

COUNCIL PROCEEDINGS OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT, LOUISIANA
JUNE 24, 2003

The Regular Meeting of the City Council of the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, was called to order by Chairman Monty Walford at 3:00 p.m., Tuesday, June 24, 2003, in the Government Chambers in Government Plaza (505 Travis Street).

Councilman Gibson led the Invocation. Before I do the invocation, I'd like a moment of silence. We lost, on Sunday, one of Shreveport's outstanding citizens, Percy Sharp who was a mainstay in the business community and the civic community working in North Highlands, working with the Chamber of Commerces, both African-American Chambers and Shreveport Chambers and Bossier and Minden Chambers of Commerce.

In fact, he was also the main individual who 4 ½ years ago was able to see that we were at an impasse on I-49 North and called a breakfast with myself and John Holt and Jerry Harris who was on the Port Commission at the time to discuss how we get that project back on course.

And his vision and fortitude actually was, and that story has not been told until this time, is the reason why now we are on track to have one of the biggest economic development projects to hit Louisiana, probably for the next 25 years, but I would ask for a moment of silence in recognition of Percy Sharp.

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

Approve Minutes. Motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Hogan to approve the Administrative Conference Summary Minutes of June 9, 2003 and the Council Meeting Minutes of June 10, 2003. Motion approved by the following vote: Councilman Lester, Walford, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

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

Councilman Green: I have one. Mr. Thompson.

Mr. Thompson: We have a resolution to recognize Mr. Milton Lea Williams, I believe he's here.

Councilman Green: Mr. Williams, would you come forward please?

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, would you like for me to proceed?

Councilman Green: Yes sir.

Councilman Walford: He can't get out of the mode yet, but please Mr. Thompson. (see Resolution No. 95 of 2003.)

Councilman Gibson: Could I have Gary Norman come forward please. Afternoon Mr. Norman. I would like to just take a second to recognize you and your staff Bill Slack and Ted Body and your entire golf course superintendent group. Last weekend we held another in a series of Shreveport City Amateurs. I will tell you anytime we have a golf tournament, it seems like we can end the drought and we went through another round of rain for this tournament, but your staff came through with flying colors. I'm truly amazed and I want to congratulate you and the professional staff that you have with SPAR in the fact that the 105 golfers that participated in last weekend's City Amateur Golf Tournament, both African-American and White golfers truly enjoyed an experience Friday through

Sunday and y'all made that possible. And I want to appreciate the efforts that you put in, in terms of, I know that y'all run a very tight budget and have been subjected to a couple of cuts in the last six months, but still despite some of those adversities come through in a clutch. Hopefully in the near future, we'll be able to help you with some of those needs to make our golf courses even better than what they are, but the course was in truly magnificent shape over the weekend and the golfers definitely appreciate and I think that showed through the caliber of golfers we had and all the different plight. We had some media that actually decided to tee it up and enjoy themselves playing. So, thank you again for your leadership and again I know on behalf of the local golfers, we really appreciate the efforts you're doing with the golf course.

Mr. Norman: Thank you and as you said, it was really our staff that really worked hard. Not so much myself, but we do appreciate the work that they put into it and we're looking forward again to another tournament, a good tournament next year.

Mr. Thompson: Mr. Chairman, Mr. Carmody asked me to announce for the benefit of his constituents that he's out of town and out of the state and will not be present at today's meeting.

Convention Center and Convention Center Hotel Project Report: Mr. Antee: I've passed out the written report to each of you as well as the documentary request ed by Councilman Carmody and Councilman Gibson. If anybody's got any questions, I'd be glad to answer 'em.

Councilman Lester: On the convention center - where do we stand in terms of the bankruptcy proceedings with Barton, Malow, Whitaker and that whole nine yards?

Mr. Antee: Once we have an agreement with SAFECO and Barton Malow, then we would petition the Bankruptcy Court to authorize the assignment of the contract to Barton Malow or in the event if somebody else and whoever that might be.

Councilman Lester: Now, when you say *someone else*, I mean, is there a potential that another construction management company can come in and say that they want to do the work or?

Mr. Antee: Yeah, there is that potential, although I think it's real slight. I think the only way that would take place is if we were able to reach an agreement with Safeco' and Barton Malow's general conditions or fees would be standing in the way.

Councilman Lester: So, assuming that Barton Malow's fees are agreeable to the City and to Safeco, then Whitaker would just assign their interest in the contract to Barton Malow?

Mr. Antee: That's correct.

Councilman Lester: Okay, now in terms of . . .how does that put us in terms of the whole public bid scenario or is the process that went forth previously, I know that there was . . .

Mr. Antee: Its all part of it. It doesn't affect the public bid in any way, shape or form, because the CM contract is a professional service contract. So, I don't anticipate that being a problem. But in trying to get to a number where SAFECO is willing to write a check and a check that we're willing to accept, we'd have to have a number that we know we can build the building for and if their general conditions are to the point where it makes that not a reality, then we do have the option of looking to bring another CM in that would do it within the parameters that we have. And again, I don't think that, that is likely, but it is a possibility.

Councilman Lester: Now, the other question that I was asking, I think your answer that I have written down here, all the discussion that we've had pre-supposes that Barton Malow is going to be the Construction Manager, so, that decision is not going to be made until we get a final number in terms of the general conditions of what not?

Mr. Antee: That's correct, its got to be a three party agreement.

Councilman Lester: Okay. Alright. I have another question in terms of the Convention Center Hotel. I was noticing you said the design team is currently designing the hotel. Do we have a showing that, that project is in terms of the design team is Fair Share compliant?

Mr. Antee: We don't have a contract with 'em yet. They're operating on good faith in the negotiations that we've put together so far. But the contract will certainly be in compliance with the Fair Share ordinance and they do have Fair Share participation. I can't tell you exactly what that is off the top of my head but that has been previously provided to everybody.

Councilman Lester: Now when you say 'good faith', is that, that's we have a contract where we have an agreement with a design team. Who is on that design team? Who are the leads?

Mr. Antee: It's . . .the two leads are primarily HCI which is a division of HRI and Slack Alost and then there's a whole list of others behind that.

Councilman Lester: Now, what was the process that was achieved to get to the point where we came to those groups. Did we have any. . . I know previously there was an A/E meeting and a presentation made to a group people. Was there a similar presentation made? Who was a party to that?

Mr. Antee: The HRI and Slack presented a list of consultants. That list was reviewed by the Mayor and further suggestions were made back to them and then they compiled their team from that.

Councilman Lester: So, was this done in the context of a . . .I believe this project is controlled by a public trust. Was that done in the context of a public trust meeting?

Mr. Antee: No.

Councilman Lester: Okay.

Mr. Antee: The prior members of the Trust authorized the Mayor to enter into a development agreement, a management agreement, and an architectural agreement and so that's where the authority came from.

Councilman Lester: I'd like to get if I could copies of those authorizations if I could.

Mr. Antee: So, that I'm clear as to what you're asking for, can you be more specific?

Councilman Lester: I'm asking for the authorization that you said that the prior members of the Trust gave. . .

Mr. Antee: So, you want the minutes of the Trust meeting?

Councilman Lester: Yes, the minutes of the Trust meeting as well as the authorization to move that project forward if I could. Also, I'd like to get a copy of the by-laws. I'd previously asked for a copy of the by-laws of the Public Trust. I know that you got that request and I know that you sent it to Mr. Barber, but I haven't yet received it so.

Mr. Antee: We'll make sure that we give that to you.

Councilman Lester: Okay, alright now my next question is you talk about the selection process for the Construction Manager. Is that part of the authority that was previously given to the Mayor in terms of picking a construction manager?

Mr. Antee: No, that's something that the current members of the trust which consist of you, Councilman Walford, myself, the Mayor and Ron Lattier will have to make that determination.

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Antee, in the information that you had given us, the memo where you talk about the meeting about Barton Malow today? Did in fact that meeting happened?

Mr. Antee: It did. It went from 9 till about 1.

Councilman Hogan: Okay, y'all discussed the cost cutting measures and what were the results of that?

Mr. Antee: Actually, we did not get to the cost cutting measures. What we focused on this morning was getting the nine packages that were re-bid out determining what those would be, the time line in which we would do that and what work needed to be done and who had to do that work so that we could meet that schedule. We will bid those nine packages which include four, that's a re-division of the dry wall bid package. We bid everything left except the elevators. We've got time to do that and we need additional time in which to really make an informed decision on that so we decided to go forward with everything but the elevators and it will be bid July 7th. The bids will be due August 6th. So, by that date, we will pretty well know what it's gonna take to build the building.

In the meantime, we'll be negotiating with SAFECO in terms of just pure dollars, them writing us a check and working out a number that we can live with.

Councilman Lester: Thank you. I apologize Mr. Antee, I had two questions that I meant to ask and I didn't ask them earlier. 1) Well, our screens just went blank, is that a hint? Okay, maybe not. The two questions that I wanted to ask is 1) In terms of the management agreement that we had with HRI, I know we had some conversation about including fair share language in that. Has that been done?

Mr. Antee: It has.

Councilman Lester: Okay, I'd like to see a copy of that if I could.

Mr. Antee: Well, the management agreement has not been signed, because we're changing language as it relates to Hilton and the guarantee to Hilton. But all the other terms remain the same and that was the same management agreement that I think we provided to each of the Council members last month or month before last but we'll be glad to get you another one.

Councilman Lester: Okay, but the new management agreement will have the fair share language because the agreement that I read did not have that in there.

Mr. Antee: Right, I think there should be one since that one that does have the fair share. We'll provide that to ya.

Councilman Lester: Okay, and the other question I was going to have was a broader one. Have we had a report from the developer? As I appreciate it, the public trust is not a City entity. It operates outside the confines of the City and as such, I don't believe that they, as I appreciate the statute are necessarily required to report to Mr. Gilliam's office in terms of fair share as is we have on the Convention Center. Do we have any agreement or anything in place from the developer that says, now, I know I've spoken with him and he said that they wanted to and they understand that we do have a Fair Share agreement in place, but you know, to quote Ronald Reagan, "you always trust, but you want to verify." So, do we have anything written between us, the Public Trust and the City that will indicate from the developer that they will subject themselves to the tenants of the

fair share agreement?

Mr. Antee: The developer agreement that is signed does have fair share in it.

Councilman Lester: And have they had any conversations with Mr. Gilliam's office, because I know that his office is the office that reports to the Mayor's Office and then to us in terms of what's going on in terms of fair share, so has there been any colloquy back and forth between the developer and Mr. Gilliam in the Fair Share Office?

Mr. Antee: No, they've been down and spoke to 'em in their office because I went with 'em. So, yes.

Councilman Lester: Uh hmmm. But other than, I mean, have they given them any reports? Cause the reason I'm asking this is because you know we asked earlier in terms of where we are on the design team and making sure that's fair share compliant and then we have some concerns about construction management. So, I was wondering had they given anything to them asides from anything verbal, anything hard copy that says this is what our plan is to achieve fair share. This is what we're going to do. Are you going to give us information in terms of what your contractors are and the whole nine yards?

Mr. Antee: I don't know, because I don't know that we've got to that point. I do know that in the contract, we do have a provision in there that they've got to comply with the fair share plan.

Councilman Lester: Is there any way possible that we could maybe get a . . . have a meeting with the developer before the next council meeting to discuss that issue or maybe get something from them that says. . .

Mr. Antee: I can give you their phone number and their address and I know you've called them and written them on several occasions, so, if you need our permission to meet with them, you've got it.

Councilman Lester: Well, I'm not asking for permission, I appreciate you giving it. But what I'm asking is that they comply with the tenants of the fair share. The reason I'm asking and I guess I'm being rather strident on that issue is we've had scenarios where this is what the law says, this is what the law requires and this is what you can do. And what I don't want to see happen is us to be caught up in a gray area between what someone says they're going to do as opposed to putting something out on paper that we can look back and say okay, at this particular date, you said that this is what you were going to do and . . . I mean that's why we have the whole fair share office to keep track of that information. I'm not trying to micromanage and certainly not trying to tell Mr. Gilliam how to do his job. I think he does a great job. I just want Mr. Gilliam to work for us and for the City to make sure that HRI in fact does do a good job of being inclusive. Because of their past history in terms of Lee Hardware and scenario show that they have not. And they have come before this body, I wasn't here, but other people have been. And they've said that they were going to be involving local companies and they said they were going to involve minority companies. After everyone says yes, lets do it, they didn't. So what. . you know, what did my great grandma say, the first time the dog bites you, shame on the dog, but the second time, its your fault. So, I don't want us to be in a position where they say that they will do this and in fact, they don't.

Mr. Antee: All I can say in response to that is, when that took place the Mayor wasn't Keith Hightower.

Councilman Lester: I understand. But HRI is still HRI.

Mr. Antee: I know, but HRI knows that Mayor Keith Hightower is not going to sit

back and ignore what was in a written agreement and if they say they're going to comply with the Fair Share Program, they know darn good and well he's gonna make sure that they do. And all I can say is its in writing, its signed, they know and they're well aware of it and you're on the committee and will be on the committee assuming you're chairman for at least a year, so you'll have the hands on ability to make sure they're doing what they say and we'll assist you in that.

Councilman Lester: Okay, I appreciate that.

Councilman Gibson: Along those lines, Historical Restoration Inc, known as HRI, the City had an agreement in writing that 50% of Lee Hardware, United Jeweler Building was to be done or performed with local contractors. After it was all said and done, less than 10% of that project was done with local contractors. In line with Councilman Lester's comments, is there any provisions in this contract that deal. . .seeing that I believe \$12-14 million of state monies are allocated to this hotel project and I believe that we have a \$7-9million exposure in City dollars. Is there any provisions to guarantee that we're going to have the lion's share, and my idea of lion share is 75-80% plus of this project be done with local contractors?

Mr. Antee: It's called Louisiana State Bid Law, where you have state monies. We've got to bid the projects out. Our plan is to break it up into packages like we did the Convention Center, so that it could assure as much local participation and minority participation and fair share participation as possible. If they AGC or if anybody out there can legally come in and show how we can mandate some local participation, I don't think anybody on the Trust would be in opposition to that.

Councilman Gibson: Okay, so we are following the public law, because this is a public private agency and as I understand it, that is not subject to public bid law.

Mr. Antee: The trust is not subject to the public bid law per se, but once we've accepted \$12 million in capital outlay money, then we're bound to use the public law for that money; so, the process is to publicly bid all of the packages.

Property Standards Program Report.

Councilman Walford: As we move to the Property Standards Report, I'd like to welcome Caddo Commissioner Patrick Williams hiding behind his hand. Patrick, thank you for joining us.

We have a written Property Standards Report, are there any questions from the Council or would you like Mr. Bowie to come forward. Mr. Bowie, I think you're off the hook.

Councilman Lester: Well, actually I do have one question.

Councilman Walford: Nope, you didn't escape Mr. Bowie, come forward please.

Councilman Lester: Quick question.

Councilman Walford: Councilman Lester says it will be a quick question.

Councilman Lester: Right, I put quick in parenthesis. Good afternoon Mr. Bowie, I appreciate you coming. Kinda give me an update on where we stand with the situation on Jackie Robinson and MLK area.

Mr. Bowie: Okay Councilman, it stands with the land owner. He was cited in court and he met the mandate. He cleaned his property up. He's on one year probation. If he breaks the probation, he will serve time for six months.

Councilman Lester: So now, this is adjudicated in front of the Shreveport City Court Judge Alford?

Mr. Bowie: Yes.

Councilman Lester: Do you. . .does the Code Enforcement Department have any plans to periodically go by and make sure he is complying?

Mr. Bowie: He'll be monitored weekly.

Councilman Lester: Okay.

Mr. Bowie: In that whole area, we had two habitual offenders in that area.

Councilman Lester: Right, but the property has been cleaned up? The cars are gone?

Mr. Bowie: All debris, all cars, everything was a, it was a care of premises violation, that would that exist, are gone on his property and the surrounding property.

Councilman Lester: Well, I just wanted to tell you, I appreciate that, not just from me, but from the citizens of District A, particularly those folks that are on Jackie Robinson. Because this individual has been a problem land owner for upwards of 20 years. And through your help and the committee and the City Attorney's office, Mr. Lafitte, the Administration and the SPD, we were all able to work to get this cleaned up. So, I wanted to say thank you and the citizens of District A, particularly those in the MLK area, thank you as well.

Mayor's Veto: Resolution 80 of 2003: Rejecting bids received for the General Fund Asphalt Overlay Program for the Dept. of Operational Services, Office of City Engineer.

Councilman Walford: Madam Clerk, can you advise me here?

Ms. Lee: At this point, its just an advisory item that we have received the Mayor's veto message on that resolution. And its listed as one of the ones that is to be considered today.

Councilman Walford: Thank you very much.

Public Hearings: None.

Confirmations and/or Appointments: None.

Adding Legislation to the Agenda.

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

1. Resolution No. 98 of 2003: A resolution amending Resolution No. 190 of 2002 relative to reports to the City Council concerning the status of the Shreveport Convention Center Project and the Shreveport Convention Center Hotel Project otherwise providing with respect thereto.
2. Resolution No. 99 of 2003: A resolution amending Resolution No. 7 of 2003 relative to reports concerning Substandard Structures and Weeded Lots otherwise providing with respect thereto.
3. Resolution No. 100 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 St. Vincent Mall for the Annual Firecracker Run on July 4, 2003 and to otherwise providing with respect thereto.
4. Resolution No. 101 of 2003: A Resolution to adopt the fee schedule for the Emergency

Medical Services Division of the Shreveport Fire Department and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

5. Resolution No. 102 of 2003 Councilman Walford: A resolution authorizing the Mayor to execute a Cooperative Endeavor with the Shreveport Opera Guild relative to the production of the 29th Annual Les Boutiques De Noel and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

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

Public Comments (Agenda Items to Be Adopted):

Arthur Chitman (2045 Bert Koums #4): Good Afternoon. Today, I am the Redress Chairman for the Shreveport Chapter NAACP and I have a few things that I wanted to talk with you about is basically, the first one is the HRC Organization. And as an organization, we want the Council to know that we are in favor of keeping that organization here in Shreveport in tact as it is.

And my question today to the NAACP, if you want to look at the procedural manuals for the organization, what it does for this city, its extensive. I have those with me and if you look at it and see what the intent of that organization has been in the past, the intent of our organization is that, we are a liaison between the community and the City. And because of the fact in some areas where I've read that you don't consider the organization to be viable for what it is need for, but we do. And we want to go on record as stating that we are in favor of keeping it and the fact that it has been a good thing for the community.

We want one place organization for all of the districts to come to rather than divide their money up, \$18,000 all over the place when its gone, then you don't have a source to go to for the problems that we're having in the problems we're having in the community. So we wanted to make sure that we went on record in favor of doing that.

Also, we'd just like to ask you today to take the public comment system on the bottom and put it on the top for some of 'em. I know this is one of 'em. So we just wanted to ask that for the record..

The other one, we wanted to ask that if you look nationally, I think you're already going to do that. We want to go on record as agreeing with you to look nationally for a Police Chief as well as locally. But to finish up my three minutes, I'm going back to the HRC.

I don't know the position that all you guys are taking, but please before you make the decision to get rid of that organization, review what that organization is about. The board itself is responsible to the community and also the director. The board is responsible for having that director make that organization work. I work with Ken before and I know some of the trials and tribulations that he's gone through to try to get funding and money to do the job. If he does not have the money, then its not there. Then there are sources statewide to get the money which you know how politics are, I'm putting it like it is, politics will not give you the money to do the things you want to do, but there are grants and every thing else that, that organization should be working with to get the job done for the community. It's too extensive for me to stand up here and tell you about. But please read all the procedures on the organization. You'll see that it is wider than any of us, and we need it to continue. But if you take the money and spread it out, when that money is gone, then there is no source to do anything with. But that's basically what we want to get with you guys about is to make sure that you're making the right decision when you disband that organization, because its definitely needed in this area. And it came about because of what happened in the Cedar Grove area and the same thing could happen now. We've got to have

somewhere as a whole to go to, to get some information and some training. And we need that organization to train the community people. I don't think most people on the Board or the area have been trained as to how to utilize that organization and we need to go about doing that. So we want to go on record, as the Shreveport Chapter NAACP, as opposing the disbanding of the HRC.

Craig B. Lee (3500 Milam Street, District G, Shreveport): I had to rush back today from Monroe from a business meeting to bring some clarity to a situation that is existing right now dealing with the Marquise Huspeth matter and the subsequent resignation of Police Chief Roberts.

I want to pass this information to the Council. The clarity that I need to bring forth to the Council and to the people in T.V. land is that, we're still confused as it relates to who the problem actually is as it relates to the Marquise Huspeth situation, police murders, police misconduct. It is not Jim Roberts. Jim Roberts is a symptom of the problem that exist in the City of Shreveport. He is a symptom.

The actually problem can be placed in three areas. Primarily District Attorney Paul Carmouche, our illustrious Mayor, Keith Hightower and all of the sell-out Negro leaders/pseudo leaders who have told you to vote for Keith Hightower and Paul Carmouche. Now, interestingly enough in the whole situation dealing with Marquise Huspeth, you've not heard District Attorney Paul Carmouche's name mentioned not one time. Paul Carmouche is the primary entity that said that the case was not going to be taken to the Grand Jury. Now that's way more egregious than anything else that Jim Roberts said. And needless to say, our illustrious Mayor Keith Hightower backed Jim Roberts every step of the way.

Now all of a sudden, a letter is created and sent on behalf of Jim Roberts to four Caucasian legislators in the State Legislature to lobby against the Citizens Review Board. Now, needless to say, Chief Roberts does not have the political sophistication to lobby four White legislators to kill this particular piece of legislation that Cedric Glover was lobbying for.

This whole situation is nothing more than a rouse or a scheme that's being concocted to create as Mayor Hightower said, "it is inexcusable" that Chief Roberts would send a letter lobbying these four Caucasian legislators to eliminate the Bill that was being introduced by Cedric Glover; inexcusable.

Councilman Gibson: Point of order. I'm a little bit confused, what is the subject matter we are talking about right here, that's on the agenda?

Mr. Lee: I'm getting to that.

Councilman Gibson: Could I ask, I'd like. . . Mr. Chair, excuse me. Mr. Chair, could I ask for clarity on what the subject matter is on this issue? That's what I'm asking for, a point of order right now.

Mr. Lee: You need to ask me.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Lee, you indicated that you wanted to discuss the Police Chief and the Human Relations Commission.

Mr. Lee: And I'm getting to that. The information that I've given you. . .

Councilman Gibson: Let's move to Human Relations.

Mr. Lee: The information that I'm given you is directly to some of the individuals that's meeting behind the scenes with Keith Hightower and negotiating a compromise to get rid of Jim Roberts and not get rid of the problems that actually exist. The issue of police murders. . .

Councilman Gibson: Mr. Chair

Mr. Lee: . . .and police misconduct are directly related

Councilman Gibson: Point of order again.

Mr. Lee: . . . to the fact that you did not have. . .

Councilman Gibson: I am still confused, if we're talking about Human Relations Commission, what does the Police Chief and what does the Mayor have to do with Human Relations Commission? And I'd like a . . .

Mr. Lee: Do you want me to start at the Human Relations Commission, first?

Councilman Gibson: That's the subject matter I thought. . .

Mr. Lee: Do you want me to start with that first? I put down two particular things that I was referencing.

Councilman Gibson: And what are those two subject matters Mr. Chair?

Mr. Lee: Absolutely.

Councilman Walford: It says "police chief and human relations with a specific reference to No. 89." I don't know if Mr. Lee put that on or if it was put on by the staff. But No. 89 is the contract between the City of Shreveport and the Greater Shreveport Human Relations Commission.

Mr. Lee: Absolutely and I'm getting to it.

Councilman Walford: If you have general comments that don't apply to these, they have another place on the agenda..

Mr. Lee: Is not today, are you not going to be deciding on. . .is the Chief not going to be decided on who the interim Police Chief going to be?

Councilman Walford: No, its not.

Mr. Lee: Okay, needless to say, this still needs to be said. I will reference the comments for the police chief at the end. Let me get to the Human Relations.

Councilman Gibson: Mr. Chairman, I'd like a point of order that we only talk about what is on the agenda and that's the Human Relations Commission, the other one can wait till Public comment.

