

COUNCIL PROCEEDINGS OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT, LOUISIANA
MAY 27, 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, May 27, 2003, in the Government Chambers in Government Plaza (505 Travis Street).

Councilman Hogan gave special recognition to persons who had served in the armed forces and Reverend Gant led the Council in the Invocation.

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

Approve Minutes. Motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Carmody to approve the Administrative Conference Summary Minutes of May 12, 2003 and the Council Meeting Minutes of May 13, 2003. Motion approved by the following vote: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

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

There were no Communications from the Mayor.

Councilman Green: I have a guest today, James Creswell Gardner (see Resolution No. 74 was read in its entirety.)

Convention Center and Convention Center Hotel Project Report: Mr. Antee: Well last Wednesday, we got all of the rest of the Convention Center bids in. They are in the process now, Barton Malow is of interviewing, starting today. The apparent low bidders to go through and make sure that the bids are good bids and so that will take about two weeks. We will start our meetings and discussion with Safeco some time next week. We will begin those to see what we can do to work out the arrangement or an agreement with Safeco so that we can get the contract signed and get construction started.

There has been no further developments since the last meeting on the Convention Center Hotel other than what we reported last time, we primarily been focusing on the Convention Center.

Councilman Carmody: I believe at our work session on Friday, I requested the information regarding the available financing and I believe that Mr. Gibson had asked that there be an inclusion of the amount that is spent for Brownsfield work.

Mr. Dark: I will have to get that to you later. We were working on other things, I'm sorry.

Councilman Carmody: We seem to have passed up other Distinguished Guests that we were going to recognize here today. I had mentioned at the work session that I have some representative here, and very quickly, if you don't mind if we return back to that.

I actually have a resolution that I am sponsoring today to recognize some ladies in our audience (see Resolution No. 75 in its entirety.)

Councilman Gibson: I have one other recognition, he was here a minute ago, Ken Saunders. Ken is just accepted a new position, he was our Executive Director for the Greater Shreveport Human Relations Commission and I'd like to publicly thank him for his coordination of working with the U. S. Justice Department Community Relations in the efforts that went into pulling together all of us on the City Council and the Mayor's Office and the Police Department. Ken you've been here for about a year or a year and half or something in that nature. It has been a pleasure to work with you being on that Commission and also it has been a pleasure to see you display the experience that you had up in the Midwest and I know you are going to the east coast, we are definitely going to miss you, but if you have any comments, I'd love to hear your thoughts.

Mr. Saunders: I've heard some things in the last few days and I would just like to tell the Council men, I think that it is very important that you have a strong Human Relations Commission. I think that it is essential to almost every city. A lot of times we didn't really have the power to do the things that we needed to do. I think that you should look and see what other cities are doing and take guidance from that; that is basically all I have to say.

Councilman Gibson: Congratulations on your future endeavor, stay in touch with us.

Mr. Saunders: Most definitely.

Councilman Green: He is also a member of Councilman Jackson's Church. I was at his church a few weeks ago and after he gets wherever he is going, he is still going to be sending his

tithes and offerings to the City of Shreveport.

Property Standards Program Report. Councilman Lester: We've received this report from the City's Community Development Department. I think that will suffice as a written report unless maybe individual Council members wanted to ask some question. I know I do want to say, publicly to Mr. Strong and to Mr. Bowie, I appreciate your working with me on the scenarios on Oxford Street that we discussed this morning, as well as the scenario on Kenneth Street. Those are both issues of residents of District A that who on one case, a tree from adjudicated property fell on their house and in the second scenario a house that was adjudicated, fell on someone else's house. So I appreciate your working with me to try to resolve those issues, expeditiously for those particular citizens. And I might just add also I got some phone calls from some residents regarding some houses in the 1900 block of Laurel Street and as per this report that I've just been handed, it appears that all three of those houses are scheduled for demolition, so apparently, the process is working.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Bowie, this is an easy one. I don't have a property to beat on you about or anything. It would help me. I think it would help, I think it would help Councilman Carmody and Councilman Lester if these reports could be made to reflect the new Council districts.

Mr. Bowie: We are working on that Councilman trying to get that corrected.

Councilman Walford: Because I see a lot of mine over there for Mr. Carmody. I'd love to give them to him, anything substandard, but I don't think he wants to take them.

Mr. Bowie: My department and DP are working to try to get that resolved.

Councilman Green: Mr. Ferdinand, I think this will be your last possible official Council meeting, so I just wanted to bring you up just to say, thank you for your work that you've done for the City. And I know from within your heart, you gave it your best shot and I would just like to commend you and say, God bless you and keep up the good work. Would you like to have expressions.

Mr. Ferdinand: I didn't know I was going to be called up, that is why I had written a letter to all of you, my farewell letter I guess one of the last communications and I'll give it to the Clerk to read into the record.

But, I would like to publicly thank the Mayor for giving me the opportunity to serve as well as the CAO, I've enjoyed working with both of them as well as the entire Council. I don't want to be redundant in this letter, but I pretty much highlighted some of the accomplishments that *my team* in Community Development—I don't use *team* loosely because we did it as a *team*, I sort of like was a coach and we got a lot of great people over in Community Development working with some significant issues.

One of the things we are most proud of and I want to be sure that, that gets into the record, that since we've been, with this Administration being here, we have not let a dollar go back to the government. We spent it all even though we inherited quite a bit. We had some first relative to the \$3.5 million dollars of EDI and 108 loans for the Queensborough area along with \$650,000 of Fair Home loan bank grants, and things of that sort.

But, as you go forward, similar to Ken Saunders said, when you measure this department or any other department, do look at the Best Practices that is being used in other cities. I think we stack up very well. The monies we have been able to get without a full time. . . team together and came up with that and that is pretty much what a lot of the Best Practices that is done in other cities. So when you compare us to that, when you compare us look at the Best Practices other places, also compare us with the other Administrations in terms of what we've done (I kind of covered that in the memo, so I won't cover it here).

Also, it is important that you go forward, I know money is going to be tight but when you look at the budget for Codes. Codes is a department that has roughly less than a percent of the budget for this City, it has about a percent of the employees but between April and September, it will receive 85% to 90% of all of the CCAR Complaints to the City. So, as you go forward and look at that piece of the budget, consider those facts. I always like to say, facts are our friends, but those are the facts. And that, you know, I'm sure Public Works wouldn't want to get all its rain between April and September—no drainage system to handle that; so when you go forward in looking at the budget, particularly in the area of the Codes, consider that too because it is a tremendous job over there with the number of adjudicated properties and I think the draft of the

Belton Daniels Report said that we are up against about 70% of the housing stock in the City of Shreveport being substandard.

But once again, I've enjoyed working the Mayor, the CAO as well as this Council. Sitting where you guys are sitting right now for 6 ½ years and 4½ years on this side, so after 11 years I'm going to pursue something else.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Ferdinand, let me be among those who are saying *thank you* for you contribution and for your time. Certainly, very often we take for granted people's time and their contributions. Certainly, it is my opinion that with the skill set that you have, you certainly could have been doing something different and I certainly appreciate your contribution to our City.

Even given, I know some difficult task, I've always been a believer that structurally, you had an impossible job, structurally to do those things that need to be done that all fall under the auspice of Community Development. But, I just want to congratulate you on doing the best that you could do and I appreciate all of those accomplishments that have happened and we certainly wish you the best as we move forward.

Councilman Lester: I would just again like to say to Mr. Ferdinand, to dovetail on what Councilman Jackson said. I think the person that inherits the Department of Community Development is going to find a department that is a lot stronger than it was when he came there.

I think you did a number of things. I've been pleased in working with you in moving the Department forward. I think whoever succeeds you is going to have a lot of big shoes to fill and I think—I don't think a lot of people realize just how important that department is to many of us in the City, particularly those of us in districts like mine that are CDBG eligible districts. So, I just want to say *thank you* for your work and God speed in your future endeavors and we hope that the Mayor and I know that the Mayor will find someone, it might be hard to find someone as good or maybe even better but the Department deserves as much. We just thank you for your work.

Mayor Hightower: I too would like to publicly thank Larry. I certainly talked to him in my office and had the pleasure of working with him over the past 4 ½ years. This is an example of a guy that left the private sector to come in and try to do something good for the City knowing he may have a job for 4 years and now the private sector is calling him back and he is going into the real estate business. You know, I'm sure he is going to be successful. He is not somebody that has come in and left and going somewhere else, he is sticking around and is going to make a living here in town and hopefully again, contribute back to the re-birth of a neighborhood, something that he is come to be a accustomed of and grown to really care about over the past 4 ½ years.

So, Larry I appreciate you coming on board and all that you've done to help us get this City back on track.

Mr. Ferdinand: Thank you, Mayor.

INTER-OFFICE MEMORANDUM
City of Shreveport
DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Phone: 673-5900

Fax: 673-5903

DATE: May 27, 2003

TO: Councilman Calvin B. Lester, District A
Councilman Monty Walford, District B
Councilman Thomas G. Carmody, District C
Councilman Mike Gibson, District D
Councilman Jeff Hogan, District E
Councilman James Green, District F
Councilman Theron Jackson, District G

FROM: Larry Ferdinand, Director
Department of Community Development

SUBJECT: Community Development Major Accomplishments

First, I would like to say it has been a pleasure working with the Mayor, CAO and City Council. I'm pleased with the accomplishments of our team in Community Development.

The major accomplishments include but are not limited to the following:

1. No funds awarded to Hightower Administration have been returned to government;
2. First-ever Economic Development Initiative (EDI) and Section 108 loan totaling 3.5 million dollars to make low interest loans to businesses in targeted neighborhoods (Attachment A);
3. Awarded three Federal Home Loan Bank grants for affordable housing totaling \$650,000 dollars;
4. First-ever initiatives such as Neighborhood Revitalization Program and Community Development Corporation (Attachment B). Please note comparison to previous administration's initiatives going back to 1995;
5. First-ever downpayment and closing cost initiatives resulting in approximately 400 first-time homebuyers buying a home in past three years, as opposed to approximately 40 in previous administration. This was our HAPPI (Homebuyer's Assistance Program Participation Initiative) Program.

I look forward to working with all of you in the private sector through my real estate company (Larry Ferdinand & Assoc., Inc.) or my civic organization called Shreveport Voters League, where I serve as President.

If you would like to contact me after May 31st, I can be reached at 631-2742.

/s/Larry Ferdinand

Councilman Green: Councilman Jackson just brought it to my attention that we have some other Distinguished Guest that would like to make a presentation at this time: Commissioner Joyce Bowman (I didn't see you over in the corner over there) so if you would be kind enough to come to the mic. I heard you all were coming, so I dressed up for this special occasion (presented a basket of butter beans). We have a planting service at my church that we just started, so this will fall right in line. Thank you very much.

Councilman Lester: I'd be remiss if I didn't recognize Commissioner Rose Wilson-McCullough who is here with us. Thank you for sharing with us Commissioner McCullough.

Councilman Green: Where is Rose?

Councilman Lester: Over in the corner.

Councilman Green: You wasn't with the Seed Committee, Rose?

Public Hearings: None.

Confirmations and/or Appointments: Motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Walford for confirmation of Sara Herrington to the MPC

Zoning Board of Appeals (reappointment). Motion approved by the following vote:
Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Walford, Green and Jackson. 7.
Nays: None.

Adding Legislation to the Agenda. Councilman Gibson: I have a couple of resolutions and ordinances.(Clerk's Note: Items No. 1 through 5 were proposed Additions to the Agenda. They were not added to the Agenda for Introduction nor assigned a Resolution or Ordinance number in association with Ordinance No. 50 of 2003.)

Motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Walford (for discussion) to add the following to the agenda:

1. Proposed Resolution 1 by Councilman Gibson: A resolution authorizing the Mayor to prepare and solicit requests for proposals for the operation of the Lakeside Golf Course, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
2. Proposed Ordinance 1 by Councilman Gibson: An ordinance amending the 2003 Water and Sewer Enterprise Fund Budget and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
3. Proposed Ordinance 2 by Councilman Gibson: An ordinance amending the 2003 Airports Enterprise Fund Budget and otherwise providing with respect thereto by Councilman Gibson.
4. Proposed Ordinance 3 by Councilman Gibson: An ordinance amending the 2003 Fleet Services Internal Service Fund Budget and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
5. Proposed Ordinance 4 by Councilman Gibson: An ordinance amending the 2003 Golf Enterprise Fund Budget and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
6. Resolution No. 76 of 2003: A resolution declaring a moratorium on the issuance of sign permits in the B-4, Central Business District and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
7. Resolution No. 77 of 2003 by Councilman Hogan: A resolution suspending the effects of certain provisions of Chapter 10 relative to alcoholic beverages and Chapter 106 relative to zoning for property located at 6200 Bert Kouns Industrial Loop Expressway for the Betty Spears Memorial Cancer Run on June 21, 2003, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
8. Resolution No. 78 of 2003: A resolution authorizing the Mayor to execute an agreement between the City of Shreveport and Government Acquisitions, Inc. and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Councilman Jackson: If I am correct, what we are doing is adding these

resolutions and/or ordinances to today's agenda?

Councilman Green: Yes, sir.

Councilman Jackson: And are we voting in globo to add these?

Mr. Thompson: You can unless you wanted to divide the question.

Councilman Green: You can divide them up or you can vote them separately.

Councilman Jackson: I don't know, is it appropriate now to ask that we would divide them up?

Councilman Green: Yes.

Councilman Jackson: Do we just simple need a motion to do that?

Mr. Thompson: Which ones would you like to?

Councilman Jackson: Each one of them.

Mr. Thompson: Then you can take each one of them individually.

Councilman Green: Any objections?

1. Proposed Resolution 1 by Councilman Gibson: A resolution authorizing the Mayor to prepare and solicit requests for proposals for the operation of the Lakeside Golf Course, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Walford to add the following to the agenda.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Norman, this proposed resolution preparing and soliciting requests for proposals to operate Lakeside?

Mr. Norman: Yes.

Councilman Carmody: In that Lakeside is one of the three municipal golf courses that we have that constitutes part of an Enterprise Fund where each facility along with the other two stands on their own revenue that they generate in order to operate the different golf courses, and Lakeside of course has been one of the three that we've traditionally had to subsidize in order to keep going.

Mr. Norman: That is correct.

Councilman Carmody: I guess I'm here to ask your opinion on what are our prospects for soliciting proposals to operate a facility that continually loses money and is your understanding that if we do solicit for proposals that SPAR would be relieved from its financial obligation to operate that facility?

Mr. Norman: As far as the first question, I really have not done anything relative to going out looking for prospects. The Councilman that is proposing this, might have some answers on that, but no we haven't done that. I can say that the course has traditionally lost somewhere in the neighborhood of \$180- to \$200,000 a year, that's how much we've come short. There would be some other, if we did not operate it as a golf course, just as a park then obviously we would have to still maintain it which would also reflect in the numbers, but I do not know what the prospects are out there. We have not done the research for that.

Councilman Carmody: Mr. Gibson, I certainly think that this deserves to have some merit. My concern though is knowing that traditionally this has been a loss to the City. I just wondered had you envisioned to what extent the City would be relieving itself

of the burden of maintaining this particular golf course or would we continue to do some sort of maintenance on it and that someone else would be there actually operating it?

Councilman Gibson: Well again, that is why I think I would like to see the Mayor be given the opportunity to see what is out there in the private sector. You also see that we are starting with the African-American Chamber of Commerce. They have connections with several African-American entrepreneurs out there, in fact I've visited with the head of African-American Chamber of Commerce, and they were intrigued with the idea.

There is some opportunities maybe to move faster with private sector operators working in conjunction with the PGA of America and the First Tee Program and also USGA which has several other grants involved to bring some assistance to the table that may be bogged down because of the City. But, I think that once we have an opportunity to have some dialogue there is an opportunity to bring both the private and public sector together to help, obviously, a nine-hole golf course that has been struggling for quite some time get to a level that it needs to be.

