COUNCIL PROCEEDINGS OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT, LOUISIANA MARCH 25, 2003

The Regular Meeting of the City Council of the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, was called to order by Chairman James Green at 3:00 p.m., Tuesday, March 25, 2003, in the Government Chambers in Government Plaza (505 Travis Street).

Councilman Lester led the Council in the Invocation.

On Roll Call, the following members were Present: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Green, Hogan, and Jackson (3:12). 6. Absent: Councilman Gibson. 1.

Approve Minutes. Motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Walford to approve the Administrative Conference Summary Minutes of March 10, 2003 and the Regular Meeting Minutes of March 11, 2003. Motion approved by the following vote: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Hogan, and Green. 5. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Jackson and Gibson (out of the City). 2.

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

Mayor Hightower: Mr. Chairman, I do have one little piece of communication today. We've got some guests in the audience. Did y'all jog down here? We've got with us the Judson Warriors, not only are they a group of good young men and successful young men, but the coach is also one of our own and he's been successful and been coaching young kids now for 26 years. He's one of our fine public servants. But Coach Delaney has been not only a Police Officer, but a volunteer in the community for again, like I said, 26 years. He has at least self-proclaims that he is the winningest coach in Shreveport, 914 wins. If that's all true, he probably is and 26 years, I would say he would have a hard time finding anybody that could beat that record, but they are in the process now of completing another successful season and moving on to the State Tournament in Alexandria, so Coach if you would come up and introduce your team to us.

Officer/Coach Delaney introduced the individual team members.

Councilman Green: Also before you all take your seat, again, I'd like to commend you all for doing a great job and if I didn't say that my granddaughter was a cheerleader at that school, Akeyla Green, I'd be in trouble. But where is the one, I saw one, I was at one of the games, the one that's almost ready for the Pros, which one is he? Okay, he's almost ready for the Pros, he is so bad until its unreal.

Officer/Coach Delaney: Mr. Chairman, I also have some of the parents and grandparents.

Councilman Green: Alright, would you all stand.

Councilman Lester: I would be remiss and would be locked out of my house if I did not comment on the fact that not only are these great young men and women and great support, my wife is a teacher at Judson Elementary. And, I think several of her students, her former students from the third grade are amongst the team and I know Sgt Delaney and his family have done tremendous work with these young people for a number of years. They sacrifice a lot going up and down the highways and bi-ways of this City and around our State, giving our young men and women an opportunity to have some leadership development in sports and I just think its tremendous that they have sacrificed so very much and so quietly just done a great job with our young people. So, I just again, commend them for everything that they've done. I know this personally and they've been

great for not only Judson, but for the young men and women of our City and I think they are great people and they really should be commended.

Councilman Green: Also, its just been brought to my attention that those great cheerleaders the reason for these guys winning, are here. Would the Cheerleaders stand?

Councilman Green: At this time, we do have another special guest with us today, that we'd like to recognize a living legend in her own day, Mrs. Virginia Shehee. Would you come forward please and I'm going to ask the Vice-Chair to go down with me (see text of Resolution 31 of 2003 by Councilman Green under Resolutions on Second Reading and Final Passage): To recognize and to thank Virginia K. Shehee for her pioneering spirit, for a lifetime of distinguished public service, for demonstrating in many extraordinary but practical ways her deep and genuine love for the City and its citizens and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Mrs. Shehee: Y'all, I don't know how I'm going to talk after that. I get kind of teary eyed, you know. First of all, I want to say, I'm so honored to be on the same program with these young men and women, there was a young lady on that team. I'm always happy to be on the same program with them, Judson. Congratulations to you all, do well. I'm just overcome, I'm not sure that I'm humbled, I don't know that I deserve all this, but I'm not going to give it back. And I'm deeply appreciative of this honor that you all have bestowed on me. You're a great group and I know you'll do great things for Shreveport. I appreciate you so very much. Thank you from the bottom of my heart.

Convention Center and Convention Center Hotel Project Report:

Mr. Antee: We as far as Convention Center, the design team and the construction manager are still working to get the bids out. The bids will be advertised, the return date for the opening of the bids will be May 7th and May 8th. Other than that, that is moving it back one week from what was reported at the last Council Meeting and the purpose of that was so that we could make sure that the set of drawings that gets put out on the street is as complete and clear, as possible. And the architect requested additional time in which to make sure that a lot of the questions the construction manager has brought up could be incorporated into the documents. And they've assured us that this date of moving it back one week to May 7th and 8th can be met and will be met. So with that, I don't see a whole lot changing between now and then except for a lot of questions back and forth from the contractors to the construction manager.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Antee, just a couple of questions. First let me start off with a request. My request is that if we could in the future have those, our reports on the Convention Center and Hotel in a written form, I'd appreciate that.

The second request or my second question deals with 1. where do we stand with the construction management portion in terms of resolving whether or not we're going to have Fair Share participation in the construction management portion with the Convention Center? Where does that stand right now?

Mr. Antee: Our last meeting about two weeks ago, maybe three weeks ago with Barton Malow, they were leaving that meeting to go back and to come back and meet with the Mayor to provide with them how they proposed to adhere to the Fair Share Plan. And that meeting was to have been last week, however, the Mayor and myself were in Washington on the "CC to DC" trip and so that's being rescheduled and I think its scheduled for later this week.

Councilman Lester: Okay, so they are going to come to the Administration and draft a plan on how exactly they plan to fulfill. . .

Mr. Antee: Their charge was to come back and to show how they plan on complying with the Fair Share Ordinance.

Councilman Lester: My next question and I shared this with you, I had an opportunity to peruse the management agreement as it relates to the Convention Center Hotel and I did not see any Fair Share language in that. Where do we stand as far as Fair Share language in either the management agreement on the hotel or how is Fair Share going to play a part in the Convention Center Hotel project?

Mr. Antee: There is language in the contract, that the final version or the most recent final version of the management contract that clearly states that the Fair Share Ordinance is applicable and that they will comply with the Fair Share plan.

Councilman Lester: Okay, I'd like to look at a copy of that. Also, the company that we're going to work with, HRI. Have they come to you with a plan on how they or what their proposal on how they are going to meet the criteria of the Fair Share. Have they done that as of yet?

Mr. Antee: Well, there is any number of ways in which to meet the Fair Share plan in the operation of the hotel. And we've got to get developed a hotel before there is a hotel to manage and that's what we're in the phase of now, designing which putting together the team to design which will have Fair Share participation. So we haven't got to that point, but it is included in the contract that they will have to adhere to the Fair Share Ordinance with the operation of the hotel.

Councilman Lester: I guess where I'm coming from Mr. Antee and my concern is, I want, first of all this Administration has been very forthcoming and very up-front that they want to make sure that all phases of this project adhere to the Fair Share Program and I think that's something that has to happen. But I think the onest is not only on us from the Administration's stand point, but I think the onest should also be to a certain extent on the majority vendors. Whether it be the construction manager in terms of the Convention Center, or the management group that's going to manage the hotel and to a certain extent, the public trust to put together a program or a plan on exactly how we want to adhere to the Fair Share program and our ideas on how we're going to make that work. And so, I guess at the end of the day, what I'm looking for is some kind of program that we can say listen, you know: community, this is how we believe that we're going to adhere to the Fair Share program because we plan to do A, B, C, D, E, F, G. Is that something that we can. . . ?

Mr. Antee: That should not be a problem.

Councilman Lester: Okay. Thank you. That's my question Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Carmody: Thank you sir, Mr. Antee, could you answer for me when the bonds were sold, GOB bonds for the Convention Center, do you remember that?

Mr. Antee: No, the election was in July of '99. If they were sold in '99, it would have been the latter part or it may have been early 2000, but we can get that information.

Councilman Carmody: Please sir, if I could get that. And also the Convention Center Hotel project, those bonds, we have not sold any bonds on that yet, have we?

Mr. Antee: No, that has to be designed. We have to have a guaranteed maximum price with a contractor and then go and try place the bonds through a private sale.

Councilman Carmody: And do we have any kind of an estimated time frame from when those bonds will be ready to be sold?

Mr. Antee: There is a schedule.

Councilman Carmody: Just a ballpark . . . will help me.

Mr. Antee: Within 12-16 months, we should be approaching the bond market. When we actually sell it, we'll be dictated more by the bond market at that particular time. Sometimes you get a much better rate if you hold off a month or two. So, we'll assess it once everything is ready and put together to the bond market.

Councilman Carmody: Hard to imagine we could get a better rate that the rates are today. But we'll see.

Mr. Antee: I agree.

Property Standards Program Report.

Councilman Lester: We don't have a report at this time, but we do have an ordinance that we would like to offer for consideration. I don't know if this is the proper time.

Councilman Green: Once we get to the 'Adding Legislation'

Public Hearings: None.

<u>Confirmations and/or Appointments</u>: Motion by Councilman <u>Jackson</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Lester</u> to confirm Mr. James Pannell to the Caddo-Bossier Port Commission (added to Agenda on 3-11).

Councilman Hogan: Well, as you mentioned yesterday in the Administrative Work Session, there were some issues about Mr. Pannell, nothing about his personality or character. But there were some issues brought up, I wondered if those issues had been resolved yet? Anybody have any idea on that?

Mayor Hightower: To the best of my knowledge, yes.

Councilman Hogan: Okay; thank you.

Councilman Carmody: Yesterday Mr. Mayor, I had asked that based on the number of phone calls that I had gotten about the public records indicated some concern over some unpaid indebtedness regarding this potential candidate for this appointment. I was hoping that you could address 1. the merits of this particular candidate and 2. provide us with that documentation that I had asked for yesterday.

Mayor Hightower: I'd have to go and get that documentation, I didn't carry that down with me.

Councilman Carmody: I think we'd be happy to postpone until you can have it. Mayor Hightower: We can do that.

Councilman Jackson: Do we need something more official than Mr. Carmody's desire to postpone?

Councilman Lester: I think we have a motion on the floor.

Councilman Green: We got a motion and a second on the floor. We had the question and the next deal with be to vote. What do we do?

Mr. Thompson: That's correct. It would be to vote unless somebody got the floor and there was another motion.

Councilman Carmody: I'll offer a substitute motion..

Motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Hogan to postpone the confirmation.

Councilman Hogan: Would you clarify that substitute motion.

Mr. Thompson: I believe the motion is to postpone.

Councilman Carmody: That is correct.

Councilman Jackson: I guess I'll ask Mr. Carmody. I was unaware of the information you've asked for, can you tell me what you've asked for.

Councilman Carmody: Yes sir, during the work session Mr. Jackson maybe you weren't here at that time.

Councilman Jackson: No, I wasn't.

Councilman Carmody: Basically I had received a number of calls regarding, some concern in the public record of some indebtedness that was owned by this individual, and yesterday had requested that the Administration that they provide us documentation of any suits or judgments that had been filed basically checking with different governmental authorities regarding possible indebtedness that is still unpaid including the Finance Department of the City of Shreveport, the Caddo Parish Tax Assessor's Office, as well as the Caddo Shreveport Sales and Use Tax Division. And that's the information that I was hoping that the Administration was going to provide to us.

Councilman Jackson: Well, since we are in a public forum, I'd like to know then maybe before the Administration would do this and before I'm prepared to vote on it, do we have that same information about those who are currently serving?

Because if not then what we've done based on the phone calls you received, we are setting another standard. My question is, are we going to hold every person to the same standard. Every body that we've voted on since I've been on this Council as it relates to confirmations and appointments, I've not heard and I'm sure that perhaps that exists. So, perhaps you can certainly understand my discontent with what seems to be having selected this particular individual as the person to 'check out' for a lack of a better term.