Councilman Walford: That's correct.

Mr. Lee: No problem.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Lee, if you want to address. . .

Mr. Lee: No problem.

Councilman Walford: You've used the bulk of your time, if someone would like to make a motion.

Councilman Gibson: I'll make a motion for three minutes Mr. Chair.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Lee, I'm gonna ask you if you would, confine your comments in this section of the agenda. . .

Mr. Lee: I have no problem with that.

Councilman Walford: To the Human Relations Commission.

Mr. Lee: I have no problem with that.

Mr. Lee: The primary reason you need to have a Human Relations Commission is based on what just happened right there. This City is a vile, racist city. Let's go ahead and say this on record, Councilman Mike Gibson.

The City of Shreveport is a vile, racist city and was the head of the Transcontinental Confederacy during the Civil War. The Human Relations Commission which was brought about during the civil unrest in 1988 at the Cedar Grove riots was never intended to work. It was put in place to fail.

Mayor Hightower has not been in favor of the Human Relations Committee at all. The budget that they get is not a mandated budget that comes from the Council. It is, you come back each year and we will see whether or not we want to give you \$125,000. Now, I will disagree with some degree with what Mr. Chitman said. In its present form, the Board needs to actually be

strengthened based on what Councilman Jackson is proposing. It does not need to be disbanded. But as it relates to the City of Shreveport, to basically say, that you're not going to have a Human Relations Committee, is basically the same that we still want David Duke and George D'Artois to be at the helm of the Police Commission and being over the City. Because at the end of the day, the City of Shreveport still refuses to deal with the issue of truth.

So, I would be more in favor of Representative Jackson's legislation that goes to strengthen the Human Relations Committee, that gives it more substantive powers and gives it substantive funding where as the Mayor is not the person determining whether or not a person is or is not going to stay. Ms. Joann Acpan has had to leave the City of Shreveport because of threats coming from Mayor Hightower dealing with her job, and she could not do her job effectively as it relates to that situation.

So, there's nothing that's going to happen is if \$18,000 is distributed to everybody's districts, you're still going to have the Human Relations issues that deal in the City of Shreveport. And, mind you my good Councilman Gibson, the prayer that you made, you cannot move a city forward until you deal with the issues of truth. And this city refuses to deal with the issues of truth and you're going to continue to have the situations that evolve with Marquise Huspeth, Cedric Harris, and also Reginald Davis. You're going to continue to have those, because this city is vile, racist to the core and you better wake up and understand that the Human Relations Commission in its present form, is not the right thing, but in a stricter form will be the right thing.

Howard Malpass (1108 Ontario): The reason for me coming is I've been out of the area for the last couple of weeks and just learned at 5:30 this morning what was going on related to the Human Relations Commission. I believe, and I'll put this in a nutshell, that we've got a good viable program in its basic concept. The program itself needs to be directed in a different manner. I think we have the tools to work with there.

I believe that our big area of waste was in personnel expenditures and I went on the record with that when I first got on board. I am a Commissioner with the Human Relations Commission, let me go back and say that. We had 89% of our funds going to budget for employment, that's way too high. We could reduce that to 45%. I think with that we can redirect the funds to more valued needed programming. I also believe that we do not need to go out of the area on a nationwide search and waste funds, we have good educated people in this city. And one person that I would strongly suggest is the person who is heading it up at Interim Director, Ms. Christine Burgess. She has done a great job. She has been in the program from the start to finish, on every program we've done, and has done a very excellent job and has gotten high marks by all of the Commissioners. She does have the experience, the education, and the knowledge of how to do the programs and the heart and it does take that.

We don't need to be nourished with another program and diluted. It needs to be a stand alone program. I thank the Mayor and the Council Members for allowing me to serve on that Commission. I think it does a good program in the City. It does serve a necessity.

The program will not benefit by diluting it, splitting the funds as I read in the newspaper to say \$18,000 to this one, this one and this one. That's a drop in the bucket in the City's budget when you start budgeting it down to \$18,000 per district; that's no money at all really to speak of. I think it be off re-directing. We've got a very good president. She does a fabulous job at the YWCA and I back her 100%. Christine's done a great job too. We need better direction and I would respectfully request to put off any specific vote to go thumbs up or thumbs down on the Commission until the next meeting of the City Council so that you can a little bit of time to digest and review what some of the Commission members, what their thoughts are and let us see what we

can do to work on it.

We did waste a substantial amount of money on that last executive director. And go back in the minutes and you'll find a lot of the Commissioners did not like the waste of the money, but we were out voted; that's all I have to say and I greatly appreciate your time.

Frederick V. Henson (3503 Del Rio): Excuse me Gentlemen, excuse me. But looking at your agenda, I think it would be more appropriate, unless we're doing the disparity study comments now.

Councilman Walford: I have no problem with that, I had written here that you wanted to talk about Item No. 80 on the agenda.

Mr. Henson: Exactly, so we're doingokay.

Giving honor to the Mayor, the City Council. It's a pleasure to stand before you to speak about the disparity study as well as Fair Share Program. For those who don't know, I've been a very active individual, both representing the former organization we were heading, the National Minority Contractors as well as the new organization that we're heading, the American Minority Contractors Association which is also a D.C. based minority contracting firm. And we pretty much promote in terms of advocacy for minority contracting. We have worked very closely with the Fair Share Office from its inception to now in helping to create opportunities for minority contractors. But as I think about the essence of the spirit of fair share and the historical challenge that you have and the Mayor had in formulating the Fair Share Program was a challenge to correct a long term cancer that had existed some 50 years or more in excluding minority businesses and specifically African-American businesses from taking part in the fruits of the City and expenditures. That challenge is a very big one because Fair Share in its present form may or not be structured to compensate that long history of being excluded of African-American and ethnic minority contractors.

The disparity study in its effort to be done would make a race specific issue to the table. Again, I'm not certain whether that's the direction, for my view has always been and very clear that concerning Fair Share, we have allowed a number of different majority White businesses to partake in the Fair Share Program.

Now to me, that deviates from erasing historical exclusion of ethnic minority contractors. Because I question when a J. C. Carter Construction Company can be in the Fair Share Program. And I would like to ask the question also, Virginia Shehee as a white-woman Business, if for no other reason, could she be in the Fair Share Program or could she be considered a minority woman owned business. I've had a problem with that for a number of years because even in Dallas, some of the richest businesses, white-woman owned can be considered as a minority business, that's a little disturbing when we are trying to eradicate a historical exclusion issue of ethnic minority businesses.

Now, I think the question is whether or not we are going to do a disparity study or whether or not some new formulation or change in terms of minority business Fair Share can be done to try to correct an historical exclusion issue. Now, that is a major challenge for you gentlemen. Because right now, Fair Share and the numbers are great, the numbers are different, opportunities do exist. But then also attitudes exist as well and I've made that very clear in all of my comments with anyone talking about minority business participation.

The historical challenge that we have exist not only from implementing a policy or law, but that policy or law need to be implemented in such a fashion that any one, any business coming down to do business with the City of Shreveport need to be made very clear that their participation of minority businesses need to exist in those contracts.

And I think that if that is done then attitudes will change. No, they won't change over

night, because we are talking about an inbred attitude in terms of race relations. But as long as we make it a definite in terms of if you are coming to Shreveport to do business, then you must include minority businesses and specifically the historical businesses that have been in disadvantaged.

Now, I would like to see if possible whether we do the disparity study or we make necessary changes or corrections to the Fair Share Program that tries to be more specific in how to eliminate the historical challenge that you have. Because, historical I question whether or not we are being as effective as we can be in bringing in ethnic and specifically African-American businesses into the mainstream of doing business with the City of Shreveport. For it gets down to taxation without representation that we are not getting our Fair Share of the dollars that is going into the City, coming back into the community.

Now that challenge is on you gentlemen for as much as we voice our opinions our here, it is going to be your decisions that make the program either work or fail. And, I hope we meet that challenge because the idea that I thought in the beginning was to eradicate a long history of exclusion of ethnic, minority businesses.

Councilman Gibson: I'd like to get clarity, when you talk about economic inclusiveness for the African American community, are we talking about local or are we talking about recruitment around the country to bring African-American firms into Shreveport?

Mr. Henson: You know, Mr. Gibson, and a lot of folks know my opinion is that, I pretty much don't hold back when it come down to what is right and just. And to me, what is right and just is anywhere African-American businesses can be nurtured and grown, be it here in the City of Shreveport or in Timbuktu, it affects our African-American community both here and there.

And if we are going to be building, I would like to just think back in terms of yesterday and the historical position that was taken by the Supreme Court and specifically, Judge O'Connor. For Judge O'Connor in all of her history from past votes and past opinions, I applaud her in her decision or even her comments concerning the need for diversity in all areas of our—if we are going to and her comment was—if we are going to be a united America, then we got to be, we got to have diversity. So, I'm saying that if we are going to, if we have to find out of state African-American businesses to come in here and joint venture with local African-American businesses that we may reach capacity and being very much involved in minority as well as local business participation on contracts, capacity seems to be a question on both sides of the track.

If we are going to build then we are going to have to build by joining and uniting with companies, both inside of Shreveport as well as outside of Shreveport.

Councilman Gibson: So in terms of your answer, you are talking about in terms of joint ventures with out-of-state firms with our local firms?

Mr. Henson: Exactly.

Councilman Gibson: I'll ask this question, and yes or no. When those out-of-state firms come in here, is the expectation from the African-American community that they invest not only in having permanent offices here but permanent staff, not just secretaries, to where monies are shift back to other parts of the country but true investment to make sure that the taxpayer who is funding the City of Shreveport, including African-American, Whites, Hispanics, women and the whole. . .

Mr. Henson: Exactly.

Councilman Gibson: Anybody that lives in this community under inclusiveness, maximizes those taxpayer dollars?

Mr. Henson: And I agree with that. But, I would hope that when we bring in large African-American companies or large companies, period, that joint venture with a local firm here, that that company would help in building our local capacity, that that local company would then become the

size company that he is now joining with. That the future may hold that we may be able to employ and reap the benefit of that capacity and growth of those local companies.

Councilman Gibson: So could ascertain that the answer is yes to that question?

Mr. Henson: Yes.

Councilman Gibson: And also, I could I just make comment that the fact that my question you is not a double standard in the fact that I have those same standards of white firms who come into this community, that they invest in making sure, in my expectation have always been since you and I have known each other, that I don't make any distinctions between white, black, Hispanic or anything of that nature. That if they are coming to this town, that I want offices, I want staff, I want technical people here in t his community where the money circulates 4 or 5 times over and not just ancillary offices. I've been clear on that since I've been here.

Mr. Henson: Exactly. Mr. Gibson, as you well know that I have made at least three trips before the Gaming Control Board in Baton Rouge. And each time in voicing my concern to the Gaming Control Board has been that we are allowing millions, even billions of dollars to be spent by casinos in our state and most of that money, ninety percent of the money is going to out-of-state construction companies who are not employing, who are not contracting local nor minority businesses. And, if we are going to feel the impact of those dollars in our community, we've got to do something about making sure participation exist in both those communities.

Councilman Gibson: I will affirm that the fact that Mr. Henson has done a yo-man's job in representing this community down in Baton Rouge for the Louisiana Gaming Control Board. In fact, he and I compare notes on a routine basis and are on the same page both for local minority and local business participation in the casino market. And, Mr. Henson I want to applaud your efforts for leading that charge because you have done one outstanding job on that but we are very much on the same page when it comes to local investment and making sure that we maximize tax payer dollars both public and in the private sector, so I do appreciate that.

Councilman Lester: Mr. Henson, would it be fair to say in a many instances, the situation of the African-American minority business person, man and woman, is much like the situation that you had in developing countries like in China or places like that in terms of not having a lot of things, in terms of for instance there is, for a lack of a better term, no architectural firm here, African-American architectural firm here?

Mr. Henson: To be very honest, at the present time, the City of Shreveport is lacking in certain areas. We have a very, I think you count on one hand in terms of African-American engineering firms here in the City and to my knowledge, a individual firm, one architectural firm that also acts as a management firm for a much larger company, as well.

Councilman Lester: In the context of a Fair Share Program, I know there is a lot of concern that a number of individuals had as far as "bringing outside minority companies in", I know that is something that a lot of people don't like, but if there is no, if there is a vaccum, doesn't it benefit the African-American community to bring in lets say a firm from a New Orleans or a Jackson or somewhere, that takes up residence here much like you would do, I think in China they call it technology transfers and many companies and corporations, multi-national corporations in the United States pay big money to come to these developing markets and set up shop in these developing markets. Is that what happens as matter of due course?

Mr. Henson: Exactly. I think the opportunity that exist and even in comparing notes with Mr. Gibson as he has said, know one of the things that we have looked at is, how do we build capacity within our local community?

Councilman Lester: Let me stop you right there. One of the concerns that I have and I am

just going to throw this out there, a lot of times when you are talking about minority companies, the buzz word is capacity. As if that is a reason not to do business with people but I would dare say that in many instances, some of the majority firms don't have the capacity to do some of the larger projects that we have here in the City of Shreveport.

Mr. Henson: That is one of the biggest, in my challenges before the Gaming Control Board is basically concerning that type of situation that the local majority company does not have the capacity to bid a hundred million dollar project. How do we get there? Same thing with African American firms. (Councilman Lester inaudible.) Exactly, exactly. Well, to me that is not a legitimate argument when it comes down to capacity.

Councilman Lester: Right, it is not a legitimate argument. My question is this, wouldn't we be served if we had a program that allowed company to come in and lets say from a Dallas or lets say from a Houston and get with that small fledgling African-American entrepreneur, set up shop with the understanding that if they are able to get certain level of business, then at a certain time that local person gets to take that business, buy the other person out and they move on? Wouldn't that be a scenario that would fit both the local company as well as the company coming in?

Mr. Henson: Exactly, most certainly it is such a—because of the efforts that we make on a daily basis concerning minority business contracting and the challenges that they face, there are a number of things that minority contractors face that so many issues that even this Board must, like I say the challenge you have is, an extensive challenge. Because 1. when you look at a minority construction company. 2. The other challenge is if I got get a one million dollar contract and I not have a banking institution to go and take that contract to it to get the necessary funding support that I need, even if it is from a start up position temporary until I got going within that contract, I am still at a detriment because the banking community has not been that favorable, so that is another challenge and that is a challenge that we must fact either now or tomorrow but that is a challenge that we must face. So we have a number of issues that affect minority or African-American contractors in bidding capacity and growth. So I am all for and I made it very clear. I mean, I have some real concerns concerning who are labeled as minority businesses and how Fair Share can best serve or erase an historical situation.

Councilman Lester: Well, let me ask you this in your experience would it make sense for us at some point, given the fact that, we've gone from point a to point b, to bring in someone to take a look at the program we have with an eye to make some changes, updates or corrections to address some of those issues that you have?

Mr. Henson: I am not certain whether I would be the one to comment to that as to whether or not, I would also, I would say that the opportunity exist that if it is needed for an outside impartial view to be taken concerning and then at the same time it may be a necessity in reference to having just the expertise within to sit down and analyze for what exists is that a lot of us have good ideas concerning how best to move this train forward or how to put the coal in the engine. So, I think the challenge is both within our grasp as well as some outside source. I am not really certain which would be best.

Beth Foster (6916 Oak Hill Circle): The reason I come here today is for you to sing a new song. The Mayor is not there and the people that are listening is that we have come to place where we are really going to have to start working together and address the issues that are important.

Now, I served on the City Charter Study Committee to change the government to bring the City together. It is important that the work of the Human Relations Commission goes on and not be dissolved, but the concept be expanded and given more teeth.

It needs to have a more inclusive position. And at this time, I do not believe it is the best

interest of the community to not continue the work or to do away with its concept and its plan.

It needs to be given another identity with its own agenda. It needs to be given maybe some more identity and a better agenda and not put limitations on what it can do or can't do. It should look at other, many cultures at heart.

Last week I heard a story of Arena Gibson whose mother and father came from Russia and were depressed and suffered pain, but there an American, she celebrated being in America for 10 years.

This morning I got a call from a lady that is an Indian and she is a relative of Governor Edwards and she is concerned about Caddo Parish, the name being changed. We have a lot of people in this community and it is very important that we let each culture speak out.

Many people and cultures have many story to tell and we are in a democracy and that is what is so great is that in Russia or some other places we do not a democracy in place. There needs to be a movement that works with the Commission, now I worked with that Commission when it was first put in place some years ago when it was first formed and it over-gall was great but all of a sudden there was teeth put in it and restrictions and so we could not do its purpose. We had to do things for people or groups that would talk against its movement.

We have many groups in the community that have many purposes and respect the citizens and leadership such as, I'm a member of the League of Women Voters and I believe that League is a group that can be used to bring the community together and it is the cornerstone for democracy and a leader and voter service and information.

There are many o there civic groups such as the Rotary Club, Civitian, Girl Scouts, Boy Scouts, Exchange Club, the National Conference for Community and Justice, and even the National Advancement of Colored People, Methodist, Catholics, Protestants, Churchman United, Inner Church Conference, Baptist, Mormons, Jewish, there are many people in this town that have a purpose and a culture.

And I want you to consider this plan that I'm bringing you today. Back in 1976 Town Meeting '76 cam together and that was when we had a plan that we worked for Shreveport, that was when Senator Ron Bean was young. And Elsie Kathy and I and many people across this community put Town Meeting 76. We came out with a song, we came with a logo, we came out with a purpose and I would like to bring this plan to you today to do and put it back into action. It was out of the Institute of Cultural Affairs. We came out with everybody worked out this and it has a purpose, it has a task force, it has a way to bring people and community together. And the song that we came out with that was, and it was tuned to *What the World Needs Now. We once had bitter forge that everyone really knew about it, it was cleared by our mighty Captain Shreve. And, then our town began to sprout and then came the war and the separate ways, jobs are mighty sparse in those hardship days. And then our town began to grow as all was found to a nation to would flow. As a city grew, the people knew there is a might need for culture too. As the river flows and the roses grow as our city cares in its young and old, with the north and the south road a port around, a place where opportunity is bound, we are not old, we are still young we are in the town that just begun.* And I just want you to think about where we are and what we can do and I think this is a good plan and I would like to bring it to your attention and I am going to leave it with you.

Councilman Hogan: Ms. Foster, a few moments ago you talked about changing the name of Caddo Parish. Did you mean changing the name of Caddo Street?

Ms. Foster: There was a Caddo Indian that called me this morning and I didn't have time because I was going to teach a Recyclable Likeable Art Project at the Cedar Grove Library, but she was concerned, she calling me. She says, they want to change a street or something, I don't know I

am going to have to get back to her, it was Caddo and she is a Caddo Indian.

Councilman Hogan: Okay, I thought you was talking about that. You said Caddo Parish and I thought that was what you meant.

Ms. Foster: Oh, no. I might have meant it. I do make mistakes, I do.

Councilman Hogan: I just want to clarify that (I'm not trying to embarrass you.)

Ms. Foster: There are a lot of things. We just can't go on changing names and all of that. I think we need to bring the people together and we need to unite and have a way to bring them together and in this Institute of Cultural Affairs out of Chicago, it had a great plan and we can bring it together and it has a plan and I just wanted to bring it to your attention.

Willie Bradford (3658 Elon Street): I am going to acknowledge Dr. Cash. Mr. Chairman I am here to speak on the Human Relations Commission but there is a lot of issues I guess we could speak on, but I am going to be specific here.

Given the climate of this City at this time, I think the notion of discontinuing funding the Human Relations Commission, it is ill-conceived. I struggled on that Commission for over 8 years, Mr. Chairman and I say "struggle" because that is what it was. It was a struggle just to maintain the dignity of that Commission. Time and time again, we was meet with great challenges.

As it comes to race and injustices and discrimination with this City, we all always seem to re-frame from talking about those issues. We were more comfortable in putting our heads in the sand and pretending everything is okay, but everything is not okay. We have got serious problems in this community and I think the Human Relations Commission could go a long way towards helping us address those problems.

I can remember in 1994 when the Commission attempted to address a racial issue at one of the schools here. And it was met with resistance from politicians and public officials and that seemed to have been the down turn of the Commission as it relates to getting out, investigating and bringing back a report as well as some resolution to some of these far reaching problems.

Too many times over the last 11 years, because I was put on the Commission and I was one of the initial members in 1991, but too many times over the years, this Commission has been met with too many people who is interested more in public perception than they were in the public well-being. And that is what we are facing with now. We seem to pull back from being fair and honest about the conditions in which we are and the solutions that it will take to address these conditions.

I am going to ask you today, that you will continue to support this organization but not only that, but to continue to fund it not only with the finances of the City but with your own personal commitments. Because I believe that given the Commission and the potential that it has within this community it can not only be an effective and viable organization, but with the strong ordinance, Mr. Chairman, it can become self-sufficient lessen any burden of tax dollars on the Commission and on this City. But I think that because of the years, we have attempted to get other resources.

My point is simply that given the fact that there are other resources available for the Commission and the Commission has over the years have tried and attempted to tap into those resources, again without the full support of the Mayor's Office or the City Council over the years. So this Commission was almost sitting out there on its own with one leg and now you want to kick that leg from under it. But I think the Commission can be viable and I think the Commission can be workable.

Now, if this about dollars and cents, which some have projected that it could be, then I think you need to take a look at al of the entities which get public dollars and then I think if you carefully and honestly evaluate those entities, then you would find that it is not the Commission who is useless, I think you would find that there are others who are getting city dollars that are more

useless than the Commission. So, I believe that the Commission is worthy of your continual funding and support.

We have been an All American City. If our objective and goals as a City is to foster better race relations, diversity, if we are going to eradicate prejudices and discrimination, if our desire really is to make this City a better place for all of us to live, then pulling the funding of the Human Relations Commission is not the problem, it's the solution and I think that you can go a long ways in making this happening.

I told the last Council, what would your legacy be? What would you like to be remembered from? Now, you are being pretty much framed early on in your tenure here, but they had a legacy in my opinion of brick and mortar. They never wanted to address the human aspect of this City. I mean, you have an opportunity over the next three years to really make a dent in this City in making this City a better place to live by the actions that you take. And, please be careful and not take the action of not funding this Commission but giving it an ordinance that will strengthen it and give it your commitment and go forward and let this Commission can do the things that its mission is set out to do.

CONSENT AGENDA LEGISLATION:

TO INTRODUCE RESOLUTIONS AND ORDINANCES ON CONSENT:

Motion by Councilman Lester, seconded by Councilman Gibson for Introduction of Ordinance Nos. 78 and 79 of 2003 to lay over until the July 8, 2003 meeting. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

RESOLUTIONS: None.

ORDINANCES:

1. Ordinance No. 78 of 2003: An ordinance closing and abandoning the 60' foot-wide Tulsa Street adjacent to Lots 15-41 and 1001 in Rosenwald Subdivision Unit No. 2 located in the NE 1/4 of Section 20 (T18N-R14W), Caddo Parish, Louisiana and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
2. Ordinance No. 79 of 2003: An ordinance closing and abandoning the Edwards Street right-of-way running from Caddo Street north to end of dedication, and closing and abandoning a portion of Marshall Street adjacent to Block 36, and closing and abandoning the 20 foot-wide alleyways located in Blocks 36, 37, and 54 of the City of Shreveport Subdivision in the SE/4 of Section 25 (T18N-R14W), Caddo Parish, Louisiana, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

TO ADOPT RESOLUTIONS AND ORDINANCES ON CONSENT:

RESOLUTIONS:

Motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Gibson for adoption of Resolution No. 87 of 2003. Motion approved by the following vote: Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilmen Lester, Walford, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

Councilman Hogan: I do have a question for Councilman Gibson, in looking at the paperwork along with this, I found that there was no dollar amount filled in yet on the cost. Do we know yet, what the cost is?

Councilman Gibson: Don't have that, I have to defer that to the Administration.

Councilman Jackson: On, what?

Councilman Hogan: The cost to annex the people into the City.

Mayor Hightower: I am not real sure if we are actually annexing the particular one in at this time. However, we do make people that connect to the City water system sign an agreement that says, when they become contiguous to the City boundaries, that they will come inside the City. As far as cost to the City to do this, that is the private property owner would bear the cost to run the lines and do the tapes.