Councilman Jackson and myself had some discussions on this back in late-November and December and I think that obviously there is merits on both sides. This is not saying that the City is going to go in one direction or another, but I think it would have merits to have the Administration look at what's out there because there are some real opportunities out there within the private sector that see some opportunities that we may not see. Again, Mr. Norman is doing a great job operating SPAR under a basically, a band-aid over a hemorrhage type process in the fact that I know that this is the second go-around since November that he has had his budget cut through revenue shortfalls, and again, that is no fault of anybody. When we are short revenue, we are short revenue. And unfortunately, SPAR is the first place, first line of defense that we start cutting and we are getting to the point where we are cutting so many different things, that we need to be exploring that. So, this is just an opportunity, it is not to say go in one direction or another, it is just to see, explore, what options and what opportunities are out there for both the African-American community and the citizens of Shreveport

Councilman Lester: I'm diametrically opposed to this. First of all, the Lakeside Golf Course was a golf course that was created in the City of Shreveport *because* African-Americans were not allowed to play golf at an of the other municipal golf courses. The Lakeside Golf Course is a 9-hole golf course and it is attempting to compete with 18-hole golf courses, so by its very nature, it is not going to be competitive.

If we are concerned about revenue and I take Councilman Gibson at his word, because he and I have talked about certain issues in terms of revenue then my question would be: If we are concerned about our Golf Enterprise Fund why not just privatize them all? Why would we selected Lakeside as opposed to Huntington or the other golf courses? I mean, if our concern is revenue why not just spend them all off, certainly we are all business people, if we can find someone that can operate Lakeside then certainly we find someone that will take a property that is going to generate income, amortize that, and then do something else with it.

I just have a problem with this resolution. I don't have a problem with Councilman Gibson, I just don't think that this is the way to go. I just don't think that this is the way to go. I mean, there are a number of options that can be explored that should be explored to make Lakeside more competitive and attractive to the golfing

community. There are a number of things that can be done. As I appreciate it, one of the comments that we entertained at one point earlier in the budgetary process last year, was turning instead of a 9-hole course into a course where you would practice tees, teeing off. I mean, I am not a golfer (I have some shoes and I have some clubs) but, I am pretty sure that there are some things that can be done relative to youth and young people in terms of making that more attractive.

So, I would just ask Councilman Gibson and the Council, before we consider raising the specter of privatizing this facility that means a lot to the African-American community, lets consider how we can make it more competitive before we spend it off. I would just ask that we would do that as opposed to just cutting this golf course off and spitting it to the wolves, if it would be.

Councilman Jackson: Councilman Lester said some of what I wanted to say, so I won't repeat all of that. At first, when we first started talking about this whenever it just came up a minute ago, I was just opposed to it. I wasn't offended by it, I was just opposed to it.

But, now as I've heard what we were talking about, I'm assuming then and maybe Councilman Gibson can clear it up, that we somehow or another, made Lakeside the African-American golf spot. We are going to get the African-American Chamber to look at something to do about Lakeside but--to me, it just suggest to me that, that is the place for African-Americans to play. And I think if we are really serious about not equality, I think to offer Lakeside to African-Americans whether it is because where it is located or whatever the case may be, is insulting at best.

I think that what needs to happen if we are serious about all people playing golf and we know that a location may be an issue and transportation may be an issue, but we want to afford all of our citizens the opportunity to play golf, then what we ought to seriously be thinking about is bond issues where we build a golf course that is a legitimate golf course in North Shreveport, is what we ought to be considering, in my opinion, us doing.

I think this effort is one that will not save us money in the long run because we will basically be tantamount---when you look at Lakeside Golf Course, Mr. Chairman, I see getting a private company in here and all these things we've talked about from First Tee to otherwise, I see that basically as rearranging seats on the Titanic. They are still all going down.

And, I would suggest to us that we not look at these kind of tactics to try to do this and I know, from maybe perhaps from a cost cutting measure it may have some merit, but outside of that, I'm struggling to find the merit in doing that. I think if provision for opportunities for golfers is what is important, we ought to be serious about it and provide them something better rather than trying to put a band-aid on top cancer.

Councilman Green: Councilman Jackson, if I was in church I'd say, Amen.

Councilman Walford: Can I borrow that, about the Titanic?

Councilman Jackson: Yes sir.

Councilman Walford: That is great, I need to remember that.

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

2. Proposed Ordinance 1 by Councilman Gibson: An ordinance amending the 2003 Golf Enterprise Fund Budget and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Mr. Dark: Can I make an observation about this particular ordinance and several others that are in the list to be added.

All of them implement an amendment that Mr. Gibson is proposing to the General Fund Budget. If you add these to the agenda, unless if his amendment does not pass, you've got them on the agenda, you are going to have to withdraw them at some point you are going to have to publish them in the official journal. It might be appropriate to wait and see if his amendment passes, if it does then it would be absolutely appropriate to add these and to do that, but you don't have to do it now, I don't think, unless you believe that that is going to pass.

Motion by Councilman Gibson (died for lack of a Second).

3. Proposed Ordinance 2 by Councilman Gibson: An ordinance amending the 2003 Fleet Services Internal Service Fund Budget and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Walford to add the following to the agenda.

Mayor Hightower: Is this amendment, Councilman Gibson's amendment?

Councilman Jackson: Yes, it is.

Mayor Hightower: I want to speak actually to his amendment list in its entirety, so I don't have to speak on each one. But the Administration has worked hard, along with the City Council to put to the 2003 budget together.

And Mike I certainly commend your thoughts from Day 1 to Day (whatever today is) but we've worked hard when we knew that we were facing a budget shortfall in sales tax revenue and fee revenue. We went back to the table, called the Department Heads in, and my management philosophy has always been, to let the guys that do the business, do the business and hold them accountable. And I think every Department Head has appreciated that and responded to that. When we asked them to give them a 4.5% cut, they came back with 4.5% cuts. Some of which were unacceptable to me, personally. We went back to them again, and told them the only sacred cow was, I did not want to cut jobs and I did not want to affect our personnel's personal life through the job, if at all possible. Every Department Head responded, came back with what I believe and Mr. Dark believes to be a workable budget to get us through 2003.

It all has to work in its entirety, obviously and some of the cuts that Mike has offered and I know that, I don't want to speak for him, but I know he sees a worse picture down the road than I do or Department Heads do or the Budget Office does, but I would submit to you that, these are premature, that we feel like we've got a solid proposal in front of you to have a balanced budget for 2003. If something changes 6-months down the road and these are words that Mike, I think almost came out of your mouth during the budget session and I deeply

appreciate that, that we can change. But, today myself, the Department Heads, the Budget Office don't see any reason to cut job, to cut salaries, to furlough people, to do any of the things that these budget amendments would ask us to do.

I would never say, never. Things could change. I'm optimistic, I hope they are going to change for the better, not for the worse and hopefully the indicators and federal government and everybody else is working towards improving the economy and not letting the economy slide any further than it has already slid. And again, I'm optimistic, I feel like we have put together a workable budget for 2003 and certainly hope that we don't have to come back to the Council but we certainly would if we needed to, so I would ask for defeat of the amendments that we have in front of you.

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

4. Proposed Ordinance 3 by Councilman Gibson: An ordinance amending the 2003 Airports Enterprise Fund Budget and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Walford (for discussion) to add the following to the agenda.

Councilman Gibson: I'm going to save my comments on all these three additions because we have got some amendments that are coming to the Mayor's proposed budget and I'll save my comments for that at an appropriate time. So, I'm not sitting over here on the sidelines not wanting to comment, but I'll say my comments here in just a few minutes.

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

5. Proposed Ordinance 4 by Councilman Gibson: An ordinance amending the 2003 Water and Sewer Enterprise Fund Budget and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Walford (for discussion) to add the following to the agenda. Motion denied by the following vote: Nays: Councilman Walford, Carmody, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 5. Ayes: Councilman Lester and Gibson. 2.

6. Resolution No. 76 of 2003: A resolution declaring a moratorium on the issuance of sign permits in the B-4, Central Business District and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

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

7. *Resolution No. 78 of 2003: A resolution authorizing the Mayor to execute an agreement between the City of Shreveport and Government Acquisitions, Inc. and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.*

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

8. *Resolution No. 77 of 2003 by Councilman Hogan: A resolution suspending the effects of certain provisions of Chapter 10 relative to alcoholic beverages and Chapter 106 relative to zoning for property located at 6200 Bert Kouns Industrial Loop Expressway for the Betty Spears Memorial Cancer Run on June 21, 2003, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.*

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

Public Comments. *Reverend Joe R. Gant, Jr. (5823 Ledbetter Street):* I apologize for having to take up your time today because I feel had I had the opportunity to address the MPC I would not be here today but I had a brother who had a stroke and I was at the emergency room with him, at that time.

I want to speak against Agenda Item 11., the forth item under New Business. And, the reason being is that I have a record of opposing the establishment of any more liquor sales in our community.

And one of the things happening here and I believe that our Councilman would adhere to it is that the people were misled believing that the business only was going to open up a daiquiri shop, whereas it is really a liquor store with the sale of daiquiris.

Also, I don't know whether or not you have seen that area, but there is a church and I have a little contention—I measure 297 feet but then I understand the rule says it has to be from the property line to the building. Well, there is a church in very close proximity to that. The other issue that I have is that if you have not seen it, the area itself and we are talking about a drive through it is almost going to be impossible for them to circle around that building for a drive-through.

But the other thing of it is, if you would note in our community, much of our problem are coming from these kinds of businesses. My congregation and I have, we've invested a lot of money in that area to try and improve it and we are looking at several other business ventures in that area now and this one is not conducive with what we are trying to do with that corridor so I would ask you to vote "nay" to this agenda item 4. under New Business.

Councilman Walford: Thank you very much for coming forward. I will tell you that I had phone calls today expressing the same concern that there was confusion or whatever about what it is going to be; thank you very much for coming.

Councilman Hogan: I want to thank you also for coming saying the Introductory Prayer for us today, I appreciate it.

Mr. Al Vinson Nash (1819 Joe Louis Boulevard): I'm coming to address 9A., Item

No. 69. I am current President of the Martin Luther King Neighborhood Association and we do have a petition of some 3 00/400 names in opposition to the proposed development for Camelot in Wedgewood duplex homes which are on the agenda today. In actuality, we were somewhat unaware of this development up until recently.

Being the President of the Martin Luther King Neighborhood Association, we would ask with all due respect to our Councilman, that for any future development coming to the Martin Luther King neighborhood community, that we would be informed prior to and at least have an opportunity to discuss those developments and the type of developments. We had not had that opportunity and now it is being proposed to us. So, as a result we are in opposition and this is similar to what we opposed before with another development that was coming into our community.

We want to make sure that our community maintain a decent standard of living. We are in favor of new development for elderly poor and what have you, but we are not in favor of substandard type development and that is a major concern.

We realize that our community is somewhat low income, the development that is there now, the housing that is there is now maybe substandard because of the age of the housing and the age of the individuals that are living there, but as a community, we have gotten together and determined that we don't want to perpetuate that type of development there. Whenever there is new development coming in to our community, we want to insure that it is high quality as well as affordable—being in construction, I know that, that can be done.

The biggest concern that we have though is that there are individuals who are making proposals for development in our community, who are not addressing the community, not coming before the Martin Luther King Neighborhood Association. So, with all due respect to any Councilman or any developer, we would ask that before you all make proposals that you would contact the Neighborhood Association and share that information with us and allow us an opportunity to determine if that is something really that we want to support one way or the other and again, we have not been given the opportunity to do so. We did make copies of those petitions. Hopefully you all have a copy of the petitions and the letters that we sent to our Councilman in opposition of that development.

Councilman Lester: Thank you Brother Nash for, I did in fact on Friday receive the letter and I appreciate the petition, I think it goes to the heart of the matter. I'm excited anytime I get to talk to folks from my district.

But so that the record is clear, I did not know nor did any one of us on this Council know about the proposed development before we came at the Administrative Council meeting (the Monday before the Tuesday meeting.) My philosophy is and the record will reflect that I did say, at that meeting before I, as City Councilman in District A vote for anything in District A, that developer (proposed or whoever, friend or foe) needs to talk to the people in the district. That is why I made them wait on Tuesday and that is why I did the best we could in terms of calling, I hastily call, I be it very hastily called a meeting of citizens in the community.

That meeting was attended by some folks, and I've had opportunity to speak to other people in the neighborhood to get the sentiments but I wanted us to be clear, Councilman Lester is never (and my wife tells me, never say *never*) but Councilman Lester is not going to vote on any development in District A before that developer comes

and makes a presentation to the affected community. That's a promise I made when I ran, that's a promise I'm going to keep and that is why we had the meeting that we did.

I appreciate your input, I appreciate the petition, I appreciate everyone that showed up and I think it backs something that you and I talked about on numbers of occasions that, what we need in District A, particularly in the MLK area is a master plan and that is one of the things that we've been successful in terms of getting some funding from this Administration and with MPC that we will be moving forward with is, a master plan for our area. Because of regardless of your socioeconomic background, everyone wants to live in a decent community.

For far too long the people on the Cooper Road have been denigrated to second-class citizenship because they just want to throw anything in our back yard because we don't know. But so long as I have privilege to have this seat, let the word go forth now and for every more that. when Councilman Lester is sitting on the district, District A is open for business, but with the caveat: if you are going to put a development in District A, you need to talk to the folks first. If you don't call me, that's fine, call Mr. Nash. There are a number of other folks that are very active in the community generally—we have people and people are going to say what they want to say. But, let it be known that in District A if you don't come before the citizens, particularly in the MLK area, then Councilman Lester is not going to vote for it.

And I appreciate your support, I appreciate the work of the Martin Luther King Civic Association and I appreciate everyone that's here and that is what we are going to continue to do; so, I thank you for coming. And I would ask that my colleagues join me in voting against this particular development because I have talked and I have heard the voices of MLK and they've spoken very clearly and resoundingly, we don't want this. We want to have quality housing. We don't want duplexes. We want to have the same standard and quality and affordable housing that everyone else has. A bricked up duplex is still a duplex and that is not something that we want in the MLK community and I think that word is clear.

So, I'll support you. You don't have to worry where I am on that. My position as Councilman is, I give everybody the opportunity. I spoke to Judge Thaxton. I said, if you want to do this, you need to make a presentation to the community and he did that, and I respect him for that. Can't support him on this, but I hope that in the future if there are other developments that he wants to do and he indicated that he did, that he will sit down as a process and get everyone involved at the beginning because we don't want scenarios like that as I consider it, a 21st Century shotgun houses that is right next to Lake Bethlehem, that's an eyesore and that's an insult to everyone that lives on the Cooper Road. So, don't worry about me, I'm in your corner, we done what we said we are going to do and we are going to move forward.

Mr. Lewis J. McCullough (2509 Kemp Lane): I am here speaking on 9A. No. 69, dovetailing on what our Association President Mr. Al Nash spoke on, opposition to the duplex housing down off Roy Road, Shreveport Blanchard. What ability to generate wealth does low-income housing have on a community? If they are a master plan of development for the MLK area or do we have to accept what others reject?

The MLK area has one of the highest home ownership percentages in the City. What happens when the value of your property goes down because of this type dwelling. Why can't we remove some of the dilapidated housing that already exists and replace

them with some nice single family units? Will we continue this plantation home mentality and never empower citizens to aspire or own homes. Why is there an industrial park down the road and no support or discussion of locating businesses or industry there?