So, until and such time, if the Administration perhaps can you tell me, and I'll be satisfied with your disposition, have we done that with everybody who we've appointed since you've asked them to come before us when confirmed and/or appointed people?

Mayor Hightower: No.

Councilman Lester: My question is, I'm trying to understand, what does that inquire have to do with the merits of this particular candidate to this Commission?

I think our responsibility is to advise and consent. If we have a problem with the nominee from the Administration, then the correct vote is a 'no' vote. I think at this particular time for us to decide that we wanted to look into this individuals' background and we want to go and, I have questions as to indebtedness or anything like that, I mean this is the first time that we have since we've been on the Council even had this issue to come before us. And, again, I apologize because I was in court yesterday, I heard nothing about any questions as to this particular candidate.

And my question is, what does that have to do with this person's ability and their fitness to serve? If you don't believe or if any member of this Council does not believe this individual is fit to serve on this Board, then I think the proper vote would be a vote of 'no.' If you believe that this individual is fit to serve on this Board, then I think the vote is

'yes.' But for us to get to point where now we want to look and examine this person's background. You've heard there are judgments and all these other kind of things, my question is, what purpose is that to serve other than to humiliate or embarrass an individual whose name has been properly moved forward by the Administration. If the Administration is comfortable with appointing this person I think this individual has been on the docket on more than one occasion and we've had an opportunity to look at this person, Mr. Pannell, in this particular case, we looked at his resume, his background and what he has done in the community and we all know what this Board is about. And so my question is, at what point are we going to look at the real issue. I mean if we believe that, again like I said yesterday, if we are going to use the rules to selectively deny people things on a brand new issue then let's say that but at the end of the day, I don't think that has any difference or bears any weight and if it does, please explain to me how you believe it does on this individual's fitness to serve on this particular Board given the fact that we've not looked at the financial background or we've not looked at any judgments or anything of that nature of any person that we've nominated to any commission since I have been on the Council.

Now, I can't speak for what happened previously, but as I appreciate it, I don't believe that we've, in my view of previous Councils, taken an opportunity to look at whether or not there is this person against this or this outstanding against this person.

So, I mean, again, if you don't believe that this individual is fit to serve then I believe that the vote should be 'no.' If you believe that this individual is fit to serve and you believe that the Administration has put forth a person whose name is sufficient and can give proper service to this Board, I think your vote should be 'yes.' But I think anything other than that, I think, my question is the timing and are we trying to hold one particular individual to a higher standard or to a different standard given the fact that this is not the first nomination to any board that we have had. And, my question would be, why is it more important for us to look at this now when we've appointed other people to other boards and we've not had this inquiry?

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Mayor to address a number of the questions that Mr. Lester had, I think he is right. This particular candidate's name was submitted before and then withdrawn. Can you go into what occurred there?

Mayor Hightower: We did submit the name and then I believe that you'd had come to me and told me that you had, had some calls about some possible liens. So, we did withdraw it until we did the research. We've now done the research. To the best of my knowledge and to the best of our ability to research your questions, they've been answered. The only piece of property that this particular candidate had that has a lien on it happens to be the piece that he has graciously donated to the City of Shreveport for our new jail site. So, as far as I know at this point there are no issues in the background.

As far as is he good candidate or not? He is a, I think, a well-known businessman, a contractor. That is part of what we do at the Port is try to grow and contract and build out there and it takes a little business sense to get that done. He is currently the Chairman of the NAACP in the city and if I'm not mistaken, holds a statewide position as well. And we forwarded that resume, I think, to each one of you but he has certainly been a community leader, someone I've known for the past 10

years and somebody I think is capable. If I didn't think he was capable, I wouldn't have submitted him to the Council. I think he will be a good addition to the Port.

Councilman Carmody: To address the second question, in that I have not received any questions or calls on any other recommendations or appointments that this Administration has put forward and that this one has generated a number of calls, I think it goes to the merit of the individual to take care of his own business. And, we are appointing this gentleman, again, to a position of trust and what I had asked yesterday was for the documentation to produced that there were no credibility to the different indebtedness that I have repeatedly heard that this gentleman has, personally and through is business and I do not think that it would be in the best interest of the community, at this point, to move forward. Therefore, I'm asking for a postponement not to say that I would not move to confirm this gentleman to the position, but to alleviate any doubts as to any particular outstanding indebtedness, I think that it is prudent for this Council to ask for that information.

Councilman Jackson: Question, Mr. Carmody. Specifically are you suggesting that the calls that you received which lead you to ask these questions were representative of the 'community'?

Councilman Carmody: Yes, sir you can take that as being factually.

Councilman Jackson: And, I guess my question is, not withstanding whether we receive phone calls or not does that absorb us of our responsibility when we see each candidate that comes?

Councilman Carmody: Not at all.

Councilman Jackson: We can in fact be moved by telephone polls and by people calling us to make decision, we have an incumbent responsibility whether or not we receive a single phone call and to suggest that the phone calls are what...in this particular case speaks to neglect in other cases, I would suggest.

And I would suggest that just as in any other case that we look t it on the merits and my thing again, I return to, I think is the original issue. I think if we do not want to support Mr. Pannell then the vote is 'no' but to publicly suggest that there are issues that need to be brought out and to ask the Administration to then present their documentation and then begin to go through all that documentation, I think a. would not sway any individual who has already done his or her homework or his homework on this Council and I would suggest to you, that that is all that needs to be done is this Council to give, what I think is adequate deliberation to the thought of whether or not we want this individual there. And having paraded all of this information publicly, in my opinion, doesn't go far to do anything other than to embarrass perhaps the individual, maybe not even embarrass the individual but needlessly take an individual who is a citizen in this community whether he is serving on the Port Commission or not and have said these things about that individual. I just think that would be derelict on our behalf and I certainly don't want to be complicit in that regard.

Councilman Lester: Again, my concern is this: This is not the first person that we have confirmed or attempted to have been confirmed since we have been on the Council. If those issues exist then I think it is incumbent upon us to make a determination across the board that this is what the procedure is going to be. But for us now to say, well, now I want to look at this particular individual then if you have some concerns then your concerns should be addressed because we all should have our

concerns addressed but at the end of the day, for us to parade out, 'I've got a phone call from a constituent that is concerned about this particular individual and this particular indebtedness and this that and other' I think that is, my concern, is at what point are we going to be able to get anyone from the community to serve on any board.

I mean it is hard enough, those of us that sit up here accept certain things. We accept that our lives are going to be put under the microscope, that is just a given. But for an individual that wants to serve on the board that this Administration has looked to this individual and has said, I want to individual to serve. I believe that this individual is competent, I believe that this individual can bring something to the table to the program of work of this individual board then that should satisfy our curiosity.

I think it also should put us in a position where if we don't believe that this person is fit to serve then say that. But for us to just say, well you know I have concerns about this person's business and they---I could sit here and I'm a lawyer, I can sit here and ask questions about every thing that comes before this body and every particular issue or any particular person that we confirmed because you can ask question to the impth degree. Someone is going to always have a concern, someone is always going to have a problem with somebody. But if this Administration has said, I want this person, I believe this person can serve, I believe that this person brings something to the table. For us to bring this ancillary issues that don't deal with whether or not this person is going to benefit this organization, I think, is treading very negative ground.

And again, I don't presume to tell any of us what to do because I have to represent my district and you have to represent yours and we all have to represent our own representative districts, but at the end of the day for us to bring a person that wants to be confirmed and drag them threw the mud and throw things on them, I think is just a bad scenario.

And again, I believe the issue is this: if you believe that his person is fit to serve, if you believe that the Mayor has appointed someone that can do something positive to this organization your vote should be 'yes.' If you believe that that person, if you believe strongly enough that this person should not serve then your vote should be 'no.' And if you feel strongly enough and moved about it, then your comment should be, I don't believe that this person should be on this board and this is why. But for us to now, after we have confirmed a number of other people, for us to announce okay, well this is the new standard, you know, I have a problem with it, especially given the fact that the new standard just happens to coincide with a person who represents a organization that has maybe confrontational to some other people in the past.

And I would hate to think that we are dealing with a scenario that gets to a racial issue because God knows we have enough of those issues that are confronting us on a day to day basis, but I think you can understand where I would be concerned and certainly the people in District A would be concerned that here we have this individual that wants to be confirmed and let me say this, for what it is worth, an individual that publicly has not always supported the Mayor on a number of different issues. That, that notwithstanding, that this Administration said, I believe that this person can serve and now we want to say, well, you know what—lets change the standard, I want to look at this. I mean we can do that to the impth degree and for us to do that at this particular time, I think that that is just wrong and again if any of us have problems with this person then we should vote not to confirm him otherwise, I think we should move forward.

Councilman Green: We are going to handle it once we do what you had asked to do.

Mayor Hightower: Oh, okay.

Councilman Green: At this time, the motion on the floor is whether or not to postpone or not to postpone. *Motion to postpone denied by the following vote: Nays: Councilman Lester, Walford, Green and Jackson. 4. Ayes: Councilman Carmody and Hogan. 2. Absent: Councilman Gibson. 1.*

Councilman Green: This time we will move to the original motion (*Motion by Councilman <u>Jackson</u>*, seconded by Councilman <u>Lester</u> to confirm Mr. James Pannell to the Caddo-Bossier Port Commission .)

Councilman Carmody: In order to answer both Mr. Jackson and Mr. Lester's comments, both of y'all of course were not here at the beginning of the meeting yesterday and a request was made that Mr. Antee who assured us that we would have this information today. And I am certain that they do have the information, that is why I'd asked for the postponement in order for them to bring it us.

Mr. Antee: At the time that the motion was first brought up, we did not have it down. I think we have that information now and I think we are able to provide that.

Councilman Carmody: Okay.

Councilman Green: What I would like to do at this particular time, we are going to vote on the original motion and then we'll move to the next.

Councilman Carmody: Very quickly, I can not vote favorable on this and not having that information then so you are kind of forcing my hand here.

Councilman Green: And here again; thank you Mr. Carmody.

Councilman Carmody: I am happy to go ahead and take the vote, if you are ready to call it, but please my direction of my vote.

Councilman Green: Let me say this 1. As Chairman I really hate for this to happen because it hadn't happened before. The Mayor said to me that Mr. Pannell was going to go out to his car and bring all of his papers up here to read them to show and I think that is simply, ludicrous that he would have to do that.

Councilman Walford said that when he heard about all of whatever was going on, I let him tell you what he found. He says that, he found one lien and that was on the property that this gentleman is giving to the City for the jail. Now, I don't know of anybody else in here that is giving property to the City for the jail or on any other boards that has given any property, but I'll let Mr. Walford speak for himself. But as Chairman, I will not call Mr. Pannell up here to this counter to go through his documents to say, 'this has been paid, this has been paid, this has been paid.' Now, if you'd like to see them, you can go in the back room and see them, but I as Chairman, will not do that.

Now, as it has already been said, if you want him to be on the board, you vote 'yes', if you don't then you vote 'no.' But as far as me as Chairman saying: Mr. Pannell, will you come up here and show us this. I will not do it.

Councilman Walford: I had no calls. No one in my district brought this to my attention but I did as a result of our Property Standards Committee and was doing some research, I found the one lien. I contacted the Mayor by phone. Subsequently I think we've had two conversations and in each conversation you've assured me that it has been taken care of, it is the property that is donated. And, I'm comfortable with that

unless somebody has something else to show me, then I'm comfortable with the Administration's appointment based on what he told me.