Councilman Walford: So it is a zero cost to the City?

Mayor Hightower: It would be zero cost to the City and a double water bill, a double priced water/sewer bill to the resident with the understanding that they will come into the City when they become contiguous.

RESOLUTION NO. 87 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING WILLIAM ROBERT PIERCE & KATHERINE JUNE PONDER PIERCE, LOCATED AT 9539 PLEASANT HILLS RD., TO CONNECT TO THE WATER SYSTEM OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, William Robert Pierce & Katherine June Ponder Pierce have agreed to secure all permits and inspections required by the Shreveport Comprehensive Building Code. Said party having submitted a petition for annexation to the City of Shreveport, and having agreed to fully comply with the regulations of the City of Shreveport in connection with said property, all as set forth in Section 94-1, et. Seq., of the Shreveport City Code. Said request and petition are attached hereto.

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened, that William Robert Pierce & Katherine June Ponder Pierce, be authorized to connect the building located at 9539 Pleasant Hills Rd., to the water system of the City of Shreveport.

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.

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 Lester, seconded by Councilman Green to postpone until the July 8, 2003 meeting.

Councilman Lester: Is there someone here from HUD or Community Development that can speak to this particular issue? Can you give me some idea of what is actually happening with this issue? I know that as I appreciate it, there has been some conversations back between the City and HUD relative to these properties, where do we stand on that?

Ms. Beard: We have had some negotiations with HUD relative to this property. There is some modifications that we need to have done that are in the best interest of this City of Shreveport. Until those modifications have been taken care of or resolved, we will not enter into or complete this project.

Councilman Lester: As I appreciate it and this is obviously prior to your tenure with the City, the City did in fact take possession of several of the SNAP houses. I think they are along Ledbetter?

Ms. Beard: SNAP I.

Councilman Lester: And where are we in terms of those properties because I pass by there and they are literally falling in?

Ms. Beard: Those properties are now surplus property to the City. We are in the process of doing a public bid for developer for particularly non-profits to develop that property.

Councilman Lester: Do we have, have we gotten any plans in terms of what are we going to do with these SNAP II properties?

Ms. Beard: We are in the process of developing a redevelopment plan. That plan should be on my desk in the morning.

Councilman Lester: Okay, well when you get that Plan, I would like to see it. Because I've spoken with a number of non-profits, particularly the portion of SNAP II that is in the Allendale area, it has been subject of much conversation and I'd like to talk to you about that.

My other question is this and I don't know if you are aware, or I don't know because I am trying to get information about this as well. It is my understanding that these SNAP II properties, especially the ones on the hill, as they call it in Allendale, the shotgun houses, are in a historic district; is that true?

Ms. Beard: They are all in a historic districts.

Councilman Lester: So does that mean that if the City takes these properties that they are going to remain shotgun houses?

Ms. Beard: No, we've gotten a ruling from the State Office of Historical Preservation. If they are substandard then we have the right to demolish them if we chose.

Councilman Lester: And who makes the determination as to if they

substandard. Is that a determination that we make?

Ms. Beard: Department of Community Development in conjunction with the Administration and certainly the Council.

Councilman Lester: Okay, well I'm hoping and praying that every last one of them is deemed substandard. Because the last thing anybody should do in the 21st Century is live in a shotgun house.

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

The Deputy Clerk read the resolution by title: Resolution No. 80 of 2003: Resolution No. 80 of 2003: A resolution rejecting bids received on IFB#03-019 for the General Fund Asphalt Overlay Program for the Department of Operational Services / Office of the City Engineer.

Mr. Thompson: In accordance with the practices of the Council, we would request that there would be a motion to adopt. And if you agree with the veto of the Mayor, please vote "no".

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

Councilman Gibson: Can I ask the Administration to kind of give an overview for the Citizens of what this actually means for our Street Overlay Program.

Mayor Hightower: If you will recall at the last Council meeting, you voted to reject the bids on asphalt overlay because we were pulling \$400,000 out of the Asphalt Overlay Program awaiting Pirate settlement money in September to be able to fund the extra \$400. You voted to reject the bids, thus our low bidder was kicked out.

In the mean time, we went back to the low bidder and talked with him about our plan to do all but \$400,000 worth of asphalt overlay, essentially immediately with the commitment that when \$400,000 was available via a Pirates settlement that we would reinstate the other \$400,000 at his original bid price via a change order. He agreed to do that, that's the reason that we asked for a veto of the rejection of the bids. So, as Mr. Thompson said, we would like for you to vote no in this case, so that that way we are back to where we are prior to the last Council meeting.

Councilman Gibson: One further comment or question, Mr. Mayor, if for some reason the Pirate settlement does not come through, could you explain or inform this Council of what the Administration's intent is to do?

Mayor Hightower: At that point, obviously I think we would have to take a look at where we are in the budget. You know our commitment to the contractor was that when we received the Pirates settlement. And again, as I told the Council several weeks ago, we see no reason, we have an agreement with the Gliebermans to okay the release of the money in September, so I don't think that is a bridge we'll ever have to cross.

Councilman Gibson: The reason why I'm asking the Administration the question is, obviously in November and December when we went through

budgetary talks and we had monies allocated and approved, I think most of us up here and I know that this City Councilman talked to my constituency about what projects had been approved and I guess we could expect come this Fall that when that Pirate settlement comes in, that all these projects are going to be completed.

Mayor Hightower: All the projects that were approved in the 2003 budget. Now, what has been discussed and promised outside the budget, I am not aware of it.

Councilman Gibson: I'm talking about in the budget. I am talking about within the budget.

Mayor Hightower: Projects that were within the budget, dedicated within the budget that will fall under the \$400,000.

Councilman Gibson: That's what I am referring to, nothing outside the budget but what is inside the budget that we approved that you submitted to us back in December.

Mayor Hightower: That is correct.

Councilman Lester: If we go back and we uphold the veto, is that going to put any additional delay on the beginning of this project?

Mayor Hightower: It'll move it quicker.

Councilman Lester: It'll move it faster.

Councilman Jackson: When you refer to the, settlement, Pirates settlement I'm familiar with the ball park figure of what that settlement is, How much are we talking about for this particular subject?

Mayor Hightower: \$400,000.

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

RESOLUTION NUMBER 82 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE MAYOR TO EXECUTE A HISTORIC PRESERVATION EASEMENT WITH A QUALIFIED HISTORIC PRESERVATION ORGANIZATION AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport is the recipient of a grant funded by the Historic Preservation Fund for the Save America's Treasures Grant Program; and

WHEREAS, the grant funds will be used to improve and preserve the architectural, historic, and cultural values and significance of the Oakland Cemetery; and

WHEREAS, as a condition of the grant, the City is required to grant a preservation easement to a qualified organization whose purpose is the improvement, preservation and maintenance of historic or historically significant the property; and

WHEREAS, the easement will be granted for a term of fifty (50) years.

NOW, THEREFORE NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, regular and legal session convened that the Mayor is authorized to execute a Historic Preservation Easement with a qualified historic preservation organization, substantially and in accordance with the draft thereof which was filed for public inspection in the Office of the Clerk of Council on June 10, 2003.

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 resolution or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

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

RESOLUTION NO. 83 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION AUTHORIZING THE EXECUTION OF AN AGREEMENT WITH THE NORTHWEST LOUISIANA CHAPTER OF THE SICKLE CELL DISEASE ASSOCIATION OF AMERICA, INC., AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the Northwest Louisiana Chapter of the Sickle Cell Anemia Disease Association of America, Inc., (hereinafter referred to as "Sickle Cell") sponsors an annual fund raising softball tournament at Cargill and Southern Hills Parks; and

WHEREAS, the proceeds of the tournament have enabled the organization to continue its work in the area of sickle cell anemia research and development; and

WHEREAS, persons residing in and around the Shreveport area are the primary beneficiaries of the efforts made by this organization; and

WHEREAS, the programs and efforts of this organization provide a benefit to the public and serve a public purpose; and

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport has been a major co-sponsor of the annual sickle cell softball tournament for the past several years.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, regular and legal session convened that the Mayor is authorized to execute an agreement with Northwest Louisiana Chapter of the Sickle Anemia Disease Association of America, Inc., substantially and in accordance with the draft thereof which was filed for public inspection in the Office of the Clerk of Council on June 10, 2003.

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 resolution or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed.

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

Councilman Hogan: I noticed that the cost to us will be \$21,400 and I was just curious to know where the money will come from?

Mr. Norman: This comes out of my budget. It is a combination of we have budgeted and participated in this over the last 5 years that I've been involved and about \$12,000 of it comes from our budget to fund officials for the event and then the rest of it is either an in-kind service and/or use of facility. We furnished them some other small items, and it is a

very good event. It brings in somewhere in the neighborhood of 200 softball teams from all over the country. It is probably one of the largest tournaments in the south and it has been a very good event.

Councilman Hogan: What have been the results of the fund raising, in the past?

Mr. Norman: You'd have to ask the Sickle Cell organization, I am not exactly sure what the amount of money that they have raised but I know it is a pretty significant sum and this is their major fund-raiser that keeps them moving forward.

Councilman Hogan: So this was a planned item in your budget?

Mr. Antee: That event you could get the economic impact from the Convention and Tourist Bureau because they bring, I want to say in excess of, it is either around or an excess of what, 200 teams from all over the south and beyond to come play in it, so it is a huge economic impact and a huge tourism event for the City. And so, I think we've got cash outlay of about \$12,000. The rest of that is through in-kind renobatement and that kind of stuff which is a very good return on investment.

Councilman Lester: Just for information purposes, I'd informed Councilman Hogan that the Northwest Louisiana Sickle Cell Disease Association is one of those organizations that has, that provides tremendous amount of financial and other resources to young people and families of those people that have sickle cell in not just the Shreveport area, but in the totality of northwest Louisiana. They service clients as far as Ruston and on back. They have done it for a number of years and this is something that allows them to take care of a number of those projects. They buy medicines, they provide a number of services to families and actual people that have this disease and they have done it for a number of years. We would just ask that you would support them.

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

RESOLUTION NO. 84 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION RATIFYING AN AGREEMENT WITH RED RIVER ROAD RUNNERS, INC., AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, Red River Road Runners, Inc., annually sponsors 5k races in the City of Shreveport; and

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport has been a co-sponsor of these events; and

WHEREAS, in 2003, runs will be held in the following parks: Mamie Hicks, Betty Virginia, Bilberry, C. Bickham Dickson, Ford, Hamels, Querbes and Southern Hills; and

WHEREAS, the City's continued co-sponsorship of these events will enable the organization to continue to provide wholesome events for citizens of the city which is a public purpose.

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED, by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, regular, and legal session convened that the agreement with Red River Road Runners, Inc., relative to the production or sponsorship of up to eight (8) 5k runs in the City of Shreveport is hereby ratified.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Mayor is authorized to execute an agreement with

Red River Road Runners, Inc., relative to the sponsorship and/or production of the 5k runs, substantially in accordance with the draft thereof which was filed for public inspection with the original of this resolution in the Office of the Clerk of Council on June 10, 2003.

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

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

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

The Deputy Clerk read the resolution by title: Resolution No. 88 of 2003 by Councilman Lester: A resolution amending Sections 1.8 and 1.11 of The Rules of Procedure of the City Council and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

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

Councilman Gibson: I would like a point of order on for, is this changing the Rule?

Mr. Thompson: Yes.

Councilman Gibson: Can I get a ruling from the Parliamentarian on what type of, is this a majority vote or two thirds vote?

Councilman Walford: Two-thirds.

Ms. Glass: I am not officially the Parliamentarian nor is Mr. Thompson, but it is a 2/3rds vote. And it is a 2/3rd vote of the entire membership of the Council.

Councilman Lester: I would ask that we support this agenda item. The whole idea about Public Comments has been a subject of some contention over the past months and weeks.

An affirmative vote on this particular agenda item, will allow citizens to come and voice their opinion to the Council in a context of the beginning of the meeting.

Now, one of the issues that we have had was as to whether or not those minutes will be transcribed and whether they will be required to be placed in the official journal and the time frame.

This amendment will allow that if in fact the comments are made on an agenda item, that will be made part of the official record as is the case now but if in fact the fact the comments are not on item that is to be taken up at that meeting, then we resolve ourselves in a Committee of a Whole and that particular set of comments is not transcribed.

I think this would go far to show the citizens that we are concerned about their views. I think it will go along way in terms showing how we determine, allow communications twixt and between this body and the Public, for at the end of the day, we are doing the business of the public. And I just would think that we would acknowledge that and give them an opportunity to speak to us because granted we get paid a whole lot of money (I say that tongue firmly in cheek) but we are paid to be here and they are not. And I would just think that if a citizen wants to express himself or herself and they take the time and trouble usually to get off of work to come down here and address

this body, then we should at least give them due deference and allow them to speak, move forward with our meeting and let them get on with the rest of their day or evening. So, I would ask that would support this particular effort.

Councilman Green: I would also like to ask that we would support this item and if by chance this item fail, I would ask that this be brought up again at election time. Because, we promised the citizens during election time that they would be first and No. 1 and I think they ought to be first and No. 1 even after the election is over.

Councilman Gibson: Just so we are clear, there is a, the way the agenda is put together, the Public is given preference treatment on items that are on the agenda just as we did today. We had several people, in fact, Mr. Chair, how many people did we have to speak prior to we going to agenda items?

Councilman Walford: Six (6), Mr. Gibson.

Councilman Gibson: We had six people that came before this body that spoke, were recognized properly and were approved properly, spoke on the subject matter that that is been, the process for quite some time for this Council. And in addition, anything that is not on the agenda, there is a provision at the end for Public Comments.

I think the reason that this historical agenda has been put together is to maintain a sequence of events and a orderly process to make sure that we are maximizing not only the citizen tax payer dollars, but also the citizens time. So, I just want to make sure I'm on record that the people that are watching this, that when we are talk about Public Comments, the public is given the opportunity at the very beginning to talk about agenda items that are set and everybody knows what that agenda is. And, things that are not on the agenda, are put at the very end in order to put the people first, but that people's agenda is based on elections of their representatives of which I am for District D, and when they have an item, we put it on the agenda for discussion and that takes precedence over everything, so I just want to be clear on that.

Councilman Jackson: I would like to also encourage a vote for this resolution simple because at the end of the day while we have affectionately referred to this *as our meeting*, it is the people's meeting. And, while we are in fact elected to represent them, we in fact do not usurp any particular authority over them and I would suggest that issues always change today people may come to speak about one thing, four months ago or five months ago, people came to speak about something else, this time next year people will come to speak about something else, and I don't want to be perceived as having a hang if you can hang attitude and when we get to you, we'll get to you.

The fact that people even watch on television and it seems very often we play to the crowd at home, but the fact that people even watch television or even take the time to come to this assembly is not, they are not here to honor us, they are not there to heap accolades perhaps on us, but to have their voices heard.

And, I think just in deference to the length of our agenda and when we look at the length of our agenda from meeting to meeting, we have very often a very ambitious agenda to hope that we can get out in an hour and a half, two hours. So, I think just in perusing that one of the things that we have to also remember is that we have the ability to flexible change the agenda. The agenda ought to be there to serve us, we are not the agenda.

I would suggest to you also, that as far as I'm concerned, this agenda serves as a guide and not a straight jacket and that we ought to be able to, with some degree or some idocum of flexibility do those things that which—we add legislation to the agenda at any given time at the appropriate time above. So, I just think that if in fact this is the wish of some people, maybe constituents have

said and certainly we've heard them say it as they come, that we think about and as Councilman Gibson has talked or at least alluded to, if it becomes a problem in the future, that we still retain the same amount of authority to put it back where it was.

And, I think that it is not going to hurt us and unless of course someone is suggesting that it will hurt us, then I would certainly be interested to see how it operates. I don't know if it has been like that since we'd had this form of government or some Council exercising their authority has changed and put it into this agenda, but I think it ought to be what serves us best as we serve the people.

Councilman Hogan: Mr. Thompson, we still could reserve the right to suspend the rules if we so desire and have someone to speak that is not a subject relevant to the agenda, correct?

Mr. Thompson: You can always do that if it gets the requisite number of votes to suspend the rules.

Councilman Hogan: Which is a majority vote. I beg your pardon, to suspend the rules it requires five votes, correct?

Mr. Thompson: Right.

Councilman Walford: I favor keeping the agenda just as it is. I think one thing we have to look back to is Councilman Green and the Mayor both served on the Council when you couldn't even address the Council on Council day, you had to come on the Monday prior. I think that it is important that we do the business of the City. We've had a bond attorney sitting over there now since 3 o'clock who serves the City waiting to address an agenda item, but I think it is important that we do the business of the City and certainly we are going to be here to hear those people who want to discuss other items; so I don't support changing the agenda.

Councilman Lester: I appreciate the comments that have been made, both pro and con. I think was a good discussion. At the end of the day, I would just say, without the public, there is no business. We talk about funds, but again if the people out there aren't paying their taxes and buying things then we don't have any bonds to sell or anything of that nature.

I don't think it is very much of an imposition to ask, I think it is just a basic matter of courtesy that if citizens who have an issue that is of a concern enough to us or to them that want to come down and address us, that we should defer to them and allow them to speak.

Now, in terms of how we are going to deal with what is transcribed and what is not, it allows us that if, they are not speaking on something of importance or on the agenda, they can still express themselves and we don't have to transcribe it, but I would just say, I think that we should send a message that we want to hear what the public has to say.

Because it is one thing for us to sit and listen and I'm sure that when different issues get hot we calls at our office and what have you, and that is one level of participation and through technology some of us even get e-mail and we respond them and we get letters but when a citizen takes out of his or her schedule and our meeting start at 3 o'clock so a lot of time they have take off of work, and so they are taking off of work to come and address the Council, I think that in and of itself says something and we should honor that.

We are going to be here. I mean, we are all intelligent folks, degreed (some of us have two, some of us have three degrees). I don't think that it is too much of an interruption. I don't think it is an interruption at all, and I'm pretty sure that we can keep our train of thought in terms of taking care of the other business that we have on the agenda.

I would just ask that we give the public an opportunity if they want to come from all parts of the City, to come and speak to this body, they should be given an opportunity to speak first and then leave if they chose to. Because I don't think Mr. Brown is going to mind sitting here or anybody

else that we are paying by the hour is going to be sitting here, I know I wouldn't.

Substitute motion by Councilman Jackson to table the resolution, seconded by Councilman Hogan. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 5. Nays: Councilman Gibson. 1. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

Councilman Jackson: I just would like to share with this body and I don't mean the audience or the t. v. audience, but with this body that I had talked with Councilman Hogan and asked him if he would support seconding this that we might put this on the table because I think that this needs to be better dealt with on a Monday when we can have discussion among ourselves. Because, potentially the looks of things are that we are always make things look like whether it is the perception or the reality a race issue and the votes come down 3 to 3 or 4 to 3 and I think maybe if we discuss it and if everybody holds their position and we will vote on it at another time. But, I would hope at this time that we would start moving beyond that and at least have this discussion perhaps in an Administrative Session and a debate in an Administrative Session so that nobody can accuse anybody else of grandstanding but that we could try to hammer this out in ways that I think we ought to certainly be mature enough to do and that will be palatable for everybody whether one side wins or losses or whatever the case and that we can have debate in another session.

Councilman Gibson: Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Walford: We don't have a motion on the table. I'm not sure where we are going with discussion unless somebody has got a Point of Order, we need to move on to No. [89].

RESOLUTION NO. 89 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION TO DISCONTINUE THE CONTRACT BETWEEN THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT AND THE GREATER SHREVEPORT HUMAN RELATIONS COMMISSION, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

By: COUNCILMAN LESTER

WHEREAS, that the City of Shreveport entered into a contract with the Greater Shreveport Human Relations Commission on February 26, 1997; and

WHEREAS, the initial contract states "Commission agrees and acknowledges that the City shall not provide funding to the organization beyond December 31, 1997 and that no funds shall be appropriated by the Shreveport City for the Commission in City's 1998 budget or thereafter"; and

WHEREAS, the contract provides that the city may discontinue this contract upon written notice to the Greater Shreveport Human Relations Commission with the understanding that all services being performed under this contract shall cease upon the date specified in such notice; and

WHEREAS, it is the interest of the City of Shreveport to discontinue said contract.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened, that the contract between the City of Shreveport and the Greater Shreveport Human Relations Commission be discontinued effective December 31, 2003.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED the Chief Administrative Officer is directed to notify the Greater Shreveport Human Relations Commission of the discontinuation of said contract and he is directed to take all other appropriate action in this regard.

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

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

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

Councilman Jackson: I am concerned, it is no secret that I'm concerned about this. I don't understand and maybe someone is going to be able to articulate for me before we move on for a vote, the logic behind discontinuing the contract between the City of Shreveport and the Greater Shreveport Human Relations Commission.

You know, I don't get a chance to read the paper everyday, but I get a phone call about the paper, every day. And, I had no idea that certain things were in there on certain days, and so I did in fact read it (no offense Mr. Walker, I did get a chance to read it after the fact) and I just would hope that somebody, whether it is the Mayor, Mr. Lester, all of those folks who have been a part of the talking and the commentary in the newspaper about, could perhaps articulate for me what is the reason that I ought to vote in favor of discontinuing the contract with the Human Relations Commission, that in fact, could very (inaudible) we need in our City. As well at this time, somebody can tell me that and I would yield, Mr. Chairman, to find out if someone has for some logic for this situation.

Councilman Lester: I would simple offer this: the Human Relations Commission, we all know was created in the wake of the Cedar Grove riots. And I would add for the record for informational purposes the riot happened diagonally across the street from the house where I grew up, just for the record.

I think the greatest Human Relations Commission that has ever been created in the City of Shreveport is this Council. I think for us to advocate that responsibility to another group, I have problems with that. Now, the fact of the matter is, this group was created as a saith to sooth the tensions, at the time. We spent \$100,000 in some instances, \$125,000 in some instances and if you carry that out over the 10 or 11 years, you can, an expense of anywhere between \$1.1 million and \$1.2 million dollars. You heard from a Board member that over 70% of the funds, he said 89 (I knew it was over 70% go to Administration). If you listen to the board member, 89% goes to the Administration and leaves very little in terms of programming.

I don't have a problem with the Greater Shreveport Human Relations Commission, in fact the Greater Shreveport Human Relations Commission can continue, it is just my opinion that we can better use those funds, elsewhere.

I have offered, I believe it is another agenda item, to create a Neighborhood Investment Program where we take those funds and disburse those funds between the different Council districts to allow small community groups, non-profit organizations, to apply for money from the City to build capacity.

In my particular area in District A, we have never had a single non-profit organization or a neighborhood group receive a single dime from the City of Shreveport. Allendale is one of the oldest most historic districts in the City of Shreveport and we do not have a neighborhood association. We had a Ledbetter Heights Association, but it has fallen by the wayside. What this program, the Neighborhood Investment Program which is a component portion to this, will allow those organizations to receive some money from the City and make something positive happen. I think that. . .

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Lester, with all due respect, I just wanted to know not

about No. 90, but about 89.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Jackson, Mr. Lester has got the floor at the moment.

Councilman Jackson: I understand. I don't want to know about No. 90, but No. 89.

Councilman Lester: Well with all due respect and due deference. . .

Councilman Walford: Excuse Mr. Jackson, Mr. Lester has got the floor unless you want to call a point of order.

Councilman Jackson: I was telling him I wanted to hear about 89, he was telling me about the Neighborhood Investment. I just wanted to know about, the discontinuation of the Shreveport Human Relations Commission.

Councilman Lester Well as I appreciate it Councilman Jackson, you asked what was the impetus for 89 and the impetus for 89 was the other.

Councilman Jackson: It is just to get the money, is what I'm asking.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Jackson, 1. You address---

Councilman Jackson: I am asking, Mr. Lester.

Councilman Walford: You don't ask Mr. Lester, you address to the Chair. Let Mr. Lester finish and I'll be happy to come back to you after other comments have been made.

Councilman Jackson: Yes, sir.

Councilman Lester: I think that the Greater Human Relations Commission, City Council.

I think that we threw money at a problem to make some of us feel good and the issue still has not been addressed.