What will this low income development do for property value? We already have Peach street, Prince Village on David Raines, I don't even know what you call that next to Lake Bethlehem and I'm not saying its an eyesore, but I'm saying to come in and put buildings like that next to a \$1.8 million dollar church I'm wondering about the master plan? Would this be allowed by Broadmoor over by Summer Grove (well, I thought not, but just needed to throw that in parenthetically). Pine Hill Estates where we allowed a low income project and all of the streets they are substandard, they are all cracked. You can barely go 10 miles an hour down those streets, but that's a low income neighborhood.

We were told that we would build a Shreveport for our children that they could come back to. No one is going to return to a city where the major part of the leadership is still share cropping, tenant farming and plantation huts that keep us all pacified to enjoy low socioeconomic aspirations. Why can't we develop North Shreveport like the Southern part of the City? I submit to you today because by design, we are not on the agenda.

What benefit have we gotten since being annexed into the City? Water and sewerage was already in place. The Parish provided parks and recreation and Sheriff protection. The park that is going to be built now was submitted to you by, I think, my wife Commissioner McCullough that is going to be built in that area now, so nothing is being planned for the area unless it is basically coming, I guess you would say through the Parish and my wife. The compactor sites for our trash were already in place. No flood control projects. You know they did a little work adjacent to MLK but that project was started and never completed, so there is no flood control. The Martin Luther King bridge that was fixed, that was state funding. We got a tip: We need to be on the agenda. We need to be on the agenda.

Now, in American history they said, no taxation with representation. We are not being represented. We are not receiving any services in our area, other than, a little garbage picked up, police that ride by, and what else? Nothing. And I submit to you today gentlemen this is not racial, this is not anything, Shreveport is not going to be a great City until everybody is at the table. And when I say, at the table, sitting down not having hidden agendas, planning what is best for the citizens of Caddo Parish.

CONSENT AGENDA LEGISLATION:

TO INTRODUCE RESOLUTIONS AND ORDINANCES ON CONSENT:

RESOLUTIONS: None.

ORDINANCES: None.

Councilman Jackson: I was listening to us move on, that was not the Public Comment section (I'm asking a question)?

Councilman Green: Not, that was the ones that were on the agenda for the vote for today.

Motion by Councilman Jackson to suspend to allow, seconded by Councilman Lester.

Councilman Gibson: Could we ask, what we are suspending the rules for?

Councilman Jackson: To hear the remaining Public Comments.

Councilman Walford: I am going to vote no. I think we have an agenda, there is a purpose for it. We have people here to do business before the Council, we have Department Heads and I am going to suggest that we follow our agenda, and I will be voting no on this suspension of the rules.

Councilman Carmody: How many requests to speak do you have?

Councilman Green: Six (6).

Councilman Carmody: And these are not on matters that we are going to vote on?

Councilman Green: Right.

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

TO ADOPT RESOLUTIONS AND ORDINANCES ON CONSENT:

RESOLUTIONS: None.

ORDINANCES: None.

REGULAR AGENDA LEGISLATION:

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

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Carmody to postpone until the June 10, 2003 meeting. Motion approved by the following vote. Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

RESOLUTION NO. 54 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO CONVEY TO THE CADDO/BOSSIER PORT COMMISSION ALL SERVITUDE OBTAINED BY THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT IN CONNECTION WITH THE SOUTHERN LOOP WATER MAIN EXTENSION PROJECT, AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened, that the Mayor be, and is hereby authorized to convey on behalf of the City of Shreveport, all servitude obtained by the City of Shreveport in connection with the Southern Loop Water Main Extension Project, to the Caddo/Bossier Port Commission.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that if any provisions or items of this resolution or the application thereof are 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 resolutions or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

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

Councilman Lester: This is issue was the subject of much conversation, not the issue, the merits of the issue but the issue as to whether or not I had received information at the last Council meeting.

I want to do something that probably not very often done in public service, certainly by people that aspire and have leadership positions. I am going to admit that I was wrong.

In fact, I want to publicly say to Mr. Strong and to the Council Office, that it was my error. I had asked for the information and I was honest when I said I had not received it. Upon leaving, I went back to my office because I was concerned that when Mike Strong and the Council Office says, they send you something, it almost always gets there. So I stayed up a little bit later looking through my office to see whether or not in fact I did receive the package and in point in fact, the package was at my office. The error was mine not yours and not yours Mr. Thompson.

So, I'm moving to move forward on this. All my questions have been answered. I just wanted to publicly say to Mr. Strong and to Mr. Thompson, the error was mine and not yours.

Councilman Green: I would like to commend you for being a great statesman and to admitting to that fact.

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

The Deputy Clerk read the following resolution by title: Resolution No. 69 of 2003: A resolution of support for the proposed construction of four (4) scattered site duplex homes developments in Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Councilman Lester: I am going to move to defeat this Item No. 69. I've had an opportunity to listen to proponents and opponents of this measure in the MLK area.

I spent some time over the weekend doing some more researching and sole searching and talking to residents and it is clear that the residents in the MLK area are not in favor of this and so consistent with my campaign promise, if the people of the district don't support something, I am not going to vote to support because I am not going to substitute my judgment for there. So, having said that,

I would move that we deny this particular item No. 69 as it relates to the MLK area, and I would urge my colleagues to vote similarly.

Mr. Thompson: In according to our practices, we would ask that you would move to adopt this and ask the Council members to vote against it.

Councilman Lester: Well, then I would do that, Mr. Chairman. I can't move to adopt. It is already on there to be adopted, so I would ask the Council members.

Mr. Thompson: I don't believe that there was a motion to adopt.

Councilman Lester: I don't want to adopt.

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

Councilman Gibson: Before we go on, I do have a question. As I understood it, this involves more than just what's in your district. This involves, is there a possibility of us, Mr. Thompson, I guess I'll defer to you. Can this be broken into 2 resolutions? There is a project that I believe that is in Councilman Green's district as well.

Councilman Green: I talked to Mr. Travis Miller and he said he wanted it broke into two resolution, of course we couldn't do that today, so this would have to be voted on as one.

Councilman Jackson: I would assume that you ought to then be able to defeat this and then do a new ordinance for whatever the separate site was.

Councilman Lester: Right.

Mr. Thompson: It can be broken up, but it is going to take some time to drafted. We didn't know this was coming and didn't prepare it.

Mayor Hightower; One thing that I would like, Calvin and I had met on this previously, the deadline is May 31st on the applications for these projects. So, I know that a couple of them are in District A, I know at least one is in District G, Councilman, I know if you had an opportunity to take a look at that but for us to delay it for, until the next Council meeting is not going to give the developers time to submit their proposals for the tax credit, so Mr. Thompson if there is a way to . . . Council members are okay.

Mr. Thompson: Can we postpone this and we'll try to work on some amendments.

Councilman Lester: I might offer a suggestion. As I appreciate this resolution is merely to write a letter (for lack of a better term) of support from the Council for that particular development in that area. So it could very well easily be accomplished by severing in terms of the resolution itself. Would that mean that, Mr. Thompson, if we vote to lets say amend, could we simple vote to amend this particular ordinance, removing all references to the District A, therefore just leaving the District F site and vote on that particular motion?

Mr. Thompson: We can prepare an amendment but our amendments need to be writing and it will take a short time to do that. We would suggest that you would postpone this until later on in the meeting and then we will come back to it at a later time once it has been prepared.

Councilman Jackson: Certainly, I rescind my motion and offer a motion to postpone, seconded by Councilman Gibson (until later in the meeting). Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Walford to consider the amendment.

The Clerk read the following amendment:

In the title and in the second paragraph of the resolution, delete the word and number “four” and substitute the word and number “two.”

Delete paragraphs 1 and 2, relative to “Camelot” and “Wedgewood” and re-number paragraphs 3 and 4 as numbers 1 and 2.

Mr. Thompson: What this does is to remove the projects that were on the MLK area and it allows you to adopt the ones that are not.

Motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Jackson to adopt the amendment. Motion passed by the following vote. Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Out of Chamber: Councilman Lester. 1.

Motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Walford to adopt the resolution as amended. Motion passed by the following vote. Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Out of Chamber: Councilman Lester. 1.

RESOLUTION NUMBER 69 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION OF SUPPORT FOR THE PROPOSED CONSTRUCTION OF TWO (2) SCATTERED SITE DUPLEX HOMES DEVELOPMENTS IN SHREVEPORT, CADDO PARISH, LOUISIANA AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the construction of new single family and multi-family housing developments are strongly encouraged in the City of Shreveport; and

WHEREAS, the proposed development of four (4) scattered site duplex homes developments in the City of Shreveport will provide much needed single family and multi-family housing for single parents, large families, handicapped citizens, the homeless and foster parents residing with the City.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council for the City of Shreveport, in due, regular and legal session convened, expresses its support of the following named proposed developments subject to compliance with applicable requirements of federal, state and local laws and ordinances:

1. “Bartlett Place”, a proposed 44 unit scattered site duplex homes development to meet the needs of single parents, large families, handicapped citizens, the homeless and foster parents, to be located on the north side of Valleyview Drive west of its intersection with Wyngate Street in Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana; and
2. “Oxford Court”, a proposed 44 unit scattered site duplex homes development to meet the needs of single parents, large families, handicapped citizens, the homeless and foster parents, to be located on the north side of Valleyview Drive west of its intersection with Wyngate Street in Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this resolution of support is provided to satisfy requirements of the Louisiana Housing Finance Agency and shall not be construed or is it intended to grant any approval, variance, or waiver of any requirement, regulation or process required by federal, state or local law for the construction, development or occupancy of the proposed 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 application, and to this end, the provisions of this resolution are hereby declared severable.

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

The Deputy Clerk read the resolution by title: Resolution No. 71 of 2003: A resolution to amend the Fee Schedule for the Emergency Medical Services Division of the Shreveport Fire Department , and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

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

Councilman Jackson: I guess my question was to Mr. Dark or the Mayor, are all of these increases immediate?

Mr. Dark: My understanding Mr. Jackson is that we are looking at July 1 on the one.

Councilman Jackson: July 1.

Mr. Dark: Yes, sir.

Councilman Jackson: I guess even further let me say, it says that—on the sheet, I can’t remember what sheet it was, looks like it may reference to one price, I guess July 1 and then another price a year later and then a final price in 2005, is that correct?

Mr. Dark: Yes, sir that is correct.

Councilman Jackson: The final price being?

Mr. Dark: Brian are you here? Mr. Nezat from Fire is here. I don’t remember the 2005 one.

Steve Nezat: That bottom price is \$600 which still would put us at the lower end of the scale.

Councilman Jackson: What's the current price?

Steve Nezat: Our current price for ALS is \$375.

Councilman Jackson: Going to?

Steve Nezat: Going to \$500 proposed at this meeting, going to \$550 at the beginning of 2004, going to \$600 in 2005.

Councilman Jackson: My question as it relates to these increases, certainly I think we obviously are faced with needing to do an increase. Our vote today will, it seems to me not only approve this increase but in approve two other increases down the line.

I'm assuming that the Administration, as a part of generating additional revenue, seeing errors of opportunity to in fact increase areas for revenue in this whole budget scenario because it was not brought up prior to this, it wasn't just a part of last year's information. I think it came up as a part of this way of increasing revenue, is that correct or not, Mayor?

Mayor Hightower: That is correct.

Councilman Jackson: That's correct. And I'm assuming that we've raised fees on individuals in our community because we are in a situation where we have a budget shortfall and the only two things that can happen is either decrease spending or increase revenue and I see this as increase revenue.

Now, I guess my concern is what happens, best case scenario, if the economy does something positive and we are able to move forward with a positive surge, if you, will in the economy, does that mean then that notwithstanding what the economic climate or conditions are, that we are still going to increase even two years down the line since this was a situation where we only begin to think of this because of the nature of our economy currently.

I guess my question to you is, we are approving multiple increases notwithstanding, we are not, in my opinion and I don't know, maybe you can answer this Mayor, if you all have factored in what, is this an indicator of what you are anticipate the economy to be and that we need to continue to raise revenue in this form over the course of the next, I guess, that would be 2 ½ years or so?

Mayor Hightower: I think what really happened here was the budget roll back that we are going through now and the demand on the department heads to come back with suggested budget changes has forced the Fire Department to take a look at fees, where in the past, they hadn't looked at fees. And I think the Chief can explain to you the whole lot better than I can, the fact that they had not be able to collect as much money as they could be able to collect via Medicaid, Medicare and those type things because our fee structure was set so low in the first place that, doesn't work on a percentage basis of what the fee is?

Mr. Nezat: Yes, sir.

Mayor Hightower: So it made it, with our price so low, the percentage that they paid was just a little bit of money and with the prices moved up to be competitive with other (and I know what) cities they compared it to but at least averages around the country, it enables us to get up to where we need to be so that

we are receiving Medicare and Medicaid and insurance money that we weren't previously able to collect. And again, I think the Chief can explain. . . .

Councilman Jackson: And to his credit, I would suggest to you that, the last time what may have been the same questions, I think he addressed that.

The issue and I guess the problem I have and at the risk of being redundant, let me say again, that I don't mind us moving fees up to national averages and those kinds of things. The problem is our per capita ain't going up to those national averages. And, so we are taxing people who are increasingly becoming more impoverished and asking them to pay more. And I think, to me, just philosophically or logically, I am struggling to understand the logic in that.

The second part, I guess you can answer this question, do we have defaults or do we have non-payment in these areas? Obviously everybody who is a victim has the opportunity to enjoy these services. Obviously I assume you bill them and then some people don't pay because they don't have insurance and they are not in that Medicare age range where they would be able to get Medicare and then, they don't have private insurance. Do you have a percentage or some kind of an amount of the folks who default or who don't pay on those particular bills?

Mr. Nezat: When it is all said and done at the end of the day, there is about 30% that we never collect anything from despite all of our efforts and using collection agencies and whatever we've done through years.

Something you brought up last time, I had a chance to look into was the local. You had asked about the local area and how we ranked. Actually what that comes down to, right now in our area people providing like service, their service ranges from \$500 to \$600 in our local area. And what we are proposing to go to right now is the \$500 so we still would be the lowest or as low as anyone on that scale. The average is \$587, they range from \$5- to \$6- but the average is \$587; so, that stills put us at the bottom. We are not charging outrageous here.

Councilman Jackson: But let me give you this scenario. Lets assume Willis-Knighton, Schumpert, everybody who is out there who provides these kind of services at a higher price than we do. The public knows that and so the public utilizes, a person who is poor is more like to call Shreveport EMS because the prices are, when you look at the market, the price are a lot lower, if you will for a lack of a better term, we are still the lowest game in town. Well, that means more people are going to use us but that also means that more people who will use us will be increasingly more impoverished people who then will, 30% of which who will using your numbers, default.

What I'm suggesting to us is, is that we've been charging people if I can use a round number \$300. If ten people default on \$300 dollars, the loss to the City is \$3,000. Now at the rate of \$600 dollars. If ten people default which we have to assume that either equal to or more than or going to continue to default, then what we've got by increasing our fees is a loss of \$6,000 on those same ten people. When we budget, my question is, are we factoring that into our budgeting? As we increase fees, it looks good from a revenue perspective but still on the loss side of it, we have to increase the loss. I would suggest perhaps proportionately if in fact, we are going to do that. And in an increasingly weak

economy, do we expect that people will default more or less? And I would suggest logically, it would suggest that people would default, more than less.

Now, I'm not suggesting that that is the reason not to raise fees, what I am suggesting that there has got to be a lot more logic in why we raise fees, move to those national averages and all these other things and we have to be concerned. I want to support this effort, but I wish that what we would do is, we raise one fee at a time. As we come back in 2004, if we need to raise fees again, we can raise fees again, that time rather than voting right now to raise fees for the next two years and I guess that is my concern Mr. Chairman, whether or not that is a possibility.

