we know we bring a lot of people in from Texas and Arkansas. We did a study last year and I'll be glad to give you that report. But, it'll show you that we're one of the entities that bring as many tourist in as possible. The Lt. Gov. will be our guest this year. He's coming in because he knows what affect we have on tourism. Okay, pass a ticket out to everyone. I won't take anymore of your time, but tell you again, we thank you for your help and we look forward to seeing you at the Fair this year. Thank you.

Councilman Hogan: Yes sir, as you were speaking a moment ago about the impact that it will have. What in terms of dollars are we looking at as far as our local economy? Do you know?

Mr. Sam Giordano: I wish I could quote that exact figure. We do have that, but it's the largest event that we have in the City of Shreveport. I forget the exact dollar impact.

Councilman Hogan: But it's probably over a million (dollars), wouldn't you say?

Mr. Sam Giordano: Oh, it's more like \$10 or 12,000,000.

Councilman Hogan: Oh, is it?

Mr. Sam Giordano: You see the difference is in our event and some of the other events, we have 17 days to put those numbers together. So, it just makes sense. Say a parade. Mardi Gras parades bring in a lot of people, but you're only talking a few weekends. 17 straight days of having people out there, really affects the economy, plus we have about 3-400 people that actually live here during those 17 days. People that come in with the carnival. People that bring in food concessions and such as that. They're either staying in hotels, or hooked up to RVs, but they're buying their groceries, and it does have a large affect on the local economy. Thank you for the question.

Mr. Antee: And Sam, how many high school kids come and spend three or four days from all over the State?

Mr. Sam Giordano: Well, the main reason for the fair, and thank you Ken. The

main reason for the fair is our agriculture. We have the largest livestock show in the State of Louisiana, even larger than the show that's in Baton Rouge, the LSU Show. We also have the largest sale. One of the few sales that are left in the State. So, we educate a lot of kids from that sale. I know some of the prior Councilman, Councilman Glover - - - went to school with some of the money that he won from raising animals and showing at the State Fair. I think every Parish in the State comes here except for Orleans. And it's not too many cows in Orleans. But they'll be up here. They'll be up here for three or four days. There again, they've got the hotels full. Thank you again for letting us come.

Councilman Green: Thank you again Sam. Also Sam said that any of your hats don't fit, then you can go to Topps and get an exchange.

Councilman Jackson: Again, we certainly appreciate that Sam for bringing those hats by and I'm sure I speak for all of the Councilmen when I say that we'll try to make as good use as possible of those hats. Any other guests, or awards of distinguished guests or recognition gentlemen? Thank you.

Public Hearing: None

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

Confirmations and/or Appointments. None.

Adding Legislation to the Agenda. None.

Public Comments

Pastor Rick Edmonds: (9817 East Chase Circle) Thank you for the opportunity to speak this afternoon and I know in just a few moments, you'll be considering adoption of Ordinance 152. And I just wanted to say, that first of all, I'm exceptionally excited about the building that's going on with the Convention Center. I think any of our residents and leaders that drive by are very excited about what we see and the future opportunities for all of our citizens here. And we're excited about that. I know you're considering this hotel and as a citizen, I hope as a community leader, I want to say that Mr. Mayor, I am in favor of the hotel. I think that once we make a decision to be involved in a project of this magnitude that we have to do whatever is necessary to make certain that not only we take the fiscal responsibility, but that we also take the hand in hand responsibility providing the right kind of atmosphere, lodging and etcetera. And so, I am in favor of that and I hope that as well, as many of the citizens of Shreveport are excited about that. I do have an issue that I am concerned about and I called the Mayor last week. Thank you Mayor for the conversation that we were able to have over the- - - concerning any kind of gambling or anything that could be done in the hotel. That we already have, in my opinion, enough casinos in town. Have enough opportunities to do that. I hope that as you consider the building of this hotel, that we will take this amendment that will be offered this afternoon, and I hope that we'll do something together unanimously. You know Mr. Mayor and members of the Council, I think for the evangelical community, we're looking for somewhere that we can hold conventions as well. I know that I had lunch with one of our board members, the Fellowship of Christian

Athletes today, and we'd love to see Regional Conferences or National Conferences regarding our churches, our National Denominational Leaders would like to see that happen. Other para-church organizations such as Focus on the Family, Fellowship of Christian Athletes, and of course many others. I think all of us look forward to having a prime time piece of real estate developed and lodging to go with it. I think that we've started that very well. And so, what we'd ask, is that no gaming be offered there. And the reason is, is because it limits us to be able to - - - as you well know, many of our people in our churches are not going to frequent the casinos. And it's not a right of trying to make a right or wrong, good or bad. It's just not gonna happen. And so what we'd really like is something that'd be a first class hotel to go with what we believe, and I think what you agree is going to be a first class convention center. And so, Mayor, I appreciate your dedication thus far on that and I know, I've read your comments and I know what you spoke to me. And I appreciate that and I look for as a citizen, your support on that and you're the No. 1 Leader. I hope that you'll be our main leader on this to allow us as the Christian Evangelical Community, that we'll have an opportunity for our families, our conventions, and our events to support this. We want to be together on something. Lets unify on something. Maybe this'll be something that'll unify us together as a City. Find something that we can build together. Lets build together something that will pull us all together. And Mayor, Council, you have my support personally, and I hope that you'll consider this and I hope you'll do something together. Make a statement to our community that we want to build something together. Thank you Mr. Mayor and Thank you Council.

Pastor Michael Brown: (6906 Henderson) I come on behalf and in favor of the hotel. And I want to share just a brief story of some 46 years ago and I had a birthday on Sunday. I was born and raised right on Sprague Street. We used to play at the Macaroni Factory, sliding down in boxes. And all the running down to the levy and running back. It's so exciting. I'm so excited to see a building that will be a convention center. I'm so excited about anything that's built on this side of the bridge. When I look across the river and I see so much developing, I somewhat was concerned that the voters were asked to vote whether we do something or not. I think when I voted for my representative, my councilman, I voted for him to make a vote for me. I want to say to you how much of an impact just on I think months ago, we were down in New Orleans at the Convention Center for the National Baptist Convention. We were just in Alexandria for a convention for an Association for Foster Kids, where I chaired the Louisiana Division for Foster Kids and when I went to cities the size of Alexandria, and I see that convention center and the money that it brings and the things that comes to it and having that hotel. I applaud the Mayor for it, and I stand behind you. And when I talk to people who are in my community, I see how excited they are to see something built in Shreveport, something positive. And I think the Convention Center is positive. I think the hotel is positive. I think instead of fighting, arguing about certain things, this is positive for Shreveport. And just as the man said before I did, this is going to bring something positive. Now, people can come to town, visit the hotel, walk right into the

Convention Center. You see these things in Alexandria. You see these things in Baton Rouge. You see these things down in New Orleans. You want to see the same thing for the city you grow up in. You live here. You want to have a Convention Center, not all based on gambling. Now, we can have a Convention Center, now we as far as the Baptist can say, "Okay, when I come to Shreveport, we got a big nice hotel and convention center, and we don't have to always go and find rooms at the boat". I'm in favor of this. I think it's positive. And I really do, and I'm so excited. Even when I look across the river, and I want to share this. At the same token, I'm excited about the hotel being built, I'm a little bit troubled with some of the contracts. I just hope that once we get contracts, like contracts we got now for building the convention center, that our workers don't get laid off and they bring in people from Houston to do the bids and do the jobs. Cause I've talked to people that's down there now, the contractors we got over there now, whoever got the bids, some of these people who go to my church, who got a little job over there, working over there. Finding out they're being fired, and people being brought in from Houston. I wish somebody would investigate on that, because a part of getting it here in Shreveport is that you employ some people here in Shreveport. That all the money go back to Houston, but that money stays here. It's some problems over there and I wish somebody would look into those problems. I talked to Dr. Cash today. We thought about looking into the problem. We shouldn't have all the bids just because you're an out of town contractor, that you bring in out of town work. We've got a good strong labor force here. We've got people who are willing to work, who want to work. I think it's enough money that's going to be in this hotel to give some of these people sub contracts. Keeping the money in Shreveport. I mean, as well as I'm excited about the hotel, and I'm in favor of the hotel, and everybody I talk to is in favor of the hotel. We don't want you to send us to vote for us to vote for something we voted for you to make the decision. Everyone in here is business men. And we voted you there, we put you in office. Make this decision. Whether you like the Mayor or not, what's good for the City of Shreveport. And like I say again, when we look across that river and I'm seeing some good things happen. I want to see the same thing happen this side of the river and I think a hotel is good. And if you really think about it, that convention center is going to be good. Because when I think that when it get's built, I think you guy's pictures are going to be somewhere posted in there, in the hotel or the convention center. So, I'm not here to argue about anything else, but the idea is I think that when you vote today, put aside all your differences and realize what is good for Shreveport. Would a convention center be good? Yes, you know it'll be good. Would a hotel be good next to that convention center? Yes, it'll be good. You know it would be good. Regardless to whose idea was it, if it was the Mayor's idea, or whomever, that's a good idea. If it was Councilman Gibson's idea, I'll say (applauding) "that's a good idea that we do a hotel along with a convention center".

Councilman Gibson: Mr. Chair, can I ask for another three minutes?

Councilman Jackson: Question. Do you need another three minutes Pastor Brown, or could you finish wrapping up?

Pastor Michael Brown: Could I get more?

Councilman Jackson: I'm just asking. Do you require another three minutes?

Pastor Michael Brown: If I can get one. I'm going to wrap it up. I just want to say this. A convention center without a hotel is almost like a glove without a ball. In order to play baseball, you gotta have a ball with a glove. It's almost being without a (unclear). A convention center without a hotel is really not a convention center in these days and times. We need a convention center and just like the man that spoke earlier today, we want somewhere in a hotel, that we don't have to go through the casino. Some people who don't do the casino. They want a place where they can go, where families can go. Because if you doing the casino, that means there are certain areas, if you're not 21, you can't go in. If I'm in a hotel, I want my kids to be able to go up and down a hotel. And I think a hotel would be good and I really want you to think about when this hotel is being built along with the Convention Center, that we've got a good labor force here. And we need somebody- - it ought to be at the end of some contract in the bid to say you're going to hire so many people from Shreveport. You're going to put them to work and you're not going to kick them out and bring in your own people for cheaper labor and whatever. Because some of that money needs to stay in Shreveport. I thank you for this opportunity, and I'm in favor Mayor. I think that was a great idea. A lot of the people who live in this City that are members of my church who were here in the beginning when Shreveport, started, are just excited to see anything go on. I want to see something positive over on this side of the river. Thank you, thank you, thank you.

Councilman Walford: You don't have to come back up. This is for both you and Rev. Edmonds. Mike Carrier, our Convention Center Manager is back there and since both of y'all mentioned conventions, we'd love to have you be diplomats and talk to Mike on how we can get those conventions here in a couple of years, because we'd sure like to have them.

Councilman Gibson: And I appreciate your indulgence. The pastor at Summer Grove Baptist has been called out of town today, but you have a copy in front of you of a letter signed by him regarding Amendment 2 of Ordinance No. 152 and I'd just like to read it on his behalf for the record. I'll make a motion to do that or- - -

Councilman Green: We don't need a motion.

Councilman Gibson: Just so we have it in the record. This is from Pastor Rod Mastellar, Summer Grove Baptist Church. ***"It is my understanding that the public will be financing the Convention Center Hotel. This pastor along with 5,000 members of Summer Grove Baptist Church are adamantly opposed to allowing gaming devices being installed in a publicly funded hotel. There are plenty of places for the people of Shreveport/Bossier to gamble if they so desire. Much more, our City is against gambling in the first place and to allow this would be a slap in the face of our citizens. We support Councilman Gibson's amendment wholeheartedly. Sincerely, Rod Mastellar.*** Thank you Mr. Chair.

CONSENT AGENDA LEGISLATION

TO INTRODUCE RESOLUTIONS AND ORDINANCES

RESOLUTIONS: None.

ORDINANCES: None.

TO ADOPT RESOLUTIONS AND ORDINANCES:

RESOLUTIONS:

The Clerk read the following resolution:

Resolution No. 219 of 204: 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 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 to adopt.

Councilman Gibson: Thank you Mr. Chair. Two months ago, I introduced legislation that would request that the Mayor send out former Request for Proposals for the Shreveport Convention Center. My colleagues stated that this legislation was premature due to the impending feasibility market study that was being pursued by Council at that time. Since then this study, market study has been completed and indicates that this hotel is somewhat feasible. As a result, I am resubmitting this legislation for your support for the following reasons. Obviously, it is important that we have a hotel for the success of the convention center. What the Mayor has not done the due diligence to solicit a private hotel firm to build this facility because only letters and cards have been sent out. A former Request for Proposal sends a message to the private sector that we are going to negotiate in good faith on this issue. And the Mayor's letter does not provide for this good faith approach. Due diligence is in all of our best interest here at City Council for this project. We are committing valuable tax dollars to this project and compromising valuable resources for our City services and infrastructure needs for the future. Until we can look in our constituents eyes and say that we've exhausted every avenue before committing \$52,000,000, we are not doing our jobs. This is not a delay tactic or a study. Lord knows the Mayor has had four and a half years to resolve the issue of funding for this hotel since the approval of the 1999 Bond Issue for the convention center. Also, don't we find it interesting that the City's purchasing of all procurement requires a former Request for Proposal and information for Bid and this is the second largest expenditure, the Administration has put before us, in our City's history. And we are not finding that we want to formerly file a formal Request for Proposal. Why the need to control the project I guess is the question. To support a formal Request for Proposal, we're assuring the taxpayer that we have exhausted all avenues for having a private hotel build this project and the likelihood of this project is to be highly successful in the private sector versus the public sector where history has shown us that four out of five taxpayer supported hotels have failed. If this project fails, then I would ask this Administration, can you assure the taxpayers of

Shreveport that their taxpayer dollars and their City Services will not be cut or that in the future, that we may have to raise taxes in order to make up the difference on the guarantee of the revenue bond. I guess when you look at this issue from that prior statement, would a few months be worth the investment to protect this great City's financial stability in putting together a group to do our due diligence to attract a private hotel into this community? I think the answer is yes. And that's why I asked for your support of this particular legislation for a formal Request for a Proposal to be sent out on this particular project. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Councilman Green: Thank you Mr. Chair. I'd like to commend Pastor Edmond and Pastor Brown for coming down today and giving us some encouraging words as to saying lets build. I appreciate that. Ms. Glass, 219 and 152 that's at the end of the agenda, these two pieces of legislation, do they go hand in hand or if we select 219, do we need 152? Or if we select 152, do we need 219?

Ms. Glass: I don't think they're mutually exclusive, no.

Councilman Green: Okay, so therefore at the end of the day, 152 is at the end of the agenda. Say we did support 219, how would 219 help 152 in the law terms? Or is there any such term? Would it help or would it hinder, or would it just be there?

Ms. Glass: Well, if you're going to require that there be RFPs before you go out for a hotel, that's if I understand it correctly, then you would have to meet that requirement before going ahead with it. The other piece of legislation relates to the financing. So, you would have to accomplish the first requirement and then go on into the second.

Councilman Green: Right, and until the first one and of course, you don't have to answer this, but to accomplish that requirement, it could take anywhere from six to nine to ten months until the author of the legislation was comfortable with the Administration's doing due diligence to satisfy this particular legislation. I just think that when you get citizens coming down and you had a former Council Member yesterday, saying it's time to build, I think that it's time to build. Thank you Mr. Chair. So, on this legislation, my vote will be No.

Councilman Jackson: Ms. Glass, and I guess to piggy back on what Councilman Green said, I know what he was asking, I don't know whether he asked something that would satisfy me. In this language, I didn't see it and maybe Councilman Gibson or you could answer this. In this particular resolution, it did not suggest that this must be done. Obviously, logic suggest that it would be a predicate to 152. That it the actual RFP would have to be in fact be a predicate to being able to doing anything else. Now this language in this resolution doesn't suggest that though.