I think that we would make this Council responsible. I don't think that we should advocate our responsibility. I think that we should do the hard the job to deal with the issues and that is why I offered that particular scenario.

I think the greatest benefit to this City in terms of human relations, economics. I think, opportunity and I think, jobs. And, I don't think that, I just think that we can do a better program of that, with this body.

And so I offered this agenda item and a companion piece of legislation to create and redirect those funds, but again this organization is not forestalled from continuing to exist. I mean, I think the organization has been in existence for 11 years. I think the organization can move forward. Nothing that we do today, if we vote for agenda Item No. 89 will disband this organization, that's a misnomer, they can continue. I am just saying, we can redirect the funds to another source.

Councilman Green: I would just like to say, along with what Councilman Lester has said, we are not ending the Human Relations. For however many years, we've been giving them money and they've said that they would do this, that or the other. We are disbanding, we are just taking our resources into another area. And, I think it is very important for us to understand that, if in fact you say well we are going to do this now and we are going to do this whenever, we did not do it then.

The Human Relations for a long time, they've only sponsored one event and that's the Martin Luther King and that's been a special project for themselves. They have not, I recall the Baptist Ministers Fellowship Conference have asked them to work with them to get the speaker. They decided to choose the speaker they want and they handled it on themselves, they've never included the entire community as

to what we want or what would you like. It has been a pet peeve and a pet project and they've done it the way they want to. We are not saying stop doing it that way, but we are saying, doing it at your own expense. Councilman Walford: Mr. Gibson.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, I thought I asked you after James started to speak?

Councilman Walford: If you'd read the Rules of procedure and the debate--- and Ms. Glass I'll ask you confirm this for me---during debate you don't call on anyone for second debate until everyone else who wishes to speak has spoken. Is that correct Ms. Glass?

Ms. Glass: That is in the rules, yes.

Councilman Walford: I will come back to you Mr. Jackson.

Councilman Jackson: Point of order. Was my asking a question constitute my having made a debate on the subject?

Ms. Glass: I believe so, it is not what you say, it. . .

Councilman Walford: The Chair would rule, yes.

Councilman Gibson: It's a pleasure to see us following some guidelines and some rules under Robert's Rules.

I agree with Councilman Lester in this aspect that the Council in this particular case has obligations to spearhead efforts to bring communities together, neighborhoods together.

I would rather substitute an amendment to this particular item or maybe not amended, but ask for a, to table this issue for 30-days with the challenge to the Commission to come back with a strategic plan.

I can speak firsthand because I am currently on that Commission and I have concerns and have had concerns from Day 1 and have voiced those concerned about certain issues of which one of the Commissioners was up here earlier about how much money we spend in terms of overhead and salaries.

But, a strategic plan is the only way that I can support continuing the Greater Shreveport Human Relations Commission in the fact that without a plan, we can't spend money. Now I believe that Councilman Jackson, you have said that on several occasions on other items.

Councilman Jackson: I haven't said that.

Councilman Gibson: But I will go one step farther. I don't believe that throwing money at this situation is the answer. That we as a responsible Councilman should work with the NAACP. . . and if each of us have those particle groups in our particular districts then our responsibility as City Councilmen, is to work with those groups.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Gibson, can I interrupt you one second and see if I misunderstood. Are you offering a substitute motion?

Councilman Gibson: I am offering, in my comments, a motion for delay for 30-days.

Councilman Walford: If you are offering that motion, before we discuss we need a second and I'll come right back to you for your discussion.

Councilman Gibson: I appreciate that. I'll appreciate if there is a second, but I do understand.

Councilman Walford: State your motion again for me.

Motion by Councilman Gibson to delay for 30-days on this issue and put as a caveat that, the Shreveport Human Relations Commission. . . .

Councilman Walford: We'll just go with the motion is to delay for 30-days.

Councilman Gibson: But with the fact that, they have to come back with a Strategic Plan before this body of where they are going in the future (motion died for a lack of a second).

Councilman Walford: We didn't get a second on that Mr. Gibson.

Councilman Gibson: That's fine.

Councilman Walford: One second Mr. Jackson. Mr. Hogan, before I go back to Mr. Jackson, Mr. Hogan do you have any comments?

Councilman Hogan: No comments.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Mayor, I believe you did.

Councilman Jackson: He is going to everybody before he come back to me.

Councilman Walford: I have no comment, now I'll come back to you.

Councilman Jackson: It is clear that you are the Chairman, so I'll follow your lead.

Councilman Walford: Back to you, Mr. Jackson.

Councilman Jackson: Thank you. Let me just say that, this is, I don't know any good adjectives other than, ridiculous.

And the reason I say this is because this is one of those issues that nobody will be able to talk about tomorrow as a race issue.

This is one of those issues where I think we have put absolutely not enough thought. I listened to Mike Gibson and I'm about to listen to the Mayor, in a few minutes talk about and I heard in the paper, the Mayor says: useless. My commentary is very, I hope, succinct and to the point. Mike Gibson No. 1 is a Commissioner on this Human Relations Commission. If there is any level of ineptitude to this particular Commission, he is a part of it.

Secondly, not only that, the Mayor has been the Mayor while there has been a Greater Shreveport Human Relations Commission, longer than any other Mayor. And I would suggest this point, Bo Williams was the Mayor four years for Human Greater Shreveport Human Relations. Hazel Beard was the Mayor about 2 ½ maybe 3 years for the Human Relations Commission. Mayor Hightower has been the Mayor now for five funding cycles. Six Hundred and Twenty-Five Thousand Dollars (\$625,000) later he suggests to us that, it is useless.

My question is does it take five years \$625,000 to find out that a program is broken when as a part of what Councilman Lester calls, the group with the responsibility, as a member of that group, Mr. Mayor, we saw it, you saw it and I think Councilman Green probably saw it, living out its last leg at that particular time, but it was sad today, it has been sad every since its, creation.

One of them said that it as put in place really to pacify the black community. That, is a misnomer. Because, the Greater Shreveport Human Relations Commission is not about black people. The Greater Shreveport Human Relations Commission is about women, its about elderly people, its about disabled people, its about folks who can not speak up for themselves, it is suppose to serve as a Commission that can in fact protect that which is the most—you see, there are some things, I would suggest to you because I believe in the Constitution of the United States of America and in that Constitution, in some

profound eloquent and unequivocal language, it suggests to us that, all of us are born equal and that all of us are in fact due some certain inalienable rights one of those are the rights to life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

In other words, there are some rights that separate this union from other totalitarian form of governments. It is that there are some rights that are neither conferred by nor derived from the state, they are God given. And what has to happen is none of us would like to live in a city where there was no police protection, none of us would live in a City where there was no fire protection, yet all of us live in a city where there is no basic and fundamental human rights protection.

What I would suggest to us that if it is in fact our responsibility to throw the baby out with the bath water, is more of advocating rather than sitting here. It takes courage to fix something that is broken. It is easy to throw it away, dismiss it and put the blame on somebody else. The key is that we have to have a responsibility to stop pacifying.

The Mayor has suggested to me that Hazel Beard and Bo Williams did it because it was politically expedient. I would suggest to you that, if you continue to do the same thing, you are doing it because it is politically expedient instead of morally compelling. We ought to do it because it is the right thing to do.

And, I suggest to you when we start talking about the percentage of money that is spent on personnel. Well listen, we sat around the whole time. We didn't just know this today. When we voted on the budget to give them \$125,000, why didn't anybody talk about it then? Whenever last year and the year before and all of that, I don't recall having these same conversations or resolutions about it and I would suggest that whatever the percentage that is spent on personnel is not the only thing we ought to be concerned about

What in fact is happening in our City ought to be a grave concern. You have to do what business people call a cost-benefit analysis. I know what the cost is and we said that there hadn't been much benefit. As a matter of fact the Mayor was saying there is \$125,000 cost, zero benefit. Well, I would suggest to you that, the leader of this organization, the Chief Executive Officer, who is the Mayor, has a responsibility for giving it its Vision, its Mission, and its direction. If the Board members, like Mr. Gibson and others who are on the Board do not accomplish the Mission, the Vision or their not given a Vision or a Mission, how can you evaluate them on having done anything.

I would suggest to you that, there has been times in the history of this Greater Shreveport Human Relations Commission where there have been offers made and Mr. Mayor help me if I'm wrong, by the EEOC and the State of Louisiana to help them, to serve as mediators so they could do Alternative Dispute Resolutions right here in Shreveport because of the case load that EEOC had. That would have been doing something more than Martin Luther King, Jr. Program.

I believe that organizations ought not exist if they are not going to do anything either. But to sit by and give them no Mission, give them no Agenda, give them no Vision, and then evaluate them and give them an "F" because they haven't done anything. I would think if you give them nothing to do, and they do nothing, they deserve a "A+."

That, Councilman Lester has suggested to me that \$18,000 will go to each area, whatever the case may be of breaking down \$18,000 in seven ways. I don't know how \$18,000 can create one job much less more than one job.

And, I would suggest to you that what we have done in my opinion, is to find a

unique way and I don't believe that it's the intention of the author of this legislation to turn back the hands of time on human rights.

I don't believe that it is his intention. If in fact he explained to me was that, the money could be better some where else, I could understand that this Neighborhood Investment Program out to be funded. I told them last night, I think it is good idea. I don't disagree with the Neighborhood Impact Program. I disagree with having it at the expense of the Greater Shreveport Human Relations Commission.

How we could sit back with such a tool that we could, in my opinion, empower to be what this City needs at the state where we are now, I just believe that somehow or another we've gone to sleep.

Councilman Green has suggested that we are not disbanding this organization. Councilman Lester has suggested we are disbanding this organization. Well the issue I have and the problem I have is, if first they have no Mission or they have no Activity and then that's the reason we'd like to get rid of them. Then, how we can say we are not disbanding and if not only do they have no Mission and no Vision, then we are going to take the money, so they have no Vision, no Mission, no money, and we say, good luck to you.

I would suggest to you that it is what it is and in my opinion it is a spade and we ought to call it just that. I would suggest to us this, that all of these arguments based on the number of dollars spent on personnel and all those other things, it is all good.

And, I would suggest and Councilman Lester knows where I'm coming from that if this Council is in fact the best Human Relations Commission that we have in this City, then we are in trouble. Because very often when it comes to the sensitive issues that this Commission would have to deal with, we clam up, go into our shell, not that we can not, very often we just do that which comes first to our human nature.

And, so what I would suggest to us that this organization. I don't care if it's the same organization, you get different people to serve on the organization, whatever the case maybe this organization, this organization, if it has not been viable why do we hold only them accountable for it whenever the leadership, in my opinion, ought to be held accountable for it as well and those of us who sit in judgment of that, ought to be held accountable for it doing, nothing, as well.

If we passed the budget, we ought to be concerned about that. We don't give people money and say do what you want and we will tell you in 10 years whether we like that or not; we never do that. We have to, in my opinion, we've not been accountable and I don't know that this action makes us any more accountable by again, proverbially throwing the baby out with the bath water.

So, I would hope that this Council whether we vote 5 to 1 or 4 to 3 or whatever he numbers may be, that this Council considers the fact that this entity can and should be a Commission as others have across the country that deals with issues that are issues that have risen to the forefront of this community in the last several months.

So, I wish that all of us who are here would give some consideration. We in fact not change our mind, but I would like to suggest Mr. Lester, I don't know how open you are to it, but if the logic behind discontinuing the contract with the Human Relations Commission is only about Neighborhood Investment Program, that the Mayor suggested to us that the Pirates is going to give us a \$1,000,000 million dollars and we are going to use \$400,000 for the Street Overlay, that leaves us with \$600,000. And I would recommend that about

\$300,000 of that money be given to the Neighborhood Investment Program. And, you can divide \$300,000 times 7 and you would make a larger impact. Because, in my opinion, taking \$125,000 cutting it up 7 way, has about the same impact of taking a pebble and chunk-ing it in the Grand Canyon.

And I would suggest that we got to be able to do and make better decision as it relates to what we are going to do and how we are going to fund it. I agree with you, there needs to be money. I don't know that, Mr. Mayor, do you have the record for the Riverfront Development Fund. Does somebody have a copy of that?

Mayor Hightower: We can get you one.

Councilman Jackson: How soon can we get a copy?

Mr. Dark: Mr. Jackson, what do you want to see? Do you what is in the Riverfront Development now or do. . . .

Councilman Jackson: I want to see line items of the Riverfront Development budget.

Mr. Dark: I can go upstairs and give it to you in a few moments, if you want. We can certainly have it for you, tomorrow.

Councilman Jackson: I need to get it today.

Mr. Dark: Well, I'll go upstairs and get you a copy.

Councilman Jackson: And the reason I wanted to get it today, I want us to see Riverfront Development Fund and other funds around the City, somebody said it earlier that we spend money on a lot of things. And, if it is about finding out what's better than the other, then I think we ought to critically be able to look at this list of things that we spend more than \$125,000 on and see if there, because to me the basic and fundamental human rights of individuals and citizens within our City is more important than some of this other stuff that we spend money on.

And I am not willing to be up-front and say, we are going to salvage this program for an \$18,000 district program. But I would suggest to us is that there are some greater things that we could be doing. Mr. Chairman, I would like to see the budget for the Riverfront Development District, before I finish.

Mr. Antee: The Council Office does have a copy of that budget.

Councilman Walford: I think we all have it as well in our book. In fact in both books that we've been given, all budget and. . .

Councilman Jackson: I'm well aware that it probably may be in every office upstairs, that's not my question. My question is can someone get that? And I was asking the Mayor if they can get it. Who produces that, Ken?

Mr. Antee: You got a staff that works---

Councilman Jackson: Who produces that, I'm asking you?

Mr. Antee: It is produced by the Administration and ya'll vote on it and your staff can run up to get it if you so direct them to, is all I'm saying.

Councilman Jackson: Let me further suggest to you that before, even prior to being a City Councilman, I'm still a citizen. And that would suggest to me that everybody who is employed works for us. And I'm saying, it is not about whether or not we have it, I just ask if whoever produces it can go and get a copy of it.

Mr. Antee: If I may I am going to try to make myself a little clearer, Councilman Jackson. If you ask your staff, I'm sure they will be more than happy to go up and get you a copy of what you need, that is all I'm saying.

Councilman Jackson: I understand that. But, I was just saying that when I directed

the question to you, you all have done that for us before. I am saying that is not unprecedented, am I right about that?

Mr. Antee: No, it is not.

Councilman Jackson: That is what I was saying, that was the reason why I asked the question. I certainly wasn't trying to suggest that they couldn't do it. I just wanted to get somebody who produced it, to get us a copy of it before, I finish.

Mr. Thompson, can somebody from our office go get it if they can't go get it?

Mr. Thompson: We can go and get the budget. Whether or not it will have those particular items that you need. Deborah as you know is here. Tom is the one who generally takes care of that. We will go and get the documents that we have, but I think you want to see where the money goes to those organizations.

Councilman Jackson: He doesn't have that so. Seeing that we may not be able to get it, can you all get it for us?

Mr. Thompson: Sharon is up there looking for.

Councilman Jackson: I don't have the floor anymore.

Councilman Gibson: I'm sorry, I thought you quit, Mr. Jackson.

Councilman Jackson: I wanted to finish whenever they got me the document. I'll think you'll exceed your time limit by quite a bit if we wait on that.

Councilman Jackson: What's my time limit?

Councilman Walford: Julie, help me out, I believe 10 minutes?

Councilman Jackson: Twenty (20).

Ms. Glass: I believe it is 10 minutes.

Councilman Jackson: Lets look at it because I thought it was 20.

Ms. Glass: I do have the memorandum here where we quoted that.

Councilman Walford: Under Section 42 of Robert's Rule, Page 382, a member can speak no longer than 10 minutes unless he obtains the consent of the assembly; the rule is the same in the Committee of the Whole, so you would have to have. . .

Councilman Jackson: How much time have I spent so far, Mr. Chairman?

Councilman Walford: Actually, I have got you at about 12 or 13.

Councilman Jackson: Where are you keeping the time?

Councilman Gibson: I'm watching it right back there.

Councilman Jackson: Oh, that's not official.

Councilman Gibson: I'm not calling time on you Mr. Jackson, but I'm saying we don't have time to wait. We are not going to suspend the meeting to wait.

Mayor Hightower: . an arm that would essentially eliminate duplication of what the Human Relations Commission should be doing. And I know that when I picked up the phone when we had the Huspeth shooting come about and talked to a person at the Human Relations Commission and I was told, we don't really want to get involved in this one, maybe we'll do something on the next one. And then the Executive Director stepped down to move away, that there was no question in my mind that the timing was right. So, I fully support Councilman Lester's efforts by commending on the leadership that he's willing to stand up and take and move a non-productive, non-result oriented board off the books, move or give the charge to the Multi-Cultural Center of the South to help come with a plan which they have already been working on I might add, to reduce staff, to reduce overhead, share commonalties and not lose the spirit of what the Human Relations Commission should be about. And that's trying to bring people together. But again, I think we've got to

realize what often time happens on those commissions, it's the preachers preaching to the choir. And that's what's happened. No money, no results, cost benefit analysis, I think Councilman Jackson hit it on the head. You need business persons or anybody looking at that with any measure at all would say, \$1million wasted. And I raise my hand and say that I should have had the nerve and the leadership and the courage to do what Councilman Lester is suggesting today.

Councilman Jackson: Well, I just wanted to say just in response to what the Mayor said. You know, it's too easy to say (unclear) and no results. We gotta say ten years we sat here and watched it and no results. And (unclear) as the people who sat on that commission for no results. Because if ultimately we kept giving them money and we knew that it was (unclear) whether we were expecting them to do anything else. If we gave it to them as a matter of pacification whether there were substantive difference being in ten years, if someone had stepped up 10 years ago with the courage to say, this thing is a toothless tiger. We ought to put an ordinance behind it, that's gonna make it law that's gonna make it significant, but I would suggest to you that in 10 years, nobody stepped up to do that. And the reason nobody stepped up to do that is because, it leads me to believe that nobody wanted significant change. That Board you're talking about bringing people together, how do they put people together to wait a decade to assist it and then analyze it and then critique it and suggest that it in fact is a, useless waste of time. If it is a useless waste of time today it has been 10 years of useless waste.

And what I'm suggesting to us is the easiest thing to do, it doesn't take courage to say you, get rid of something that we can't show any results for. We ought to be able to stand up and suggest that there is a need, there is a niche, there is a place. If it is worth it for that Commission, it ought to be run correctly. If it's the wrong director, they ought to be fired, they ought to be run out town, whatever the case may be, but we ought to not compromise the mission for our inability to hold them accountable on a regular basis.

I've had this conversation I think, that you just elluded Mr. Mayor is that over 10 years, nobody brought it up, nobody's talked about it. Everybody just kinda let it sit there like the big pink elephant in the corner and everybody knows its there, but nobody talked about it.

Well I'm suggesting to you that even now as we get into dialogue and to conversation about it, my concern is whether or not we think that with its mission and with its goals, that's it's worth \$125.000. And I don't know if somebody can answer that question, but I pose that question to the Administration. Do we think that its mission and its role and scope, as described in writing, is it worth \$125,000? Mr. Chairman, I addressed the question to the Mayor, but he's waiting for you to recognize him.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Mayor, I'm sorry, please go ahead.

Mayor Hightower: Mr. Chair, to Councilman Jackson's question, I think that you are correct, that over the past 10 years, it has been a passive organization and there has been, I don't want to say, passive talk about it on every Council since it's initial inception, there's been much debate every single budget session, I think since its inception. But the votes have never been there to do what's necessary to hold somebody accountable, to ask for the results and then have a Council that would stand up and say, hey there are none.

Again, I commend Councilman Lester on his efforts to call it what it is and although the timing may seem inappropriate, the reason again, the timing is appropriate because you are fixing to be faced with a Commission that's out acting on its own going to hire

another executive director without securing funding. And I think that's unfair to whoever the applicant or eventual hiree may be that you would transfer someone in here for a 3-month period or whatever that term be and then their job go away; so, that's why I think the timing is important at this point. Do I think \$125,000 well spent; is that your question?

Councilman Jackson: I'm saying did you think that the Human Relations Commission's existence and the goals and the mission of the Human Relations Commission is worth \$125,000?

Mayor Hightower: I think the results that they produce, are not worth a penny.

Councilman Jackson: No, I asked you about the goals that they are suppose to produce and the mission that they are suppose to have on paper, that should have been a directive to them. Do you think that's worth \$125,000.

Mayor Hightower: (unclear) to this City?

Councilman Jackson: Yeah. Is \$125,000 a large price to pay or a small price to pay?

Mayor Hightower: I think if results were produced, it would be a small price to pay.

Councilman Jackson: Can it be reconfigured, in your opinion, to make it in fact what it ought to be? Is it in fact impossible for them to function and operate as their by-laws or their constitution of the document that, that organization is given. If they do what they are supposed to do, is it possible for them to be successful and provide for this City what it needs from the Commission?

Mayor Hightower: I think its possible. I think you have to have the right person in there, that's working, working.

Councilman Jackson: Right, but what I'm suggesting. . .

Mayor Hightower: Everyday, working.

Councilman Jackson: But what I'm suggesting if its possible to try to make it happen for the citizens of this City. If we believe just an iota that's its possible, (unclear) the investment or perhaps a dis-investment for over 10 years, I guess my concern is, why don't they try to fix it before they stop funding it? I've said its not unprecedented when I've had situations before. We've had bad comments about bad contracts that the City for example. We've got together with them, we said there are some things that you are going to need to, if you want to keep your contract with us, you're gonna have to work on A, B, C, and D. And if you correct those things. we are willing to keep the contract--that would not be unprecedented.

My question is, I guess I see us moving, in an extreme way without ever having being able to articulate at least what the steps were. What did we do to try to make sure that this organization functioned according to its Mission, according to its Purpose and according to its Goals and are we satisfied that we've done everything possible to help it survive. Throwing money at it ain't the answer as you've said. But throwing money at it and giving it direction and being held accountable for that direction is our responsibility, financially, fiduciary and otherwise. Have we done and are we comfortable and I'd be willing to move on?

My question was are we comfortable? And you've been around longer than all of us, so I'll ask it to you, are you comfortable that we've done everything as City together, the Administration and the Council, that we could do to make the Human Relations Commission, successful? Yes or no?

Mayor Hightower I'm absolutely, without a doubt comfortable in supporting

Councilman Lester's motion. No question about.

You know, again when we had one of the most potentially racially divisive situation happen in our city over the past 3 months and help was zero, help was running the other way. Without a doubt I can tell you I support what Councilman Lester tries to do. We don't want to do away with the mission should be and should have been of the Commission all along and that is to, provide racial unity. I think that we tried to do that through this Administration. We are going to try to do that in conjunction with the Multi-Cultural Center of the South, but I think it is time for a change and. . .

Councilman Jackson: How did the.

Mayor Hightower: . . . been there for 10 years.

Councilman Jackson: Was it just that the Greater Human Relations Commission responsible for having the Justice Department come to Shreveport during this Hudspeth issue?

Mayor Hightower: They absolutely were not.

Councilman Jackson: They weren't responsible at all?

Mayor Hightower: No.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Jackson and Mr. Mayor, I believe everything is suppose to go through the Chair. I don't really believe we need to have a debate going on between the two of you.

Councilman Jackson: That's why I called you. As I appreciate it, there are people from the Department of Justice who support (inaudible). I don't want to put you on the spot and ask (inaudible) contacted the Department of Justice to give, gave them an invitation to come at any point in time?

Councilman Walford: May I ask you, who contacted the Department of Justice?

Mayor Hightower: I will say, that in this instance the Department of Justice was on the ball in doing their job and they contacted the city. Carmalita happened to be in a conference in Natchitoches where the Director of the Human Relations Commission was at the time, and approached him. And then subsequently approached me and asked permission to come in and work with our City. So, the Justice Department didn't barge in.

And then this Council, you know in the same timeframe, voted to send the tapes to the Justice Department. So, the Justice Department if it was invited in by anybody, I would say that it was this Council. But the truth of the matter is, is the Justice Department took the initiative themselves to see if they could come in and help the City of Shreveport and we certainly welcome them with open arms.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Jackson, at this point, although debate is limited to two discussion, you have three plus and I have others asking for their second opportunity. I will come back to you. I will violate Roberts and come back to you.