Mr. Dark: We've done a couple of things. 1. In the process of making our estimate of how much additional revenue this would be in, we did not use as high a number as Fire did, just to be conservative on it. 2. The other thing is that although you actually have in this resolution fees for 2 other years, it is within the power of the Council at any point prior to the, if you didn't want the 2005 one to go into effect, it is certainly within the power of the Council to change it by resolution the same way it is being changed here. If it is not working out the way you think it should be or if it is too onerous or if for some reason we've gotten ahead of ourselves competitive wise, you have the power and certainly so does Fire to come in and request, that it be changed. We think the growth is reasonable. They simply did not want to try to get to that average in one pop for the reasons you described. So, we would urge you to pass the resolution as is.

Councilman Jackson: Obviously you all believe that you can survive on whatever the 2003 and 2004 numbers are, before you even get to the 2005 number and I just would feel more comfortable voting on those things specifically rather than doing this thing like mail order people do. You know they send you something free and tell you, you don't pay for it—just remember to cancel it. And very often they hope that you forget to cancel it so that you can continue to have the debt .

So, I guess my concern is not whether or not it is within the auspice of this Council to be able to do that, at some point down the line, my concern is about doing it, Mr. Chairman, at this point, and then coming back when we said because we have been since our inception on this particular Council a group who said, well look, we'll do this now and down the road we'll look at again, and if we need to do this, we'll do it again. I just think that to be able, rather than to vote for three years worth of or two years worth of continually increases, that we could do it one time and certainly Chief Cochran and the Fire Department will certainly not let us forget if in fact there are still in that same position this time next year, having those same needs.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Thompson could we amend this particular issue so as to deal with Councilman Jackson's concerns relative to the multi-year increase whereas we would in fact move forward with an increase in, I believe it is the first 2years and then require an affirmative vote of this Council for any subsequent increase?

Mr. Thompson: Like the other one, it can be amended. We don't have it in our electronic copy, but if that is what you want us to do, we can look to do that.

Councilman Lester: Well I would offer that as an amendment to Item 71.

Councilman Green: I think what we have to do at this point, I think everybody has already voted. We would have to (Councilman Lester: Clear the machine?) withdraw the motion and the second.

Councilman Walford: I'd like to go ahead as is, would be my choice.

Mr. Thompson: I think at this time, the appropriate vote would be to reconsider it and if that does not pass, then the vote would stand as it is.

Councilman Walford: Can you clear the machines for those us who have. .

..

Mr. Thompson: It has already been adopted, so then the vote would be to reconsider.

Councilman Walford: Oh, okay.

Councilman Jackson: Hold on, when did we vote? There was a motion and a second and I asked a question.

Councilman Green: By the time you asked the question, we'd already voted.

Councilman Jackson: I'm sorry. Their vote should not prohibit me procedurally from asking my question. I mean, to cast votes even not withstanding my question.

Ms. Lee: They have already registered as votes in the machine and all I have to do is save it and it'll flash, and indicate what their vote was. However, if you want to reconsider it after that time, that is what he is trying telling you.

Mr. Thompson: I understand your point. Your point was that it was not time for the Council to vote. And the Chairman will have to determine whether or not the Council was at a point where it was to vote or whether, the question by Councilman Jackson, his unreadiness, would have prevented the Council from voting.

Councilman Green: This my last day; so, lets just clear the machine and we'll just vote back over. I really want to have peaceful day. So, we'll just clear the machines and vote all back over again. I'm sorry that I jumped. . .

Mr. Thompson: So, as i understand the motion is to adopt. That is the only motion that is on the table, that was a motion and second; is that correct?

Councilman Lester: Right and then I offered an amendment; so, will we vote on my amendment first?

Mr. Thompson: There is no amendment. We don't have an amendment in writing. So, again I think we would have to postpone so that we could find out precisely what you amendment is and try to. . . .

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

Mr. Thompson: Do you want the Administration or us to try to prepare that amendment?

Councilmen Lester: My amendment would be to allow the first 2 years of increase and then require an affirmative vote of the Council for the other increases, as I appreciate Item 71.

Councilman Green: Are you clear, Mr. Thompson?

Mr. Thompson: Yes. Is that something that you want to try to do today?

Councilmen Lester: Yes.

The Clerk read the following amendment:

Delete the first "NOW, THEREFORE paragraph and substitute:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City of Shreveport Emergency Medical Services Schedule adopted previously by the City Council is hereby amended and implemented as described in the Attachment "A" provided to the Clerk of Council with the original copy of this resolution; provided, however, that the proposed increases for 2005 shall not go into effect unless approved by the City Council by resolution.

Motion by Councilman Jackson, seconded by Councilman Carmody to adopt the amendment. Motion passed by the following vote. Ayes: Councilmen Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 5. Nays: Councilman Walford. 1. Out of Chamber: Councilman Lester. 1.

Councilman Walford: I voted against the amendment not the resolution.

Motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Walford to adopt the resolution as amended. Motion passed by the following vote. Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 5. Nays: None. Out of Chamber: Councilman Lester and Gibson. 2.

[RESOLUTION] ORDINANCE NO. 71OF 2003

A RESOLUTION TO AMEND THE FEE SCHEDULE FOR THE EMERGENCY MEDICAL SERVICES DIVISION OF THE SHREVEPORT FIRE DEPARTMENT , AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO

WHEREAS, Section 46-32(a) of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport provides for the establishment of a fee schedule of costs for emergency ambulance services to be adopted by the Council;

WHEREAS, the ordinance recognizes that from time to time it may be necessary to increase the fee schedule for supplies and medications;

WHEREAS, the ordinance further provides that all such fee increases in excess of 5% of the initially adopted fee schedule must be approved my the Mayor and submitted to the City Council for approval 30 days prior to the implementation of the increase;

WHEREAS, the Fire Department has recommended certain increases in fees for supplies and medications to the Mayor, which he has approved; and.

WHEREAS, the Shreveport City Council finds such increases in fees for supplies and medication to be necessary.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City of Shreveport Emergency Medical Services Schedule adopted previously by the City Council is hereby amended and implemented as described in the Attachment "A" provided to the Clerk of Council with the original copy of this resolution; provided, however, that the proposed increases for 2005 shall not go into effect unless approved by the City Council by resolution.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this fee schedule may be implemented thirty (30) days after final approval of this Resolution.

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.

RESOLUTION NO. 72 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION REQUESTING BIDS FOR THE OFFICIAL JOURNAL OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT FOR THE PERIOD COMMENCING JULY 1, 2003 THROUGH JUNE 30, 2004, APPROVING THE ADVERTISEMENT FOR SUCH BIDS AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, regular and legal session convened that bids for the publishing of all minutes, ordinances, resolutions, budgets, official notices, advertisements, and other official proceedings of the City of Shreveport, be and the same are hereby requested for the period July 1, 2003 through June 30, 2004.

BE IT RESOLVED that the bids submitted shall be for a printing in 6-point type. The bids shall also specify the rate to be charged for any display advertisements, such as advertisements for the Municipal Auditorium, Civic Theater, and Convention Hall, as distinguished from legal and advertisements which may be published by the City of Shreveport at any time.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Clerk of Council be and he is hereby authorized to advertise for such bids in accordance with this resolution in a newspaper of general circulation in the City of Shreveport.

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

Kansas City Southern Railroad a distance of 472.5 feet; thence run South 89 degrees 02' 21" West a distance of 1.0 feet; thence run South 0 degrees 57' 39" East along the West right of way line of Kansas City Southern Railroad a distance of 507.3 feet to the beginning, said tract containing 369,974 square feet. Municipal Address: 6200 St Vincent Avenue Council District "C"

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

RESOLUTION NO. 74 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION TO RECOGNIZE JAMES CRESWELL GARDNER FOR A LIFETIME OF DISTINGUISHED PUBLIC SERVICE TO THIS CITY AND THIS STATE, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO

BY: COUNCILMAN GREEN

WHEREAS James Creswell Gardner served as a Louisiana State Representative from 1952 to 1954 and as State Representative, he authored Act 34 of 1954, the Shreveport Metropolitan Planning Act. It was the first Metropolitan Planning Act in Louisiana and since 1954 has been widely copied by other cities. It remains the basic planning and zoning authority for Shreveport; and

WHEREAS James Creswell Gardner was the Mayor of Shreveport from 1954 to 1958 and during his term as Mayor, Shreveport had the largest public improvement and annexation program in the history of Shreveport until that time. The annexation program included the annexation of Mooretown, and *Look Magazine*, a major national publication at that time, cited Shreveport for having one of the best housing improvement programs in the United States; and

WHEREAS James Creswell Gardner was a member of the committee that drafted the 1978 City Charter and was referred to by the media as the "architect" of the structure of Shreveport's present form of government; and

WHEREAS James Creswell Gardner was elected by the citizens of Shreveport from District C, to serve on the first Council under the new form of government, and he was elected by that council to serve as the first Chairman of the Council; and

WHEREAS James Creswell Gardner has been appointed to serve on many local and state quasi-governmental boards and commissions including appointments by five governors of the State of Louisiana, some of which include:

Board of Directors, Confederate Memorial Medical Center, 1949 - 1951
Louisiana State Science Foundation, 1965 - 1971(Chairman 1967 - 1969)
Louisiana Expressway Authority, 1971 - 1972
Superdome Management Advisory Committee, 1975 - 1976
Louisiana Board of Commerce and Industry 1990 - 1992; and

WHEREAS James Creswell Gardner has served the citizens of this state by committing his time and resources to many civic organizations including:

Vice President, Shreveport Chamber of Commerce, 1987
Past President, Chairman Greater Shreveport Economic Development Council
The Committee of 100
State Exhibit Museum, 2000-2002
Shreveport Rotary Club, 1967 - 1968
Shreveport-Bossier Metropolitan YMCA, 1966
Shreveport Junior Chamber of Commerce, 1951 -1952
The Community Foundation of Shreveport and Bossier, 1975 - 1978
LSU-Shreveport, Citizens Advisory Committee, 1975 - 1978
Board of Directors and Executive Committee, Council for a Better Louisiana,
1970 - 1986
Director, Greater Shreveport Economic Development Foundation
Board of Directors, Caddo Chapter, American Red Cross, 1975 - 1978
Board of Trustees, Centenary College of Louisiana, 1964 - 1979
Treasurer, The Community Foundation of Shreveport and Bossier, 1977 - 1985

WHEREAS James Creswell Gardner has had many distinguished awards bestowed upon him because of his service to the citizens of this city and state including:

Shreveport Young Man of the Year, 1954
“Mr. Shreveport” - Shreveport Optimist Club, 1979
Business Leader of the year, Shreveport Chamber of Commerce, January 1981
Community Council Paul M. Brown Humanitarian Award, 1981
National Conference of Christians and Jews Brotherhood, 1986

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 **James Creswell Gardner** for his pioneering spirit, for a lifetime of distinguished public service and for demonstrating in many extraordinary but practical ways his 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 **James Creswell Gardner** and the other filed in perpetuity in the office of the Clerk of Council for the City of Shreveport.

/s/James Edward Green, Chairman
Council District F

/s/Calvin B. Lester, Jr.
Council District A

/s/R. M. "Monty" Walford
Council District B

/s/Thomas G. Carmody, Jr.
Council District C

/s/Michael G. Gibson
Council District D

/s/Jeffrey A. Hogan
Council District E

/s/Theron J. Jackson
Council District G

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

Councilman Green: We would like to present this to you today and we will get you a framed copy of it. We'll let you hold it for a minute and then we'll take it and frame it.

Mr. Gardner: I would like to thank you for this very warm and moving resolution. It is greatly appreciated.

It has been just a little over 20 years since I left the membership of this Council and in the years since then, I have retained a great affection for the institution of the Shreveport City Council and because of that affection, I am especially pleased to have this recognition from this body. I consider myself a Charter Member of it. As my wife reminded me when we were walking up today, this does mark, this year, the 25th Anniversary of the institution of the Charter of 1978 and the beginning of this form of government.

And as it mentioned in the resolution, I do have a great love and affection for this City and I hope that in some way that the deeds mentioned in this resolution are a manifestation of that. And from that love of this community, I wish you well in your undertakings, you have a lot of great challenges ahead of you and I wish you well in it and Mayor Hightower and his Administration, I extend those same best wishes.

Councilman Green: I would just like to, again, commend you and to say that I did not know you but former Judge Councilman Huckaby is the one who told me about you, about the great work that you had done for the City of Shreveport and certainly you were one of his admirers and I'd just like to say, thank you and God bless you.

Councilman Gibson: Mr. Gardner and I can't tell you, I have first hand experience working with you. That resume that was just read off doesn't do you justice or your family justice. Obviously you continue to invest your time and effort into this community to try to do everything in your power to make it a better place. In fact, I think you truly exemplify what I consider what, if anyone wants to look at a legacy because I think you know what legacy is in terms of

leaving something behind a little bit better than what you found and it is something you and I've discussed at a lot of different occasions in terms of the things we are looking at and are going to be challenged with in the near future with this City whether it be infrastructure, whether it be job creation, whether it be just personal reinvestment into our neighborhoods and you Sir, are truly a pioneer and it has been a pleasure. I will continue to experience the pleasures of working with you, so thank you very much.

Councilman Carmody: Just for perspective, Mayor how old were you when you were elected to the Mayor?

Mr. Gardner: 30.

Councilman Carmody: You were 30-years old. Gentlemen, look around this body. It is always a pleasure to speak with you Mr. Gardner and you are certainly one of the first citizens of this community and as a member of this body, now for the second time, I can honestly say that we stand on the shoulders of giants and you are certainly one of those giants and I thank you for your service.

Mayor Hightower: I think it might be appropriate, following Thomas' question to ask you, you were 30 when you started, Mayor. When did you start losing your hair?

Councilman Gibson: You don't have to answer that.

Mayor Hightower; I suspect about 31.

Councilman Gibson: Mr. Gardner don't answer that, those are beauty marks and you know it.

Mayor Hightower: I too am certainly grateful at the foundation that you laid to enable everybody that is sitting up here today to be able to serve the citizens in the neighborhoods that they do and without folks like you and Councilman Huckaby and others, we would probably not have as a united city as we do, we probably would not have grown to the extent we've grown and again I appreciate you for your foresight and the foundation that you laid to make this a place that everybody that lives here is truly proud to live.

Mr. Gardner: Thank you very much.

RESOLUTION NO. 75 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION TO PROUDLY RECOGNIZE CADDO COUNCIL ON AGING, CHRISTUS SCHUMPERT HEALTH SYSTEM AUXILIARY VOLUNTEER GUILD, SENIOR FRIENDS, AND THE WOMEN'S DEPARTMENT CLUB FOR THEIR ACTIVE PARTICIPATION IN THE AMERICAN CANCER SOCIETY TELL A FRIEND PROGRAM AND OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO

BY: COUNCILMAN CARMODY

WHEREAS, breast cancer is the most common cancer among women and ranks 2nd among cancer deaths in women.

WHEREAS, the two greatest risk factors for breast cancer are being a woman and growing older.

WHEREAS, mammography is the best tool for early detection.

WHEREAS, there is a 97%, five-year survival rate when breast cancer is detected and treated in localized stages.

WHEREAS, women age 65 and older are least likely to get a mammogram and more likely to develop breast cancer.

WHEREAS, according to the 2000 Louisiana Census there are 21,233 women age 65 and older living in Caddo Parish.

WHEREAS, 61.1% of Caddo Parish women age 65 and older did not receive a mammogram in 2001.

WHEREAS, the majority of women age 65 and older qualify for a yearly mammogram under Medicare Part B, yet only 38.9% of these women in Caddo Parish received the benefit in 2001.

WHEREAS, the American Cancer Society Tell A Friend program strives to increase mammography utilization in this focus population to reduce breast cancer deaths in Caddo Parish.