Councilman Hogan: First of all let me say that, I would disagree with you Mr. Lester on as far as if we want him to be there, we vote 'yes' if we don't 'no.' It is not quite that simple. But I believe and first of all let me say that I'm for Mr. Pannell being on the committee, I'm for that. I believe it is a privilege not a right to serve on this committee. And I don't think that it is bad business for us to---let me preclude this with saying something else. That, I thought mistakenly, that the process was anytime someone is appointed to a committee, that we check them out. That if they owe us any taxes, any property taxes, any type of business (sales tax) or anything, I mistakenly assumed that the person was checked out and I think that it would be a good idea for us to check somebody out.

I think it is a privilege and not a right to serve on one of these committees. And I would like to propose a resolution for anyone that is appointed to a committee in the future (black, white, man or woman) to be, someone to find out about their record. I'm not talking about their personal credit. I am talking about whether they owe the City money. I don't think that is asking too much and that is a proposition that I would like to make. And I'm not wanting to embarrass Mr. Pannell, that is why I asked when we first called for questions, Mr. Mayor has these issues been resolved? His answer was, yes. From that point I was ready to vote and I'm ready to vote right now.

Councilman Jackson: While I understand the points and the passion of Mr. Hogan's concern and proposed proposition, I just I can't—reality will not allow me to stand idly by while we subject people who are appointed to commissions and to boards to something that people on this very elected body are not held to, a standard that does not even apply to even those of us who are elected and yet we want to impose that on citizens in this City.

I think we've gone way too far and whatever we want to call ourselves as policing. I think we ought to be sure that when we make recommendations, Mr. Mayor and the Administration that, we recommend upstanding people. And again people are upstanding only to the degree that we know them. I am sure a lot, that if you pull back the curtains and covers that you could find out about everybody in this room. The question is about their ability and their capacity to serve this City and do what is the will of the people of this City without being unnecessarily subjected to the moral police, who in fact themselves do not have to meet the same standards. I think we sit in a posture of hypocrisy if we advocate this without first applying that same measure to ourselves.

And until such time as we are prepared to change the City Charter to say that about ourselves and to ask the citizens to vote on those things, then I think it is not fair to be able to advocate that. It is lofty, it is laudable, it makes good sense. I mean, I agree. But the problem is it puts us in a statute, puts us in a posture of hypocrisy. If we are not going to meet that to ourselves, then how can we measure that to someone else? And I think we have to think about that. I think it is a noble concern, however, we have to be realistic in this.

We are not and I would suggest that the Mayor and Administration are not bottom-feeding. They are not scrapping the bottom of the barrel to find people to serve. They are finding people, I would suggest that are upstanding citizens who have Shreveport at the core of their concern. Now, there are some people who serve on

boards in this City that have been appointed by this Mayor and the previous Administration who may still be in positions whose character, I might question, but that is not my job here today.

We are to sit and to look at those appointments, these confirmations. Our job is to confirm the appointments of this Mayor. And if this Mayor suggest that these people are the kind of people that he wants to serve and that we as citizens should have to serve, then we due our due diligence. We have the right from the time they have given us the names to go out, get on the Internet and find his birth certificate and everything else, if that is what we want to find. But at the end of the day this should not be a place where people are publicly or have their character questioned and/or assassinated.

If it becomes an issue that rises to the level of concern, we ought to meet in private and ask the Mayor to take his name off rather than getting on television, bringing citizens in this place, and beginning to castigate them publicly. I don't want to be a part of that. I don't know what the ordinance may contain, but if it is anything close to that, I think we are 1. taking ourselves too seriously and 2. that we have got to think about progress for this City and not try to embarrass our citizens.

Councilman Walford: One more thing, Councilman Jackson you said it very eloquently but one thing you missed is a 'willingness to serve' because these are not exactly high paying positions.

Mr. Kirkland is going to nod when I say this but you do an awful lot of work for a free lunch and I think that if we have people who are also <u>willing</u> to serve and certainly the Mayor is accountable for how the person serves that you appoint; so, I'm going to vote for Mr. Pannell.

Councilman Lester: My question is: why now? Why now? If we are concerned about the morality or we are concerned about a person's indebtedness to the City and all these other questions, why are we starting, now? This is not the first person that we voted to confirm. Why is the standard now?

And why is it, more often than not and I hate, I promised I wasn't going to say this, but why is it seems like that when someone that looks like me gets confirmed then the standard has to be different but when other people come up here, we don't even ask those questions? But now because I got a question from a constituent or what have you, now we want to bring this man out here who has served this community. I don't agree with everything that Mr. Pannell has said, okay. But the issue is whether or not he can give something of serve in a positive direction for this board. And Mr. Pannell has gone on record, he has not always been in favor of everything that the Mayor has said and yet with that, the Mayor said, even not withstanding the fact that I don't agree with this person on a lot of issues, I believe that this person has something to contribute. So, why now? All that sounds good.

I think what Councilman Hogan is offering that sounds good, but my question is, why now. Why is it that it just seems like that when someone of color gets to the mark, the standards has to change. Why is it that now we are concerned about okay, lets look at a, b, c, d, e, f, g? My question is not of substance, my question is of timing and I think that is an issue that needs to be concerned. And the fact of the matter, I don't even think we even need to go down that road because I think we are moving in a direction of putting those issues behind us as a Council but when something like this happens, I

mean, part of my just---the hair on the back of my neck stands up because I have to ask the question, why now.

This is not the first confirmation. This isn't even the second confirmation but why now? And why are we going to subject this individual to this type of public scrutiny? Why are we going to have it, the media think that, well maybe there is something to why this person wasn't confirmed or what questions could they have.

At the end of the day, if this person owes the money, that needs to be taken care of, assuming that is the case. But are we going to castigate a person who wants to serve because they owe us a bill? I mean, are we really going to get to that point. I don't think that is the message that we want to send out. I think that what we charged this Administration with doing is bringing us back good people that want to serve on the boards that can do a good job.

Again, if you feel like this person can do a good job, your vote should be to confirm him. If you do not believe this person can do a good job or will do a good job, your vote should be not to confirm him and lets move on.

Mayor Hightower: Before the Council votes I do want to again, reassure the Council that when Councilman Carmody brought the concern up that we do the research, we went on the Internet, we took a look at all the stuff and I don't want anybody in the general public to think when you vote today that there may be something looming out there, there is not, not to the best of my knowledge and the staff's knowledge. Those matters were taken care with the exception of the piece that he is donating to the City to put the jail on which is, good news for us.

So, again, when we bring somebody to you, I do want to bring outstanding, upstanding, contribution-makers to be put on these boards and I happen to think this particular individual is one of those and would ask that you support him. But again, I want to be sure that the record is clear and Councilman Walford did take a look (someone other than me looking at it) and everything seems to be in order.

Councilman Carmody: Then based upon the assurance from the Administration that everything is in order, I would be happy to vote now.

Motion confirmed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Gibson. 1.

Councilman Hogan: Just one quick comment, I don't know if Mr. Pannell is in the audience I didn't see him. I just want to personally thank you if you are out there and you can hear me, for your donation of the land for the city jail. That is honorable and I really appreciate that, I want you to know how much we thank you for that.

Councilman Green: He may be gone now, but I was going to recognize another celebrity that we had in the audience with us whose a book writer and to-be film maker, Brother Baritu, but I guess he had to catch a plane and he is gone now (but tell him I did call his name).

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

1. Resolution No. 44 of 2003: A resolution authorizing the Purchasing Agent to dispose by public auction certain supplies, material, equipment and vehicles and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

- Resolution No. 45 of 2003 by Councilman Green: A resolution to increase police presence and effectiveness in District F; authorizing and requesting the Chief of Police to devise a plan to effectively combat crime with the Sheriff, federal authorities and the State Police to eliminate rampant crime, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
- 3. Resolution No. 46 of 2003: A resolution authorizing the Mayor to execute a lease agreement with Libbey Glass, Inc and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
- 4. Ordinance No. 32 of 2003: An ordinance to amend Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, as amended, the City of Shreveport Zoning ordinance, by amending Section 106–1130 (g) (2) I., by modifying the requirements for temporary telecommunication towers allowed as specific administratively approved uses, and by otherwise providing with respect thereto.
- 5. Ordinance No. 33 of 2003: An ordinance amending the 2003 General Fund Budget and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
- 6. Ordinance No. 34 of 2003 by Councilman Lester and Walford: An ordinance to amend Chapter 38 of the Code of Ordinances to add Section 38-87 and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Councilman Lester: I'd like to offer and move for Introduction and consideration an ordinance that comes from the Property Standards Committee. It deals with the cost of the administrative fees to be collected for performing work authorized by Chapter 38 of the Code of Ordinances as it relates to property standards.

This ordinance will permit the City to assess and collect and administrative charge of \$125 to each bill for performing such work for the City and this is something that has come from our work in the Property Standards Committee an is offered by both myself and Councilman Walford (seconded by Councilman Carmody).

Motion by Councilman <u>Lester</u> to add Ordinance No. 34 to the agenda, seconded by Councilman <u>Carmody</u>.

Councilman Jackson: Are we introducing that ordinance today, Councilman Lester to be voted on today or to placed on the agenda, not to be voted on until. . . Councilman Jackson: To be placed on the agenda. I think it is an ordinance, so it is a two reader.

7. Ordinance No. 35 of 2003: An Ordinance Amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the southwest corner of Stratford Avenue & Youree Drive, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from SPI-3-E(B-1), Commercial Corridor Overlay/Extended Use (Buffer Business) District to SPI-3-E (B-1), Commercial Corridor Overlay/Extended Use (Buffer Business) District, Limited to "Cellular Phone Sales" Only, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Motion by Councilman <u>Carmody</u> to add the Resolutions and Ordinances to the agenda, seconded by Councilman <u>Walford</u>.

Councilman Jackson: We are introducing these items, all of which will be entertained 2 weeks from now or what?

Mr. Dark: That one about the auction is for today and the only reason it is for today is that it is adding an additional, like I say, 10 or 12 vehicles to the auction that they are going to sell this coming April 5th before you meet again, so that is the only one that they would ask that you vote for today so we can put those in the auction.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman can you delineate for me which ones we would be having some action on today, versus those. . . .

Mr. Thompson: That one and also the resolution introduced by the Chairman, can be voted on today.

Councilman Jackson: Well what is the pleasure of the Chairman as we introduce that resolution?

Councilman Green: What is my pleasure?

Councilman Jackson: To be added for vote today or. . . .

Councilman Green: Yes, mine is to be voted on today.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman then, my question is---okay, we are just adding it to the legislation. Councilman Green: Yes, Sir.

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

<u>Public Comments:</u> Keith Oaks (98060 Woods Drive): I am here today to reiterate what I wrote in a letter to the Mayor and to the Council regarding a resolution that is going to be adopted today in issuing a new contract for the Shreveport Urban Renaissance Corporation.

I'm representing that non-profit organization today, I'm the Executive Director. I'd spoken to some of you gentleman on the phone and I'd written you letter and sent you some other background information about our organization and what we do.

And the resolution today is going create a new contract that we'll expire December 31st of this year, but it does not include a provision to extend that contract. Our previous contract did include a provision to extend our contract for three, one year term at the discretion of the Council if you so chose to do that.

So, I am asking that the Council include that provision in this resolution today that would allow you at the end of this year to have the option to extend this contract another two years, one year per term if you so desire.

Nettie O. Brown (3522 Penick Street): I stopped by yesterday to find out whether or not you all had received your annual report from the Personnel Board, City of Shreveport and also the addendum that we had on there.

If you had any questions, I told you that the Board would be here today and I am glad ya'll have such favor about boards because I have at least two of the Board Members: Randy Snyder and Mr. Charles Wilson. Also, Mark Mathater and Larry Williams are not here, they had other commitment; so, we are here to answer any questions that you have concerning the addendum, if you have any. Any time ya'll need us, just call us.