Councilman Jackson: I wanted to say Mr. Mayor, as I appreciate it Ms. Freeman was at a conference as you said in Alexandria and they had a conversation about it and Mr. Saunders gave her the information to get in contact with you. Subsequent to that, I believe that the Department of Justice has been working with the Human Relations Commission to be trained on what a Commission really is, what they ought to do. And, I assume from your last answer that, you don't feel that we've done everything possible to support them and I guess my effort is only to say that before we scrape anything or before we throw things away and before we give up and abandon ideas that could help our City

that I would like to certainly feel comfortable, in a non-confrontational way, simple feel comfortable that we've done everything we possible can do to do it.

It is no secret you I've talked to you one-on-one about my feeling about the (inaudible) down and putting it with the Multi-Cultural Center of the South and basically diluting its real purpose and mission. I don't support that. It sounds as if from the conversation today, that's already a done deal.

I just would hope that we would have done all that we could have done to make sure that we have done everything we could to establish and to fortify this Commission in this City whose mission is more than race relations because a Human Relations Commission and that is the problem we have, and I said this to you in your office, that we put a black and white face on everything in this City.

And when you put a black and white face, human relations is greater than just a black and white having a conversation. Human relations is really about people who are disadvantaged, people who are disabled, people who are over 40, women, all of those protected classes of people who are minority or who are otherwise, that is what that is about. It is not just about black and white race relations and building a bridge between the black and white community. If that is what it was for from the beginning, I would agree, its done a miserable job of what it should have done.

But I would suggest to you that Council who Councilman Lester says is defacto the same thing has done just a misery job in doing the same thing. I would suggest that it needs to get beyond race and beyond race relationships. It ought to be about human dignity, human works, and human rights and it can not be that without an organization who is armed with an ordinance that suggest that they are able to do what they are suppose to do. We have (inaudible) this thing down and we love the level of discussion, a race relations commission. We have had a Bi-Racial Commission and all of those things. This is not what this is supposed to be. This (inaudible) understood what it is really supposed to be and what it could really do.

If there is something to help people who are elderly, people who are disadvantaged, people who are disabled, people who have alternative lifestyle---all of these other groups that are protected classes, this is what this is about. This is not about black and white relations. So I wish that we would give that some consideration as move forward, because I am just a proponent of trying to in fact change the way we look at basic and fundamental human dignity work and human rights.

[Councilman Green called for the question, seconded by Councilman Gibson and approved.]

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Walford: There is no debate at this point.

Councilman Jackson: I am not debating, I've got a question.

Councilman Walford: Okay, we have 6 for. The debate has ended on the question.

At this time, can we vote on the motion that is on the floor and that is. . .

Councilman Jackson: Point of Order. Am I correct, and I may be wrong, but did you say that whenever I got this, I'd be able to ask questions about it?

Councilman Walford: I did and you were sitting there with it. Now, you are at the point that. . .

Councilman Jackson: I just picked it up when I stopped talking.

Councilman Walford: You'll have to deal with your fellow Councilman now, they

have called for the question.

Councilman Jackson: I just wanted to know, really from the Chair was I wrong. Did you say I could talk about it?

Councilman Walford: I did indeed, but I had not had a call for the question which ends debate. Ms. Glass, help me out here. Am I correct that when the question was called or the previous question, as it is called, ends debate if it is voted on by a two-thirds vote, am I correct?

Ms. Glass: That is correct.

Councilman Walford: Mr. Jackson, I', sorry. I have no choice in the matter at this point, as Chair. The motion was made, we are now voting on I believe it was your-- Madame Clerk, help me out. I had a motion from Councilman Lester, a second from?

Ms. Lee: Councilman Green.

Councilman Jackson: A point of order. Could I was ask Ms. Glass a question. You can me one and I'll relay it to her or you can ask it direct, either way.

Councilman Jackson: So anything that was said prior to that, I thought, I apology if I'm being redundant, but anything said prior to that like whether or not we could speak on a subject and all those things, are null and void at this particular time, whether or not?

Ms. Glass: That's correct. The previous question, is for the purpose of ending debate.

Councilman Jackson: Okay.

Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Hogan, and Green. 4. Nays: Councilman Gibson and Jackson. 2. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

RESOLUTION NO. 90 of 2003

A RESOLUTION REQUESTING LOUISIANA DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION AND DEVELOPMENT TO AUTHORIZE THE CITY TO ADVERTISE FOR BIDS ON THE SOUTHERN OAKS SUBDIVISION FLOOD CONTROL IMPROVEMENTS (STATE PROJECT NO. 576-09-0019) AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, The City of Shreveport has submitted an application for funding of the Southern Oaks Subdivision Flood Control Improvements Project under the Statewide Flood Control Program; and

WHEREAS, the State's share of the project funds has been made available and the City of Shreveport has available it's local matching share of the project funds in an amount of not less than ten (10%) percent; and

WHEREAS, at the request of the City of Shreveport, Atchley & Atchley, Inc. has prepared plans and specifications for said project, which plans and specifications are designated by State Project No. 576-09-0019; and

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport has reviewed the final plans, specifications, and cost estimate and accepts them as submitted and the Department of Transportation and Development has reviewed the final plans, specifications, and cost estimate and has approved them inasmuch as they comply with the requirements of the Statewide Flood Control Program; and

WHEREAS, all necessary servitudes, rights-of-way, spoil disposal areas, rights of

ingress and egress and the means thereof have been acquired by the City of Shreveport and the titles thereto are valid and indefeasible; and

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport has obtained all necessary permits required for the construction of this project; and

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport has agreed to accomplish all necessary utilities, fence and other facilities relocations and alterations made necessary by this project; and

WHEREAS, the Official Journal for the City of Shreveport is the Shreveport Times, whose mailing address is P.O. Box 30222, Shreveport, LA 71130, and whose telephone number is (318) 459-3200; and

WHEREAS, the City of Shreveport desires to advertise for competitive bids in accordance with LRS 38: 2212 et seq for the award of a contract in the name of the City of Shreveport and furnish engineering services during the progress of the work.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in regular session assembled on this 24th day of June, 2003, that the Department of Transportation and Development be and hereby is requested to authorize the City of Shreveport to advertise for competitive bids in accordance with LRS 38: 2212 et seq for the award of a contract in the name of the City of Shreveport covering the aforesaid improvements.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Department of Transportation and development be and hereby is assured that all necessary servitudes, rights-of-way, rights of ingress and egress and the means thereof have been obtained by the City of Shreveport and the titles thereto are valid and indefeasible and the City of Shreveport expressly agrees to defend any action for the failure of any servitudes, right-of-way, right of ingress or egress, and the City of Shreveport does hereby assume complete responsibility for providing engineering services during construction and the maintenance and upkeep of the project after construction.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Department of Transportation and Development be and hereby is assured that all required permits have been obtained by the City of Shreveport.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Department of Transportation and Development be and is hereby assured that the City of Shreveport has available its local matching funds in an amount of not less than ten (10%) percent and which combined with the State's share is sufficient to insure construction of this project.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City of Shreveport will and hereby does assume complete responsibility for all utilities, fences, and other facilities relocations and alterations made necessary by this project.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City of Shreveport does hereby save and hold harmless the Department of Transportation and Development against any loss or damage of any kind incident to or occasioned by activities undertaken in pursuance of this agreement and expressly agrees to defend any suit brought against the Department of Transportation and Development, and pay any judgement which may result from said suit as it relates to this project.

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

items, or applications and to this end the provisions of this resolution are hereby declared severable.

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

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

Councilman Jackson: On this No. 90, can you tell me the amount of money, the Administration or somebody, is this \$403,000 for the total project and DOTD, \$363,247?

Mayor Hightower: Which was is that Mr. Chairman.

Councilman Walford: No. 90, Southern Oak Subdivision Flood Control Improvement Project.

Mr. Antee: And what is your question, I'm sorry?

Councilman Walford: Mr. Jackson is wanting to know the amount of money involved?

Mr. Antee: The total project is \$403,608 and DOTD is paying \$363,247 of that; \$40,361 comes from GO Bond.

Councilman Jackson: Mr. Chairman, are you aware that we gave \$190,000 to Shreveport Green, \$325,000 to Sci-port?

Councilman Lester: Point of order.

Councilman Jackson: Shreveport Development Corporation gets \$75,000.

Councilman Walford; Mr. Jackson you are out of order at this time.

Councilman Lester: I call for the Orders of the Day, which says, whatever matter we are on, to state that, and lets move forward.

Councilman Walford: This is a motion.

Councilman Jackson Can we ask questions about the finance?

Councilman Walford; You can address this issue, Mr. Jackson.

Councilman Jackson: Okay.

Councilman Walford: Do you wish to address this one?

Councilman Jackson : I don't if my question will be relevant or not and so I don't want to, maybe I'll just pass. I just wanted to find out if we were sure we understood about, we gave \$270,00. . . .

Councilman Walford: Mr. Jackson you are out of order. At this point we are on Resolution No. 90 requesting DOTD to authorize the City to advertise for bids for Southern Oaks Subdivision Flood Control Improvement Project. So there are no other---we already have a motion and a second, we just need to move forward and vote.

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

RESOLUTION NO. 95 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION TO RECOGNIZE MILTON LEA WILLIAMS FOR HIS DISTINGUISHED BUSINESS CAREERS, PHILANTHROPIC AND PUBLIC SERVICE TO THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT AND THIS COMMUNITY AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

BY: COUNCILMAN GREEN

WHEREAS Milton Lea Williams founded the Williams Pressure Service, the first hydrostatic pipeline testing company in the oil industry in 1951; he merged Williams Pressure Service Company with Kansas-Nebraska Gas Company in 1968; and served on the board of directors of that company until his retirement in 1978; and

WHEREAS Milton Lea Williams has used his considerable business skills to help develop and maintain a strong business community in Shreveport by serving on the board of directors of many businesses, banking institutions, and trade associations including: Bar-Brook Manufacturing Company, First National Bank and Bank One of Shreveport, Southern Gas Association, American Dehydrators Association, Berg, Inc.; Bossier Federal Savings and Loan, and Bossier Bank and Trust; and

WHEREAS Milton Lea Williams has used his business practices, his organizational skills, and his time and resources to direct and assist religious, educational and philanthropic organizations to improve the quality of life for the citizens of this community and this State. This philanthropic service includes: service on several boards and committees at Broadmoor Baptist Church; Trustee for the New Orleans Baptist Theological Seminary for 10 years, a member of the Southern Baptist Convention Foundation Board for 6 years; Trustee of the Haggai Institute for 23 years; Founding member and lifetime board member of the Louisiana Tech Engineering Foundation; founder and Board Member of the Louisiana Tech Alumni Foundation; Past President and Board Member of the Louisiana Tech Alumni Association, and Member of the Louisiana Tech Athletic Council for 30 years; and

WHEREAS Milton Lea Williams was elected by the citizens of City Council District D to serve on the Shreveport City Council from 1990 - 1994, and as Chairman of the Council from November 27, 1991 until May 26, 1992. As a member of the Council Mr. Williams used his vast business skills, the experiences gained in philanthropic work and his interest in politics to bring balance, wisdom and leadership to the Council and Shreveport City Government; and

WHEREAS Milton Lea Williams has and continues to serve the public interest to include service on the Louisiana Highway Safety Commission, the Shreveport Airport Authority, Mayor's Police Advisory Board and the Shreveport Jail Advisory Board.

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 and thank Milton Lea Williams for making Shreveport and this community a better place to live by creating and helping to create strong businesses and wealth in this community, by helping to create strong religious, educational and philanthropic organizations, and by using the skills developed in the private sector for distinguished public service.

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

/s/R. M. "Monty" Walford, Chairman

/s/Calvin Ben Lester, Jr., District A
/s/Michael "Mike" Gibson, District D
/s/James Edward Green, District F

/s/Thomas G. Carmody, Jr., District C
/s/Jeffery "Jeff" A. Hogan, District E
/s/Theron J. Jackson, District G

Mr. Milton Williams: Thank you very much Councilman Green and members of the Council. You all personal friends of mine and I do admire the work that you do and everything that you do, I feel for ya and know where you're coming from.

I want you all to know that the things that I've done. . . . I did because I love this city and I want all of us to take that position. This is our city, we live in it together, we love each other and there is only one God and let's keep that in mind as we go forward.

And anytime I can be of any service to any of you, please call on me, I'm here, I'm not going anywhere, I'm not moving out of town. I think it's a great place to live and I want you all to know I appreciate you recognizing today and Art, I didn't realize that thing was all that long.

I didn't know I'd done all those things. But it kinda humbles you when somebody reads it off to ya. But I appreciate it and I appreciate y'all's recognition of me today and I thank you very much.

Councilman Green: Again Mr. Williams, and we'd just like to say thank you and keep up the good work and may God bless you.

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

RESOLUTION NO. 96 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION TO RECOGNIZE AND THANK DEBORAH FARRAR TOMASEK FOR HER 21 YEARS OF SERVICE TO THE CITIZENS OF SHREVEPORT, LOUISIANA, AS AN EMPLOYEE OF THE SHREVEPORT CITY COUNCIL AND THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO. By:
COUNCILMAN GREEN

WHEREAS, Deborah Farrar Tomasek was employed by the City Internal Auditor, Office of the City Council on August 25, 1982, and she later transferred to the Management Services Office, in the Office of the Chief Administrative Officer; and

WHEREAS, On May 19, 1986, the City Council re-organized its offices and Deborah Farrar Tomasek was hired as the first Council Analyst, a position she created and held until retirement; and

WHEREAS, during Deborah Farrar Tomasek's 21 years of employment with the City of Shreveport she has embodied the traits of a model employee. She has been highly skilled, dependable, efficient, highly productive, and loyal; and

WHEREAS, Deborah Farrar Tomasek has been especially effective as an analyst for the City Council because of her intellect, computer skills, productivity, loyalty and especially because she is very inquisitive and had a need to know everything that occurred in Shreveport City government; and

WHEREAS, Deborah Farrar Tomasek has always maintained the highest standards that are expected and required of those to whom the public trust has been committed, and in her duties as a Council Analyst she has husbanded the public's time and resources as if they were her own; and

WHEREAS, Deborah Farrar Tomasek has decided to retire from the City of Shreveport for medical reasons.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened, that it recognizes Deborah Farrar Tomasek 21 years of dedicated and valuable service to the Shreveport City Council and the Citizens of Shreveport.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the City Council thanks Deborah Farrar Tomasek for her commitment and dedication to the Citizens of Shreveport during her employment with the City Council and the Council wishes her well in her future endeavors.

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

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

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

Councilman Jackson: I think Deborah usually, she is not here, is she? She is the person who usually gets our budget together for us?

Mr. Thompson: Correct.

Councilman Jackson: She probably knew about the \$270,00 to the Sports Authority.

Councilman Lester: With all due respect, Mr. Chair, if Councilman Jackson wants to read this into the record, I don't have a problem with it. I think we should do that at the end of the meeting because I think we need to let everybody know where we spend our money. I would just state for the record, that you can't find Allendale or anybody in District A on this list.

Councilman Jackson: Yes you can, The Shreveport Development Corporation - \$75,000 North Shreveport, that's your district.

Councilman Lester: Okay, and that Queensborough is down here somewhere.

Councilman Walford: On the resolution to recognize Deborah Tomasek, is there other discussion on that resolution?

Councilman Green: When, Deborah is off with dialysis today, and whatever Council meeting should could come then I would like for us to present her with that resolution.

Councilman Walford: Absolutely. I think that that would more than appropriate. And I think any of us would be remiss if we didn't recognize what Deborah has done for this Council.

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

RESOLUTION NO. 97 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION TO REQUIRE A NATIONAL SEARCH FOR THE NEW CHIEF OF POLICE FOR THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO

By: Councilman Jackson

WHEREAS, on Friday June 20, 2003, Jim Roberts retired from the Shreveport Police Force and as Chief of Police after repeated demands for his resignation; and

WHEREAS, while the public's request for the resignation of Chief Roberts grew out of the fatal shooting of Marquise Hudspeth by Police officers, the persistent and deep seated demand that he resign grew out of a long standing belief that the Police Department has systemic problems that can only be solved by a Chief of Police with the dedication and skills to change practices and actions which are inconsistent with sound police policies, including unwarranted aggression against citizens; and

WHEREAS, to insure that the next Chief of Police has outstanding technical policing, personnel and communication skills; has the ability to objectively evaluate the policies, practices and personnel of the police department and has the confidence of the entire community; a broad national search for the next Chief of Police should be conducted, and the best candidate should be appointed.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened that as a condition of confirmation, the appointment of the next Chief of Police shall be the product of a broad national search and shall be the best person to apply for the position based on such factors as education, training, communication skills and experience.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Mayor is strongly encouraged to involve citizens in the selection process, particularly the evaluation of applications and the interview of the candidates.

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

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

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

Councilman Gibson: This is item, which one?

Ms. Lee: It is not on there, it was one that was added.

Councilman Gibson: It was added, for the National Search?

Ms. Lee: Yes.

Councilman Gibson: I will be introducing a resolution in two weeks regarding this and I'm going to take a page out of the Mayor's book and I think the timing is appropriate that, we look at this and I'm asking for full consideration of this body on several points. 1) This city is going through, and you've heard this Councilman talk about this on several occasions and will continue to talk about the budget issues. We have already cut the budget 4.5%, we are going to be continuing to look at future cuts, in my opinion. We currently do not have a police chief because of his resignation.

And I would like to, in that resolution in two weeks, I would be asking for consideration to move toward a metro form of police patrol or law enforcement that is a combination of both the Sheriff's Department and the Shreveport Police Department in the fact that we have an opportunity, at this point in time, to look toward a man who is heading

up the Sheriff's Department. And I haven't had the opportunity to visit at great length, but this is an opportunity that I think that we have a proven commodity in Sheriff Prator who is very familiar with the Police Department, he is well respected within the Police Department. He is also well respected within the Sheriff's Department. He is also, in what I have heard in canvassing both the black and white community, well respected in both the black and white community.

And that at any point in time or most importantly in the point in history of this community that he could bring a presence for law enforcement for not only Shreveport but also what he is doing in Caddo Parish. We also would have the opportunity to develop through this Council and the Sheriff's Department and the Administration an opportunity to streamline duplications of efforts between what the Sheriff's Department is doing and what the Police Department is doing. Right now, they both have dispatchers, same—different dispatchers. They also have drug enforcement. They have a variety—every thing is duplicated.

I would suggest to you that you have an opportunity to save millions of tax dollars and at the same time, use those tax dollars to reinvest in our Police Department and our Sheriff's Department in terms of the needs that they have in equipment, training. And in addition, I would say that there is even money, enough monies left over to deal with some of the subject matters that we just went through.

But I would ask strong consideration in two weeks of the resolution that I will be bringing forth before this body to look at that very seriously and I would encourage my City Councilmen to talk to Sheriff Prator and talk to the Mayor about the opportunity to explore the opportunities for, what I would consider, a historical opportunity for a metro form of law enforcement for metro area and deliver an enhanced product which would also bring more presence of police which in this particular case Police/Sheriff's Department into play.

Councilman Jackson: I would just like to urge the Council to support this resolution in its form that we might continue, not necessarily changing the forms of government, but that we could have the best candidates for Chief of Police that we can get.

I think that one of the things that I've said and I don't know, and I'm sure that he understands what I mean. One of the first things he did when he became the Mayor was talk about *Bring the Kids Home* from wherever they are gone and all across the nation and wherever they've been. And I think that is a good thing, as long as it is not incubate in the parochial mind set that the only people who could serve may in fact be here.

When it comes to business opportunities and business, we recruit, recruit and I think that is a healthy thing but not at the expense of local businesses as well, but we know that for a healthy economy we get what every is going to be best for this particular market.

We also didn't limit, I think Mike can appreciate, we didn't limit ourselves to Shreveport contractors to build the Convention Center Hotel, you know, a lot of them from out of town. And I've heard us talk a lot about moral and I suggested that boasting morale didn't have to come at the expense of excellence. And that if we can get excellence, moral affects, in my opinion, performance but performance affects compensation. And so if people simply suggest that the morale is going to be low, I don't think you put public safety at bay for morale and for the lifting of morale.

I think when you appoint a Police Chief you've got to have a greater sense of duty and a greater sense of purpose than simply to lift morale. There is no doubt that you could probably lift moral in such a way that public morale would go down and public sentiment

may in fact decrease.

So, I would ask that we would do this and the other part of my resolution suggested that the Mayor would in fact, have citizens involved. I am certainly not asking or advocating that the citizens hire a chief, I am simply suggesting that citizens be involved in the screening process of those people who have an interest and that they be a part of this, I mean, after all it is the citizen who is in fact, who has the greatest amount of concerns about who will be next to lead this Police Department.

And finally as I said to Chief Owens, who is the Acting Chief right now, my suggesting of someone who is from out of town has cast no, absolutely no aspersions on the people who are within ranks. But, I think if you are going to be the Shreveport Police Chief, you ought to be able to compete against others around this country who have similar experiences and those kinds of things and that if in fact one of the men or women from within the ranks of the Police Department would rise to a level that they could stand toe-to-toe and head-to-head with any other candidate from around the country, then we then also need to accord accommodations to this Department for being able to nurture a person a person who can be that good candidate.

But I don't think at the expense of public sentiment, that we ought to be concerned only about morale and that there ought to be a lot more philosophical thought given to and a whole lot wider reach given to selecting our next Police Chief in such a critical time.

Councilman Lester: I want to say one thing, one of the things that unfortunately has come to light in the mind of many citizens out in the City is that certain Councilmen, myself included have the statements that we have made in an effort to get an African American Police Chief, and that is not the case.

I think what is most important for us at this City, at this time is that the next Police Chief whoever he is or she is be someone that can 1. Deal with our policies in terms of use of force because that is what brings us to where we are today. 2. That has a demonstrated background to deal with diverse cultures and diverse populations. 3. Will create a Police Department in terms of hiring and staff that looks like the City of Shreveport. Color absolutely makes no difference, that is not even in my mind a consideration.

And so I would suggest and I would ask and implore the Administration as they go through this process, find us someone that we can bring back that can deal with our issues, that as I said before that can unite as opposed to divide and someone can restore the confidence of the Shreveport Police Department to everybody, regardless of what side of the tracks you live on. I think that is where we need to be at this particular time and I would call for the question (motion seconded and unanimously approved.)

Resolution passed by the following vote: Councilman Lester, Hogan, Green and Jackson.

4. Nays: Councilman Walford and Gibson. 2. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

RESOLUTION NO. 98 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION AMENDING RESOLUTION NO. 190 OF 2002 RELATIVE TO REPORTS TO THE CITY COUNCIL CONCERNING THE STATUS OF THE SHREVEPORT CONVENTION CENTER PROJECT AND THE SHREVEPORT CONVENTION CENTER HOTEL PROJECT OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

By: Councilman Jackson

WHEREAS, the City Council adopted Resolution No. 190 of 2003 authorizing and

directing the Chief Administrative Officer of the City of Shreveport, or a designee of the Mayor to provide the City Council with a detailed report of the status of the Shreveport Convention Center Project and the Shreveport Convention Center Hotel Project at the second City Council meeting in December 2002, and at each Council meeting thereafter until the projects have been completed; and

WHEREAS, in order to more efficiently address this issue, the City Council now wishes to amend said resolution.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened that the ninth paragraph of Resolution No. 190 of 2002 is hereby amended to read as follows:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened that the Chief Administrative Officer of the City of Shreveport, or a designee of the Mayor, is authorized and directed to provide the City Council with a detailed written report of the status of the Shreveport Convention Center Project and the Shreveport Convention Center Hotel Project at each administrative conference of the City Council until the projects have been completed.

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

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

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

RESOLUTION NO. 99 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION AMENDING RESOLUTION NO. 7 OF 2003 RELATIVE TO REPORTS CONCERNING SUBSTANDARD STRUCTURES AND WEEDED LOTS AND OTHERWISE PROVIDING WITH RESPECT THERETO.