Ms. Glass: I'd have to look. I don't recall exactly, Mr. Gibson (unclear)- - -.

Councilman Jackson: I didn't see it say before a hotel or before - - - or I didn't see it suggest specifically that this was going to be a predicate. So, the logical sequence of things would suggest that it would a predicate, but it doesn't say that in this resolution.

Councilman Gibson: Mr. Chair, the spirit of the legislation again, if you recall over

60 days ago, I introduced this legislation, y'all - my colleagues told me, that 1) it was premature because of the feasibility issue that we put on the table. And we approved. And we then heard the report two weeks ago. So, two weeks ago, we heard that this hotel is feasible to some extent and if we were going to take the consultant's report that we spent \$30,000 on that obviously in my mind, and I think some others felt, that if it's feasible, they why wouldn't we want to go out for a formal Request for Proposal and see if anybody wants to attach an amendment that limits that scope of time for a 30 or 60 days or whatever you feel comfortable with in order to send a message out there to the private sector, that we are going to negotiate in good faith. And that formal Request for Proposal does have some legality to it that the private sector is looking for, because again, it'd be equivalent to a contractor being called by me right now and saying "hey come down and submit an estimate to build a parking garage. And they know that we've got to go through a public bid process and they're going to say, "I don't think so, because it's publicly bid". "Oh, don't worry about that, just go ahead and submit something. The formal Request for Proposal is there for a reason. And I think again, it's the proper thing to do in order to send a message back to our constituents, that before we ask for them to put their taxpayer dollars to guarantee this project, that we have done everything in our power to do that. That's not to say, it's a delay tactic, because it's not. Because this could have been done 60 days ago. It could have been done over the last four and a half years. A letter was sent out and the Mayor said about three months ago or two months ago, that he sent a letter out on April 4, 2000 encouraging private hotels to come to the table. But those private hotels are not coming to the table unless they see that formal Request for Proposal. And 2) and most importantly, why wouldn't we do a formal Request for Proposal when all the millions of dollars that we spend within City government, we go through that same process, but not on this particular project. So, the spirit is to ask that, that be done and how much time it would take. I'm not Tom Mattox in procurement, I'm not Ken Antee or anybody else that's in the procurement side of things, how long that would take. I think it would be at least a minimum of 30-60 days, because they'd have to advertise it. But at least we could look our constituents in the eyes before we use their taxpayer money.

Councilman Jackson: My next question is and is this to suggest and this is in context of what's already being proposed today and Councilman Carmody, certainly has an amendment to 152, which would require a referendum and I know that you have Councilman Gibson voiced you support for that. I'm assuming the spirit of your support for that would also then suggest that if an RFP is issued, and if we receive requests, and you say we've got one or two requests that look wonderful, then the next step would then be to put it out to a referendum to say to the people we've got two, do you think we ought to go with this. Would we in fact have a referendum and then the people still need in fact to vote on the results of the RFP.

Councilman Gibson: Mr. Chair, a formal Request for Proposal is seeking private dollars, not public dollars.

Councilman Jackson: No, I'm asking you, once we get the private dollars, it's still

going to be an asset built in the City, so we wouldn't need to ask the citizens at that time, what they think about that?

Councilman Gibson: Again, if it's private dollars, we are not asking for public dollars to be involved, so there wouldn't be a reason to ask for a public vote. The public vote as I understand it Councilman Carmody, is put on the agenda because we have gone from what was an original idea by the Administration of a public/private investment process to a 100% publicly financed. And again, there is the difference.

Councilman Jackson: But my question is does the public need to know what's an RFP, what we've requested and then what the folks have said they were going to do. Because to say to them if whatever the name of the hotel, ABC says they'll come and do it for this much. Good deal, we feel like doing it. It's a good deal. Whose land is it on?

Councilman Gibson: Again, a formal Request for - - -

Councilman Jackson: I'm asking whose land would it be on?

Councilman Gibson: The City's land.

Councilman Jackson: Okay, so would we then say "is it okay for them to build a private hotel on your public land by referendum?" Or would this Council say sounds like a good idea, think it's a good business decision. It's our land, people don't need to vote on that because by the way, it's only land.

Councilman Gibson: Mr. Chair, I think that would be the pleasure of the Council and that would be another subject matter.

Councilman Jackson: But is the vote we're talking about today, and you have supported an amendment to this legislation that says build a hotel, on private land with private dollars- - -excuse me. On public land with public dollars, we're suggesting and you have vocally, publicly as well as at this Council Meeting voiced support for it vociferously supported, in fact does the fact that a private sector being or body or group of folks, entity is going to build a hotel, change the fact that it's on the people's land? Does it in fact?

Councilman Gibson: Absolutely not.

Councilman Jackson: If it's on the people's land, then should the people then, because that's their asset, still then in the spirit of 152, Amendment A or 1, should the people then still by referendum vote on it?

Councilman Gibson: I don't have a problem with that and that would be strictly up to this Council.

Councilman Jackson: The reason I'm asking and I'm not trying to put you in a trick bag, the reason I'm asking is because if we look at the time line associated with this, we do have to then factor in an RFP, which by law has a time frame. Okay. We can't just pass an amendment and say, we'll take 25 days, 30 days. If we're going to issue an RFP, there is a law that governs what must happen prior to the RFP, so on and so forth. So we're governed by that law. Then once we've done that, and all I'm trying to do is put into my understanding mentally, what is the time frame we're looking at, in the scenario, if 219, 152, 152-1, all of those things of today are accepted, what is the

realistic time frame and does this then make fiduciary and financial sense? Or is it in fact an attempt to muddy the water and that we deal with murky water. I'm not accusing you of that, I'm asking a question so that we can get clarity. The people deserve that.

Councilman Gibson: Can I answer your question?

Councilman Jackson: Yes sir.

Councilman Gibson: There is a big difference in what we're talking about here.

1) if we're pursuing private dollars, I think the public - - - it's in their best interest to have private dollars in here, because we're going to be pursuing public dollars and those public dollars could be going into other areas of this City, whether it be inner city development, re-development, infrastructure, Police and Fire and other things that we're going to be committing these resources to, not only now, but for the next 30 years.

Councilman Jackson: You've answered my question, because you've said, you believe that if it's done privately, it's your belief that it would be in the best interest of the City. That's your judgement. Not a referendum (unclear). And I'm suggesting that, that's what people elect you for. To decide what's in your judgement, the best interest of the City. But whenever other Councilmen have suggested, well let's do this. You say, well let the people vote on it. Why? Because it's still public land. And I'm suggesting either we're doing what we as Councilmen believe is in the best interest of the City all the time, or we do it none of the time. I don't think we can arbitrarily select which ones we think - - -

Councilman Gibson: Don't twist my words, because - - -

Councilman Jackson: I have the floor Councilman Gibson.

Councilman Gibson: Okay. Excuse me.

Councilman Jackson: I don't believe we can arbitrarily choose in this case versus this case without producing some evidence as to why one scenario is different from another. Public is public, whether it's a strip of land or 40 acres. It's still belongs to the people and we have to be consistent and not only our deliberations, but in the way we voice this, in our passion and all these things. And what people are seeing is a consistent inconsistency. And I think we owe it to them to govern not by polls, not by whatever the opinion is, but what we think is right. And so, I just want to suggest to us, the reason I'm asking is because I want to get in my mind what the time line would be if all of these resolutions and ordinances, excuse me these resolutions, both 152 and 219 are employ, what would be the possible and/or probable time line. I know that's not a difficult question. But that's what I'm trying to find out.

Councilman Gibson: Councilman, but at the same time, that's a separate issue from what you just said. I've been consistent. I have no problem with the public weighing in, whether it be a private investment sitting on our land or, are we going for public dollars. I think the public needs to weigh in either way. And I've been consistent on that from day one. And then I answered your question and then you went off on another tangent. But in terms of time line, that's a separate issue altogether, versus whether we should go through a referendum if we attract through a formal Request for Proposal for a private hotel to come in and build on that land, that should also be

something that the public weighs in, because they've weighed in on the Convention Center and passed \$85,000,000 worth of investment on that particular complex. And I have no problem with the public weighing in on anything that we do regarding dollars. I think I have the floor Mr. Chair.

Councilman Jackson: No, I have to give you to the floor sir. You answered my question, that's adequate.

Councilman Carmody: Excuse me Mr. Chair. And just as a point of information and it goes back to - - - I think it address the Chairman's question. In the original plan for the Convention Center, the public was told that we would end up having a private hotelier come in and develop on this public property, this site. So when you ask, would it require a public vote, I don't think that, that was ever - - -

Councilman Jackson: Well, let me ask you this Councilman? I think you've said something.

Councilman Carmody: I'm sorry.

Councilman Jackson: Let me ask a question about what you've just said. Because there's no reason for you to see without clarity on the first part.

Councilman Carmody: But I didn't finish my thought though.

Councilman Jackson: Okay, I'm sorry. Please accept my apology.

Councilman Carmody: That's okay, and you're welcomed to question. I just want to make sure that we were right on the - - - originally what we were talking about and the Administration laid out for the previous Council was that they envisioned that the City would have to back stop or guarantee about \$3,000,000. Okay? And today what we're talking about is a little bit greater than 13 times that amount. So, the equation has changed somewhat. And the significance of what the community is going to be required to stand behind and guarantee if the hotel does not make enough money to cover it's debt service and operation, is the reason why the consideration for the public to have a chance to vote on this, because it will directly affect the ability of the community to provide services if the present level of service have to be cut in order to keep the hotel open and operating. Yesterday, Mr. Dark pointed out to the Council that the Administration is anticipating about a million dollars a year, from the General Fund that we'll have to spend for the Convention Center to keep it open. We know that. But again, if you look at the schedule of debt service on the Convention Center, it's approximately \$2.4 (million) that's the debt service. If we don't make enough money to cover the debt service and the operational cost on that business, a Mayor and that Council has got to make a pretty hard choice about where to find the money and what to cut to keep it going. That's going back to what you'd asked.

Councilman Jackson: Are you done?

Councilman Carmody: Yes sir.

Councilman Jackson: Now, let me go back to what you said. You said that the people were told in '98 I'm assuming, '99, that it was going to be private land, it's gonna be a hotel - - -

Councilman Carmody: Public land.

Councilman Jackson: It's going to be public land, it's going to be a private hotel, so that's the reason. Now, I think we may be mixing words. The people were told, if I'm not mistaken, I remember voting on that. I don't remember reading anywhere in that voting machine that please vote for this and by the way- - - we may be having a- - -. So, whatever the people were told at that particular time was probably what everybody expected. What everybody did not expect is that on September 11, 2001 we would experience the problem that we experienced in America. Now, I don't know how you sandbag, (I guess that's not the right - - -) how you prepare for that. The unforeseen. And all of us have agreed that the economy changed drastically because of that. That was in fact a mitigating factor if nothing else. So, my suggestion is, it almost sounds as if every time we talk about it, that someone is guilty and I guess it would be the previous Council and this Mayor of somehow or another lying, or would be guilty of having lied to the people if we move forward. Because the people thought we were going to do this and somehow or another we may be (unclear) not in good faith. I don't want to accept that as what in fact, I'm interested in doing. What my concern is that, there are things that we decide again, arbitrarily. The law dictates that certain thing we must by referendum do. I think we send a bad message when we suggest we're not levying taxes. The law suggest we must bring that back to the voters for a referendum before we levy any new taxes. We never bring back to the voters the fact that the prior Council raised water bills-water rates 33%. They never asked the people to vote on that. 40+ %. Never asked the people to vote. That affects every person. What we're talking about today, if things work well, and nobody knows how well, they'll be or how bad they're going to work. But if things work well, the City will not be out of a red cent. When it comes to water bills, you're going to pay 41% come January. You're going to have, and all of us have seen as individuals, all been affected by that. But I guess my concern is that at some juncture, we feel like what we do is in the best interest. We have fiduciary responsibilities, financial responsibilities, and we do it, we grit our teeth. Sometimes hold our noses, but we do it because it's the hard work of the Council, yet in other times, and moments of what seems to be political convenience, we then all of a sudden pass the ball off and suggest that there is some other way. I don't mind doing that. I just don't want to be one of the Councilmen that as general public label say "well you lied to us, you went along with it, you knew they say- - -". Cause people believe what they hear us say. And very often, we're mixing words, and it's not necessarily all accurate. That's the reason, I've asked what about the time line. The truth of the matter is if this hotel is going to open, whatever date- - - Mr. Mayor, what's the perspective opening date for the hotel? I'm sorry, the Convention Center, I meant to say the Convention Center..

Mayor Hightower: The Convention Center will be January of '06.

Councilman Jackson: January of '06, and if we RFP, and then we referendum, then it would be fair to say that it would be 2007, maybe mid 2007 before we - - - maybe I ought to ask Councilman Gibson, I don't know, but in that time frame, wouldn't that put us somewhere, that would put us far behind the opening of the Convention Center. Am

I wrong about that?

Councilman Gibson: I'll defer to Councilman Carmody.

Councilman Carmody: That's alright, I just wanted to make sure that I kinda came back to clarify for you. What I'd like to do is to speak to the merits of the legislation that's before us.

Councilman Jackson: Well, let me say - - -

Councilman Carmody: I know, but - - -

Councilman Jackson: I didn't - - -

Councilman Carmody: I'm sorry, but you'd asked me to help bring some clarity to this and that's what I was trying to do.

Councilman Jackson: Let me just clarify. I think that I was asking Councilman Gibson, you weighed in to clarify your side right?

Councilman Carmody: Yeah - - -.

Councilman Jackson: Well, I'm satisfied with what you've said.

Councilman Carmody: Okay, and then I will request another opportunity to speak.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Carmody.

Councilman Carmody: Thank you sir. Again, because, and I really want to make sure that the public understands this. Because the scenario of what we envisioned as being the process as to how we would proceed to have a hotel adjacent to our Convention Center has changed. I think that Resolution 219 requesting a formal RFP is a prudent action on the part of the Shreveport City Council, because again, what we have done is that we have had communication, and all verbal through the Administration whereby they have sent letters to persons to ask them to respond back to the City if they had a level of interest on the hotel in downtown Shreveport. We have not actually gone out and formally told those hoteliers or developers what we would be expecting. If indeed an RFP were sent out and we did receive back, some proposals, then the public would know that we had done the best we could to evaluate those. It's not again, an intent I think, on anyone's part to delay a project, but if we do not at least formally request proposals, we will not know what is out there. As I say, the Administration has assured us, they've contacted people. They've called, they've sent letters. We have not seen anything back. And so, my support will be for 219. It appears that the Council may not agree with me, but I do think that it's the right way for us to proceed. Thank you Mr. Chairman. I appreciate the opportunity to put in my two cents.

Councilman Green: Thank you Mr. Chair. I have one question to ask Mr. Gibson, and then I have a statement. Mr. Gibson, on your amendment that's on 152 that deals with - - -

Councilman Jackson: Councilman Green, with all due respect, we're not on that.

Councilman Green: No, I'm making a - - -

Councilman Jackson: I understand, but we have to wait until we're on that resolution. If it's not relevant to 219 - - -

Councilman Green: Yes sir, it is.

Councilman Jackson: Then it would be out of order.

Councilman Green: It is.

Councilman Jackson: If it's relevant to 219- - -

Councilman Green: Yes.

Councilman Jackson: As long as it's not 152.

Councilman Green: It's not 152. If in fact a private sector comes back and say, "yes, we want to build a hotel". What if in fact, they won't gaming in their hotel, that they're going to be. Then how would we deal be with an amendment that says no video poker in the nice hotel beside our convention center?

Councilman Gibson: Again I will be consistent and ask for the same thing, because it'd be incorporated in the contract.

Councilman Green: So, if in fact, they say if we can't have three video poker machines, then you will say to them- - -

Councilman Hogan: Point of Order Mr. Chairman. I'd like to call Point of Order, cause we're not discussing whether it'll have video poker or not.

Councilman Jackson: Let me - - -

Councilman Green: What happened to him?