WHEREAS, four senior organizations in Caddo Parish recently participated in the American Cancer Society Tell A Friend program resulting in 453 senior women that received the life-saving information on the importance of mammography.

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 proudly recognizes Caddo Council on Aging, Christus Schumpert Health System Auxiliary Volunteer Guild, Senior Friends, and the Women’s Department Club for their active participation in the American Cancer Society Tell A Friend Program. Their personal commitment to increase mammography utilization for women age 65 and older in Caddo Parish will save the lives of mothers, sisters, daughters and friends in our community. We salute you for making a difference in Shreveport.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this resolution shall be executed in multiple originals with one original each presented to Caddo Council on Aging, Christus Schumpert Health System Auxiliary Volunteer Guild, Senior Friends, the Women’s Department Club and one original filed in perpetuity in the office of the Clerk of Council for the City of Shreveport.

/s/James Edward Green, Chairman
Council District F

/s/Calvin B. Lester, Jr.

Council District A

/s/Thomas G. Carmody, Jr.

Council District C

/s/Jeffrey A. Hogan

Council District E

/s/R. M. “Monty”

Walford

Council District B

/s/Michael G. Gibson

Council District D

/s/Theron J. Jackson

Council District G

Councilman Carmody: Very quickly ladies, if you would not mind standing for just a moment, I did want to at least recognize the fact that the Caddo Council of Aging, represented by Rhonda Howard reached 160 senior women, the

Christus Schumpert Health System Auxiliary Volunteer Guild represented by Susan Hall and Tina Dinger they reached 173 senior women, the Senior Friends represented by Doris Leslie reached 50 senior women, and the Woman's Department Club represented by Betty Mayo reached 70 senior women. Because of their dedication of these four organizations, 453 senior women in Shreveport received this life saving information on the importance of this particular benefit. Ladies, I would like to thank you on behalf of the citizens of the City of Shreveport. We do have Certificates of Appreciation which have been signed by all of the members of this Council and they are being prepared right now. I will make sure that each of you receives yours.

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

RESOLUTION NO. 76 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION DECLARING A MORATORIUM ON THE ISSUANCE OF SIGN PERMITS IN THE B-4, CENTRAL BUSINESS DISTRICT AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the B-4, Central Business District ("District") is the symbolic, managerial, and cultural focal point of the City of Shreveport; and

WHEREAS, the completion of several key projects has increased development in the District resulting in a significant economic and cultural impact upon the City of Shreveport; and

WHEREAS, the District's unique characteristics and liberal regulations (narrower streets, absence of set-back requirements, unlimited hours of operation, etc) are designed and intended to further development in the District subject to limitations designed to prevent congestion and visual clutter while cognizant of scale and dimension; and

WHEREAS, the proliferation of new or expanded businesses within the District has lead to a corresponding increase in the number of signs or other advertisements within the District. Left unregulated, this proliferation of signage may have a detrimental impact upon further development within the District thereby stifling further economic growth and development both within the District and the City of Shreveport as a whole; and

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport, while cognizant of the rights and desires of business owners or others in the B-4 District to advertise their businesses or present their message, intends to undertake a comprehensive study of the regulations governing outdoor signage within the District with a view toward maintaining and improving property values and the economic welfare and development in the District; and

WHEREAS, it is intended that the study of the regulations governing outdoor signage within the B-4 District will result in significant and substantial amendments to the outdoor signage ordinance; and

WHEREAS, potential loss of economic value of properties in the B-4 District may result if sign permits continue to be issued before the completion of the study and

the adoption of regulations governing on-premises outdoor advertising within the District.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened, hereby finds it in the public interest to declare an immediate moratorium on the issuance of on-premise outdoor sign permits within the B-4, Central Business District.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this moratorium shall not apply to the issuance of sign permits for: 1) the installation or construction of “signs applied directly or indirectly on the exterior walls of buildings”, which, for purposes of this moratorium are defined to mean signs which do not project above the parapet or roof ridge line of the building to which it is attached or greater than twelve inches beyond any permanent vertical wall surface or awning; or 2) the repair or replacement of signs in existence in the District on the effective date of this moratorium which have been damaged by an Act of God or other catastrophic events or occurrences not attributable to the owner, tenant or lessee of the property upon which the sign is located.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that this moratorium shall remain in effect until December 31, 2003.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that if any provision of this resolution of 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 Walford, seconded by Councilman Carmody for passage.

Councilman Jackson: I did receive information in reference to this particular item. Who is the author of this, Madame Clerk?

Ms. Lee: That line is blank, I'm not sure who it is.

Councilman Walford: This [resolution] comes from the Metropolitan Planning Commission.

Councilman Jackson: From the Metropolitan Planning Commission.

Councilman Walford: It is a resolution and it comes from the MPC.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Kirkland, made reference in this resolution on doing some kind of comprehensive study?

Mr. Kirkland: Yes.

Councilman Jackson: Whose doing that?

Mr. Kirkland: The Staff will do that in conjunction with members of the Downtown Property Owner Group as well as DDA. We are not anticipating a long drawn out process. In fact over the last year, we have been working with a number of proponents of new and different signage in the B-4 and it is a good problem to have in that we've had pressure from businesses, new businesses and others wanting to locate in the district, some of which have already located there.

What the most difficult thing to deal with on signage, is understanding 1. that owners value almost more than anything in business, their right to have a sign. And so when you start dealing with changes in those regulations then many businesses might try to go through a window or a door that is there as opposed to waiting until the regulations are heard and decided, ultimately by you the City Council. This comes from the experience I had about fifteen years ago in this City where we chaired an On-Off Premise Sign Committee for almost 2 years. And what happened to us because we didn't do a moratorium, some businesses went out, jumped the gun, took what amounted to an unfair advantage and others waited. But so when we are asking for a moratorium this time, is to keep that playing field level.

It will not prohibit any new business from putting a sign up. It will also allow us, now they can't put up any new sign. They can put up any sign. They can put up applied wall sign to identify their business, and frankly, that's about 80% to 90% of the signage in the B-4 District, now. And in fact Councilman, I had tried to reach you several times and you were out of town and I was going to show you some of the examples that we've been dealing with. In fact I've got a meeting tomorrow in my office with some of the folks that are proposing some signage changes about the Red River Entertainment District. And we are not certain what direction those are going to take, but we hope to take a positive, pro-approach to these regulations and look at any and all of those to promote all the businesses in the, not only the B-4, but the Entertainment District as well.

Councilman Jackson: Well it looks as if from the letter of what's here, that it in fact talked about economic development, it talked about perhaps this signage even being a deterrent to development and to economic development and to the quality of that same development in that area. I guess, I had just kind of 2 or 3 issues: 1. I think you've answered, it doesn't affect anybody who is currently down there now?

Mr. Kirkland: No.

Councilman Jackson: 2. What is the period of the moratorium?

Mr. Kirkland: It would be until December 31, 2003 and my anticipation is that within 60 days from this date, we the Staff and others (DDA Staff and others) that are involved will have some regulation proposed to the Metropolitan Planning Commission. There will be public hearings that any citizen can come to, to advise of whether they think they are good or bad and whatever changes. Then those recommendations would come forward to you, I would hope to this City council no later than about the first or end of November, and therefore, you would then have the right to vote prior to the moratorium expiring.

In any event as someone said earlier, I believe it may have been the Mayor, you the Council if you can adopt this moratorium, if you find some reason that it is not in the best interest of the City, you can abandon this and declare it null and void at any time as well.

Councilman Jackson: And I understand. And I guess my whole philosophy has been such that, as a good carpenter will tell you: *you measure twice and cut once* and I would suggest very often we talk about voting for something and then we come back and we can change it, but I think if we give the appropriate amount

of thought to it in the beginning and then we won't have to come back and change it. And, so in that same spirit I understand you all trying to study and to move this forward. I just think that when you talk about loss of economic value and value of properties and those kinds of things, that those businesses are concerned about loss of property and loss of other things even during this moratorium period, I would suggest that those businesses in my opinion ought not be saddled with, what I see as an encumbrance of not being able to do anything until December 31st, assuming after December 31st or whatever time, we/the moratorium would be over and we would have voted to say no more new signs or whatever the case may be then those businesses during this period of time were not able to take advantage of whatever signage they would have used, whatever they would have put out there, whatever is a part of their long term plan whether it be their investment plan, or whatever for that particular business.

I don't understand why we need a moratorium if in fact, those folks who are in that B-4 understand where we are going. I'd allow them to make their investment and it is not their fault that the City doesn't have in place either an ordinance or something that when they came here, it wasn't in place. And I see this as a way of temporarily handcuffing them until we make a decision. And I guess I would always side on the side of that business owner and allowing him to do what he or she perceived that they would be able to do in the beginning before any kind of government intervention. I think government has a specific role in play in business, I mean, as it relates to the field of business. I don't think this one of them. For us, I understand, I think long term putting something place may be the right thing to do, but I just don't want to see us temporally hand cuff them while we do that.

Mr. Kirkland: Councilman the only thing I can say, keep the playing field level until the new rules are put in place. And there are certain circumstances, and this is one that I would strongly urge this Council to adopt this moratorium and I understand and I heard what you said and I appreciate that. I lived in the private sector for 23 years of my life and I understand the importance and value of signage. I also understand government not infringing n the rights of the private sector, 99% of the time that is exactly where I am going to be. In this case, I am strongly urging this Council to adopt this moratorium so that we keep this playing field level, in our B-4. I believe Ms. Scott who drafted this resolution has captured, rather well, in a succinct way what the real issues are, and the reason we are asking your support.

Councilman Jackson: Again, I would say this to this Council the that, I understand these issues and I think he has a valid point. Again, I still think that lack of planning on our part ought not constitute an emergency on the business owner's part to be able or to have to stop doing what they were planning to do and those kind of things because we are putting something in place, now. I just really would hope that we as a Council would consider that and then I'd ask Mr. Kirkland, as well, I know we are talking about a B-4 District right now. There are some very gaudy and ridiculous looking signage all around many of these low-income communities that I wish this Council and our City could do something about prohibiting folks from doing those kind of signs, as well. I understand our

B-4 and our Downtown District, but I think that the Councilman who represents that area has areas in his district that are more than just B-4 and I think we ought to show equal concern for those areas outside of our B-4 district where these signs are, in my opinion, polluting our community with ads for liquor and cigarettes, for the most part. So, I would just hope that we could consider that and take a more universal approach to this because this is a good idea, but I just think that it just needs to get beyond downtown.

Councilman Lester: As I appreciate it, this moratorium in terms of signage advertising will only apply to B-4 areas?

Mr. Kirkland: That is correct.

Councilman Lester: And is it also correct that we already have some type of rules and regulations and procedure in terms of signage in other parts of the City?

Mr. Kirkland: Yes. We do.

Councilman Lester: One of my concerns as Councilman Jackson has very eloquently articulated is, us changing the rules in the middle of the stream. I don't think that is fair. Certainly coming from the background that I have and others come from, sometimes we are a lot more sensitive to that than other people are.

My concern certainly is if we are going to make these regulations, let make them in a way that it does not denigrate a business owner and his free exercise and certainly I'm sensitive to idea of any type of censorship of commercial free speech. So, I have been satisfied in talking with Ms. Scott in your office that we are not in fact limiting commercial free speech and that this moratorium goes only to signage and does not get into the areas of dealing of content, what we like, we don't like and things of that nature because certainly I think would subject us to litigation which we don't want--of course, *litigation* isn't a bad word to all of us.

But having said that, I just would ask and reiterate as we, you and I met, that we do this in an expeditious fashion so that the businesses that want to locate in that area have some idea of what they are going to be looking at in terms of future regulations so that they aren't hampered from doing businesses in a manner they have contemplated because certainly, I think one of the reputations that we have earned for better or for worse in the City of Shreveport is, we are all for you if you like you and if we don't like you, we will change the rules and I don't think that is message that needs to be sent forward.

So, with that, I would voice my support and ask that we again, be as expeditious as possible so that we don't hamper our business community because at the end of the day or business community is the engine that is driving the wagon in terms of what we are trying to do up here.

Councilman Carmody: Very quickly, just to address Councilman Jackson's concern. The particular signage that you were saying was detrimental to the community that targets particular products at individuals, that is off-premise signage. And as Mr. Kirkland was saying, about 15 years ago, the City had gone through a re-write of the off-premise sign ordinance including prohibiting billboards in the B-4 District.

And so, the billboards that you see downtown were grandfathered in, those that come down, they are not allowed to be put back up. I commend the MPC for coming forward to say that now, we need to start taking a look at what our downtown signage requirements are and in order to get a uniform code that everybody can live by and all businesses can understand, we'd like to take this opportunity to basically put the moratorium on the issuance of any more permits so that we don't have a rush of permits for people to say, well I've got an idea. I want to put up a great big sign and put it up 200 feet in the air and advertise my business. Well, this will give us a chance to get a uniform sign ordinance in the B-4 District and I'm in support of it.

Councilman Jackson: When would the moratorium go into effect?

Mr. Kirkland: As I appreciate it, that is a matter for the lawyers, but I believe within a few days, I am not sure. Mr. Thompson, do you know? Mrs. Glass?

Mrs. Glass: I believe under the Charter it is seven (7) days after the Mayor's signature.

Councilman Jackson: What do we do in the event that someone is already making investments on signage for their particular buildings even prior to now, that don't have them up?

Mr. Kirkland: Someone that has got a sign that is considered a detriment, is that the question, what do we do?

Councilman Jackson: No, no, no. We are taking a moratorium on any kind of a sign.

Mr. Kirkland: It is only on on-premise.

Councilman Jackson: Any kind of on-premise sign. If someone is already in the process of getting one done, say right now?

Mr. Kirkland: If they are permitted and have a right to do it, that would proceed.

Councilman Jackson: So it is just after the seven (7) days we will cease issuing those permits, at that point?

Mr. Kirkland: What we will issue once this moratorium is in effect will be any on premise sign permit that is applied to a wall of a business which is the typical signage, I want to say 80- to 90% of the businesses in the B-4 district.

Councilman Jackson: Got you.

Mr. Kirkland: And then the other signage, off-premise signage that is in the B-4 now, they can continue to get permits to repair, maintain, whatever they need to do to keep that signage in place; so we won't disturb their rights at all.

Councilman Gibson: I call for the question.

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

RESOLUTION NO. 77 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION SUSPENDING THE EFFECTS OF CERTAIN PROVISIONS OF CHAPTER 10 RELATIVE TO ALCOHOLIC BEVERAGES AND CHAPTER 106 RELATIVE TO ZONING FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 6200 BERT KOUNS

INDUSTRIAL LOOP EXPRESSWAY FOR THE BETTY SPEARS MEMORIAL CANCER RUN ON JUNE 21, 2003, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

By: Councilman Hogan

WHEREAS, Buster's Bar & Grill, located at 6200 Bert Kouns Industrial Loop Expressway, intends to host the Betty Spears Memorial Cancer Run fundraiser to benefit The American Cancer Society on June 21, 2003; and

WHEREAS, Buster's Bar & Grill desires to dispense, and allow the consumption and sale of alcoholic beverages in the parking lot of the establishment during the fundraiser, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. June 21, 2003, and 2:00 a.m. June 22, 2003; and

WHEREAS, Section 106-130(6) of the Code of Ordinances provides that unless otherwise excepted, all uses shall be operated entirely within a completely enclosed structure; and

WHEREAS, the special exception approval granted to the establishment for alcoholic beverage sales, consumption and/or dispensing does not specifically authorize outside sales and/or consumption on the premises; and

WHEREAS, Section 10-80(a) of the Code of Ordinances makes it unlawful for any person to sell, barter, exchange or otherwise dispose of alcoholic beverages except within those sections of the city wherein such sale is permitted by the applicable zoning ordinance; and

WHEREAS, Section Chapter 10-103(a)(5) of the Code of Ordinances provides that the city council may suspend or revoke any permit if a retailer allows any person to consume any alcoholic beverage on the licensed premises or on any parking lot or open or closed space within or contiguous to the licensed premises without a proper license; and

WHEREAS, The Eighth Annual Betty Spears Memorial Cancer Run fundraiser is raising money for the American Cancer Society in the name Betty Spears; and

WHEREAS, the adoption of this resolution would allow the dispensing, sale and consumption of alcoholic beverages on the parking lot of Buster's Bar & Grill, 6200 Bert Kouns Industrial Loop Expressway, on June 21, 2003, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. - 2:00 a.m. for a Betty Spears Memorial Cancer Run.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened that Sections 106-130(6), 10-103(a)(5), and 10-80(a) of the Code of Ordinances are hereby suspended on June 21, 2003 from 8:00 a.m. until 2:00 a.m. June 22, 2003, for the Betty Spears Memorial Cancer Run fundraiser at Buster's Bar & Grill, 6200 Bert Kouns Industrial Loop Expressway.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that all other applicable provisions of the City of Shreveport Code of Ordinances shall remain in full force and effect.