By: Councilman Jackson

WHEREAS, pursuant to Resolution No. 7 of 2003, the City Council authorized and directed the Chief Administrative Officer, the Director of the Department of Community Development and/or the Bureau Chief of Codes Enforcement, or another designee of the Mayor, to provide the City Council with detailed reports, in the form approved by the Property Standards Task Force, at each City Council meeting, beginning at the second City Council Meeting in January 2003; and

WHEREAS, in order to more efficiently address this issue, the City Council now wishes to amend said resolution.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened that the tenth paragraph of Resolution No. 7 of 2003 is hereby amended to read as follows:

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, regular and legal session convened that the Chief Administrative Officer, the Director of the Department of Community Development and/or the Bureau Chief of Codes Enforcement, or another designee of the Mayor, is authorized and directed to provide the City Council with detailed written reports, in the form approved by the Property Standards Task Force, at each administrative conference of the City Council.

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

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

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

RESOLUTION NO. 100 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 ST. VINCENT MALL FOR THE ANNUAL FIRECRACKER RUN ON JULY 4, 2003 AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

By: Councilman Walford

WHEREAS, Sport Spectrum located at St. Vincent Mall intends to host the annual Firecracker Run July 4, 2003; and

WHEREAS, the establishment desires to dispense, and allow the consumption of alcoholic beverages on the grassy knoll on the Fairfield side of St. Vincent Mall, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m.; and

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

WHEREAS, any 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 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, activities planned by Sport Spectrum in conjunction with the Firecracker run is open to the public as spectators or participants; and

WHEREAS, the adoption of this resolution would allow the dispensing, and

consumption of alcoholic beverages on the grassy knoll on the Fairfield side of St. Vincent Mall, on July 4, 2003, between the hours of 8:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m. for activities associated with the Firecracker Run.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport in due, legal and regular session convened Sections 106-130(6), 10-103(a)(5) and 10-80(a) of the Code of Ordinances are hereby suspended on July 4, 2002 from 8:00 a.m. - 2:00 p.m. for activities associated with the Firecracker Run sponsored by Sport Spectrum, on the grassy knoll on the Fairfield side of St. Vincent Mall.

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

RESOLUTION NO. 101 OF 2003

A RESOLUTION TO ADOPT 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 adoption of a fee schedule for emergency ambulance and medical services by resolution of the Council.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport that the Emergency Medical Services Fee Schedule set forth in Attachment "A", attached hereto and made a part hereof, is hereby adopted; provided, however, that the proposed increased for 2005 shall not go into effect unless approved by the City Council by a subsequent resolution.

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

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

INTRODUCTION OF RESOLUTIONS:

1. Resolution No. 91 of 2003: A resolution accepting the bid of The Times and selecting The Times the Official Journal for the City of Shreveport for the period commencing July 1, 2003 through June 30, 2004 and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
2. Resolution No. 92 of 2003: A resolution authorizing the waiver of building permit fees and authorizing the donation of building materials and supplies to 12 qualified low income homeowners in the City of Shreveport and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
3. Resolution No. 93 of 2003: A resolution authorizing the Mayor to execute certain agreements with the Louisiana Department of Transportation and Development, concerning local matching funds for Federal Intelligent Transportation System Grants, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.
4. Resolution No. 94 of 2003 by Councilman Lester: A resolution to establish the Neighborhood Investment Program (NIP), and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

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

5. Resolution No. 102 of 2003 Councilman Walford: A resolution authorizing the Mayor to execute a Cooperative Endeavor with the Shreveport Opera Guild relative to the production of the 29th Annual Les Boutiques De Noel and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Read by title and as read motion by Councilman Gibson, seconded by Councilman Green for Introduction of the Resolution to lay over until the July 8, 2003 meeting. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

INTRODUCTION OF ORDINANCES:

1. Ordinance No. 80 of 2003: An ordinance amending the 2003 Riverfront Development Special Revenue Fund Budget, appropriating the funds therein, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.
2. Ordinance No. 81 of 2003: An ordinance amending Chapter 94 of the Code of Ordinances relative to Water and Sewer Reorganization of Services and Fees, and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

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

for Introduction of the Ordinances to lay over until the July 8, 2003 meeting. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

ORDINANCES ON SECOND READING AND FINAL PASSAGE:

1. 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.

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 Gibson for adoption.

The Council considered the following amendment:

Delete the ordinance as Introduced and substitute the attached ordinance.

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

Councilman Lester: Mr. Antee, do we have participation in terms of the Legal?
Mr. Antee: We do.

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

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

2. 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.

Having passed first reading on May 27, 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 adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman

Lester, Walford, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

3. Ordinance No. 72 of 2003: An ordinance amending the 2003 Capital Improvements Budget and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on May 27, 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 passage.

The Council considered the following amendment:

AMEND THE ORDINANCE AS FOLLOWS:

On page 2 of the ordinance, delete the paragraph titled “In Program H (Airports Improvements) and substitute in lieu thereof the following:

In Program H (Airports Improvements):

Establish a project entitled **Redesign of Taxiway “D” and Rehabilitation of Terminal Apron - Downtown Airport (03-H006)** and fund it at \$550,000. Funding sources are Shreveport Airport Authority \$50,000, State Grant \$50,000 and Federal Aviation Administration \$450,000.

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

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

4. Ordinance No. 73 of 2003: An ordinance amending the 2003 budget for the Police Grants Special Revenue Fund and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on June 10, 2003 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Green , seconded by Councilman Gibson adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

5. Ordinance No. 74 of 2003: An ordinance to amend Chapters 34 and 78 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport by revising storm water regulations to reflect new federal regulations, improve enforcement provisions, and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on June 10, 2003 was read by title and on motion ordered passed to

third reading. Read the third time in full and as read motion by Councilman Green, seconded by Councilman Gibson adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

2. Ordinance No. 75 of 2003: An ordinance to amend Section 46-32(a) of the City of Shreveport Code of Ordinances relative to Medical Services and to otherwise provide with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on June 10, 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 adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

Councilman Gibson: I'd respectfully request that we remove Item 76 and 77 from the Agenda.

3. Ordinance No. 76 of 2003 by Councilman Gibson: An ordinance amending the 2003 General Fund Budget and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on June 10, 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 Green to remove the ordinance from the agenda.

Councilman Jackson: No. 77 dealt with amending the 2003 budget for the Riverfront Development Special Revenue Fund, is that correct.

Councilman Walford: Yes.

Councilman Jackson: Can I talk about that now?

Councilman Gibson: Relative to exactly what's in this ordinance, be glad to hear it.

Councilman Jackson: Can I talk about the—the ordinance as I see it, as I see No. 77, talks about the budget for the Riverfront Development Special Revenue Fund, is that correct?

Councilman Walford: You can discuss the amendment.

Councilman Jackson: Are we amending the budget?

Councilman Walford: No, we are not doing either. We are removing these from the agenda.

Councilman Jackson: Would the amending of the budget as originally put on this agenda as the ordinance. . . .

Councilman Walford: The motion as it stands right now, is to remove these two items from the agenda. We are not discussing the items. You can discuss his motion to remove.

Councilman Jackson: Point of Order. Ms. Glass what is the limitation of my discussion as it relates to him and those things that are currently on the agenda?

Ms. Glass: I believe the Chairman makes a ruling as to whether the discussion that you are pursuing is in order, as being relevant to the motion that's.

Councilman Walford: If you have debate on Mr. Gibson's motion to remove these two items, it is in order. If you have other debate, it will be taken up at an appropriate time.

Councilman Jackson: So, I could in fact tell you that I'd like to see it stay on the table?

Councilman Walford: Absolutely.

Councilman Jackson: Because what would happen to the budget if it stayed on the table.

Councilman Walford: You are going to have your Councilman's comments.

Councilman Lester: I would ask for a ruling from the Chair that Councilman Jackson are not germane and out of order.

Councilman Walford: I think that the Chair has already ruled that Councilman Jackson's is addressing the budget and not the removal of these two amendments.

Councilman Lester: I call for the question on the motion to remove Items 76 and 77 from agenda (seconded by Councilman Gibson.)

Councilman Walford: At this point we are not voting on removing them but voting on end debate and vote the question. Motion approved by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Gibson, Hogan, and Green. 5. Nays: Councilman Jackson. 1. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.)

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

4. Ordinance No. 77 of 2003 by Councilman Gibson: An ordinance amending the 2003 budget for the Riverfront Development Special Revenue Fund and otherwise providing with respect thereto.

Having passed first reading on June 10, 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 Green to remove the ordinance from the agenda. Motion adopted by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

The adopted Ordinances, follow:

ORDINANCE NO. 61 of 2003

Offered by Councilman Lester and seconded by Councilman Gibson:

ORDINANCE

AN ORDINANCE AUTHORIZING THE INCURRING OF DEBT AND ISSUANCE OF NOT TO EXCEED TWELVE MILLION DOLLARS (\$12,000,000) 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.

BE IT ENACTED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, acting as the governing authority of said City, that:

SECTION 1. Definitions. As used herein, the following terms shall have the following meanings, unless the context otherwise requires:

"Agreement" means the agreement to be entered into between the Issuer and the Paying Agent pursuant to this Ordinance.

"Bond" means any Bonds of the Issuer authorized to be issued by this Ordinance, whether initially delivered or issued in exchange for, upon transfer of, or in lieu of any Bond previously issued.

"Bond Register" means the records kept by the Paying Agent at its principal office in which registration of the Bonds and transfers of the Bonds shall be made as provided herein.

"Bond Insurer" means Financial Security Assurance, Inc.

"Bond Insurance Policy" means the municipal bond insurance policy issued by the Bond Insurer.

"Bonds" means the Issuer's General Obligation Refunding Bonds, Series 2003B, authorized by this Ordinance, in the total aggregate principal amount not to exceed Twelve Million Dollars (\$12,000,000).

"Code" means the Internal Revenue Code of 1986, as amended.

"Executive Officers" means, collectively, the Mayor, the Director of Finance and the Clerk of Council of the Issuer.

"Governing Authority" means the City Council of the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana.

"Government Securities" means direct obligations of, or obligations the principal of and interest on which are unconditionally guaranteed by the United States of America, which are non-callable prior to their maturity, may be United States Treasury obligations such as the State and Local Government Series and may be in book-entry form.

"Interest Payment Date" means March 1 and September 1 of each year, commencing March 1, 2004.

"Issuer" means the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana.

"Outstanding" when used with respect to Bonds means, as of the date of determination, all Bonds theretofore issued and delivered under this Ordinance, except:

1. Bonds theretofore canceled by the Paying Agent or delivered to the Paying Agent for cancellation;
2. Bonds for which payment or redemption sufficient funds have been theretofore deposited in trust for the owners of such Bonds, provided that if such Bonds are to be redeemed,

irrevocable notice of such redemption has been duly given or provided for pursuant to this Ordinance or waived;

3. Bonds in exchange for or in lieu of which other Bonds have been registered and delivered pursuant to this Ordinance;

4. Bonds alleged to have been mutilated, destroyed, lost or stolen which have been paid as provided in this Ordinance or by law; and

5. Bonds for the payment of the principal (or redemption price, if any) of and interest on which money or Government Securities or both are held in trust with the effect specified in this Ordinance.

"Ordinance" means this ordinance authorizing the issuance of the Bonds, as it may be supplemented and amended.

"Owner" or "Owners" when used with respect to any Bond means the Person in whose name such Bond is registered in the Bond Register.

"Paying Agent" means Argent Trust, a division of National Independent Trust Company, in the City of Ruston, Louisiana, until a successor Paying Agent shall have been appointed pursuant to the applicable provisions of this Ordinance and thereafter "Paying Agent" shall mean such successor Paying Agent.

"Person" means any individual, corporation, partnership, joint venture, association, joint-stock company, trust, unincorporated organization or government or any agency or political subdivision thereof.

"Prior Bonds" means collectively, the outstanding balance of \$11,426,000 of the General Obligation Bonds, Series 1996 previously issued to finance the construction, acquisition and improving works of public improvement of the City including roads, streets, drainage, parks and recreation facilities and public facilities including facilities for the police department and fire department, and other public purposes, and acquiring the necessary land, equipment and furnishings.

"Record Date" for the interest payable on any Interest Payment Date means the 15th calendar day of the month next preceding such Interest Payment Date.

"Underwriter" means collectively Morgan Keegan & Company, Inc., Stephens, Inc., William R. Hough & Co., and Carty & Company, Inc., representing the original purchasers of the Bonds.

SECTION 2. Authorization of Bonds Maturities. In compliance with the terms and provisions of Chapter 14-A of Title 39 of the Louisiana Revised Statutes of 1950, (the "Act") as amended and other constitutional and statutory authority, the City of Shreveport, Louisiana (the "Issuer") governed by the City Council (the "Governing Authority"), there is hereby authorized the

incurring of an indebtedness of not to exceed Twelve Million Dollars (\$12,000,000) for, on behalf of, and in the name of the Issuer, for the purpose of providing funds to refund the Prior Bonds in accordance with the provisions of the Act. To represent said indebtedness, this Governing Authority does hereby authorize the issuance of not to exceed Twelve Million Dollars (\$12,000,000) of General Obligation Refunding Bonds, Series 2003B, of the Issuer. The Bonds shall be in fully registered form, shall be dated the date of delivery, shall be issued in the denomination of Five Thousand Dollars (\$5,000) each or any integral multiple thereof within a single maturity and shall be numbered from R-1 upward. The unpaid principal of the Bonds shall bear interest from the date thereof or from the most recent Interest Payment Date to which interest has been paid or duly provided for, payable on each Interest Payment Date, commencing March 1, 2004, at an average interest rate not to exceed 5.0% and shall mature serially on March 1 of each year no later than March 1, 2016.

The principal of the Bonds, upon maturity or redemption, shall be payable at the principal office of the Paying Agent, upon presentation and surrender thereof, and interest on the Bonds shall be payable by check of the Paying Agent mailed by the Paying Agent to the Owner (determined as of the close of business on the Record Date) at the address shown on the Bond Register. Each Bond delivered under this Ordinance upon transfer of, in exchange for or in lieu of any other Bond shall carry all the rights to interest accrued and unpaid, and to accrue, which were carried by such other Bond, and each such Bond shall bear interest (as herein set forth) so neither gain nor loss in interest shall result from such transfer, exchange or substitution.

No Bond shall be entitled to any right or benefit under this Ordinance, or be valid or obligatory for any purpose, unless there appears on such Bond a certificate of registration, substantially in the form provided in this Ordinance, executed by the Paying Agent by manual signature.

The Principal of the Bonds is payable at the principal corporate trust office of Argent Trust, a division of National Independent Trust Company, in the City of Ruston, as Paying Agent and Bond Registrar with respect to the Bonds upon surrender thereof.

Each Bond shall be dated the date of delivery. Except as otherwise provided in this Section, the Bonds shall bear interest from the date thereof or from the most recent Interest Payment Date to which interest has been paid or duly provided for, as the case may be. However, when there is no existing default in the payment of interest on the Bonds, each Bond executed after the Regular Record Date for any Interest Payment Date but prior to such Interest Payment Date, shall bear interest from such Interest Payment Date provided, however, that if and to the extent that the Issuer shall default in the payment of the interest due on any Interest Payment Date, then all such Bonds shall bear interest from the most recent Interest Payment Date to which interest has been paid or duly provided for, unless no interest has been paid on the Bonds, in which case from the date of delivery.

The person in whose name any Bond is registered at the Regular Record Date with respect to an Interest Payment Date shall in all cases be entitled to receive the interest payable on such Interest Payment Date (unless such Bond has been called for redemption on a redemption date which is prior to such Interest Payment Date) notwithstanding the cancellation of such Bond upon

any registration of transfer or exchange thereof subsequent to such Regular Record Date and prior to such Interest Payment Date.

SECTION 3. [Reserved]

SECTION 4. Redemption Provisions. The Bonds are not subject to redemption prior to maturity.

SECTION 5. Registration and Transfer. The Issuer shall cause the Bond Register to be kept by the Paying Agent. The Bonds may be transferred, registered and assigned only on the Bond Register, and such registration shall be at the expense of the Issuer. A Bond may be assigned by the execution of an assignment form on the Bond or by other instruments of transfer and assignment acceptable to the Paying Agent. A new Bond or Bonds will be delivered by the Paying Agent to the last assignee (the new Owner) in exchange for such transferred and assigned Bonds after receipt of the Bonds to be transferred in proper form. Such new Bond or Bonds shall be in the denomination of \$5,000 or any integral multiple thereof within a single maturity. Neither the Issuer nor the Paying Agent shall be required to issue, register, transfer or exchange any Bond during a period beginning (i) at the opening of business on a Record Date and ending at the close of business on the Interest Payment Date or (ii) with respect to Bonds to be redeemed, at the opening of business fifteen (15) days before the date of the mailing of a notice of redemption of such Bonds and ending on the date of such redemption.

SECTION 6. Form of Bonds. The Bonds and the endorsements to appear thereon shall be in substantially the following form, to-wit:

No. R- _____ Principal Amount
\$

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA
STATE OF LOUISIANA
PARISH OF CADDO

GENERAL OBLIGATION REFUNDING BOND, SERIES 2003B
OF THE
CITY OF SHREVEPORT, STATE OF LOUISIANA

Maturity Date	Interest Rate	Bond Date	CUSIP Number
March 1, 2016	_____ %	_____ 1, 2003	

THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT, STATE OF LOUISIANA (the "Issuer"), promises to pay to:

REGISTERED OWNER: _____

PRINCIPAL AMOUNT: _____

or registered assigns, on the Maturity Date set forth above, the Principal Amount set forth above, together with interest thereon from the Bond Date set forth above or the most recent interest payment date to which interest has been paid or duly provided for, payable on March 1 and September 1 of each year, commencing March 1, 2004 (each an "Interest Payment Date"), at the Interest Rate per annum set forth above until said Principal Amount is paid, unless this Bond shall have been previously called for redemption and payment shall have been duly made or provided for. The principal of and premium, if any, on this Bond, upon maturity or redemption, is payable in such coin or currency of the United States of America as at the time of payment is legal tender for payment of public and private debts at the principal office of Argent Trust, a division of National Independent Trust Company, in the City of Ruston, Louisiana, or successor thereto (the "Paying Agent") upon presentation and surrender hereof. Interest on this Bond is payable by check or draft mailed on or before the Interest Payment Date by the Paying Agent to the registered owner at the address as shown on the registration books of the Paying Agent maintained for such purpose. The interest so payable on any Interest Payment Date will be paid to the person in whose name this Bond (or one or more predecessor Bonds) is registered at the close of business on the Record Date (which is the 15th calendar day of the month next preceding an Interest Payment Date). Any interest not punctually paid or duly provided for shall be payable as provided in the Bond Ordinance (hereinafter defined).

During any period after the initial delivery of the Bonds in book-entry-only form when the Bonds are delivered in multiple certificates form, upon request of a registered owner of at least \$1,000,000 in principal amount of Bonds outstanding, all payments of principal, premium, if any, and interest on the Bonds will be paid by wire transfer in immediately available funds to an account designated by such registered owner; CUSIP number identification with appropriate dollar amounts for each CUSIP number must accompany all payments of principal, premium, and interest, whether by check or by wire transfer.

This Bond is one of an authorized issue aggregating in principal the sum of _____ Dollars (\$_____) (the "Bonds"), all of like tenor and effect except as to number, denomination, interest rate and maturity, said Bonds having been issued by the Issuer pursuant to Ordinance No. ___ of 2003 enacted by its governing authority on _____, 2003 (the "Bond Ordinance"), for the purpose of refunding the Prior Bonds.

The Bonds are issuable only as fully registered bonds in the denomination of \$5,000 principal amount or any integral multiple thereof within a single maturity, exchangeable for an equal aggregate principal amount of bonds of the same maturity of any other authorized denomination.

Subject to the limitations of and upon payment of the charges provided in the Bond Ordinance, the transfer of this Bond may be registered on the registration books of the Paying Agent upon surrender of this Bond at the principal office of the Paying Agent as registrar, accompanied by a written instrument of transfer in form and with guaranty of signature satisfactory to the Paying Agent, duly executed by the registered owner or his attorney duly authorized in writing, and thereupon a new bond or bonds of the same maturity and of authorized denomination or denominations, for the same aggregate principal amount, will be issued to the transferee. Prior to due presentment for registration of transfer of this Bond, the Issuer and the Paying Agent may deem and treat the person in whose name

this Bond is registered as the absolute owner hereof for all purposes, whether or not this Bond shall be overdue and neither the Issuer nor the Paying Agent shall be bound by any notice to the contrary.

The Bonds are not subject to redemption prior to maturity.

The Bond Ordinance permits, with certain exceptions as therein provided, the amendment thereof and the modifications of the rights and obligations of the Issuer and the rights of the owners of the Bonds at any time by the Issuer with consent of the owners of a 2/3 majority in aggregate amount of all Bonds issued under the Bond Ordinance, to be determined in accordance with the Bond Ordinance.

This Bond shall not be valid or become obligatory for any purpose or be entitled to any security or benefit under the Bond Ordinance until the certificate of registration hereon shall have been signed by the Paying Agent.

This Bond and the issue of which it forms a part constitute general obligations of the Issuer, and the full faith and credit of the Issuer is pledged for the payment of this Bond and the issue of which it forms a part. Said Bonds are secured by a special ad valorem tax to be imposed and collected annually in excess of all other taxes on all the property subject to such taxation within the territorial limits of the Issuer, under the Constitution and laws of Louisiana, sufficient in amount to pay the principal of this Bond and the issue of which it forms a part and the interest thereon as they severally mature.

It is hereby certified, recited and declared that all acts, conditions and things required to exist, to happen and to be performed precedent to and in the issuance of this Bond and the issue of which it forms a part to constitute the same legal, binding and valid obligations of the Issuer have existed, have happened and have been performed in due time, form and manner as required by law, and that the indebtedness of the Issuer, including this Bond and the issue of which it forms a part, does not exceed the limitations prescribed by the Constitution and statutes of the State of Louisiana. It is certified that this Bond is authorized by and is issued in conformity with the requirements of the Constitution and statutes of the State of Louisiana.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the City Council of the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, acting as the governing authority thereof, has caused this Bond to be executed in the name of the Issuer by the manual or facsimile signatures of its Mayor, Clerk of Council and Director of Finance and its corporate seal to be impressed hereon.

CITY OF SHREVEPORT, STATE OF LOUISIANA

Clerk of Council

Mayor

Director of Finance

(SEAL)

* * * * *

(FORM OF PAYING AGENT'S CERTIFICATE OF REGISTRATION -
TO BE PRINTED ON ALL BONDS)

This Bond is one of the Bonds referred to in the within-mentioned Bond Ordinance.

Independent Trust Company

Argent Trust, a division of National
Ruston, Louisiana
as Paying Agent

Date of Registration:

By: _____
Authorized Officer

* * * * *

(FORM OF ASSIGNMENT)

FOR VALUE RECEIVED, the undersigned hereby sells, assigns and transfers unto

Please Insert Social Security
or other Identifying Number of Assignee

the within Bond and all rights thereunder, and hereby irrevocably constitutes and appoints

attorney or agent to transfer the within Bond on the books kept for registration thereof, with full power
of substitution in the premises.

Dated: _____

NOTICE: The signature to this assignment must
correspond with the name as it appears upon the face of the within Bond in every particular, without
alteration or enlargement or any change whatever.

* * * * *

(FORM OF LEGAL OPINION CERTIFICATE -
TO BE PRINTED ON ALL BONDS)

I, the undersigned Clerk of Council of the City of Shreveport, State of Louisiana, do hereby certify that
the following is a true copy of the complete legal opinion of Casten & Pearce, Bond Counsel, the
originals of which were manually executed, dated and issued as of the date of payment for and delivery
of the original Bonds of the issue described therein and were delivered to Morgan Keegan & Company,
Inc., New Orleans, Louisiana, representing the original purchaser thereof

(Bond Printer Shall Insert Legal Opinions)

I further certify that executed copies of the above legal opinions are on file in my office, and that executed copies thereof have been furnished to the Paying Agent for this Bond.

(facsimile)

Clerk of Council

* * * * *

[STATEMENT OF INSURANCE
TO BE PRINTED ON ALL BONDS]

* * * * *

SECTION 7. Execution of Bonds. The Bonds shall be signed by the Executive Officers for, on behalf of, in the name of and under the corporate seal of the Issuer, and the Legal Opinion Certificate shall be signed by the Clerk of Council of the Issuer, which signatures and corporate seal may be either manual or facsimile.