Councilman Jackson: I think Councilman Green, I think was wise enough to craft it and to talk about the RFP and what would be in the RFP in regards to gaming. And so, it would make it relevant in this particular context.

Councilman Green: At least we ought to know when to call Point of Order. So, my question is how could we tell a private entity what you can't have in your hotel? That's my question. And then my next question is, on the one hand, and I'm sure that you invited the Pastor down to speak, so that when we got to the part of your amendment, that you would have his support. But he supports you on that, but then you ignoring what he says. He said, let's build. He has 5,000 members. He says lets build the hotel, and lets build it now. So therefore, we can't have our cake and eat it too. We've got to decide what are we going to do? You've got the Pastor that says, "listen lets build, I've got conventions that's ready to come. I'll help you, I'll work with you, but on the other hand, I just don't want the video poker". So therefore, with yours, you say "lets build, but wait".

Councilman Gibson: Mr. Chair.

Councilman Green: Sir, I'm not finished.

Councilman Gibson: Oh, okay. I heard two questions. Okay, I'll wait for your third question.

Councilman Gibson: So my question is how do we divide this and then on the other hand before we put something on the agenda, I think we ought to think it all the way out. It has to get all As and all the Bs together, because if I were spending my own money to build a hotel, \$52,000,000 or whether it cost \$52. I wouldn't want this Council and nobody else to tell me what I can or what I can't have in there. So therefore before we move from this, I think it ought to be clarified in this RFP, are we going to put in

there, you can build a hotel, but there are some specifications that you've got to read, to go in, you can't have video poker. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Gibson: Can I ask you a question? I sure appreciate Councilman Green. Thank you Councilman Green, thank you Mr. Chair. First of all, it is your money. You said if it was your money, it is your money Councilman Green. It is all our money that is guaranteeing this hotel, and lets not lose perspective of it. First of all, the distinguished Pastor Edmonds of Calvary Baptist Church, never said he was in support of publicly financing the hotel, he said he was in favor of the hotel. This Councilman has been in favor of the hotel from day one. The question I have had from day one is how we go about financing this hotel? And if you heard in this RFP, one of the reasons why I have questioned the publicly financed is that we have not done our due diligence and go out and send out a formal Request for Proposal in order to do good faith negotiations with a private hotel under the disguise that we have to control this hotel. I don't understand why the City has to control a hotel, we're not hotel operators. So, to be clear plus the Pastor of Summer Grove Baptist, nowhere in his statement did he say he was supporting the publicly financed hotel, he said he was in support of the hotel. Just like Pastor Edmonds said the same thing. I think you will find most people in this town that I've talked to, my district has said unequivocally, they're in favor of the hotel, they have problems in how we're going about financing the hotel, and that's the issue that we're dealing with here ladies and gentlemen. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Councilman Green: You didn't answer the other part.

Councilman Walford: Y'all are not going to like me, because I'm going to start throwing some numbers out to you. Get your pen and your pad ready. If you'll recall, Mr. Gibson wanted a feasibility study and we voted for a second one, and here it is.

Councilman Gibson: That's actually a market study.

Councilman Walford: HVS feasibility study, market study, whatever. It tells us pretty clearly that year one the net income of the hotel under a public ownership would be \$2,134,000. That's fine for us. But let's talk about a private operator coming in and operating this hotel. Mr. Carmody, you're going to be very familiar with this, because you deal with this. Mr. Johnson's going to be out there and I can take this in ten minutes and he would tell us this is a bad deal. They're going to invest \$52,000,000. They expect a return on their investment. Being very conservative at 12 ½ %, they would expect six and a half million dollars return on an investment, year one. They're going to pay interest on that \$52,000,000. I'm going to assume six and three-quarters, which is a very low cost of capital - - - three and a half million dollars worth of interest. They're going to pay property tax that we will not pay in a public ownership. I don't know how to put a figure to those. I'm going to say that several hundred-thousand dollars at a minimum.

Councilman Carmody: I think it's just on some improvements though, above ground, because we'd actually own the land that the amenity would sit.

Councilman Walford: Granted. But we get a big chunk off the two casino hotels for the improvements.

Councilman Carmody: Right.

Councilman Walford: \$200,000 in there. They're going to pay income tax. Well, not really, because they're not going to make any money when it's over. So, it's not going to work for a private operator. It's just not there. Their cost of capital is so different than ours. Their expected return on investment is different than ours. Their tax structure is different than ours. So, this has gone out. I mean it's not like it's a secret that Shreveport is considering a hotel. The Administration has sent it out. We didn't get any response. The only response that we had recently was Omni Group and they wanted us to do like Ft. Worth and give 'em the moon, and I'm not sure that I'm ready for us to take public land, spend a fortune and hand it over to them like Ft. Worth did. I don't think we have to, I think we're in a position where we can effectively do this without it. And I frankly, I think this is a delaying tactic. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Lester: Thank you Mr. Chairman. A Request for Proposal is one way that a city would invite people to do something. It can be done in a number of ways. I think the record is clear. I'm going to put my- - I want to wear my black hat, but I'm not going to do it. I'll put the black hat on later. The fact is the record is clear, that the City through this Administration has solicited the private hotel industry to build a hotel. I think the record is clear. Some people say they're not satisfied with that. Some people say that, that's not up to their expectation. But the record will reflect that it has been done. Then I hear that the RFP is seeking private dollars to build the hotel. Well, if the question is seeking private dollars to build the hotel, then why do we need an RFP? I would imagine if Marriot, or (unclear) in hotel chain, from the top to the bottom, from the Westin, (unclear) Annatole, or any of those guys, if they were interested and wanted to build a hotel here in Shreveport, they wouldn't need an RFP. They would contact the Mayor and say "Mr. Mayor, I want to build a hotel next to your convention center. This is my package." And at that point, then the decision would be ours as a City Council, whether or not we dealt with the land. The question then will become - would we obligate the land through a lease? Would we obligate the land through a purchase? If we decided to purchase the - - - quite obviously, the constitution says we cannot give anything that's the City's without due process and RFP. But if they come to us and say this is what I want to do, then at that point, we make a decision, put it out. Say look, someone has come in with this offer. If anybody wants to beat this offer, you've got 30 days to beat this offer, otherwise we're taking it and we're going. Whether that's a lease or a purchase or whatever. But the fact of the matter is, if we're talking about private dollars with a private hotel, that the City is not going to own, there is no need for an RFP. There is none. We're talking about a publicly owned, publicly financed hotel. We're talking about apples and oranges gentlemen. I don't understand the need for an RFP, because like I said at the end of the day, the question is has the Administration sought other people to do this? The answer is yes. Bottom line. And if we're concerned about private dollars, if tomorrow someone comes and says I want to build a hotel right next to the convention center, they will make themselves known. Anything else, I think is not necessarily a stalling tactic. I wouldn't subscribe anybody's

motive, but I would have to question whether or not they were truly in favor of a hotel. It just doesn't make any sense to me. It's not as if the City Council today has decided to run off and elope with Marriott. I mean, we've had an engagement, it's been pretty extensive. Everyone knows about it, it's been out there. Now we're at the point where we're going to speak now or forever hold your peace. Those that are for what the Mayor has done will speak now, those that aren't will speak as well. Those will be on the record. Fine. And we'll move on to something else. But for us to say we want to do an RFP for a privately owned, privately financed hotel, I don't understand the need because there is no need for an RFP if the public is not going to own it. Thank you Mr. Chair.

Mayor Hightower: Thank you Mr. Chairman. First of all, let me make one thing clear. We've done our due diligence. We've been working on this project for months, as a matter of fact, for years. And let me make it very clear and I think everyone on the Council understands, I don't want the City to be in the hotel business. Never have, don't want 'em to be in it now. But unfortunately, the private sector has not stepped up to any measure to say that they would come here. Given the dilemma, we went out and tried to figure out a way that it could be done. Shreveport is not alone in this dilemma. This scenario has been repeated several times in other cities across the country that have convention centers and could not attract the private sector to come in and build hotels. The facts are we've been down this road, once before. We sent out letters, and call them what you will, they were letters of invitation with the Mayor of Shreveport's letterhead and my signature on them asking for interested parties to contact us so that we could explain to them what we had to offer and what we felt like the opportunities were for their companies. We did it several years ago and we did it after it came before this Council several weeks ago and the Council voted not to request formal RFPs. We went back to the marketplace anyway and once again asked. We've had articles and scenarios sent to us, we follow up on every single one of 'em. We've talked to hotelier after hotelier after developer after developer to try to encourage them, spur them on, incentivize them to come take a look and put their money in Shreveport, Louisiana. We've been told no by people from as far as away as far away can get to people two blocks down the road, that they weren't interested in the development of this convention center hotel. So, to say that we hadn't gone out to the private sector to seek solutions is not correct and I think every citizen needs to understand that. We've done it twice. Twice in letters of request to numerous hotel companies, management companies and developers. And the fact of the matter is that there has been no significant interest other than companies and individuals that would have liked to come in and manage the hotel. No one has come to the table to say "we want to put up our money to make this thing work". We can look, it's been mentioned a couple of times here today and over the past several weeks of the Ft. Worth scenario. I think most people given the facts of the Ft. Worth scenario would have to say they were crazy. They gave away city assets, the City of Ft. Worth is putting up 55-60% of all the incentive to do the hotel, and at the end of the day, the private sector company will own the hotel. I suspect we could get

that deal too. I think there are a lot of takers on a deal like that. But do we want to put up our money, turn it over to the private sector and even go so far as to enable them to sell the property two years down the road, pocket the profits and walk? That's not something that I think that we want to do. If there is a Council Member, Councilman Gibson, this is your piece of legislation, you've had as long as I've had to work on this project and if there is a hotelier out there, a development company out there, that wants to come to Shreveport, sit at the table and talk about putting and structuring a deal that this Council will accept, I'd be more than willing to do that from day one. Again, I don't want to be in the hotel business and neither does anybody here. But given the circumstances, it's time to either put up or shut up. And I think we're to that point. And if there is a better way to finance it, we're certainly open to that as well. Again, I didn't dream this up, Ken didn't dream it up. There are many scenarios across the country. We went to the best. We went to PKF. At your insistence, we went to HVS. We went to Citigroup, Solomon Smith Barney, Hilton Hotels. You know I could go on, and on, and on - - HRI. Of the people, the experts that we've gone to insure that this hotel will be a successful venture, that we argue about today and are proud of a year and a half from now because it will make the convention center do the things that it wants to do. But to say that we hadn't done our due diligence, we haven't done our job, we haven't solicited. That there's anything out of order or misplaced, through this process is divisive, its misleading and its simply not true.

Councilman Gibson: Thank you Mr. Chair. First of all this legislation is not divisive in any form or fashion. And in response to giving away City assets, if a private hotel came in. Ladies and gentlemen, we're talking about \$52,000,000 worth of city assets if this thing goes south and I guess too Mr. Mayor, I've got a question to you that opens the door - - - Resolution 150, that this City Council passed for a feasibility study. HVS was selected? Was that a feasibility study or was that a market study? Because on the cover it says Market Study.

Mr. Antee: Well, you can call it what you want. But it's the company that you asked for Councilman Gibson with the instructions that this Council ask him to do. So, the study is what the Council asked for.

Councilman Gibson: Excuse me Mr. Antee.

Mr. Antee: I can answer your question.

Councilman Gibson: Is it a feasibility study?

Mr. Antee: Is it po-ta-to or po-tot-o? You can call it a feasibility study or market analysis study.

Councilman Gibson: Mr. Chairman, I'd like to defer to Mr. Thompson. Could you read Resolution 150 to ask what this council passed regarding that resolution that this City Council instructed the Administration to perform? Could I ask you to read that specific caption?

Mr. Thompson: The Mayor is authorized and urged to execute a contract between the City and Price Waterhouse Cooper Inc., a hospitality evaluation services inc., or any other professional company for an independent feasibility study of a new

land based hotel provided in said contract as approved by the City Council.

Councilman Gibson: Thank you Mr. Thompson. The reason why I asked for that is because again, it was independent nature, it would look at the - - - I understand that, I'm - - -. Okay. That's fine.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Thompson, in that same, the Council approved that, is that correct?

Mr. Thompson: That's correct.

Councilman Jackson: Was there an amendment to that as well, which put in place a committee?

Mr. Thompson: That's correct.

Councilman Jackson: And gave a particular number of days to come back?

Mr. Thompson: Correct.

Councilman Jackson: And I think it was September, I think last month when we received it back, and I think at the last Council Meeting, they came and gave us an overview of it?

Mr. Thompson: Right.

Councilman Jackson: I guess my questions was, and I think, I mean I don't know, and I don't want to say we're splitting hairs. But we sat for about two hours I believe, and watched the people give us the deal the last time, and I don't remember ever and I don't have the record, but I think if we go back and look at the minutes, Councilman Gibson, you can tell me, I don't remember that every being a subject and I think perhaps it leads people to believe that every time we come to a meeting, there is something different, though maybe it may not be.

Councilman Gibson: No sir. Well, let me explain because Councilman Walford had cited some numbers out of there saying that these numbers are going to produce a profit, which then drives the question - - - is this a market study or whether it's a feasibility study, and that's what got me to address that to the Administration, on the fact that we did express specifically. And I also heard you make some comments in some prior conversations between Councilman Carmody and I, talking about we're mixing apples to oranges. But the fact when it comes down to things, we asked for specific information. We approved specific dollars and then we get something different.

Councilman Jackson: I'm asking, did we get- - - when we listened to the whole deal and we questioned the guys last Council Meeting, were we in fact dissatisfied at that meeting?

Councilman Gibson: We're still, we're still - - -

Councilman Jackson: Because nobody expressed (unclear)

Councilman Gibson: We're still in a position of not knowing where we're at.

Councilman Jackson: But I'm saying, we asked questions about its feasibility that you know, whether or not, then what it meant- - - we asked a lot of questions about it. But I guess I'm concerned that now, it becomes an issue of whether or not it's a feasibility study or a market study. It was a market study at the last meeting in September, it's going to be a market study today, it's going to be a market study a year

from now. And I guess my concern is if you had a question- -I don't want to accuse you of simply splitting hairs or stalling, but I mean if it quacks like a duck, and it walks like a duck, most times it's a duck.

Councilman Gibson: Well, do I still have the floor Mr. Chairman?

Councilman Jackson: Yes sir.

Councilman Gibson: Well, first of all, we're in a discussion on 219 regarding putting out for a formal - - (unclear) feasibility study. Oh, I know that, but it's tying into this. To ask for a formal Request for Proposal, because we're on the verge of committing significant second largest capital project in the City's history. Which again, we're up here making decisions based on information that's provided to us, then again, I go back to that word due diligence. This Mayor has been a Councilman for eight years. We've got to answer to those constituents when this vote is cast today, either right, wrong or indifferent. I know what my constituents have said overwhelmingly. And again, when we start seeing the results of things, a year or so down the line or two years down the line- - - oh, but we asked for a feasibility study, or we relied on what Councilman Walford said in terms of it's going to make \$2.1 (million) and the private sector can't come in here. On top of that, the Mayor says, he's done his due diligence in the fact that he put out letters and only got a few inquiries. Did anybody on Council see those inquiries? Did we see any of that information?

Councilman Lester: They gave us copies and it's in the record.

Councilman Gibson: I didn't ever see that.

Councilman Lester: No, he did.

Councilman Carmody: No we got his letters.

Councilman Gibson: His letters?

Councilman Carmody: Yeah_

Councilman Gibson: I'm talking about the responses.

Councilman Carmody: No, I didn't see any responses.

Councilman Gibson: Alright and again, hey_ That's fine. But that's when I say due diligence. There's a lot behind that. Just like when we go into business, we have to cover certain things, and this is a business decision ladies and gentlemen, that we're dealing with up here. And again, I'm not splitting hairs. It comes down to fiscal responsibility, due diligence and things of that nature in terms of the people that we represent in our district and what the best interest would be. No doubt, the hotel is needed, but again, we paid money and I know if I ask Mr. Antee what's on the cover of that book, that HVS produced, I don't see anything on there that says feasibility.