Richard King (330 Marshall Street): I am here with regard to 9D. No. 25, the Zoning Appeal by Canatella Investment. I was told that this was the appropriate time to make public comments

regarding that. I'd come by the workshop yesterday and made some just general brief comments and would like to get in just a little bit of detail, if I can.

I represent Canatella Investments and I don't know if each of you have seen the zoning that he require, but, he filed with the MPC, zoning here in this strip of land that is, right here. In connection with that, he initiated a site plan with regard to automotive sales and automotive merchandising sales. The MPC granted B-3 zoning to about to this point so the only thing in dispute is about 500 feet to the bottom of this line with regard to our request for B-3 zoning.

With regard to residential, our recommendation to the MPC and to Mr. Kirkland's office is that there be a 400 foot buffer zone here. I do have a site plan with regard to aerial photographs and as each of you are aware, and this is not a very good photograph, this is Bert Kouns (would be this way), Walker Road runs in this direction, this would be the Thrifty Liquor store there. This is right directly next door with regard to the Thrifty Liquor zone. It is approximately five acres plot that run there and each of you know that with regard, you see the photographs here with the Thrifty Liquor, t would be right next door with his automotive sales.

The only thing in dispute and he also initiated a site plan which indicates this and indicates the buffer zone that he proposed and the closest residential area would be somewhere approximately down in this area at the bottom of the page in connection with that, that is why he proposed a 400 foot buffer zone.

We had Fred Aycock with Pinnacle Realty contact each of the adjoining and neighboring property owners with no objections that we were aware of. We asked them to come forward. I was told that no one objected to the proposed site plan that we were here. The MPC was submitted a list of names, a few names, in connection with the objections. I think that we confronted those and we have proposed to them with regard to the site plan itself, they were worried about traffic behind the Thrifty Liquor. We have now purchased the piece of property which was included in the site zone which now shows that we have exits to both Walker Road and Bert Kouns which would alleviate traffic concerns and that was the objections that were presented to the MPC with regard to those individuals and I believe we've alleviated those objections.

If anyone has any questions, I know Councilman Hogan has some concerns about why needed B-3 zoning, the additional 500 feet. Certainly, I meant my client wants the most marketable property that he can have, but if you give concern regarding that, he would accept, maybe B-2 zoning in connection with the additional 500 feet past what has already been presented or approved by the MPC. So, the only thing at issue is the approximately 500 feet that is behind the B-3 zoning.

Councilman Hogan: One of the things that I am not clear on, such as the application. The MPC's application says that it is for, development of auto sales. And then, in another case, I've spoken to you and you have spoken about the person, the applicants you are representing selling the property. I'm a little bit confused on what his intentions are, can you clarify that for me.

Mr. King: His intentions are, in connection with the site plan that he has developed for you is to build an automotive sales dealership there. Certainly, if anything changed from the site plan, it would have to be presented to this Council for approval and that was one of the conditions, the stipulations that was placed upon before the MPC itself. So, in connection with that, that is the submission is an intent to have automotive sales, which he has done for years.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Kirkland, to the best of your ability after having heard the explanation given by Mr. King for the granting, if you will of that particular zoning, to the degree that you can answer the question, what is the disposition of the Metropolitan Planning Commission?

Mr. Kirkland: The Board approved the depth of 350 feet which I believe Mr. King pointed out to you—this being Bert Kouns here. And frankly, the prime reason the Board has been reluctant

to approve a greater depth: 1. they were willing to grant the request to the extent that they thought it was needed for the auto sales. But they have been reluctant to approve heavier zoning, B-2 and B-3 to the heavier dense back in here hoping that eventually this quadrant, if you will, property would come in for a more logical site plan.

A lot of these owners that live in here are more than happy to sell. They really are not objecting to B-2 or B-3 zoning, but logically to develop lots this deep and this tract, it would make more sense if we had some sort of development plan.

Now, we can't require those owners to do that and I know Mr. Aycock, the real estate broker has tried, I think, to get some of these owners together, but it is sort of at a point where I believe the applicant is probably more than in his rights to say, I want to go ahead and do something with my property. And, he has agreed to the 400 foot, if you will, buffer on the rear but that's the best answer I could give you, I believe, Mr. Jackson.

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Kirkland, one more question. Could you tell us the difference between B-2 and the B-3 zoning? I know there is some on the hours of operation and stuff like that.

Mr. Kirkland: B-2, typically, if it is within 300 feet of residential which in this case wouldn't apply, would be restricted to operating hours 7 a.m. until 10 p.m., as well as the B-2 list of uses which typically are more retail type sales (appliances, bedding, et cetera and all of those typical, clothing, et cetera, all those uses) as opposed to B-3, gets into heavier services (auto sales, auto repairs) can operate by right until 12 Midnight. Now, when B-2 is more than 300 feet from residential, it also can go to Midnight.

So, in this case if you were to grant the additional depth in B-2, that could still go to Midnight. They can't have auto sales in B-2 without MPC approval, so if you were to go that direction and they still want to do auto sales on the rear, that would have to come back to the MPC although I think you could probably grant that approval, I'm not sure Julie, on that one it might be a little interesting, if you wanted to go that way, I think you might can get that.

Councilman Hogan: The land due west of this strip that we are talking about, Mr. King, I don't know if you have your map available there.

Mr. King: I do.

Councilman Hogan: Just to the west, where you finger was right there, that actually is R-1D, correct?

Mr. Kirkland: Correct, although over the past years, Mr. Hogan, I know I've been to I am going to say at least 3 or 4 meetings of those property owners at various times looking at everything from R-3 apartment type zoning to B-2 to B-3 and I know for certain, unless some of those owners are different and they may be they are all seemingly supportive of commercialization beyond the R-1D.

The ones who have more concern with the commercialization of this area, live more in this area on the east side of Walker Road and right in this section here as well as some of the folks on Walker Road along this area here; so, I think that is probably who you heard from.

Councilman Hogan: One more question, if we vote for approving this we are approving the back 400 feet as B-3, is that correct?

Mr. Kirkland: No, there would be, as is requested by the applicant there would be from here to here, a 400 foot still zoned residential R-1 or R-1D, that's is what the applicant...the MPC approved to this depth here, from Walker Road to here, about 350 feet. The applicant asked for a full, I think, 850 feet and that would still leave 400 foot, from here to here of residential, that could not be used commercial purpose at all.

Councilman Hogan: So from the line, where the MPC approved it, to the back of where the stripping is there or what have you. . . .

Mr. Kirkland: From there to here is about 500 feet. This is an additional 400 feet.

Councilman Hogan: And they are asking for that 500 feet for B-3?

Mr. Kirkland: That's what the applicant asked for, yes.

Councilman Hogan: You know Mr. King, as you just mentioned a few minutes ago that the applicant would be willing to accept the B-2. I believe that is what I'm going to have to recommend for my Councilmen, since this is in my district. I've got just a little problem with the B-3. I've not had any calls, but since you said a moment ago, did I understand you correctly, that your applicant was willing to accept the B-2 on that?

Mr. King: Well with regard to that issue, I've not directly discussed that with him, but as certainly had represented the individual before, what you are telling me is what you are going to recommend is B-2 zoning, I mean yes we are going to accept it because right now it is R-1. I mean, anything of an increase that we are going to be willing to accept that this Council grants and we will be more appreciative of that. But, I just wanted to clarify for the Council, I mean, in connection with this he has—there is 1300 some odd feet in connection with a five acre tract, in depth. He has already indicated and already gave up as, to make it more palatable for everyone, 400 some odd feet which is over a third of the property at this site that he has already given up in hopes of getting B-3 zoning but certainly whatever the Council wants to do, we'd be most appreciative of any action taken; so, the answer is yes, we would accept B-2 zoning.

Councilman Hogan: I just have one other comment being that this is in my district, I'm going to recommend to the other Council members that we go with the B-2 zoning for the 500 feet instead of the B-3. I think the B-3 is a step too far being that there is residential on the west side of the property, that's my recommendation.

Councilman Lester: Mr. King, a couple of quick questions. Well, really one quick question. The size of that tract that we are talking about, the total useable area, we are talking about 5 acres? Councilman Lester: No further questions.

Mr. King: That is correct. I think it is 170 x 1300 feet measures out to approximately 5 acres.

Mr. Kirkland: Let me be sure for clarity, Mr. Hogan, what I'm understanding and for clarity, this is what the MPC approved B-3 to approximately this point, 350 feet deep. This was approved for B-1 on the Walker Road frontage and what I'm hearing you say is you would say, B-2 from 350 feet further to the south and 500 feet leaving a 400 foot section zoned R-1D, is that correct?

Councilman Hogan: No, I misunderstanding you. We are not on the same page because from Bert Kouns back, I can't quite make that about but it looks like and I understood that it was B-2 that was approved.

Mr. Kirkland: The MPC approved B-3 for 350 feet of depth.

Councilman Hogan: That looks like a "2" up there to me, but I misunderstood you.

Mr. Kirkland: That was the original zoning was B-2.

Councilman Hogan: So the MPC did approve B-3?

Mr. King: For 350 feet.

Mr. Kirkland: The MPC approved B-3 for 350 feet south from Bert Kouns (that's your line about here).

Councilman Hogan: That's already B-3, that has been done? Mr. Kirkland: Well it is not already B-3 until you act on it.

Councilman Hogan: I understand.

Mr. Kirkland: It is currently B-2 their request is for B-3. The property is zoned B-2 to a depth of 350 feet as we speak. The applicant requested B-3 for this entire 850 foot of depth. The MPC approved B-3 to a depth of 350 feet from here to approximately here. What Mr. King, on behalf of his client is saying is, they will accept B-2 for an additional 500 feet.

Mr. King: And that is what I meant, I apologize.

Councilman Hogan: Okay, I hear what you are saying now. I was not clear on that before. And if they've already approved the B-3 from the Bert Kouns, 350 feet back, I have no problem with going with the B-3 for the remainder of it with the 400 foot buffer in the back.

Mr. King: As long as they maintain a 400 foot buffer?

Councilman Hogan: As long as they maintain the 400 foot buffer.

Mr. Kirkland: Good.

Mr. Thompson: I don't believe we have any amendments. Did the Council intend to act on this today?

Councilman Green: We don't' have any amendments at this time. It'll have to be postponed?

Mr. Kirkland: Actually you don't Art but if I hear Mr. Hogan and I understand him correctly, it is simply to grant the request of the applicant.

Mr. Thompson: But we don't have that in the ordinance.

Ms. Glass: You'll need the ordinance to say that, the ordinance does not say that right now because that is not what the MPC recommended.

Mr. Kirkland: Well, couldn't we simply type an ordinance that matches what the Council approves?

Mr. Thompson: I think your office could.

Mr. Kirkland: Well, I know we could. We would be happy to do that, that is simple to do, we do them anyway.

Mr. Thompson: Thank you.

Ms. Glass: However, under the Charter, the title of the ordinance has to state what the ordinance does and the title of this ordinance was very specific. I believe this change would expand on what was in the existing title, so normally, we advise that in that case the amendment should be made and then it should lay over for an additional two weeks so that it has laid over with the correct title. Am I misunderstanding?

Mr. Kirkland: Mrs. Glass, I hear, and I think the confusion Mr. King may be, we try and anticipate (what Ms. Glass is saying) what the Council is going to do with a prepared ordinance. But frankly, with all full respect to every one of you, we never know for sure what you are going to do, so I would think though that since this was an appeal asking for the full 850 feet of B-3 zoning we could simply prepare an ordinance fairly easily, but Ms. Glass you are the lawyer, so.

Mr. King: And my understanding and I've been before this Council many times in connection with an appeal of that and before we've always in connection if it was affirmed or modified by the Council itself, it was passed on that day.