SECTION 8. Pledge of Full Faith and Credit. The Bonds shall constitute general obligations of the Issuer, and the full faith and credit of the Issuer is hereby pledged for their payment. This Governing Authority does hereby obligate itself and is bound under the terms and provisions of law and the election authorizing the Bonds to impose and collect annually in excess of all other taxes a tax on all of the property subject to taxation within the territorial limits of the Issuer sufficient to pay the principal of and the interest on the Bonds falling due each year, said tax to be levied and collected by the same officers, in the same manner and at the same time as other taxes are levied and collected within the territorial limits of the Issuer.

SECTION 9. Application of Proceeds. The Executive Officers are hereby empowered, authorized and directed to do any and all things necessary and incidental to carry out all of the provisions of this Ordinance, to cause the necessary Bonds to be printed, to issue, execute and seal the Bonds, and to effect delivery thereof as hereinafter provided. The proceeds derived from the sale of the Bonds, except accrued interest, shall be deposited by the Issuer with its fiscal agent bank or banks to be used only for the purpose for which the Bonds are issued. Accrued interest, if any, derived from the sale of the Bonds shall be deposited in the Sinking Fund to be applied to the first interest payment.

SECTION 10. Bonds Legal Obligations. The Bonds shall constitute legal, binding and valid obligations of the Issuer and shall be the only representations of the indebtedness as herein authorized and created.

SECTION 11. Ordinance a Contract. The provisions of this Ordinance shall constitute a contract between the Issuer, or its successor, and the Owner or Owners from time to time of the Bonds and any such Owner or Owners may at law or in equity, by suit, action, mandamus or other proceedings, enforce and compel the performance of all duties required to be performed by this Governing Authority or the

Issuer as a result of issuing the Bonds.

No material modification or amendment of this Ordinance, or of any ordinance amendatory hereof or supplemental hereto, may be made without the consent in writing of the Owners of two-thirds (2/3) of the aggregate principal amount of the Bonds then outstanding; provided, however, that no modification or amendment shall permit a change in the maturity or redemption provisions of the Bonds, or a reduction in the rate of interest thereon, or in the amount of the principal obligation thereof, or affecting the obligation of the Issuer to pay the principal of and the interest on the Bonds as the same shall come due from the taxes pledged and dedicated to the payment thereof by this Ordinance, or reduce the percentage of the Owners required to consent to any material modification or amendment of this Ordinance, without the consent of all of the Owners of the Bonds.

SECTION 12. Severability; Application of Subsequently Enacted Laws. In case any one or more of the provisions of this Ordinance or of the Bonds shall for any reason be held to be illegal or invalid, such illegality or invalidity shall not affect any other provisions of this Ordinance or of the Bonds, but this Ordinance and the Bonds shall be construed and enforced as if such illegal or invalid provisions had not been contained therein. Any constitutional or statutory provisions enacted after the date of this Ordinance which validate or make legal any provision of this shall be filed with the Paying Agent, but such filing shall not be a condition precedent to the validity of any action taken in reliance upon such waiver.

SECTION 13. Cancellation of Bonds. All Bonds surrendered for payment, redemption, transfer, exchange or replacement, if surrendered to the Paying Agent, shall be promptly canceled by it and, if surrendered to the Issuer, shall be delivered to the Paying Agent and, if not already canceled, shall be promptly canceled by the Paying Agent. The Issuer may at any time deliver to the Paying Agent for cancellation any Bonds previously registered and delivered which the Issuer may have acquired in any manner whatsoever, and all Bonds so delivered shall be promptly canceled by the Paying Agent. All canceled Bonds held by the Paying Agent shall be disposed of as directed in writing by the Issuer.

SECTION 14. Mutilated. Destroyed. Lost or Stolen Bonds. If (1) any mutilated Bond is surrendered to the Paying Agent, or the Issuer and the Paying Agent receives evidence to its satisfaction of the destruction, loss or theft of any Bond, and (2) there is delivered to the Issuer and the Paying Agent such security or indemnity as may be required by them to save each of them harmless, then, in the absence of notice to the Issuer or the Paying Agent that such Bond has been acquired by a bona fide purchaser, the Issuer shall execute, and upon its request the Paying Agent shall register and deliver, in exchange for or in lieu of any such mutilated, destroyed, lost, or stolen Bond, a new Bond of the same maturity and of like tenor, interest rate and principal amount, bearing a number not contemporaneously outstanding. In case any such mutilated, destroyed, lost or stolen Bond has become or is about to become due and payable, the Issuer in its discretion may, instead of issuing a new Bond, pay such Bond. Upon the issuance of any new Bond under this Section, the Issuer may require the payment by the Owner of a sum sufficient to cover any tax or other governmental charge that may be imposed in relation thereto and any other expenses (including the fees and expenses of the Paying Agent) connected therewith. Every new Bond issued pursuant to this Section in lieu of any mutilated, destroyed, lost or stolen Bond shall constitute a replacement of the prior obligation of the Issuer, whether or not the mutilated, destroyed, lost or stolen Bond shall be at any time enforceable by anyone and shall be entitled to all the benefits of this Ordinance equally and ratably with all other Outstanding

Bonds. Any additional procedures set forth in the Agreement, authorized in this Ordinance, shall also be available with respect to mutilated, destroyed, lost or stolen Bonds. The provisions of this Section are exclusive and shall preclude (to the extent lawful) all other rights and remedies with respect to the replacement and payment of mutilated, destroyed, lost or stolen Bonds.

SECTION 15. Discharge of Ordinance; Defeasance. If the Issuer shall pay or cause to be paid, or there shall otherwise be paid to the Owners, the principal (and redemption price, if any) of and interest on the Bonds, at the times and in the manner stipulated in this Ordinance, then the pledge of the money, securities, and funds pledged under this Ordinance and all covenants, agreements, and other obligations of the Issuer to the Owners of the Bonds shall thereupon cease, terminate, and become void and be discharged and satisfied, and the Paying Agent shall pay over or deliver all money held by it under this Ordinance to the Issuer.

Bonds or interest installments for the payment or redemption of which money shall have been set aside and shall be held in trust (through deposit by the Issuer of funds for such payment or redemption or otherwise) at the maturity or redemption date thereof shall be deemed to have been paid within the meaning and with the effect expressed above in this Section, if they have been defeased pursuant to Chapter 14-A of Title 39 of the Louisiana Revised Statutes of 1950, as amended, or any successor provisions thereto.

SECTION 16. Successor Paying Agent; Paying Agent Agreement . The Issuer will at all times maintain a Paying Agent meeting the qualifications hereinafter described for the performance of the duties hereunder for the Bonds. The designation of the initial Paying Agent in this Ordinance is hereby confirmed and approved. The Issuer reserves the right to appoint a successor Paying Agent by (a) filing with the Person then performing such function a certified copy of an ordinance giving notice of the termination of the Agreement and appointing a successor and (b) causing notice to be given to each Owner. Every Paying Agent appointed hereunder shall at all times be a bank organized and doing business under the laws of the United States of America or of any state, authorized under such laws to serve as Paying Agent, and subject to supervision or examination by Federal or State authority. The Executive Officers are hereby authorized and directed to execute an appropriate Agreement with the Paying Agent for and on behalf of the Issuer in such form as may be satisfactory to said officers, the signatures of said officers on such Agreement to be conclusive evidence of the due exercise of the authority granted hereunder.

SECTION 17. Arbitrage. The Issuer covenants and agrees that, to the extent permitted by the laws of the State of Louisiana, it will comply with the requirements of the Internal Revenue Code of 1986 and any amendment thereto (the "Code") in order to establish, maintain and preserve the exclusion from "gross income" of interest on the Bonds under the Code. The Issuer further covenants and agrees that it will not take any action, fail to take any action, or permit any action within its control to be taken, or permit at any time or times any of the proceeds of the Bonds or any other funds of the Issuer to be used directly or indirectly in any manner, the effect of which would be to cause the Bonds to be "arbitrage bonds" or would result in the inclusion of the interest on any of the Bonds in gross income under the Code, including, without limitation, (i) the failure to comply with the limitation on investment of Bond proceeds or (ii) the failure to pay any required rebate of arbitrage earnings to the United States of America or (iii) the use of the proceeds of the Bonds in a manner which would cause the Bonds to be "private activity bonds".

The Executive Officers are hereby empowered, authorized and directed to take any and all action and to execute and deliver any instrument, document or certificate necessary to effectuate the purposes of this Section.

SECTION 18. Continuing Disclosure. The Director of Finance of the Issuer is hereby empowered and directed to execute an appropriate Continuing Disclosure Certificate (substantially in the form set forth in Appendix F of the official statement issued in connection with the sale and issuance of the Bonds) pursuant to S.E.C. Rule 15c2-12(b)(5).

SECTION 19. Bond Counsel Employment A real necessity is hereby found for the employment of bond counsel in connection with the issuance of the aforesaid bonds, and accordingly Casten & Pearce is hereby employed as bond counsel to the Issuer and requested to do and perform comprehensive legal and coordinate professional work with respect to the issuance of the aforesaid bonds of the Issuer for the purposes stated hereinabove. Said Bond Counsel shall prepare and submit to this Governing Authority for adoption all of the proceedings incidental to the authorization, issuance, sale and delivery of the bonds, shall counsel and advise this Governing Authority as to the issuance and sale of the bonds, and shall furnish their opinions covering the legality of the issuance thereof. The fee of Bond Counsel in connection with the issuance of the aforesaid bonds of the Issuer is hereby fixed at a sum not to exceed eighty per cent (80%) of the maximum fee allowed by the Attorney General's fee guidelines for comprehensive legal and coordinate professional services in the issuance of general obligation bonds, based on the amount of said bonds actually issued, sold, delivered and paid for, plus "out-of-pocket" expenses, said fee to be payable solely out of the funds derived from the sale of said Bonds and to be contingent upon the issuance, sale and delivery of said Bonds. A certified copy of this ordinance shall be submitted to the Attorney General of the State of Louisiana for his written approval of said employment and of the fee herein designated, and the Director of Finance is hereby empowered and directed to make payment to said Bond Counsel in payment of the fees herein provided for under the conditions herein enumerated.

Section 20. Employment of Special Counsel to the Issuer. It is found and determined that a real necessity exists for the employment of Special Counsel to the Issuer in connection with issuance and delivery of the Series 2003B Bonds and, accordingly, Harvetta Colvin, Esquire, Shreveport, Louisiana has been employed as Special Counsel to the Issuer in connection with the issuance and delivery of the Bonds. The fee to be paid to Special Counsel shall be an amount less than the Attorney General's then current hourly fee schedule, together with reimbursement of out-of-pocket expenses incurred and advanced in connection with the issuance of the Bonds, said fee to be payable out of the Bond proceeds subject to the Attorney General's written approval of said employment and fee to be paid with Bond proceeds as required by the Act.

SECTION 21. Sale of Bonds. The sale of the Bonds to the Underwriter is hereby in all respects approved, ratified and confirmed and after their execution, the Bonds shall be delivered to the Underwriter or its agents or assigns, upon receipt by the Director of Finance of the Issuer of the agreed purchase price. The execution and delivery on behalf of the Issuer by the Mayor or the Director of Finance of the Bond Purchase Agreement is hereby approved and ratified in all respects. The Mayor and Director of Finance of the Issuer are each hereby empowered, authorized and directed to execute and deliver or cause to be executed and delivered all documents required to be executed on behalf of the Issuer or deemed by them necessary or advisable to implement this Supplemental Resolution or

facilitate the sale of the Bonds including an Escrow Agreement with The Bank of New York Trust Company of Florida as escrow trustee.

SECTION 22. Official Statement. The Governing Authority hereby approves the form and content of a Preliminary Official Statement pertaining to the Bonds submitted to the Governing Authority and hereby ratifies its prior use by the Underwriter in connection with the sale of the Bonds. The Governing Authority further approves the form and content of the final Official Statement and hereby authorizes and directs the execution by the Mayor or Director of Finance of the Issuer and delivery of such final Official Statement to the Underwriter for use in connection with the public offering of the Bonds.

SECTION 23. Employment of Underwriter. The employment of Morgan Keegan & Company, Inc., Stephens, Inc., William R. Hough & Co., and Carty & Company, Inc., as Underwriters of the Bonds is hereby approved and ratified.

SECTION 24. Publication. A copy of this Ordinance shall be published immediately after its adoption in one (1) issue of the official journal of the Issuer.

SECTION 25. Section Headlines. The headings of the various sections hereof are inserted for convenience of reference only and shall not control or affect the meaning or construction of any of the provisions hereof.

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

SECTION I: BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, in due, legal and regular session convened, that the rezoning classification of the north side of Greenwood Road, 500 feet west of Curtis Lane, Shreveport, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, legally described below, **be and the same is hereby changed 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.**

A tract of land in the SE/4 of Section 8, T17N-R14W, Caddo Parish, Louisiana, and being more particularly described as follows: Beginning at a point on the north line of Greenwood Road, which said point is 560 feet west of the east line of Section 8, T17N-R14W, thence north parallel with the east line of Section 8, 323 feet; thence east parallel with the north line of said Section 8, 160 feet; thence south parallel with the east line of said Section 8, approximately 323 feet to the north line of Greenwood Road, thence west along Greenwood Road approximately 160 feet to the P-O-B.

SECTION II: THAT the approval of the continuation of the property described herein is subject to compliance with the following stipulations:

1. **Development of the property shall be in substantial accord with the site plan submitted with any significant changes or additions requiring further review and approval by the Planning Commission.**
2. **Hours of public operation are from 7:00 a.m. to 7:00 p.m.**
3. **The number of dogs to be housed at the facility at any given time shall be limited to 12.**

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. 72 OF 2003

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

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

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

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

In Program A (Buildings and Improvements):

Modify the funding sources for **Texas Avenue Campus Plan Phase IV - Police Building (96-A004)**. Decrease 1997 GOB, Prop. 1 (Public Safety) by \$159,900. Increase 1998 GOB, Prop. 1 (Public Safety) by \$113,600 and 1999 GOB, Prop. 1 (Public Safety) by \$46,300.

Increase the appropriation for **Shreveport Convention Center (97-A004)** by \$267,000. Increase Interest Earned by \$410,100 and decrease 1999 Convention Center Bonds by \$143,100.

In Program B (Recreation Improvements):

Increase the appropriation for **Riverfront Park Extension (96-B002)** by \$102,000. Decrease 1996 GOB, Prop. 8 (Riverfront) by \$33,900 and increase 1999 GOB, Prop. 8 (Riverfront) by \$135,900.

Modify the funding sources for **Bilberry Park Improvements (97-B004)**. Decrease 1997 GOB, Prop. 2 (Parks) by \$59,000 and increase 1998 GOB, Prop. 2 (Parks) by \$59,000.

In Program D (Drainage Improvements):

Modify the funding sources for **Youree Drive Drainage (96-D004)**. Increase 1998 GOB, Prop. 10 (Drainage) by \$103,400. Decrease 1997 GOB, Prop. 10 (Drainage) by \$26,600 and 1999 GOB, Prop. 10 (Drainage) by \$77,400.

In Program E (Water Improvements):

Establish a project entitled **82nd, 83rd and Ray Street Water Main Replacement (03-E001)** and fund it at \$320,000 from Water and Sewer Revenues.

Establish a project entitled **Hearne Avenue Water Main Replacement - Milam to North Market (03-E002)** and fund it at \$235,000 from Water and Sewer Revenues.

In Program F (Sewer Improvements):

Decrease the appropriation for **Stoner Lift Station Improvements (01-F004)** by \$1,567,000. Funding source is Water and Sewer Revenues.

Establish a project entitled **900 Erie Sewer Main Improvements (03-F001)** and fund it at \$220,000 from Water and Sewer Revenues.

Establish a project entitled **North Regional Main and Manhole Rehabilitation (03-F002)** and fund it at \$1,759,900. Funding sources are Water and Sewer Revenues \$792,000 and EPA Grant \$967,900.

In Program H (Airports Improvements):

Establish a project entitled **Redesign of Taxiway "D" and Rehabilitation of Terminal Apron - Downtown Airport (03-H006)** and fund it at \$550,000. Funding sources are Shreveport Airport Authority \$50,000, State Grant \$50,000 and Federal Aviation Administration \$450,000.

Adjust totals and subtotals accordingly.

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

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

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

AN ORDINANCE AMENDING THE 2003 BUDGET FOR THE POLICE GRANTS 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 desirable to amend the 2003 budget for the Police Grants 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. 172 of 2002, the 2003 budget for the Police Grants Special Revenue Fund, be amended and re-enacted as follows:

In Section 1 (Estimated Receipts):

Fiscal Year 2003 Revenues:

Appropriate 2003 Project Safe Neighborhoods grant at \$250,000.

In Section 2 (Appropriations):

From FY 2003 Revenues:

From 2003 Project Safe Neighborhoods grant, appropriate \$152,400 to Personal Services, \$2,700 to Materials and Supplies, \$81,600 to Contractual Services and \$13,300 to Improvements and Equipment.

BE IT FURTHER ORDAINED that the remainder of Ordinance No. 172 of 2002 shall remain unchanged and in full force and effect and that totals and subtotals shall be adjusted accordingly..

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 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. 74 of 2003

AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND CHAPTERS 34 AND 78 OF THE CODE OF ORDINANCES OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT BY REVISING STORM WATER REGULATIONS TO REFLECT NEW FEDERAL REGULATIONS, IMPROVE ENFORCEMENT PROVISIONS, AND TO OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO.

WHEREAS, the City is required by federal and state law, as well as by permit issued by the state, to maintain a storm water program for the protection of local water resources against point and non-point source pollution;

WHEREAS, the City implements this program primarily through Articles IV and V of Chapter 34 of the Code of Ordinances;

WHEREAS, recent changes in federal law require changes to these articles, in order to ensure that City ordinances are consistent with federal and state laws and regulations;

WHEREAS, the enforcement provisions of these articles, as well as Article III, need to be strengthened in order to improve their effectiveness; and

WHEREAS, these articles, as well as a portion of Chapter 78 of the Code, also need to be clarified and streamlined in several respects, in order to make the provisions readily understandable by the developers, builders, businesses and industries that must comply with them;

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

(1) Section 34-94 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

Sec. 34-94. Building permit requirements.

(a) No building permit shall be issued for any construction on any lot and no construction shall be started on any lot that will result in the pervious surface being changed to an impervious surface unless (1) the plans for the construction include provisions for stormwater detention in accordance with the requirements of this article, and (2) the requirements of article IV of this Chapter are met.

(b) In the drainage basin of Ockley Ditch and its tributaries and in flood-sensitive areas, no building permit shall be issued for any construction on any lot and no construction will be started on any lot that shall result in changes to the existing impervious surface unless the plans for the construction include provisions for stormwater detention in accordance with the requirements of this article.

(c) All building permit applications on any lot covered by this article shall be submitted to the city engineer for examination. The plans shall be accompanied by a survey or a sketch of the lot with the location of proposed improvements shown together with a drainage report and drainage plan, and all other information required by article IV of this Chapter. The city engineer shall either approve the stormwater detention and land-altering activity provisions, require changes to comply with this article and/or article IV of this Chapter, or disapprove the plans within ten days. If the proposed stormwater detention or land-altering activity plans are not approved, the city engineer will state in writing the reasons for disapproval. Disapproval of the plans or requiring changes to the plans to be made shall be considered and appealed from as a denial of a building permit.

(2) Section 34-97 shall be amended so as to read as follows:

Sec. 34-97. Stormwater detention facilities; duty to maintain.

Each owner of each lot for which any facilities for stormwater detention are required or constructed in accordance with the requirements of this article must keep such facilities in working order and in good repair and must take no steps to cause such facilities to malfunction or to cease to function. The City engineer or his designee shall inspect stormwater detention facilities on an annual basis to ensure that the provisions of this section are complied with, and an annual inspection fee of \$100 shall be charged to each owner.

(3) In Sections 34-98 and 34-99, “department of public works” shall be replaced by “Department of Operational Services.”

(4) Sections 34-102 and 34-103 shall be added, as follows:

Sec. 34-102. Notice to cease violation.

Any person found to be violating any provisions of this article may be served by the city with written notice stating the nature of the violations and providing a reasonable time limit for the satisfactory correction thereof. The offender shall, within the period of time stated in such notice, permanently cease all violations.

Section 34-103. Enforcement.

(1) Administrative Fines and Remedies. In the event of a violation of any provision of this article, any stop work order issued pursuant to this article, or a notice to cease violation, the City, through the Director of the Department of Operational Services or his designee, may issue an administrative fine to the violating party in an amount not to exceed \$500 per day per violation, and/or may terminate the violating party's water service. Every day any such violation continues shall constitute a separate violation for purposes of this paragraph. Unpaid fines shall, after 30 calendar days, be assessed an additional penalty of one percent of the unpaid balance, and interest shall accrue thereafter at a rate of 12 percent per year. A lien against the violating party's property will be sought for unpaid fines.

A party which has been fined may contest the fine by written request for a hearing, filed with the Director of the Department of Operational Services or his designee within 15 days of receipt of the fine.

(2) Judicial Remedies.

(a) The City may also avail itself of judicial enforcement remedies in the event of a violation of the any provision this article or a notice to cease violation, including injunctive relief, civil penalties of up to \$500 per day per violation, and/or any other action as is appropriate for legal and/or equitable relief. Each day any such violation continues shall constitute a separate violation for purposes of this paragraph.

(b) Any person who violates a provision of this article or who fails to comply with a notice to cease violation shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction, shall be punished by a fine in an amount not to exceed \$500 per day per violation or by imprisonment for not more than 60 days or both. Each day any such violation continues shall constitute a separate violation for purposes of this paragraph.

(c) In addition to any fines or penalties which may levied in judicial proceedings, a person who violates a provision of this article or a notice to cease violation shall be liable for attorney fees and court costs associated with such proceedings.

(3) Liability for Damages. In addition to the remedies cited above, a person who violates a provision of this article or who fails to comply with a notice to cease violation shall be liable to the city for all damages and costs incurred as a result of any such violation.

(4) Remedies Nonexclusive. The remedies provided for in this article are not exclusive, and the city may take any, all, or any combination of these actions against a noncompliant party.

(5) Judicial review of adjudication. Any person who is aggrieved by a final decision or order issued under any provision of this Article is entitled to judicial review. Proceedings for review may be instituted by filing a petition in the First Judicial District Court of the State of Louisiana, within 30 days after mailing of notice of the final decision by the Department of Operational Services or, if a hearing is requested, within thirty days after the decision thereon.

(5) The following definition shall be added to Section 34-121:

Permittee means any person or entity which has received a permit authorizing a land-altering activity.

(6) Section 34-123 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport is hereby amended

so as to read as follows:

Sec. 34-123. Land altering activities, permit required; application, contents.

(a) Permit required; exceptions. An owner is required to obtain a permit from the department of operational services prior to any land altering activities within the city limits or the Cross Lake watershed as such is defined in section 78-341 (the "watershed"), except for the following:

- (1) Small home gardens.
- (2) Minor repairs and routine maintenance work to existing utility services.
- (3) Persons engaged in agricultural operations requiring the tilling of soil; however, in such case the owner/operator shall have a plan approved by the board of the Caddo soil and water conservation district showing how his crop land will be protected from erosion throughout the year; and
- (4) Certain activities outside the city limits, but within the watershed, which are specified as exempt from such requirement in Section 78-344(h)(2) and (3).

(b) Application; contents. All permit applications shall be submitted to the city engineer for examination. The application shall contain two copies of the following information, unless the city engineer determines that, due to the scope and nature of the proposed development, some of the information is unnecessary:

- (1) A grading and drainage plan containing the following information:
 - a. The date, scale, north arrow and existing property lines on which the land altering activity is to take place.
 - b. The location, type of use, and total percentage of proposed and existing improvements on the site.
 - c. Existing and proposed topographic features.
 - d. Location of all temporary and permanent runoff detention basins, along with any constructed and/or altered drainage systems.