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

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

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

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS:

1. Resolution No. 78 of 2003: A resolution authorizing the Mayor to execute an agreement between the City of Shreveport and Government Acquisitions, Inc. and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Walford for Introduction of the Resolution to lay over until the June 10, 2003 meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

INTRODUCTION OF ORDINANCES:

- 1, Ordinance No. 64 of 2003: An ordinance closing and abandoning existing utility servitude on Lot One of Galilee Subdivision located in the NE/4 of Section 2 (T17N-R14W), Caddo Parish, Louisiana and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
2. Ordinance No. 65 of 2003: An ordinance amending the 2003 budget for the Water and Sewerage Enterprise Fund and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
3. Ordinance No. 66 of 2003: An ordinance to amend and reenact Part 3, Section 100 of the Shreveport Comprehensive Building Code, the Electrical Code, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
4. Ordinance No. 67 of 2003: An ordinance amending the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport by Amending Sec. 26-109 of Chapter 26, Division 2 of Article IV, Fees, relative to charging fees for services rendered by the Department of Operational Services; and to repeal, amend and reenact certain provisions of the Code relative to same and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
5. Ordinance No. 68 of 2003: An ordinance amending the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport by adding Sec. 34-55 of Chapter 34, Division II of Article II, Floods, relative to charging fees for information pertaining to flood zone determinations, legal descriptions, right of way information and any other related services or information provided by the City Engineering Map Room; and to

repeal, amend and reenact certain provisions of the Code relative to same and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

6. Ordinance No. 69 of 2003: An ordinance amending the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport by adding Sec. 78-42 of Chapter 78, Division 1 of Article II, Streets relative to charging inspection fees for work done by private entities on streets and drainage properties intended to be donated to the City for public use; and to repeal, amend and reenact certain provisions of the Code relative to same and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
7. Ordinance No. 70 of 2003: An ordinance amending the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport by amending Sec. 94-44 of Chapter 94, of Article II, Utilities, relative to charging inspection fees for work done by private entities on water and sewer properties intended to be donated to the City for public use; and to repeal, amend and reenact certain provisions of the Code relative to same and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
8. Ordinance No. 71 of 2003: An ordinance amending Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, rezoning the north side of Greenwood Road, 500 feet west of Curtis Lane, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, from R-1D, Urban, One-family Residence District, to R-1D-E, Urban, One-Family Residence/Extended Use District, "limited to a dog kennel and pet boarding as applied for", only, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Carmody, seconded by Councilman Walford for Introduction of the Ordinances to lay over until the June 10, 2003 meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

ORDINANCES ON SECOND READING AND FINAL PASSAGE:

1. Ordinance No. 50 of 2003: An ordinance amending the 2003 General Fund Budget and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on May 13, 2003 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Carmody seconded by Councilman Lester for adoption.

The Deputy Clerk read the following amendment:

By: Councilman Gibson

AMEND THE ORDINANCE AS FOLLOWS:

In Paragraph 2. Appropriations:

Under Office of the Mayor decrease **Personal Services** by \$47,400

Under Public Assembly and Recreation decrease **Personal Services** by \$191,500 and **Transfer to Fleet Services** by \$2,700

Under Finance decrease **Personal Services** by \$94,700

Under General Government decrease **Transfer to MPC Fund** by \$19,800, **Transfer to Retained Risk Fund** by \$5,100, **Transfer to Community Development Fund** by \$18,300

Under Police increase **Personal Services** by \$116,100

Under Operational Services decrease **Personal Services** by \$ 70,100, **Transfer to Fleet Services** by \$23,600 and increase **Improvements and Equipment** by \$451,00

Under City Council decrease increase **Personal Services** by \$19,400

Under City Court decrease **Personal Services** by \$49,500

Under City Marshal decrease **Personal Services** by \$25,000

And adjust the totals and subtotals accordingly.

EXPLANATION OF THE AMENDMENT

This amendment puts a City-wide freeze on all merit increase commences on June 15, 2003 and ending on September 15, 2003. It also calls for unpaid furloughs for all administrative support and administrative management personnel (except Public Works, Police and Fire department Personnel). These furloughs shall be two (2) days per month, per employee. These unpaid furloughs shall be taken on the last day of each pay period and shall begin on June 15, 2003 and end on September 15, 2003.

This amendment restores asphalt overlay for city streets and restores the late fall 2003 Shreveport Police Training Academy for new police officers.

Motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Walford (for discussion) for adoption of the amendment.

Councilman Gibson: Seeing that several of my budget amendments were shot down earlier, I want to comment. I seem to be the only one up here that sees some real troubles coming to the City's way. And this has not gone without some

thought on my behalf in terms of the concerns I have within my district and city wide.

1. This city has some serious problems on revenue coming into this City that I predict will continue for the next 18 to 24 months. The reason for that is, the lion's share of the construction and design in this community and business has already taken place with General Motors, the casinos and other entertainment venues. We are hopeful that we are going to see some growth through the Convention Center, but there is no assurances with that particular project as we see right now.

Right now, this City is faced with migration of population. I think the 2000 Census shows that we have been losing population. Over 30% of this community is 65 or older. The only reason why I mention that is the spending habits of our experienced community, when they were 20, 30, 40, 50 years old, they were spending money, building homes, buying cars and things of that nature.

Once they reached retirement age, they are not going to be able to be out there spending the money. That's going to affect our tax base, affect in a big time way of which Shreveport hasn't seen in probably its history.

Aging of infrastructure. The Mayor submitted and again I applaud him for a pro-active measure and a 4.5% cut. We sat right up here in November and December as a Council, heard cut after cut after cut. What was the first thing we did the first week? We tried to pound with budget amendments. We asked to wait until April or May to see where the revenue stream fell. Now, we are in a revenue shortfall and we are cutting 4.5%.

Aging infrastructure is not going to go away, ladies and gentlemen. It is only going to get worse. Each year that goes by exponentially it is like an old car. You hold your breath hoping that the engine doesn't go out or the transmission doesn't go out, or the tires don't go out. We got some great people out in the audience I see, out in Public Works that hold together with bailing wire just about and chewing gum, in some cases, to keep this City moving but again they can't do it without resources.

Outsourcing of work has been unbelievable. It is not just in this Administration. It has been going on this town for years. An estimate of over \$900,000,000 worth of construction design has been outsourced to out of region, out of state companies. That company could have stayed here locally, staying circulating 4 to 5 times over building tax base, over and over again. Now we are sitting here with a 4.5% cut. And we are going to continue to say, lets give merit increases. Yeah, I'm the first to say, we've got some great people in our City that are doing great things but when you are cutting a budget 4.5% and taxpayers expect services, streets, water and sewerage, and drainage and garbage pick up, police and fire and you are cutting 30% out of Overlay and you are cutting Police Academy right off the bat. I will suggest to you that come August or September, we are going to be right back at the table looking at another proposal from the Administration and this time it is going to be some deep cuts with employees.

I would suggest to you and again, that is why I said, lets start at the top. Lets look at the Mayor, look at the City Council, look at administrative management, administrative support because if we don't start now, ladies and

gentlemen, it is going to be pink slip time coming out and I think that most people during the summer time wouldn't mind looking at a change in terms of a furlough, an unpaid furlough versus what may be coming in the near future and that near future is just like where we were in November and December. I am very concerned about where we are. Nothing the Administration has done in terms of revenue. That is something, again, Mayor no disrespect, but this isn't a national economy issue. This is local economy of which it is going to continue to get tougher and tougher. We got people building out in Greenwood, Bossier City, and other places, that money doesn't come back in here in property taxes.

So, when we talk about making hard choices, I think that this is just the tip of the iceberg. The tip of the ice berg. I which we didn't have to talk about these things. I wish we didn't have to talk about golf courses and things of that nature, but again, hard choices are going to have to be made. We talked about a wait and see mentality.

We didn't talk a wait and see mentality in November and December on proposals. This is a proposal that we know right now we got revenue shortfall. We can't wait depend on a million dollar settlement out of the Pirates to save our behinds on this thing. That is a short term solution to a long term problem. Aging streets, aging water and sewer system, are not going to go away.

We are maxed out on our bond capacity. I will suggest that even if we had a bonding opportunity right now, the trust that the taxpayers have with this City, is suspect, at best. And we are going to have to work hard to gain that trust back. I think that this City Council and this Administration are up to the task of doing so, but again, I think it is up to us to set the tone, set the example to do the things to anticipate what is on the horizon. It isn't going to change. Even if the economy was turning right now and turned by the end of the year, we would not see those effects until some times in the next budget period. Best case scenario. The only thing we got going for us right now in terms of economy in residential and commercial construction is the low interest rates. Thank goodness that we do have low interest rates both here locally and nationally. If it wasn't for that, we would be sitting here with no choice in terms of what we were going to do with our city employees.

So, again this isn't a heartless City Councilman up here, believe me. I gave thought, after thought, prayed over this, time and time again, what was the right thing to do. But if you take pro-active measures, you can avoid the inevitable and it is going to be a tough decision. A tough decision that each one of us are going to be affected in our respected district, at some point in time whether it be a new street, whether it be a drainage project for a neighborhood, whether it be more police officers out there of which my district is in desperate need of more police officers out there and we are already short, but this is just a temporary band-aid over a major hemorrhage of the patient and right now, I submit to you. It is tough. We knew when we all ran for office with the exception of Mr. Carmody, who was back, he already knew first hand we were going to be dealing with major problems and the biggest problem we had was a budget issue that was not going to go away anytime soon; that's all I have to say at this point and time.

Councilman Jackson: I just also would like to add as Mr. Gibson has said. It may seem like it hard choices.

To do away with merit pay, I understand the desire to do that, but as I appreciate it, maybe Mr. Antee or the Mayor can help on this, merit pay raises are the only kind of pay raises most people get. Is that correct? And without merit pay raises, what you simple do is you hurt the people who is at the bottom whose only hope to get pay raises are merit pay raises, and so my initial discontent with this is particular amendment was that the Mayor talked about the people being the sacred cow and not wanting to sacrifice the people. While Councilman Gibson said we are going probably have to sacrifice some people in September or whatever, I would like to deal with that in September when that comes up rather than even trying to anticipate that at this particular point because I don't know what the Administration used as it relates to indicators and all those financial indicators to make their decision nor do I know what indicators Councilman Gibson used but when I juxtapose the two, I will go with the one that will keep people paid versus the one that will not give them an opportunity to get a pay raise at all.

Councilman Lester: I understand where Councilman Gibson is coming from and I think he is to be commended, because it is obvious that Councilman Gibson put in a lot of thought and hard work into each and every last one of these amendments, so I commend him for that. And I understand his desire to deal with a serious problem up front.

My concern again, in terms of certainly what our merit increases and taking those away from our city employees. The fact of the matter is: 1. Our city employees are poorly paid to being with. 2. I don't claim to be an economist from the Keynesian or the other school of economics, but as I appreciate when you take money out of the economy, it slows the economy down and so certainly, I would not be in favor of doing anything that is going to take money out of the economy. As, I appreciate it, studies show that any increase that you make in the lower age earning bracket in terms of increased minimum wage or anything like almost invariably winds up right back into your economy in terms of further purchases. Most of the people that we are dealing with on these merit pay raises in our City aren't folks that are in the scenario of their building wealth or things of that nature, these are folks that are just working hard from pay check to pay check trying to survive. And so for us to do away with that benefit, and again, merit pay raises aren't something that automatically happens. It is not a scenario that you are going to get the payraise like social promotion, but certainly I just would ask that, we don't take money out of the economy but we inject the money into the economy and I just don't think that this particularly the way to go.

Certainly I believe that there are some issues that we have Councilman Gibson and he and I have shared those. I mean, certainly when you get to a scenario where you represent a district like mine in District A where CDBG money is the lifeblood of dealing with your infrastructure problems then you have scenarios where CDBG funds is paid to developers to pay for revenues that they have generated and they are not paying their bills and you can draw a direct one-to-one correlation to some developers not paying his or her obligations to the City

under a CDBG scenario and the Overlay scenario. So I mean, I think a lot of those things are things that we need to discuss and I'm ready to discuss them with the Administration at the appropriate time, but in this particular instance I don't believe that the furlough and the doing away with the merit pay raises is the way to go. I understand your desire. I think it is headed in the right direction, I just don't think that we need to go that way at this particular time.

Councilman Walford: I seconded it for discussion and we got a great deal of discussion and I've got to commend Councilman Gibson. He has put a lot into this. He and I have had a number of telephone conversations. He is truly committed to what he is doing. There is nothing I would rather be able to do than not cancel the Police Training Class and keep over laying streets and I'm hoping that, that is not a cancellation of the class but delaying it into early next budget year, but I can't support these because, like the comments that have been made, I don't support the furloughs which effectively takes 9% of someone's pay out of their pocket. And, I feel like merit raises, as we've said are the only way our employees right now are getting a raise and I'm not ready to cut that so with that said, Mike I commend you for your efforts. I think you've put a lot into it, right now I can't support it.

Councilman Gibson: Just one follow up. Again, I have deep concerns about what the future holds in terms of economy, in terms of lay offs that are happening in the private sector right now here in Shreveport, that right now we are faced with voting a 4.5% cut. We can call it anything you want but it is a cut. In those cuts, Departments heads themselves recommended layoff and again I commend Mayor Hightower for what in my opinion is the inevitable, but you the employees and the taxpayers of Shreveport, the taxpayers expect minimum services, that is why they pay taxes. Employees expect a pay check for providing the services that they are paid to do. I think at the end of the day when we come up later this year, I will be able to look each and every one of the employees, if they receive a pink slip which I hope I'm the first one just as my Councilman did earlier admitting, I will be the first to apologize to everybody out there in audience to say, I was dead wrong, but the question is, what if.

At the trend we are going and again in November and December my fellow colleagues sat there in a room up on the 2nd floor for three solid weeks, Department Head after Department Head came and presented their case in terms of budgets, every one of them said I been asked to cut "x", I've been asked to cut "y" and we cut "x". And, we cut "y" and then guess what, five months later we are back to cutting again 4.5% and I'll suggest to you unemployment is not getting, employment levels aren't getting better, they are getting worse. Again, our major projects have come and gone. Thanks goodness we had the opportunity with the Convention Center, that's a major shot in the arm for the community but that is not going to be salvation just like General Motors is not going to be the salvation of the City by itself most of which have already been completed out there.