Mr. Thompson: If it is a ZBA matter that could be done, but this is an ordinance and it changes the zoning classification of the property.

Mr. King: Okay.

Mrs. Glass: It would just affect the potential validity of the ordinance and I just want to make sure that we. . . .

Mr. King: I understand.

Mrs. Glass: I just want to make sure we do that.

Mr. Thompson: But it would be good if we could get one to introduce today, so that it could be adopted at the next meeting.

Mr. King: Thank you.

Councilman Green: So Mr. Kirkland, would you be kind enough to call your office and prepare that document and we'll just come to it before the meeting closes, we'll suspend the Rules and have it introduced.

Mr. Kirkland: Mr. Chairman, with all respect I don't think Mrs. Glass is saying—I think Mrs. Glass is indicating and Mr. Thompson, that it has to be 2 readings, Mrs. Glass, the ordinance does?

Mrs. Glass: You could either introduce a new ordinance or (Mr. Kirkland: Oh, just Introduce it.) simple if the Council, if we could do an amendment to amend the title to broaden it, to cover what you want to cover then we could amend it, amend this title, let it lay over and finally adopt it in two weeks and make sure that the body of it does exactly what you want it to. I would suggest making a broad title that would cover that.

Mr. Kirkland: Mrs. Glass, I don't have a lawyer available to me at the moment, but since you are lawyer, could you suggest some amendments that we could incorporate that would accomplish that?

Mrs. Glass: Yes, I think just on amending the title, I could make it broad enough.

Mr. Kirkland: Mr. Chairman, if that is alright with you, I think Mrs. Glass probably can do that as well if not better than we could.

Councilman Green: That's fine.

CONSENT AGENDA LEGISLATION:

TO INTRODUCE RESOLUTIONS AND ORDINANCES ON CONSENT:

Motion by Councilman <u>Carmody</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Jackson</u> for Introduction of Ordinance Nos. 28 and 29 of 2003 on the Consent Agenda to lay over until the April 8, 2003 meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Gibson. 1.

RESOLUTIONS: None.

ORDINANCES:

- 1. Ordinance No. 28 of 2003: An ordinance closing and abandoning a portion of Aquarius Drive and Twilight Lane in the Twilight Meadows Unit No. 2 Subdivision, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
- 2.. Ordinance No. 29 of 2003: An ordinance closing and abandoning the apparent 40 foot wide Desoto Street right-of-way running between Mansfield Road and the Southern Pacific Railroad in the SE/4 of the SW/4 of Section 11 (T17N-R14W), Caddo Parish, Louisiana, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

TO ADOPT RESOLUTIONS AND ORDINANCES ON CONSENT:

Motion by Councilman <u>Jackson</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Lester</u> for Adoption of Resolution No. 32 of 2003. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Gibson. 1.

RESOLUTIONS:

RESOLUTION NO. 32 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION ACCEPTING DEDICATION FOR TWILIGHT LANE IN THE TWILIGHT MEADOWS UNIT NO. 4 SUBDIVISION, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, legal, and regular session convened, that the dedication for Twilight Lane in the Meadows Unit No. 4 Subdivision in Section 11 (T17N-R15W), Caddo Parish, Louisiana, and as shown on the plats attached hereto and made a part hereof, be and the same is hereby accepted as dedicated to the public for public use in the City of Shreveport.

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

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

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

ORDINANCES: None.

REGULAR AGENDA LEGISLATION:

RESOLUTIONS ON SECOND READING AND FINAL PASSAGE:

RESOLUTION NO. 27 OF 2003

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 Reducing Community Gun Violence: Project Safe Neighborhoods; and

WHEREAS, the award, if approved will be for \$250,000 with no cash match required by the City of Shreveport; and

WHEREAS, these funds will be used to implement a strategic approach to reducing gun violence. Partnerships between federal, state, local and community organizations will serve as the basis for a coordinated approach that will address the problem of gun violence through enforcement, adjudication, prevention and education.

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.

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

The Deputy Clerk read the resolution by title: Resolution No. 28 of 2003: A resolution authorizing the Mayor to negotiate a collective bargaining agreement with PACE International Union and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Councilman Walford: I am not prepared to vote on this one today without, I need additional information on what the ramifications are of collective bargaining to a municipality, so I would ask that we postpone action on this.

Councilman Green: The representative PACE, the communication that I had said that she would like for us to table this item until the Council and the Administration was educated.

Councilman Walford: So that fits with what I am asking for, so I'll make a motion to table it, if that is okay; that's what my motion would be.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman <u>Carmody</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Walford</u> to table the resolution. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Gibson. 1.

The Deputy Clerk read the resolution by title: Resolution No. 29 of 2003: A resolution authorizing the execution of an agreement with the Shreveport Redevelopment Agency and Shreveport Urban Renaissance Corporation, Inc., and to otherwise providing with respect thereto. Read by title and as read motion by Councilman <u>Carmody</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Lester</u> to postpone the resolution until the April 8, 2003 meeting.

Mayor Hightower: We'd ask that you postpone that. Councilman Carmody: I'll make a substitute motion to postpone.

Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Gibson. 1.

RESOLUTION NUMBER 30 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO ACCEPT THE DONATION OF CERTAIN PROPERTY FROM FINANCIAL PLAZA, L.L.C., AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, Financial Plaza, L.L.C., desires to donate a Fifty Thousand Dollar credit to the City of Shreveport towards the purchase price of Seven Hundred and Fifty Thousand Dollars for the building located at 401 Texas Avenue, Shreveport, Louisiana 71101; and

WHEREAS, the property intended for donation was formerly the location of the Pioneer Bank Building and consists of 52,745, square feet; and

WHEREAS, the property intended for donation will be of tremendous benefit to the City of Shreveport and citizens thereof as it will enable the City to lease the building to the Multi cultural Center of the South after the City purchases the building.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened that the Mayor of the City of Shreveport is hereby authorized to accept the donation of certain property in the form of a Fifty Thousand Dollar credit towards the purchase price of Seven Hundred Fifty Thousand dollars for the building located at 401 Texas Avenue, Shreveport, Louisiana 71101, and, after review and approval by the Office of the City Attorney, to execute any and all documents on behalf of the City of Shreveport relative to same.

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 <u>Jackson</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Green</u> passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Gibson. 1.

RESOLUTION NO. 31 OF 2003

TO RECOGNIZE AND TO THANK VIRGINIA K. SHEHEE FOR HER PIONEERING SPIRIT, FOR A LIFETIME OF DISTINGUISHED PUBLIC SERVICE, FOR DEMONSTRATING IN MANY EXTRAORDINARY BUT PRACTICAL WAYS HER DEEP AND GENUINE LOVE FOR THE CITY AND ITS CITIZENS AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

By: Councilman Green

WHEREAS, Virginia K. Shehee is a very successful business woman. She owns and serves as President and Chief Executive Officer of Kilpatrick Life Insurance Company and Kilpatrick's Rose-Neath Funeral Homes and Cemeteries. Because of Virginia Shehee, these businesses contribute to the wealth and stability of Shreveport and surrounding communities; and

WHEREAS, Virginia K. Shehee is an exemplary citizen. She was elected to and served in the Louisiana State Senate; she serves as a member of the LSU Board of Supervisors, a member of the Committee of 100, and she has served and continues to serve on many state and local "blue ribbon" committees tasked with the responsibility of improving government, public education and the economy; and

WHEREAS, Virginia K. Shehee is a patron of the arts, religion and education. She provides time, management skills and resources to a long list of organizations and causes, including St Paul's Episcopal Church, the Shreveport Symphony, Centenary College, the Foundation for Excellence in Public Broadcasting, Southfield School, the State Fair of Louisiana, the Strand Theater and she is a Fellow of the Royal Society of the Arts, London, England; and

WHEREAS, Virginia K. Shehee is a philanthropist. She contributes to many philanthropic causes and she has been honored by many organizations for her philanthropy including, the Louisiana Association of Nonprofit Organizations, the Optimist Club, the Samaritan Counseling Center, Volunteers of America, the American Rose Society, the March of Dimes, Junior Achievement, Easter Seals, the Arthritis Foundation; and

WHEREAS, Virginia K. Shehee is a visionary. As an example, she was a founding member of the Biomedical Research Foundation of Northwest Louisiana and has been a guiding force in it's development having served as President and Chairman of the Board of Directors. The Foundation has recognized Virginia Shehee's unequaled contributions by bestowing upon her the title of Chairman Emeritus, and by naming the Biomedical Research Institute Building the Virginia K. Shehee Biomedical Research Institute; and

WHEREAS, Virginia K. Shehee is a pioneer. She was the first woman elected to the Louisiana State Senate; the first woman to receive the Community Council Special Humanitarian Award; the first woman to receive the Clyde E. Fant Memorial Award for Community Service, and the first woman to receive the Optimist Club's Mr. Shreveport Award; and

WHEREAS, Virginia K. Shehee's life has been marked by an extraordinary dedication to the best interest of this community as she has worked constantly for the betterment of its economic, cultural, religious and aesthetic development

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened, that the City of Shreveport and all its citizens publicly recognize Virginia K. Shehee for her pioneering spirit, for a lifetime of distinguished public service and for demonstrating in many extraordinary but practical ways her deep and genuine love for this city and its citizens.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this resolution shall be executed in duplicate originals with one original presented to Virginia K. Shehee and the other filed in perpetuity in the office of the Clerk of Council for the City of Shreveport.

/s/James Edward Green, Chairman /s/Calvin B. Lester, Jr., /s/R. M. Monty Walford /s/ Thomas G. Carmody, Jr. /s/Michael G. Gibson /s/ Jeffery A. Hogan /s/Theron J. Jackson. Read by title and as read motion by Councilman <u>Carmody</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Walford</u> passed by the following vote: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Gibson. 1.

The Deputy Clerk read the resolution by title: Resolution No. 33 of 2003 by Councilman Carmody: A resolution directing the Director of Finance to transfer expenditures from the Riverfront Park Extension Project to the Shreveport Convention Center Project and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman <u>Carmody</u> for passage (motion failed due to a lack of a second.)

Councilman Hogan: Can I make a comment on this. I'm not real clear, Mr. Carmody, would you mind offering some explanation on this for?

Councilman Carmody: I think it requires a second, Mr. Hogan for me to. . . .

Councilman Hogan: Okay, I will second it. You got the second.

Councilman Green: No, it has died from a offer of a second.

Councilman Hogan: Is it to late for me to offer a second, Mr. Thompson?

Councilman Green: It died for a lack of second. The motion died for a lack of second.

Mr. Thompson: That is correct.

Councilman Green: He wanted Mr. Carmody to make a comment on it at this point and time, but the item itself has died for a lack of second.

Mr. Thompson: Under Robert's Rules, if there is no second then there is nothing on the table to discuss.

Councilman Jackson: He offered the second to it after the fact.

Mr. Thompson: That is up to the Chair as to whether. . . .

RESOLUTION NO. 34 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION TO DECLARE THAT THE CITY OWNED PROPERTY ON CADDO STREET BETWEEN COMMERCE STREET AND SPRING STREET SHALL BE USED ONLY TEMPORARILY AS A PARKING LOT AND IS NOT TO BE PAVED OR IMPROVED WITHOUT PRIOR CITY COUNCIL APPROVAL AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

By: Councilman Walford

WHEREAS, the City owned property on Caddo Street between Commerce Street and Spring Street has been developed as a temporary public parking lot by the City in conjunction with Harrah's Casino; and

WHEREAS, this property was purchased with bond proceeds from the 1996 GOB, Proposition 8, Riverfront Park Extension for a public park and to the extent feasible for the project set forth in the City Bond Issue Committee Report; and

WHEREAS, although the City Bond Issue Committee Report recognized that additional funds for site development would be needed and that these funds would have to be budgeted over a number of years, the City Council wishes to insure that this property remains available for development as a park and that it is only used temporarily for parking purposes.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, legal and regular session convened, that the City owned property on Caddo Street between Commerce Street and Spring Street shall be used only temporarily as a parking lot and shall not to be further paved or further improved for any use without prior City Council approval by resolution.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that nothing contained herein shall prevent the administration from landscaping and installing signage for the temporary parking lot without first obtaining City Council approval.