Mr. Antee: Mr. Chairman, may I just respond to- -?

Councilman Gibson: Thank you Mr. Chair.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Antee, I really don't want this to go on any further that it already has- - .

Mr. Antee: (unclear)

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Antee, I don't want it go any further than it has, because somewhere or another somebody is going to say something and then we're

going to define that word and say what does that really mean and we're going to go on an on and at the end of the day, there has not been any significant debate and certainly not substantive debate that's going to change anybody's minds. At the end of the day, if it were a good deal and I want to explain this, because I'd like to also call for the question. If it were a good deal and I think the public deserves to know the truth. \$52,000,000 in the private sector, we talked about the City is going to spend or lose - - I think the word was \$52,000,000. You know \$12,000,000 of those dollars are not the taxpayers dollars from the City of Shreveport. They are Capital Outlay dollars from the State of Louisiana. Now, if it were a good deal, the bottom line is, and I think somebody said it. And if I'm wrong, you can correct me. The private sector - - - we wouldn't have to ask the private sector. If it made sense for the private sector, they'd be in it. Why won't the private sector do it. Somebody said, I think it was Monty. It won't make money. Well, a person who's sitting out in the audience and listening to television or something may say, "well if it won't make money, why do it"? That sounds like a real no-brainer question. It's dumb. If it doesn't make money, why do it"? Well, it doesn't make money in the private sector. We have what I would like to call a municipal advantage. We have a municipal advantage because the taxes that a private sector person would pay, the City is not going to pay. \$12,000,000 of capital outlay, the private sector cannot get from the State of Louisiana. We have it. The interest rates that we can get the private sector would not be able to get. They would not make money. It would take a long time for the private sector to make money in this deal, whatever they did. They can't afford to wait 12 or 15 years to make money. We're going to be making tax dollars at the same time that we're going to be moving to stabilization. But the City has a municipal advantage. It's simple. The City can do what an individual can't do. That's just the bottom line and so, since we need it, and nobody stepped to the table, I want to know - - - I was listening for anybody to tell me what Councilman Gibson knows, that even if we do an RFP, it doesn't guarantee that we have to take any of those proposals. I mean it could - - - that whole process could be over and we say, well we did it and you know, lets go back and do it. He would tell you himself that if it doesn't work out, we're going to be back to where we are right now. And I'm suggesting that I have done due diligence. Everybody in my district - - - I'd be lying if I told you all my constituents felt one way. They don't. Some of them didn't vote for me, some of 'em did. Some gone like it, some of 'em will not. That's not the issue. The issue is have we done our due diligence? Do we feel comfortable? If Councilman from District D does not fee comfortable, he has a right to be uncomfortable. I feel comfortable. I vote out of my level of comfort. On item 219 gentlemen, I'd like to call for the question.

Motion by Councilman Jackson, seconded by Councilman Walford to call for the question.

Councilman Jackson: I'm sorry.

Councilman Carmody: Clear the board Bea.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Thompson, if I made the motion and we've got a second, can I rescind my motion before we vote?

Councilman Thompson: Yes.

Councilman Jackson: I want to rescind my motion because I think it would be unfair. Councilman Hogan has sat here and not had an opportunity to speak. If we vote, then he would not have had any say, and I think that would be not allowing his district to have a voice. So, I hope you gentlemen will allow me to do that.

Councilman Walford: Sure, we just need the board cleared.

Councilman Jackson: You can undo it.

Councilman Carmody: Yeah, you can now do it.

Councilman Walford: My "No" vote doesn't want to do it.

Councilman Hogan: Thank you Mr. Chairman. I couldn't agree more with what you said more, that nothing I say or nothing any of have said is going to change our minds. I would like to be on the record as explaining why I'm about to vote and I have a few comments to make about that. It won't take long. Councilman Gibson, was it about - - - how many weeks ago? Five or six weeks ago, you introduced the ordinance, the amendment rather? About six weeks ago, that you came up with the ordinance or the Request for Proposal which included a full service hotel or a limited service hotel. And as you mentioned a while ago, we had debate over that and we thought it was premature. I did vote against that and one of the main reasons I voted it against it, is because I felt like based on the information that I had, that we need a limited, excuse me. A full service hotel. And also I shared the opinion too that it could have been premature, so I was looking forward to you bringing this amendment back today so I could vote in favor of it. I just wanted to clarify that. I'd also like to clarify. A couple of comments have been made that this is a delay tactic. This is not a delay tactic on my part. I'd like for everyone to know that there is no conspiracy up here. If there is, I'm not a part of it. Mr. Mayor, somebody mentioned a while ago about whether or not we like you or not. I happen to like you. I'll say that on record. It's nothing against you personally. You know, we don't always agree and I'm okay with that. However, I think it would be the prudent thing to do to go out for this RFP since 1) technically, one has not been done. You know back to the convention center originally, and sometimes I think when I mentioned 18 months ago, we still ought to consider changing the name of the "Convention Center" to the "Contention Center", but nonetheless, we went out for RFPs on that in the beginning. Several months later, time rocked on, things happened, we ended up going out for another RFP, which resulted in a much better situation than before. Is that not right? We were several million dollars less. Mr. Antee, isn't that correct? The second time we went out for RFP on the convention center, it came in some \$15,000,000 less?

Mr. Antee: I'm not following you. You're talking about the second time we sent out to see if any private company was willing to build and own it?

Councilman Hogan: Yes.

Mr. Antee: No, it came back that the only legitimate response of anybody that

had the (unclear) to come in and do it, wanted the concessions along “had to be something equal or better than what we got in Ft. Worth”, which was 56% of the capital put up by the public entity.

Councilman Gibson: Point of Order Mr. Chair. I think he’s asking about the - - -

Mr. Antee: I don’t think he asked you Councilman Gibson.

Councilman Hogan: I’ll defer to Councilman Gibson.

Councilman Jackson: No, no. Councilman Hogan- - -.

Mr. Antee: We never went out for an RFP.

Councilman Hogan: You’re not answering my question actually Mr. Antee.

Mr. Antee: I’m trying to understand what the question is.

Councilman Jackson: Let me - - - let Councilman Hogan, if you can ask the question again?

Councilman Hogan: Well, as I recall, we had gone out the second time after - - - we went out a second time to look for people, construction companies that would build the convention center.

Mr. Antee: Oh, on the construction. I’m sorry.

Councilman Hogan: The construction. Yes. And so, I’m not asking for a dollar amount. My point is that it came in less.

Mr. Antee: No, no. It completely changed the process from a construction manager to a public, lump sum public bid. And that bid came in \$6,000,000 below what the Whitaker contract was.

Councilman Hogan: \$6,000,000 below?

Mr. Antee: Correct.

Councilman Hogan: Thank you. That answers my question.

Mr. Antee: I misunderstood.

Councilman Hogan: That’s what I was looking for. You know, so, I guess my whole point is- - - why wouldn’t we go out for an RFP? We could argue that till the cows come home. However, I’d just like to make my point clear and by the way, a while ago, I know this is going to generate a response, but I’m going to say it. I just felt like my point of order was in order because we got off on discussion of Amendment 2 of No. 152, item No. 152. And that’s all I have to say. Thank you Mr. Chair. And I call for the question.

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

Motion failed on the adoption of Resolution 219 by the following votes: Nays: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Green and, Jackson. 4. Ayes: Councilmen Carmody, Gibson, and Hogan. 3.

RESOLUTION NO. 220 OF 2004

A RESOLUTION TO ALLOW THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT TO USE THE GOVERNMENTAL CHAMBER ON THE THIRD TUESDAY OF EACH MONTH AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the Shreveport City Council and the Caddo Parish Commission jointly adopted by resolution the rule that the Government Plaza Chamber's use shall be limited to meetings by the Shreveport City Council, the Caddo Parish Commission, the Metropolitan Planning Commission, the Shreveport Metropolitan Zoning Board of Appeals, Louisiana House of Representatives and the Louisiana State Senate; and

WHEREAS, the legislation also established a Government Plaza Chamber Standing Committee to oversee the operation of the Chamber and adjoining conference rooms and to make recommendations to the Shreveport City Council and the Caddo Parish Commission relative to the use and operation of the chamber and conference rooms; and

WHEREAS, the City Council created the City of Shreveport Youth Council (one student from each High School in the City), and Councilman Jackson wants to schedule their meetings in the Governmental Chamber on the third Tuesday of each month; and

WHEREAS, the Caddo Parish Commission has no objection to this use.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, legal and regular session convened, to allow the City of Shreveport Youth Council to use the Governmental Chamber on the third Tuesday of each month.

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

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

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.

The clerk read the following resolution: Resolution No. 221 of 2004. A resolution accepting dedication for Kempton Park Circle in the Steeple Chase Estates Unit No. 2, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

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

ORDINANCES: None.

REGULAR AGENDA LEGISLATION:

RESOLUTIONS ON SECOND READING AND FINAL PASSAGE OR WHICH REQUIRE ONLY ONE READING:

1. Resolution No. 199 of 2004: A resolution authorizing the renewal of an agreement between the City of Shreveport and KPMG, LLP for an external audit of the City of Shreveport for fiscal year January 1, 2004 through December 31, 2004, authorizing the Mayor to execute an engagement letter evidencing said renewal, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

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

RESOLUTION NO. 213 OF 2004

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO MAKE APPLICATION WITH THE UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, AND OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO

WHEREAS, the Department of Justice has authorized the City of Shreveport Police Department to apply for grant funds for Solving Cold Cases with DNA; and

WHEREAS, the award, if approved will be for \$263,200 with no cash match required by the City of Shreveport; and

WHEREAS, this project will seek to review DNA evidence in the most violent cold case crimes on file at the Shreveport Police Department by utilizing experienced investigators in an overtime capacity, to reduce DNA testing backlogs at the regional crime lab through the addition of a full-time DNA analyst, and to increase the number of eligible cases entered into the Combines DNA Index System (CODIS).

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, regular and legal session convened, that it does hereby authorize the execution by Keith P. Hightower, Mayor, those grant documents necessary to apply and receive funding established within the program administered by the United States Department of Justice.

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 affect 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.

RESOLUTION NO. 214 OF 2004

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO EXECUTE GRANT DOCUMENTS WITH THE U.S. DEPARTMENT OF JUSTICE, OFFICE OF COMMUNITY ORIENTED

POLICING SERVICES AND OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO

WHEREAS, the U. S. Department of Justice has invited the City of Shreveport Police Department to apply for up to \$3,000,000 in grant funds with a \$1,000,000 matching funds requirement under the FY 2004 Interoperable Communications Technology Program; and

WHEREAS, this program will provide funding to improve the effectiveness of public safety communications systems and to assist in resolving both voice and data interoperability issues. This collaboration will be an effort between the Shreveport Police Department and Caddo Parish 911 with approximately \$100,000 of the required match being supplied by the Shreveport Police Department, and approximately \$900,000 being supplied by Caddo Parish 911.; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, regular and legal session convened, that it does hereby authorize the execution by Keith P. Hightower, Mayor, those grant documents necessary to accept this award and receive funding established within the program administered by the U. S. Department of Justice.

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 affect 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.

RESOLUTION NO. 215 OF 2004

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING AMENDMENTS TO THE AGREEMENT WITH THE KREWE OF CENTAUR, INC., AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport desires to support cultural, educational and leisure activity programs which serve the public and render a public service; and

WHEREAS, the Krewe of Centaur parade (“the parade”) is one of several Mardi Gras parades held annually in the City; and

WHEREAS, the parade provides a benefit to the general public and to visitors to the City by providing an opportunity to celebrate the cultural history of this State; and

WHEREAS, Resolution Number 12 Of 2001 authorized the execution of a three (3) year agreement with the Krewe relative to sponsorship and production of the parade; and

WHEREAS, other amendments to the agreement have been authorized by subsequent resolutions; and

WHEREAS, the parties now desire to further amend the agreement to provide for additional matters relative to the production of the parade.

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

Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened that the Mayor of the City of Shreveport is hereby authorized to execute amendments to the agreement with the Krewe of Centaur, Inc., substantially in accordance with the draft thereof which was filed with the original copy of this resolution for public inspection in the Office of the Clerk of Council on September 28, 2004.

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

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

RESOLUTION NO. 216 OF 2004

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING AN AMENDMENT TO THE AGREEMENT WITH THE KREWE OF GEMINI, INC., AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport desires to support cultural, educational and leisure activity programs which serve the public and render a public service; and

WHEREAS, the Krewe of Gemini parade ("the parade") is one of several Mardi Gras parades held annually in the City; and

WHEREAS, the parade provides a benefit to the general public and to visitors to the City by providing an opportunity to celebrate the cultural history of this State; and

WHEREAS, Resolution Number 11 of 2001 authorized the execution of a three (3) year agreement with the Krewe relative to sponsorship and production of the parade; and

WHEREAS, other amendments to the Agreement have been authorized by subsequent resolutions; and

WHEREAS, the parties now desire to further amend the Agreement to provide for additional matters relative to the production of the parade.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened that the Mayor of the City of Shreveport is hereby authorized to execute an amendment to the Agreement with the Krewe of Gemini, Inc., substantially in accordance with the draft thereof which was filed with the original copy of this resolution for public inspection in the Office of the Clerk of Council on September 28, 2004.

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

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that all resolutions or parts thereof in conflict

herewith are hereby repealed.

RESOLUTION NUMBER 222 OF 2004

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

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

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

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

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened that the following described properties are hereby declared surplus:

Lot 57, Broadway Park

Geographic Number
171416-094-005700

Municipal Address: 12643 None
Council District "F"

Lot 67 and the East 10 of Lot 68 lying

Geographic Number
171306-016-012500

next to adjoining Lot 67
Municipal Address: 127 Stoner Avenue
Council District "B"

West 30 feet of Lot 68 and the East

Geographic Number
171306-016-010400

10 feet of Lot 69, Lister Subdivision
Municipal Address: 129 Stoner Avenue
Council District "B"

Lots 1, 2, 10, 11, 12, 15, 16, 18, 19

Geographic Number
161505-002-
001500,

20, 21, 22, 42 and 43

161505-002-001600,
161505-003-000100,
161505-003-000200,
161505-003-001000,

Unit No. 1 & 2

161505-003-001100, 161505-
003-001200,
161505-003-004200, 161505-

003-004300,

161505-004-001800, 161505-
004-001900,
161505-004-002000, 161505-
004-002100,
and 161505-004-002200

Audubon Meadow Subdivision
Municipal Address: 91186 None
Council District "G"

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

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

Read by title and as read, motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Gibson to adopt Resolution No (s) 213, 214, 215, 216, and 222. Motion approved by the following votes: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and , Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Chairman, I just wanted to renew my issue as it relates to 215 and 216 to Ms. Ragle, that Martin Luther King Drive is available for either one of those parades, if Broadmoor does not in fact work out. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS

1. Resolution No. 223 of 2004: A resolution authorizing the submission of the 2005 Consolidated Planning and Development Program Update (Annual Action Plan) to the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Green to introduce Resolution No. 223 of 2004 to lay over until the October 26, 2004 meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson: 7. Nays: None.

INTRODUCTION OF ORDINANCES

1. Ordinance No. 170 of 2004: An ordinance to create and establish the intersection of Mercedes-Benz Drive and Sugarland Drive as a stop intersection, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
2. Ordinance No. 171 of 2004: An ordinance establishing a 10' foot-wide utility servitude running 169.8 feet adjacent to the northwest and west boundaries of Lot 31 in the Timber Knoll Subdivision Unit No. 3, in the SE 1/4 of section 2 (T17N-R15W), Caddo Parish, Louisiana and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
3. Ordinance No. 172 of 2004: An ordinance amending the 2004 Community Development Special Revenue Fund Budget.