But the fact is when it comes down to the end of the day and some of the employees I've talked to taking a furlough versus losing their job completely, from the response I heard was, that's no decision there but again, I respect each

one of my colleagues. Again, maybe somewhere down the line some of this information if it doesn't pass could be used for future considerations. Again, streets, water, sewer, drainage, police and fire, that's what you pay your taxes for and we are already cutting, that was the first thing that we cut out of this last budget round. My question is, what is going to be cut the next go around?

Mayor Hightower: One final comment, first of all I would publicly like to thank Mike for again, heightening the awareness of situation that we are in, but again, when we started looking at budget cuts, the sacred cow was our employees. I believe that the guy up top has to stand behind the guys at the bottom and they doing a heck of a job, there is no doubt about it, that most of them have jobs that most of us would never considering doing.

I think that it is up to us to continue, in our community—Mike I think you made a good point when you said when you started talking about local economy. I think we can hugely affect our local economy by believing, by continuing to march forward, and we've done that over the past 2 years since 911 happened. We didn't stop projects. We continued to move forward. We continued to move bond issue projects to the forefront to get them on the street, to get them into the hands of the construction professionals in our community. And we continue to move with all of the other major efforts that we have out there to continue to let the private sector understand that, we are not going to succumb to the national trend, that we can support ourselves, and we have to continue to invest and part of what we have to invest in is the people that work for us and we continue to do that.

And, I think when you take a step back and you look at 4 ½ years ago when I became Mayor of this City, we started cutting the budget back then during took times and I certainly think it paid dividends today in that we are not having to let any of these folks go and we are not having to do furloughs to make it to the end of 2003, but we are asking to do more probably than they have every done before because we have roughly 200 less employees at City Hall than we had four years ago—hard to believe but it is true and it is because we've got people out there that like their jobs, that want to keep their jobs, that want to impress and want to continue to get those e merit pay increases; so, I think the system has worked.

Over the past four years (Tom correct me if I'm wrong) but I think we've only had one cost of living increase and we all know that the cost of living has gone up over the past 4 years, but we didn't feel like we were in a position to provide it at any one time. So merit pay I think is imperative to reward these guys that that are doing, again, more of a job than they had to do 4 years ago.

And, from my view point at least, the City is cleaner, we are in better shape than we were 4 years ago from an infrastructure stand point. We just had some struggles to go through over the past 4 years, 8 years, 12 years, 16 years. You know, is the infrastructure going to get worse before it gets better? You know, every single day, every street get worse, and every single day we can only repair a handful, so the answer to that question is an obvious, yes. It is going to get worse. It is hard to keep up with, but we are not unlike any other city in the country or any business in the country. You've got to plan, you've got to do what

you can do, you've got to afford what you can afford and you've got to take care of what you have out there and I think we've done a pretty good job of doing that. I think you guys have done a good job at guiding the way through the budget process earlier in the year, and again, we don't want to go off track. I think about the only place that we may be off track on that is \$400,000+ thousand dollars on asphalt overlay. Good news sometimes happens to those that are patient and some times you just get luckily. In this case Councilman Serio (back on the prior Council) insisted that we go after. . . putting that into a police academy or something that has obviously ongoing expense attached to it. So, this is non-recurring revenue and we'll put it to the one time cuts.

You know, I like everyone else want to have more policeman on the streets. I've probably been on the biggest proponents for more police and money going into the Police budget than maybe any Council member in history, I don't know. But again sometimes good things happen when you tighten your belt a little bit.

We're not going to lose the policeman off the street through this even losing the class losing people to the war in Iraq. The Police Department has had to tighten their belt and move people out from behind desk back behind steering wheels which that's where the real policing goes on as far as our citizens see, as far as deterring crime. I don't think there's too many criminals out there that are scared to death of a bunch of police officers sitting behind the desk at City Hall.

So, again I don't want anyone in the community to think that for one minute that there is less police patrols, that there is less presence on the street, that there's less of a desire to crack down on and stop criminal activity in our city; that's not the case.

Again, Mike, 1. I applaud your efforts to dive in and try to say, we do have problems and we do. All cities have 'em and will always have 'em and I think we all have to search for solutions. And you've tried to do that in this case however, I would urge the Council to defeat those proposed amendments. I think that again, our Department Heads know what they can work with and what they can survive with and I think our Budget Analysts have done their job.

And again, you don't ever say *never*, we may be back, but I think first things first and before we go cutting jobs. Once, we go cutting jobs, make no mistake, we're cutting services. If we don't have 'em standing out on street corners with three holding onto a shovel—some ditch isn't going to get dug or somebody's garbage won't get picked up if we let people go; so, in an effort to maintain City services to a level that our constituency expects, we have to keep the people on that we have. So, I would ask that you give our budget proposal an opportunity to succeed and hang onto the jobs that we have out there now.

Councilman Jackson: Call for question.

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

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

2. Ordinance No. 51 of 2003: An ordinance amending the 2003 budget funding contractual services provided to Sportran by Metro Management Associates, Inc. and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on May 13, 2003 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Green for adoption.

Councilman Gibson: The only question I have is what is the dollar amount that the City of Bossier is paying or don't they pay a flat fee to the City of Shreveport for access to our services?

Mayor Hightower: You're correct in they do pay a flat fee.

Mr. Dark: I'm trying to open it up as we speak to answer your question.

Mayor Hightower: I'm thinking it's \$300 and something thousand.

Councilman Gibson: If I recall, its \$300,000. I just want for the record, if I'm not mistaken in looking at the data there is approximately 175thousand riders in Bossier. Those are obviously not different people, those are obviously repetitive, but. . .

Mr. Dark: \$315(thousand).

Councilman Gibson: That's one heck of a deal when you take into account and again, I'm a little slow on some things, but the fact being is \$315,000 divided by 175,000 riders, is Bossier is getting one heck of a deal because we have to take care of the buses, we have to take care of the maintenance. We have to have all those things that go into play and I was just curious to confirm what that number was.

Mayor Hightower: One thing that I would like to comment there too, and I know its been a long time ago since I came on the Council, but Mike back in 1990, that number was \$30,000. So, we have come a long way, not that it's enough. I agree with you and if we can figure out a way just run 'em one way, over this way, not take anybody back home. Let me get you to think about that awhile.

Councilman Gibson: Mr. Chair, that is not, I don't want that to come across as a shot at the Administration. What I'm suggesting is we're going to be going through and I think Mr. Dark, you start your process with the Administration in July for next fiscal year, but again, you're going to hear this as a broken record. There are certain hot buttons that we all have up here, but from this standpoint, this City Councilman is deeply concerned about revenue and costs and there is a direct relationship between the two. And when you allow those costs to go for a long period of time, whether it be golf courses, whether it be buses, whatever it may be, eventually, we'll be back at the top item on No. 50 from Enterprise Funds running short to where then they start tapping into General

Funds and then when they start tapping into General funds, then we start cutting services and that's the only thing I'm saying.

These things are black and white and paper and that's the only thing I look at and we have got some black and white issues on paper and really in this particular case, black and red numbers that are going to be something that this City Council probably will deal with since what has been described to me, we probably won't have something like this faced us since probably '88 or '89 when this City went through some serious, serious challenges. So, again, I appreciate the Administration on that update in terms of SporTran.

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

3. Ordinance No. 52 of 2003: An ordinance amending the 2003 budget for the Community Development Special Revenue Fund and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on May 13, 2003 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Carmody seconded by Councilman Lester for adoption. The Deputy Clerk read the following amendment:

AMEND THE ORDINANCE AS FOLLOWS:

In Paragraph 1. Estimated Receipts:

Under Fiscal Year 2003 Funds, decrease **Transfer from General Fund** by \$18,300 and the subtotal and grant total by a like amount.

In Paragraph 2. Appropriations:

Under Administration decrease **Personal Services** by \$26,975 and establish **Operating Reserves** at \$48,372

Under Housing and Business Development decrease **Personal Services** by \$21,397

Under Codes Enforcement decrease **Personal Services** by \$18,300

Adjust the totals and grand totals accordingly.

EXPLANATION OF THE AMENDMENT

This amendment puts a City-wide freeze on all merit increase commences on June 15, 2003 and ending on September 15, 2003. It also calls for unpaid furloughs for all

administrative support and administrative management personnel (except Public Works, Police and Fire Department personnel). These furloughs shall be two (2) days per month, per employee. These unpaid furloughs shall be taken on the last day of each pay period and shall begin on June 15, 2003 and end on September 15, 2003.

Ms. Lee: There is an amendment to it which address the City wide freeze on the merit increases, the furloughs and the unpaid leave (unclear).

Councilman Gibson: At this point and time, I'm going to remove those. I'll remove the remaining amendments.

Mr. Thompson: Withdraw them.

Councilman Gibson: Withdraw 'em.

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

4. Ordinance No. 53 of 2003: An ordinance amending the 2003 budget for the Metropolitan Planning Commission Special Revenue Fund and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on May 13, 2003 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Carmody adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

5. Ordinance No. 54 of 2003: An ordinance amending the 2003 budget for the Retained Risk Internal Service Fund and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on May 13, 2003 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Carmody seconded by Councilman Lester adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

6. Ordinance No. 55 of 2003: An ordinance amending the 2003 budget for the Riverfront Development Special Revenue Fund and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on May 13, 2003 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Carmody seconded by Councilman Walford adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: Councilman Gibson. 1.

7. Ordinance No. 56 of 2003: An ordinance to amend Section 94-138 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport by establishing a new permitting procedure for Wastewater Discharges from restaurants into the City's Sanitary Sewer System, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on May 13, 2003 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Walford seconded by Councilman Green adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Out of Chamber: Councilman Lester. 1.

8. Ordinance No. 57 of 2003: An ordinance declaring certain city-owned property as surplus property, authorizing the exchange of same with property owned by Word of Life, Ministries, Inc., and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on May 13, 2003 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Carmody seconded by Councilman Walford to postpone the ordinance until the June 10, 2003 meeting. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Out of Chamber: Councilman Lester. 1.

9. Ordinance No. 58 of 2003: An ordinance to amend Section 26-106 of the Code of Ordinances relative to Finance and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on May 13, 2003 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Walford seconded by Councilman Green adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Out of Chamber: Councilman Lester. 1.

10. Ordinance No. 59 of 2003: An ordinance to amend Section 78-386 (b) of the City of Shreveport Code of Ordinances relative to Streets, Sidewalks and other public places and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on May 13, 2003 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Carmody seconded by Councilman Green adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Out of Chamber: Councilman Lester. 1.

11. Ordinance No. 60 of 2003: An ordinance to amend Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, as amended, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, by amending Section 106-22.7., by increasing the fee required for a Certificate of Occupancy, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on May 13, 2003 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Walford seconded by Councilman Hogan adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Out of Chamber: Councilman Lester. 1.

12. Ordinance No. 61 of 2003: An ordinance authorizing the incurring of debt and issuance of Eleven Million Dollars (\$11,000,000) of General Obligation Refunding Bonds, Series 2003B, of the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana; prescribing the form, terms and conditions of said bonds; designating the date, denomination and place of payment of said bonds; providing for the payment thereof in principal and interest; and providing for other matters in connection therewith.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, you might want to inquire of the Administration as to whether they want to postpone this one?

Mr. Antee: We do Mr. Chairman.

Having passed first reading on May 13, 2003 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Carmody seconded by Councilman Walford to postpone the ordinance until the June 10, 2003 meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Out of Chamber: Councilman Lester. 1.

13. Ordinance No. 62 of 2003: An ordinance amending and reenacting portions of Section 105.6 of Chapter 1 of the City of Shreveport Comprehensive Building Code and to and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on May 13, 2003 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Walford seconded by Councilman Green adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Out of Chamber: Councilman Lester. 1.

14. Ordinance No. 63 of 2003: An ordinance authorizing the sale of city-owned property at 2704 Frederick Street and 2730 Judson Street to qualified purchasers and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on May 13, 2003 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Carmody seconded by Councilman Walford to postpone the ordinance until the June 10, 2003 meeting. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Out of Chamber: Councilman Lester. 1.

The adopted Ordinances, follow:

ORDINANCE NO. 50 of 2003
AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2003 GENERAL FUND BUDGET AND
OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

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

WHEREAS, the City Council finds it necessary to amend the 2003 General Fund budget, based on current estimates of revenues and expenditures 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. 161 of 2002, the 2003 General Fund budget, is hereby amended as follows:

In Section 1 (Estimated Receipts):

Decrease Prior-Year Fund Balance by \$2,483,400.
Decrease Taxes and Special Assessments by \$4,700,000.
Increase Licenses and Permits by \$250,000.
Decrease External Service Charges by \$745,000.
Increase Internal Service Charges by \$300,000.
Increase Fines and Forfeitures by \$129,000.
Increase Transfer from Riverfront Development Fund by \$933,700.
Increase Miscellaneous by \$606,000.

In Section 2 (Appropriations):

In Office of the Mayor, decrease Personal Services by \$59,200, Materials and Supplies by \$7,800, Contractual Services by \$17,300, Other Charges by \$4,000 and Improvements and Equipment by \$4,700.

In SPAR, decrease Personal Services by \$256,600. Decrease Contractual Services by \$92,000.

In Finance, decrease Personal Services by \$133,200. Decrease Improvements and Equipment by \$20,500.

In General Government, decrease Personal Services by \$90,000, Contractual Services by \$20,000 and Other Charges by \$30,000. Decrease Operating Reserves by \$610,000. Decrease Transfer to MPC Fund by \$38,000. Decrease Transfer to Community Development Fund by \$90,000. Decrease Transfer to SporTran Fund by \$100,000. Decrease Transfer to Retained Risk Fund by \$768,700.

In Police, decrease Personal Services by \$921,600, Materials and Supplies by \$34,200, Contractual Services by \$6,200 and Improvements and Equipment by \$288,000.

In Fire, decrease Personal Services by \$1,040,000 and Improvements and Equipment by \$100,000.

In Operational Services, decrease Personal Services by \$424,800, Materials and Supplies by \$60,000 and Improvements and Equipment by \$451,900.

In City Council, decrease Personal Services by \$38,500, Contractual Services by \$3,500 and Improvements and Equipment by \$3,000.

Adjust all totals and subtotals accordingly.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the remainder of Ordinance No. 161 of 2002 shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

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

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

ORDINANCE NO. 51 OF 2003
ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2003 BUDGET FUNDING CONTRACTUAL
SERVICES PROVIDED TO SPORTRAN BY METRO MANAGEMENT
ASSOCIATES, INC. 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 SporTran budget, to adjust expenses and reduce the subsidy provided by the City's General Fund 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. 168 of 2002, the 2003 budget funding contractual services provided to SporTran by Metro Management Associates, Inc., is hereby amended as follows:

In Section 1 (Estimated Receipts):

Reduce City of Shreveport by \$100,000.

In Section 2 (Appropriations):

Decrease Contractual Services by \$100,000.

Adjust subtotals and totals accordingly.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the remainder of Ordinance No. 168 of 2002 shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

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

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

ORDINANCE NO. 52 OF 2003

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2003 BUDGET FOR THE COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT SPECIAL REVENUE FUND 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 budget for the Community Development Special Revenue Fund, to reduce the amount contributed by the General Fund and for other purposes.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in legal session convened, that Sections 1 and 2 of Ordinance No. 170 of 2002, the 2003 budget for the Community Development Special Revenue Fund, as amended, are hereby further amended as follows:

In Section 1 (Estimated Receipts):

Under "Fiscal Year 2003 Funds":

Decrease Transfer From General Fund by \$90,000.

In Section 2 (Appropriations):

Under "2003 Revenues":

Decrease Administration - Personal Services by \$15,000.

Decrease Codes Enforcement - Personal Services by \$30,000, Materials and
Supplies by
\$10,000,
Contractual Services by
\$15,000,
Other Charges by
\$10,000 and
Improvements and
Equipment by
\$10,000.

Adjust totals and subtotals accordingly.