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

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

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

RESOLUTION NUMBER 35 OF 2003

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

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

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

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

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

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

Geographic Number 171410-075-0040

Municipal Address: 3527 Huston

Council District "F"

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

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

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

Councilman Green: Madame Clerk did you miss 35?

Ms. Lee: The screen that I brought up was probably a different, they all read the same.

RESOLUTION NUMBER 36 OF 2003

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

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

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

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

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

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

Lot 79, Cooper Heights Subdivision,

Geographic Number: 181418-022-007900

Unit No. 4

Council District "A"

Lot 2, Block 2, Talbot & Perrin Subdivision

000200

Municipal Address: 1813 Ford Street

Council District "A"

Lot 27 and W/2 of Lot 28, Block 8 Geographic Number: 171415-026-

004000

Lonoke Subdivision

Municipal Address: 3018 Woodford Street

Council District "F"

Southerly 98.48 feet of Lots 1, 2, and 3, Mary Club Geographic Number: 171330-

115-000700

Geographic Number: 181435-064-

Subdivision

Municipal Address: 8209 Harris Street

Council District "D"

Lot 25, Block 8, Oakview Subdivision Geographic Number: 171425-031-

002500

Municipal Address: 563 Marx

Council District "D"

North 1 acre of Lot 614, Jones Mabry Geographic Number:181417-028-

067200

Subdivision

Municipal Address: 2824 Freddie

Council District "A"

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 <u>Lester</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Walford</u> for passage.

Councilman Jackson: Will that last vote that was 36 prior, be allocated to

35?

Ms. Lee: Yes.

Councilman Jackson: So the last vote will be for 35, this one will be 36?

Ms. Lee: Exactly.

Resolution passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Gibson. 1.

RESOLUTION NO. 37 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE INSTITUTION OF EXPROPRIATION PROCEEDINGS AGAINST CERTAIN DESCRIBED PROPERTIES WITHIN THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT IN CONNECTION WITH THE EASY STREET PAVING PROJECT NO: 01-C016, FOR THE ACQUISITION OF NECESSARY RIGHT OF WAY, AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport has developed the Easy Street Paving, Project No: 01-C016; and

WHEREAS, the properties described in the attached legal descriptions, and more fully shown on the attached plats, are situated in said development; and

WHEREAS, all attempts to amicably acquire fee title to the properties comprising Parcel Nos: R-1, R-2, R-5, R-8, & R-12 have failed; and

WHEREAS, all attempts to amicably acquire temporary construction servitudes comprising Parcel Nos: T-1, T-2, T-5, & T-6 have failed; and

WHEREAS, public necessity dictates that this property be owned by and subject to the use by the City of Shreveport;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened, that the expropriation of these properties is necessary for the public interest; therefore, the City Attorney be and he is hereby authorized to institute expropriation proceedings against the owners of record, as they might appear at the time of filing suit, of the attached described parcels of property as Parcel Nos: R-1, R-2, R-5, R-8, & R-12 to be acquired in fee title for street right-of-way. He shall also hereby be authorized to institute such proceedings against the owners of record, as they might appear at the time of filing suit, of the attached described parcels of property as Parcel Nos: T-1, T-2, T-5, & T-6, to be acquired as temporary construction servitudes for the construction of said project.

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

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

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

RESOLUTION NO. 38 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE INSTITUTION OF EXPROPRIATION PROCEEDINGS AGAINST CERTAIN DESCRIBED PROPERTIES WITHIN THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT IN CONNECTION WITH THE UNION STREET OUTFALL

DRAINAGE PROJECT NO: 98-C002, FOR THE ACQUISITION OF NECESSARY RIGHT OF WAY, AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport has developed the Union Street Outfall Drainage, Project No: 98-C002; and

WHEREAS, the properties described in the attached legal descriptions, and more fully shown on the attached plats, are situated in said development; and

WHEREAS, all attempts to amicably acquire a permanent drainage servitudes comprising Parcel Nos: D-1, D-2, D-3, D-4, D-5, D-6, & D-8 have failed; and

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened, that the expropriation of these properties is necessary for the public interest; therefore, the City Attorney be and he is hereby authorized to institute expropriation proceedings against the owners of record, as they might appear at the time of filing suit, of the attached described parcels of property as Parcel Nos: D-1, D-2, D-3, D-4, D-5, D-6, & D-8, to be acquired as a permanent drainage servitudes for the construction of said project.

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

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

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

RESOLUTION NO. 39 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE INSTITUTION OF EXPROPRIATION PROCEEDINGS AGAINST CERTAIN DESCRIBED PROPERTIES WITHIN THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT IN CONNECTION WITH THE UNION STREET PAVING PROJECT NO: 98-C002, FOR THE ACQUISITION OF NECESSARY RIGHT OF WAY, AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport has developed the Union Street Paving, Project No: 98-C002; and

WHEREAS, the properties described in the attached legal descriptions, and more fully shown on the attached plats, are situated in said development; and

WHEREAS, all attempts to amicably acquire fee title to the properties comprising Parcel Nos: P-2, P-3, P-4, & P-9 have failed; and

WHEREAS, all attempts to amicably acquire temporary construction servitudes comprising Parcel Nos: T-8, T-9, T-10, & T-15 have failed; and

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

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened, that the expropriation of these properties is necessary for the public interest; therefore, the City Attorney be and he is hereby authorized to institute expropriation proceedings against the owners of record, as they might appear at the time of filing suit, of the attached described parcels of property as Parcel Nos: P-2, P-3, P-4 & P-9, to be acquired in fee title for street right-of-way. He shall also hereby be authorized to institute such proceedings against the owners of record, as they might appear at the time of filing suit, of the attached described parcels of property as Parcel Nos: T-8, T-9, T-10, & T-15, to be acquired as temporary construction servitudes for the construction of said project.

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

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

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

RESOLUTION NO. 44 OF 2003

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

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

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

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

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

NOW BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened, that the Purchasing Agent is hereby authorized to

dispose of, by public auction, the surplus supplies, materials, equipment, and vehicles described in Exhibit A, attached.

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

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

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

RESOLUTION NO. 45 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION TO INCREASE POLICE PRESENCE AND EFFECTIVENESS IN DISTRICT F; AUTHORIZING AND REQUESTING THE CHIEF OF POLICE TO DEVISE A PLAN TO EFFECTIVELY COMBAT CRIME WITH THE SHERIFF, FEDERAL AUTHORITIES AND THE STATE POLICE TO ELIMINATE RAMPANT CRIME, AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO

By: Councilman Green

WHEREAS, City Council District F is comprised of Shreveport Police Districts 10, 11 and most of District 9; and

WHEREAS, from January 2002 through February 2003 the Shreveport Police Department reports the following crime statistics for Police Districts 9, 10 and 11; eleven homicides, 27 rapes, 132 persons robbed, 62 businesses robbed, 236 aggravated batteries, 158 aggravated assaults, 769 residential burglaries, 268 business burglaries, 14 purses snatched, 411 instances of shoplifting, 90 thefts from businesses and 200 thefts from residences, 108 automobiles accessories stolen, 429 packages or other items taken from automobiles, 428 automobiles stolen and 630 reports of general theft; and

WHEREAS, in March 2003, a man forced his way into a home on Dandridge Place in District F, kidnaped a 22 year old mother, took an automobile from the residence, forced the young mother into the automobile drove away and murdered her; and

WHEREAS, school truancy is a problem: some students leave school during the school day and commit burglaries and other crimes, engage in fights and disturb the peace; and

WHEREAS, loud music from automobiles regularly disturbs and annoys residents of District F, particularly the sick, the elderly and the home bound; and

WHEREAS, the sale and use of illegal drugs in many neighborhoods in District F has become so pervasive that these neighborhoods can be described as drug infested; and

WHEREAS, felons, drug dealers and other criminals use guns to commit violent crimes; and

WHEREAS, many residents in District F live in a constant state of fear and anxiety which affects their health and state of well being; and

WHEREAS, the extremely high number of crimes openly and brazenly committed in District F; the open air drug markets, the large number of guns present, the roving gangs of school children, and the resultant fear, anxiety, and feelings of helplessness experienced by law abiding citizens in District F constitute a public emergency in District F, that must be addressed and ameliorated immediately; and

WHEREAS, it is therefore necessary and proper for the Police Chief of the City of Shreveport to be authorized and encouraged to invite other law enforcement agencies to join the Shreveport Police Department to make every effort to eradicate the pervasive lawlessness that exists in City Council District F.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Chief of Police is requested to increase patrols and to aggressively combat crime in District F.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Chief of Police of Shreveport is authorized and requested to invite the Sheriff of Caddo Parish, the United States Attorney for the Western District of Louisiana, other Federal law enforcement agencies, and Troop G of the Louisiana State Police to devise a plan which uses the authority and the resources of their collective offices to eliminate rampant crime in District F, and to execute that plan until rampant crime no longer exists.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman <u>Green</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Carmody</u> for passage.

Councilman Lester: My question, Mr. Chairman would be and I think Councilman Jackson brazed this issue on yesterday regarding expansion of this inquiry. I think it is a great idea and I would like to see any efforts to deal with this issue to be, I guess what I am saying is I would like to invite this same group in to come into District A deal with some of the issues that we have in District A, as well.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, I am going to ask, respectively that either we vote to not accept this ordinance as is or to postpone until such time as I've said on yesterday, that we can expand the scope of this ordinance which reads "District F" to include other areas who have the identical problem and as not to prioritize any particular district over another and certainly we don't suggest that crime is any worse in one place than others but would certainly ask of this Council to either postpone or consider broadening the scope of this particular ordinance that is before us today.

Councilman Green: Thank you Councilman Jackson. I'm respectfully, I appreciate that.

When I did this ordinance, I am doing it at the request of the citizens of District F. I wouldn't dare to cross the line into any other district to say and this is not an "ordinance" this is a "resolution" so anybody on this Council has the opportunity to do a resolution. So, I am not asking you to cross the line into my district because if I had put everybody district in here and send this to the whole

City then that would have been comments possible to say, why are you interfering in my district?

Now, what I will do in the future if you publicly say to me that, from here on out when I have a wonderful suggestion that you would like for me to include your district in there I will do it, of course I would require possible a consulting fee but until then, this is just for District F (Councilman Jackson: That's my problem with it, Mr. Chairman). You all have the same right to do a resolution.

Councilman Jackson: I understand Mr. Chairman. I'm thinking that we were talking about, crime and not districts.

Councilman Green: Sir, this is district. This doesn't say "crime".

Councilman Jackson: According to this resolution, Mr. Chairman, it is about crime.

Councilman Green: Mr. Jackson. Mr. Jackson. I understand it is a beautiful idea, you would like a part of it.

Councilman Jackson: I'd ask for your recognition when you finish.

Councilman Green: Just ask Mr. Clerk to do you a resolution. Other than that, I respectfully ask you until I invite you to District F, leave it alone.

Councilman Jackson: I would hope that when we move forward not withstanding what District we represent that we would be beyond the parochial small mindedness that we are talking simple about our districts. If the crime is something that affects you directly, it will affect all of us indirectly. Now each of us can stand or sit here and propagate what we think is the concern only of our district but it inures not to the benefit of this entire City to do.