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

Councilman Hogan to introduce Ordinance No(s).170, 171, and 172 of 2004 to lay over until the October 26, 2004 meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None

INTRODUCTION OF ORDINANCES (not to be adopted after October 26 and before Dec 15)

1. Ordinance No. 153 of 2004: An ordinance adopting the 2005 Capital Improvements Budget, appropriating the funds authorized therein, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
2. Ordinance No. 154 of 2004: An ordinance adopting the 2005 General Fund Budget, appropriating the funds therein, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
3. Ordinance No. 155 of 2004: An ordinance adopting the 2005 Budget for the Retained Risk, Internal Service Fund, appropriating the funds authorized therein, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
4. Ordinance No. 156 of 2004: An ordinance adopting the 2005 Budget for the Fleet Services Internal Service Fund, appropriating the funds authorized therein, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
5. Ordinance No. 157 of 2004: An ordinance adopting the 2005 Budget for the Metropolitan Planning Commission's Special Revenue Fund, appropriating the funds authorized therein, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
6. Ordinance No. 158 of 2004: An ordinance adopting the 2005 Budget for the Community Development Special Revenue Fund, appropriating the funds authorized therein, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
7. Ordinance No. 159 of 2004: An ordinance adopting the 2005 Budget for the Riverfront Special Revenue Fund, appropriating the funds authorized therein, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
8. Ordinance No. 160 of 2004: An ordinance adopting the 2005 Budget for the Environmental Grants Special Revenue Fund, appropriating the funds authorized therein, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
9. Ordinance No. 161 of 2004: An ordinance adopting the 2005 Budget for the Shreveport Redevelopment Agency Special Revenue Fund, appropriating the

funds authorized therein, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

10. Ordinance No. 162 of 2004: An ordinance adopting the 2005 Budget for the Police Grants Special Revenue Fund, appropriating the funds authorized therein, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
11. Ordinance No. 163 of 2004: An ordinance adopting the 2005 Budget for the Downtown Entertainment Economic Development Special Revenue Fund, appropriating the funds therein, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
12. Ordinance No. 164 of 2004: An ordinance adopting the 2005 Budget for the Golf Enterprise Fund, appropriating the funds authorized therein, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
13. Ordinance No. 165 of 2004: An ordinance adopting the 2005 Budget for the Airports Enterprise Fund, appropriating the funds authorized therein, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
14. Ordinance No. 166 of 2004: An ordinance adopting the 2005 Budget for the Water and Sewerage Enterprise Fund, appropriating the funds authorized therein, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
15. Ordinance No. 167 of 2004: An ordinance adopting the 2005 Budget funding contractual services to SPORTRAN by Metro Management Associates, Inc., and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
16. Ordinance No. 168 of 2004: An ordinance adopting the 2005 Budget for the Downtown Parking Enterprise Fund, appropriating the funds authorized therein, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
17. Ordinance No. 169 of 2004: An ordinance adopting the 2005 Debt Service Fund Budget, appropriating the funds therein, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Carmody to introduce and to table Ordinance No(s).153, 154, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 160, 161, 162, 163, 164, 165, 166, 167, 168, and 169, of 2004 to lay over until the December 15, 2004 meeting.

Councilman Jackson: We have a clerical correction. It should say December 14, not December 15th.

Mr. Thompson: No, it's to be adopted after October 26th and before December

15.

Councilman Jackson: Okay, the date should be changed to after October 26th and before December 14th.

Mr. Thompson: And before December 15th.

Councilman Walford: That's a statutory requirement.

Mr. Thompson: Anytime we do it before December 15th. Would you also want to table those? Would the motion be to table?

Councilman Green: So moved to table. My motion is also to table.

Councilman Carmody: Second.

Mr. Thompson: I think it's part of the original motion to introduce and to table.

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

ORDINANCES ON SECOND READING AND FINAL PASSAGE

1. Ordinance No. 98 of 2004: An ordinance authorizing the Lease of City-Owned property to North Shreveport Development Corporation, Inc. (Postponed September 14, 2004)

Having passed first reading on June 22, 2004 was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Lester to postpone. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

2. Ordinance No. 141 of 2004: An ordinance authorizing the donation of City-Owned property at 2800 Darien Street to Shreveport/Bossier Community Renewal and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on August 24, 2004 was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Motion by Councilman Jackson, seconded by Councilman Green to postpone. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

3. Ordinance No. 149 of 2004: An ordinance enacting section 62-85 of the City of Shreveport Code of Ordinances relative to Department of Public Assembly and Recreation and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on September 14, 2004 was read by title, and on

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

4. Ordinance No. 150 of 2004: An ordinance amending certain provisions of Section 10-82(a) of the City of Shreveport Code of Ordinances relative to alcoholic beverages businesses and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on September 28, 2004 was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Green for adoption. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

5. Ordinance No. 151 of 2004: An ordinance amending the 2004 Capital Improvements Budget.

Having passed first reading on September 28, 2004 was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Lester for adoption. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

6. Ordinance No. 152 of 2004: An ordinance authorizing the Mayor of the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana to enter into a cooperative endeavor agreement with the Shreveport Convention Center Hotel Authority; pledging certain sales tax revenues and hotel/motel tax revenues to secure bonds issued by said Authority; and providing for other matters in connection therewith.

Having passed first reading on September 28, 2004 was read by title, and on motion, ordered passed to third reading. Motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Walford for adoption. The Clerk read the following amendments:

Amendment No. 1

By: Councilman Carmody

Amend the first paragraph of the Now Therefore Be It Resolved clause (the paragraph before "definitions") to read as follows:

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Shreveport, Louisiana, acting as the Governing Authority of said city, that: the approvals, pledges, assigns, representations, warrantees, covenants, remedies and agreements contained

herein, specifically in the paragraphs numbered Section 1 through Section 10, are conditioned upon and shall only be valid if an election is held at which a proposition or question is submitted to the voters of the City of Shreveport, for them to decide whether public funds shall be used or pledged to plan, design, construct, equip, or operate a convention center hotel, and said proposition or question is approved by a majority of the persons voting at said election; and that:

Motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Gibson to adopt Amendment 1.

Councilman Carmody: Not a question. Gentlemen, I'd just like to make a few comments about this particular amendment. And as a member of the Shreveport City Council, I feel it's imperative that I communicate my concerns to all of our citizens regarding the current proposal to publicly fund, build and operate a hotel adjacent to our \$85,000,000 convention center in downtown Shreveport. Some folks including my friend Mayor Hightower have stated that opposition to the current proposal constitutes obstruction. And although some in our community may feel that this is my role with respect to the current hotel proposal. I certainly want them to be aware of my thoughts. After having followed this municipal project close at hand for almost six years, Shreveport started this venture with the understanding that if the public would support \$85,000,000 in general obligation bonds, then the City could construct a state of the art meeting space to draw convention, (unclear) this financial commitment and the City's history, the City would then have many hoteliers lining up to negotiate for the rights to develop a hotel. In its original inception our consultants told us that a public private partnership between the City and a private developer, would place little or no financial liability on the City for the hotel. We understood that we would offer a sight immediately adjacent to our state of the art Convention Center and then we could select a private hotelier such as, Hilton, Westin, or Marriot, which would also share the use of our Convention Center garage. We we're assured by the Administration that a major hotel developer would jump at the opportunity to fund, build, and operate a first class, full service, Convention Center Hotel in North Louisiana's burgeoning entertainment and tourism market. Oceans, oceans of water have passed under the bridges that span the Red River since the public voted to construct, own, and operate our new Convention Center. The project has experienced delayed scheduling due to a number of factors, and the once growing entertainment and tourism market has flattened. We now find ourselves as a City with a heavy decision to make. Since we followed the original consultant's recommendations we have contacted perhaps too informally, and perhaps too restrictively, in negotiating terms major hotel chains and private developers. These private investors have decided under the terms and conditions presented to them by the Administration that they cannot turn a profit to justify the investment required to build, own, and operate a hotel. I've learned through experience that for a man to make a profit he must expose himself to a risk.

Successful investors must educate themselves on how a business operates and what risks are involved so that they will know the potential for profits as well as for the downside potential of the total loss of their initial investment. By relying on those whose careers depend upon the operation of successful hotel businesses, I do not feel comfortable with making a personal investment in this Convention Center Hotel. Now, the Administration, challenges us to change the original proposal claiming that to make our \$85,000,000 Convention Center profitable, we must build the hotel ourselves. We are being asked to pledge \$40,000,000 of our City's credit plus repayment with interest, on the amount loaned, to construct a hotel that the City of Shreveport will fully, and for at least for a 30-year period operate. In my business the term and level of financial commitment is crucial to evaluating the potential liability associated with an investor's risk. Often, the determining factor is educating yourself to know what the risk may be involved for getting your money out with profits within an acceptable time period. I've always taken my fiduciary responsibility seriously in determining how I vote to spend the citizens tax money, to do otherwise I believe would constitute malfeasance in office. Certainly, I do not agree with the outcome of every decision rendered by the Shreveport City Council, regarding the expenditure of public funds, which have been entrusted to us, however, all elected officials, Mayor's and Council members, are giving the responsibilities of watching over just how the funds are allocated and spent, and then determining rather or not it was a prudent use of the City's resources. We are now at a point of having to face the consequences of making an initial guarantee of \$40,000,000. The public needs to be aware that if the hotel fails to perform to expectation, that is if it loses money, the citizens through the City, must make an annual infusion of capital in order to keep the hotel doors open. This would require the Mayor, and the City Council, to divert available sources of revenue, which are currently used to operate the City and provide the current level of basic City services such as, police and fire protection, street repairs, drainage and sanitation improvements, therefore, we should require a public vote and determine if the public is willing to accept the risk and gamble on a hotel, which the private sector will not build, operate or support. Under the circumstances, I would feel much more secure with a venture and vote accordingly with a public's consent. Other larger cities, as close as Dallas, Fort Worth, and Houston, have experienced difficulties in getting and agreeing on the best course to pursue downtown convention center hotels adjacent to their existing convention center facilities. Certainly, we as a community, have much more to offer to visitors and conventioners. But the reality is that we are banking on gaming in North Louisiana to draw conventioners. Thirty years is a very long time, to be financially responsible for the operation and the debt services on a hotel. If our neighbors in Texas vote to allow gaming, Shreveport will certainly feel the very real and lasting effects on the adverse performance of a city-owned hotel. Therefore, without passage of the amendment, this one requiring the public to vote on the proposal, and allowing the public to have an opportunity on whether or not to follow this plan, I will and cannot support the Administration, to support request to ask the State Bond

Commission, for approval, to allow the City of Shreveport, to issue \$40,000,000 worth of bonds to construct a hotel. In closing, I sincerely believe that we have higher priorities here in Shreveport that need to be considered and addressed now, other than building a municipally owned and operated hotel. We should be concentrating our efforts on securing the funds, to pay for the necessary improvements needed to our infrastructure, like our streets, the drainage, and our water and sewer system, and as well as, making sure that we pay all of our City employee's both civil service, as well as classified employees, a fair and just way for their services. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Jackson: Councilman Gibson.

Councilman Gibson: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Councilman Carmody, I think you covered several things that I wanted to say but first of all, obviously this City needs a hotel to go with its convention center, they are a hand and glove situation. I too, am in support of a public vote, in fact, back in April I called for a public vote, in fact, I even consulted with our State Delegation about the importance of a public vote. Without a public vote I think we disenfranchise the voters. I'm looking at a letter dated October 6, 2004, signed by the Mayor, it says that he is going to urge each citizen to become engaged in the salesmanship of the convention center, which obviously was voted on by the citizens. But, in order for the convention center to work we have to have a hotel, which on this particular case, we're asking for a public vote there. How can you ask the citizens of Shreveport to support a complex when they haven't had their say? To me, that's the ultimate in a slap in the face to the tax payers, I've been very critical of the process, because at the end of the day, we've heard from our department heads, and the Administration, since we've been on City Council, right now we have to have \$200 plus million, is that not correct? Mr. Strong, on infrastructure water and sewer, that's what you reported about two weeks ago, is that not correct? Chief Campbell, you stood up before us at the same time stating your concerns about resources for manpower equipment, in order to protect and serve our citizens. And what is the top priority that we see before us right now? A convention center hotel, and financing up. Councilman Carmody I will take one exception on your comment, it's not \$40,000,000, it's \$52,000,000, the State of Louisiana, has stated unequivocally in writing that if we sell or default we shall pay back the \$12,000,000, to the State of Louisiana, not me but shall, I shudder to think what the terms of that note would be, is that on demand, or is that going to be spread over time? But, it's a \$52,000,000 commitment. If it works, I think everybody will stand up that either voted for or against this, I'll be the first to say to Mayor Hightower, my friend, it's been projected that we play golf together, we do a lot of things together, but the fact is I disagree philosophically, on a management style. And the press, and some of my colleagues can make more of it, but the fact is we were elected to be a check and balance. We are not elected to show courage up here, we are elected to be fiducial responsible, and represent our constituent. I see several activists in the audience here, and those activists feel the same way, I've heard them stand at that podium many of time, do I agree with everything they say, absolutely not,

but at the same time, I'm not going to quit talking to them, because again, I can learn from them and they can learn from me. This process has been extremely difficult. I had an opportunity to visit with some fraternity brothers, out in West Texas not too long ago, and this is the way I see this process going, he said you know what? You can sell a lot of things, but when it comes to a cow patty, a cow patty is a cow patty, you can put perfume all over and try to sell it as filet mignons, but the fact is are you going to take a bite of that? I will suggest to you I can't bite into this process and put at risk, our City services, our infrastructures, mark - - -. There's no mistake about it, infrastructure is the key to economic development and economic success. I see the Shreveport Chamber of Commerce in the audience, Dick Bremer, Lindy Broderick, you go all over the country and compare notes with other chambers, those cities that have decaying infrastructures and all we have to do is look to our neighbors down in New Orleans, to look at decaying infrastructures and high crime, they're suffering severely down there. They need \$2,000,000,000 worth of infrastructure improvements right now. Our numbers', in the neighborhood of about \$700,000,000 million. We will continue to struggle with that issue starting this week with our budget talks, and I will suggest to you that it won't be this Mayor, it won't be this City Council, it will be a future group of leaders that will be sitting around the table, if that hotel goes south, like four out of five across the country, City services are going to be compromised, inner-city neighborhoods, all the way down to Southern Trace, and we are all going to have to look at each other and look our city employee's in the face, and our constituents in the face, and our other political leaders, and say that we made a choice, again, due diligence is the key to this whole process. I'm in construction, I represent contractors, there's going to be four votes cast here today and part of me says, thank you, but at the same time I have constituents, I'm going to have to continue to look at their eyes and when they ask for resources out their district, and if the Mayor says, or department heads says, no I can't do that, I can't do work in your district, then I'm just going to have to say, where's our priorities? Is it the hotel? Is it city services and infrastructures? I've also been accused of being anti-economic development. Let me state for the record, I said the City should not be the lead economic development agency, it should be a facilitator of economic development. It appears to me that we are shifting our focus, to be the lead economic developer, which then again I ask, we got a great Chamber of Commerce, we got several Chambers of Commerce in this area, that's their role, we're here to build infrastructures, to support economic development, just like I asked the Administration, not too long ago, when General Motors chose to come to Shreveport, did Shreveport build their \$1,000,000,000 facility? Absolutely not, we built the roads, we built the water and sewer, the other infrastructure, and the Parish provide the land. what a partnership. My question is to each and every one of you, did we do the due diligence in this particular process to do everything possible to bring together the public/private sector to make this work of which, Councilman Carmody, you were there when this was originally proposed and that's how it was presented a public private partnership, and now we're down to a

100% public financing. Again, I appreciate Mayor Hightower, Ken Antee, and all the consultants that were involved in this, they feel that this is the right thing to do, again, I am pledged to listen to what my constituents to say, they've been broad and clear since day one and I will have to be voting "no", on this because of the process that took place. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Councilman Jackson: Councilman Walford.