- (2) An erosion control plan showing both temporary and permanent erosion controls as required by section 34-125.
- (3) Special notes or attachments as may be required by other sections of this article.
- (4) A sequence of scheduled activities.
- (5) The 100-year floodplains and/or floodways with related elevations.
- (6) A detailed street drainage layout.
- (7) Except for residential single-family detached dwellings, a registered professional civil engineer must stamp and sign that the plans are complete and that the technical data it contains is accurate when required by the city engineer.
- (8) For land-altering activities which will result in the disturbance of five or more acres of land, or that are part of a common plan of development or sale within which five or more acres of total land will be disturbed, a copy of the Notice of Intent submitted or to be submitted to the state and/or federal government for coverage under the general permit for construction activity.
- (9) For land-altering activities within the watershed which are commercial, industrial or business in nature, the information described in Section 78-344(h)(4).

(7) Section 34-125 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport is hereby amended

so as to read as follows:

Sec. 34-125. Guidelines for erosion control plan preparation.

(1) General requirement.

The erosion control plan shall include, at a minimum, the following: a description of temporary and permanent structural controls; temporary and final stabilization; an erosion control inspection schedule providing for site inspections at least every two weeks and after each rain event of ½ inch or more; and a list of measures to minimize off-site tracking of sediment by vehicles.

(2) Additional requirements for construction activities that disturb at least one acre of land.

The erosion control plan for construction activities that disturb at least one acre of land, or that are part of a common plan of development or sale within which one or more acre of total land is disturbed, shall meet the requirements of Sec. 34-125(1) above and shall also contain all elements of the Storm Water Pollution Prevention Plan as such is defined and required by the applicable state or federal permit.

(8) Section 34-126 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport is hereby amended

so as to read as follows:

Sec. 34-126. Duty of owner to maintain control measures.

A Permittee must keep both temporary and permanent erosion control measures in working order

and in good repair, and in compliance with the permit and all applicable ordinances and state and federal laws, regulations and permits. A Permittee must take no steps to cause such facilities to malfunction or cease to function. The city may require additional or different erosion control measures than those approved in the permit if it is determined by the city that such are needed in order to adequately control erosion from the site.

(9) Section 34-127 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport is hereby amended

so as to read as follows:

Sec. 34-127. Inspection and enforcement.

(1) Stop Work Orders/Notices of Violation. The Director of the city's Department of Operational Services, or his designee, has the right of supervision and inspection over the land altering activity and shall have the right to stop any of the activity under a permit required by this article as a result of (a) a violation of the permit and/or any provision of this article, or (b) a determination by the city that erosion controls in place are inadequate to prevent erosion from the site. The Permittee shall be informed in writing of all defects noted, the measures needed to come into compliance, and the time frame within which such measures shall be completed.

(2) Administrative Fines and Remedies. In the event of a violation of the permit, any provision of this article, or a Stop Work Order or Notice of Violation, the City, through the Director of the Department of Operational Services or his designee, may revoke the permit; issue an administrative fine to Permittee in an amount not to exceed \$500 per day per violation; and/or terminate water service to Permittee. Every day any such violation continues shall constitute a separate violation for purposes of this paragraph. Unpaid fines shall, after 30 calendar days, be assessed an additional penalty of one percent of the unpaid balance, and interest shall accrue thereafter at a rate of 12 percent per year. A lien against the Permittee's property will be sought for unpaid fines.

The Permittee may contest the fine by written request for a hearing, filed with the Director of the Department of Operational Services or his designee within 15 days of receipt of the fine.

(3) Judicial Remedies.

(a) The City may also avail itself of judicial enforcement remedies in the event of a violation of the permit, any provision of this article, or a Stop Work Order or Notice of Violation, including injunctive relief, civil penalties of up to \$500 per day per violation, and/or any other action as is appropriate for legal and/or equitable relief. Each day any such violation continues shall constitute a separate violation for purposes of this paragraph.

(b) Any Permittee who violates the permit, any provision of this article, or a Stop Work Order or Notice of Violation shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction, shall be punished by a fine in an amount not to exceed \$500 per day per violation or by imprisonment for not more than 60 days or both. Each day any such violation continues shall constitute a separate violation for purposes of this paragraph.

(c) In addition to any fines or penalties which may be levied in judicial proceedings, the Permittee shall be liable for attorney fees and court costs associated with such proceedings.

(4) Liability for Damages. In addition to the remedies cited above, Permittee shall be liable to the city for all damages and costs incurred as a result of any violation of the permit, any provision of this article, or a Stop Work Order or Notice of Violation.

(5) Remedies Nonexclusive. The remedies provided for in this article are not exclusive, and the city may take any, all, or any combination of these actions against a noncompliant party.

(6) Judicial review of adjudication. Any person who is aggrieved by a final decision or order issued under any provision of this Article is entitled to judicial review. Proceedings for review may be instituted by filing a petition in the First Judicial District Court of the State of Louisiana, within 30 days after mailing of notice of the final decision by the Department of Operational Services or, if a hearing is requested, within thirty days after the decision thereon.

(10) Section 34-128 shall be amended so as to read as follows:

Sec. 34-128. Appeals.

An applicant aggrieved by the decision of the city engineer may first appeal to the Director of the Department of Operational Services. If the decision rendered by the Director of the Department of Operational Services is unsatisfactory, the applicant may then appeal to the building board of appeals for a final decision.

(11) Section 34-129 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport is hereby deleted.

(12) Section 34-150 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport is hereby amended

so as to read as follows:

Sec. 34-150. Statement of purpose.

It is the purpose of this article to promote the public health, safety and general welfare and to minimize the degradation of the water quality in receiving waters of the city's storm drainage system, Cross Lake, and all tributaries, streams, drains, ditches or watercourses which drain into Cross Lake (collectively referred to in this Article as "tributaries of Cross Lake") caused by discharges of contaminants, by provisions designed:

(1) To control by ordinance the contribution of pollutants to the city's storm drainage system, Cross Lake, and tributaries of Cross Lake by stormwater discharges associated with industrial activity and quality of stormwater discharged from sites of industrial activity;

(2) To control through ordinance the discharge of spills, dumping, or disposal of materials other

than stormwater to the city's storm drainage system, Cross Lake and tributaries of Cross Lake;

(3) To prohibit through ordinance illicit discharges to the city's storm drainage system, Cross Lake and tributaries of Cross Lake;

(4) To establish the authority for the city to carry out inspections, surveillance and monitoring procedures necessary to determine compliance and noncompliance with EPA, state and city regulations concerning stormwater quality and prohibition of pollution and illicit discharges to the city's storm drainage system, Cross Lake and tributaries of Cross Lake;

(5) To establish authority and penalties to insure compliance with the conditions of this article;

(6) To promote public awareness of the hazards involved in the improper disposal of petroleum products, household hazardous waste, industrial waste, sediment from construction sites, pesticides, herbicides, fertilizers, and other contaminants into the city's storm drainage system, Cross Lake and tributaries of Cross Lake;

(7) To encourage recycling of used motor oil and safe disposal of other hazardous consumer products;

(8) To facilitate compliance with state and federal standards and permits by owners and operators of industrial and construction sites within the city and the Cross Lake Watershed, as such is defined in Section 78-341 of this Code of Ordinances.

(9) To enable the city to comply with all federal and state laws and regulations applicable to stormwater discharges.

(13) The definition of "Director of public works" in Section 34-151 shall be replaced with the following:

Director of the Department of Operational Services means the head administrator for the City's Department of Operational Services.

(14) Section 34-152 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

Sec. 34-152. Administration.

Except as otherwise provided herein, the Director of the Department of Operational Services shall administer, implement, and enforce the provisions of this article. Any powers granted to or duties imposed upon the director may be delegated by the director to other city personnel.

(15) Sections 34-164 through 34-167 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport are hereby amended so as to read as follows:

Sec. 34-164. General prohibitions.

No person shall introduce or cause to be introduced into the city's storm drainage system, Cross Lake or any tributary of Cross Lake any discharge that is not composed entirely of stormwater, except for discharges within any of the following classes:

(1) Discharges that are authorized by an NPDES or State DEQ permit other than the NPDES permit for discharges from the city's storm drainage system;

- (2) Discharges resulting from fire fighting;
- (3) Agricultural stormwater runoff; and
- (4) Discharges of flows from water line flushing, landscape irrigation, diverted stream flows, rising ground waters, uncontaminated pumped ground infiltration to the city's storm drainage system, uncontaminated pumped ground water, discharges from potable water sources, foundation drains, air conditioning condensation, irrigation water, springs, water from crawl space pumps, footing drains, lawn watering, individual residential car washing, flows from riparian habitats and wetlands, and street wash water unless any such discharge or flow is determined by the city to be a significant source of pollutants to the city's storm drainage system or waters of the United States.

Sec. 34-165. Specific prohibitions.

No person shall deposit or caused to be deposited by dumping, spilling, leaking, pumping, pouring, emitting, emptying, discharging, leaching, disposing, or otherwise introducing any of the following substances into the city's storm drainage system, Cross Lake or any tributary of Cross Lake:

- (1) Used motor oil or any other petroleum product or waste.
- (2) Any industrial waste.
- (3) Any domestic sewage from a septic tank or any other source.
- (4) Garbage.
- (5) Any untreated washwater from commercial carwash facilities or from any vehicle washing at new or used automobile or truck dealerships or rental agencies, truck stops, fleet maintenance or storage facilities.
- (6) Any external building washdown water containing soap or detergents.
- (7) Any pavement washwater containing soap or detergents or from washdown of any pavement where any spills or leaks of any petroleum, toxic or hazardous substances have occurred, unless all spilled material has been removed prior to washdown.

Sec. 34-166. Sanitary sewer exclusion.

No person shall connect or allowed to be connected any line conveying sanitary sewage, domestic or industrial, or any waste drain to the city's storm drainage system, Cross Lake or any tributary of Cross Lake.

Sec. 34-167. Gas and service station discharge exclusion.

Any discharge into the city's storm drainage system, Cross Lake or any tributary of Cross Lake of oil, motor fuel, solvents, paint, machining part waste, or other automotive fluids or solids from facilities that fuel or maintain motor vehicles or equipment is prohibited. Any pavement washwater from service station facilities must be free of any soap, detergent or solvent; be free of any spilled or leaked oil, motor fuel or other petroleum that could have been removed prior to pavement washdown; and pass through a grease, oil, and sand interceptor before discharge into the city's storm drainage system, Cross Lake or any tributary of Cross Lake.

- (16) Sections 34-180 and 34-181 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport are

hereby amended so as to read as follows:

Sec. 34-180. Release reporting.

(a) In the event of any unlawful spilling, leaking, pumping, pouring, emitting, emptying, discharging, escaping, leaching, dumping, disposing, or other releasing of any substance that may flow, leach, enter, or otherwise be introduced into the city's storm drainage system, Cross Lake or any tributary of Cross Lake, the following procedure must be followed:

(1) Immediate notification shall be provided to the fire department and hazardous material response teams as required.

(2) Notification shall be provided to appropriate state and federal agencies as required by their laws and regulations.

(3) The person in charge of the facility, vehicle, or other source of the release or his designated representative shall immediately telephone and notify the Director of the Department of Operational Services or his authorized representative of the incident. This notification shall include the location of the release, type of the release, type of substance, concentration, and volume if known and corrective actions taken by the responsible party.

(4) The person in charge of the facility, vehicle or other source of the release must submit a detailed written report within five days following the release unless waived by the Director of the Department of Operational Services. The report must include the type and estimate of the amount of material released, the date and time that such release occurred, the circumstances leading to the release, causes of the release, the remedial action taken to clean up the release, and the measures to be taken by the responsible party to prevent similar future occurrences. Such notification shall not relieve the responsible party of any expense, loss, damage, or other liability which may be incurred as a result of the release, including any liability for damage to natural resources, to the city, or to any other person or property; nor shall such notification relieve the responsible party of any fines, penalties, or other liability which may be imposed pursuant to this article or to state or federal law.

(b) Failure to notify the Director of the Department of Operational Services of the above defined releases shall be deemed a violation of this article.

Sec. 34-181. Illegal release clean-up responsibility.

In the event that an unlawful release is discharged to the city's storm drainage system or any waters of the United States, the party responsible for the release shall be required to take remedial action to clean-up the release and bear the costs to rectify or repair any damage made to any other person or property injured or damaged by the release. This cost includes any cost to the city incurred in assisting in clean-up of the release.

(17) Section 34-192 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport is hereby amended

so as to read as follows:

Sec. 34-192. False complaints.

It is prohibited for a person, agency or organization to make a knowingly false report or complaint to the city concerning a release of polluting substance to the city's storm drainage system, Cross Lake or any tributary of Cross Lake for the stated purpose of causing harm to or to falsely implicate the supposed discharger.

(18) Sections 34-204 through 34-207 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport

are hereby amended so as to read as follows:

Sec. 34-204. Industrial facilities requiring compliance.

The following categories of industrial facilities are required to meet the requirements of this article:

- (1) Municipal and private landfills,
- (2) RCRA TSD facilities,
- (3) SARA Title III facilities,
- (4) Industrial facilities required by federal or state regulation to apply for a stormwater NPDES permit,
- (5) Any other industrial facility that the city determines to be contributing a substantial pollution loading to the city's storm drainage system, Cross Lake or any tributary of Cross Lake.

Sec. 34-205. Permit submission requirements.

All industrial facilities that discharge into the city's storm drainage system, or waters of the United States within the city boundaries, Cross Lake or any tributary of Cross Lake, are required by this article to meet all federal and state requirements for submission of permit applications and supporting documentation. One copy of the current permit application or the notice of intent to comply with the appropriate federal or state general permit for that industry must be submitted to the Director of the Department of Operational Services or his authorized representative within two weeks of the submission to the federal or state agency. A copy of the notice of termination must also be submitted to the Director of the Department of Operational Services or his authorized representative upon termination of the permit within two weeks after the submission to the federal or state agency.

Sec. 34-206. Requirements for the stormwater pollution prevention plan.

Industries required to prepare stormwater pollution prevention plans (SWPPP) must comply with the following requirements:

- (1) Prepare SWPPP in compliance with federal and state regulations and provide to the Director of the Department of Operational Services or his authorized representative a synopsis of the SWPPP along with a certification by a registered professional engineer that the SWPPP complies with federal and state regulations and sound engineering practices. No review or approval is required by the city.

(2) A synopsis of modifications to the SWPPP must be submitted to the city and certified as described in subsection (1), above.

(3) Owners and operators must comply with the provisions of their SWPPP. Continuous violation of the SWPPP can be punished by the penalties stated in division 7.

(4) A copy of the SWPPP must be retained at the facility and be available for inspection by the Director of the Department of Operational Services or his authorized representative.

(5) The owner and operator of the facility is required to periodically review his SWPPP and modify ineffective parts of the SWPPP as required in the general permit.

Sec. 34-207. Discharge monitoring reporting.

The city may require that the following information be submitted by the discharger to the Director of the Department of Operational Services or his authorized representative upon written request:

(1) Certification of testing or evaluation for the presence of non-stormwater discharges in accordance with the federal or state general permit for industrial stormwater discharges.

(2) Submission of the annual comprehensive site compliance evaluation report required by the federal or state general permit.

(3) Submission of discharge monitoring reports (DMR) and/or results of water quality monitoring tests for facilities required to conduct monitoring of stormwater discharges by Part VI.B.3. of the federal or state general permit.

(19) Sections 34-218 through 34-219 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport

are hereby amended so as to read as follows:

Sec. 34-218. Right of entry, inspection, and sampling at industrial facilities.

The Director of the Department of Operational Services or his authorized representative shall have the right to enter the premises of any person or facility discharging stormwater to the city's storm drainage system, Cross Lake or any tributary of Cross Lake, or waters of the United States within city jurisdiction to determine if the discharger is complying with all requirements of this article, and with any state or federal discharge permit. Dischargers shall allow the Director of the Department of Operational Services or his representative ready access to all parts of the premises for the purposes of inspection, sampling, records examination and copying and any other necessary duty. In addition, the city has the authority to:

(1) Require that when a discharger has security measures in force which require proper identification and clearance before entry into its premises, the discharger shall make the necessary arrangements with its security guards so that upon presentation of suitable identification, the Director of the Department of Operational Services or his representative will be permitted to enter without delay for the purposes of performing specific responsibilities.

(2) To install up on the discharger's property, or require installation of such devices as are necessary to conduct sampling and/or metering of the discharger's operations.

(3) To require the discharger to install monitoring equipment as necessary. The facility's

sampling and monitoring equipment shall be maintained at all times in a safe and proper operating condition by the discharger at its own expense. All devices used to measure stormwater flow and quality shall be calibrated to ensure their accuracy.

(4) Require that any temporary or permanent obstruction to safe and easy access to the facility to be inspected and/or sampled shall be promptly removed by the discharger at the written or verbal request of the Director of the Department of Operational Services and shall not be replaced. The costs of clearing such access shall be borne by the discharger.

(5) Consider any unreasonable delays in allowing the Director of the Department of Operational Services or his representatives access to the discharger's premises as a violation of this article.

Sec. 34-219. Search warrants.

If the Director of the Department of Operational Services or his representative has been refused access to any part of the premises from which stormwater is discharged, and he/she is able to demonstrate probable cause to believe that there may be a violation of this article, or that there is a need to inspect and/or sample as part of a routine inspection and sampling program of the city designed to verify compliance with this article or any order issued hereunder, or to protect the overall public health, safety, and welfare of the community, the Director of the Department of Operational Services may seek issuance of a search warrant from any court of competent jurisdiction.

(20) Sections 34-230 and 34-231 and Division 8 of Chapter 34 of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport are hereby deleted. Division 7 is hereby amended so as to read as follows:

DIVISION 7.
PENALTIES.

Sec. 34-242. Notice to cease violation.

Any person found to be violating any provisions of divisions 1 through 6 of this article may be served by the city with written notice stating the nature of the violations and providing a reasonable time limit for the satisfactory correction thereof. The offender shall, within the period of time stated in such notice, permanently cease all violations.

Sec. 34-243. Enforcement.

(1) Administrative Fines and Remedies. In the event of a violation of this article or a notice to cease violation, the City, through the Director of the Department of Operational Services or his designee, may issue an administrative fine to the violating party in an amount not to exceed \$500 per day per violation, and/or may terminate the violating party's water service. Every day any such violation continues shall constitute a separate violation for purposes of this paragraph. Unpaid fines shall, after 30 calendar days, be assessed an additional penalty of one percent of the unpaid balance, and interest shall accrue thereafter at a rate of 12 percent per year. A lien against the violating party's property will be sought for unpaid fines.

A party which has been fined may contest the fine by written request for a hearing, filed with the Director of the Department of Operational Services or his designee within 15 days of receipt of the

fine.

(2) Judicial Remedies.

(a) The City may also avail itself of judicial enforcement remedies in the event of a violation of the any provision this article or a notice to cease violation, including injunctive relief, civil penalties of up to \$500 per day per violation, and/or any other action as is appropriate for legal and/or equitable relief. Each day any such violation continues shall constitute a separate violation for purposes of this paragraph.

(b) Any person who violates a provision of this article or who fails to comply with a notice to cease violation shall be guilty of a misdemeanor and, upon conviction, shall be punished by a fine in an amount not to exceed \$500 per day per violation or by imprisonment for not more than 60 days or both. Each day any such violation continues shall constitute a separate violation for purposes of this paragraph.

(c) In addition to any fines or penalties which may levied in judicial proceedings, a person who violates a provision of this article or a notice to cease violation shall be liable for attorney fees and court costs associated with such proceedings.

(3) Liability for Damages. In addition to the remedies cited above, a person who violates a provision of this article or who fails to comply with a notice to cease violation shall be liable to the city for all damages and costs incurred as a result of any such violation.

(4) Remedies Nonexclusive. The remedies provided for in this article are not exclusive, and the city may take any, all, or any combination of these actions against a noncompliant party.

(5) Judicial review of adjudication. Any person who is aggrieved by a final decision or order issued under any provision of this Article is entitled to judicial review. Proceedings for review may be instituted by filing a petition in the First Judicial District Court of the State of Louisiana, within 30 days after mailing of notice of the final decision by the Department of Operational Services or, if a hearing is requested, within thirty days after the decision thereon.

(21) Section 78-344(i) of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport is hereby

amended so as to read as follows:

(i) Stormwater. The provisions of Sections 34-150 through 34-243 shall be applicable within the Watershed.

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. 75 OF 2003
AN ORDINANCE TO AMEND SECTION 46-32(A) OF THE CITY OF SHREVEPORT
CODE OF ORDINANCES RELATIVE TO MEDICAL SERVICES AND TO
OTHERWISE PROVIDE WITH RESPECT THERETO

BE IT ORDAINED by the City Council of the City of Shreveport, in due, legal and regular session convened that Section 46-32(a) of the Code of Ordinances of the City of Shreveport is hereby amended to read as follows:

Section 46-32. Fees ; membership program.

(a) A fee schedule for emergency ambulance and medical services shall be adopted by the city council by resolution. Any future amendments thereto shall also be adopted by resolution. Such fees shall be collected by the department of finance.

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.

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.)

Councilman Walford: We have not set another hearing date. Mr. Thompson, have we received the brief from the second attorney?

Mr. Thompson: We have not. I will contact him the first thing tomorrow morning and try to see if we can get this on the agenda for the next Council meeting.

4. 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)

Motion by Councilman Lester to remove Resolution 203 2002 from the Table and from the Agenda, seconded by Councilman Green.

Councilman Walford: Ms. Glass can we do that in one motion, both remove it from the table and remove it from the agenda?

Councilman Jackson: Point of Order. I think we need to vote in order. I think Councilman Lester's request is well taken, but I think that is No. 2 on the agenda rather than No. 1.

Councilman Walford: I don't believe that we can act on Item 1.

Councilman Jackson: We didn't say anything about it, we just skipped it.

Councilman Walford: Would you like to withdraw that motion?

Councilman Jackson: I will. (Council addressed Item 1.)

Motion by Councilman Lester to remove Resolution 203 of 2002 from the Table and from the Agenda, seconded by Councilman Gibson. Motion passed by the following vote: Ayes: Councilman Lester, Walford, Hogan, Gibson, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

2. 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)
4. Resolution No. 85 of 2003: Urging and authorizing the Mayor to execute an agreement with R. M. McCarthy and Associates to conduct a review of the Shreveport Police Department Shooting Incident of March 15, 2003 and to provide other services all substantially in accordance with the Proposal dated May 21, 2003. (C/Carmody) (*Tabled on June 10*)

NEW BUSINESS:

1. ABO Card appeal: Demarcus Bedford. [El Chico's (D/Gibson) - Postponed until July 7]
2. BAC-37-03, *Frank Jackson*, 1616 Hollywood: Special Exception Use in a B-2 District - Restaurant with on-premise consumption of low alcoholic content beverages. (B/Walford)

Councilman Green: Mr. Chairman, Items 2 and 3, they are in your district. Of course some people have called me about it. If it is okay with you I would like to make a motion to postpone those items.

Motion by Councilman Green to postpone the application until the July 8, 2003 meeting, seconded by Councilman Walford. Motion approved by the following vote: Councilman Lester, Walford, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

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

Motion by Councilman Green to postpone the application until the July 8, 2003 meeting, seconded by Councilman Walford. Motion approved by the following vote: Councilman Lester, Walford, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

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

Councilman Green: Since Mr. Carmody is not here, I would like to move for postponement.

Councilman Walford: And that was a request made by Mr. Carmody, of this Council.

Motion by Councilman Green to postpone the application until the July 8, 2003 meeting, seconded by Councilman Gibson. Motion approved by the following vote: Councilman Lester, Walford, Gibson, Hogan, Green and Jackson. 6. Nays: None. Absent: Councilman Carmody. 1.

REPORTS FROM OFFICERS, BOARDS, AND COMMITTEES. None.

CLERK'S REPORT:

Letters of Appeal (*cases not to be considered before July 8, 2003*):

1. C-13-03, *Shreveport Christian Church*, 905 Francais Dr., MPC approval in a B-1 District, school. (E/Hogan)
2. BAC-53-03, *Wyvornia Decarol Nunley*, 4103 Santa Monica Circle, Special Exception Use in an R-1D District, expanded home occupation (bridal consultant). (G/Jackson)

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 7:50 p.m.

/s/ Monty Walford, Chairman

/s/ Arthur G. Thompson, Clerk of Council