We voted earlier and I might say in a parochial nature to allow some cameras or some surveillance equipment to go to District F. Mr. Chairman, respectfully, I understand that you represent District F, great. We represent the whole City as a body and what I am suggesting to you is simply what I am offering to you is not to do away with having increased police protection because this resolution is all about crime. It is about increased police protection, I would assume to reduce the level of crime in District F. I think it is a great idea, I support that but what I don't support is doing it in a parochial nature where everybody comes up with a resolution in every meeting we have, resolution de jure where everybody comes up with a resolution where crime is important in their district, housing is important—the truth it is a situation and a scenario that goes beyond the boundary, I might add, invisible boundaries of districts.

And I would only suggest that—my only question was for your consideration, was to expand the scope so that each of us didn't have to go out and produce a parochial resolution that talked about what is going on in our district and before we know it will be making resolutions that deal our districts, block-by-block.

I'm simply suggesting that this is problem that affects all of us in a larger and in a more universal scale and that as a Council, I would ask the other Councilmen to consider widening the scope, Mr. Chairman of your resolution which as you've have called it, a great idea, I just would hate to see our great idea segregated to one portion of our City when there is a need for it in all parts of our City.

Councilman Green: And also I would like to say, I really appreciate that and all that you are saying is possible true. But when I was running, I ran that I would take care of my district and that is what I am trying to do. And of course, all of those big words you said, I don't understand most of them, but if you in fact could take those big words and come up with a big-word resolution for whatever I'm doing, I'll be satisfied but today that is not the issue.

I have a resolution on the floor. I am asking my fellow Councilmen to support it. I didn't put it on here to say that District F was this or whatever. The camera that we have it is a city-wide camera, I just happen to come up with the idea. I am not brilliant, but I been trying to figure out ways to address the problems in my district not a city wide district. I was elected sent to do that. I am here to take care of District F. Yes, I do want to entire City to be safe and possible, as we do and as I can appreciate it--Mr. Lester, being a lawyer when he goes to court there are different cases that he try and he base it on a model from another case. Maybe District F just might happen to be the model that we all, and of course Mr. Jackson, you are an educator---Southern University has a model radiation system, so some school from there will be modeling. District F will possible be a model. Once they finish, I don't have no right to tell you to tell the police, don't go to your area. This is just something that I feel and my constituents are comfortable with it; so, I'm asking my fellow Council members to just support the resolution. We can move from point a to point b, that's all I'm asking.

Councilman Lester: I think, what I want to offer is basically in the spirit of compromise in trying to accomplish what we are all put there to do. The seven of us have our own agendas and we come before this body and before this City twice a month to not only advance our agendas but to find where our individuals agendas for our individual districts unite and mesh to represent the City of Shreveport as a whole and I think that is our responsibility.

My concern in this particular instance is, Councilman Green has come up with a wonderful idea and I think his resolution is right on target and I understand that his resolution sprang from a very distressing, very unfortunate incident that happened to a resident within the confines of his district and he is more than right, and certainly if I was in that situation, I would have offered a similar resolution. And I think that he is perfectly within, and I think it would be derelict for him <u>not</u> to offer this resolution given what has happened and continues to happen in his district.

I think what Councilman Jackson is saying and not trying to put words in his mouth because his vocabulary is quite extensive but my concern and where I'm coming from is I think we can put this in a win-win situation.

I think what I'm asking and prevailing upon on the Chair to do with his particular resolution is to broaden the scope and let me tell you why. One of the things that I have learned since having this responsibility as being a Councilman is, when we speak, people listen. When we speak as a group, people listen. And certainly if we speak in terms of law enforcement and increasing police presence, that is going to be heard by our Police Department and they will take the appropriate steps. Understanding quite obviously that this is a zero sum type

scenario, if things are changed within the law enforcement community that deal with one particular area, you might have a situation where you take resources from one area and move to another. What I am requesting and I think Councilman Jackson is requesting of the Chair, of this again, great idea, is to expand his call for a plan to effectively combat crime and bring these different agencies (the sheriff, the federal authorities, the state police) not only to deal with the scenarios that he is dealing with in Hollywood and Mooretown, but to deal with some similar scenario that he is dealing with in Queensborough that I certainly I deal with in the MLK and Lakeside and Allendale area.

I don't think that what Councilman Jackson and again, not trying to put words in his mouth and certainly from my perspective, we are not saying that this resolution isn't a good one. We are saying that it is so good that we are asking that we are asking the Chair if he would be so gracious to expand the scope of his resolution to include other areas of this city, particularly, I'm making the request and the petition to the Chair on behalf of District A because I do believe that if we are successful as the Chair has been in calling attention to certain issues, then I think people will listen. And certainly I would not like to get us into a point where each of us looks at our particular district as a phethem that only I can control or say what is going on here because to certain extent, we do do that and that is a reason why we defer to those areas.

But in certain instances that the issues cuts across racial and other lines, district lines, artificial lines that we have placed I think it behooves us as a Council to broaden our scope to include everybody. So I guess what I am asking the Chair and prevailing on the Chair to consider would be expanding the scope of what he is doing and be the statesman that I know that he is and allow other districts to participate in what I think is going to be a monumental and a tremendous process by including District A and as I appreciate it, Councilman Jackson is concerned about District G and if we maybe listen to some of the other Councilmen they might be concerned and want to be included in this resolution because the fact of the matter is once this resolution is passed, and I think the resolution is gonna pass, that the law enforcement community and everyone is going to listen.

And so, what we are asking and certainly like I said, I'm asking on behalf of the citizens of District A, if we want to be included and I think by including us and using your statesman-like skills I think that would be something that would be seen as moving forward beyond the lines of District F.

I do appreciate the fact that you did not offer as a resolution as a resolution from the City of Shreveport in general because I think too often we have a tendency to think that our ideas are so great that they, we automatically want to impose them upon another Councilman, I don't think that is a good idea. But I think the fact that you have offered this is a beginning point and I think if you expand this to include other districts, I think we will be in a win-win scenario and from District A, we are prevailing on the Chair to use his powers as a statesman to do that and that would be my request.

Councilman Green: Thank you so very kindly and I will use my statesmanship and thank you for recognizing that. There are some things that I

will negotiate, but when one of my constituents, on yesterday, bring me a hand full of shells that was shot in his front yard, Sunday night, it is Mr. John Simon and when crime is just rampant in my district. There are some things that will negotiate but as a statesman and this is how a statesman would handle this, I am saying to my fellow Councilmen, please support this resolution and we will broaden it as soon as possible.

Resolution passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Hogan, and Green. 5. Nays: Councilman Jackson. 1. Absent: Councilman Gibson. 1.

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS:

- 1 Resolution No. 40 of 2003: A resolution authorizing the employment of special legal counsel to represent the City of Shreveport, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
- 3. Resolution No. 41 of 2003: A resolution to authorize the Mayor to execute an "Ozone Flex Agreement" for the Shreveport-Bossier City MAS, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
- 4. Resolution No. 42 of 2003: A resolution authorizing the Mayor to execute a contract accepting a grant on behalf of Libbey Glass Inc. and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
- 4. Resolution No. 43 of 2003: A resolution authorizing the Mayor to make application with the United States Department of Justice, and otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman <u>Lester</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Walford</u> for Introduction of the Resolutions to lay over until the April 8, 2003 meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Gibson. 1.

5. Resolution No. 46 of 2003: A resolution authorizing the Mayor to execute a lease agreement with Libbey Glass, Inc and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman <u>Lester</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Walford</u> for Introduction of the Resolution to lay over until the April 22, 2003 meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Gibson. 1.

INTRODUCTION OF ORDINANCES:

1. Ordinance No. 30 of 2003: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on

the northeast corner of Martin Luther King Drive and Hill Street, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from B-1, Buffer Business District, to B-2, Neighborhood Business District with Planned Building Group approval and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman <u>Lester</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Carmody</u> for Introduction of the Ordinance to lay over until the April 8, 2003 meeting. Motion approved the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Gibson. 1.

2. Ordinance No. 31 of 2003: An ordinance authorizing the donation of city-owned property to qualified non-profit organizations, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman <u>Carmody</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Green</u> for Introduction of the Ordinance to lay over until the April 22, 2003 meeting. Motion approved the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Gibson. 1.

- 3. Ordinance No. 32 of 2003: An ordinance to amend Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, as amended, the City of Shreveport Zoning ordinance, by amending Section 106–1130 (g) (2) I., by modifying the requirements for temporary telecommunication towers allowed as specific administratively approved uses, and by otherwise providing with respect thereto.
 - 4. Ordinance No. 33 of 2003: An ordinance amending the 2003 General Fund Budget and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
 - 5. Ordinance No. 34 of 2003 by Councilman Lester and Walford: An ordinance to amend Chapter 38 of the Code of Ordinances to add Section 38-87 and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
 - 6. Ordinance No. 35 of 2003: An Ordinance Amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning property located on the southwest corner of Stratford Avenue & Youree Drive, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from SPI-3-E(B-1), Commercial Corridor Overlay/Extended Use (Buffer Business) District to SPI-3-E (B-1), Commercial Corridor Overlay/Extended Use (Buffer Business) District, Limited to "Cellular Phone Sales" Only, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman <u>Lester</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Carmody</u> for Introduction of the Ordinances to lay over until the April 8, 2003 meeting. Motion approved the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Gibson. 1.

Councilman Lester: I would just like to note for the record I did request some information from Mr. Ferdinand, Department of Community Development, and I did get a response on that. I don't know if other Councilmen have been given privy to that response but that I will give the information that I've been given to Mr. Thompson so that everyone will get the benefit of that information.

ORDINANCES ON SECOND READING AND FINAL PASSAGE:

1. Ordinance No. 25 of 2003: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning the south 150 feet of the north 350 feet of Lot 1, Dean Terrace Subdivision, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana from R-1D, Urban, One-Family Residence District to B-1, Buffer Business District and by rezoning the north 350 feet of Lot 2, Dean Terrace Subdivision, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana from R-1D, Urban, One-Family Residence District and B-2,Neighborhood Business District to B-3, Community Business District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on <u>February 25, 2003</u> was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman <u>Hogan</u> seconded by Councilman <u>Carmody</u> for passage.

The Deputy Clerk read the following amendment: Amendment No. 1:

Amend the title of the ordinance to read as follows:

An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by rezoning portion of Lots 1 and 2, Dean Terrace Subdivision, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana from R-1D, Urban, One-Family Residence District to B-1, Buffer Business District and from R-1D, from R-1D, Urban, One-Family Residence District and B-2, Neighborhood Business District to B-3, Community Business District, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto

Motion by Councilman <u>Hogan</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Green</u> for adoption of the amendment. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Gibson: 1.

Motion by Councilman <u>Jackson</u>, seconded by Councilman <u>Lester</u> to postpone the ordinance as amended. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Gibson: 1.

2. Ordinance No. 26 of 2003: An ordinance amending the 2003 Capital Improvements Budget and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on <u>March 11, 2003</u> was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman <u>Hogan</u> seconded by Councilman <u>Carmody</u> for passage.

The Deputy Clerk read the following amendment (s) Amendment No. 1:

AMEND THE ORDINANCE AS FOLLOWS:

In Program E (Water Improvements):

Increase the appropriation for Cross Lake Dam Analysis (99-E006) by \$225,000. Funding source is 2000-A Utility Revenue Bonds.

Motion by Councilman <u>Carmody</u>, seconded Councilman <u>Walford</u> for adoption of Amendment No. 1.