Councilman Walford: I will say that I've heard very little from my constituents on this, but those that I did hear from did not favor a referendum. I got a very interesting call from a pastor, Sunday night, that told me he supported me in election, he encouraged other people to vote for me, and he said Councilman, we don't govern by referendum, he said I was elected to represent him and my other constituents and that's what he expected. Boy, have I got some hypocrisy to talk about here, and talk about a ultimate slap in the face, let's go back to February 2003, Councilman Gibson, was trying hard to raid the Riverfront Fund, for paving and concrete, that was not a prudent thing to do, because it was rating our reserves. So, instead this council in six to one vote, took bond issue money that the citizens had voted for a specific project, you went to the polls, you said you wanted that money spent on a capital project on Texas Avenue, but this Council, is now telling you that they are so concerned about how you feel and what should be done with your money, took that money and used it for what I call, operating expense and not capital expense, to do concrete repair. Now come on folks, we're hearing two different stories here now, I don't understand how you can sit here and tell the voters that you're so concerned about what they want you to do with their money, when they told you and you did something else, but that's something you'd have to live with, I will say that I was the one vote that voted "no". You heard one of my constituents at the last council meeting, and I thought he said things very well, it's been a lot of misinformation disseminated about the hotel, it's turned into something to me, is more politics and personality, its not about what we need, I'm not going to get into my discussion, Mr. Chairman, about my feelings on the hotel until we get to the ordinance itself, but I have some very strong feelings there but I do agree with the Pastor that called me and said we can't govern by referendum. We are elected to make those difficult decision and I'm willing to make them. Thank you, Mr. Chairman

Councilman Jackson: Thank you, Councilman Walford. Councilman Lester.

Councilman Lester: Thank you, Councilman. A couple of things, first of all I had this idea, and I had this thought that we were going to be throwing a lot of words around today, and something told me that it would important for me to bring a dictionary, so I brought a dictionary to the meeting today, not that I necessarily need one in terms of vocabulary, but just a few things. A moment ago, we had some discussion about feasibility study versus market study, for the record, Webster's Ninth Collegiate Dictionary, feasibility - capable of being done or carried out, capable of being used or dealt with successfully, suitable, reasonable, likely; see possible. We asked for

a feasibility study, we got something that on its cover said market ability, but in reality the study that we took hours to go over on last meeting, dealt with capable of being of used successfully, reasonable, likely, that's what the report was that we went over for three hours. Marketable - fit to be offered for sale in a market, wanted by purchasers or employers, relating to buying or selling, I mean we can split hairs and trust me I'm in the word business, but the reality of it is we got what we asked for bottom line, you can obfuscate the issue by saying, well the letter said this or the letter said that at that point, your insulating our intelligence on the to-ma-to versus ta-mot-to, and that's not what it's about. Other thing I want to hit is, I think this vote today says more about what our City is going to be in the future as opposed to any of our political leanings left or right and, you know, I want to apologize ahead of time that I did not prepare a speech, because I don't think it's necessary for us to prepare a speech, our job is to listen to the information that's been given, process it, and give an answer, not a prepared text, not a soliloquy, that's not our job. But let me say this city - cause I live in Shreveport, and my Shreveport is going to be a city, my Shreveport is not going to be a town, like some people would like, a city, is an inhabited place of greater size, population, or importance than a town or village, of major size or importance having the status of an episcopal use, large, or important, municipality in the U.S. governed under a charter granted by the state. I want the place that I live to be a large place, that's governed by our statutes and our rules, an important place, not a town, a city. Town, what is a town? A cluster or aggregation of houses, recognized as a distinct place with a name, a compactly settled area, as distinguished from surrounding rural territory. In 1960, Shreveport, Dallas, Atlanta, and Little Rock, will be the exact same sized, and it's because of mind sets like that, that have pervade some of our councilmen that we remain at 200,000. Little Rock is 400,000, Dallas is millions, Atlanta is growing, every place is growing but us, because there is a school of thought that pervades this city, some people call it Shreveportitis, we can't, what if it goes wrong, we can't, last meeting I gave you a poem, I forgot the author, that talked about drowsing to death inside the sheltered shore, one of my colleagues thought I wanted to go sailing, I'm not going sailing it's not about that, it's about whether or not we're going to have a City that includes everybody, that is large enough to bring things in that grows a City. Shreveport has been a town for too long, Shreveport has a town has a structure, where you have one black political leader, that everybody goes to and that's the person that controls. That day is over with, Shreveport has had a town where you go to three or four people and they make the decisions for everybody, that day is over with, we have a council that each time any one of us opens our mouth we speak for at least, any where between 15 -17,000,000 people. It's not necessary for us to go to the expense every time we want to do something. Let's roll out the ballot box, let's roll out the voting booth and vote, that's a pure form of government, we have a representative form of government, the people elect us to make the tough choices. Sometimes you are not going to make the people happy. Sometimes the people are going to be upset with you, sometimes you're going to be on, Channel 3, Channel 6, Channel 12, in the

Times, in the Sun, in the Inquisitor, telling you, you need to go. Trust me I've been there, but at the end of the day your job, as a Councilmen, is to hold your head up high, do your job, and vote your conviction. If you choose to vote one way, fine as long you're able to look yourself in the face, that's your job, not to pass the buck to the citizens, if you didn't want this job why should you have spent the time and the money to campaign, and if you want to be a town alderman, you should have been in Benton. We are City Councilmen, ours is a large important place, Shreveport is going to be an important place, and I'm just sick and tired of this mind set that provides this pervasive in our community that we cannot, that we cannot, any time that we have an idea the first thing I hear some of colleagues say is we can't, we can't. Well if we continue to have it, you know what you're right, it's going to be a self fulfilling prophecy, just like you have a child, and you tell a child that, that child can't it's guarantee that, that child can't, I believe that we can, and that we should and that we will, because that's the place that I want to live, a large important place, a city, not a town this vote, we can talk about this to death it's not about the hotel ladies and gentlemen, it's not about the hotel. It's about whose going to have that job in two years, it's about what the City is going to be, it's about whose going to control Shreveport, and I've gotten news for my colleagues, this is a city, this isn't the 1980's Shreveport, this isn't the 1970's Shreveport, and it's certainly not the 1960's Shreveport, so mind sets are going to have to change, there some people that you are going to have to deal with, I hate it for you but that's just the reality, it's a new day in this City, it's a new day in this City. People talk about what's going on in Bossier City versus Shreveport. It's amazing to me that we a City of 200,000 with everything that we have would compare ourselves to a City of less than 70,000, what is wrong with that? As a professional baseball player does he compare himself to somebody in triple A, or the minor leagues, now I'm going to get hate mail from Bossier, but I'm not running for Senate, I'm not running for anything that's going to require anything from Bossier, because I represent the Shreveport side of District A. It's about what is Shreveport going to be about, are we going to continue to have this mind set that we can't, lets just run down the record; we can't have casino's, we only want one, Bossier got four, they have the money, now we're struggling on this side for what to do, you know, well they built their complex with money that they had, yes they built their CenturyTel Center with money from the casino's that we did not want and gave to them, so that's twice. We had a situation where we could have had CenturyTel downtown, first class facility. Councilman Serio was here, and I don't agree with Councilman Serio on a lot of things. But Councilman Serio said we voted no on Tuesday, Bossier voted yes on Thursday and look at the results. Look at the results. It's obvious. It's successful. Schlitz manufacturing. We don't want to do that. That offends my conscious. It goes somewhere else and for a decade you have significant jobs and employment opportunities. Louisiana Downs, we don't want to do that. It goes across the river and has significant jobs and economic development. The list goes on and on. I did not get elected to sit by and let Lafayette pass us, Bossier City pass us, Slidell pass us, and all of these other cities. I want to live in a large and

important place. I want to have a situation where ten years from now, God willing, if I'm coming before this Council, instead of being a city of 200,000, I can say I live in a city of 300,000. I want to live in a city that's growing faster than the national average. But if we continue to have this idea where we are so afraid, we are so afraid to grow, that we would literally choke this city, rather than to see it grow and prosper. And that is wrong. I said something yesterday, Booker T. Washington said, if you want to hold a man down in a ditch, ultimately, you're going to have to get in the ditch with him. We've been in the ditch too long in this city. It's time to get out of the ditch. It's time to dust ourselves off, it's time to deal with each other to the left and to the right, Black and White, Democrat and Republican, rich or poor, Brown, whatever and lets start moving forward. And that's my comment. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Green: I call for the question Mr. Chair.

Councilman Gibson: I'll second.

Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Gibson to call for the question. Motion passes by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 5. Nays: Councilmen Carmody, and Gibson 2.

Motion to adopt Amendment No. 1 fails by the following vote: Nays: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Green, and Jackson. 4. Ayes: Councilmen Carmody, Gibson, and Hogan. 3.

Councilman Jackson: Amendment 1A Mr. Clerk?

Mr. Thompson: Amendment 1A is the Administration's cleanup or amendment where they insert the final information in the document.

Amendment No. 1A to Ordinance No. 152 of 2004

Amend the Ordinance as follows:

Delete the Ordinance as introduced and substitute the attached Ordinance.

Explanation of amendment:

Inserts final information.

Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Lester to adopt Amendment 1A.

Councilman Carmody: Thank you sir. Mr. Mayor, I did send you an email asking some questions specifically regarding the project and the issuance of revenue bonds. Your communication back to me was that you would have Mr. Brown available as well as the Bond Attorney, I guess.

Mr. Antee: Yeah, we've got it.

Councilman Carmody: Could they come forward please?

Mr. Antee: They did prepare a response through email that we can hand out.

Councilman Carmody: Okay, I think - - - is that what y'all sent to me? This just says that they would be made available?

Mr. Antee: No, they prepared it today to send.

Councilman Carmody: Oh.

Mr. Antee: Concerning the property tax issue and how it's provided for.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Brown, how are you today sir?

Mr. Brown: Doing fine, how are you today?

Councilman Carmody: I'm very well, thank you. There were some questions that I had regarding the Citi Corp financial projections that were brought to us, and hopefully, y'all can help kinda clarify this because again, this is what we're talking about, is the issuance of bonds. The TIF revenues, specifically they reference the Citi Corp projections reference TIF revenues saying that the sales taxes collected for each of the categories will be used for debt retirement. These are the 2.5% of general sales tax revenue, a .75% room tax, and a 3.4% convention center tax rebate. My question to the Mayor was that I don't remember the City Council authorizing the transfer of these funds to a hotel project. And I thought that this type of financing if ever proposed to the State legislature and then withdrawn before the vote at the last session. The Mayor's response was that the City's portion of the taxes are being dedicated to the hotel. The State had to approve the State's portion of the Convention and Tourism Bureau portion. Has the State already approved the State's portion and the Convention and Tourism portion?

Mr. Antee: Mr. Chairman, I can answer that, because that response was a synopsis of what I was trying to give yesterday. It's not a TIF. It's used as TIF, just as a reference. What this ordinance today does, is dedicate or earmarks certain tax revenue generated only by the hotel facility to go towards the hotel. And that is the City's portion of the sales tax, the City's portion of the .75% occupancy tax, that currently goes to the convention center stadium account. And then the City's portion of the rebate that we get on an annual basis from the State from the 4% occupancy tax. Now, what the State had to approve was what the subject of the legislation was this past session. And that was the State's portion of the sales tax, as well as the Convention and Tourist Bureau's 3% of the occupancy tax.

Councilman Carmody: So, the State- - -, I want to clarify that. So, the State actually did pass to do that.

Mr. Antee: No, they did not. It did not pass.

Councilman Carmody: Oh, okay.

Mr. Antee: So, the only thing that the City is doing, they're not creating a TIF. All they're doing is dedicating or earmarking whatever term you want to use, the tax revenues that is the City's tax revenues, that the hotel would generate. Kinda of a mini TIF

Councilman Carmody: Okay, well I mean, it's stated in there as a TIF, that's why I asked the question.

Mr. Antee: Right.

Councilman Carmody: TIF revenues, that was the only association I had, not a mini TIF, but.

Mr. Antee: And they did that just as a reference, and not as a "TIF" (tax incremental financing) because there is none.

Councilman Carmody: The second question that I asked is does Citi Corp anticipate that we would actually be charging for the parking in our adjacent garage? The Mayor's response was yes, we would be charging for parking. My thought again, as I don't know how realistic that expectation would be, when you've got two casino garages within close proximity of the proposed site. But that's again my opinion. The third question I asked was that I would like clarification of the earning rate shown on the projections, as I don't know where in today's market, an investor can be guaranteed or secure an earning rate of 5% on their money? As Citi Corp indicates that we'll be able to get on our reserve fund. The Mayor's response was that he would have the question forwarded in order to be answered. Do y'all - - -is that - - - I understand is that to guarantee a 5% return on our money?

Mr. Antee: No, what that is, is that's an estimate, that over the life of the 30 years that the reserve would be there, that the average over that 30 years would be at the 5%. That's a question for David Livingstone.

Councilman Carmody: Right and he's not available?

Mr. Antee: No and we were in the process of trying to get that information.

Councilman Carmody: Well, when you get it to 'em, please let me know, because I have persons who would love to get a guaranteed return of 5% right now.

Mr. Antee: Like I said, it's not a guarantee. There is nothing in either one of these analysis that guarantees anything. It's what they project that over the term of 30 years, they can average is 5% return on that. It may be 1% this year. It may be 9% in year 17. But they project an average return.

Councilman Carmody: Okay. No. 4 was that there was no real estate tax expenses any of the projections. On what authority do you believe the City of Shreveport be exempt from paying real estate taxes as it now appears to be a for profit hotel venture? And this kinda goes back I guess to what Mr. Walford had said earlier. Was that his understanding that we would not be paying any taxes and therefore that was an incentive. But I think that the improvements above ground would actually be taxable, am I not correct?

Mr. Brown: No.

Councilman Carmody: In that the furniture, fixtures and improvements would not be taxable?

Mr. Brown: No, your - - -your - - - under the constitution, I think it's in the memo we sent Article VII, Section 21A, it's a public facility on public land owned by a public entity, there would be no property taxes at all.

Councilman Carmody: Okay, and I know that we've been through this before, but I did want to point this out again. And hopefully, y'all are the persons that would actually be going to the market with these bonds. There is a disclaimer in the reports

that we've see that they are market studies and not to be utilized for feasibility study. Will the investors in the market require that we seek a feasibility study in order to make the solicitation to the market, for them to purchase the bonds?

Mr. Brown: No, the current studies are what we'll be used.

Mr. Antee: If I may, what they say, the PKF was done for the sole purpose of taking to the bond market. The HVS was the one as we all know was authorized by the Council. It states - - - both of 'em state that they are not to be used without their written consent. And so prior to attaching it to the bond package, we'll have a letter from them authorizing us to use it, but that's a protective measure that all these companies do.

Councilman Carmody: Okay, and again gentlemen, y'all have to excuse me, I don't try to practice the law and that I don't have the credentials to do so, but there are some issues that I think need to be at least brought to the table that we need to discuss or have investigated and maybe it would be the City Attorney as well as our Bond Attorneys that might want to look at, specifically, and you might want to make notes of these. You had just made the statement Mr. Brown, that this is actually going to be a public facility?

Mr. Brown: It's going to be owned - - - yes sir.

Councilman Carmody: Okay, as a public facility, entitled to all the works, buildings and improvements should be in the name of the public. Is that correct?

Mr. Brown: The hotel authority.

Councilman Carmody: But the public is the beneficiary, is that correct?

Mr. Brown: The City is the beneficiary.

Councilman Carmody: Okay. Well, let me just point these out to you please sir. If we could ask y'all to take a look at Title 33-2711.15, Section E, Title 33-2717.2, Title 33-2717.3, and then Title 39, Section 553. Specifically gentlemen these are and I go back to the comment that my colleague made from District A, in that he wants to live in a city that's operated under statutes and rules. These are actually the Louisiana Revised Statutes that concern public trust and the beneficiaries as such. And my point is this. According to the Louisiana Revised Statute 92341A. Public trust may be created to provide funds. For authorized public functions or purposes. Revised Statute 2341B provides a list of public functions or purposes. A hotel is not listed as public function or purpose, but cultural and civic facilities are listed as well as Community Development and Redevelopment facilities. Does the hotel fit into one of these categories?