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

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

ORDINANCE NO. 53 OF 2003
AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2003 BUDGET FOR THE METROPOLITAN
PLANNING COMMISSION SPECIAL REVENUE FUND 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 budget for the Metropolitan Planning Commission's Special Revenue Fund, to adjust expenses and reduce the subsidy provided by the City's General Fund 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. 167 of 2002, the 2003 budget for the Metropolitan Planning Commission's Special Revenue Fund, is hereby amended as follows:

In Section 1 (Estimated Receipts):

Reduce Operating Subsidy - Transfer from General Fund by \$ 38,000.
Increase External Service Charges and Fees by \$20,000.

In Section 2 (Appropriations):

Decrease Personal Services by \$18,000.
Adjust subtotals and totals accordingly.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the remainder of Ordinance No. 167 of 2002 shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

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

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

ORDINANCE NO. 54 OF 2003

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2003 BUDGET FOR THE RETAINED RISK INTERNAL SERVICE FUND 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 budget for the Retained Risk Internal Service Fund, to appropriate additional funds and for other purposes.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in legal session convened, that Ordinance No. 165 of 2002, the 2003 budget for the Retained Risk Internal Service Fund, be amended as follows:

In Section 1 (Estimated Receipts):

Increase Estimated Fund Balance as of 1/1/2003 by \$4,273,000.
Decrease Transfer From General Fund by \$768,700.

In Section 2 (Appropriations):

Increase Liability Reserves by \$3,504,300.

Adjust totals and subtotals accordingly.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the remainder of Ordinance No. 165 of 2002 shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

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

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

ORDINANCE NO. 55 OF 2003

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2003 BUDGET FOR THE RIVERFRONT DEVELOPMENT SPECIAL REVENUE FUND 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 budget for the Riverfront Development Special Revenue Fund, to appropriate additional funds and for other purposes.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in legal session convened, that Ordinance No. 171 of 2002, the 2003 budget for the Riverfront Development Special Revenue Fund, be amended as follows:

In Section 1 (Estimated Receipts):

Increase Estimated Fund Balance as of 1/1/2003 by \$1,114,000.

In Section 2 (Appropriations):

Increase Operating Reserves by \$180,300.

Increase Transfer to General Fund by \$933,700.

Adjust totals and subtotals accordingly.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the remainder of Ordinance No. 171 of 2002 shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect.

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

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

ORDINANCE NO. 56 OF 2003

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND SECTION 94-138 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT BY ESTABLISHING A NEW PERMITTING PROCEDURE FOR WASTEWATER DISCHARGES FROM RESTAURANTS INTO THE CITY'S SANITARY SEWER SYSTEM, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO

WHEREAS, the City requires restaurants to obtain permits for their wastewater discharges to the sanitary sewer system, as part of the City's program for controlling grease in the system;

WHEREAS, the current permitting system is administratively burdensome to the City and the restaurants, and prevents City staff from performing important field work such as monitoring for compliance;

WHEREAS, the permitting process can be made simpler by converting to a "general permit" program, which will allow the City to spend less time on administrative matters and more time in the field addressing and preventing grease-related problems;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, legal and regular session convened, as follows:

(1) The first paragraph of Section 94-138 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport is hereby amended so as to read as follows:
Section 94-138. Permits required.

(A) Industrial Users Other than Restaurants

Industrial users other than restaurants shall be required to obtain a wastewater discharge permit, and shall not commence any construction, modification or addition to any industrial facility which discharges or will discharge industrial waste without first submitting a discharge permit application.

(2) The following shall be added at the end of Section 94-138:

(B) Restaurants

Restaurants must obtain coverage under a general permit issued by the City's Department of Operational Services in order to be authorized to discharge wastewater into the sanitary sewer system. Permit coverage shall be obtained as follows:

- (a) Upon the issuance by the City of a general permit for restaurants, facilities with existing individual permits will be automatically covered by the general permit and the individual permits shall terminate, as of the effective date of the general permit.
- (b) Facilities without existing individual permits shall obtain general permit coverage by submitting a Notice of Intent to be covered by the general permit, utilizing an approved City form. General permit coverage for a facility shall be effective as of the date of receipt by the City of a properly completed Notice of Intent.
- (c) Permit fees shall be prorated and assessed as a quarterly charge on each restaurant's water bills. Continued coverage under the general permit shall be contingent upon timely payment of the quarterly charge.
- (d) Coverage under the general permit is non-transferable.

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.

ORDINANCE NO. 58 OF 2003

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND SECTION 26-106 OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT CODE OF ORDINANCES RELATIVE TO FINANCE AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO

WHEREAS, the Shreveport Police Department provides various services to the public for which a fee schedule has been set forth in Section 26-106 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport

WHEREAS, the cost of providing these services has increased with no corresponding increase in the fee schedule.

WHEREAS, the Shreveport Police Department desires an increase in the fee schedule to

reflect the increased costs of the providing the services listed in Section 26-106

NOW THEREFORE BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due,

legal and regular session convened that Section 26-106 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of

Shreveport is hereby amended and now reads as follows:

Sec. 26-106. Fee schedule for services rendered by the police department.

A fee schedule for certain services provided by the police department is hereby established as follows:

- (1) *Reports.*
 - a. *Accident reports.* Five dollars per report that does not exceed two pages and \$7.50 per report that exceeds two pages.
 - b. *Offense or incident reports.* Six dollars per report that does not exceed two pages and \$2.00 per page for each page in excess of two pages including but not limited to witness statements and supplemental reports.
- (2) *Background record checks.* Twenty dollars per individual record check, except when provided to other law enforcement agencies.
- (3) *Fingerprinting for visas, security guards, certain security procedures, various licenses, naturalizations, etc.* Twenty dollars per person, except when provided to law enforcement agencies.
- (4) *Three and one-half inch by five-inch photographs produced by officers of the police department.* Ten dollars per photograph, except when provided to other law enforcement agencies. If multiple photographs are taken, the entire package must be purchased.
- (5) *Eight-inch by ten-inch photographs produced by officers of the police department.* Twenty dollars per photograph, except when provided to other law enforcement agencies. If

multiple photographs are taken, the entire package must be purchased.

- (6) *Use of police vehicles used by off-duty police officers working off-duty jobs. Fifty dollars for the first two hours and Ten dollars for every hour thereafter, with a \$50.00 minimum. The fee for the use of police vehicles for funeral escorts is \$10.00 per funeral per vehicle used in the escort.*
- (7) *Reproduction of video cassette recordings produced by officers of the police department. Fifty dollars per video cassette recording, per incident, except when provided to other law enforcement agencies.*
8. *Reproduction of audio cassette recordings produced by officers of the police department. Twenty-five dollars per hour, with a one hour minimum, per audio cassette recording, per incident, expect when provided to other law enforcement agencies.*

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

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

ORDINANCE NO. 59 OF 2003

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND SECTION 78-386 (b) OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT CODE OF ORDINANCES RELATIVE TO STREETS SIDEWALKS AND OTHER PUBLIC PLACES AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO

WHEREAS, the Shreveport Police Department desires to increase fees for boat inspections and permits performed by them.

WHEREAS, the costs of performing these services has increased without a corresponding increase in fees since 1994.

WHEREAS, the proposed increase in fees will offset the increased cost for performance of these services.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, legal and regular session convened that Section 78-386 (b) of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport is hereby amended and now reads as follows:

Section 78-386. Permit Required; duration; waiver of fee.

- (b) Permits for all boats shall be issued for a fee of \$20.00. This permit shall be displayed on the boat in the same line and immediately following the state boat registration number.

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

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

ORDINANCE NO. 60 OF 2003

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTER 106 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES, AS AMENDED, THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT ZONING ORDINANCE, BY AMENDING SECTION 106-22, 7., BY INCREASING THE FEE REQUIRED FOR A CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY, AND BY OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, Louisiana, in due, legal and regular session convened, that Section 106-22, 7., of Chapter 106 of the Code of Ordinances, as amended, the City of Shreveport Zoning Ordinance, is hereby amended and reenacted to read as follows:

7. *Certificates of occupancy*

Issuance of certificate of occupancy **\$50.00**

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

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

ORDINANCE NO. 62 OF 2003

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING AND REENACTING PORTIONS OF SECTION 105.6 OF CHAPTER 1 OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT COMPREHENSIVE BUILDING CODE AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened, that Section 105.6 of the City of Shreveport Comprehensive Building Code is hereby amended as follows:

105.6 SCHEDULE OF PERMIT FEES

The schedule of permit fees for all construction shall be:

- 6. Commercial Construction (new construction and new additions)

- 3. The minimum permit fee for commercial projects shall be \$30.00.
- 4. Mixed Occupancy

 - 2. Permit fees for repairs, alterations, or renovations shall be calculated at the rate of \$5.00 per \$1,000 of the contract price or fraction thereof, with a minimum fee of \$30.00. A copy of the signed contract shall be provided, or in the alternative an affidavit which indicates the total contract price of the work. If neither the contract or the affidavit are provided, the permit fee shall be calculated at the rate of \$0.50 per square foot of the project, which a minimum fee of \$30.00.

- 7. Residential Construction

 - 3. Minimum permit fees for residential occupancies shall be \$30.00.
- 8. Miscellaneous Construction

For all other structures and construction, the schedule of permit fees shall be:

- g) Temporary structure (as defined in Section 501 of the Building Code) - \$5.00 per day/ \$30.00 minimum.
- h) The minimum permit fee for miscellaneous construction shall be \$30.00.
- d. Phased Construction

The permit for shelled-in buildings shall be calculated using the percentages below of the complete construction amount:

In all cases, the minimum permit fee shall be \$30.00.

- e) Demolition
The schedule for permit fees shall be as follows:

- a) Residential (1-3 units)

 - Selective Interior.....\$4.00/\$1,000
(\$30.00 minimum)

- b) Commercial (including residential with 4 or more units)

Selective Interior\$5.00/\$1,000
(\$30.00 minimum)

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that Section 105.6 of Chapter 1 of the City of Shreveport Comprehensive Building Code is hereby amended to add thereto Section 105.6 (i) to read as follows:

105.6 SCHEDULE OF PERMIT FEES

i. Plans Review Fee (Commercial)

A non-refundable plans review fee equal to twenty-five (25%) percent of the permit fee shall be charged for all commercial plan review submittals.

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

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

UNFINISHED BUSINESS:

1. Alcohol Retail Permit: Ms. Deborah Hawkins [Employer: 2901 Milam St. (Take-A-Bag Grocery)] (G/Jackson) (Special Meeting scheduled on Tuesday, April 29, 2003 at 3:00 p.m.)
2. 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)
3. Resolution No. 28 of 2003: Authorizing the Mayor to negotiate a collective bargaining agreement with PACE International Union. (Tabled on March 25)

Councilman Lester: I'm sorry Mr. Chairman, I apologize for my absence. I'm the youngest person up here, but I guess I have the weakest bladder (in reference to the comments that we made the last meeting).

Motion by Councilman Lester to remove Resolution No. 28 of 2003 from the table, seconded by Councilman Jackson.

Councilman Green: Mr. Thompson, can we do that at this time, or do we need to wait until we get to the Committee of the Whole?

Mr. Thompson: I mean, if there are no objections, you can do it at this time, otherwise you would need to suspend the rules.

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

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Gibson to adopt Resolution No. 28 [substitute].

Councilman Lester: I just wanted to say that this is . . .

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, if I could, to make sure that everybody knows what you're referring to. . . are you referring to the Substitute?

Councilman Lester: Yes, yes Mr. Chairman.

Mr. Thompson: . . .resolution that everybody would have in front of them and not the one that was originally introduced?

Councilman Lester: That's correct. I'm moving to adopt resolution---the amended resolution in terms of the PACE recognition. Mr. Chairman, Council Members, I would ask that you adopt this resolution. This resolution has been bantered about a lot by ourselves, by members of the City workers.

One of the things that I think that's important is you know we talked a lot today about the men and women that work for our City, that keep things together, many of whom are out here today and what they are asking for in this resolution is merely to be recognized as a Union with the power to have one person speak for them.

All references to collective bargaining had been removed completely. They're asking simply to be allowed to have their own representatives. To have their own people speak for them at Administrative Hearings, and I think it's a positive thing. I think anytime that City workers decide to get together and speak with one voice, I think that's going to be a positive for the City because I think it gives the workers an opportunity to have their issues heard and know that they are speaking with one voice; so, that we as a Council and an Administration does not hear a number of varied voices so that we can deal with some of the real legitimate issues that our City workers face on a day to day basis.

So, I would urge that we move forward with this amended resolution and that we adopt this resolution and recognize this group of men and women that have worked so hard for us today as a union and move forward into what I think is going to be a positive direction between relationships with our City workers and us, as Administration.

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

4. Ordinance No. 40 of 2003: Changing the names of the Shreveport Blanchard Road from the Roy Road to North Hearne Avenue, and of Ford Street from North Hearne Avenue to Pete Harris Drive, and of Caddo Street from Pete Harris Drive to the Clyde Fant Parkway to Hilry Huckaby III Avenue. (A/Lester) (*not to be adopted prior to July 8 - Tabled on April 22*)

NEW BUSINESS:

1. ABO Card appeal: Casey Price (Residence: Bossier City - Employer: Semolinas - Line Ave.)

2. Taxi Driver License appeal: Charles Caple (Residence: G/Jackson - Employer: Action Taxi) [decision rendered May 23]
3. SOB Employee Card: Kimberly Jones [decision rendered].
4. BAC-22-03, M L & FANNIE H. CALDWELL, 2216 Hollywood Avenue, Special Exception use and a variance in hours of operation in a B-2 Dist., package liquor (including daiquiris) with a drive-thru operating to Midnight Mon-Thur and 1 a.m. Fri-Sat. (B/Walford)

Councilman Green: Do we vote on that today?

Mr. Thompson: It can be resolved today Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Green: Mr. Walford, what's your pleasure?

Councilman Walford: Mr. Chairman, if I could and I'll make some comments but I would like to make a motion to postpone on this and if I can get a second, I'll discuss it.

Motion by Councilman Walford, seconded by Councilman Carmody to postpone the application until the June 10, 2003 meeting.

Councilman Walford: I really appreciate Reverend Gant being here. I had calls from the neighborhood asking that we postpone because they are confused. So, I actually support the position that Reverend Gant is taking, but in fairness to those who asked for a postponement to let them know more, I told them I would do that and I will. Reverend Gant, I'm not coping out on you sir; so, I would ask ya'll to support me on this and allow the residents and I to communicate during this two weeks.

Motion to postpone approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, and Green. 5. Nays: None. Out of Chamber: Councilman Lester and Jackson. 2.

5. Election of City Council Officers: Chairman and Vice-Chairman.

Chairman of the Council:

Councilman Green: I would like to say before the election starts that certainly it has been a pleasure for me to have served these six months and I really appreciate your vote and your support. And at this time, its time to pass the torch and at this time, I would like to nominate *Mr. Monty Walford for Chairman of the Shreveport City Council* (seconded by Councilman Gibson)

Councilman Jackson: Do we take any additional nominations or we just vote on the single nomination?

Councilman Green: We can vote on single nominations. Motion has been on him already, so it was closed. We were actually voting at this time.

Councilman Jackson: So in other words, we don't have any choices?
Councilman Lester: Right

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

Vice-Chairman of the Council:

Motion by Councilman Jackson to nominate *Councilman Calvin Lester as Vice-Chairman*, seconded by Councilman Gibson. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Carmody, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 7. Nays: None.

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS, BOARDS AND COMMITTEES: None.

CLERK'S REPORT: None.

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

ADJOURNMENT. There being no further business to come before the Council, the meeting adjourned at approximately 8:20 p.m.

/s/James Green, Chairman

/s/Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council