Councilman Lester: As I appreciate it at the last meeting, there was some discussion about starting or creating a Capital Improvement Committee and submitting these types of requests to that committee. My question is, was this in fact submitted to that committee and has that committee made a report? The reason I asked that question is Councilman Gibson who is the chairman of the committee is not here and I guess if there is not a report, I would ask that we postpone this until we can hear back from that committee.

Mr. Thompson: The only thing I can tell you is that Mr. Gibson did not call a meeting of the committee. The first meeting of the committee will be in April and the agenda he has given us does not include these items. So, I guess if one would make an assumption, it would be that he has no problem with these items even though he has not told me that.

Mr. Dark: The Administration would very strongly request that you not continue to delay this. If you recall, we tried to pass an ordinance now four weeks ago and there was discussion about having a committee and going on and doing all of that and we sent this particular, the base ordinance not the two amendments you are voting on today, but the base ordinance to Mr. Gibson about ten days ago and said that if you have any concerns about these before it is time to vote, please let us know and we did not hear back.

We really need to get these on. Several of these items are pending change orders or contracts that need to get underway. Mr. Strong came to me before the meeting and made it real clear the was very much in hopes that you would pass these suggest today. We are not aware of any problems with Mr. Gibson and he has in fact had plenty of time to express them if he had them.

Councilman Lester: Again, my question is, again, like I said, as I appreciate it we move to set up that committee and certainly I don't want to be in a position to step on the toes of that committee. If they have made a report, if that has been submitted, that is fine. My question I guess we can answer that very easily, if Mr. Gibson was here. I guess my question will be and I guess Mr. Strong, if he could approach, could you describe to us

the actual exigency of moving forward on this particular amendment and what would happen if in fact we delayed it until another Council meeting to give Mr. Gibson or at least get a report from Mr. Gibson?

Mr. Strong: I can give you first hand knowledge of speaking with Mr. Gibson. I asked, did he have any issues with this that we needed to sit down and talk about because I have some sewer mains in here that we have got change orders going on that we can not go any further with the projects and they are causing us problems and we do need to get these projects going.

Councilman Walford: Does this include the wash facilities that was. . . .

Mr. Dark: Yes, sir. That was one that was in the last. . . .

Councilman Walford: And that needs to be done.

Mr. Dark: Yes, sir it does.

Councilman Walford: The clock is ticking on that one and I would like to see us move forward on that one.

Mr. Dark: And the regulatory agencies are not getting very happy with us because we are taking our time.

Councilman Walford: I understand, this is not to make it convenient to wash airplanes this is going to make it legal.

Mr. Dark: Yeah.

Councilman Walford: I would like to see that one moved forward.

Amendment No. 1 passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Gibson. 1.

Amendment No. 2:

AMEND THE ORDINANCE AS FOLLOWS:

In Program I (Fire Improvements):

Increase the appropriation for Relocation of Fire Station #13 (01-I001) by \$900,000. Funding sources are 1997 GOB, Prop. 1 (Public Safety) \$718,800, 1998 GOB, Prop. 1 (Public Safety) \$81,200 and 2001A GOB \$100,000.

Decrease the appropriation for Fire Maintenance Facility (01-I004) by \$100,000. Funding source is 2001A GOB.

Motion by Councilman <u>Carmody</u>, seconded Councilman <u>Walford</u> for adoption of Amendment No. 2. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Gibson. 1.

Motion by Councilman <u>Carmody</u>, seconded Councilman <u>Walford</u> for adoption of the ordinance as amended. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Gibson. 1.

3. Ordinance No. 27 of 2003: NINETEENTH SUPPLEMENTAL ORDINANCE: A Supplemental Ordinance amending and supplementing Resolution No. 131 of 1984 (the "General Bond Resolution") adopted on June 12, 1984, as amended; providing for the issuance of \$19,600,000 principal amount of Water and Sewer Revenue Bonds, 2003 Refunding Series B, of the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, pursuant to the General Bond Resolution; approving and confirming the sale of such bonds; prescribing the form, fixing the details and providing for the payment of principal of and interest on such bonds and the application of the proceeds thereof for refunding certain bonds issued for the purpose of constructing and acquiring extensions and improvements to the City's combined waterworks plant and system and sewer plant and system (the "System") of the City; making application to the State Bond Commission; and providing for other matters in connection therewith.

Having passed first reading on <u>March 11, 2003</u> was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman <u>Carmody</u> seconded by Councilman <u>Lester</u> to postpone the ordinance until the April 8, 2003 meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Gibson. 1.

The Adopted Ordinance, as amended, follow:

ORDINANCE NO. 26 OF 2003

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2003 CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS BUDGET AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

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

WHEREAS, the City Council finds it necessary to amend the 2003 Capital Improvements Budget to provide additional project funding, to create new projects and for other purposes.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in legal session convened, that Ordinance No. 162 of 2002, the 2003 Capital Improvements Budget, be further amended and re-enacted as follows:

In Program A (Buildings and Improvements):

Establish a new project entitled McNeill Street Pumping Station Improvements (03-A005) at \$300,000. Funding sources are Federal Grant \$150,000 and Water and Sewer Revenue \$150,000.

In Program D (Drainage Improvements):

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

In Program E (Water Improvements):

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

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

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

Increase the appropriation for Cross Lake Dam Analysis (99-E006) by \$225,000. Funding source is 2000-A Utility Revenue Bonds.

In Program F (Sewer Improvements):

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

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

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

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

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

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

In Program H (Airports Improvements):

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

Adjust totals and subtotals accordingly.

In Program I (Fire Improvements):

Increase the appropriation for Relocation of Fire Station #13 (01-I001) by \$900,000. Funding sources are 1997 GOB, Prop. 1 (Public Safety) \$718,800, 1998 GOB, Prop. 1 (Public Safety) \$81,200 and 2001A GOB \$100,000.

Decrease the appropriation for Fire Maintenance Facility (01-I004) by \$100,000. Funding source is 2001A GOB.

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

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

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

/s/James Green, Chairman /s/Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

1. Alcohol Permit Renewal: Michael Smith for The American Legion (1725 Jamison St.) (Postponed on March 10 - Appeal denied on March 24, 2003.)

Alcohol Retail Permit: Ms. Deborah Hawkins [Employer: 2901 Milam St. (Take-A-Bag Grocery)] (G/Jackson) (Special Meeting scheduled on Tuesday, April 29, 2003 at 3:00 p.m.)

Resolution 203 of 2002: Authorizing the execution of an Intergovernmental Agreement with the Parish of Caddo relative to the development and operation of a park and related facilities in the MLK area. (A/Lester) (Tabled on Feb. 11)

NEW BUSINESS:

Public Safety Committee:

Councilman Jackson: There was something that I had as New Business that I wanted to ask of the Council, please.

Councilman Green: I don't think that we are with—once we get to the Resolving then we will do to that point, is that correct Mr. Thompson or can you add New Business without having New Business?

Mr. Thompson: I thought you had passed New Business.

Councilman Green: Yes.

Mr. Thompson: He is just simply asking whether or not you will allow him to go back to that.

Councilman Green: Yes, sir.

Councilman Jackson: My request today in the form of an motion and open for whatever kind of discussion we need to have is, as I understand the history of this Council and look at the composition of it even now as it relates to our Committees and those committees that serve this Council, obviously as councils deems

necessary they formulate committees and/or disband those committees as we come with new councils.

I wanted to ask Mr. Chairman in the form of a motion for the formulation of a Public Safety Committee, seconded by Councilman Lester.

Councilman Hogan: I would like to get an explanation from Mr. Jackson on that, if you would allow him to speak.

Councilman Green: Let me ask the Clerk, does this have to be in writing or can we?

Mr. Thompson: No, I believe the rules just say that special committees are established by motion of the Council.

Councilman Jackson: To give you very specifically, one of the things that, Mr. Chairman that you alluded to and have alluded to is the idea of crime in our communities.

I remember some few yeas back that there was an effort underfoot if you will that was not insisting but certainly suggesting that we would consider a Citizens' Review Board as it related to public safety specifically as it related to, I don't know if it is by Fire and Police, put specifically for the Police Department. I don't know, I don't think we ever that every happened for whatever reason, but I think as a alternative to that, that this Council can and ought to at least formulate and put into place a public safety committee.

Because, like Councilman Carmody and maybe others have said today, I entertain a lot of phone calls that have a lot to do with public trust and with confidence. Once of the areas that is rapidly becoming what I personally described as a powder keg is one of public safety in our Police Department. I don't have to go into a whole lot of details to talk about the kind of things that we have experienced in this City that have been unfortunate. I've spoken with the Mayor as well about some of these things and my concerns. I think that public trust is important and I think that we have to be able and have some responsibility to exercise in some kind of oversight as it relates to those things that happen in our communities. A lot of things, I won't enumerate, I will not necessarily enumerate the kind of issues that I speak to, but I would ask the indulgence of this Council to at least consider putting together this Public Safety Committee for the purpose of being able to hear some of these things that we hear about in the media and so and so forth to have an opportunity to, in a formal setting, to sit with the Chief of Police and/or representatives from his staff without having to have done that in this meeting or having to call an executive session every time we chose to do so that in a regular and in a formal way, we can continue to increase, I hope what is relations not only among the department and this Council but with the department and our citizens in general.

So I wanted to ask, Mr. Chairman, that was the reason for that motion that we would in fact, formulate that committee and would ask that if we would formulate the committee that this Council with the help of the Administration and others who are pertinent in this case to define and to delineate what are the specific parameters of the committee much like we did with the Infrastructure Committee and other committees that we have formulated, where we are putting the parameters together

as we go, but we are formulating the committee to in fact stress and to symbolize our intent to try and move forward in a formal manner.

Councilman Hogan: I think you have a great idea. One of the questions, I am not sure if you have come to this point yet, but as far as combination of members of the committee it sounds like it is going to be a combination of Council members and public citizens?

Councilman Jackson: No, sir just like the other committees. It will be three Councilmen and then of course anybody who is pertinent would come--like we had the SOB Committee, how we have the Property Standards Committee and other Committees that would in fact be able to convene other people who are pertinent to public safety to being to talk about issues that may be pertinent or may be issues of concern so that would be the purview of that committee and it would be the committee would be made up of three members as appointed by, what would be appointed by the Chair.

Councilman Hogan: One recommendation I would have is that you invite someone from the Office of Emergency Awareness and have them serve on the committee, as well.

Councilman Jackson: Well, the thing is not necessary add them as permanent members to the Committee but as that becomes an issue then we invite them, perhaps to testify before the Committee, give whatever information is necessary to help the committee to make an informed thought but not to necessarily place them on the committee because it will be just a committee of the Council, if you will and then anybody in the public who is pertinent as the Chairman or as the Chairman of that group would see fit or that body itself could invite anybody to come including those people.

Councilman Lester: What I am hearing Councilman Jackson say and I think it is a great idea and I think it would track some of the same things that we are doing over at the Property Standards Committee where you have myself and Councilman Walford on that committee and we invite other related agencies that deal with those particular issues to work through some of the problems that we are having so that we can craft some policies and procedures that we can promulgate from this body in our legislative capacity to deal with some of the issues that we have in the City. So I just want to applaud what Councilman Jackson is coming up with and I think it is a good idea.

Councilman Jackson : Is Chief Roberts still here, Mayor. Can he come forward.

Councilman Green: He can come forward once we resolved ourselves into the Committee of the Whole. He'll come after then. We will go on and vote now and then he'll come after we move to that level.

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

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS, BOARDS AND COMMITTEES: None.

CLERK'S REPORT: None.

THE COMMITTEE RISES AND REPORTS (reconvenes Regular Council Meeting).

ADJOURNMENT. There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting adjourned at approximately 5:55 p.m.

/s/James Green, Chairman /s/Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council