Mr. Antee: Councilman Carmody, it's been a while since I've looked at that statute, but when we created the public trust, I think if you'll read down, it states that at the public trust is for economic development, then it does and there's a case, the City of Vidalia, specifically dealing with a hotel and states that a hotel can be and in that case is a public purpose. So, this trust would fall within that.

Councilman Carmody: Thank you sir. In order to provide funds for public functions or purposes, the trust may incur debt and issue bonds. However, under

Louisiana Revised Statute 923-47A, Section 1, provides that if the beneficiary of the trust is a municipality or a public subdivision and the bonds and the obligations are for certain purposes, then a vote by the qualified electors must be held in a special election. Again gentlemen, I would ask y'all to take a look at these particular revised statutes, so that we are aware of what we're doing. Thank you Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Antee: If I may, I think Ms. Glass has done some research on that issue and I defer to Ms. Glass.

Ms. Glass: Not really in debt Mr. Antee. I've answered a couple of quick questions, but I think we discussed that we were really relying on Bond Counsel on that.

Mr. Antee: Okay, well, I must have misread the email.

Councilman Carmody: And the Bond Counsel is Mr. Brown, right?

Mr. Antee: Yes sir.

Councilman Carmody: Then we'll look to you for the responses.

Mr. Brown: That's fine. Thank you.

Councilman Gibson: I have one question for both of you, Mr. Brown and the Administration. The hotel trust is planning to go to the Bond Commission, is that correct? When is that going to occur.

Mr. Brown: You're going to act on an ordinance today.

Councilman Gibson: I understand.

Mr. Brown: And so, assuming that the staff of the Bond Commission can review all that, you go to Bond Commission twice. First for a preliminary approval and then for a final. So, it's a two time process and whether it happens this month in October the first time or November, will be up to the Bond Commission.

Councilman Gibson: They specifically meet for this particular item only?

Mr. Brown: Oh, no. They meet the third Thursday of each month on numerous-

--

Councilman Gibson: Has there been any correspondence whatsoever with the Bond Commission saying that we're ready to move forward on this?

Mr. Brown: There's been an application filed with the Bond Commission which all projects do. And then what they - - - un-passed ordinance and it's assuming that it's passed today, it'll move forward. If it's not passed today, then of course it would not be move forward at all.

Councilman Gibson: Okay, so correspondence and applications have been filed?

Mr. Brown: Yes sir. Pursuant to the resolution that was passed by the authority, back a number of months ago to go to the Bond Commission, and then by this Council.

But that's - - - until this ordinance passes, then there's nothing to take to the Bond Commission.

Councilman Gibson: Any other question from any of the council? Councilman Green.

Councilman Green: Thank you, Mr. Chair. From my understanding this is just a clean-up piece of legislation, is that?

Mr. Antee: That's correct, the original did not have the exhibit A, which was the property description, or the exhibit B, which was the corporative endeavor, and I think there was a couple of typos correct, where one was listed as a two or vice versa.

Councilman Green: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Gibson: Okay, any other question from the Council? All in favor of amendment 1A, vote, yea – in fact I'm going to delay this for just a second for Councilman Jackson to return.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you, Councilman Gibson.

Motion passed by the following votes: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Hogan, Green, and Jackson. 5. Nays: Councilmen Carmody, and Gibson. 2.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Clerk, Amendment 2.

Motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Carmody, on Amendment No. 2.

Councilman Lester: Question.

Councilman Jackson: Councilman Lester.

Councilman Green: What's the amendment? He didn't read the amendment.

The clerk read the following amendment:

Amendment No. 2

By: Councilman Mike Gibson

Amend Section 1 of the ordinance to read as follows:

Section 1. Approval of Documents. The form of Cooperative Endeavor Agreement is approved, subject to the condition that it shall be amended to include a provision that the Convention Center Hotel Authority agrees that no video poker devices, other gaming devices, gaming or gambling shall be permitted on the premises of the convention center hotel, the restaurant, the bar or any other space constructed with the funds described herein. The Guarantee Agreement is hereby approved. The Mayor is hereby authorized to execute and deliver the Cooperative Endeavor Agreement to the Authority and the Guarantee Agreement to the Trustee; provided, however, said agreements can only be executed and delivered upon closing of the Bonds.

Councilman Lester: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. I'm voting "no" on this for a number of reasons, but let me tell you my main reason. We are – and my good friend, Councilman Gibson is asking us to move forward and make a change in the operating

agreement or corporative endeavor agreement, as it relates to the operations of the Convention Center Hotel, that being with HRI, and it is to prevent video poker, and as we discussed yesterday, we are talking about three video poker machines in a restaurant. And yet, my council colleague who says he is for inner-city revitalization, and fair share and all of those kinds of things, voted against something very similar that I wanted to do to require this same group to ensure that fair share was codified in their agreement. And I'm not about to say, and my vote reflects, that I'm putting three video poker machines in a restaurant in the Convention Center Hotel, in front of fair share compliance with 25% and women in minority owned businesses. I don't see how you can make that and at the same time say you're concerned about inner-city revitalization, and you concerned about fair share, and you concerned about things of that nature. I think that school of thought goes back to what I said earlier the town versus city that they put process and machinery in front of people and I think that's wrong, so I'm voting "no." Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Jackson: All right, Councilman Gibson.

Councilman Gibson: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Is City Attorney, Ramon Lafitte, in the room? I thought I saw him a second ago, if for some reason that he's out there could he come back in, I've got a second question for Julie Glass. Ms. Glass, you reviewed this particular amendment?

Ms. Glass: Yes.

Councilman Gibson: And from a legal standpoint we have specifically looked at all the legal in's and out and the fact that this was incorporated in the contract with HRI, is that correct?

Ms. Glass: Yes, that it would be done contractually.

Councilman Gibson: Okay. I don't see the City Attorney at this point and time, but if I recall, and Ms. Glass, maybe you can help me, I believe this Council asked for a legal opinion, regarding some of the legislation that Councilman Lester had introduced, regarding fair share and other things, and I believe it was the legal opinion of our City Attorney that we could not do that.

Councilman Jackson: No, no, Councilman Gibson.

Councilman Lester: That's a mis-characterization, that's a mis-characterization.

Councilman Gibson: Well then fine, we'd like to get Mr. Lafitte in here.

Councilman Jackson: We can get his – Mr. Lafitte in here, but let me as a chairman, let me just say that what was actually said that is, if I'm not and you may recall it as I say it, that it's a contract.

Councilman Lester: Right.

Councilman Jackson: And if they want to agree to it that you can't force them to agree to it, because it a contract –

Councilman Lester: Yes, correct, just like this is a contract and I would not dare to tell Councilman Gibson, anything on billing any where in the City. I am a lawyer, this is (already speaking) issue and just like we're talking about amending a contractual

agreement as it relates to HRI, and three video poker machines – yes, yes, we won't do three video poker machines

Councilman Gibson: Mr. Chairman, I ask for point of order.

Councilman Jackson: Councilman Lester, Councilman Gibson is –

Councilman Gibson: Councilman Lester.

Councilman Jackson: Hold on.

Councilman Lester: Okay, go ahead.

Councilman Gibson: Thank you, Councilman. I appreciate your passion for the law.

Councilman Lester: And for my people.

Councilman Gibson: And I think that my record, speaks very clearly in terms of fair share and I believe that the Mayor can speak unequivocally, that I was on the ground floor for fair share and exception.

Councilman Lester: But for the record, you voted against the amendment that I (inaudible).

Councilman Gibson: Councilman Lester.

Councilman Lester: Okay.

Councilman Gibson: Okay.

Councilman Lester: I apologize.

Councilman Gibson: To speak onto the amendment that we're talking about here, there were some questions yesterday at the work session of motivation. We talked about a lot of motivation today, in fact I think the motivation has been generated by the Pastor here and a Pastor here that do a great job on motivating their congregation.

Councilman Green: Point of order, Mr. Chair.

Councilman Jackson: Keep going, Councilman Gibson.

Councilman Gibson: There was an email that triggered this legislation that email was from a response from the Administration to Councilman Carmody, and I alluded to this email yesterday, item four of the email deals with video poker license. This was an email from Ken Antee to Thomas Carmody, stating our position, I have to assume that our position, the Administration, cause he represents the Administration is that the historical restoration and cooperated who is the hotel operator, should manage video poker in accordance with all of the State laws, just like a liquor license. We believe it is a source of revenue that the hotel can capture and to go to the bottom line, however, since it is the source of many unfounded lies and rumors, we don't care if it's prohibited. We would have historical restoration cooperated, either if licensed or keep all the revenue in the hotels revenue stream to minimize the risk on the bonds but would not be opposed to them going out, and I quote, "on an open and formal request for proposal", interesting comment there, to get the best deal for us. I just think we just had a prior conversation on formal request for proposals, there have been no deals with anyone including, and I am going to leave out the four families that were noticed here out of professional courtesy and just say video poker operators. As a result of

that email, it became apparent that there was an interest in putting video poker into a hotel, of which the public is going to pay money, and we're going to finance for over 30 years. I think that it's high time that we draw a line in terms of the City facility and this is a specific piece of legislation that is site specific, as my pastor said, there's plenty of gaming to go around in the State of Louisiana, specifically in Shreveport. And some people choose to do that and they can do that at those particular facilities, but in terms of another Pastor, my good friend, Rick Edmonds, over at Calvary Baptist stated, "it would reduce the likelihood of Conventions coming to Shreveport". And my good friend, Mayor Hightower, on last Thursday, Shreveport *Times* even stated the same thing, which I was glad to see him state, there's no political motivation behind it, this is the right thing to do. We're going to have Conventions, we're going to have food and beverage, we're going to have other things there, but video poker is one thing that should not in any form of fashion be allowed inside that Convention. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Antee: Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Antee.

Mr. Antee: I just want to – since he quoted the email, I want to put it in the context in which it was received and sent. The Mayor and I have not had any conversation about video poker, we hadn't even thought about it, but when the question was asked by Councilman Carmody, as to whether – basically, what were the plan for video poker. I responded to him in the email that was sent, at that point and time it really – hey that's another source of revenue that has not been planned for, that could help us pay off the debt, but if – I later found out that, that was the source of some lies and rumors that we cut some political deals or, you know, or a contract was already out there to ensure that, that's not the case with video poker or anything else, I've responded back to him "do away with it". Since then, the Mayor had the conversation that Pastor Edmonds talked about and he said, "right it does cut off a segment", so our official policy is, we are not opposed to banding video poker in the hotel. The revenue it could create does not offset the negatives of it, so we did not want video poker to become an issue, and that's the context that the email was sent prior to the conversation that the Mayor had, but all the cards on the table and the reason that there four names listed in the email is because those were four names that came to my mind immediately that I know that are in video poker business, and so I want to make it clear, and the Mayor's been clear, he sent a letter to y'all asking do away with it, and let's take that one issue off the board. Thank you.

Councilman Green: Mr. Chair, one thing is that on one hand I don't want the hotel, and I see that you're getting the votes to get, then I'm going to make sure I tell you what you can and cannot do, and I think that since we have basically declared this a very sacred piece of land we ought to just go all the way with it, I think that the mothers against drinking could appreciate that if in fact we would put in this amendment, amend this amendment to say no drinking in this hotel to just make sure that we have everything, then we ought to go a little further and say no sex, and if

you're not married then you can't say in this particular hotel, because we want this hotel sin free. And then I think we will just have the right amendment, because sometimes we the church, we put together different statements and then so that we can say, now we fixed that so it ought not be any sin over at that hotel and it ought not be any sin in this town because we have passed the law to say that you can't do it, so therefore, we've done our evangelistical job and everybody ought to be safe. So, I would like to if we can do this since we going to have a wonderful sin free hotel, and I think if you in fact look at what our problem is in America, it's not a skin problem it is a sin problem so since we're fixing it we ought to just go all the way, because this legislation here is to make us feel good, to say we did not stop the hotel, but I tell you what they want have video poker there, so now I feel good.

Councilman Jackson: Councilman Green, if that's going to be an amendment, I think we got to have it in writing, so that notwithstanding –

Councilman Green: Well, my question would be, would the author of the legislation be in agreement to put a sin free hotel? He's getting a note from his counselor so –

Councilman Jackson: Is that it Councilman Green?

Councilman Green: But I just think my point is, I'm going to help you out on this Mike, so that you can feel good, I know that it hadn't been a lot of times up here that you've basically got your votes to go your way lately, and I'm going to help you out on this one. As long as we get the hotel, I don't care about a video poker, I'm not going down there to gamble, I'm not going to do any of that so if this in fact is a feel good for you then I'm going to help you, because I wouldn't want you to go out and talk about me that I'm a reverend and I'm pushing for video poker, I'm not, but I just think that if in fact when America play on a level playing field then we ought not make certain grounds sacred, because we are not dealing a church, and this is not close to a day care, it's not close to a school, in fact if we hadn't said anything about it they would have had it in there and nobody would have ever known. But, I'm going to help you out on this, and I hope you feel good and wonderful, and that's my story, Mr. Chairman, and I approve that message.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you, Councilman Green. Councilman Walford.

Councilman Walford: Next time could I go before him, this is tough to follow? I got to tell you, when this first came up, frankly I was not of a mind to go along with it I questioned what the motivation was, Mayor I got your letter and I actually was accusing you of running from controversy, and I will tell you know that I have a great deal of respect for Pastor Brown, and Pastor Edmonds, and for Rod Masteller. I was looking at it in terms of a revenue source, if it's going to hurt us in having the Conventions that Pastor Brown and others nodded their head, that they were going to help us get then it's hurting our revenue, to me it's not that big a thing, I don't know what video poker machine make, but I believe that we'll probably make it up from the Conventioneers that go to the boats and we get our percentage down there, but based on what these gentlemen have said, Mr. Gibson I'm more than willing to go along with you on this

one, I feel like we will get the revenue in the Convention, at least I certainly hope so, thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Jackson: Councilman Lester.

Councilman Lester: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Mr. Lafitte, could you come up, please? I think earlier that we had some question, and I don't want to engage in revisionist history. But, some weeks ago I offered a resolution that would have authorized the Mayor to enter into an agreement with HRI, whereby HRI would have signed a document codifying that they agreed to bound by fair share. Do you recall that?

Mr. Lafitte: Yes.

Councilman Lester: And do you recall that discussion?

Mr. Lafitte: Yes sir.

Councilman Lester: And the question was whether it was legal or whether it was illegal, or whether it was prohibited by any statute rule or ordinance; whether that be in the City Charter, City Ordinance or by State law, and I think your response was that it was not prohibited. Is that correct, because it was a contractual situation, isn't that correct?

Mr. Lafitte: The two parties agreed and it's a legal contract.

Councilman Lester: Right, so that it was not a situation where we would be (inaudible) to HRI. If HRI, decided to sign the document they could, if HRI decided not to sign the document they were free to do so as well, isn't that correct?

Mr. Lafitte: That's correct.

Councilman Lester: So in fact any statements to say that, that document or that amendment was some what a foul with any statute, ordinance or whatever that would be incorrect, wouldn't it?

Mr. Lafitte: That would be incorrect.

Councilman Lester: Okay, I just wanted to make sure. Now, this amendment that we have before us, is basically also a contractual agreement between the Convention Center Hotel Authority through the Mayor and HRI, is it not?

Mr. Lafitte: I believe it is.

Councilman Lester: Okay, and it too can either be signed by HRI, or not signed by HRI, is it not?

Mr. Lafitte: Yes sir.

Councilman Lester: So, in terms of procedure, in terms of processing, in terms of form there not substantively that different.

Mr. Lafitte: They're not substantively different, right, correct.

Councilman Lester: Okay, I just wanted to make sure cause, you know, I don't build buildings, I draft contracts, just for what it's worth. Thank you, Mr. City Attorney.

Mr. Lafitte: You're welcome.

Councilman Lester: I'm not finished with my statement. I'm finished with Mr. City Attorney. Again, we can say what to say and the votes are going to be there one way or the other, and if I'm the only one that vote against this, that's fine, I'm not

worried about whether I'm running for State Representative, whether I'm running for Mayor, Congress, whether or not some voters guide going to say I cast a vote in 2004, that can be seen as an expansion of gaming that's used by one group or another to vote against, it's not even about that, what I don't understand is my council colleague would offer an amendment that says, we cannot put three video poker machines in a building where we're concerned about revenue. The whole colloquy of the last few hours is about revenue, we don't want to take this revenue because it's going to offend someone, and yet when given the opportunity to cast a vote that says, yes I'm in favor of fair share the exact same thing that he's doing now, his words and his deeds do not line up. And I just want to make sure that is on the record, for the council, and for my colleague, so that when people say, that they are for you, I'm for fair share, I'm concerned about inner-city revitalization, and all that does your record meet your rhetoric? And the answer is, "no". Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Jackson: Councilman Gibson.

Councilman Gibson: Thank you, Mr. Chair. Again, I can appreciate my colleague there's two separate issues, but with that said I call for question.

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

Councilman Jackson: Amendment 3.

Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Walford to adopt Amendment No. 3.

Councilman Jackson: What does it say, Mr. Clerk?

The Clerk read the following amendment:

Amendment No. 3

By: Councilman Monty Walford

Amend Section 1 of the ordinance to read as follows:

Section 1. Approval of Documents. The form of Cooperative Endeavor Agreement is approved, subject to the condition that it shall be amended to include a provision that: a) in addition to regular debt service payments, the Convention Center Hotel Authority shall expend fifty percent of all net annual operating profit after debt service payments to accelerate the reduction of the debt and b) said payments shall be made annually no later than 180 days after the end of the Authority's fiscal year. The Guarantee Agreement is hereby approved. The Mayor is hereby authorized to execute and deliver the Cooperative Endeavor Agreement to the Authority and the Guarantee Agreement to the Trustee; provided, however, said agreements can only be executed and delivered upon closing of the Bonds.

Councilman Lester: Question, Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Jackson: Councilman Lester:

Councilman Lester: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. And I guess this question would be to the Administration, and to our hotel developer, and operator HRI, that question, and I support this idea, and I guess my question would also be to Mr. Walford. I understand that in the hotel business certain times you have to reinvest money into the upkeep of the hotel, in fact down the street, one of the competing hotels has spent a great portion of money doing some painting and things of that nature. Will this prevent the Convention Center Hotel from using funds to reinvest in itself to make sure, because I know that under the operating agreement they have to spend "X", amount of dollars to maintain the Hilton plan?

Mr. Antee: No, in the itemized projections, both from the two studies, as well as the hotel development budget, there is a line item expense for FF&E Reserve, and that type, so this would come after those reserves are funded.

Councilman Lester: Okay, that solves my unreadiness.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Jackson: Councilman Walford.

Councilman Walford: Just for clarification, this is net income after debt services, in other words they make the debt payment, 50% of the left over within an 180 days is paid to accelerate retirement of the debt, and I think it would be very worthwhile amendment, and I'd like your support on it.

Councilman Lester: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Jackson: Any other question?

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

Motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Lester to adopt the ordinance as amended.

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Chairman, I made a mistake on my vote, and I'd like to go back and correct it, please.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Clerk, for the record can you clarify, in the minutes that the vote is four for three against.

Mr. Thompson: If there are no objections from the Council.

Councilman Jackson: Are there any objections to the change? All right.

Mr. Thompson: For the record we will in fact it was four three.

Councilman Jackson: Yes sir.

Councilman Hogan: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Green, and Jackson. 5. Nays: Councilmen Carmody, Gibson, and Hogan. 3.

Councilman Jackson: Councilman Green.

Councilman Green: Mr. Chair, I'd like to make a motion to suspend the rules for a minute.

Councilman Jackson: What's the purpose?

Councilman Green: To tell us that we can't take these hats, because we received some legislation that –

Councilman Jackson: Councilman Green we'll take care of that at another time, to continue now will make you out of order. I know you would want to be out of order.

Councilman Green: We hadn't had any order.

UNFINISHED BUSINESS: None.

NEW BUSINESS: None.

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES. None.

CLERK'S REPORT: None.

The adopted ordinances and amendments follow:

ORDINANCE NO. 149 OF 2004

AN ORDINANCE TO ENACT SECTION 62-85 OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT CODE OF ORDINANCES RELATIVE TO DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC ASSEMBLY AND RECREATION 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 62-85 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport is hereby enacted and now reads as follows:

Section 62-85 Shreveport City Jail, Consent to Search

The entrance of any person or vehicle into the grounds of the Shreveport City Jail shall be considered as the granting of permission to search said person and vehicle for contraband as defined by La. R.S. 14:402, provided that a legible sign is posted at all entrances giving notice as to this right of inspection and search.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that if any provisions 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. 150 OF 2004

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF SECTION 10-82(a) OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT CODE OF ORDINANCES RELATIVE TO ALCOHOL BUSINESSES 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 10-82(a) of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport is hereby amended and now reads as follows:

Section 10-82 Sale near school, churches, etc.

(a) Except as otherwise provided in this subsection and 10-193, it shall be unlawful for any person to sell at either wholesale or retail, or otherwise dispose of, any beverage of low or high alcoholic content from, and no permit shall be granted for, any premises situated within 300 feet or less of a parish or municipal playground or of a building used exclusively as a church or synagogue, a full-time day care center as defined in R.S. 17:405(A)(4), public library or school, except, those used as an accredited institution of higher learning, a school for business education conducted as a business college; provided, however, that where the premises to be licensed is located in the central business district, zoned B-4, as defined in chapter 106, it shall be unlawful for any person to sell at either wholesale or retail, or otherwise dispose of, any beverage of high or low alcoholic content from, and no permit shall be granted for, any premises situated within 200 feet or less of the above mentioned places, except a public library, or any premises situated within 90 feet or less of a public library. The required distance shall be measured as a person walks using the sidewalk from the nearest point of the property line of the church, synagogue, public library, public playground, or school to the nearest point of the premises to be licensed. This measurement shall be accomplished by the Zoning administrator or his designee as appointed by the executive director of the Metropolitan Planning Commission, Caddo Parish, Louisiana.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that if any provisions 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. 151 OF 2004
AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2004 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS BUDGET AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.**

WHEREAS, the City Charter provides for the amendment of any previously-

adopted budget; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds it necessary to amend the 2004 Capital Improvements Budget to shift funds between projects, appropriate additional 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. 159 of 2003, the 2004 Capital Improvements Budget, be further amended and re-enacted as follows:

In Program A (Buildings and Improvements):

Increase the appropriation for **Festival Plaza Covered Pavilion (04A001)** by \$290,000. Funding sources are \$250,000 from State Capital Outlay and \$40,000 from Private Donations.

In Program D (Drainage Improvements):

Decrease the appropriation for **2600 Leaf Lane Drainage (01D008)** by \$27,000.

Funding Source is 2003 GOB.

Increase the appropriation for **6600 Santa Monica Drainage (01D011)** by \$27,000.

Funding source is 2003 GOB.

In Program F (Sewer Improvements):

Increase the appropriation for **Southern Loop Improvements (00F004)** by \$1,150,000. Funding sources are \$650,000 from Private Developers and \$500,000 from 2000A URB.

In Program H (Airports Improvements):

Increase the appropriation for **Construct 10 T-Hangars - Downtown Airport (03H001)** by \$10,000. Funding source is Shreveport Airport Authority.

Adjust totals and subtotals accordingly.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the remainder of Ordinance 159 of 2003, as amended, shall remain in full force and effect.

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

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

ORDINANCE NO. 152 OF 2004

An Ordinance authorizing the Mayor of the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana to enter into a Cooperative Endeavor Agreement with the Shreveport Convention Center Hotel Authority and guarantying the obligations of said Authority with respect to its issuance of bonds; pledging certain sales tax revenues and hotel/motel tax revenues to secure bonds issued by said Authority; and providing for other matters in connection therewith.

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana (the "City") created the

Shreveport Convention Center Hotel Authority (the "Authority") by Indenture of Trust dated April 9, 2002 under and pursuant to the provisions of the Louisiana Public Trust Act (La. 9:2341-2347 as amended); and

WHEREAS, the Louisiana State Bond Commission approved the formation of the Authority on May 16, 2002; and

WHEREAS, the City declares that the Authority, with its sole purpose of planning, designing, constructing, equipping and operating a convention center hotel to be located adjacent to the new convention center in Shreveport, Louisiana on the property described in Exhibit "A" hereto (the "Project"), serves such a public purpose and will be of great economic benefit to the City and enhance its new convention center; and

WHEREAS, the Authority intends to finance the Project through the issuance of its revenue bonds in an amount not exceeding \$40,000,000 (the "Bonds"); and

WHEREAS, in order to make the Bonds marketable at reasonable interest rates and to achieve significant savings, the City desires to guarantee the obligation of the Authority with respect to the Bonds pursuant to a Cooperative Endeavor Agreement between the City and the Authority (the "Cooperative Endeavor Agreement"), the form of which is attached as Exhibit "B" hereto; and

WHEREAS, this City Council desires to authorize the Mayor to execute and deliver the Cooperative Endeavor Agreement; and

WHEREAS, to secure any payment obligations that may arise under the Cooperative Endeavor Agreement and the Guarantee Agreement (the "Guarantee Agreement") from the City to Argent Trust, a division of National Independent Trust Company, as Trustee (the "Trustee") the City desires to pledge to the Trustee its portion of the sales and use taxes derived from operation of the Project and its portion of hotel/motel taxes rebated to the City from the State of Louisiana (the "State") attributable to the Project;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the Council of the City of Shreveport, Louisiana, acting as the governing authority of said City, that:

DEFINITIONS

"Pledged Avails" means the avails or proceeds of the Tax, subject only to the prior payment of the costs and expenses of administration and collection of the Tax.

"Tax" means collectively, the sales and use tax being levied and collected in the City directly derived from use and operation of the Project under the authority of Article VI, Section 29 of the Constitution of the State of Louisiana of 1974 (the "Constitution"), Section 2711 of Title 33 of the Louisiana Revised Statutes of 1950, as amended, and other constitutional and statutory authority supplemental thereto, and the revenues rebated to the City from the State directly attributable to the use and occupancy of the Project in accordance with Sections 301 and 302.2 of Title 47 of the Louisiana Revised Statutes of 1950, as amended.

SECTION 1. Approval of Documents. The form of Cooperative Endeavor Agreement and the Guarantee Agreement is hereby approved and the Mayor is hereby

authorized to execute and deliver the Cooperative Endeavor Agreement to the Authority and the Guarantee Agreement to the Trustee; provided, however, said agreements can only be executed and delivered upon closing of the Bonds.

SECTION 2. Pledge and Obligation of Bonds. This Governing Authority and the City do hereby pledge and assign to the Trustee all right, title and interest in and to the Pledged Avails, if any, as security for the payment of the principal, premium, if any, and interest or other requirements on the Bonds. The Pledged Avails shall be deposited semiannually in a special account of the Authority with the City's fiscal agent bank and disbursed in accordance herewith. This pledge and assignment is effective from the date hereof without any further action by the City.

SECTION 3. Representations and Warranties. City represents and warrants as follows:

(a) City is, or shall be, the legal and beneficial owner of the Pledged Avails, free and clear of all liens, security interests, options, or other charges or encumbrances other than the security interest created hereunder, with full right and power to pledge the Pledged Avails to secure the Bonds.

(b) This Ordinance, creates in favor of Trustee, a valid security interest in the Pledged Avails enforceable against City and securing the payment of the Bonds.

SECTION 4. Security Interest. City hereby covenants and agrees to warrant and defend Trustee's security interest in the Pledged Avails herein created, against all claims of all persons, and will maintain and preserve such security interest. City shall take all reasonable action as may be necessary, or which may be reasonably requested by Trustee, to effect and maintain the validity, perfection, enforceability and priority of the security interest in the Pledged Avails granted herein or to enable Trustee to exercise and enforce its rights hereunder. City hereby authorizes Trustee, at its option without any obligation so to do, to file financing and continuation statements and amendments to financing statements, naming City as Debtor, with respect to any of the Pledged Avails without the signature of City.

SECTION 5. Application of Proceeds. Trustee may apply any proceeds derived or to be derived from the collection or other disposition of the Pledged Avails first to the reimbursement of any expenses incurred by Trustee in connection therewith, including the fees of Trustee's attorney and court costs; and then to the payment of any additional sums that Trustee may advance on City's behalf under this Ordinance, together with interest thereon; and then to the payment of the Bonds in such order and with such priority as Trustee may determine within its sole discretion.

SECTION 6. Additional Remedies.

(a) If the Authority defaults on any payment of principal or interest as provided under the terms of the Indenture under which the Bonds are issued (each an "Event of Default") then Trustee may exercise all other rights to which it is entitled under the financing documents and Louisiana law including the seizure of all proceeds of the Pledged Avails.

(b) Trustee's rights under this Section 6 which arise upon the occurrence of an

Event of Default shall cease and terminate upon correction of such Event of Default by the City.

SECTION 7. Termination. This pledge hereunder shall terminate upon payment in full and the performance and satisfaction of the Bonds, and upon such termination Trustee shall, without undue delay, assign, transfer and deliver without recourse and without warranty the Pledged Avails to City (and any property received in respect thereof) as has not theretofore been sold or otherwise applied pursuant to the provisions of this Ordinance.

SECTION 8. Governing Law. This Ordinance is a contract made under, and the rights and obligations of the parties hereunder shall be governed by and construed in accordance with, the laws of the State of Louisiana applicable to contracts made and to be performed entirely within such State.

SECTION 9. Severability. In case any one or more of the provisions of this Ordinance shall, for any reason, be held to be illegal or invalid, such illegality or invalidity shall not affect any other provisions of this Ordinance and the Ordinance shall be construed and enforced as if such illegal or invalid provisions had not been contained herein or therein.

SECTION 10. Notice Provisions.

(a) Notices to City or Trustee under or with respect to this Ordinance shall be made in writing, signed by the party giving the same, and shall be deemed properly given when personally delivered, sent overnight express or when mailed, postage prepaid, certified mail, return receipt requested, to the parties at their respective addresses listed below.

If to City:

Keith Hightower, Mayor
City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana
Travis Street, Suite 670
Shreveport, Louisiana 71101

If to Trustee:

Lucius D. McGehee Jr.,
Senior VP
Argent Trust, a division of National 505
Independent Trust Company
500 East Reynolds Drive
Ruston, Louisiana 71270

follows:
introduced and substitute the attached Ordinance.

on
inance to read as follows:

Section 1. Approval of Documents. The form of Cooperative Endeavor Agreement is approved, subject to the condition that it shall be amended

to include a provision that the Convention Center Hotel Authority agrees that no video poker devices, other gaming devices, gaming or gambling shall be permitted on the premises of the convention center hotel, the restaurant, the bar or any other space constructed with the funds described herein. The Guarantee Agreement is hereby approved. The Mayor is hereby authorized to execute and deliver the Cooperative Endeavor Agreement to the Authority and the Guarantee Agreement to the Trustee; provided, however, said agreements can only be executed and delivered upon closing of the Bonds.

ford

finance to read as follows:

uments. The form of Cooperative Endeavor Agreement is approved, subject to the condition that it shall be amended to include a provision that: a) in addition to regular debt service payments, the Convention Center Hotel Authority shall expend fifty percent of all net annual operating profit after debt service payments to accelerate the reduction of the debt and b) said payments shall be made annually no later than 180 days after the end of the Authority's fiscal year. The Guarantee Agreement is hereby approved. The Mayor is hereby authorized to execute and deliver the Cooperative Endeavor Agreement to the Authority and the Guarantee Agreement to the Trustee; provided, however, said agreements can only be executed and delivered upon closing of the Bonds.

None.

RS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES. None.

eing no further business to come before the Council, the meeting adjourned at approximately 5:57 p.m..

man

Clerk of Council